

lopments which bear on this provision of the Bill, with the developments in Gujarat. We are very concerned and exercised over it. As you know, Sir, the Chief Minister is on hunger strike. We know others are also on hunger strike. We should like to know how the people are reacting; then only would it be possible for us to give an objective judgment on this matter as to whether the bilingual proposal is right or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no doubt.....

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: But why is the hon. Minister sitting silent?

MR. CHAIRMAN: .....that everybody in this House is watching the developments in the matter; as also the Minister, I have no doubt about it. Why do you think that the Minister is unmindful of what is happening?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, when a thing happens, everybody watches; you too: I too and the Minister also does it. But I would like to know from the Government as to how they are reacting to such developments. We cannot know their mind until they open their mouths.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Like the great Manthara of Ramayana, my friends are more anxious.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: It applies to his side.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why has he become a *mauni*, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Mr. Narayanan Nair.

# THE STATES REORGANISATION BILL, 1956—continued

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR (Madras): Sir, we are trying to....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has taken three minutes already.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR:.....discuss this Bill here without passion in a very calm atmosphere but things are happening outside, things having an intimate bearing on the subject-matter of our discussion. People

outside feel, people in Gujarat feel, that they must assert themselves. Of course, our leaders are wise; they have the interests of the people at heart; they have reason, they have logic; they have statistics to support their case but history has often proved that the people are wiser still.

12 NOON

History has often proved that the vague aspirations of the people, vaguely expressed apprehensions of the people, still more the vague hopes and aspirations, are better statistics than the statistics culled from budget memoranda and from the reports of experts. Now, I am not referring to the past revolutions, the great human upsurges which have turned the course of history. For the time being I have in mind what is happening in our country. What has happened in our country just a few months ago? Leaders of the Congress thought, the Chief Minister of Bengal and the Chief Minister of Bihar thought that a bilingual province was good for Bengal and Bihar. Then the legislatures ratified the thing, approved of the thing. And then our own Prime Minister blessed that proposal, but you know the people of Calcutta, the people of Bengal thought otherwise. They never wanted that. And the leaders of the Congress rose in stature because they paid heed of the wishes of the people, to the will of the people. Now, the strangest thing is that the lesson they could have learnt from their experience in Bengal seems to have been lost on them. They put the people of Bengal on trial. They got it back. Now they are putting the people of Gujarat on trial and they are getting it back. Now, what is it we have read in today's papers? Shri Morarji Desai, whose writ has run unquestioned in Gujarat for decades could not get a few people in the City of Ahmedabad to hear him on this question of bilingual State. It is a strange thing. I think it is a historic thing. It is a significant thing and I think it must make the Congress leaders sit back and review the whole position. Not only Shri Morarji Desai in his own State, in the city of Ahmedabad, but Shri A. K. Gopalan, who is the leader of the major opposition party in his Parliament, is on hunger strike. He has been refused a curfew pass. He, the leader of the Communist Party, went to that area. He went up to the people and he went about exhorting the people to be firm

[Shri Perath Narayanan Nair.]

but to be peaceful. But then he was refused a curfew pass and he has been obliged to go on hunger strike. Shri Morarji Desai is on hunger strike because he could not get a few people in Ahmedabad to hear him. And Shri A. K. Gopalan is on hunger strike because he was refused the opportunity to meet the people to speak to the people who flocked to him in thousands. That is a significant thing. I am not mentioning these things just to score some debating points. Strange things are happening and the lessons must not be lost on the leaders of the administration in this country. It is time they sat up. Now, Shri Morarji Desai has been trying to be quite persuasive. He has been trying to convince the people of Gujarat that Maha Gujarat if formed will be a deficit province, deficit to the extent of Rs. 2 crores. Shri Morarji is quite sound in his statistics. I do not dispute that. He has been trying to persuade the people of Maharashtra that Samyukta Maharashtra if formed will be deficit to the extent of about Rs. 6 crores. But then something is lacking in Shri Morarji's statistics. If the creative energies of the two crores of Gujaratis is properly roused, if it is effectively canalised, the creative energies of the two crores of people will more than make up for the deficit. The creative energies of three crores of Maharashtrians, if they are properly roused and effectively canalised will more than make up for the deficit. That factor Shri Morarji neglects. And when you do not take into account these human factors, you do not take into consideration the people of the country. And then you are getting it back. Now, Shri Morarji Desai has been saying rather in pontifical seriousness, what will the opposition parties do if they are confronted with the same situation. Sir, to me the answer is simple. The opposition parties will hit back. will take counsel with the people, will review the decision and will rectify the mistake. This is what the opposition parties will do. I do not think in such circumstances they will stand on prestige. Let us not stand on prestige. It is not a small thing. It is not an inch of territory. When the deepest emotions of the people are roused, when the most primary urges are touched, naturally you have to reckon with that and I have been obliged to refer to these things because the upsurge of the people of Gujarat has been foremost

in the people's minds and we must take into account these things.

Now, I was referring on Friday last to the equally important issue of Kerala, equally important from a different angle. Now, under the provisions of this Bill the State of Kerala of all the States in India alone is denied the right and the benefits of democratic rule. Now, I say.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not under the States Reorganisation. Democratic rule in Kerala has nothing to do with this Bill.

SHRI PERATH NARAYAN NAIR: I was trying to make out as objectively as I could that the political situation now in Kerala is not the situation which existed in March last, when the then Chief Minister found it necessary to resign. Then, may be I agree for argument's sake that the Rajpramukh could not be persuaded about the prospects of a stable ministry, a stable alternative ministry to form the Government. I do not want to rake up those controversies. I accept that position. My point today is that an entirely new political situation is emerging in Kerala in the wake of this new set-up. What was the position in March last? The Congress party which was functioning rather precariously with about 58 members in a House....

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have nothing to do with the set-up in Kerala today.

SHRI PERATH NARAYAN NAIR: Now, Mr. Chairman, I may be permitted to point out that under clause 5 we are getting a new State and provisions are made in this Bill about the representation in Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Quite true.

SHRI PERATH NARAYAN NAIR: Now, I am also moving certain amendments to certain clauses in this Bill to see that under the provisions of the Bill, within the framework of the Constitution, it will be possible for us to get this self-rule back. So, I am just trying to maintain that a new situation has arisen. The constitutional device which was tried in March last does not hold the field now. There are other possibilities which in its collective wisdom this Parliament can adopt. My only point was that in this new political situation which is emerging there a new political approach is necessary to solve this problem. After all it is an important

thing for us, because of all the other States we have been cherishing this Kerala State; when we actually get it, if we the people of Kerala are denied the opportunity to make the best of that State, well, it is something and I think I must get an opportunity to say something about that. Now, the political situation has changed. There has been depletion in the Congress strength. There has been a measurable depletion in Congress strength. I can quote the figures if only the Chairman would permit me. And my other point is that there is a measurable accretion to non-Congress strength. My contention today is that there are possibilities of a stable alternate Ministry in the new set-up there which were not there previously. Of course I am moving certain amendments. I would go into the figures later. My only point is that it is politically necessary, it is politically desirable, that there should be such a Ministry. I will give the figures on a later occasion. Of course there is accretion in non-Congress strength, but will the leftist parties unite? That is the pertinent question. My reply is that there is every possibility of these parties uniting to form a stable Ministry, and I am not without hopes in this regard. If my suggestion, which I maintain, is incorporated within the provisions of this Bill and within the Articles of the Constitution, if my submission for the creation of a new interim assembly for the new State of Kerala is accepted, I say that in an interim Assembly of 137, we the leftists will have a majority of 70, and the leftists are the Praja Socialist Party, the Revolutionary Socialist Party and the Communist Party. Early this month the Executive of the Praja Socialist Party in Malabar and the Executive of the Praja Socialist Party in Travancore declared their willingness, their readiness, to try to form an alternate Ministry there, and the Revolutionary Socialist Party has declared its readiness to explore the possibility of this thing. In the new set-up Malabar is being tagged on to Travancore-Cochin and Malabar goes there with a particular experience. What is the political background of Malabar for the last two or three years? Within their limited sphere, with their limited powers—of course it was a District Board there—these leftist parties united and ruled it for the last three years. They have got the experience, they have proved to the people that they can form an alternate administration, alternate Government to the Government which has been functioning

all along under the auspices of the Congress. So, we go there with this experience. All these stabilising factors are there, and in a House of 137 there is more than a majority of 70. Now I want the Home Minister and the Government of India to take into consideration these facts, because conditions have changed, because an entirely new political situation obtains there now. They can explore this possibility. The question is asked "After all it is only a question of four or five months, you are getting elections soon, so why worry?" That is exactly the reason why we are most insistent on that point because anybody who knows about the politics in Kerala will say that the bane of our politics has been this reactionary attitude, this influence of the landlords, of the Palace, of the great feudal chieftains, of the communal organisations, of the Muslim League, of the Catholic Church, of the Nair Service Society. According to our party, the greatest democratic task which you have to do in Kerala today is to fight these reactionary influences, and however efficient and able an official Adviser may be, the fight can be fought only in the political plane, it can be fought only by the people of the State, and we want the political parties in Kerala to be given this opportunity. These three or four months immediately preceding the General Elections are the most critical and the most effective months for this purpose. So, in the interests of a steady and healthy development of democracy I plead that this opportunity be given to them.

Now, there are some well-meaning friends who say that of course it is politically necessary and desirable, that it is practically possible also, but then the Constitution stands in the way. Sir, I am not a constitutional pandit, but I know that if the President of the Indian Republic can issue a proclamation he can revoke it also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we are discussing something which is utterly irrelevant to the present Bill. You are talking about the suspension of the President's rule and the setting up of a democratic constitution. We have nothing to do with this in the States Reorganisation Bill. I think you should leave that point and go to another.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: May I point out...

MR. CHAIRMAN You have pointed out at length and I have been following

to find out whether you are ever going to refer to the Bill before us. You are merely saying "Give us a chance of building up a democratic Assembly". It has nothing to do with the States Reorganisation question. I would like you to proceed to some relevant point.

**SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR:** I am permitted to move an amendment. . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** That is all right. We will see whether it is permitted later on. You talk something else now.

**SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR:** Now under article 4 of the Constitution. . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** we are discussing the Bill. We are not discussing Article 4 of the Constitution.

**SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR:** May I submit that this Bill. . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I do not think it can come up here at all. I have been trying to follow you at great length. You are just discussing that you will get 79 and 84 out of 137, etc. It has nothing to do with the reorganisation of the States.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal):** Can we not make a suggestion that between the time the States Reorganisation Bill comes into operation and the General Elections—there is a gap, there is a void, and there will be no formal functioning of the Constitution—whether it would not be possible for the Government to adopt a provision so that in this interim period some democratic set-up. . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** You may have an independent resolution and discuss it on merits but not under this Bill.

**SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR:** I abide by your ruling, Sir. I will do it. Now, on this question of Kerala I want to bring to the attention of the House another factor—I refer to the Laccadive and Minicoy Islands and the Amindivi Islands. Under clause 6 of the Bill they are constituted into a Part C State. I think that is the only part of India which under the Bill does not get any representation in Parliament. The people there are very backward, they are classified under the Tribal Act and, Sir, the regulation of 1912 applies to them. Even today, as at present, the people of these hundreds of islands scattered over a large portion of the Arabian Sea have been enjoying franchise in the Chhevayur constituency in

the Madras Assembly and the Calicut constituency in Parliament. All of a sudden they have been removed from the purview of representative Government. I am told that there was some proposal to constitute a certain Advisory Committee, or so. I would like to know from the hon. the Home Minister if they will be given any representation in any Legislature or in Parliament. After all they are also Indian citizens and they deserve some sort of representation. Going through the Bill I do not find any provision made there for this.

Now, Sir, when we are on this subject, I might point out that the other day an hon. Member made one suggestion that we must have a code of ethics or a code of conduct for all the different political parties. Well, I welcome that suggestion, but I only suggest that in that code of ethics there must be some proper relationship established between precept and practice. Sir, we talk of democracy for the whole of India. But somehow or other I feel that whenever there is any opportunity for the Opposition parties to rule over a particular portion of the country through so many devices, constitutional and political, that opportunity is denied to them. And that thing, Sir, according to me, offends against democracy. Therefore I would suggest that when we have that code of ethics, different concepts of democracy must not apply to different political parties.

Then, Sir, I was surprised to hear the other day—I think it was Shri Parikh who said that—that outsiders were going to Gujarat and other places and were creating trouble there. He was referring to the incidents in Ahmedabad. Obviously, this reference cannot be to the members of the Gujarat Chamber of Commerce or to the members of the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation, or even to the members of the Ahmedabad Congress Committee. This reference can only be, I think, to Shri A. K. Gopalan who has gone there. Sir, Shri Parikh and his friends may not, of course, like Shri A. K. Gopalan's politics. They may even dislike him personally. But after all, Sir, in this Parliament, which is claimed to be supreme, he happens to hold the position of the Leader of the chief Opposition Party. Shri Parikh has been talking to us about common citizenship for India and about unity of India. In this context, Sir, I cannot understand how Shri A. K. Gopalan is an outsider. Is that the conception of common citizenship which is animating

our friends over there? I fail to understand that. Sir, up to this moment, it has never struck us to say that Shri Dhebar belonging to Saurashtra is an outsider in Kerala. We say that he is the Congress President and we accept him as being the leader of the Congress Party. So, Sir, if that is the meaning of common citizenship according to some responsible members of the Congress Party like Shri Parikh, then I think it is high time that they should revise their views about it. Sir, we have been told that people have been behaving in a disorderly way and people are doing this thing and that thing, and the Communists are inciting people to violence. We have also been told that the working class people there in Ahmedabad have been taking their lessons in non-violence, and they have learnt the lesson of non-violence very well. But again this message of non-violence comes to us in a different form, in the form of orders to shoot at sight and kill people. There have been such orders in Bombay, Ahmedabad, Kharagpur, Kalka, Patna etc., Mr. Chairman, Sir, when this is the sort of thing which is going on and when this trading in non-violence is going on, some home truth, I think, must be told so that the Government may be able to consider all these things in a proper way. I know that there are very good provisions in this Bill. The Nizam will no longer be there; the Hyderabad State is being disintegrated; the Rajpramukhs will not be there, and out of the 13 new States, eleven will be based on language considerations. These are very great things no doubt. We only say that you have not been fair to the people of Gujarat, and you have not been fair to the people of Kerala. In regard to the boundaries also, let us lay down certain broad principles on the basis of which this problem might be solved satisfactorily. And let us give certain guarantees to the linguistic minorities and to the services. If that can be done, then we also will be convinced that this Bill, in India's onward march along the path of democracy, will definitely be a milestone. That is all that I have got to say.

**SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR (Bombay):** Mr. Chairman, I have great pleasure in supporting the motion for consideration of the States Reorganisation Bill that is being discussed in this House for the last two days. I am not very keen to deal with the provisions made in

the Bill with regard to other States. I would, therefore, restrict my remarks to Bombay State alone.

Sir, I was a Member of the Select Committee, and let me say that certain provisions made in the Bill in the Select Committee were such as would not have allowed me to vote in favour of the Bill. At the most, I would have remained neutral. But that difficulty is now removed, and I do not hesitate to vote wholeheartedly for the Bill.

Sir, during the course of the last ten or eleven months many things have happened. Events in history leave a trail of memories both bitter and sweet for us to ponder over. It will take probably a number of days or a number of months to interpret the events, to understand them, and to appreciate them, as also to mould our political life. But we will have to take lessons from history. History is a teacher, and we know from our experience during the last ten or eleven months that there are many things that have to be learnt from History. I would personally like to take lessons from the events that have happened during the last ten or eleven months, or since October, 1955. The first lesson to be learnt is to keep oneself away from the appointment of commissions or committees over vital issues like these. We had the Dhar Commission; we had the J. V. P. Committee, and we had the States Reorganisation Commission. All these committees and commissions have abundantly proved that they are incapable of solving the vital problems affecting the lives of millions of people in India. Therefore I would like to suggest to the Government not to make experiments on matters which are of vital importance to the country. The second thing that I would like to suggest is that if at all you are going to appoint such commissions, then better be careful about the personnel. I have nothing to say against the members of the Commission, but all the same, I would suggest, as I suggested last time, that the persons concerned ought to be in touch with the lives of the people and should not only be academicians or men reputed to be impartial. So, persons who are in vital relationship with the people would be better judges to come to decisions in matters like these. That is another lesson which I have learnt from the tragic events of the last year.

Then, Sir, there is one more lesson which I have learnt, which is this: Independence has taught us no tolerance. We

[Shri T. R. Deogirikar.] have become independent, but we have not learnt as yet how to tolerate differences in views. Sir, we have got to learn many things still. One more thing which history has taught us is that we have not gone beyond the elementary stage of democracy. India does not know even the elements of democracy, and we will have to revise the whole outlook of our life and adjust it to the democratic conditions that we are trying to create in this country.

The third thing I have learnt is that human nature is everywhere the same cussed. You go to East, you go to West, you go to North and you go to South. It is no use saying that only people in one particular region are intolerant, or that persons in one particular region are lacking in nationalism. That charge should not be attributed to any person in India. After all, we belong to the same soil. There may be differences here and there but ultimately I rely more on human nature and I say that so far as India is concerned, human nature everywhere is the same. That is another lesson which I have learnt in this struggle.

I have also learnt that Independence has not made us strong. Though I cannot say that it has made us weak, yet certainly we have not become stronger. After analysing or scanning the psychological aspect of life, I think that those who want to carry on in politics must learn psychology. Those who do not understand psychology don't deserve to be leaders of people. Politics alone will never lead you to successful aims or successful objectives. You must understand the psychology of the people. On the other hand, the psychologists must learn politics. Unless both combine, it will not be possible for a country like India to progress successfully. I have seen for the last 10 or 11 months that politicians are not looking to psychology at all. If we do a certain thing, they say 'You are sentimental, you are parochial, you are regional, you are this and that'. They are perfectly right in criticising a certain section of the people but after all there are human sentiments, there are human aspirations which cannot be brushed aside with the stroke of a pen. Therefore, with all humility I would request the Government not to divorce psychology from politics. If you do, you will do it at the cost of—what should I say, not at the cost of your life but at the cost of people's lives. Therefore such experiments should not be repeated in this country.

Another thing which I have learnt is that we have given too much freedom to the press and to the platform. We are doing that experiment. I think no country in the world enjoys so much freedom of the press and so much freedom of speech as we, Indians, do, and can we say with pride that we have utilized this freedom both of the platform and of the press responsibly and well. I think at no time in the history of India such rabid literature was written as was written during the course of the last 10 or 11 months. I can also say that at no time in the history of India such rabid speeches were made as were made during the last 10 or 11 months and thirdly. I should say that at no time in the history of India there was so much less protection to Congressmen as was there during that period. I think you will not be able to appreciate through what tortures we have gone during the past 10 or 11 months. Our lives were in danger, I don't attribute it to any Party, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta may kindly take it from me. I am scanning human nature and in scanning human nature, I came to the conclusion that we have given away freedom of the press and freedom of speech to others and kept nothing to ourselves. We have nothing left to ourselves. Look at the things that are happening.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Something is left. . . .

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Only life is left and that is being staked by Mr. Morarji Desai. We have staked every thing and allowed the world to praise us for being *ultra*-democratic and all those things, but I would request the Government—I will not say 'to restrict the freedom of expression or freedom of speech' but at least—to give protection to us if it can. Otherwise, see what is happening there. A poor man, the secretary of the Congress Committee, the day before yesterday in Maharashtra, was stoned and he died immediately after two hours. So, such things should not be repeated. I don't attribute it to any Party at all because I have not full information but the freedom of the press and freedom of speech must be seriously thought about and this is the lesson which the States Reorganisation Commission has taught us.

Now another suggestion that I would like to make to the Government is this

Now riots are becoming frequent and I am told that in foreign countries the method of dealing with them is quite different to that of ours. We are sending a good many delegations to many countries. Why not send some delegation to study how the riot situation is met in other countries and what are the modern methods to deal with it? (*Interruptions by Shri Bhupesh Gupta*) What is it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing. He is just doing it out of force of habit.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: You would like to be a delegate—to add to the troubles?

(*Interruptions.*)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If you will allow me.....

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: These are the various lessons which I have tried to learn from the events of the last 10 or 11 months. Let the Government think over it, let the people think over it and let us evolve a life wherein everybody's future will be well-directed and well shaped. With that object in view, I have made this suggestion.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Now coming to the main question, when the States Reorganisation Commission published its report, Maharashtra totally rejected it because we were not for bilingualism and so many other things. I don't want to repeat all the arguments now but Maharashtra was emphatically against the recommendations of a bilingual State which was later on called a 'Balanced State'. So we did not like a 'Balanced State'. We rejected it and I must thank the Congress Subcommittee and the Government for not forcing those recommendations on us. Various alternatives were tried. Some were accepted—not by us—but by the other side, and some were rejected by them. So when this balanced bilingualism was given up by Maharashtra, we said, let there be full bilingualism or a bigger bilingual State and I must thank the High Command for persuading my friends in Vidarbha and Nagpur to come and join the Marathi-speaking area. As soon as we passed this Resolution, there was reaction both in Gujarat and in the B.P.C.C. and even the

High Command did not look with favour on that Resolution. That Resolution said that if, after five years Gujarat wanted to opt out, they would be permitted to do so. I am not going to say that the present solution has come directly from the Resolution of the M.P.C.C. Our Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee Resolution said, let there be a bigger bilingual State and if, at the end of 5 years, Gujarat wants to opt out, it should be permitted to do so. We were charged with many things. I don't want to repeat those charges now because it has become a matter of the past and sad things are happening in Gujarat and I don't want to embitter them. I only want to say that this Resolution which we passed was not out of any bad intention or bad motive. We wanted to assure our Gujarati friends that if we cannot pull on together, say for five years, then they can go out. But this provision in our Resolution was not liked by the Gujarat Congress Committee and, as it was said then, it was to be a marriage for good and it was not to be a marriage for some time. So they wanted this union to be permanent and as we did not say that in our resolution, they did not accept it. Personally, I believe that in keeping that time-limit, we were honest. We did not want to force anything on any unit against their free will. We felt that if they wanted to separate, there should be a provision for that separation. With that object in view, we had passed our resolution. But our resolution did not find favour with them. Afterwards it so happened that members of my Pradesh Congress Committee also said that since Gujarat and Bombay have not accepted this bilingual resolution since the High Command is not looking with favour on that resolution, why should we force them to accept it? Therefore, that chapter was temporarily closed. I do not, therefore, take credit by saying that what is proposed to be adopted by Parliament has come from the Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee, though the germ of that solution is to be found in the resolution of the M.P.C.C.

I was told, curiously enough, that this idea of a bigger bilingual State was conceived by the late Sardar Patel long ago. So, at least let Gujarat not charge us with forcing something upon them. If at all this idea has come, it has come from Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. I do not

[Shri T. R. Deogirikar.]

know the details, but I know that there was a great storm in Bombay State when this idea was mooted. It was left there and no further progress was made.

So after this, the chapter on bilingual State was finished. Then came the three State formula and then came the Central administration and so on and so forth. Maharashtra wanted that they should have one unilingual State and nobody was prepared to grant that. People began to say that we were speaking with many mouths. The Pradesh Congress Committee was the target not only of our neighbouring Pradesh Congress Committee was the target not only of word of sympathy for us. They thought that we were demanding something which was horrible, which was unthought of. That was the criticism levelled against us and this has pained me most. Not only that, but sometimes it so happened that people said that we were stooges in the hands of the Government and the Sub-Committee said openly that Maharashtra leaders were vacillating every now and then. You can imagine, therefore, the ordeals we were passing through. There was no protection for us. The non-Congress parties were bent upon finishing the Congress. The ordinary people were accusing us of playing into the hands of the Government and the Government was saying that we were vacillating. This was the most unimaginable condition through which we passed. And one of the reasons why we accepted this bilingual State is to put an end to all these tortures once and for all. I am now explaining why we have come to that conclusion and just to give an idea through what stages we passed, I just make mention of this.

As regards this unilingual and bilingual affair, let me tell you, I have not yet understood why unilingual States are not good. I said once that now that we have become independent and we want to establish a secular State in India, we have to give up so many things. Can anybody tell me how the various regions in India can be made cohesive, can be united and can be well-knit? I think language is one of the greatest forces to bring men together. So unless I am convinced that language is a hindrance in the way of bringing several people together, to make a united life. I will not give up my faith in unilingual States. If at all a mistake was committed,

it was not committed by us, but it was committed by Government when Andhra State was granted. If Andhra State had not been granted, we poor people would have said, "No, we are not keen upon this unilingual State." But you have raised hope in our minds that unilingual States are going to come to into existence and we pursued that matter. But if you now go on saying, linguism is not good, then of course, I cannot be converted to that view all of a sudden. That much I can say.

Another thing is all around me I am seeing unilingual States. Then why make an exception of Maharashtra and Gujarat?

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): There is Punjab too.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Punjab is not like that. But in the case of Gujarat and Maharashtra you are making an exception. Some people are now raising us to the sky saying that Gujarat and Maharashtra are the proper regions where this experiment can be tried. I am thankful to them for this compliment. But in my mind, I think that about Maharashtra there is something like doubt, some suspicion, and that suspicion is not with regard to Maharashtra alone, but it is with regard to Bombay too. If there had not been any Bombay problem, this bilingualism would never have arisen. I may tell you that. This Bombay problem comes everywhere, at all times, in all places and at all circumstances. And I may tell you, even with the signatures of the 280 Members of Parliament, you have not yet solved the Bombay problem. You have by-passed it. If you are thinking that the Bombay problem is solved, I may say that I personally do not hold that view. I still feel that you have set aside that question skillfully and brought both the language groups together. I am not at all convinced that you have solved that problem. Bombay, of course, is a rich city and everybody naturally would like to have a share of Bombay. I will be dishonest to myself if I did not say that that is my sentiment also. But there are some more grounds as to why Bombay should be united to Maharashtra.

Just now I said that the initiative for the solution of that problem, the present solution, does not rest with us. It rests with the 280 Members who have signed



that memorandum submitted to the Prime Minister. So let the credit go to them. And let them share the responsibility also, for taking credit alone is not sufficient. You must see it through and through, which I am sorry to remark, is not yet being done by my friends.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Were you consulted?

**SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR:** No. I was not here, Mr. Gupta and I was not consulted.

Then, I told him.....

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** That is all right.

**SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR:** You do not want a reply from me?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** We are not concerned. That is all. I only wanted to know whether the President of the Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee who belongs to the Congress Party was consulted.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Order, order.

**SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR:** Mr. Bhupesh Gupta may be aware that on the 1st of August, Panditji, had gone to Poona. He left on the second and he had no idea that any such thing was going to happen. I was with Panditji. He came by plane and I came by train avoiding the flooded areas and somehow or other reached Delhi on the 5th morning. After coming here, I learnt that there was such a move.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** The trick had been done.

**SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR:** They were of this view that the Resolution which the Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee had passed long ago had not lapsed. They, therefore, thought it unnecessary to consult me again. That much explanation I can give you.

As I said, I am not at all convinced about the non-utility of unilingual States. If somebody tells us, we are prepared to accept it but you must convince us. The only thing is, do not brush

us aside. Now, we have accepted this bilingual State for various reasons. I told you just now that controversies must be ended at some time or at some stage. We cannot go on fighting indeterminately for all times. If we go on fighting, it weakens us as I saw the Congress Committee in Maharashtra getting weak. I do not know whether the Opposition was very serious about the solution of the problem or whether it was serious about putting the Congress down. They were not concerned with the former. I do not accuse any party. That is their right. Whenever an opportunity presents itself to them, they must take advantage of it and must put down the Congress Party. Ultimately we came to realise that the States' reorganisation business should not break up the organisation; that anything might happen, but that we should stand by the Party. That was the stand that we took and it is the democratic stand. As I said, Parliament is, after all, a sovereign body and it has passed it and will pass it. Therefore, we must accept it. I should like to say that my Pradesh Congress Committee did not express any views because it did not get any opportunity but all the top-ranking people in Maharashtra had unequivocally accepted this solution and, therefore, I have no fear that it will find favour with Maharashtra. Some say that Maharashtra has gained. To a certain extent, it is true; let me be true to myself. At the same time, I must say—I do not want to keep anything secret from my friends.....

**SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad):** Which friends?

**SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR:** Those friends outside.

It is said that Maharashtra is going to get a 65 per cent. majority in the bigger bilingual State. It is true, but Maharashtra does not want to rule any minority for its own sake. We would try to do justice. I can assure my Gujarati friends here that we will do them full justice. As a matter of fact, this should not be an issue of majority and minority especially when both of us belong to the same Party. They belong to the Congress and we also belong to the Congress.

**SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal):** But there are other people outside.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Of course, the Communists try to drive us away from power.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Is this a domestic issue for the Congress?

SHRI N. B. DESHMUKH (Hyderabad): This is a question of Party then?

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: The Praja Socialists also want to drive us away from power. It will be a question of united parties, Congress versus all parties combined together. I am sure that they will not be able to do so in spite of all their attempts. I only wish that the unity should last long. That is very difficult.

The only obstacle that lay in the way of the solution of the problem of Bombay, if I may be allowed to say candidly, is the problem of Bombay City. If Gujarat wants to give up its claim over Bombay, Gujarat's problem will be solved in no time. It is in their hands. I cannot understand the reason why they are fighting. But the present is a national solution no doubt, which Parliament has given.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do I understand the hon. Member to say that if the Maharashtra's claim for Samyukta Maharashtra including Bombay was acceptable, then the hon. Member would be also ready to give up this bilingual State and build two States, Maha Gujarat and Samyukta Maharashtra?

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: I could not follow him and, therefore, I cannot reply.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would make myself understood. Do I understand from what the hon. Member has said that.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One of you will have to sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will make myself clear, Sir, if you allow me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He does not yield.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, he does not want me to make it clear.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You draw your own conclusion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If you want to understand, just yield.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Yield for what?

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: You must allow him to speak.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: I was just saying that we do not want to rule any part of Bombay State simply because we are in a majority. We want to work in co-operation. In this connection, I would like to make a personal request to Shri Morarji in this House. Let the Maharashtra and Gujarati friends sit together and try to solve the problem. We, on our part, are prepared to do away with all suspicion from the minds of Gujaratis and Shri Morarji may give up his fast. He himself has said that he has no faith in fasts for solving such problems. Therefore, my request to him is that we should sit together and give assurances to each other. Safeguards are no use; regional formulae are of no use, only the heart responds to the heart, to the soundings of the heart on the other side. Then alone can we solve major problems; not otherwise. I hope that this request of mine would go to Shri Morarji and that he would immediately give up his fast for paving the way for better understanding and for a progressive and final solution of the problem.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Morarji Desai is fasting on a different issue altogether. His fast is due to the fact that people have refused to listen to him.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: I know it very well. Therefore, I say, even if you want an audience to be attracted, let us sit together and let us speak with one voice. That is the main issue which the other parties do not want.

To my friends from Vidarbha, I must say that throughout these alternative solutions, they had acted worthily. I can also say that there were times when I was to be involved in settling the question of the capital but I avoided it and I must say that I am glad I did not intervene. Now, Vidarbha and Maharashtra have no quarrel with regard to the capital. To the people of Marathwada also, I say that they should be safeguarded. The contents of what is called the Nagpur agreement have been incorporated in the Constitution. When we did that, we never knew that Bombay was going to come to us. So, we have honestly carried out that part of the agreement which devolved upon us. This issue has been nicely solved. We look forward to a permanent solution but only with the hope that not only Maharashtra and Gujarat but other parts of India also will be made bilingual States.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Never, never. We have permanently thrown away one of them.

**SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR:** If they do not want to take a lesson from us now, they can do so later on. I can assure my hon. friends that Maharashtra and Gujarat will carry out their wishes and their responsibilities as honestly and as sincerely as is possible. Let others follow Gujarat and Maharashtra later on if they are not prepared to do so now.

After having said so much about this vexed question of Bombay State, I shall have to pass or refer in short to the border area question. Mr. Datar is sitting here; he is probably involved in it. I am not in that awkward position in which he is put now. I have entire faith in him. We have had several meetings and we were trying to solve the problem of border areas or contiguous areas. I think somebody said that it is a contiguous area, 2,000 square miles.

1 P.M.

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Hyderabad):** That would have solved Shri Datar's problem also.

**SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR:** And my problem also. So we had not one or two meetings but 19 meetings under the inspiring leadership of Mr. Dhage who is sitting there. He never lost his patience

though I have lost mine many times. Mr. Dhage never lost his patience. He tried to find out solutions, to bring together persons, to call them together, and all credit and honour goes to Mr. Dhage for helping us in this crucial problem and I would request him on behalf of all to carry on this experiment—I cannot use any other word except experiment—till we get success. Sir, the problem is very simple if at all it is to be considered, and curiously enough I have seen that every person including the highest person in the country, says, “the case is very strong; I am convinced about that, but don't create any trouble just now. Leave it here. We will try to solve it afterwards,” and so on and so forth. That is being said. If you look at the figures you will find that in this disputed area the population of Kannadigas is only 20 to 25 per cent. and the population of Marathi-speaking people is more than 50 per cent. Still, just as in Bombay, in Secunderabad and other places the minorities are getting whatever they want and it is a sin to be in a majority. If you are 55 per cent. and if the other community is 20 per cent. then there is no chance for you to get that region annexed or attached to your side. That is the present position. I would therefore request the Government that, after passing this Act, attempts should be made to give satisfaction to those people. Let us not keep anybody discontented. We are making the whole thing clear. We are wiping the slate clean. So let there not be discontent in some parts of the country and let not the troubles be again and again repeated. So with these words, Sir, I conclude.

**SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore):** Are there not other areas or districts.....

**SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR:** In the beginning I said I was not going to refer to other questions or other areas. Do you mean Kasaragod?

**SHRI H. C. DASAPPA:** Either in Maharashtra or the new Bombay are there not other districts or taluks where the non-Maharashtrians are in a majority, for example, Akolkot?

**SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR:** I have not kept it concealed. If in Maharashtra there are certain areas where Kannadigas are in a majority I am prepared to give the whole tract to them. I said the same

[Shri T. R. Deogirikar.]

thing to my Gujarati friends also, in respect of areas where they were in a majority, and fortunately the Bombay Government and the Central Government have got the census figures and the number of those who speak the minority languages, and anybody can decide this question in no time provided he has the will to do it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Just one question, Sir. I want to know from him whether, in his view, the people of Maharashtra have accepted this formula, and I also want to know from him how he explains the decision that on the day on which the reorganised States would come into force there would be a general strike all over Maharashtra.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I can speak on behalf of the Congress alone, and I cannot speak on behalf of the other parties. So so far as the Congress is concerned....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I asked about the people of Maharashtra. I know some Congress members are there but what about the people of Maharashtra?

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: If you want to learn something from me, just listen to me. If you want a categorical reply, I can give you and that is that so far as the Congress is concerned, they will take to this decision without any mental reservation. That is one thing. So far as the people are concerned, those that are not under the influence of particular groups or particular parties will also join us. That is also settled. As regards the general strike to which you referred just now, of course I can say that there are professional agitators in this country and whatever solution you give—I don't blame you: I don't blame you to Mr. Mazumdar or anybody, because I would have said the same thing if I were in a minority party—there are those who are trying always to come into power and whether the solution is acceptable to the people in general or to the mass of people in Maharashtra or not, they are going to declare that strike, and if you have got any influence, you kindly wield that influence in our favour and not in your favour.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support this Bill but, not in the sense that this is a Bill which substantially or in toto could be considered to be a very desirable and healthy measure. My support is due only to this fact that probably in the present context of things, because the language passion was roused and people were expecting something, we could not do anything better than what is being produced in this Bill. But, Sir, certainly when we consider the events that took place during the last ten or eleven months and the speeches that we have had the privilege of listening to in this House and those, we have read of the other House, there is no doubt in my mind that the whole country was agitated and agitated, if I may be permitted to say so, in certain directions which are not in the best interests of the unity and the solidarity of this country.

The Bill that is presented to us, Sir, is a compromise between the forces that were working for the solidarity of the country on multilingual lines and the forces that were working to have unilingual States. When I say, Sir, unilingual and multilingual, I want it to be clearly understood that, to a certain extent, language is a great factor for the all-round progress of the people and is also a unifying factor.

But at the same time I want hon. Members and the country to remember that language is also a disintegrating factor; it is a factor which would separate and weaken you. It is this position that we have to face. And the difference between these two points of view is genuine and honest. But the question is about the extent and emphasis that is being laid on one side or the other. I am one of those who feel, who think—and probably quite naturally, having lived in a trilingual State—that in the greater interests of the country—I am looking to the future—and even after having listened to my learned friend Mr. Deogirikar, I think that multilingual States are the best not only for the States themselves but for the greater and larger good of the country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: So do you want Hyderabad back on this logic?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am coming. Now, with this observation I would

say that there are two very good features of this Bill. One is the bilingual State of Bombay. We all know what we have gone through not only in the recent past but what the people of Maharashtra and Gujarat are still going through. Violent demonstrations are taking place and these violent demonstrations should open our eyes. It started in Orissa and I hope it will end in Gujarat soon. Sir, is it not a challenge to democracy and to all democratic ideals? Is it not a challenge to our genius, to our history and to our culture? Is it not a challenge to the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi, through whose teachings we got our freedom? I can quite understand differences of opinion. I do not want that the people should come to a decision without going into the problem in detail. But I want to know if there is a difference of opinion as to whether a certain territory should go to one State or to another State. What is the procedure to be adopted? How are we to solve this problem? That is the most important thing that I want to place before this House and through this House before the country. We may not agree; we may sincerely disagree and strongly feel that each one of us is right but in order to solve the problem, is it the approach that our friends on the opposite benches will take the law into their own hands, hold demonstrations and demonstrations with violence with serious risk to the life of the innocent people of the country? If that is not their method, then I want to know whether they have condemned and condemned in unequivocal terms these outbursts that have taken place in different parts of the country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is the hon. Member aware that some people have been killed by the police?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am not here to defend the police but what I want to say is.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Are you ready to condemn the police in unequivocal terms without reservation?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: You better ask this of the Treasury benches.

What I want to say is that it is the duty, as a citizen, as a national, of every person, irrespective of party, creed or religion, to see that there is no disturbance, no loss of property and no

loss of life and to see that law and order prevails.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: They should not provoke disturbances by ordering to shoot to kill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Now, my submission is that we have to see whether this linguistic passion could be allowed to have its way. I will pose a question. I would say that there are certain fundamental things which cannot be left to popular sentiment and where popular sentiments cannot be followed. It is Parliament which is saddled with this responsibility and has to think over the matter and take decisions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: By collecting signatures in the lobby.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: That is one of the ways; absolutely democratic. My submission is what the country is faced with and what we are faced with is not whether a portion of the territory should go to one State or the other, but what we are faced with is what is the method—and we have to very seriously think about this—of correcting a thing which we think is not correct. The only democratic way for this is to fight the election on this issue, to remove this Government, come into power and carry out that policy. That is the democratic way and I think we should all agree that in this matter if we cannot agree among ourselves, we should fight constitutionally and we should give a practical lesson to our people that in no case law and order should be disturbed.

That is the position so far as this general question is concerned.

The other thing that I welcome in this Bill is the formation of the Zonal Councils. I think it is a step in the right direction and I do hope that in course of time these Zonal Councils will really become strong and prove an asset to the future development of the country and help to fight against this linguistic passion which, in my humble opinion, has gone a little too far.

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.]

Now, I would just submit that so far as Hyderabad is concerned, I can quite understand certain changes being made in view of public sentiments or in view of the demands of the time. Sir, I would request you to bear with me for a while. It is one thing to make certain changes in course of time but it is an entirely different thing to say that the history of Hyderabad has been such that it cannot be considered to be one with reference to which anybody can be proud. Probably I am speaking on the last occasion on behalf of Hyderabad State as it exists today and I would submit that when I say anything, I want you to forget that black period in Hyderabad's history preceding the advent of democracy. When you want to decide whether Hyderabad should be disintegrated or not, please consider it on merits and whatever you decide will be followed. When this States Reorganisation Commission came to Hyderabad, there was a very strong representation made before it by people like the late Ramchandra Naik who was a pioneer in the national movement. The representation was by people of all areas; by M. Narsing Rao and Shrikeshav of Telangana area; by persons like the late G. Kamachari from Karnataka, and by Hon. Desai and Raghav of this House; from Maharashtra by Mr. Vidyalankar, the present Finance Minister and several others. They all made strong representations to the Commission that Hyderabad should not be disintegrated.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO (Hyderabad): But they did not succeed.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I will come to it. These people made representations that in the greater interests of India and in the interests of the people of Hyderabad, Hyderabad should not be disintegrated; but, Sir, the three wise men who sat on that Commission came to a different conclusion. I have got great regard for them, especially for my hon. friend Dr. Kunzru, but I am inclined to feel that they only looked at the surface of things and they only looked at the recent passions that were aroused. If they had looked to the history of Hyderabad and to the deeper currents of love and amity that exist not only between different communities but also between people of different regions—I

am not talking of the Government, which was also divided—in that case they would have come to an entirely different conclusion and, with Bombay bilingual, they would have made Hyderabad bilingual. Anyhow they did not do so. It is not only that a few local people made this representation. I would tell you that one of the greatest daughters of India, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, every time publicly in her speeches had said: "I am proud of Hyderabad. I am proud to be called a Hyderabadi. I would like Hyderabad to remain as it is and Hyderabad culture as it is." She used to be proud of it.....

SHRI N. B. DESHMUKH (Hyderabad): Would you explain that specially?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: After all, you know it as much as I do. Not only that. When this Report came out, Rajaji came out with a statement saying that it is not in the national interest that Hyderabad is being disintegrated. Not only that, the great newspaper of the south, "Hindu" came out with a leader expressing its resentment and disapproval of the disintegration of Hyderabad. The matter does not end there. Already our revered leader Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru even recently and on several occasions has given expression to his personal opinion—that he thinks that Hyderabad should exist as it is and he is against disintegration.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What does he say now?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: He surrenders to the will of Parliament, to the order of Parliament as everyone should do and you should also learn to do it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You mean to say that he still thinks that Hyderabad should remain intact and yet surrenders to the will of Parliament?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: He will follow what the Parliament will decide. That is his view. I want to know why it is that people like Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, who was born in Hyderabad and who was brought up in Hyderabad, were of that view. Why is it that Panditji.....

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Did she at any time say that Hyderabad should not be disintegrated?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Yes, Sir, she said so.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: No, Sir.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I will give you the speeches and I will put the evidence of her family members if necessary before you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any-way that is past history.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Now, I say that this regard is not only superficial. There were certain things which were in the very inception, in the very foundation of Hyderabad that gave its people, communal harmony, tolerance, mutual love and affection which are responsible for this proud position. I would just give only two events of history, history which is absolutely recognised and accepted by all the historians. Six hundred years ago for the first time a Muslim dynasty was formed in the Deccan—you know what the name of that dynasty was—it was the Brahamini dynasty. Do you know what was the name of the man who founded that dynasty? His name was Hasan. He incorporated with his name the name of his guru and patron Gangoo and he called himself Hasan Gangoo and the dynasty was called Brahamani dynasty. Could you imagine the amount of love and affection, the amount of regard that was in the very inception of that Brahamini kingdom? It was called Brahamini out of love for his Brahmin patron. He put his name with his name and that remained for four hundred years. Could you think that any organisation or any dynasty or any rule can go on for such a long period? I say this name and this history is unique not only in India but in the world's history where such an example of demonstration of love and affection was given.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: What about the flag of Asaf Jahi dynasty which was made part of the British?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am coming to that. Now, Sir, we have in Hyderabad a place as historical and as great as the Qutub Minar of Delhi. We call it the Char Minar. That was built about five hundred years back. You go

and look on the top of that Char Minar. On one side there is a mosque and on the other side there is a temple. The rulers were proud of being great literary people in Telugu language. That was the history which fused together the different communities and different cultures. And this State was in the beginning bilingual—State of Andhra and Karnataka formed the Brahamani kingdom. Then, at a later stage when Asaf Jah took over the State, I would only refer to the will that he made. And it is printed in every historical book. Through his trusted colleague and Peshkar Lala Mastaram he got his will written in which he had given direction that "justice and toleration to every religion and every community should be the guiding principle. Otherwise I will hold you responsible before Almighty."

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Sir, I rise on a point of order. Are we discussing the history of Hyderabad?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I know you have had your object. Be courteous to me at least at this stage.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you opposing the proposals?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am just giving.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Unless you are opposing. . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am discussing that whatever has been done is incorrectly done.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you are opposing the proposals, then it should be incidentally relevant. But that is not the main thing.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Now, Sir, my respectful submission is that in view of this liberal policy, lakhs of rupees of endowments were given to all religions and temples and there was not a key post whether it was of the commander-in-chief, or whether it was of the prime ministership, or whether it was any other, which was not open and given to men of all communities and all religions. That is the history of Hyderabad though it was under a personal rule, and much before the advent of democracy in India. And these were the

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.]

factors which brought affection and love between the communities and the people of different regions that lived there. Could anybody believe here that there are temples, now, and the persons who have to look after them are Muslims? And there are mosques and shrines which are being looked after by Hindu friends? So, I am just giving this to show why Jawaharlalji wanted Hyderabad to exist, why Mrs. Sarojini Naidu wanted Hyderabad to exist, why at least the sober elements of Hyderabad wanted that Hyderabad should exist without disintegration.

Now, Sir, when the States Reorganisation Commission recommended its disintegration, we were very sorry. But in the greater interest of the country, in the larger interest of the country and, as now we have to look to the whole country—India and not to Hyderabad—we accepted it and accepted it with grace. Then, what has the States Reorganisation Commission recommended? The States Reorganisation Commission had recommended that, of course, Hyderabad as it is could not exist, but a major portion if it called Telangana with sixty per cent. population and sixty per cent. of the income should exist. That was the proposition. Then, Sir, we thought if we could not save the whole, at least let us save a part of it. We stood by it and ninety per cent. of the population of Telangana was behind this Telangana movement.....

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: No.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: This was .....not because of any parochial feeling. This was challenged by Dr. Raj Bahadur Gour also. As my friends are challenging, let me say the great communist leader, of Andhra movement, Shri. R. Narayana Reddi, who is supposed to have taken more votes than our leader Pandit Jawaharlalji, came to me when the Telangana movement was going on and asked me whether I "will help them to improve the situation". Naturally I told him that he was trying to pull my legs. But he sincerely said "No, things are such that unless the Telangana leaders come to our rescue it will be difficult to improve the situation". That was the tempo. That was how, Sir, the States Reorganisation Commission recommended Telangana with the name of Hyderabad. We fought to uphold the S. R. C.

Report. We placed the matter before the four wise men—our leader Mr. Nehru the hon. Home Minister, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and Shri Dhebar. We were told "Yes, the public opinion and S.R.C. are with you, but in the greater interests of the country, in the larger interests of unity, and as our Andhra brethren are in difficulties—they have been practically deprived of Madras—in view of all these things you had better look at things in the all-India perspective and agree to accept merger with Andhra. Sir, we fought to the last and we represented, and we were told that in the greater interests of the country we should yield, and our Andhra brethren were also very solicitous about it. So we yielded. This, Sir, is the genius of Hyderabad, this is the culture of Hyderabad. My learned friends were asking, what was the culture of Hyderabad? This is the culture of Hyderabad. When ultimately our elders said "No, in the greater interests of the country you should agree", we accepted it, we faced our public and we faced them with courage. Not a bullet was shot, not a single violent demonstration was made. I am saying this in no spirit of boastfulness or arrogance, I am saying this in all humility. When I see what has happened in Maharashtra, when I see what has happened in Gujarat, and when I compare that with how the people of Telangana have behaved over this matter—I feel proud of my people; that is the position that I want to place before my country. It is because of the Hyderabad culture, Hyderabad genius—and thanks to the leadership of Shri Ranga Reddy—that we went through this trial with tact and dignity. Now we have accepted it and we will try our best to implement it, that is, the States Reorganisation Bill. I would not go into details, Sir, nor have I put in any major amendment; I leave that to my Andhra friends and other Members of Parliament.

I would just mention a fact. Sir, as you know, in Southern India there was a move that every State should be styled or named according to its language—for instance, Madras to be named Tamilnad, Myore to be named Karnataka, Bombay to be named Maharashtra and Gujarat, and so on. In that context, Sir, the name of Andhra was given to Hyderabad. I would appeal to you and to the good sense and the sense of justice of this House and of my Andhra brethren



and ask whether it is right that Karnataka should be called Mysore, that Tamilnad should be called Madras, Maharashtra and Gujarat should be called Bombay, and only Hyderabad should be called Andhra Pradesh. I leave it to your decision and I would not go into details; neither have I moved any amendment as I feel it is the duty of Andhra friends to do so.

Now, Sir, I would come to the question of safeguards. I do not attach much importance to safeguards. They are only to help co-ordination. But I do attach importance to their goodwill and I appeal to our Andhra friends to act like great people with large-heartedness and to appreciate in what way the Telengana people and the Hyderabad people have acted in this matter. Now I do not want to say that I have got University buildings second to none in India. I do not want to say that I have got the Nizam Sagar and the great Sagar that were built. I do not want to say that Hyderabad will furnish palatial buildings for the capital of Andhra, nor do I count upon the sugar industry, the biggest in India, nor Sirpur Paper Mill nor do I refer to the Salar Jung Museum which is the best in the whole of the East. But I would humbly say that the gift from the people of Hyderabad to the Andhra brethren—I want to entrust it to my Andhra friends, through the Chairman of this august House in whose personality I see a great and eminent Andhra—is a humble gift of the Hyderabad's 'composite culture'—though less literate than others. Preserve it and preserve it for the good of Andhra as well as for the good of India. I am sure with that composite culture as it would be seen in every walk of life—it cannot be described, it has to be looked into and appreciated—if that culture is preserved, Andhra will form a very important link between the southern States and the northern States, and there will come a time when it will prepare men for all-India leadership, leadership which at the present day is being circumscribed with narrow loyalties and narrow regional patriotism. It will broaden the outlook of leadership which is very necessary in the future context of things, for the greater welfare of our country—India.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** You conclude your remarks. There are 42 other speakers.

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN:** I shall be very brief, Sir. Then, there has been a demand for a Boundary Commission. I tell, you, S.r., that I am sick of such Commissions. These matters cannot be settled by Commissions. There are certain demands which Hyderabad has got regarding, Raichur, Sironcha and Bastar. There are certain demands that the Andhra State has got against Karnataka, Kolar, Bellary and others. I do not give up those claims, but in the larger interests of the country, with full appreciation of the efforts of my friend Mr. Dhage to get these boundary matters settled amicably and their failure, I would say, let us close this chapter for the moment. We have had enough of it. We have to do a lot of work; we have to do a great work in implementing the Second Five Year Plan; we have to remove the poverty of our people; we have to remove the ignorance of our people, we have to bring real joy and happiness to the teeming millions of our people to whom democracy will have no meaning, who would not be interested in whether a certain territory goes to one State or another. Let us finish this chapter and let us settle down for doing greater and higher things. When I oppose this Boundary Commission, I cannot shut my eyes to the various difficulties that the linguistic minorities may feel in their own region. Even if he had followed the Communist proposal of dividing every unit according to villages, there will be hundreds of villages with two languages. How can you solve those problems? I say it is a wrong approach to the problem. Let the Centre assume the responsibility for this. I request and very emphatically request, the Home Minister to form a Board under the Chairmanship of the Home Minister which would look after the legitimate interests of these language minorities. It is no use brushing aside things. Let us face the problem. Don't give the initiative to the States. It will not promote good relationship between them. One State will say to another "You are not treating these linguistic minorities properly". The other State will say "You are not treating other minorities properly". That would be a wrong policy. Let the initiative be in the hands of the Centre. Let the Centre, the Home Ministry through a Board, see that no injury is done to these minorities.

Now, Sir, I do not want to say much, but there has been some discussion unfortunately about Urdu. I would only

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.]

say that even today I would consider it a privilege to learn Urdu and sit at the feet of hon. Pandit Kunzru and hon. Master Saksena.

Sir, a suggestion has been thrown irresponsibly that Urdu is a language of four crores of Muslims. I strongly repudiate that suggestion. The service that Chakbast has done, the service that Sharar and Shad have done, the service that Munshi Prem Chand has done is well-known. Sir, there are scores of Hindu literary writers in Urdu who have built up Urdu.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): It is a common inheritance.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Yes, it is a common inheritance. You have reminded me of the speech made by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, when he was the President of the Urdu Academic Association. He said "It is as much my language by inheritance as of anybody else in this country, and let us be proud of it." Simply because somebody says that it is not your child, you should not disown it. It has been nursed by Hindus, by Sikhs and by Muslims. Make it yours. Do not inflict any punishment on it for the omissions and commissions of people who are beyond our control. They had not before them the country's interests, and even now they are not satisfied. They will do damage to any good thing. Therefore let us think over the problem of Urdu,—because this is our baby and we have to nurse it. I won't say anything else, and I won't go to that regional controversy of U. P. and say what this man has said or what that man has said.

But, Sir, there is one thing which pains me. Repeatedly our revered leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, has said that Urdu is not being treated well in his own State. Sir, when the Moghul Emperors in those periods, when they had become weak used to issue firmans, the expression that was used was "वाजिबुल ताजिम है वाजिबुल तामील नहीं" that is to say, they are to be respected, but not to be implemented. Sir, we must respect the opinion of our great leader on account of whom we are holding ourselves intact in our country and on account of whom we are enjoying high prestige in the comity of nations. In this respect, I make an earnest and

humble appeal to the hon. Home Minister Pantji to solve this quandary, and I am sure that with his determination and statesmanship he will be able to solve this problem satisfactorily.

Now, Sir, I have given notice of two amendments and.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can speak on them when you move them.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: All right, Sir, I would like to say something at the time when I move my amendments.

DR. P. V. KANE (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I do not say that I heartily endorse this Bill, but it is the next best that we can have. I do not understand one thing about it. When there are fourteen States with a unilingual bias, why a fifteenth could not have been created at all, is beyond my comprehension. In the last eleven months anything but a just and equitable solution has been put forward. I am not, of course, speaking as belonging to any party. I belong to no party. And it is a sad thing for me to see that among Congressmen themselves there has been a great deal of difference of opinion. The Maharashtra Congress Committee says one thing and the Gujarat Congress Committee says another thing. That is a very sorry spectacle. However, it is none of my concern to say that, because they are there to defend themselves and to put forward their points of view. But I must say one thing, before I proceed with this particular Bill, that the best thing would have been "Maharashtra with Bombay". That has been an admitted fact, and there is justice in it. And our great Prime Minister went so far as to say "Let the tempers that are frayed be quitted, and I myself will plead the case of Maharashtra having Bombay in the very near future." So, that is the goal to which at least I should attach great importance. But since so many hon. Members have taken upon themselves to bring forward this motion, it has been accepted by the Government, because after all this wrangling must come to an end some day. We cannot always be fighting, because there are very great stakes before us, and we have to improve the lot of the common man. We have the Second Five Year Plan before us. It has already gone into the background

during this period of eleven months. Therefore, Sir, I am supporting this measure as the next best under the circumstances.

Now here, Sir, something has got to be said about the disturbances in Bombay, Gujarat, Orissa and in other places. I look at them from a particular point of view. We have told in very high quarters that Bombay behaved very badly, and therefore there was going to be a Centrally-administered Bombay. I do not know whether the same reasoning will apply to Ahmedabad to make it Centrally-administered. Probably, it will not. We have learnt, I suppose, the lesson that Central administration is the very negation of the democracy provided for in the Constitution for which we fought. That is the total negation of that democracy, which does credit to nobody, and particularly the Central administration of such a big city with a population of, I believe, 3 million people who are supposed to be in the forefront of everything in India. If they are to be Centrally-administered, then probably the whole of India may as well be Centrally-administered. We also find, Sir, that public property worth Rs. 40 lakhs was destroyed by Oriyas who were to lose nothing. Their State was quite intact. Simply because certain parts or districts which they wanted were not given to them, there were these riots. And we had riots in many places. I have stayed in Bombay for 60 years and during that period I have passed through twenty riots, during the British rule and after. So, rioting is a symptom which prevails very often in our country, and it should not upset those who are responsible for keeping order. They brought in twelve thousand policemen in Bombay. That is an admitted fact. People said that there were 25,000 policemen, but the Chief Minister agreed that there were 12,000 and half of them were Armed Police. Let us roughly take it at 12,000. What an effort! In order to keep order, 12,000 people were engaged day and night! That spells great indignity and that entails great loss of respect to us in foreign countries.

Why is this so? It is so because justice is not done. Look at Bihar and Bengal. There were some kite-flying that they were going to join together. That is how I look at it from a distance—I call it kite flying. The first defeat of the Con-

gress in one bye-election induced the Chief Minister of Bengal to say 'That is an end of this matter'. Now they are having bickerings over the transfer of Purulia and Purnea. It has come to that. That shows that whatever you may say from a very high pedestal about unity, security and being sons of the same soil etc., language is a force to count with. You cannot shut your eyes like a cat drinking milk. You must remember that it is one of the greatest binding forces that bind people together. Why did the Constituent Assembly say that it will be Hindi that should be the official language and that too in the Devanagari script? Why? Because too many things cause confusion, division, discrimination and so forth. Therefore we want one official language, never mind if not immediately, but that is the goal and we want one script. Similarly on a smaller scale, in a different plane altogether, language is a binding force and as many people belonging to a particular language should be brought together to the extent humanly possible. Though the 280 or 300 Parliamentarians took upon themselves to suggest this bilingual State, nothing was done to educate the people that such a thing was coming. It was all at once introduced. Remember now in Maharashtra particularly, which I know very well, and Bombay, the whole thing has gone too deep. It is not I and people like me who can deliver the goods. The matter has gone down to the sweepers and to the lowest class of people. Sweepers, barbers etc. are fighting with others. You must now satisfy the common man that what you are doing is for the benefit not only of the country but for his own benefit. Nobody has tried to do that. So many solutions have come and gone and this is the last one. All these have been at a very high level. The common people simply don't look at them; and they think that they will not touch the one with a pair of tongs. For these riots particularly in Gujarat—the land of the Father of the Nation—it is said that the students alone were responsible. I don't think they alone were responsible. There must be others too. But the students were university students—most of them major now and educated and voters too. remember. Every man of 18 is entitled to vote. The future voters in the next elections are charged with having created this trouble, but I don't think it is true. Who is to blame? Everybody wants to make everybody else the scapegoat. My friend, Mr. Parikh, said that it is the professors who are to

[Dr. P. V. Kane.] blame. I don't understand how. A professor has to teach or lecture to 150 students at a time and there is no personal contact. Remember that if you always blame the professor, you will lose the little good that they do and the quality they possess will not be forthcoming. I have been also a professor for many years and a teacher for many years and then I joined this profession. Everybody wants the teacher and the professor to rise very high. While they themselves are comfortably engaged in profitable business, they tell you that the teacher's profession is a very noble one; but I know from my experience that it is the sorriest of trades. Therefore, don't lecture to them. The fault lies with you; namely, you have done nothing practically to tell the common man his rights and his duties. You have done nothing to educate him and let him know at least the A, B, C, or the three R's. Nothing has been done and very little has been done in the last 8 years. The Directive Principles say that within 10 years literacy must be there throughout India but nothing has been done in practice. Hardly 20 per cent. of the population is literate in the whole of India even after 9 years of independence. I don't blame anybody. This is what has been done. You give the right to vote to everybody who is 18 years' old including women. In some countries even now women have no rights but we gave them, but the literacy among women is 5 per cent. We are always travelling in the mid-air but we have never been travelling on this bare ground. This is the result. This is the result of your always being high up in the air and not coming to grips with the lower world. So what I feel is this: Let the common man be approached by you. Suppose this Bill is passed, the first task of those who are responsible will be to go round and tell the people that this is the thing done and it may be changed. As the Prime Minister was saying, there is nothing permanent in this world. Ten years back we were ruled by the British. Today we are ruling ourselves. There is nothing permanent. It must be told and must be told in a way they will understand. Simply giving a lecture would not help. Particularly now, the tempers are frayed and everybody looks at everybody else with a certain amount of suspicion. It is a very sad sight, no doubt, about this particular matter of a bilingual State of Maharashtra and Gujarat. But supposing as you feel and as the majority of the

Parliamentarians feel, that this is a good thing, let us try it. I am, therefore, supporting it only as a measure to be tried. I am myself rather doubtful. I must say so. I am 77 years and after the long experience of human nature as a professor, as a lawyer and in many other ways. I say that this whole thing is fraught with danger; but let us try to make the best of it as the next best and in that connection I will suggest certain changes if it is possible to do so. Those changes I shall first give lest my time should be up.

I am against the Zonal Councils altogether. We have already so many authorities. There are the States and then there is the Supreme Union Parliament. Why do you want a Zonal Council? That will only mean postponement, procrastination, delay, etc. That will be the result. I am therefore entirely against that system. If once you decide that the Zonal System must come, then it may be improved but the fundamental idea of it is not liked by me. Look at clause 21 which lays down that they are only advisory, without the power to enforce their decisions. There must be power to enforce but there is nothing given. Therefore advice only can be given. Supposing the Home Minister sends tomorrow for the Chief Ministers of both Bombay and Mysore if they are fighting with each other, they are bound to come. Then there is no Zonal Council necessary. That is my idea.

As regards a Boundary Commission, I also think that a Boundary Commission is necessary in certain respects provided certain suggestions made in the amendments by some people are accepted. If they are accepted, then a Boundary Commission is absolutely necessary; but it should not be a general Boundary Commission. That will open the sores again. Therefore I am not in favour of a general Boundary Commission but a Commission of an impermanent nature or for a short time may look into the disputes which may be left to them by the Parliament or by the President or by some other constituted authority.

These are the few matters on 2 P. M. which I wanted to say something even now, because I did not want to omit them during my speech.

Then I come to the most important point to which I would call your attention, namely, the inclusion of the Belgaum district in the Karnataka State.

There I would plead the case of Belgaum and the other talukas of Karwar, Haliyal and Supa Peta. These people representing some 40 different associations sent in their representation. All that has been done. Now it rests with you whether you will align yourself on their behalf or try as far as lies in you to bring them round to the peaceful path and to work out an agreed solution. I do not want to give too many figures; if you want I can give them, for I have the whole lot of them here.

The point is, if you look at a map of the area, you will find that Belgaum is divisible into two parts, the eastern part which is the Karnataka part and the other part which is Marathi-speaking predominantly. If you draw a line there, may be a village here and a village there may go on either side. But on the western part are the four or five talukas of Belgaum, Khanapur and Chikodi and Chandgad. If you take them together, they are really 70 per cent. Marathi-speaking people. If you look into the figures, you will find that in Belgaum town at least 54 per cent. are Marathi-speaking, although 70 per cent. has been laid down by the Commission as the required minimum. I do not see why 70 per cent. should be fixed because the Commission itself had recommended the transfer of areas even when the percentage was less than 70 per cent. Take the case of the Kolar district. In Kolar 54 per cent. are Telugus and 21 per cent. Kannadigas and yet it has gone to Mysore. Of course there are some reasons given and reasons can be found for anything. They can find good or bad reasons for anything. But I may point out that even in this Bill you have got this idea of transfer of Talukas and even smaller areas or territories. Let me invite your attention to certain of the clauses of this Bill itself. Look at clause 10 dealing with the formation of the new Rajasthan. There Abu Road taluka of Banaskantha district has been taken away from Gujarat, I suppose, and is now added to Rajasthan. Then below that you find:

“(d) Sunel tappa of Bhanpura tahsil of Mandsaur district”—I do not know what a “tappa” is, but I suppose it is something like a “petta”, consisting of some 25 or 30 villages, because a district is divided into tahsils and a tahsil is divided into tappas. So naturally it must be a small area. And even that is taken away and given to some other State.

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

Then I may take up an earlier clause, say, clause 4. There, speaking of the State of Travancore-Cochin, they say:

“As from the appointed day, there shall be added to the State of Madras the territories comprised in the Agastheeswaram, Thovala, Kalkulam, and Vilavancode taluks of Trivandrum district and the Shencottah taluk of Quilon district”

Therefore, even talukas have been taken away when it suited the purposes of those who drafted the Bill. It is not, so to say, a sacrosanct principle that you should go only by the district. That principle has not been followed. Not only that, in certain cases, talukas have been bodily taken away from one State and put in another. Take for instance the case of Kasaragod dealt with in clause 5 of the Bill. This taluka of Kasaragod which is in South Kanara is joined to Kerala State. If you follow the logic of it, either the whole district should go or nothing should go. So, what I say is, even in this Bill you find that there is nothing sacrosanct with a district unit, that you can transfer one taluka from one part to another part, from one district to another district and that has been done.

Therefore, I suggest this matter of Belgaum should be considered. The population of Belgaum is a lakh and a thousand and odd. In fact it is 101,038. Of these Marathi-speaking people comprise some 54 per cent. Kannada-speaking people 25 per cent. and others come up to 21 per cent. In the city itself the majority are Marathi-speaking, being 54 per cent. The same is the case if you take the schools. Then take the talukas that I have mentioned—the talukas of Belgaum, Khanapur and Chikodi, including the towns of Belgaum and Nipani. There you will find that 70 per cent. of the people are Marathi-speaking and that should satisfy even the high percentage fixed by the Commission, though that is not necessary. In the opinion of those who drafted this Bill, that 70 per cent. is not necessary because there have been exceptions.

[Dr. P. V. Kane.]

Then of course, other circumstances come in, circumstances like the wishes of the people, economic structure and so on and so forth. There are so many circumstances which can be cited in order to buttress your case. Take the case of Bellary to which the Commission has devoted some 3 or 4 pages in order to show that it should go to Andhra on grounds of administrative convenience, economics, the importance of the Tungabhadra project and so on. But Tungabhadra project is a national thing. It is for the whole of India. Then they come to Rayalaseema and say that is very important in Andhra. And so they say, Bellary should go to Andhra.

Take the case of Chandgad taluka. You can make a special case of that. Then why not make a special case of an area where there are 54 per cent. of Marathi-speaking people, if the other circumstances are there, the other circumstances, which I have mentioned, namely economic links and all that. The economic links of Belgaum are not with Karnataka or Bangalore, but with Ratnagiri and Maharashtra. For four months in the year there is no connection by the sea side. About 80 per cent. of the trade of Samantwadi, Malwan and Vengurla is with Belgaum. If you take all these facts into consideration, they will speak for themselves. Similarly there are other points also and I have got them, but I do not want to trouble the House with all details. I mention only some of the important ones. What the Commission says about cotton and oilseeds is entirely wrong because only Rs. 150 of octroi duty comes to Belgaum from cotton as against the total of Rs. 1,43,000 resulting from the trade in catechu, cocoanut and jagery. These are connected more with the Konkan parts than with the other parts.

Similarly, you take the case of Belgaum. Hundreds of people, Talatis, Patils and teachers, will be displaced. They come to about a thousand and they are all Marathi-speaking. If they are put there, they cannot at once become as clever as the Kannadigas, the originally born Kannadigas. This will create another problem of displaced persons. You have to look into all these things. What I am saying is that if you divide Belgaum District into two parts, the East going to Karnataka and the West to

Maharashtra, it will be all right. The smaller part to the West is about 55 miles broad and 150 miles long. It will be a Marathi-speaking part and the population will be about 5 or 6 lakhs. These people in Belgaum and other talukas and in Karwar, to which I am coming a bit later, are in one contiguous line and they come to about six lakhs of people. These six lakhs of people are to be handed over as if they are dumb driven cattle to a part where the language is entirely different. There may not be much difference between Bengali and Behari because the basic structure of these languages is the same but there is a lot of difference between Kanarese and Marathi. In the case of the Northern languages, there are hundreds of Sanskrit words; even the inflections are very near. But that is not the case here. Therefore, you have to look into the question of satisfying these people who are in a minority. If you take the whole district of Belgaum, there are nearly 1,300 villages with a population of seventeen lakhs out of which 4,60,000 are Marathi-speaking. If you take the whole district, more than one-fourth are Marathi-speaking. If, as I have suggested just now, you make this district into two parts, Belgaum Western and Eastern, then the Western region will have 75 per cent. of Marathi-speaking people. The people of Belgaum, Chikodi, Nipani, and other talukas speak Marathi. These people have more important connections with Maharashtra than with people lower down in Karnataka, Bangalore, Mysore and so forth. All these factors should incline you to try to meet these people and their wishes and just not to tell them that this is the decision of Parliament which they must accept. If you do it, then their anger is roused, they behave like the people in Bombay and they are shot. This is not the way to rule; this is not the way to induce these people to think well of their independence. They say that independence is nothing to them if they are forced against their will into the company of one whom they do not like. They want the company of X, Y or Z. I do not want to take more time of the House but shall end up with a few remarks about Karwar.

If you take the three talukas of Karwar—actually four including Karwar town—Halyal and Supa Peta, you will find that the dialect is Konkani. For

some reason now, Konkani is being treated as a different language. If you look at the old Gazetteer of Karwar there is no Konkani mentioned anywhere. You have only Kanarese mentioned besides Marathi. In the later Gazetteers, Konkani was mentioned specially but is put under Marathi and its dialects. You must know that the Konkani people have no special literature of their own. During the last few years they may have had some but even now there is not much literature. It is a spoken language and not a written language. That is one thing. Secondly, high class books in Marathi like Jnaneswari are read by far more, perhaps, in this area than even in Maharashtra. Similarly, as late as 1948, in the Political and Services Department of the Bombay Government, a Resolution was adopted recognising Marathi as a regional language in Karwar, Halyal and Supa Peta. I am talking only about the Northern parts, not the downward Southern portions. If you take the people of Karwar town, Karwar taluka, Halyal and Supa Peta along with Belgaum, they will be about five or six lakhs; you will find that 72 per cent. are Marathi-speaking and only 22 per cent. are Kanarese-speaking in Karwar taluka. In Halyal, 59 per cent. are Marathi-speaking while 22 per cent. speak Kanarese. In Supa, 82 per cent. are Marathi-speaking while 18 per cent. are Kannadigas. If you take the total of these places, you will find that the proportion is 70 to 20 Kannada-speaking with 10 per cent. speaking other languages. My submission is that, if you so desire, these parts could form part of Kolhapur district or, if you do not like that, a separate district could be brought into existence for them. There is nothing wrong in having a district with a population of six lakhs of people. It is not necessary that all the districts should have 18 or 20 lakhs of people. You may make this as a special district or, if you have no objection, join it with Kolhapur—it will be the southern extension of Kolhapur—and make the latter a big district. I am not particular about what you do but I want these Marathi-speaking people to be kept together. It will be a great hardship if you force them to go elsewhere. Barring children, even half of the number of people may not be knowing Kanarese at all. Therefore, it will be a real hardship on them to tell them that for the sake of the country they must suffer, that they must be shifted from one place to another as if they were

dumb driven cattle. That will not solve the problem. That will not redound to the credit or to the safety and security of the whole of India.

I do not want to elaborate it now but I have given notice of an amendment and, if the Chairman permits, might talk on it later. I am putting forward, on behalf of the people who might be affected, this plea. There is no particular or any very strong reason why certain things should be imposed upon them and they cannot be left to their own choice.

With these words, Madam, I commend this Bill. I accept it as the next best but some changes will have to be made.

**श्री चरनजीलाल वर्मा** (बिलासपुर और हिमाचल प्रदेश) : जनाब चेयरमैन साहिब, जो बिल इस वक्त हाउस के सामने है, मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूँ। स्टेट्स के रिआर्गनाइजेशन का काम बहुत मुश्किल काम है और एक वक्त ऐसा महसूस होता था कि कहीं यह मुलतवी न करना पड़े क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान के जो बड़े-बड़े सियासतदां थे वे भी यह कहने पर मजबूर हो गये थे। लेकिन मुलतवी करना उसका कोई हल नहीं था क्योंकि अगर हम आज यह काम नहीं कर सकते, खास तौर पर अपने हरदिल अजीज नेता श्री जवाहरलाल की जेर साया में हल नहीं कर सकते, तो आयन्दा इस चीज को हल करना मुश्किल ही नहीं था बल्कि नामुमकिन था। इसलिए मैं केन्द्रीय सरकार और हाई कमान्ड को बधाई दिये बगैर नहीं रह सकता कि उन्होंने इस काम को सरअन्जाम किया। मैं हाउस से भी अपील करता हूँ कि वह इस बिल को जल्द से जल्द पास करके पब्लिक के सामने स्टेट्यूट बुक पर ले आये, ताकि हम दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना का काम शुरू कर सकें, इस वक्त मुल्क में जो बेचैनी फैली हुई है उसको दूर कर सकें और साथ ही साथ लोगों की गरीबी को भी दूर कर सकें।

इस बिल के अन्दर जोनल कौंसिल का जो प्राविजन है, मैं उसका भी स्वागत करता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे दो फायदे हमको जरूर हैं। एक फायदा तो यह है कि दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में जो स्कीमें वाँग रह हैं, उनको पूरा करने में यह इमदाद देगा। अक्सर यह देखने में आया है कि कोई स्कीम किसी सूबे का प्लानिंग कमीशन तो पास कर देता है, लेकिन अगर कोई

[श्री चरनजीलाल वर्मा]

ऐसा मामला आता है जैसे कि कोई सड़क है, जो एक सूबे से दूसरे सूबे में हो कर जाती है तो एक सूबे में तो उस सड़क की स्कीम पास हो जाती है और उसमें काम भी शुरू हो जाता है लेकिन दूसरे सूबे में उस पर काम होने में देरी हो जाती है। इन जोनल कौंसिलों के होने से इस तरह की मुश्किलता सब दूर हो जायेगी। हर एक आदमी हर एक रियासत को अपनी रियासत समझने लग जायेगा। जोनल कौंसिल का जहां इस बिल में जिक्र आया है, वहां उसके सफा १०, पैरा १६ में, पार्ट सी स्टेटों के बारे में यह कहा गया है कि :

“Where any Part C State is included in the Zone, not more than two members from each such State to be nominated by the President”

इसके मुताबिक राष्ट्रपति ने दो आदमियों को नामजद करना है। उसके लिये मेरा सुझाव यह है कि उनमें से एक पार्लियामेंट का मेम्बर हो, जो उस इलाके का रहने वाला हो और उस इलाके से इलैक्ट हुआ हो। दूसरा जो मेम्बर हो वह ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी का हो या ऐडवाइजरी में से हो। मुझे आफिशियलों के खिलाफ तो कुछ कहना नहीं है मगर आफिसरों को नामिनेट नहीं किया जाना चाहिये क्योंकि सन् १९५० में एक्लेवों का जो एक्सचेंज हुआ था उसका हमें काफी तजर्ब है। इसलिए मैं अपील करूंगा कि इसमें महज मेम्बर पार्लियामेंट और ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी के जो मेम्बर हों इन टेरीटरीज के, वही ले लिये जायें।

जहां तक इन टेरीटरीज का सवाल है बिल के अन्दर उनके न्यू सेट अप का कोई जिक्र नहीं है। पहली नवम्बर को न्यू स्टेट्स बन जायेंगी। बहुत सी मौजूदा पार्ट सी स्टेट्स खत्म हो जायेंगी और कुछ टेरीटरीज बन जायेंगी। इन टेरीटरीज का क्या सेट अप होगा, इसका कोई जिक्र नहीं है। इस सिलसिले में जहां तक कमीशन का सवाल है, उन्होंने यह ऐडवाइज कर रखा है कि उनमें महज ऐडवाइजरी कमेटियां होंगी। मैं माननीय होम मिनिस्टर का बहुत मशकूर हूं कि उन्होंने दूसरे सदन में इस सिलसिले में यह बतलाया कि वे लोकल ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में लोगों को जरूर असोशिएट करेंगे। जितनी भी टेरीटरीज हैं उनको अलग रखने की एक खास वजह यह भी

है कि वे इक्तसादी और सियासी तौर पर बैकवर्ड हैं। जहां तक इक्तसादी हालत है उसको सटल गवर्नमेंट बहुत से डेवलपमेंट करके सुधार देगी। लेकिन जहां तक सियासी हालत है इन टेरीटरीज में जो डेमोक्रेटिक सेट अप मौजूदा तौर पर है उसके निकालने के बाद अगर कोई दूसरा सेट अप नहीं होगा तो ये हमेशा के लिये बैकवर्ड रह जायेंगी और अगर कभी यह सवाल पैदा हुआ कि जो साथ वाली स्टेट्स हैं उनके साथ इनको मर्ज कर दिया जाय तो जहां तक उनके सियासी बैकवर्डनेस का सवाल है वह वैसे का वसा रहेगा। मिस्टर महंती ने अपने डिसेंटिंग नोट में हवाई (Hawai) और अलास्का (Alaska) का जिक्र किया जो कि अमरीका के अन्दर टेरीटरीज हैं। मगर वे टेरीटरीज अमरीका की अपनी नहीं हैं बल्कि उन्होंने किसी वक्त उनको दूसरे मुल्कों से फतह किया है। इसके बावजूद मेरा एक सुझाव है। यह न समझा जाय कि मैं एक ऐसी टेरीटरी का नुमायन्दा होने की वजह से कोई लम्बे चौड़े सुझाव दे रहा हूं। मेरा यह खयाल है कि इन टेरीटरीज के लिए ऐसा विधान बनाया जाय जो कि उस विधान से बहतर हो जो कि अमरीका ने यह किसी दूसरे मुल्क ने अपनी टेरीटरीज को दे रखा है क्योंकि जहां हम बहुत सी बातें और मुल्कों को दे रहे हैं वहां हमको यहां भी फराखदिली के साथ काम लेना चाहिये। इस सिलसिले में मेरे सुझाव ये हैं :

- (१) मेम्बरान एलेक्टोरल कालेज की ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी के मेम्बर हों।
- (२) एलेक्टोरल कालेज के मेम्बरान डाइरेक्ट एलेक्शन से चुने जायें।
- (३) ऐडवाइजर्स महज ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी के मेम्बरान में से लिये जायें और कम से कम एक ऐडवाइजर हरिजन जरूर हो।
- (४) ऐडवाइजर्स को काफी पावर्स मिलने चाहियें ताकि जो सब्जेक्ट्स उनके जिम्मे हों उनको वे अच्छी तरह सर अंजाम दे सकें। इसके लिये यह जो ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी है वह वहां के इलाके की जरूरत के मुताबिक छोटे मोटे कानून बना सके। यह ठीक है कि पार्लियामेंट को यह पावर हो कि वह चाहे तो उन कानूनों को रद्द कर दे। नहीं तो



यह होगा कि पार्लियामेंट के पास इतना वक्त नहीं होगा कि वह इन इलाकों की बहबूदी के लिए कानून बना सके। आप देखिये कि मणिपुर और त्रिपुरा के लिए न कोई कानून बन सके और न वहां कोई खास डेवलपमेंट का काम हो सका। ये मुश्किलात इन टेरीटरीज के सामने पेश आ रही हैं। इसलिए ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी को पंचायत और दूसरे छोटे मोटे कानूनों में अमेंडमेंट करने का अख्तियार होना चाहिये जिसे वे अपने इलाके की जरूरत के मुताबिक कर सकें। बाद में पार्लियामेंट अगर यह महसूस करे कि उसमें कोई गलती है तो वह उसको रद्द कर सकती है। इस मसले पर खास तबज्जह देने की जरूरत है।

- (५) कमेटी की बैठक साल में कम से कम दो मर्तबा होनी चाहिये। इसके अलावा कमेटी की जो बैठक हो उसमें अगर पब्लिक के आदमी आना चाहें तो वे भी आ सकें और उसकी प्रोसीडिंग्स सुन सकें ताकि सबको असली हालत का पता लग सके कि गवर्नमेंट हमारे लिए क्या कर रही है। इस तरह गवर्नमेंट के सामने जो मुश्किलात होंगी और जो डेवलपमेंट के या दूसरे काम नहीं हो पायेंगे उनके बारे में सबको पूरी जानकारी हो जायगी।

इसके अलावा इन टेरीटरीज के लिए जो गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया खर्च करती है उसके लिए एक छोटा मोटा सेट अप बनना चाहिये। त्रिपुरा में आप देखिये कि वहां तीन ऐडवाइजरों पर १२६०२३ रु० खर्च हुये। इतने ही रुपये में वहां एक छोटा-मोटा सेट अप बन सकता था। जिसमें लोगों का सहयोग भी हो सकता था और साथ साथ जो वहां भीतरी ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में मुश्किलात हैं वे दूर हो सकती थी और जो वहां वहां स्लाहात करने की जरूरत थी वे भी हो सकते थे।

जितनी पार्टी सी स्टेट्स मौजूदा हालत में हैं खास कर मणिपुर, त्रिपुरा और हिमाचल प्रदेश, इनमें जुडीशियल कमिशनर की अदालतें हैं। दूसरे

हाउस में भी और इस हाउस में भी इन अदालतों की कुछ चर्चा हुई है। मालूम होता है कि सिलेक्ट कमेटी में भी इस पर काफी बहस हुई और यही बजह है कि चेयरमैन, सिलेक्ट कमेटी, ने अपने नोट में सफा ७ पर खास तौर से हिमाचल प्रदेश के जुडीशियल कमिशनर के बारे में यह लिखा :

“The question of extending the jurisdiction of the High Court of Punjab to Himachal Pradesh has also been considered by the Committee. They agree that it would be desirable to leave this question to be examined further by the Government after a detailed inquiry and report by an officer who might be specially appointed for this purpose.”

इस सिलसिले में मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है सिवा इसके कि जहां तक हिमाचल प्रदेश के लोगों का सवाल है उनको इस कोर्ट से कोई शिकायत नहीं है। जुडीशियल कमिशनर हर डिस्ट्रिक्ट में जाकर मुकदमे करता है। इससे मुकदमा जल्दी हो जाता है और इसाफ सस्ता पड़ता है। यह मैं जानता हूं कि इस सिलसिले में पहले भी एक दफा पंजाब के वकीलों की तरफ से काफी शोर शराबा हुआ था। सन् १९५० में जिस वक्त पंजाब हाई कोर्ट शिमला आया था, उस वक्त जुडीशियल कमिशनर की कोर्ट भी वहां थी। ये दोनों कोर्ट एक दूसरे से दो फर्लांग की दूर पर थे। उस वक्त यह सवाल पैदा हुआ कि एक जगह दो कोर्ट स की क्या जरूरत है। उसके बाद गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया ने इस बात की छानबीन के लिए मरहूम श्री कानिया, सुप्रीम कोर्ट के चीफ जस्टिस, को नियुक्त किया। छानबीन करने के बाद वे इस नतीजे पर आये कि जुडीशियल कमिशनर की कोर्ट रहनी चाहिये। असलियत यह है कि बगैर हिमाचल प्रदेश गये वहां की गुरबत का अन्दाजा नहीं हो सकता है। कल किशन चन्द जी ने कहा कि दिल्ली में हाई कोर्ट की वेंच फंक्शन कर रही है। जहां तक किशन चन्द जी का सवाल है मैं उनकी बड़ी इज्जत करता हूं। लेकिन मैं उन्हें बतला देना चाहता हूं कि दिल्ली और हिमाचल प्रदेश में उतना ही फर्क है जितना दिन रात में फर्क है। दिल्ली में सब सीधी सड़कें हैं, इसलिये कुछ मालूम नहीं होता है। लेकिन अगर वे हिमाचल प्रदेश एक मर्तबा जायें और तीन मील ही उतार चढ़ाव का रास्ता पार करें, तो कम से कम छः महीने तक वे विलिंगडन हास्पिटल से बाहर नहीं निकलेंगे।

**SHRI KISHEN CHAND** (Hyderabad): On a point of explanation may I point out that this is a question of life and death, and does the hon. Member want that even a sentence of hanging, the capital punishment, should be given by one Judge?

**श्री चरनजीलाल वर्मा** : इस सिलसिले में मैं यह समझता हूँ कि जहाँ तक इस कोर्ट की वहाँ जरूरत है वह इस वास्ते है कि वहाँ के लोग बहुत गरीब है और वे हाई कोर्ट में कौंसिल को पे नहीं कर सकते ।

**श्री किशन चन्द** : फांसी की सजा एक जज दे दे ।

**श्री चरनजीलाल वर्मा** : जहाँ तक फांसी की सजा का भी सवाल है, मैं नहीं समझता कि वहाँ से एक भी अपील हुई होगी । इसके अलावा अगर फांसी की सजा भी देनी होगी, तब भी वहाँ पता लग जायगा कि मुल्जिम कौन है । लेकिन हाई कोर्ट में फाइलो से ही पता लगेगा कि दर-असल मुल्जिम कौन है । इस सिलसिले में एस० आर० सी० के चेयरमैन ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में सफा २४० पर यह लिखा है :

“The system of judicial administration now in force in Himachal Pradesh, under which the Judicial Commissioner visits every district seems to me admirably to suit the requirements of her people who need cheap and expeditious justice. The expensive and time-consuming formalities involved in taking the appeals to the Punjab High Court, which is not so easily accessible, will rob the hillmen of the advantage which they enjoy today.”

मैं समझता हूँ कि ये चेयरमैन के इन अलफाज के बाद कोई वजह नहीं रह जाती कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया इसके लिए कोई आफिसर मुकर्रर करे । जहाँ तक हिमाचल प्रदेश के लोगों का सवाल है उनको जुडीशल कमिश्नर की कोर्ट से कोई शिकायत नहीं है । बाकी रहा यह कि जो चीजें मिल सकती हैं उनके मिलाने से हमको कोई शिकायत नहीं है । मसलन हमारी यूनिवर्सिटी इकट्ठी है । यूनिवर्सिटी के सेंटर हिमाचल प्रदेश में बन जाते हैं और इम्तहान हो जाता है । इससे थहाँ के लोगों को न कोई शिकायत है और न कोई उज्र ही है । इसलिए मैं पंजाब के लोगों से यह अपील करूँगा कि वे यह सोचें

कि चूंकि हिमाचल प्रदेश के लोग बैकवर्ड हैं इसलिए पिछड़े हुये लोगों को उठाया जाय और जो उनके यहाँ मेडिकल, इंजीनियरिंग और टेक्निकल कालेजेज हैं उनमें हमें रिजर्वेशन दिया जाय ताकि हम भी आगे बढ़ सकें । जहाँ तक हाई कोर्ट में वकीलो की फीस का ताल्लुक है, वे तीन सौ रुपया पर डे हियरिंग का चार्ज करते हैं । मैं आपसे दरियाफ्त करता हूँ कि हिमाचल प्रदेश के लोग जो इतने गरीब हैं तीन सौ रुपया दे सकते हैं ? वे यही सोचेंगे कि अपील ही न करें ताकि सारा झगड़ा खत्म हो जाय । क्या कोई हिमाचल प्रदेश का गरीब आदमी पानगी और चीनी से चंडीगढ़ पहुंच सकता है ?

एक सवाल श्री एन० सी० चटर्जी ने हिमाचल प्रदेश के मिलाने के बारे में अपने डिसेंटिंग नोट में उठाया था और कल श्री किशन चन्द जी ने भी इसका कुछ जिक्र किया था । इस बारे में मैं एक दो लफ्ज ही कहूँगा । चटर्जी साहब अपने नोट में लिखते हैं : “Linguistic States are necessary for the advance towards social democracy.” मगर जिस वक्त वह हिमाचल प्रदेश और पंजाब को मिलाने की बात कहते हैं तो उस वक्त वह यह बात बिल्कुल भूल जाते हैं और इसके साथ ही साथ जहाँ वह लिखते हैं कि टेरिटरीज कौन कौन सी होनी चाहियें उसमें लिखा है कि जो टेरिटरीज बैकवर्ड हों, स्टेट्स से बाहर हों या कुछ स्ट्रेटेजिक प्वाइंट की हों उनको सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के डाइरेक्टर एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में होना चाहिये । तो हिमाचल प्रदेश के बारे में उनकी ये सब चीजें लागू नहीं होती । फिर वह कहते हैं कि जो वाडर स्टेट हैं वे इतने बड़े होने चाहियें कि स्टेबिल हो, रिसोर्सफुल हों और अगर कभी हमला हो जाय तो उसका मुकाबिला कर सकें । तो मैं पूछता हूँ कि जो टेरिटरीज सेटर के मातहत होंगी उनकी क्या ठीक से देखभाल नहीं होगी और अगर हमला हो तो क्या उनकी देखभाल नहीं हो सकती है । जब बड़ी स्टेट्स का सवाल आता है जैसे कि बंगाल और बिहार के मर्जर का जब सवाल आता है तो उस वक्त वह और किस्म का गाना गाते हैं और उस वक्त उनके सामने ये बातें नहीं आती हैं । तो जब उनका अपना सवाल आता है तो और तरह की बातें करते हैं । मैं समझता हूँ कि हो सकता है कि इस वक्त हिमाचल प्रदेश में हिन्दू महासभा का कोई वीज मौजूद नहीं है, वहाँ महासभा का जर्म अभी नहीं पहुंचा है क्योंकि जितने कैंडिडेट्स

उनके वहां पर खड़े हुए थे उन सबकी जमानतें जन्त हो गई थी इसलिये वह यह चाहते हैं कि वहां भी हिन्दू महासभा का किसी तरह से कुछ जर्म पहुंच सके और जो बेचैनी पंजाब में फैली हुई है उसी तरह की कुछ बेचैनी यहां भी फैलाने में कुछ कामयाब हो सकें। जहां तक हिमाचल प्रदेश के लोगों का सवाल है, जैसा कि होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने दूसरे हाउस में कहा है, हिमाचल प्रदेश का कोई भी आदमी इस बात के लिये तैयार नहीं है कि वह पंजाब में मिले क्योंकि पंजाब की जो हालत है उसको आप सब जानते हैं। कौशल साहब ने कल कहा था कि पैप्सू वालों ने फराखदिली का सबूत दिया लेकिन जो जो मुश्किलात उनके सामने पैश आ रही हैं वे अब उनके सामने आ गई हैं। जो चीजें वे आज महसूस कर रहे हैं उसको हम लोग बहुत पहले से महसूस करते रहे हैं। उनके लिये तो कोई खास बात ही नहीं है क्योंकि उनकी एक जबान है, उनकी एक लैंग्वेज है और सब बातें एक हैं।

एक थोड़ी सी बात और है। वह यह है कि चम्बा का जो जिला है उसके नक्शे को अगर आप देखें तो आप पायेंगे कि उसके अन्दर दो छोटे-छोटे टाउंस हैं, डलहौजी और बकलोह। इनकी १५, १५ या २०, २० हजार की आबादी है। डलहौजी से हमारे माननीय सदस्य रायजादा हंसराज आये हैं। उन्होंने होम मिनिस्ट्री को और गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया को बहुत दफा लिखा है कि इन शहरों को हिमाचल प्रदेश में मिला दिया जाय क्योंकि उनका डिस्ट्रिक्ट गुरुदासपुर है और गुरुदासपुर कई मील के फासल पर है और वहां से एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में बहुत दिक्कत होती है और लोगों को आने जाने में मुश्किलात आती हैं। उनको वहां से पठानकोट जाना पड़ता है। उन्होंने कहा है कि जो इस तरह के छोटे छोटे एनक्लेव हैं उनको हिमाचल प्रदेश में मिला दिया जाय। इसी तरह से जब आप कालका जायेंगे तो तीन तीन मील पर दूसरी दूसरी बाउंडरियां हो जाती हैं, जैसे पंजाब आया, फिर उसके बाद हिमाचल प्रदेश आया, फिर पंजाब आया और तब फिर हिमाचल प्रदेश आया। उसका नतीजा यह है कि इन सब के एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के करने में इतना खर्च हो जायगा कि जो बहुत ज्यादा होगा और उससे कोई फायदा भी नहीं है। वह इलाका भी पहाड़ी इलाका है और बैकवर्डनेस वहां भी उसी तरह से है। तो अगर इसमें सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट हमारी कुछ मदद कर सकती हो तो जरूर करे

और इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि वह हमारी मदद कर सकती है। अगर कोई यह कहे कि वे हिमाचल प्रदेश में आना नहीं चाहते हैं तो उसके लिये मैं यही कहूंगा कि इसके बारे में वहां के लोगों से पूछ लिया जाय। यही हालत शिमला की भी है, हर तरह से हिमाचल प्रदेश और शिमला एक है। तो अगर इन एनक्लेव्स के बारे में और इनकी एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव कनवीनिएंस के बारे में कुछ कर दिया जाय तो बड़ा अच्छा होगा। इन ड्यू कोर्स आफ टाइम हिमाचल प्रदेश डेवलप हो ही जायगा और तब शायद मुमकिन है कि ये एनक्लेव्स उसमें मिल जायं लेकिन बेहतर यह है कि मौजूदा हालत में यह चीज जरूर हो जाय।

जहां तक डिलिमिटेशन आफ कांस्टीट्यूंसीज का सवाल है उसके सम्बन्ध में यह है कि पांच एमोशिऑन मेम्बर्स सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट नामजद करेगी जो कि वह मेम्बर्स पार्लियामेंट या मेम्बर्स लेजिस्लेटिव असेम्बली में से लेगी। यह चीज नई स्टेट्स के लिये है। लेकिन हिमाचल प्रदेश न तो नई स्टेट है और न पुरानी स्टेट है, उसकी टेरिटरीज रह गई है और उसके अन्दर भी कांस्टीट्यूंसीज बननी हैं। तो वहां पर क्या होगा, उसका कोई प्राविजन नहीं है क्योंकि उसके जो पुराने मेम्बर हैं वे तो असेम्बली के खत्म होने के बाद नहीं रहेंगे और सिर्फ एम० पी० रह जायेंगे। जब सिर्फ एम० पीज० रह गये तो उस लिहाज से क्या सिर्फ एम० पीज० लिये जायेंगे या कोई और मेम्बर सेलेक्ट किये जायेंगे?

इस अल्फाज के साथ मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Madam Vice-Chairman, one of the incidents of a bicameral system is that the initiative in matters vitally affecting the responsibility of the executive to Parliament and through it to the people resides in the lower House. It is to it and to it alone, whatever may be the theoretical equality that an upper Chamber may claim, that Government is answerable in the sense that it can be removed by an adverse vote of the lower House. Armed with the backing of an overwhelming majority in the lower House.....

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: May I remind the hon. Member that our Constitution does not mention lower and upper House?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I can argue with you for hours together if necessary and convince you that under our Constitution the executive is responsible to the lower House alone.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: My point is that the word 'lower House' is not constitutional. Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha are the expressions to be used.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: It is only a difference in wording.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA): You can use the wording 'House of the People' or the 'Lok Sabha'.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: The words 'upper House' and 'lower House' are well known to constitutional theorists all over the world and my friend Mr. Kishen Chand is the first person to have discovered that there is some difference between the lower House and the House of the People.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): At one time I think the distinction between the lower and the upper House was made clear by the Prime Minister himself because there was some trouble some time back in this House about the privileges of the two Houses and it was conceded by the Prime Minister that there was no distinction in the privileges.....

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I did not say that there was any distinction in privileges.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA): Why don't you call it Lok Sabha or the House of the people?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: All right; I shall use the word 'Lok Sabha' if that is the pleasure of the House.

So, armed with the backing of an overwhelming majority in the Lok Sabha, how can it be denied that the Prime Minister as the leader of a democratic party, and a person who derives his authority from the people of India and not from the States into which India is divided for administrative purposes, can make declarations of a far reaching character affecting vital matters, including the reorganisation of the States? I wish to say that as a self-respecting member of the Rajya Sabha, I do not

share the view that the Prime Minister was not entitled to declare, while the Bill is still under the consideration of this House, what the policy of the Government in regard to matters of an important character is. If the argument that Ministers must not speak about matters which are under discussion in either House is pushed to its logical conclusion, Parliamentary Government would indeed become impossible.

A parliamentary executive cannot act as the mere servant of the legislature. Its business is often to give a lead to the legislature and this it does by staking its life on measures promoted by it. I do not want to stress actually on this word 'principles' and there has been a lot of discussion on this word 'principles' in both Houses. A Prime Minister is the pivot round which the parliamentary system works. Historical precedents from Britain, in British history, can be quoted to show how even in a country with long traditions of democracy and well-established conventions governing the working of democracy, Prime Ministers have pledged their parties in advance to policies which they had no doubt would be ratified by those whom they led. I will give five such instances from British history and I can give many instances from Dominion history. The first instance that I shall give was in 1886, in his glorious Midlothian campaign, Mr. Gladstone committed the Liberal Party to Irish Home Rule without previous consultations with his Cabinet. It was on this issue that Mr. Joseph Chamberlain resigned. Then, thereafter the Liberal Unionist Party was formed and Mr. John Bright resigned, but did not cease to be a Liberal. Lord Roseberry in the 90's of the last century.....

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: It is not House of Commons or House of Lords here.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Let him speak please.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Kishen Chand may be a very good mathematician and I shall accept his verdict on matters of mathematics. I am speaking about things which I know and I am speaking about things which can be verified from a reading of the biographies of those men of that period.

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN:** You are quite correct.

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU:** Lord Roseberry in the 90's of the last century declared that the Liberal Party would not carry through any Home Rule measure for Ireland unless it was prepared to carry that measure independently of the vote of Irish members. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald advised dissolution of the House of Commons and the formation of a national government in 1931 without prior consultation with his Labour colleagues. Indeed, he betrayed the Labour Party. Mr. Neville Chamberlain pledged his country's support to the Munich agreement without his party's or his cabinet's or Parliament's prior approval. Mr. Winston Churchill fighting a great war announced in a broadcast that Russia would be treated as an ally without any reference to his cabinet and much before Parliament had occasion to consider the situation created by Russia's entry into the war. Instances of this character can be multiplied. A Prime Minister's position is undefinable. The Prime Minister is, under a parliamentary system of Government, the Prime Minister and if the House or Houses are dissatisfied with his policy there is a remedy open to them and that is to pass an adverse vote of no-confidence. These are instances just to illustrate how enormous is the prestige and the position that the leader of a parliamentary party in a parliamentary democracy possesses. Leadership, therefore, is not inconsistent with democracy. Therefore, Madam Vice-Chairman, I would think that there is no force or point in the criticism that a free discussion of this measure is being stifled in this House.

Apart from this fact, the House should have no grievance in regard to the procedure that has been pursued by the executive in regard to the reorganisation of the States. It was associated with the Joint Select Committee and the decision regarding Bombay was reconsidered by the Prime Minister on the initiative of Members belonging to both Houses, Members who came not only from the 'reptile State' of Uttar Pradesh but from Maharashtra and Gujarat. They were the persons who indeed took the initiative in promoting a reconsideration of the Bombay issue. The decision taken by the Prime Minister was after proper consultation with the Gujarat Members and with the Maharashtrian Members separately. Then they were con-

sulted jointly. The matter was put to the vote of the Congress party and it was approved by the Congress party as a body. Therefore, Madam Vice-Chairman, to say that there had been any disregard of the democratic process is, if I may say so, to talk, well, something that is not sensible. Let me point out that the procedure regarding the reorganisation of States has been completely correct and is in strict accordance with the spirit and letter of our Constitution, which can be only loosely described as a quasi-federation but which possesses many strong unitary features. The power of forming a new State or modifying the boundaries of a new State or altering the boundaries of a new State has been vested not in the States but in Parliament. The States did not frame their Constitutions. The United States model was not followed here. In this House a measure affecting the States of this character has to be recommended by the President before it is introduced and all that the States are entitled to is consultation. Well, now, consultation is not consent; consultation is not even advice. Although the States are entitled to consultation, yet when once a measure is before the House it is up to the House to amend it in any way it chooses. If you say that amendments must go to State Legislatures, you will make the working of the whole system impossible and whether an amendment is in order or is not in order is a question which you and you alone, as Chairman, can decide. There is no requirement that the legislatures of the States must agree to anything that we later decide. In actual practice we are and we have been observing the Constitution both in the letter and spirit. The word 'consultation' was deliberately introduced by the framers of the Constitution. Partition had unnerved us. We were afraid of the fissiparous tendencies which an over-emphasis on State autonomy might create for us in future, and therefore the founding fathers wisely vested this power in the people of India. The sovereignty which this House derives is from the people of India. It is not derived from the States composing the Indian Union. The States are not the creatures of any compact at all. There is no dual citizenship in our Constitution and any individual in India is free to move about throughout the territory of India subject to restrictions of a reasonable character, in accordance with Article 19 of the Constitution. While, therefore, not denying, that power has been given to the

[Shri P. N. Saprū.]

States of an autonomous character for the purposes of administrative convenience, I am prepared to agree with my friends that in the formation of a State, for the purposes of administrative convenience, language is a very important factor to be considered. In fact I may confess that I was one of those who rather believed in linguistic States subject to certain safeguards. But life is dynamic, and political thinking too has to be related to the facts of any particular situation. We cannot be completely doctrinaire in these matters. Let us assume\* that the linguistic principle is desirable in some cases. It may not prove to be so in other cases, and we have to remember that we are living in an age of planning. My friends opposite call themselves leftists. Madam Vice-Chairman, I am free to confess that I myself belong to what they would call the bourgeois leftists, and I have sympathies with leftist ideals. But leftism is a progressive creed, it is a dynamic creed, it changes from day to day. It is not impervious to new ideas. Today the broad fact that stares us in the face is that we are in an age of planning, and in an age of planning, economic planning on a vast scale. Surely there is a case for big units. It was for that reason that I welcomed the formation of a big State comprising Bombay, Gujarat and Maharashtra. Our Constitution does not proceed on the basis of a multinational theory. We rejected the multinational theory. We have not proceeded upon that theory. The question of linguism can only be, therefore, discussed in the light of the circumstances which exist in our country today.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Madhya Pradesh): May I ask a question, Madam. if you will allow me? The question is this: If the States are bigger in size, correspondingly the Centre will be weaker. On the other hand, if the States are smaller, then the Centre is likely to be very strong. Therefore in the interests of the unity of this country, will it not be better that we have small States rather than big States?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: My friend does not ask a question. He has delivered a speech, and it is a big issue which he raises. I do not know how the Constitution will ultimately work. When the French and the British were engaged in

fighting and in rioting in Canada, the solution propounded by Lord Durham was responsible Government for Canada. Responsible Government has worked in Canada for the last hundred years, and Canada is the most prosperous of the white Dominions associated with Britain. When Scotland and England were having controversies in 1704 regarding church matters and such other like matters, the solution accepted was the Act of Union. It was passed in the year 1707. That Act of Union has proved to be a great success. The Scottish people have got intermingled with the British people so much so that the British people now find that these Scottish people control their commercial and industrial life. I know that there are movements today for Scottish Home Rule and Welsh Home Rule, but they do not want a federal solution. They want some devolution of authority in Scotland and Ireland. Therefore, when you are dealing with vast masses of men, when you are dealing with these experiments in Constitutions, as to how a Constitution will ultimately work, there is in all these matters the big factor of the human will, and if the will is there to make a Constitution great, that Constitution can be made great. If the will is there to make a Federal Constitution a unitary Constitution, contrivances and devices will be found to give it a unitary bias. Therefore, to imagine that big States will necessarily lead to conflicts between the Centre and the States in which the Centre will prove necessarily weak is to conjure up a state of affairs which may or may not arise. I personally think that with all the safeguards, the plethora of safeguards—and the States Reorganisation Commission has added to those safeguards—with all those safeguards which our Constitution possesses, there is little danger of these Zonal Council or of these bigger States developing into competitors with the Union Government. In any case my friends of Vidarbha should be rather happy because these big States will tend to restrain the activities of an other big State. So the big States are there. Therefore, why not have some more big States also?

Now, Madam, I will answer a few criticisms which have been made from some benches regarding the mistakes which have occurred in regard to the States Reorganisation Bill. In the first place, it has been said that the question of reorganisation should not have been

taken up at all. In the second place, it has been said that the S.R.C. Report should have been accepted without any reservations and without any 'ifs' and 'buts'. In the third place, it has been said that the procedure adopted in connection with the reorganisation of States was wrong from beginning to end. Now, Madam, the answers to these questions are as follows.

We could not avoid, having regard to our own commitments and having regard to the events that had shaped the history of this country for the last 60 or 70 years, taking up the question of reorganising our States. We had to deal with the problem of Part B and Part C States also. We had somehow to integrate them with our political and economic systems.

Secondly, Madam, we could not accept the Report of the Commission as it was, for several reasons. It was the Report only of a Commission, and no executive body or Legislature can give up its right to examine that Report on its merits. Then, Madam, under the Constitution we were bound to consult the State Legislatures, and we could not do so without first consulting public opinion. Then I may submit with all respect for, and without meaning any disrespect to, the distinguished authors of the Report that it is not a perfect document. It is not a perfect document because it has not been fair to the State of Himachal Pradesh. That is No. 1. It overlooked the fact that Himachal Pradesh was a backward area and that it needed support and encouragement. It overlooked the fact that it should not have been brought into the vortex of Punjab communal politics. It also overlooked the fact that its judicial system, primitive as it might seem to us, had, according to competent legal opinion, served the needs of that State. My friend Mr. Varma referred to the opinion of Chief Justice Kania and Mr. Fazl Ali on this point. I am glad that the question is still an open one, and it will have to be tackled after the Bill is through. In the second place, Madam, the Report was not completely to the liking of the people in the Punjab. The framers of the Report say that the real controversy in the Punjab is one regarding scripts. Yes, so be it. But I think there is something deeper than that. The Sikh section of the population which was enjoying a position of

privilege felt that if PEPSU was integrated with the Punjab, it would not have the say that it did have in the new Punjab. Now that is, up to a point, a legitimate apprehension, and the wise men of the Commission, who were able to evolve a formula for the protection of linguistic minorities through the agency of the Governor, were not able to devise or hit upon the formula of regional committees. Now, you may say that the device of regional committees is a very ugly device.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I submit that one never knows how a particular Constitution will work. Ugly devices have worked very well. The British Constitution is full of ugly features, and yet it works well. The Weimar Constitution was one of the most perfect Constitutions that were ever devised, but it failed. Why did it fail? Because there was not the will of the people to work a democratic system. In human affairs, the human factor cannot be ignored.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Weimar Constitution was well-known to the people, and they were willing to work it. It was only when a certain Government came into power and kept the Constitution alive and yet tried to subvert it, that it resulted in the advent of Hitler.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Well, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I was saying that the problem with regard to the Punjab had been ignored, or it had not been properly tackled, to put it in more definite language, by the Commission.

Sir, the third point against the Commissions is this. I find that Dr. Kunzru is here, and I have got a very high regard for him. He is one of the most selfless men in the public life of our country, and I attach a very great deal of importance to his judgment. Now the basic fact about Bombay was—and it is a fact which has been stressed by the Commission—that it was geographically inseparable from Maharashtra. No logic or no argument could get over that fact. It is connected with the hinterland of Bombay. Geographically, culturally and economically, Bombay is part of Maharashtra. Therefore, instead of making a definite recommendation that Bombay should go to Maharashtra, they talked of the difficulties involved in

[Shri P. N. Saprú.]

handing over Bombay to any particular community or to any particular unilingual State. They did not suggest, of course, that it should be a Central enclave, but they did not in so many words say that it should be made a City State.

They did not, in putting forward their solution of a joint State, say that this, in their opinion, was the ideal solution but there was a second best solution which should be explored and that was the possibility of Bombay being assimilated with Maharashtra. After certain events have occurred, Dr. Kunzru comes forward with the statement that they never contemplated that Bombay would form part of or would be a Centrally administered area and that Bombay indeed belongs to Maharashtra. I wish wisdom had dawned on them earlier. I wish wisdom had dawned on Mr. Panikar and I wish also that the Chairman had been more alert. Mr. Deputy Chairman, there is always a danger in appointing small Commissions. We seem to be thinking in terms of super-men in this country. We had in the old days big Commissions. I don't regret the passing away of the old order but there are some things that it has left which we might still remember. In the old days Commissions used to be representative Commissions. They used to be rather big Commissions and they used to be Commissions in which every section of opinion had a chance of being represented.

Now that being the state of affairs, it is I think, wrong for any political party to blame the party in power for all that has occurred during these months. Our Maharashtrian friends too are to blame and our Gujarati friends too are to blame. The Maharashtrians talked of fighting the matter out in the streets of Bombay and they did fight the matter out in the streets of Bombay. Gujarat has unfortunately retorted with the result that one of the great Indians from one of our States is atoning for their sins by his fast. Mr. Deputy Chairman, I think there were certain difficulties inherent in the situation and often it happens in human affairs that man becomes a pawn in the chess-board of destiny.

Having said all this about Bombay, I would say that it is my sincere hope and it should be our sincere effort to

make this Gujarat and Maharashtra State a real grand success. Gujarat has given to this country very great men. It gave to this country Gandhiji, it gave to this country the Patel brothers—the Patel who integrated the States and who brought about the unity of this country—and Swami Dayanand Saraswati. Maharashtra has given us many great men. It has played a very great part in the renaissance of India. It gave to this country Ball Gangadhar Tilak, Mahadev Govind Ranade whose writings on economic affairs may still be read with profit by our historians, Gopal-krishna Gokhale and in the world of scholarship, Ramgopal Bhandarkar. The country has not produced a greater orientalist. Surely these two great peoples can, like the English and the Scottish people, learn to forget their differences and help each other. If there is the desire on their part to do so, they can help and build up a State which will be an example to all the States in India, which will be the symbol of Indian unity.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is therefore our earnest desire on this day when the news of the fast has come to us, to see that we discuss these problems in their proper perspective. There are one or two things that I would like to say about this matter before I conclude. I would say something about Second Chambers. Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am not personally, though I work in a Second Chamber, a very great believer in Second Chambers. But there are Second Chambers and Second Chambers. The Second Chamber visualised by the authors of the Joint Select Committee and by the Bill for these States is not a Second Chamber with a property bias. It very often happens that some men who would be valuable in a legislature are left out or cannot seek election to popular houses and it is desirable to make provision for them. In England they promote from time to time men who have distinguished themselves in the House of Commons to the House of Lords. In the second place, a Second Chamber can be a useful Chamber for revising purposes and our drafting in these days is not perfect and in the third place, a Second Chamber can be useful for discussing questions which the First Chamber is unable to take up for want of time. Therefore I approve of the provisions regarding Second Chambers.

Before I conclude I would say a few words about safeguards for linguistic



minorities. We all have a great love for Hindi. The controversy so far as Hindi is concerned is over. Our first loyalty is to our State Language but surely our regional languages—and I include in our regional languages a language which is our common inheritance, which was developed in Delhi and round about places by the Hindus and Muslims, I mean the Urdu language—those languages have a right to live and have a special claim upon our attention. This is not a Constitution Bill. So I will not suggest how this can be done but I think, broadly I agree with the Commission that there should be provision for linguistic safeguards. They suggest that the linguistic safeguard should be administered by Governors but I have not yet been able to understand whether placing a safeguard of that character in the hands of the Governor will not impose an intolerable burden upon him. It may be that a good solution of the problem will be to have a special officer who will report to this Parliament from time to time and who will be under the control of the Union Government. Also it is the basic right of a child to be educated in the primary stage in his mother tongue. It is the basic right of a citizen to have the liberty of presenting an application to a Court in his mother tongue. I think we should view this problem in a big way because it is the bigness which we display on these matters which will emphasise the secular character of our State.

We should never forget that this is Gandhiji's land and in working out solutions of difficult problems, we should invoke his spirit and endeavour to the best of our ability to find solutions which will firmly entrench our State in the affections of every section of the people.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to say.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are still some 32 speakers.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I am just concluding.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And we have only one day more.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Sir, I would like to conclude on a note of hope. We are passing through a very difficult phase in our history. But this is a phase which is not peculiar to our

country. The United States of America had to fight a civil war before it could discover its own soul. Other countries have had to go through similar struggles. But that does not justify our doing wrong things. I am not worried about the reactions of what we do or what we do not do, on other nations. I think that should be the least material factor with us. But what I am afraid of is that in all these controversies, we are not living up to the true ideals of the Panch Shila. We are not in our own internal affairs, showing that spirit.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: May I ask a question? When the hon. Member presses for safeguards for linguistic minorities, is he acting up to the ideals?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: No, I have not said anything, not a word about the nature of Constitutional safeguards.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: You approve of it?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: My concrete and actual suggestion is this. No Constitution can be without safeguards. I have yet to come across a Constitution without safeguards. The Constitution of the United States of America which is based on what is called the theory of balance of powers.....

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: It does not provide any safeguards for the Negroes.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: That is why it is in trouble.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Deputy Chairman my hon. friend is wrong for there are safeguards of the equal protection and the 'due process' clause for everybody including the Negroes and the Supreme Court of that great country is a very powerful body. Its authority is of an extensive character and many writers on the American Constitution have said that the Supreme Court is the sovereign body in the U.S.A. And the Supreme Court, in a memorable judgment, dealt with this matter. The Chief Justice of that country is here now and I had the pleasure of meeting him and...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sapru, we need not go into all these theoretical considerations here now.

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU:** And they have decided in a case that there shall be no segregation so far as Negroes are concerned. That is being implemented and it is on this issue that there is much agitation in the U.S.A. Therefore, that analogy will not do.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I fear I have taken far more time than I had intended. I will now conclude on a note of hope. I have faith in the greatness of my people, I have faith in the destiny of my people and I have faith in our leadership. I am sure all these things which are disturbing us now will disappear and we shall be having, after the Bill has passed through, a happier and contented India.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** I would request each hon. Member to take not more than fifteen minutes. I will ring the bell on the thirteenth minute and the Member will please not take more than fifteen minutes.

**SHRI T. V. KAMALASWAMY (Madras):** Mr. Deputy Chairman, the provisions of this Bill have been so long under discussion on different platforms and so many different viewpoints have been expressed that there is very little that can usefully be said at this stage. Nor do I think it is any use putting forward any suggestion because the ruling Party with its steam-roller majority, having come to some conclusions, it is difficult for them to change them, however erroneous or halty they may be. But still it is my duty to sound a note of warning to the Congress Party and say that this Bill has left in its trail a large amount of bitterness and it has created bad blood and ill-feeling and created distrust among the people and there is rancour and bitterness in the minds of the people in different parts of the land.

Speaking about my own state of Madras, I do confess that the Government of India has not realised the magnitude of the feeling of resentment and the feeling of neglect and the feeling of injury at the injustice meted out to that part of the country by this States Reorganisation Bill. I will touch upon only two points. There is this loss of territory involved by the non-secession of the taluks of Devikulam and Peermade and the taluka of Shencottah which should have gone to the township of Shencottah. Of course, it is inevitable in a process of linguistic redistribution of the

country that there should be territorial changes and in that process some States will lose some territory and some will gain. But as far as the State of Madras is concerned, if you look into the matter, you will find that the net result has been that while as a result of the reorganisation plan the neighbouring States of Kerala, Andhra and Mysore are well supplied with forest wealth, the State of Madras has been practically denuded of its forest areas. Tamilnad, already poor in its natural resources and made poorer by the gross neglect of the powers that be at Delhi, by their refusal to give sufficient funds for developmental plants, has been impoverished by the refusal to secede these two talukas of Devikulam and Peermade which belong to it by right.

The Central Government may remonstrate and say that no part of the country should think itself to be isolated or that no part of the country can claim to be self-sufficient in every respect. If we look at the two taluks of Devikulam and Peermade, we will find that these two taluks which are on the Western Ghats, can be approached only through Tamilnad. They have been built up in the course of more than hundred years by the diligent toil of the Tamilian labourers who have built up prosperous plantations in the same way as they have done in Ceylon and Malaya. The people of these taluks, though predominantly Tamilian, have been denied their fundamental right to join with their motherland, that is, Tamilnad. Various compromise proposals were put forward by Members of this House and of the other House to say that at least a portion of these two taluks which contain a majority of Tamilians ought to be ceded to Tamilnad but the vested interests and others prevailed upon the Congress High Command and convinced it that it would be very difficult for the Congress Party in Kerala to pacify the people of that State over the loss of the Tamil-speaking districts unless these two taluks were retained in Kerala. They further seem to have convinced the Congress High Command that the Tamilians have always been well-tempered and non-violent and that the views of these Tamilians could always be made to be subservient. The result is that these two valuable and prosperous areas which by right ought to belong to Tamilnad have been denied their rightful places. These areas are not only full of plantations but herein

lies the catchment area for a large number of rivers and rivulets which at present run waste into the Arabic Sea. They are of absolutely no use to the Kerala State. On the other hand, if they are dammed over, like the Periyar, and the water diverted towards the Madras side, they will be useful for irrigating thousands of acres of land in Madurai and Ramnad districts. It is a very tragic picture to see this colossal waste of natural resources. It is a tragic picture to see the Central Government siding with the Government of the Kerala State which adopts a dog-in-the-manger policy by denying to the people of Tamilnad valuable natural wealth and by preventing them from exploiting the natural resources of the land. The logic behind this refusal to cede these two taluks to Tamilnad is understandable to anyone with a sense of justice and fairplay. As regards the consistent indifference to the Tamilians, it is evident from the partitioning of the tiny taluk of Shencotta which is to be transferred to the Madras State. Shencotta is a very small taluk whose people, for many decades, have been living in a kind of no man's land, disclaimed for all practical purposes both by the Travancore State and by the Madras State. Shencotta is at the base of the hills on the eastern side of the Western Ghats, that is on the side of the Madras State. The entire population is Tamil-speaking; they have got, at the foot of the hills, about 10,000 acres of paddy land which are very poorly productive because of lack of irrigational facilities. A few years back, the Government of Travancore-Cochin examined a scheme costing about four or five lakhs of rupees to block up some of the streams and provide irrigation facilities for this land but even these minor irrigation schemes—such as the interest or lack of interest towards the Tamil-speaking people there—were not implemented. Now, a few months ago, in the original draft, the whole of Shencotta taluk was agreed to be ceded to the Madras State but the Travancore-Cochin State and the other interested parties cleverly manoeuvred to interpolate with the result that in the final scheme, only the township of Shencotta is to be transferred to the Madras State and not the other surrounding areas. This denial to the people of Shencotta the valuable hill area surrounding it is not far. If the Madras State is to help these people by providing certain irrigation facilities, it is absolutely necessary that the Puliara

Hill Pakuthy—the portion round about Shencotta—which is absolutely of no use to Travancore-Cochin Government should be transferred—this being on the other side of the Western Ghats—to the Madras State. I, therefore, appeal to the House to forget all sense of false prestige or dignity and accept Dr. Subbarayan's amendment calling for the cession of this entire Shencotta taluk to Madras State.

I have only one word to say before I come to the Zonal Councils. I here want to stress upon the dangers inherent in fragmentation of the country. Much has been said in this House as well as outside about the potential danger of the vast re-organisation programme the Government has embarked upon. The country is torn by factions which have multiplied since the States Reorganisation Commission submitted its Report to the Government. There are many new and big problems created but I do not propose to go into them. I am, however, in duty bound to say that, with regard to my own region in the South, this Bill will be dangerous for its future security and development unless the requisite precautions are taken even now. It is too late in the day to conceal the fact that people in the South have developed a feeling that the politicians of the North have been carried away by the temptation to keep the Southern Region fragmented, desolate, if not disrupted, so that the writ of the North may run in this region for ever. Throughout the length and breadth of Tamilnad, we hear the cry today that the North is not at all concerned about the welfare and interests of South India and, taking advantage of this fact, various political parties have sprung up. They have built up political, linguistic, racial and communal agitations and cries of self-help, self-reliance and self-determination have been raised. There are even factions which are crying for independence. The same state of affairs occurs on a smaller scale in the neighbouring States of Kerala, Andhra and Mysore. Let us look at history, history not of a few years or even of a few decades hence but of centuries. What prevents these States which, as I said just now, are fragmented, desolate and disrupted, from seeking their own integral existence independent of the rest of India should be the power and authority of the Central Government ever fumble or weaken? There is not the slightest doubt today

[Shri T. V. Kamalaswamy.]

that in several other parts of India, there is a new consciousness of national unity and pride of nationhood. May I ask in all sincerity, whether this Bill has succeeded in providing the means and the where withall to the Government of the country to go ahead with a sense of national pride and national unity among these different groups of people, speaking different languages and observing different customs? The idea of Dakshina Pradesh was proposed by many patriotic leaders in the South. Considerable lip service was paid by the Central Government but apparently it did not suit their present day interest to build up a united Southern region and they gave up the proposal. If you are interested and sincere about it, it may be that the situation in the South need not be utterly handicapped by this sense of fragmentation and this fear of neglect and indifference by the powers that rule in the far off capital. This is the proper function of the Zonal Council in each region and the one in the South is very important to us. The Bill contains the necessary provisions to make the Zonal Councils useful in ensuring regional co-operation and bringing all the States into an integrated pattern of relationship *inter se* and *vis-a-vis* the capital. Important functions have been assigned to the Zonal Councils under clause 21(2) (a). Nearly all subjects can be brought up in the Zonal Councils by consent of the participating States but it is well known that all these functions will remain simply meaningless empty words unless the Central Government puts life into them by making these Councils an effective machinery of advice and consultation. Sir, these Councils can be made utterly ineffective also should the authorities at Delhi permit factions and controversies to saddle them.

On the contrary these Councils can be made little parliaments by giving to their decisions and recommendations the sanctity of legislation. Sir, I am not speaking of today or tomorrow, but I am speaking of the days to come when our children and our children's children will read the pages of history we are making here now in our generation. Sir, ten years ago this great country was a bigger State with an integrated social and political character. May be owing to pressure of circumstances, may be owing to lack of our own capacity and

sagacity we had had to accept the idea of partition, but by commendable efforts the nation has been set on its feet again, and may I ask in all humility for an assurance from the Home Minister that the great work which has been begun under such good auspices will not be made to look like empty nothing for lack of efforts on the part of the Central Government to sustain the movement of national integration already set on foot? This is a historic Bill and we have to give our sanction to it in a spirit of humility and sincerity and I hope it will go on record that the Government of the country will at all times attach such sanctity to the provisions of this Bill, that the men in Cape Comorin and Kashmir and the man in Gujarat and Assam may shake hands and call themselves brothers and sons of one great nation.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to accord my support to the Bill wholeheartedly. It is true, Sir, as many hon. Members have observed, that history is being made and now that we are almost at the end of our labours it may not profit us much to subject this Bill to any meticulous analysis. We must take it as the quintessence of the wisdom of all the people, the Government, the Parliament, the State Governments and Legislatures and see that we make the best use of the reorganisation and the consequences that flow from it. After freedom, Sir, we know in what condition this country found itself with a large number of Princely States, 562, in number, and it was one of the most wonderful achievements of our Government that without the slightest trouble they were able to integrate these States of varying sizes and varying types of Government. That is an achievement, Sir, which has baffled most people outside India. But, after all, that was a kind of a makeshift which had not much of a logic in it and therefore there was a continuous demand of the people for reorganisation of the States on linguistic principles, as far as possible. Sir, this is one of the things on which there is still a lot of uncertainty, I am sorry to say. It is true that for a long time this country has been fed on this idea of linguistic States. It was only in Hyderabad that the idea was replaced by the idea of reorganisation of States taking various other things also, into consideration along with languages. But today, Sir, we are not sure whether the States should be modelled on the basis of a unilin-

gual system or on the basis of a bilingual system or that of a multilingual system. In fact, Sir, that has led many people to a lot of confusion. I would therefore, be very happy if my friend, Mr. Datar, is able to say exactly whether the Government is wedded to the principle of unilinguism, bilingualism or multilinguism.

Sir, there has been a gradual evolution from the idea of unilinguism to multilinguism and then a step back to bilingualism. Personally, Sir, if you ask me, I have had no misgivings that this unilinguism was not going to be the best arrangement for this country. It is far better that we have not only bilingualism but multilinguism as our basic principles.

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): There is a contradiction.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: There is no question of contradiction.

PROF. G. RANGA: There are three negatives in one sentence.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: My friend, Prof. Ranga, ought to follow what I say.

I am not sure what holds the field today. Personally I would prefer multilinguism to either unilinguism or bilingualism. I would very briefly—I am sorry you have fixed the time unfortunately; I should hurry up—I would very briefly tell you how the idea has undergone a change. Up to Hyderabad we were paying homage to unilinguism. Thereafter there was a certain development. We found how difficult it was to adopt that as the most salutary principle, and we switched over to other considerations with the result that the States Reorganisation Commission gave us this bilingual State of Bombay. Sir, here and there certainly are States which have more than one language.

Take for instance Madras itself. Nobody says it is merely a Tamil State. You have got a large Telugu population in Madras today. Likewise in Mysore. In Mysore, for instance, you have got a whole district which is predominantly Telugu in character. So it was not as though it was possible with

the best of ingenuity to carve States purely on a linguistic basis. What happened afterwards was that there was the suggestion of merger of West Bengal and Bihar and afterwards came the brilliant suggestion of a Dakshina Pradesh comprising not all the four States of Dakshina Pradesh—they are Madras, Kerala, Mysore and Andhra—but three of them, Kerala, Madras and Mysore. That was a suggestion which was largely welcomed not only by humble souls like me but by Cabinet Ministers, by the hon. Mr. K. C. Reddy, and various other friends. Sir, naturally the suggestion was that there should be a multilingual State comprising Andhra, Madras, Kerala and Mysore, and I welcomed it as a matter of fact. It is only friends like Mr. Ranga, who were not ready, who had not the large-heartedness to welcome a scheme like that. After this suggestion of a Dakshina Pradesh what happened was—I have got correspondence on this point; I am armed with that from high quarters—what happened was that there was a shift from multilinguism and trilinguism to bilingualism. I have been unable to exactly go behind this idea and understand what has motivated the shift to bilingualism from trilinguism and multilinguism. I do not think, Sir, it would profit anybody to go and make a searching analysis of this, but the fact is here that today this unilinguism does not hold the same field which it did some-time back.

I hope I am interpreting the mind of the Government aright if I were to say that they are leaning much more to bilingualism today than to unilinguism. I hope they will just take a step forward and even think of multilinguism if possible. That is a matter on which men in the same group or men in one and the same place, are not thinking alike. That is a most extraordinary thing.

I would in passing say in support of Mr. Sapru's ideas that when we are thinking of States we must think as far as possible of States of similar size and if possible of similar population. Once we give up the idea of smaller States, I think we must have as far as possible all big States. It is rather unfair that we should have one huge State, a sprawling State of 80,000 to 90,000 sq. miles or even a lakh of sq. miles and at the same time have a tiny State—the poor Kerala. We should have as far as possible States

[Shri H. C. Dasappa.]

of equal size and that would be more conducive to greater strength, solidarity and harmony than otherwise.

I would then deal with this question of Bombay. I must say I wholeheartedly welcome this new Bombay State.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR (Travancore-Cochin): But the people are not welcoming it.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: My friend there says that the people are not welcoming it. Sir, I consider that the incidents in Ahmedabad are merely an aberration, a temporary aberration. If any one wants to make capital out of that solitary situation and say that the people of Gujarat are not welcoming it, I am afraid one is sadly mistaken.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): There was nobody at yesterday's meeting there.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Sir, when something great is to happen, a certain amount of scum comes to the surface.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do you mean to say that this is scum coming to the surface when millions of people are protesting?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: There may be honest differences of opinion. I do not deny that there can be honest differences of views but surely this exhibition of rowdyism, these violent things that are happening in Ahmedabad, I do not think that even Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will endorse them and if he does I will have to think differently about him.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: What about the order to shoot to kill?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: You will find that this is merely a temporary aberration which will soon settle down. I put Ahmedabad, that one solitary city on one side and put the whole of Gujarat on the other side and I would ask, is it not astounding that there should be so much unanimity in Gujarat with regard to this new State? Sir, Maharashtrians have stood to gain by this; they are 65 per cent. in the new State. They have not only gained Bombay, which is a little part of the country but also the

whole of Gujarat. Similarly, Gujarat also stands to gain; there is no doubt about it because we have the authority of its leaders. They have not only got a small part of the country, which would have come under Maha Gujarat, but a vast territory, in fact the biggest State in India which they could make use of in the best interests of the country as a whole. Therefore they stand to gain and Bombay stands to gain too. There is not one man in Bombay who does not welcome this bilingual State. Therefore viewed from every point of view, it is not only the wisest decision but the most acceptable decision. But it is very unfortunate that Shri Morarjibhai has had to go on fast. I only hope that friends there and elsewhere will all prevail upon him to give up the fast. After all, he is the Chief Minister of the new State and his services are required immediately for the country. I would therefore appeal most sincerely and earnestly that he may give up the fast and I hope the people there will create the necessary psychological atmosphere to make him end the fast. Imagine, Sir, that these people should not have allowed him to make a speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is not true. They never came in the way. They did not attend the meeting.

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He could have made a speech in Kali Bazar.

SHRI H. S. DASAPPA: We know on authority as to who provoked the situation in Ahmedabad and I hope you don't want me to go into that. The P.S.P. leaders want the bilingual State but the P.S.P. followers are working against that. Is that a Party? Is that organisation? Our friend Mr. A. K. Gopalan...

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: He is also on fast.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: ... They do not bother in the least when there is trouble in Anjar due to earthquake, but the moment there is this sort of trouble, they go to fish in troubled waters.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Can't he go there to study the situation? Is it their monopoly?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: This is the kind of service that they render to this country. I do not get generally provoked, so do not provoke me to say things.....

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Then I would like to say something about these boundaries. Many hon. Members have referred to this question; even the hon. Lady Member, Dr. Seeta Parmanand, said something about that. I really do not know whether she has chosen Bombay or Madhya Pradesh for her constituency. Anyway, I want to lay down these general propositions. I am not anxious that any unwilling people should be coerced to stay in a State and I am not prepared to allow anybody who wants to stay in a State to go out of that State. And I think the people must accept these general propositions and that is why I just tackled my hon. friend who was talking about Belgaum by asking him about Akalkot, South Sholapur, Madaksira and a part of Kasaragod. I may say a word or two about these places. Madaksira is a mere enclave because 95 per cent. of the area around it is Mysore State and the people there want to be in Mysore State.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: What about Kolar?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: The representatives of Kolar is here. Do you think he ever cares to go out of Mysore? Ask him here. Take any one; they want to remain in Mysore. Such is the fair and just treatment that Mysore metes out that not one person wants to go out of Mysore. On the other hand there are people who want to come into Mysore. There are people who have said that the area about Chandragiri forms part of Tululand which means of course Karnataka or Mysore. Then there are these Manjeswari and Kumbbla.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN (Madras): It is Manjeswar.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR: You don't know even the name of the place?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: You may have made a special study of that. Manjeswar and Kumbbla are two firkas which do not even form one-third part

of the Kasaragod Taluk, and they are within eight to nine miles of Mangalore. So from all points of view at least these two firkas ought to go to Karnataka. Historically also from the time of Vijayanagar Kings right down to the present day it comes under Karnataka. Take the Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee for instance. The most astounding thing is that nobody bothered about this up till the States Reorganisation Commission took up the question. When the Congress provinces were constituted, why is it that my Kerala friends did not create some agitation that this portion must be in Kerala? They did not choose to do it. I have all my sympathies for Kerala. My Kerala friends know that I was one of those who were the earliest to welcome the formation of Dakshin Pradesh. I even said that, when the question of bilingual States came up, I personally would not be against Karnataka-Kerala merger. Now, they ought to win the goodwill of the people of the neighbourhood.

4 P.M.

By just foregoing a small patch of territory they are not going to lose much; they are not going to lose a new place to colonise and all that kind of thing. I would beg of my Kerala friends to see this much of reasonableness and you will see the volume of goodwill that will be on your side and you will make it more easy for that happier consummation that all have in view of wider collaboration.

I do not want to go into many other things. The House may be aware as to how it was decided virtually first that north of Chandragiri river should go to Karnataka, the new Mysore, and how Gudalur came in the way because the Madras Government—naturally I suppose, I do not want to quarrel with them—objected to Gudalur being handed over to Kerala. So, it is not that my Kerala friends are not unreasonable. They were reasonable, but merely because they lost some places elsewhere they turned their ire and anger on the portion north of Chandragiri. I hope that by the time we rise, Mr. Datar who is, of course, very reasonable, I am sure, would not object to these two firkas Manjeswar and Kumbbla going to Karnataka.

About the name I want to say a word. I see in one of the amendments here a most extraordinary suggestion. Certain

[Shri H. C. Dasappa.]

friends have suggested a change in the name of Mysore. They want it to be Karnataka. How our Kerala friends are concerned about the name of Mysore is a thing which is very difficult for all to understand. Sir, Tamilnad is Madras; Maharashtra and Gujarat together is Bombay; and likewise U. P. is Uttar Pradesh. It does not go by the name of Hindi State. Madhya Pradesh has not the linguistic complexion in its name. Likewise so many States. But with regard to Mysore alone they want to have a change for Karnataka. Now, I say it is better that this question..... (*Interruptions.*) I do not want hon. Members to interrupt me because I have no time. I hope my friends who are there will not try to unnecessarily interfere in this fine happy compromise that has been effected in Mysore State. There was a section in Mysore which was against this merger of all the Kannada areas. They have happily reconciled themselves and we want to make a fine success of it. Today there are some elements who are not happy at the considerable amount of unanimity and homogeneity that exists in this new State of Mysore. I suppose in no other place has there been such fine feeling as between the different Kannada areas which come under the new Mysore State. They are very silent. I do not know why now other people want to create some agitation. Having found nothing else they want to create some agitation.

Then, Sir, I want to speak something about the financial aspects. You will find from Shri Morarji Desai's own statement that Karnataka districts of Bombay have a deficit of Rs. 3.25 crores. My friends from Hyderabad alone know how undeveloped those districts are—Bidar, Gulbarga and Raichur. (*Interruption.*) Then, people know how much money we have had to pump into Bellary in order to provide the minimum amenities.

PROF. G. RANGA: Rs. 40 lakhs every year.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: My friend says it is Rs. 40 lakhs. Then, we have got other areas and we have got to have our own development. The Chief Minister of Mysore, who was the Finance Minister till yesterday says that if we bring up the Services to the scales prevailing in Bombay, it may mean Rs. 5 to Rs. 6 crores of additional funds. The States Reorganisation Commission would

have done well to have had a financial expert with them to find out what the result would be of giving effect to its recommendations. Then, they would have made certain other proposals to help the smooth ushering in and the progress of these new States with the result that we have possible about..... (*Time bell rings.*) Only a couple of minutes more, Sir. About Rs. 10 or Rs. 12 crores will have to be found for Mysore. All that I am saying is that it is not very easy to redraw the map of India by just bringing the different areas together into different zones or different States. It is not very easy to implement it. Not only questions of integration of taxes and integration of laws but also of the integration of the services—these are going to create a tremendous problem. I would ask humbly my hon. friend, Mr. Datar, just to tell us what the commitments would be in case the scales of pay are all made uniform, say, up to the level of Bombay scales, both gazetted or non-gazetted.

Then, Sir, I want to say a word about Zonal Councils. This is one of the happiest portions of the States Reorganisation Bill. I have fallen in love with the idea of Zonal Councils. I think they are going to really bring about that emotional integration which all of us desire. May I suggest this, because I have no time to develop it? We have now only the Chief Ministers and one or two Ministers and one or two officers as advisers. I would suggest this for the kind consideration of the hon. Minister, Mr. Datar. Having a long-range view of things I would rather like that every State should be represented by certain observers also, who may not be enabled to vote there but just as in other international organisations to do the work of observation. Each State may have five to ten per cent of its legislators to go and take part in these, if necessary, and then we will be laying the truest foundation for real harmony between different States. And I would say this that if that is done, they would be able to work in the sub-committees, and there would be a first class liaison between the different States of the zone.

Then, Sir, about Mysore being tacked on to Bombay. I followed the speech of my hon. friend, the Minister for Home Affairs, very closely. The only reason that he gave was that Bombay had become bilingual and there was no other



State to go with it. Therefore, they took hold of Mysore and tacked it on to Bombay, because the northern districts of Mysore were originally with Bombay. Sir, you know and everybody knows that there were certain statements about these Indo-Aryan languages, that we were speaking some Dravidian languages and so on. And so, the natural affinities are between the four southern States of Andhra, Madras, Kerala and Mysore. Not that I am against association with any State. I want to make it absolutely clear. Personally I would join any other State. There is no trouble with Bombay. Certainly I will get on very well with Bombay. We will get on exceedingly well. They need have absolutely no fear. We would be friends with all the States. But I am only saying that these are the natural affinities with the Southern States and why should we be tacked on to Bombay. If that could be avoided it would be so much the better.

There is only one other point—and I will close my speech—and that is about the membership of the Rajya Sabha. You will find from clause 24 of the Bill—original clause 26 of the Bill—that from Bombay four are to be given seats to represent the new State of Mysore instead of two that they had agreed to before. The other two were made up of one from South Kanara—Shri Sadanand Hegde and another to be elected from the new legislature of Mysore. I am unable to understand why this change has been made and how can the Government justify this at all? There are only two people from Karnataka area now in the Rajya Sabha. If they have got to add two more they won't be of Karnataka. They cannot represent Karnataka—not that I do not welcome them here. That is a different thing. But it is a misnomer to call them, people who do not belong to that area, to be Kannadigas representing this new State of Karnataka. This is a matter which has got to be settled fairly.

Just one other matter, I will just say a few words with your kind permission, and that is with regard to assets and liabilities. This has given one of the greatest headaches in the past when we have had this federal finance integration. What I would say is—whether it concerns Madras or Bombay or Hyderabad

—apart from the question of the sharing of assets on a *per capita* basis we have got these large, what you call, building assets developed in each of the States. When we think of our assets and liabilities, due credit must be given for the large amount of money spent on public buildings in Bombay, Hyderabad, Madras and elsewhere. We must get our due share to that extent. So, when we are to share the assets and liabilities, to that extent the liabilities must be made less or the assets must be made more. I think these are very important points and I hope that the hon. Home Minister will kindly give us some assurance on these points.

**श्रीमती अनीस किदवाई (उत्तर प्रदेश) :**

मि० डेपुटी चैयरमैन, आज दो, तीन रोज़ से इस हाउस के अंदर स्टेट्स रिऑर्गनाइजेशन बिल पर बहस चल रही है। जिन लोगों ने उसमें हिस्सा लिया, किसी के नजदीक यह बिल ठीक है तो किसी के नजदीक गलत, और किसी का ख्याल है कि यह जल्दी आ गया। मुझे इस पर याद आता है कि जब किसी बड़े आदमी का जिक्र होता है, तो उसके बारे में लोग कहते हैं कि वह तो वक्त से पहले पैदा हो गया था। शायद यह स्टेट्स रिऑर्गनाइजेशन बिल भी वक्त से पहले पैदा हो गया है। यह तो कहा जा सकता है कि यह वक्त से पहले आया है अभी माहौल तैयार नहीं हुआ था, जमीन बनी नहीं था, मुल्क शायद इतना तैयार नहीं था, लेकिन यह नहीं कहा जा सकता कि इसको आना ही नहीं चाहिये था। बहरहाल, जो चीज़ आई है, हो सकता है कि एक कदम आगे बढ़ने के लिये हो, उससे एक कदम हम आगे बढ़ें, हिन्दुस्तान को यूनिटी बढ़ती रहे और मुल्क ज्यादा तरक्की कर सके। और यह भी हो सकता है कि पैर डगमगा जाय और हम लोग और नीचे गिर जायें।

अब से पहले एक आनरेबल मम्बर न अपनी तकरीर में कुछ फिरकापरस्ती और प्राविसियलिज्म की बात और पाकिस्तान बनने का भी तजक़िरा किया। मैं उसके बारे में सिर्फ़ इतना ही कह सकती हूँ कि वह प्राविसियलिज्म या फिरकापरस्ती जो थी, जिसने कभी पाकिस्तान बनवाया था, वह अब अपना चोला बदल चुकी है। वही फिरकापरस्ती, आप इसको मानें या न मानें, लेकिन यह वाक़या है कि, वही फिरकापरस्ती

### [श्रीमती अनीस किदवाई]

अब कभी संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र का नारा लगाती है, कभी महापंजाब की मांग करती है, कभी महागुजरात का मतालबा करती है, कभी किसी और सूरत में सामने आती है और कभी लैंगुएज प्रब्लम बन कर सामने आती है। हमारे दिमाग के पीछे जो चीज छिपी हुई है उसकी वजह से हम किसी चीज को उस नजरिये से नहीं देख सकते हैं जिससे देखना चाहिये। मैजारिटी और माइनारिटी का किस्सा हर रोज पैदा होता है। हमारी समझ में नहीं आता है कि जब मैजारिटी को सारी ताकत हासिल है तब माइनारिटी से उसको डर क्या हो सकता है, खतरा क्या हो सकता है। दूसरे, यहां जो माइनारिटी हैं, कुछ जबान की बुनियाद पर मानी गई है, कुछ मजहब की बुनियाद पर और कोई आबादी के लिहाज से मानी जाती हैं, लेकिन दुनिया के दूसरे मुल्कों में तो कहीं ऐसा नहीं होता। हर जगह पोलिटिकल माइनारिटी हुआ करती है और पोलिटिकल मैजारिटी होती है। यह कहना कि लिंगुइस्टिक माइनारिटी का सवाल उठा कर हम कोई गलत काम करना चाहते हैं, और इससे हम एक नया प्रब्लम पैदा करते हैं, यह चीज गलत है। लेकिन लिंगुइस्टिक माइनारिटी का मतलब जरा मेरी समझ में आया नहीं अगर हम हिन्दुस्तान में लिंगुइस्टिक माइनारिटी मानते हैं तो सवाल यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान की लिंगुइस्टिक माइनारिटी कौन सी हैं? अगर वे प्राक्सियल हैं तो प्राक्सिस में जो जबानें बोली जाती हैं वे माइनारिटी में कैसे हो सकती हैं। अगर पंजाब में पंजाबी और गुरुमुखी है तो उनमें से कौन सी माइनारिटी में होगी?

अगर बम्बई की बाईलिगुवल स्टेट बनेगी तो उसमें जो दो जबानें बोली जायेंगी उनमें से किस को माइनारिटी करार दिया जायेगा? जब आफिशियल गुलैएज हिन्दी हो गई तब उसके बाद रीजनल लैंगुएज ही किसी इलाके की जबान हो सकती है। लेकिन रीजनल लैंगुएज को माइनारिटी की जबान कैसे कहेंगे? वह जबान बुनियादी तौर पर माइनारिटी कैसे बनाई जा सकती है। हिन्दुस्तान में चौदह जबानें कानूनी तौर पर मंजूर हो चुकी हैं। वे जिस इलाके में बोली जाती हैं, और जिस जगह पर जिस सेफगार्ड्स की उन्हें जरूरत हो, वह गवर्नमेंट को देना चाहिये।

हमारी गवर्नमेंट एक सेक्यूलर स्टेट है। सेक्यूलर स्टेट में बसने वाले हर आदमी को,

जमात को, मजहब को, चाहे वह कोई भी जबान बोलता हो, उसको जिन्दा रहने का हक मिलना चाहिये। कोई हुकूमत किसी को मरने के लिए मजबूर नहीं कर सकती है, किसी को खुदकशी करने के लिए मजबूर नहीं कर सकती है। उसी तरह से जो भी जबानें हिन्दुस्तान में बोली जाती हैं वे सब इस हिन्दुस्तान की हैं। ये जबानें जिस जगह और जिस इलाके में बोली जाती हैं वहां वहां उनको जिन्दा रहने का हक मिलना चाहिये। बंगाल में बंगाली को तसलीम किया जा सकता है, गुजरात में गुजराती इलाके की जबान मानी जा सकती है और इसी तरह से महाराष्ट्र में मराठी जबान मानी जा सकती है। इसी तरह से तेलगू और तामिल जबानें भी मानी जा सकती हैं। यू० पी० और दिल्ली वगैरा में उर्दू भी इलाके की जबान हो सकती है, उसकी भी वही हैसियत है जो कि और जबानों की है। अगर कोई यह सोचे कि इस जबान से शायद किसी तरह की फिरकापरस्ती बढ़ेगी या पाकिस्तान की तरह का कोई और प्रब्लम पैदा होगा तो यह सोचना गलत है। अगर उर्दू का कोई पाकिस्तान बन सकता है तो उस पाकिस्तान में हमारे डा० समू साहब भी होंगे। अभी कुछ समय पहले हमारे एक आनरेबिल मेम्बर साहब ने उन हिन्दू अदीबों का नाम लिया था जिन्होंने उर्दू की बहुत बड़ी खिदमत सर-अन्जाम दी। उन्होंने चकबस्त, सरशार, मुंशी प्रेमचन्द और बहुत सारे लोगों का जिक्र किया है, जिन्होंने उर्दू जबान में बहुत बड़ा नुमाया हिस्सा लिया। आज प्राक्सिस के बारे में, एक एक चीज के लिए जिस तरह झगड़ा हो रहा है, उससे ऐसा लगता है कि हम अभी सूबा-परस्ती को भूलें नहीं हैं। हमें महज सूबों को नहीं देखना चाहिये, हमें सारे हिन्दुस्तान को एक मानना चाहिये। लेकिन जब यूनियनों का सवाल आता है, या किसी प्राक्सिस का सवाल आता है तो हर एक आदमी अपने अपने प्राक्सिस का मफाद सोचता है।

गवर्नमेंट ने इस बिल के जरिये एक प्राक्सिस का कुछ हिस्सा लेकर दूसरे को दे दिया और उसने यह सोचा है कि इस तरह से मुल्क का इंतजाम अच्छी तरह से चल सकेगा। लेकिन मुझे डर है कि स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन बिल से यह प्रब्लम हल नहीं होगा बल्कि कुछ और बढ़ जायेगा अब भी वक्त है कि इस बात पर ठंडे

दिल से गौर किया जाय । हुक्मत एक नये सेट अप का इंतजाम कर रही है और इस नये सेट अप में किसकी कहां जगह होगी यह सोचना पड़ेगा । लेकिन जो नया सेट अप है उसमें ज्यादा नुकसान मालूम नहीं पड़ता । बम्बई, महाराष्ट्र, गुजरात और विदर्भ का जो मिला जुला प्राविन्स बनाया जा रहा है वह अच्छा ही है । सारे दक्षिण का भी एक बड़ा प्राविन्स बन जाता तो वह भी बेहतर होता । बड़े बड़े स्टेटों को बनाने से फिरकापरस्ती को बढ़ावा नहीं मिलेगा लेकिन इससे दिल बड़े हो जायेंगे । मगर मैंने यहां पर जितनी तकरीरें सुनीं उनमें हर एक ने अपने अपने प्राविन्स की भलाई के बारे में ही जोर दिया । किसी ने भी इस सवाल को इस नजर से नहीं देखा कि यह सारा हिन्दुस्तान मेरा है और सारी हिन्दुस्तान की चीजें मेरी हैं । अगर एकता के नुकतेनजर से हुक्मत इस मसले को सामने लाई है तो अपनी अकलियतों को हुक्मत को जमानत देनी होगी, सेफगार्ड्स देने होंगे । जब कानून में अक्सरियत को कानूनी तौर पर हिफाजत का हक हासिल हो सकता है उसके लिए हिफाजत का बन्दोबस्त हो सकता है तब माइनारिटीज को भी हिफाजत का हक हासिल होना चाहिये ।

लेकिन अगर यह सवाल न उठता तो ज्यादा अच्छा था कि कौन मेजारिटी में है और कौन माइनारिटी में है । वाक्या यह है कि न कोई अक्सरियत में है और न कोई अकलियत में है । अक्सरियत में जो पार्टी होती है वह हुक्मरां होती है । अक्सरियत और अकलियत का सवाल अगर सिर्फ पोलिटिकल बेसिस पर रहे तो शायद हमारा सारा मामला तय हो जाय । मैं फिर एक मर्तबा यही कहूंगी कि यू० पी०, देहली, बिहार और आंध्र से उर्दू के लिए आवाज उठी है । यू० पी० के बीस लाख दस्तखत सदर के पास पड़े हुये हैं और अभी तक इस मामले को तय नहीं किया गया है । अगर यह मामला भी कांस्टीट्यूशन में आ जाता है और तय कर दिया जाता है तो जो लोगों के दिलों में चोर छिपा हुआ है वह निकल जायगा । मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि यू० पी० गवर्नमेंट ने शायद इस पर ज्यादा गौर नहीं किया है कि उसकी पालिसी से लोगों के दिलों के अन्दर कितना दुःख और कितनी बेचैनी पैदा हो रही है । यह मामला बहुत छोटा है और इसकी सियासी अहमियत नहीं है । लेकिन इसको बड़ा बना करके हम खुद ही एक प्रॉब्लम

खड़ी कर रहे हैं । अगर लोगों को यह मालूम हो जाय कि उनको यह आजादी है कि वे अपने बच्चों को उर्दू पढ़ा सकते हैं और उनकी दरखास्तें अदालत में उर्दू में ले ली जायंगी और उर्दू को वही सहूलियतें दी जायंगी जो कि और जवानों को हासिल है, तो हो सकता है कि जिस तरह से पहले उन्होंने अंग्रेजों के जमाने में अपने बच्चों को अंग्रेजी पढ़ाना शुरू कर दिया था और उर्दू नहीं पढ़ाते थे, उसी तरह वह अपनी मर्जी से हिन्दी पढ़ाना शुरू कर दें और उर्दू न पढ़ाएँ । बहुत से लोग यही करेंगे और जिन लोगों की ज्यादा तबज्जह इसकी तरफ होगी वे हिन्दी और उर्दू दोनों पढ़ाएंगे । हिन्दी और उर्दू दोनों जवानों हमेशा से साथ साथ रही हैं । कभी उनका इस तरह से बटवारा नहीं हुआ था जिस तरह से अब किया गया है । इसका नतीजा यह है कि कुछ ऐसी पार्टियां हैं जिन्होंने इसको एलेक्शन इश्यू बना रखा है । कुछ ऐसे हंगामा पसन्द लोग हैं जो जल्से करते हैं और इसी सवाल पर कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट को बुरा भला कह कर अपना उल्लू सीधा करने की कोशिश करते हैं । यू० पी० में उर्दू के लिए यह शर्त है कि अगर कहीं ४० बच्चे यह कहें कि हम उर्दू पढ़ेंगे, तब उनको उर्दू पढ़ाई जायगी । जॉइंट सिलेक्ट कमिटी (Joint Select Committee) में भी किसी जवान के लिये १५ पर सेंट की शर्त है । ये दोनों शर्तें ऐसी हैं कि इनसे सिवाय झगड़ा फसाद के और कुछ नहीं होगा । अगर देखा जाय तो हर जवान इसी हिन्दुस्तान की है और यही पली है । जिस तरह हिन्दी, संस्कृत, अरबी, फार्सी, तमाम जवानों मिल करके उर्दू पैदा हुई, उसी तरह से अगर आप अब मौका दें तो सारी जवानें मिल करके एक ऐसी जवान पैदा होगी जो सबकी होगी और पूरे हिन्दुस्तान की बोली बन जायगी इसलिए मैं फिर यही दरखास्त करूंगी कि बेहतर यही होगा कि यह जो १५ पर सेंट की शर्त है और जो हमारी यू० पी० की गवर्नमेंट ४० बच्चों की पढ़ाई का सवाल उठाती है, ये सब चीजें खत्म कर दी जाय और लोगों को एक मर्तबा यकीन दिला दिया जाय कि उनकी हर चीज इस गवर्नमेंट के हाथ में महफूज है । जिस तरह से हिन्दुस्तान के तमाम हिस्सों में तमाम जवानों को प्रोटेक्शन दिया जा रहा है, उसी तरह से उर्दू को प्रोटेक्शन दे दिया जाय । उसके बाद सारा किस्सा खत्म हो जायगा । एक मामूली सी चीज को इतना बड़ा बना दिया गया है । आखिर मैं मैं आपका शुक्रिया अदा करती हूं ।

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH** (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am one of those who always believed that time was not ripe for a step of this magnitude—the question of reorganisation of States—to have been taken up by the Government. I would like to show, Sir, the conditions prevailing in our country at the time when it was decided that the States should be reorganised. There were enough forebodings all round. Indiscipline pervaded the country expressing itself in violence not only amongst the students and politicians, but there were also instances where workers had taken drivers out from the engines and thus letting the trains crash driverless into a platform. Probably nowhere in the world could such things have been seen or could ever have been seen. In addition to that, the condition of the various States was such that people were losing confidence in the local Governments. Thus, Sir, the political and public tone of the country was being lowered, the civil services from the highest to the lowest were losing their grip and morale. In addition to these factors, there was an instance in front of us, and that was in regard to the formation of Andhra as a linguistic State. The formation of this State was the direct result of surrender to violence. Our Prime Minister, of course, is teaching to the world the concept of non-violence and *Panch Shila*. But it is a matter of regret that even he, only day before yesterday, in Bhuj, at a public meeting, had to state that it was regrettable that while India advocated the *Panch Shila* in the matter of international relations, here people should be found lacking in that spirit. In this context, Sir, may I know whether the Prime Minister feels that India and her people are two different identities? On the one hand, he says, that India is advocating the concept of *Panch Shila*, and on the other hand, he says that the people of India do not believe in this concept. So, this in itself is contradiction in terms. In the circumstances, Sir, the first and foremost duty of this responsible Government was to have put its house in order and consolidated its position, and when everything had been all right, questions of this kind could easily have been undertaken. We have seen from our experience, Sir, that raw surgeons make experiments on human bodies. If a particular operation succeeds, then it is the good luck of the patient concerned, but if it does not succeed, it is the bad luck of the patient concerned. In any case, the surgeons get their practice quite all

right. Similarly, Sir, I find that our Government has been experimenting with regard to the new steps that it should take in various directions without first consolidating its own position and without realising what effect those steps would have on the public at large. With this background, Sir, the States Reorganisation Commission was appointed. When this Commission made its recommendations, how they were acted upon by the Government is a matter on which so much has already been said in this House and I don't wish to repeat it. However, our Government took recourse to democratic processes of consultation and this process was unending, so much so that they themselves were not prepared to take the responsibility and this process went upto a certain point which, as we see, has resulted in real mobocracy. Thus it would be seen that under the circumstances, if the appointment of the States Reorganisation Commission was a mistake, the Government's handling of the report was a bigger mistake and not only a bigger mistake but it was even a blunder. Government now feel that it is a mistake to form these units into linguistic States. We have seen that throughout India excepting Gujarat and Maharashtra, linguistic States have been formed whether we like them or not, and now to withhold the formation of linguistic States in regard to Gujarat and Maharashtra cannot be understood and it cannot last for a long time. At this stage the aspirations of the Maharashtrians and Gujaratis cannot be ignored without harming the interests of the country in the long run. We have been told time and again by everybody that from any point of view or criterion, Bombay belongs to Maharashtra but when Maharashtra is to be formed into a linguistic State, the Government and the Congress Party state with one voice that Bombay cannot be given to Maharashtra. I would state that from every point of view Bombay belongs to Maharashtra and therefore when Bombay was refused to Maharashtrians to form a linguistic State, it became an obsession with them. They feel that without Bombay their State will be a body without heart. The word 'animus' has acquired special significance and in fact it has become a sort of a red rag to the bull, to our Government; but it can be said without any fear of contradiction that in not giving Bombay to Maharashtrians it is definite that in any case it has been felt that Maharashtrians cannot be

trusted to have Bombay and do justice to Gujaratis and other minorities living in that State. What has been the reaction after this bilingual State was decided upon? We are seeing how the Gujaratis have been frustrated. Our Government and the previous speakers who have spoken in this House have been throwing the blame on other parties, particularly the Communists, the Praja Socialist Party and the Hindu Mahasabha, and they say that all this trouble is due to the Communalists and Communists and as far as the Gujaratis are concerned, they personally have nothing to do with this agitation. This is a thing which cannot carry conviction with anyone. In fact as far as the Bombay riots are concerned, the incidents in Bombay were worse than what is taking place in Gujarat. There solely and wholly the responsibility was that of Congress politicians. The other day—two days ago,—during the course of the debate Shri Gopikrishna Vijaivargiya referred to a veteran Congress leader like Mr. Gadgil speaking in the streets of Bombay preaching violence and he went to the extent of stating that even if Mr. Gadgil had shed tears, they would have been crocodile tears.

If in regard to a veteran statesman and a Congressman of his status even the Congress party can say such things, it is no wonder what they say in regard to Communists and others. I hold no brief whatsoever on behalf of the Communist Party or others but as a man with a detached mind and with a dispassionate point of view I am trying to see; and as a man who is not interested in any party. Probably Mr. Bhupesh Gupta would have nothing to do with me as an ex-Jagirdar because of the sins of my forefathers who were Jagirdars. I am of course now a commoner—much commoner than any of the Members in this House. Therefore the support which I am giving to the Communist or the Leftist parties is purely from fair-mindedness and is based on the situation as I see it from a detached view.

The latest position in regard to Ahmedabad is that Mr. Morarji Desai, who says that he does not believe in fasting, has resorted to a fast. Of course he is a very clever politician. He has not put any limit to his fast. Gandhiji used to put a limit of 21 days or 11 days. Shri Shankar Rao Deo, the other day,

put a limit to his fast of 11 days and some of our politicians generally take a vow of fast until death but Shri Morarji is a clever politician and he has only taken a vow to fast till the Gujaratis hear and listen to him. Naturally our Congress friends and this huge organisation will prevail upon the masses of Ahmedabad to go and listen to him and his fast will soon be over and the anxiety that has been expressed in this House also will soon be over but in any case it is a good thing that a person of the status of Shri Morarji Desai has realized that if he goes, or for the matter of that, if anybody goes against the wishes of the people, howsoever big the leaders may be, they will have to see that they must not any longer go against the wishes of the general public. Not only that. But it is a matter of shame also that a portrait of the personality of Pandit Nehru, because he went or put his weight in any case against the wishes of the people of Maharashtra, decorated with black flags and what not, was publicly taken out in the streets of Bombay. Nobody in the world could ever imagine that such things could possibly have happened but howsoever big a person may be, if he goes against the wishes of the general public and because of party considerations wants to override the general interests of the people, these things just happen. This morning Mr. Deogirikar told us that from the happenings of the last 10 months he had learnt many lessons. In any case I have learnt one lesson from what he said today, that the interest of the party—for a staunch party man—and the interests of the country are not consistent. What I understood from him was that he does realise—and he said that every Maharashtrian realizes—that the interests of Maharashtra and the interests of the country demanded that Maharashtra should form into a linguistic State but because the Congress Party did not want, for certain reasons, that Maharashtrians should be entrusted with Bombay and as such they cannot form their own State, they had to veer round and follow the decision of the party and not their conscience. So this is a big lesson for those of us who are not Members of any party, that to be a member of a Party is not consistent with the interests of the country.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): And that is probably why the hon. Member is not the member of any party.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Yes, certainly. And today having heard all this, my conviction has grown that it is a serious matter to ponder over.

*(Time bell rings.)*

Sir, I have hardly spoken and I.....

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: In the Advisory Committee, every Party has been given two hours and our Party so far has not taken more than 45 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is one-and-a-half hours.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Even if it be one-and-a-half-hours, we have not taken more than 45 minutes. But this morning it was decided with the Chairman that we should each be given 2 hours, every party. And three Members have taken about 15 minutes each and now Shri Jaswant Singh has taken about fifteen minutes and that makes about an hour. We have, therefore, still one hour more left. So I do not think any limitation should be placed on the time of the speech.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I will be as short as possible.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are other speakers also.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: It was decided in the Advisory Committee that every one should have two hours, every party, I mean, and we are as far as possible trying to keep within that time. I do not think any speaker.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am given to understand that it is one-and-a-half hours. If you are not putting up another speaker next day, you will have the full time. If you are putting up another speaker next time, you have to close.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: This morning we had decided with the Chairman that we will have two hours.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Secretary informs me that it is one and a half hours.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: And we have been trying to cooperate by taking as little time as possible.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am given to understand that it is one and a half hours.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: I don't think my word should be doubted in this manner, because the Secretary was not then present, and Mr. Gupta here will bear out what I say, that we were given two hours. I don't think that statement should be doubted at all.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not a member of the Business Advisory Committee, but I think eight hours were given two hours each; and now I am told it is one and a half hours.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Very well, we will see about it.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: The hon. Member, Shri Parikh, while speaking the other day said that Bombay was very necessary for Gujarat, because Gujarat's economy was so closely linked with Bombay. In that case, I do not know what my friends of Bengal will think of Rajasthan, particularly of the Marwaris coming from Bikaner and Jai-pur and Jodhpur, because the whole of Calcutta and Bengal is linked to Rajasthan by the enterprise of these Marwaris. And this argument of Mr. Parikh, coming from a politician of his type, is really one that cannot be understood, that the interests of Gujarat are linked with Bombay and therefore, Bombay should stay with Gujarat. Similarly.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: So many Birlas have been claiming Calcutta.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Yes, and more than the Birlas, the Bikaner Marwaris have got the monopoly of the whole of Calcutta and of its industries. Therefore, that argument does not hold good at all.

Now, I have to say a few words about the indiscriminate shooting which took place in Bombay first and now in Ahmedabad.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please speak about the Bill, shooting apart. It may be relevant in the local legislature, but not here.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: But everybody has spoken about this in this House and of what happened.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order, I rise, Sir. We are discussing the question of bilingual Bombay State and the question of Gujarat naturally arises and so the opinion of the people who are there is relevant. Various things had happened and we are giving the circumstances as we understand the whole situation. Therefore, they are relevant to this Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. Please speak about the Bill.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, if you order me not to touch this subject, I will not touch it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Anything you speak about the Bill will be relevant.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am talking about the direct result of the formation of this bilingual State.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing the Ahmedabad situation.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But it has been.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, this is a question of our rights.

*(Interruptions.)*

Kindly listen to me. The suggestion had been made here that Mr. Gopalan went there to make trouble and all that had become relevant then. But when we refer to the shooting down of people it is not in order. When we refer to firing, of certain things being forced down through the bayonet, it is not relevant.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I submit it is relevant in the sense that this has resulted from the formation of the States. The firing took place as a direct result of the protest of the people in a democratic way. These things have been referred to not only by me, but at least a dozen people have spoken, not for five or ten minutes, but for about half an hour. I want only two minutes to deal with this point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please go on. But that is not the main thing here.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: These things have happened, whether it be the responsibility of the local Government or whether the ultimate responsibility is that of the Central Government. The question may concern the local Government, but here is the Home Minister sitting in front of me and I say that even in ordinary matters of law and order, he intervenes in Rajasthan. Only recently in the case of the kidnapping of a man when a Congress Minister there and some Congress leaders joined in a conspiracy and took a ransom of Rs. 50,000, he intervened though it was a local matter for the Rajasthan Government. But that is something apart and I will not touch on that.

Here, has it been seen anywhere that when peaceful people protest in regard to certain measures, or in regard to certain steps taken by the Government, they are fired upon indiscriminately? The other day my hon. friend Mr. Nair showed some photographs which he laid on the Table, where we saw children of four and five being shot. Sir, I pretend to be a sort of a sportsman and I have got association with well known sportsmen not only of this country but of other countries also and I know that among all sportsmen, we have got a moral code that while we go out big game hunting, we shall never shoot female or the cub. That morality is kept up. Only big heads we shoot. When we shoot a buck or an antelope, we never shoot the female or a young one. Even while we shoot small game for eating purposes, we make it a point not to stalk it but induce the bird to fly, giving it a sporting chance and then try our skill. Till now, I never knew that while shooting human beings such indiscriminate shooting could be resorted to, that the heads of women could be broken without compunction, that children of four and five could be shot at random, and no enquiry whatsoever is to be held. They say the passions should subside and then they will take action. The result will be that the death roll will mount up by the time the passions subside. Will it not then be too late? This is a thing which is becoming very serious. Sir, I may submit in this connection that before India got independence and when in Bombay the Congress Government

[Shri Jaswat Singh.]

was there and Mr. Morarji Desai was the Home Minister, there was Hindu-Muslim riot in Ahmedabad. At that time also, of course, they said that passions should subside first. But Gandhiji rebuked Mr. Morarji Desai and asked him, "Why do you sit in Bombay? Why don't you go to Ahmedabad and reason with the people?"

The other day, in his speech, Mr. Morarji Desai asked—as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said this morning—as to what the Opposition would have done in such a position. The Opposition or any reasonable and responsible people would have joined the fray and found out what they wanted but the death roll, under no circumstances, would be allowed to mount up as is being done now. I know that if the Bombay Government cannot take action, the overriding powers are with the Central Government and they should intervene. Of course, Delhi and Bombay are safe places but if the Ministers or any Party take the responsibility to govern a country, it becomes also their responsibility to take risks, if necessary, and save the heads from being broken as well as stop the death roll from mounting up, as far as possible.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): We are not discussing the propriety of Government action here.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Why not?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Your States Reorganisation Commission kills people.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I know that Government have power to put down with a heavy hand these outbursts but they have no power to heal these deep wounds. Mr. Parikh referred not in a lighthearted manner but very seriously that on the 19th they were having their Provincial Congress Committee meeting wherein they would pass a resolution of condolence for those who have died. This is the height of irresponsibility on the part of any Member even to say these things. I would like to see how, by the passing of a resolution of condolence, the wounds of the mothers and wives are going to be healed. We know the circumstances under which Dr.

Shyama Prasad Mookerji died. Our Prime Minister was out of the country then and when he returned, he sent a letter of condolence to the old mother of Dr. Mookerji and I would invite the attention of the hon. Members of this House to the reply that the old lady gave to Mr. Nehru to which he had not the courage to reply. After all, the Congress is a big organisation but if it thinks that it can kill any number of people and afterwards the Congress Committee or the A.I.C.C. could just pass a resolution of condolence which would soothe the people, it is mistaken. People can never be soothed by this sort of speeches here. To say that on the 19th they will pass a resolution of condolence and what has happened will all be forgotten by those is a meaningless thing. In this connection I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he could very kindly place on the Table of the House the figures of deaths due to Government action after Independence. We should know the credit of our country after Independence, the credit of our national Government after Independence, for shooting the people of this country. Can any country in the world—not to talk of democracies but, any country, including our neighbour Pakistan which is a rotten country to the core—have such a record? It will be a revealing position as to what our principle is in regard to violence and non-violence. As far as talking about it is concerned, naturally we can cry hoarse and we can teach the world but not as far as our internal position is concerned, especially in regard to the happenings after the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission was submitted. Naturally, it is very disconcerting and very revealing and I do hope that the Government, for once, will realise the effect that Panch Shila will have on international affairs when people in India are not accepting it. Sir, in this country and in this House, we have seen as to what happens to bilingual States. People are being told that they must forget what happened and that we must work for this formula. I agree that once this national Parliament passes any Bill, and it becomes an Act, it becomes our duty to see that, as far as possible, we should accept this and by constitutional methods try to subvert it or try to change it or do something else. I would submit that the solution that has been presented before the country is a palliative; it is not a permanent cure. We will have to see how long it lasts. This means that two strange fellows have



been brought together to share the same bed; but from the commonsense point of view, it is definite that this is not going to last for long. A position, before long, would be created when one of the partners, the weaker one, by himself would request the stronger partner to allow him peacefully to leave the place. This is what is going to happen whether we admit it or not. We know that the Maharashtrians have accepted this formula but why? They have accepted this under duress.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** We do not have any indication that the Maharashtrians have accepted it. The Maharashtra Congress has accepted it.

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** Maharashtra politicians.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Congress politicians.

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** They have accepted it under duress. At the same time, since Bombay was an obsession with them, they felt that life without Bombay was not worth living and so, they had to select the second best alternative. With Vidarbha coming in, they thought that they would be in a majority and could create a situation wherein the minority by itself will request for the parting of company as good friends. The same tactics were adopted as far as Bengal and Bihar was concerned but the Bengalis were too shrewd and with the overwhelming majority of the Biharis, they would, under no circumstances, agree to a merger.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Even with a minority, we would not agree.

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** I would submit that it is not a good thing that among the comparatively small States, the redrawn map of India should have units as big as Uttar Pradesh and the new bilingual State of Bombay. These units are too vast for orderly internal administration by a single authority. Lucknow and Bombay maintaining control and providing for the adequate development of an area covering something like 2 lakh square miles in U.P. and 1,80,000 square miles in Bombay will not be an easy affair.

**SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh):** One lakh and thirteen thousand square miles.

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** Whatever it is, it is a big area.

**SHRI B. B. SHARMA:** What about Rajasthan?

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** If you want that this country of ours should have the conditions of Rajasthan, I cannot help but be sorry. I am sorry my friend, Mr. Himatsingka, is not here. Marwaris are known to be millionaires but they cannot reside in villages. If they do so, some of our politicians will kidnap their children and demand big money as ransom, which our Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs knows. This is a matter of everyday occurrence there. If you want the conditions of Rajasthan to prevail in Uttar Pradesh, you are most welcome to it. The conditions of service are such that officers are afraid; they are demoralised and they cannot have independent views. They are afraid to give correct advice because of the politicians. In these circumstances delegation of power will have to be done and powers will have to be delegated to the Commissioners and the Collectors and with the type of Services that we have interests of this country cannot be looked after when such huge States are being formed.

One last word with regard to Rajasthan and then I will end in about two or three minutes. In regard to Rajasthan, I have to submit that we are thankful to the Reorganisation Commission for removing one sore point that we had. Abu has been restored to us. Abu was literally annexed from us by our Gujarati friends and it is a matter of satisfaction to us that Abu has been restored to us. We know how our kith and kin and our dear and near ones were treated during the last four or five years. They were literally harassed, put to deprivation and had to undergo untold hardship that one could think of. I could well understand the feelings of the Gujaratis for not wanting to join the Maharashtrians because of the experience that they have gained by treating the Rajasthanis so far as Abu Taluk is concerned. I look forward and every Rajasthanis is looking forward to the 1st of November when our people will be restored to us and when, on the hills of Abu, which is overlooking Gujarat,

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]

we would all be happy and in a rejoicing mood be drinking a bumper to the health of the Gujaratis and particularly Shri Morarji Desai.

Sir, with these words I would only submit that, as it is, the position is very serious and very bad but, once the Parliament passes this Bill, it becomes our duty to accept this, but at the same time, Sir, it becomes the duty of the nation that, when it is not in the interests of the country, to have bilingual States, of course all these things should be reverted, and I have every hope that we will see the day in the near future when India will have unilingual States and that the aspiration of the Maharashtrians to have their own State will be fulfilled and their dream realised. Similarly I also hope that the Gujaratis who are also undergoing such great hardships at this time in Ahmedabad will have their dream of a separate State of their own realised.

Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are a large number of speakers. Is the House prepared to sit for an extra hour to-day?

HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. There is a Message from the other House.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA.  
THE BIHAR AND WEST BENGAL (TRANSFER OF TERRITORIES) BILL, 1956

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

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 133 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Bill, 1956, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 17th August, 1956."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. day after to-morrow.

The House then adjourned at two minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 22nd August 1956.