

of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to inform you that Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 20th August, 1956, agreed without any amendment to the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Bill, 1956 which was passed by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 10th May, 1956."

I lay the following four Bills on the Table :—

(1) The Jammu and Kashmir (Extension of Laws) Bill, 1956.

(2) The Supreme Court (Number of Judges) Bill, 1956.

(3) The Indian Coconut Committee (Amendment) Bill, 1956.

(4) The National Highways Bill, 1956.

PETITIONS ON THE STATES REORGANISATION BILL, 1956

SECRETARY : Sir, I beg to report to the House that I have received forty petitions relating to the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

NOTIFICATION PUBLISHING THE IRON AND STEEL (CONTROL) ORDER, 1956

THE MINISTER FOR HEAVY INDUSTRIES (SHRI M. M. SHAH) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (6) of section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, a copy of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry Notification S.R.O. No. 1109/ESS. COMM/Iron and Steel, dated the 8th May, 1956, publishing the Iron and Steel (Control) Order, 1956. [Placed in Library see No. S-346/56.]

THE STATES REORGANISATION BILL, 1956—continued.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we are now going back to the States Reorganisation Bill. I have before me a long list of speakers. I am calling upon Dr. Kunzru to open the discussion today. As he happened to be a Member of the States Reorganisation Commission, I am not insisting on any time-limit for him. But for the rest it will be fifteen minutes. The House will sit till 6 O'clock, and the Minister will reply tomorrow.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Sir. I would like to make a submission. It is quite right that you are fixing this time-limit. But since we have saved some time from the question Hour.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Since we have saved some time day before yesterday and since today we are extending the sitting from 5 O'clock to 6 O'clock, you will actually be having 22 or 23 hours instead of the stipulated 20 hours. I have put the Minister's reply for tomorrow. So that is one hour and there is another hour in the evening from 5 O'clock to 6 O'clock and if we are saved from interruptions, there will be a little more time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, Sir, I suggest that ten hours have been fixed for amendments. It may be possible to save some time there, and that time may be allotted for general discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You cannot decide for the whole House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is only a suggestion, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kunzru.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Chairman, the questions before us have been under discussion for so long a time that it is hardly possible to say anything new in regard to them. Yet, as observations continue to be made which are not in accordance with the facts, and as the States Reorganisation Commission is still being charged with faults of omission and commission, I think it is necessary that I should make the position of the Commission clear once more in regard to these matters.

However, Sir, before I do so, I should like to refer to the manner in which the question of the future of the Bombay State has been handled by the Government of India.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh). By the Commission.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: The hon. Member had his say the day before yesterday, and I hope he will listen patiently today to what I have to say in

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]
regard to the baseless charges that he brought against the Commission.

(Interruption.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Sir, the Government went on saying that they thought that the States Reorganisation Commission had suggested the best solution for the Bombay question. Subsequently, Sir, they went on putting forward proposals which gave offence to Maharashtra. And later on they proceeded in such a way as to offend Maharashtra too, and now they have succeeded in creating dissatisfaction in Gujarat also. The handling of this question by the Government has been tragic indeed. They have come back to the principle of bilingualism which, in spite of their theoretical support for it, they discarded under pressure. But they have done it in such a way as to dissatisfy most of the people of that area where this principle was not disputed by any large section of the people. What has happened recently in Gujarat is well-known. The developments that have taken place during the last few days have made the Chief Minister of Bombay go on an indefinite fast. Sir, Shri Morarji Desai has made sacrifices for the sake of his country. The fast that he has undertaken must therefore be a matter of concern to all people, irrespective of their party connections. But while we have great respect for Shri Morarji Desai, it is scarcely possible for some of us at least to agree with him in the step that he has taken. According to the statement issued by him, he has undertaken this fast in order to purge the atmosphere of Gujarat of violence which he detected ever since he went to Ahmedabad. And his contention is that the people were prevented from attending a public meeting that he was to address, by force.

Now, Sir, wherever there is picketing, there is, I grant, a certain amount of force, and the picketers in Ahmedabad may, in certain cases, have easily overstepped the limits of propriety. But I am sure, Sir, that had it been made clear to the people that their presence at the meeting that was to be addressed by Shri Morarji Desai would not be regarded as an indication of their support for what the Government were

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]
doing, there would have been no objection on the part of anybody to the people of Ahmedabad attending that meeting. What created opposition to the meeting was the fear that the presence of large numbers of people at Shri Morarji Desai's meeting would be regarded as a proof of their agreement with the Government of India in regard to their latest proposal with regard to the future of the Bombay State.

There is another important fact, Sir, which, we ought to bear in mind when considering this matter.

Shri Morarji Desai was to address a public meeting on Sunday. Another public meeting was held on Monday but not under the auspices of the Congress Committee, and it was attended by about a lakh of people. Now, surely the presence of the people in such large numbers at the Ahmedabad meeting could not have been due to pressure of any kind. It is thus doubly clear that the people who refrained from attending or who were prevented from attending Mr. Desai's meeting were not generally in favour of the solution suggested by Government.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ (Madhya Pradesh): Was there picketing in the next day's meeting also?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: There was no picketing at all but there was no obligation on the part of the people to attend that meeting in such large numbers.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): That is what they cannot understand.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: That is a fact which my hon. friend ought to bear in mind when considering this matter. I do not know what the future has in store. It has been suggested in official quarters that the present state of feeling in Gujarat will be short-lived, that it is the result of a misleading agitation carried on by some people and that the acceptance of the solution suggested by Government will soon become general throughout Gujarat. I should certainly, being in favour of the principle of bilingualism, be extremely happy if the people of Gujarat accepted the new bilingual State. I have no doubt that in the interests both of Maharashtra and Gujarat a bilingual State is not merely desirable but

necessary. But we have to remember that Government proceeded for the past six or seven months in such a way as to create the impression that two unilingual States were going to be created in place of one bilingual State. Now, suddenly they have changed their course and they expect the people to adjust their minds to the new situation as quickly as they have been able to. If I may use the language that was used by Shri Deogirikar the other day, the moral of all this is that great questions should be handled in a great way, that whatever the strength of the Government in this House may be, the people still count for something and that their wishes cannot be totally ignored in the settlement of a question bearing on their vital interests. The handling of the Bombay problem by Government gave rise to a controversy in the Cabinet itself. The disclosures made by Shri Chintaman Deshmukh must be fresh in the minds of all the Members. The point made by him was that no Cabinet meeting was held between the date on which Government decided to have a City State of Bombay and the date on which the new announcement with regard to Bombay was made, and that the decision was changed by some Members of the Cabinet who had not been previously authorised by the Cabinet to change its decision. No satisfactory reply has been made.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh): Is it not a fact that the hon. the Prime Minister has repudiated these allegations?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: After the Prime Minister's repudiation of what Shri Chintaman Deshmukh said at first, Shri Deshmukh returned to the charge and mentioned the fact that I have already referred to. So far as I remember, no reply has been vouchsafed by Government to this statement of Shri Deshmukh.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): The repetition often of an incorrect thing does not make it correct.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: My hon. friend does not realise the difference between the previous statement of Shri Chintaman Deshmukh which was of a general character and his second

statement which was specific and which showed that no Cabinet meeting was held between, I believe, the 11th and 15th January 1956.....

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad): 16th January.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU:and 16th January when a change was made in the previous decision with regard to Bombay. This question has been debated in the other House. I do not want, therefore, to go into it at length, but the manner in which the Cabinet functions, the Government functions, is a matter of great concern to us.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Has any Member of the Cabinet other than Mr. Deshmukh made this charge?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: It cannot but be a matter of deep concern. So far as I know, the Prime Minister in England cannot change any decision of the Cabinet. (*Interruption.*) He is only one in the Cabinet.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: He has got a right even to ask for a dissolution of the House without consulting the Cabinet.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Shri P. N. Sapru satisfied himself on certain points yesterday and is satisfying himself on certain new points today. Here, whatever the popularity of the Prime Minister may be, can we say that the position is totally different 12 NOON. from that in England and that the Prime Minister or some colleagues of his could act in the same way as for instance the President of America does? So the question that Shri Chintaman Deshmukh's disclosure raises is a question of fundamental importance to the future of democracy, and I hope that hon. Members who belong to the Congress Party will themselves take this matter seriously. I know from my personal contacts with them.....

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): But is it possible in England for certain classes of people to defy the decision of Parliament in the way in which people are doing here?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: There is nothing in England to debar anybody who is dissatisfied with the law passed by

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

Parliament from carrying on an agitation against it; the only thing is that he has to carry on the agitation in accordance with constitutional methods.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Yes, but is it done so here?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: If violence is used, the law will take its course in England as it will doubtless do in this country. No question, therefore, of parliamentary sovereignty arises here.

Sir, the hon. Member, Shri Sapru made certain observations yesterday pointing out where the Commission had erred. One of the matters with regard to which he blamed the Commission was its silence with regard to the future of Bombay, in case the solution proposed by it was not accepted.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: On a point of personal explanation.....

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I have got his very words before me and.....

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Sir, on a point of personal explanation I want to explain what I intended to convey. What I did succeed in conveying was that if the Report or the chapter on Bombay was read, the only conclusion that could be drawn from that chapter was that Bombay was not to be given to a unilingual State. I challenge Mr. Kunzru to prove that that is not the impression conveyed by that chapter.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: It requires no little courage, Sir, on Mr. Sapru's part to have made this statement. Yesterday while speaking about Maharashtra, he said:

"It is connected with the hinter land 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 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."

My hon. friend contributed three articles to *The Statesman* soon after the publication of the Report of the Commission and this is what he has said there with regard to the position of Bombay:

"The decisive reason against Samyukta Maharashtra is, of course, the position of Bombay city. It is cosmopolitan in every sense of the term to the building up of this great metropolis, Gujaratis, Parsis, Christians, Marwaris, people from the north and the south and even Europeans, have contributed....."

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: All except Maharashtrians?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: "It cannot, therefore, be looked upon as the exclusive affair of the Maharashtrians. To convert it into a City State or to administer it centrally with large powers for the Bombay Corporation, would not be fair to the progressive people of Bombay. It is reassuring to be told that the Gujarat Congress Committee's line before the Commission was helpful, for its attitude was that the Gujarati people would like to live and work together in one State with their Maharashtrians brethren in the larger national interest as also in the interest of the City of Bombay."

My hon. friend is entitled, Sir, to revise his opinion as many times as he likes; but it is rather strange that he should blame the Commission for not doing what he himself could not suggest when the Report of the Commission was published. He fully accepted the bilingual principle, and he is today giving his support to this Bill which provides for a bilingual State of Bombay. Yet he blames the Commission for not having suggested that two unilingual States should be created and that Bombay city should go to Maharashtra.

Next, the hon Member said that the Commission stated only that Bombay city should not belong to a unilingual State. I should like here to draw the attention of the House to paragraph 419 of the Commission's Report in which it says:

"Having regard to the population and the size of the area as well

as the fact that it is primarily a city unit, it will not, in our opinion be entitled to be treated as a full State of the Union. On the other hand, Greater Bombay has been the hub of the political life of a democratically advanced State and its administration as a central enclave may be regarded as a retrograde step."

You will thus see that the Commission ruled out three things: First that Bombay should be separated in any manner from the rest of the Bombay State, or that it should be given exclusively to any unilingual State. This was the position of the Commission and that is why it recommended that the existing bilingual State should, with certain additions, continue.

Sir, I have been blamed for saying when there was dissatisfaction in Maharashtra, that Bombay should have belonged to Maharashtra. Sir, I along with the other members of the Commission, suggested, as I have already stated the continuance of the bilingual State. But when that suggestion was turned down by Government and unilingual States were created, a new situation arose.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Was there any other suggestion for the formation of bilingual States excepting Bombay?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Under the new circumstances, Bombay should have been unhesitatingly given to Maharashtra because its hinterland is Maharashtra. This question has been fully argued in the Commission's Report on Bombay. I ask any fair-minded person to say.....

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: My question has not been answered.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I will answer your question. Don't be troubled too much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't be so impatient.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I ask any fair-minded person to say whether there was any inconsistency in my position as a Member of the Commission and in what I said subsequently when Government rejected the bilingual solution and proposed the creation of unilingual States. A new situation arose then and one had

to make suggestions in connection with this new situation. Now, it has been asked, "Why did not the Commission say that while the solution suggested by it was ideal, if it was not accepted, then Bombay should be given to Maharashtra?" Sir, my experience of these matters is very limited but yours is extensive. I wonder whether you too, in the course of your varied experience have ever come across a Report wherein alternative suggestions are made to take the place of the suggestions regarded by it as the best. To make such suggestions is virtually to invite rejection of the proposals that you consider best. No responsible Commission would ever act in the manner suggested by Shri P. N. Sapru. It is clear from what I have said that my hon. friend, Shri P. N. Sapru, when he spoke was not fully conversant with the facts. I do not, therefore, think that I need deal with his other objections in any detail and shall therefore, pass on to the question of Himachal Pradesh.

With regard to Himachal Pradesh, it was suggested by Shri P. N. Sapru that the Commission overlooked the economic backwardness of this region. Now, anybody who has read the Report of the Commission overlooked the economic backwardness of this region, fully considered it and then came to the conclusion that the economic development of Himachal Pradesh would be better secured if it was integrated with the Punjab. It suggested certain safeguards in order to remove the apprehensions of the people. Those suggestions are given in the first chapter of the Part IV. I do not think, therefore, that I need repeat them. It has provided both economic and political safeguards for Himachal Pradesh. Briefly speaking, it suggested that the Central Government should retain its overall responsibility for the economic development of Himachal Pradesh and that Himachal Pradesh should be represented on the Cabinet by a Minister. I shall deal with the future of Himachal Pradesh when the Constitution Amendment Bill is taken into consideration but I should like to put a question with regard to the size of the territory of the future State of Punjab. The Commission has said paragraph 560 of its Report—

"The economic and administrative advantages of Himachal Pradesh being integrated with the adjoining States are on the other hand quite

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

clear. The catchment area of the Sutlej and the Beas, for instance, is mostly in Himachal Pradesh; and from the point of view of the Bhakra project, this fact is of such great relevance that the need for the transfer of some area to the Punjab has been accepted in principle and a Committee appointed by the Union Ministry of Irrigation and Power has already gone into the details of this proposed transfer."

Now, this Committee which is known as the Hejmadi Committee, sometime ago, as far as I remember, had recommended the transfer of 90 square miles of territory from Himachal Pradesh to the Punjab. Now, what has happened to this question? So far as I can see, no part of this territory has been given to the Punjab in the Bill before us. I should, therefore, like to know what the intention of the Government with regard to the transfer of this area is. It is accepted that this transfer which includes the catchment area of the Sutlej is necessary in the interests of the Bhakra project and yet nothing has been done about it nor has Government made any pronouncements with regard to it.

I shall pass on to Tripura. I referred to this question when the Constitution amendment Bill was under discussion some months ago. Shri Datar, winding up the debate then said that there was no evidence that the Assam Government wanted that Tripura should be included in Assam or that the people of Tripura wanted to join Assam. He also said, Sir, that even if the Assam Government wanted to have Tripura, that could be no reason for linking Tripura with Assam if the people of Tripura were not in favour of it. Now, Sir, I should like to make it clear to him and to the House that the Government of Assam has said in no uncertain terms that it will welcome the inclusion of Tripura in Assam provided the people of Tripura agreed to it. It was quite understandable, Sir, that Assam, as a State, should not be understood by any section of the people of Tripura, to put any pressure on the Central Government to make Tripura compulsorily a part of the State of Assam but Shri Medhi, who spoke on this subject on the 16th November 1955, made it clear that if it was decided on economic

and administrative grounds to transfer Tripura to Assam, he would welcome it.

Now, I come, Sir, to the question of the wishes of the people of Tripura. When did the Government consider the wishes of the people of Part C States when it decided, generally speaking, to accept the recommendations of the Commission with regard to them? Did it obtain the views of the people of Vindhya Pradesh? Did it obtain the views of Ajmer? Did it obtain the views of the people of Delhi?

Take again Madhya Bharat, which is a Part B State. It is going to be merged in Madhya Pradesh. Did Government ask the people of Madhya Bharat whether they were agreeable to this transfer, to this amalgamation? They have done nothing of the kind, Sir, and yet they trot forward this argument in order to justify their rejection of the Commission's proposal for the transfer of Tripura to Assam. Sir, the transfer, there could be no doubt, would be advantageous both politically and economically to Tripura, as the Commission has pointed out. Fifty-nine per cent. of the people in Tripura speak Bengali. It was therefore suggested that it, along with the district of Cachar in Assam, should be formed into a division with a special Commissioner to look after its interests and that special provisions should be made for safeguarding its future economic development on the lines suggested for Himachal Pradesh. It was also pointed out by the Commission that the people of Tripura, whose wishes the Government of India is anxious to respect, were asking for democratic Government, and this ambition of theirs would be satisfied if Tripura was included in Assam. Are the Government, who are anxious to satisfy the people of Tripura, going to establish a Legislature and to have a Ministry in Tripura? If not, if you are going to flout the wishes of the people of Tripura in this respect, what right have you to justify the exclusion of Tripura from Assam merely on the ground that the people of Tripura are not in favour of it? Sir, as the Commission has pointed out in more than one place that if the status of every small bit of territory is to be changed only in accordance with the wishes of the people, no reorganisation and no reform would be possible. The Government of India understand this very well and have proceeded on this principle, but they have departed from

it only in the case of Tripura without giving any adequate reasons for it.

Now, Sir, I will quickly finish the remarks that I have to make on one or two other subjects. Sir, it is necessary that steps should be taken in order to integrate the new States that are going to be created and I say this with special reference to Madhya Pradesh. Now one of the questions which bears on this matter is the position of the High Court. It was published in the newspapers sometime ago that it had been agreed to between the Chief Ministers of the States that are going to form the new Madhya Pradesh that there should be a bench of the High Court at Bhopal, at Indore, at Rewa, at Gwalior and at Jubbulpore.....

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARAMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Also at Raipur.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU :.....at Raipur and of course at least a bench at Jubbulpore. Now, if you are going to have Sir, five benches, what will be left of the High Court of Madhya Pradesh? I know that the Bill before us empowers the President to decide where the seat of the High Court should be and to create benches which would sit permanently at certain places. Well, I hope that the power that the Central Government has thus taken will be used wisely, that it will be used in such a way as not to split up the High Court into fragments and reduce the prestige and authority of that body, which is necessary for the development of the State, to a shadow.

The next question which I want to refer to is the question of communications. It is well-known, Sir, that access to Raipur will be possible only, generally speaking, through the Bombay State, that is, through Nagpur or through Gondia unless a road is built connecting Jubbulpore with Raipur. Now, I do recognise that this is not a matter which could have been dealt with under this Bill, but since we are considering the question of the reorganisation of States and it is vitally necessary to see that the position of the new States does not become as unfortunate as that of Rajasthan is to-day, that steps should be taken to connect the various parts of the State so that rapid inter-communications may be possible and the people may forget

in a few years that they ever belonged to a State other than Madhya Pradesh. I hope that Shri Datar will be able to say something on this subject in his reply.

Sir, lastly I would like to refer to the new western zone. Sir, it is somewhat strange that the new western zone should include both Bombay and Mysore. Now as there will always be questions of common interest, of more than common interest, to discuss between these two States, is every meeting of the Zonal Council to begin with a wrangle about the future of Belgaum or north Karwar or any other territory included in Mysore? I am really unable to understand how Government came to lump these two States together. If there had been one more Zonal Council for Bombay itself and another Zonal Council, say, for the rest of the south, or, say, for Mysore and Andhra, no harm would have been done, I mean, the present grouping seems to me to be particularly inappropriate.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore): May I know which State you would suggest to go with Bombay in the western zone?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Is it necessary that some other State should go with that? The Bill enables two Zonal Councils to meet together to discuss questions of common interest by agreement between the Chairman of the Councils. Therefore no harm will be done if Bombay, whose population will be about five crores and whose area will be about two lakhs of square miles, were to constitute a zone by itself.

Sir, there are other questions that arise in connection with this reorganisation but I think that they can be more appropriately taken up in connection with the discussion of the Constitution (Amendment) Bill.

Sir, I am grateful to you for the time that you have given to me to make certain points clear. You have generously allowed me to make the position of the Commission clear in those respects where it was unnecessarily misunderstood by some hon. Members. I repeat, Sir, that I am most grateful for the indulgence that you have shown to me.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR (West Bengal) : Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 15 minutes hereafter.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: I am grateful to you for the warning and I shall try to keep within the 15 minutes allotted to me. Sir, I would like to rise in support of the Motion for Consideration of the States Reorganisation Bill, so ably moved by my friend, the hon. Mr. Datar. But before I take up the consideration of one or two issues which were raised by Pandit Kunzru in his own unique and inimitable manner, I would like to make one or two general observations. I entirely agree with Pandit Kunzru that at this late stage of the discussions it is not possible for anyone to make any observations or remarks which will be in any sense new. This subject has been covered over and over again and one can only in the light of the developments and the discussions that have taken place, offer a comment here or suggest an amendment there, and in this way try to give one's own reactions to this very momentous issue which is under the discussion of this House and the whole of the country.

I think there are one or two general considerations which should weigh with every one of us when we are discussing the question of the reorganisation of States. The first is that whatever happens, no part of the country is going outside India. Unfortunately, the manner in which the debate has sometimes been carried on suggests as if there was a struggle between rival States. An hon. friend on an earlier occasion stated that it was perhaps unfortunate that the term 'State' was used in connection with the different constituent units of the Indian Union. I entirely agree with him. It is perhaps because they are called States that some kind of a mentality has grown that territorial claims are being made by one State against another. What actually is happening is a redistribution of the administrative units which together constitute the Indian Union,—a redistribution for certain specific purposes. One of these purposes is certainly simplification of administration in view of the great obligation placed upon the country in raising the standard of life of the people. Another is the necessity of carrying out the Second Five Year Plan effectively and efficaciously, I would indeed say, not only carrying out but surpassing the targets in the Plan because I

have never concealed my opinion that this Second Five Year Plan does not attempt to do all that this country is capable of. I have never felt that it is an over-ambitious plan; I have held that in certain respects the Plan does not go as far as it can go and ought to go. If we are to carry out the Plan, a more economical, a more rational and a more efficient administration of the country is in any case necessary. From this point of view also, the question of reorganisation of States becomes very important.

I do not think I would agree with those friends who have sometimes said that this question was taken up prematurely. It has not been taken up too early, perhaps it should have been taken up earlier, certainly earlier in the life of this Parliament and not at the fag end of its life when the general elections looming large, the attitude and feelings of Members are likely to be coloured with what the impact of the decisions of this House will be on the electorate in the coming elections. Therefore, Sir, from this point of view it was necessary that the States Reorganisation Bill should have been taken up earlier.

If we remember what I mentioned a moment ago, that no area is going outside India, some of the controversies which have developed, would have become irrelevant. I would concede readily—and I think other Members of this House would also concede the fact that in an issue like the present one, there is room for genuine difference of opinion, genuine and honest difference of opinion. We should not attribute motives to those who differ from us on any particular issue. We should try to lift the whole question outside the field of controversy look at it from the point of view of the interests of the common man in the country. If we look at the question from the point of view of the common man in India, I think, apart from many other considerations, the consideration of language will be a very important one. For the common man in India, it is a definite advantage—and it has been recognised by the Commission itself—that the administration of a particular compact area is carried on in one language. There are advantages in such arrangement which outweigh certain other fears which we have in mind. I would indeed go further and say that some of these fears are unjustified. These fears about the unity of

India need not arise out of linguistic jealousies. These fears and conflicts do not arise out of linguistic differences but out of the fact that over large areas of the country, people have not yet fully realised the fact that India is now an independent country, where there is the rule of the law, where equality is guaranteed to all citizens regardless of what their language, religion, sex or community is. Unfortunately our practice is not always equal to our professions. It is perhaps because our practice is not always equal to our professions that people have at times been exercised and worked up by linguistic, caste and other differences. In the background of any possible fears and apprehensions in the mind of the public about justice, new issues would have been found out even if these linguistic and caste differences were not there. I do not think therefore that an emphasis on the linguistic reorganisation of the States of India would, in itself, in any way, jeopardise the unity of India. On the contrary, I have always felt that one of the peculiarities of the Indian solution of different problems has been that here we have aimed at unity in diversity. Here we have tried to reconcile differences; here truth has revealed itself in different forms. In spite of the difference in form in spite of differences in customs, institutions, languages, religion, beliefs and habits, a temper has been developed in India which is recognised throughout the world as the Hindustani way of life, the Indian way of life. If we remember the great truth, these differences would not have been so important.

In the light of what I have said, I am afraid that in spite of the very eloquent and persuasive speech of Pandit Kunzru, I would not agree with him that the Commission does not have great responsibility with regard to the unfortunate situation which has developed in the western part of India, I would agree with him in the latter part of his speech that tranquillity must be restored. If the Commission had from the very beginning, recognised this principle of linguistic reorganisation and if, from the very beginning, they had said that Bombay should go to Maharashtra in view of the cultural, linguistic and other affinities of that area with the hinterland of Maharashtra, if from the very beginning they had recommended two different States, much of the difficulties with which we have

been faced in recent times could have been altogether avoided. The arguments which were used by the Commission at that time, if I remember aright, were mainly two. One argument was that Bombay was built up—and this was repeated by Dr. Kunru today—by the efforts of people from all over the country. Sir, there is no area of India which has not been built up.....

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I repeated the words of Mr. Prakash Narain Sapru.....

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: With a certain amount of approbation and in so far as you approved of them, they became your own words. Therefore both Pandit Kunzru and Mr. Prakash Narain Sapru, for a while, held that Bombay had been built up by the efforts of people from different parts of India and outside. That is true of every metropolitan town and if on that ground any area.....

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: May I interrupt my hon. friend? Does he remember that now Shri Chintaman Deshmukh himself approves of the bilingual plan and has expressed his readiness to go about explaining the beauty of this bilingual State to the people of Maharashtra.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: If my hon. friend had waited a little I would have come to that point myself because I started by saying that....

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I was entitled to assume in writing those articles for the 'Statesman' that the Commission had satisfied itself that the bilingual State was acceptable to the people whom it was going to affect. They must have proceeded on some evidence and that evidence must have been placed before us. Therefore I was justified in assuming that the Commission had satisfied itself.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: I do hope that these interruptions will be taken into account in counting the time allotted to me.

Sir, I was saying that if the Commission had taken into consideration the wishes of the people of Maharashtra and Gujarat much of the difficulties which have arisen now would not have arisen. One of the arguments used for a bilingual State was the contribution

[Prof. Humayun Kabir.]

of other parts of India to the development of Bombay and I have already referred to it briefly.

The other is the argument about the financial viability of the Maharashtra and Gujarat States I know that Gujarat is a deficit State and so is Maharashtra, apart from Bombay. But I think almost all States of India—it you take them separately—are more or less deficit States. Some financial arrangement could easily have been established by which some of the surplus income of Bombay over a number of years could have been given to Gujarat and to Maharashtra till such period as they develop their own resources. The Commission itself in a way recognised this fact when it said that for five years, its proposed arrangement might continue, till the Kandla port developed and Gujarat had its own outlet for foreign trade and its own economic resources were developed. Perhaps Bombay might in that case have gone to Maharashtra in the end even according to the recommendations of the Commission.

From many points of view I think that the decision which the Government had earlier taken was the right decision and not the decision which the Commission recommended. The Commission recommended a bilingual State for which neither of the two parties seemed to be ready from what has transpired now, it seems that Gujarat wants its own separate State and so does Maharashtra. Therefore, one of the main arguments in favour of a bilingual State of that type has disappeared, but today when this.....

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: On a question of fact, it is not correct to say that Gujarat, when the Commission went there, was not in favour of a bilingual State. It is totally incorrect to say that.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: I am quite aware that at that time there was no direct opposition in Gujarat to the formation of a bilingual State.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: No, I go beyond that and say that a good many people were in favour of a bilingual State in Gujarat.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: I would concede that point also. A good many people might have been in favour of a bilingual state, but as Shri Kunzru, in

his very clear manner has himself indicated, the position has completely changed. The reason for this is the change in the ratio of the population—of Gujarati and Marathi people—in the new Bombay State. If then the Gujarati people had earlier agreed to a bilingual State, it was with certain mental reservations. If they had known that the ratio of population was changed, they would not have accepted a bilingual State as they have not accepted it today. This is why I thought that it was not the recommendation of the Commission but the earlier decision of the Government which was a fairer solution of the whole question. Under that decision Bombay would have remained a centrally administered area for some years. In two or three years' time and perhaps in less, it would have merged into Maharashtra. Neither Gujarat nor Maharashtra would then have suffered from any sense of dissatisfaction or the feeling that they have been overlooked. The decision which was ultimately taken was in a sense not the decision of the Government but the decision of the other House. A large number of Members of Parliament suggested a solution to Government and a great deal of feeling was located in its favour. It was this upsurge of emotion which has actually weighed with the Government and persuaded the Government to accept a decision which, after due consideration, it had earlier rejected. Here I cannot help saying that perhaps in issues like this, emotion is the worst guide we can have in taking final decisions. They must be taken on concrete, specific facts and considerations. I remember some friends in this House came and asked me to sign a document suggesting the unification of Gujarat and Maharashtra into a bilingual State. I put to them one question. I said I would agree to sign that document only if it was clear that the people of Gujarat and Maharashtra wanted such unification, wanted a bilingual State and I added that clause before I signed that document which was placed before me.

I, therefore, think that the earlier decision of the Government was right, but, nevertheless, to come back to the point where Pandit Kunzru interrupted me, to come back to what I was saying, I still support at the present stage, the proposal for a bilingual State. This is because all these different stages have been passed. We have had the discussion about two unilingual States. If that

had been the original recommendation of the Commission, if the Commission had not drawn a red herring across the path and diverted the attention of every one in this country, perhaps this question of a bilingual State of Bombay would not have arisen. And I have not yet understood what was the consideration which weighed with the Commission finally for not recommending two unilingual States in their report. (*Time bell rings.*) Is my time over? I will take only two minutes more to finish.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: Since the time at my disposal is very limited, I would only say that now that a final decision has been taken, we want that there should be no further disturbance. Now that the entire country, in a sense all the people through their representatives in the Parliament have supported this new decision, it should be given a trial. It should be given a chance and nothing should be done which might in any way disturb the atmosphere and leave any room for uncertainty. Whatever leads to uncertainty or any possibility of change at this stage in bound to have further repercussions make for uncertain and unstable conditions, and things may happen for which every one of us may be sorry and ashamed hereafter.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI (Nominat-ed): The whole speech has been against that decision as far as I can understand.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: No, Sir. Then I have singularly failed in conveying my impressions.....

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: I think so.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: Unilingual States should have been the recommendation of the Commission, but that stage has now been passed. We are now at a stage when a final decision has been taken and this final decision should not be upset in the interest of tranquility of the country. I would appeal to my friends from Gujarat who at the moment are opposed to this decision. The main ground of their opposition seems to be that whereas in the bilingual State recommended by the States Reorganisation Commission, they would have been approximately 38 or 40 per cent. with a Marathi population of 54 or 55 per cent. today in the new Bombay

State, they will be only about 34 per cent. of population with about 68 per cent. of Marathis. It is the reduction in their position which seems to have disturbed them most. I would appeal to all my friends in Gujarat that they have been in the fore front of the national struggle in the past and not only today. They know that it is not numbers alone but quality that counts. If a minority has the requisite character,—and the Gujaratis have shown that character in the past—if they show that vision and devotion they have always displaced, and if they can merge their interest with Greater Bombay out of a sense of unity for India. They will play a most important part in the Greater Bombay State and Bombay may in that way start a new era in Indian politics.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: What is your assessment of public opinion at the moment in Gujarat?

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: I have not been there and I could not give any assessment. I wish I had more time, but since Mr. Chairman you have asked me to finish, I will only end with this appeal to my friends in Gujarat.

PETITION ON THE STATES REORGANISATION BILL, 1956

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): Sir, I present a petition signed by nearly six lakhs of people of Gujarat asking for a separate Maha Gujarat State. The bundles of signatures are with me.

THE STATES REORGANISATION BILL, 1956—Continued.

श्री रामेश्वर अग्निभोज : सभापति महोदय, हमने पिछले चार, पांच वर्षों में देश की सर्वतोमुखी उन्नति की है। यदि हमारा राष्ट्र अधोमुखी हुआ है तो केवल एक दिशा में और वह दिशा है हमारी राष्ट्रीयता और एकता में बाधा, और यह बाधा पैदा हुई नये प्रान्तों की रचना से।

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

और नये प्रान्त रचना का सवाल जब हमारे सामने आया तब हमने अपनी गलती से, अपनी गलतफहमी से अथवा मूर्खता से उसका अर्थ यह लगा लिया कि हमारे राज्य में केवल भाषावार