THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS AND TRANSPORT (SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN) : (a) to (c). The information is being collected and will be iaid ton the Table of the Sabha in due course.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

MODIFICATION OF THE DISPLACED PERSONS (COMPENSATION AND REHABILITATION) RULES, 1955

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 Rules 352 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to inform Rajya Sabha that the annexed motion for modification of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955 as further amended by the Notification No. S. R.O. 1161, dated the 30th April, 1956, laid on the Table of Lok Sabha on the 21st July, 1956, has been passed by Lok Sabha under the provisions of sub-section (3) of section 40 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) . Act, 1954, at its sitting held on Wednesday, the 22nd August, 1956, and to request that the concurrence of Rajya Sabha in the said motion be communicated to this House.

MOTION

"This House resolves that in pursuance of sub-section (3) of section 40 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954, the following sub-rule be substituted for sub-rule (3) of rule 19 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955 as further amended by the Notification No. S.R.O. 1161, dated the 30th April, 1956, laid on the Table on the 21st July, 1956, namely:—

'(3) For the purposes of calculating the number of members of a joint family under sub-rule (2), a person who on the relevant date—

(a) was less than eighteen' years of age ;' or 2—17 Rajya Sabha/56

(b) was a lineal descendant in the male line of another living member of the joint family; shall be excluded;

Provided that where a member of a joint family has died during the period commencing on the fourteenth day of August, 1947, and ending on the relevant date leaving behind on the relevant date all or any of the following heirs, namely,—

(a) a widow or widows ;

(b) a son or sons (whatever the age of such son or sons);

but no lineal ascendant in the male line, then, all such heirs shall, notwithstanding anything contained in this rule, be reckoned as one member of the joint family'."

"This House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do concur in the said resolution".

"The above motion was passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on Wednesday, the 22nd August, 1956."

THE HINDU ADOPTIONS AND MAINTENANCE BILL, 1956

THE MINISTER FOR LEGAL AFFAIRS (SHRI H. V. PATASKAR) : Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend and codify the law relating to adoptions and maintenance among Hindus.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend and codify the law relating to adoptions and maintenance among Hindus."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

THE STATES REORGANISATION BILL, 1956—*continued*

MR. CHAIRMAN : We now go back to the States' Reorganisation Bill. The Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am venturing to intervene in this debate on the States Reorganisation Bill because of certain remarks that were made by the hon. Member, Dr. Kunzru, yesterday. He referred to certain observations and allegations made by Shri C. D. Deshmukh relating to the manner in which decisions on important issues are made and announced either in this House or elsewhere by certain Members of the Cabinet and the Prime Minister, without the knowledge of their colleagues in the Cabinet, and without collective consideration and decision by the Council of Ministers. I made a statement in the Lok Sabha in regard to these observations. 1 stated then that the facts as were set out by Shri Deshmukh were not correct, but that I did not wish to pursue the matter, as I wanted to avoid a controversy which was, to some extent, personal, and further that it would not be possible or desirable to do so without divulging Cabinet proceedings. The Home Minister also referred to this matter in the Lok Sabha and pointed out that Shri C. D. Dcshmukh's statement was not correct. My colleagues in the Cabinet were much distressed at the statement made by their former colleague on the 25th of July. They considered this matter at length amongst themselves because that statement cast aspersions on the Cabinet as a whole and on every member of it. It gave a distorted version of democratic processes at work in Indian and an erroneous version of the nature and content of Cabinet and Parliamentary Government in this country. The picture drawn by Shri Chintaman Deshmukh about relations between the Members of the Cabinet and of lack of collective deliberations and decisions is contrary to the facts and the practice of the Cabinet. Even the few instances cited by him are not in accord with the facts. Matters concerning the reorganisation of States have been discussed in Parliament and in the State Legislatures and every interest which considered itself affected, has had an opportunity of making known its views all of which were taken into consideration before the States Reorganisation Bill was finally drafted. It might even be said that there was too much, rather than too little, consultation on all important matters with the interests concerned.

The Cabinet discussed this matter on 14 occasions between the 30th September 1955 and the 30th May 1956, Shri Deshmukh, to the best my belief, attended 13 of these meetings. On the one occasion that he was absent, no decision was in fact taken which affected the future of either Bombay of Gujarat or Maharashtra. On the 8th January the Cabinet decided that matters concerning details of certain aspects of the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission should be considered by a Committee of the Cabinet consisting of the Prime Minister, the Minister for Education and the Minister for Home Affairs. Some other Ministers were often invited to the meetings of this Committee. Shri Deshmukh attended two meetings of this Committee. The Committee kept the Cabinet informed from time to time of the progress made in the work and the tentative decisions taken by it. The broad decisions of the Cabinet were made public on the 16th January 1956. Only one or two matters had not been decided till then. The States Reorganisation Bill was then framed as a whole and as a whole put before the Cabinet. It was twice—on two separate occasions—considered by the Cabinet before it was finally approved on the 8th March 1956. That is in so far as the broad questions of the Bill and the content of the Bill is concerned. The announcement made by me in Bombay at a meeting of the All India Congress Committee consisted of a repetition of what had been stated in the States Reorganisation Bill with one addition. This addition was that the City of Bombay could be given an opportunity of expressing its view in regard to its future position in about five years' time. This was not in the Bill nor was it intended to be in the Bill and this statement was, in no way, isolated from the Cabinet decisions or contrary to them. In fact, it was in keeping with the broad policy which had been repeatedly referred to previously.

Shri Deshmukh also referred to an earlier incident, that is to be the Andhra-Tamil Nad issue. When the formation of the Andhra State was decided upon, this matter was considered by the Cabinet as early as 1949 before Shri Deshmukh became a Minister and certain steps in the matter of separation of Andhra were actually taken then. The final decision had to be postponed owing to some unresolved differences among the leaders concerned and because the introduction of our Constitution intervened. The principal question at issue then was about the future of Madras

City. When later this question was decided amicably, it was possible for the Prime Minister to refer, in the course of his reply to a question in the Council of States on December 9, 1952, to what was or had been the decision of the Government which had remained pending on account of the aforesaid difficulty which had then been resolved. Before the final decision was announced in Parliament, the Cabinet discussed this matter and approved the lines of the announcement which was made in Parliament on the 19th December 1952. It was not my desire to enter into this controversy but I am making this statement in this House in order to remove any erroneous impressions that might have been created in the minds of Members of Parliament or of the public in regard to the way our Cabinet functions and the participation of the members of the Cabinet in the shaping of the policies of Government and decisions thereon from time to time. I feel that it is necessary to do so in the interests of the future of constitutional Government in our country and out of regard to the concern that Parliament would legitimately have in a matter of this kind.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pra desh) : Sir, may I put a question to the Prime Minister? I welcome the statement that has been made but the Prime Minister has not dealt with the specific point made by Shri Chintaman Deshmukh during the discussion of the States Reorganisation Bill clause by clause. What he said was this. Up to a certain date in January I think 10th or 11th ____

AN HON. MEMBER: 10th.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU:.... 10th January, 1 am told, the decision of the Cabinet to treat Bombay as a City State stood but on the 16th January, when the announcement was made, it was found that Bombay was to be a Centrally administered territory. Between these two dates, namely the 10th and the 16th no meeting of the Cabinet was held. This is what Mr. Deshmukh has said. Whether it was right or wrong, it is for the Prime Minister to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You did say something about 8th January and some decision of a Committe that was appointed ?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It is a little difficult to deal with these matters without going precisely into every day's meeting of the Cabinet. My colleague, the Home Minister, as the House knows, has been in charge of this matter particularly and he may be able, to give some further information but I might say this that it had been decided and the House should remember that every decision was, in a sense, a tentative decision till the full Bill was drafted. When the full Bill was drafted and placed before the Cabinet, it was only then that the full thing came up and that was considered by the full Cabinet twice. That itself, I think, disposes of any intervening decisions which sometimes were changed because of circumstances. But in regard to the particular matter which the hon. Member has referred to, it had been decided, if I may say so, that Bombay should be Centrally administered. That was the decision taken. But here I find myself in difficulty because I don't know how far I should bring out confidential matters but because of certain events in which Mr. Deshmukh was involved, we were agreeable to having Bombay as a separate State. We had no objection to it provided, of course, the others concerned agreed. We were given to understand that the others did agree and we said, "Well and good". Soon after, we were given to understand that the others did not agree and so we reverted to the previous decision and there the matter ended.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : I understand there is the question of certain decisions of the Cabinet being influenced by the former Finance Minister—the former Finance Minister being involved in certain things—which the Prime Minister has not explained. We would like to know what that factor is.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : May I say, Sir, that there is no question of being involved in anything ? We were discussing various matters, each Member putting forward his own view.

THE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT) : Sir, before dealing with the various points that have been raised here in the course of the debate on the motion for the consideration of the Bill, I, with your permission, would like to supplement the remarks made by the hon. the Prime Minister.

[Shri Govind Ballabh Pant.]

The Prime Minister referred to the 8th of January. On the 8th of January, if I remember aright, the consensus of opinion in the Cabinet was that in the circumstances, Bombay should not be a separate State but should be a Centrally administered unit. Mr. Deshmukh then said that the leaders of Maharashtra had authorised him to say that they would prefer Bombay being a State to the other alternative of its being administered from the Centre. He was advised to call those people and one of the conditions of the arrangement was this that Vidarbha would be attached to Maharashtra. It was suggested that the leaders of Vidarbha also might be called so that an understanding between the representatives of Maharashtra, Marathwada and Vidarbha might be reached and the whole thing closed to enable us to announce a definite decision. When these people came, though they had given Mr. Deshmukh to understand that they would prefer Bombay to be "a separate State instead of being administered from the Centre, they did not endorse their previous view or whatever impression they might have given to Mr. Deshmukh. So, Mr. Deshmukh was in a difficult position and he said that hey were really not agreeable. In the circumstances, we fell back upon the decision which almost had been reached by the Cabinet that Bombay should be administered Centrally instead of being a separate State. That was tentatively included in the communique that was issued on the 16th of January. After that also, the matter was discussed, I believe, but for all practical purposes it was settled that Bombay would be Centrally administered. That decision was not announced in a formal way but it was included in the communique that was issued. In the formative stage, we were considering various proposals that were arising from day to day when the Bill was being framed and all proposals had been embodied in it. The Bill, in its final stage, was placed before the Cabinet and the Cabinet considered it ; it was not at one sitting that this was done but further time was taken and it was approved by the whole of the Cabinet. It was presented to the Lok Sabha. It was presented to the Lok Sabha after the Cabinet had fully approved of the Bill and in this form, k was circulated to the States. Everything was done with utmost care. I doubt if any other matter has received similar attention at the hands of the Cabinet for that matter, at the hands of Parliament.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU : Why does the Home Minister call the communique 'tentative' ?

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: The communique was tentative in tire sense that so long as the Bill was not framed, we were prepared to receive comments on what we had decided in the communique and, if necessary, to further adjust matters in order to suit the wishes of the people.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad) : Is it correct to say that at no time the Cabinet came to the decision that Bombay should be a City State ?

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: I cannot say that the Cabinet gave a decision that Bombay should be a City State at any time. I am not prepared to say more because I have not consulted the Cabinet records and I am giving you only my impression just now.

The decision that Bombay should be Centrally administered is included, embodied and incorporated in the Bill as it was circulated to the States and placed before the House. Nobody ever objected to it on the ground that it has not been reached in a regular and proper way.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE : Am I correct in understanding the hon. IVtinister that the Cabinet did not also come to a decision that it should be a Centrally administered area before the 8th of January ?

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: I said that the Cabinet was, on the day on which this matter was discussed, on or about the 8th of January of the opinion almost that Bombay should be administered from the Centre and that it should not be a separate State. That decision had been taken by the Congress Working Committee that there should be three units, Gujarat, Maharashtra and Bombay and that there should be three separate States. That matter was discussed in the Cabinet and in view of the support given by the leaders of Maharashtra to the alternative of a Centrally administered state and the preference shown by them for Bombay being Centrally administered, we were going to accept that proposal finally to the extent it was open to us to accept it j at that stage. Then we were told that I our view that the leaders of Maharash-

tra wanted Bombay to be Centrally administered was not right—that Mr. Deshmukh had been told by them that they would prefer a State and not Central administration for Bombay. In view of what he *said*-—in fact, he said that he had been authorised by those people to say so—we wanted to assure ourselves that it was so. However, they did not stick to that position. It was out of regard for them that we were going to have this State, we were going to give preference to it, as against the proposal to administer it Centrally which had been made to us by several prominent leaders of Maharashtra. I myself was of the opinion that they held this view but when Mr. Deshmukh said that he had been authorised by them to say something to the contrary, we postponed that decision in order to assure ourselves that it was so. They did not agree to a separate State but preferred a Centrally administered Bombay. This being so, we veered back to the proposal which had our approval out of regard for their wishes which, on being consulted again, were confirmed by them.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That will do so far as this question is concerned.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: I might say only one word. After all, it did not upset anything. The scheme was that Maharashtra should be one State, Gujarat should be one State and Bombay should be one State. Whether Bombay would be a State or would be Centrally administered did not upset the scheme. The scheme remained as it was. If it was to be administered from the Centre, it would not be a State by itself under the Bill but its future status would -be determined by the Centre in consultation with the people of Bombay. I do not think there was any material change even.

Sir, coming now to the provisions of the Bill, I am glad that the proposals contained in the Bill have been endorsed but for one or two solitary exceptions, by all the speakers who have expressed 12 NooN^f views on this Bill. As I had expected the Bill has come to this House with the unanimous approval of the Lok Sabha. There was not a single 'No' when the proposal, That the Bill be passed' into law, was put before the House in the Lok Sabha. It was really a unique experience that a measure, which had aroused such a sharp controversy and which had been the subject of prolonged discussion not only in the two Houses of Parliament but also outside, should have ultimately received the approval and the *imprimatur* of the entire Lok Sabha. I say that was something remarkable and unique for which I am grateful to the Members there and I am equally grateful to this House for the views which have been generally expressed.

Sir, while some of the speakers have approved of the matter or the substance of the Bill, they have found fault with the manner in which the decisions were reached. Well, it is sometimes difficult to go the whole hog and to support everything that comes from Government. So, if you cannot blame the Government for the decisions, at least you must find some handle, some stick to beat the Government with and that you can find by raising objections as to the manner in which those decisions had been reached though those decisions by themselves may be sound, proper and correct. Well, so far as I am concerned, I am gratified to find that the operative part of the process or the Bill has been approved by all and that matters to me more than the manner in which objections have been raised to the man-[ner of reaching decisions. Well, as to the manner itself I do not know if there was any occasion in any way to criticise the Government for what it had done. In fact nobody is infallible. I have paid tribute to the authors of the States Reorganisation Commission Report not once, not twice but perhaps a large number of times, but I have the temerity still to hold that they were not infallible because man being a mortal does err and even if they be a trinity, a trinity can err. ...

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU : There is a more powerful trinity here.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT : Well, I hope it is. The proposals of the Commission came to Government by way of recommendations and the decisions had to be taken by Government. So, any way it could be said to be more powerful as it had a decisive voice.

But, Sir, so far as the proposal about Bombay is concerned, I wish that the Commission had exercised greater imagination. So far as we are concerned, we have always been for a bilingual State. The Commission too had proposed a bilingual State. Mr. Kunzru said the other day, if the report that I have seen is correct, that he was against Bombay being part of a unilingual State. Well, if that was his view, then the opinion

[Shri Govind Ballabh Pant.]

expressed later by him did not quite tally with the opinion.that he held at a previous stage but, after all, every man is entitled to change his opinion.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU : What is the inconsistency ?

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT : The inconsistency may not be visible even now. To me it seems to be quite clear. If one says that Bombay should not be included in a unilingual State and then advocates the inclusion of Bombay in a unilingual State, apparently there is an inconsistency.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU : But the Commission also said that it should not be a City State or a Centrally administered territory.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : (Uttar Pradesh) It did not say that.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I read out a paragraph in the Commission's Report in which that has been stated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us not have this verbal jugglery.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT : I am not responsible for it. The entire argument in the Report was against Bombay being included in a unilingual State and whatever one may say, the force of those arguments cannot in any way be overridden by any vehement assertion. Sir, so far as that goes, I am not concerned with the little inconsistencies. Life is bigger than logic and one is entitled to change and must change his opinion if he finds that he had been in the wrong previously or if the circumstances forced him to do so. Our fault lay there and our mind has always been open, is in a receptive frame and we have been prepared to do what is right regardless of anything that we might have said previously, and we will continue to stick to that principle even hereafter. So, what really happened was this that the Commission proposed a bilingual State for Bombay. The whole of Gujarat was to come within that bilingual State and the Maharashtra people living in the Marathwada area and those living in the Bombay State were to form part of that bilingual State. But they separated Vidarbha from Madhya Pradesh, and instead of attaching it to bilingual Bombay, they made a singular State consisting of not more than seven millions of this Vidarbha, and when its recommendation was published, then there was a wave of resentment and indignation in Maharashtra. Had this been foreseen by the Commission and if they advised a bigger bilingual State as. the Parliament has now accepted, many of the tragic events that have happened in between would not have happened. But they could only do what according to their lights seemed to them to be proper at that time.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI (Nominated) : Where was the provocation for creating a separate Vidarbha State ?

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: Well I am only stating facts, and I am sorry that this proposal was not made at the outset. Then seeing that this proposal about the sort of bilingual State that was proposed by the Commission would not be workable, we had to find some alternative and in consultation with the people concerned we suggested that we might have three units, but while suggesting these three units we always placed before ourselves the ideal and objective of a combined bilingual State for Bombay and with that objective in view we also provided that Bombay, Gujarat and Maharashtra would have a single High Court, a single Public Service Commission and a common Governor. That provision was made with a view to ensuring the future development of these three units in such a way that they might coalesce into one bigger State of Bombay. That was our objective and that is what we worked for. We would have liked to do so at once. We couldn't and we did'nt because there was considerable opposition—not from any one particular quarter— Gujarat, Maharashtra all were opposed to that proposal. So in spite of our desire that we should have such a State, we had to wait for some time to see that things took a favourable turn and shaped themselves in a way which would enable us to see that this bigger bilingual State or the Bill was placed before Parliament. While the matter was under consideration in Parliament, an amendment was proposed to the effect that these three units should form a bilingual State of Bombay. This finds a place in the Bill as it has come to this House, not earlier but just now. How could we oppose that ? We ourselves had been in favour of this proposal. We thought that it was an ideal proposal and we were working for it by providing other means

which would lead to the consummation of this objective. Now, this proposal came and came from a Member of Gujarat; it was supported by another talented leader of Gujarat. It was supported by Maharashtrians. In the entire House, almost through its whole being, there was unanimous support for this proposal. What were we to do in a democratic set-up ? When the entire Parliament wants the Government to accept a certain proposal, should we be so headstrong, so stubborn, so wayward—even though we were satisfied that the amendment proposed was sound —and so perverse as to say that we will not accept the advice of the House although it comes from all the Members of the House ? That, I say, would be undemocratic ; that would be against the spirit of the Constitution and as we are here as servants of Parliament, it was our duty and I think it was also in the interests of the country that we should accept the proposal which had the backing of all sections of the House including those who had to take the responsibility of working this scheme thereafter. So, if there had been any delay, if other expedients had been suggested during the interval, it was because we hadn't that support and that backing and not because we were ourselves not in favour of it. And when it became available, we accepted it. We welcomed it not only with cordiality but I am prepared to say, even with a little avidity. We accepted it and we hope that when the storm passes and when the little ripples that have arisen have settled and subsided, then the country will work out this scheme and find that it will contribute to the richness of culture and prosperity of our ancient land. So we accepted it. I do not know why there should be any quarrel about it aift why anybody should have any grievances against it when especially all agree in substance that it is right. It is a matter of sorrow and grief to me that certain incidents have happened in Ahmedabad recently. We are all distressed over them that some of our dear young friends, on whom the future of our country rests and to whom we look for the furtherance of the causes which we have the privilege and opportunity to advocate today, were misled by others and they were consequently involved in certain matters which have caused us grief. We appreciate their point of view. They are young men, receptive, impulsive and inspired by ideals and when one goes to them, they can be easily led away but we repose our trust in them and we have every confidence that they will come round and do the right thing.

But there is one thing which sometimes causes some little concern. We look forward to the day when we will have a world federation. The progress today is towards bigger and bigger States and the future of humanity, as many thinkers tell us, lies in obliterating all differences on the ground of caste, creed or colour and also in effa-*cing all boundaries which divide one nation from the other so that we have a human family of an international character, not at all separated into compartments or divided into sections. So, our young men have to prepare themselves for that day. It would be clearly unfortunate if that outlook today were narrowed and if within the country itself they were to attach greater importance to the region in which they have been born or bred and think less of India. They know more than anybody that if India lives, every State lives ; if India weakens, no State can be strong. So, they must know this more than anyone else and I hope they will develop that wide, that catholic outlook which one has a right to expect from them especially when they are free from political prejudices and other narrow interests which often misled men into wrong straits.

Sir, it is again a matter of great anxiety to us that Shri Morarji Desai is on a fast today. He is one of the greatest Indians ever born in our country, one who has devoted his life self-lessly to the service of the country, whose sacrifices would compare with those of any other patriot in the country, and he is a man of firm will and strong commonsense. That he should have endangered his life is a matter, I think, of concern to everyone of us and we can only pray and wish that matters may be so settled and settled speedily that he may begin his normal course and attend to his responsible duties as the Chief Minister of the State of Bombay which has earned reputation not only in this country but also outside.

Sir, there are some other points which have been mentioned in the course of the discussion here. It is difficult in fact to cover the entire ground and if I were to make an attempt, I would have to repeat much of what I have said elsewhere. Some

[Shri Govind Ballabh Pant.]

suggestion was made about a Legislative Council being provided for Andhra. Well, so far as that goes, we have no objection one way or the other but Andhra is not a new State. Madhya Pradesh is a new State. Andhra continues as a State. So, the provisions of the Constitution come in the way. It will be necessary for the Assembly of Andhra to pass a Resolution in the manner prescribed in the Constitution and if they do it, I think there will be no difficulty in the way of a Legislative Coun-. cil being provided for Andhra. There was also some argument, I understand, about the Southern or Western Zone, that is about Karnataka being included in the same zone with the bigger bilingual Bombay. Well, the reasons which led us to take this decision will, I think, be found adequate by those who may have had some doubts. The Karnataka State is being formed today by the addition to the Mysore State of districts which in the past formed part of Bombay State. There had been partnership between the people of Maharashtra and Karnataka ; and certain areas also from Hyderabad, from Marathwada, are being transferred to Bombay. They had very close life links in the past. So, we stated when the zones were announced that it was a remedial measure against the de-linking of the States which had been working together so far, that the zones were devised. Now, in order to give some solace to the people who would otherwise suffer the pangs of separation, we thought it would be better to put them together. .

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore) : May I know, Sir, whether this was not the position even earlier when the previous recommendations were made in the Bill ?

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT : When the present recommendations were made then the bilingual Bombay State was not there and so much against our will we had to put Karnataka in a different zone, but the opportunity came and we availed ourselves of it. Then, there are also other reasons. Karnataka and Bombay have many outstanding problems to be settled even after this thing has been launched and for that it will be necessary for them to be in close contact with each other. Again, as hon. Members are aware, there are certain boundary disputes between Karnataka and bigger Bombay State and for the settlement of those disputes which have caused considerable worry to some of our friends it is desirable that the two should form part of one unit and they may be able to discuss things between themselves. Then, we will have small and big ports on the western coast for our coastal traffic and that will be another factor which will help us in the establishment of such ports in a rational way. Apart from |that, for marketing and exporting that of cotton it is desirable that Bombay and Karnataka should go together and also the timber of Kanara will be sold in Bombay. So there are many economic reasons, social reasons why they should go together.

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): What about Tungabhadra which is equally important ?

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT : Well, Tungabhadra received enough of attention at our hands and Karnataka has the benefit of having Bellary with them and you the benefit of the Tungabhadra project in Andhra....

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : Mysore.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT : Mysore. Well, anyway I was just stating reasons, but there is nothing very rigid about it. If experience showed that it would be better to join Karnataka with another set of States, that can be done later just as we give a trial to this experiment; and by the time we have settled the outstanding problems arising out of this reorganisation of States. I think, it will be possible to give further thought to this question. It need not be regarded as a very rigid, final and conclusive one for all time to come.

Some reference has also fceen made, I understand, to Shencottah taluk. Well, it is a small thing in a way. But Shencottah, as hon. Members will remember, has a part to the west of the watershed. So, it was thought that the part lying to the west should go to Kerala and that to the east to Madras. There was one *pakuthy* which was to go to the west. Then, the Madras and Travan-core-Cochin Governments had given thought to the matter, made a survey at the spot, seen what would be the best boundary line between the two, and in order to close the question and not to leave anything to be settled later, they reached an arrangement and a notification was issued with the consent of both Governments. So, I do not see why there

should be any trouble or any objection in this regard now. What has been done is the best arrangement and there is nothing that could at any time cause any inconvenience to either of the two.

Mr. Kunzru again raised an objection to our keeping Himachal Pradesh as a separate unit. Well, I can only say that there was a difference of opinion between the Chairman and the Members and we thought that we should follow the Chairman in preference to the Members. So, the fault is not only ours but also of the Chairman. Then, as hon. Members know, so far as 1 am aware, there is not a single soul in Himachal Pradesh today who is prepared to join Punjab. The resolutions passed by Himachal Pradesh were distinctly in favour of remaining and continuing as a separate unit. They even said. "Do not give us any legislature. Have only an administrator, but save us from our friends at least for the present." So, we had to submit to their wishes. Then, Dr. Kunzru accepted that Himachal Pradesh was backward and some special arrangements had to be made for its development, even if it were attached to the Punjab. So, instead of Having any such clumsy contrivance we thought it would be better to leave Himachal Pradesh alone to develop itself without any sort of interference from any other quarter. Once there was some hint about Himachal Pradesh being joined to Punjab and I cannot tell you how many telegrams I received and how many meetings were held in Himachal Pradesh against this imaginary proposal which was never made by anybody. That showed the strength of feeling on the subject.

Then, he also raised some objection as to why Tripura had not been attached to Assam. Well, I have not heard of a single resolution passed in Tripura by any meeting whatsoever in favour of Tripura being joined to Assam and I Tiave received numeros telegrams, resolutions, etc. from Tripura again and again pressing for the continuance of Tripura as a separate State. And in the face of public opinion we had to do that. Mr. Kunzru likes us to respect public opinion. So, the preference lay, within the context of the country's claims, between the recommendation of the Commission and the opinion of the public. We had to bend before the latter.

There was also some objection from some quarters as to the Laccadive and Amindivi Islands being formed into a Centrally administered unit. Both the islands concerned have passed resolutions to the effect that they should be a Centrally administered area. A lot of money has to be spent in order to develop these States, and no State can by itself provide necessary funds for that purpose. So, they had to be taken under wings of the Centre.

Some question was also raised about our having a Boundary Commission just now. That question was also discussed in the Lower House. If a Boundary Commission is appointed, I am afraid there will be a plethora of claims, perhaps hundreds. The States Reorganisation Commission worked for more than two years and after considering everything it reached certain decisions. Now, if we appoint a Boundary Commission, then everything will be reopened and the country which has become sick perhaps of these controversies over territorial mergers will be bored further and we will have this melancholy chapter continuing indefinitely for all time perhaps. The country requires a little respite, some rest, so that it may apply itself for the purpose for which we all exist. We have to concentrate on the second Five Year Plan. We have to devote every ounce of our energy towards the development of the various areas which stand in need of immediate attention. So, let us concentrate on them for the time being. Of course, if there are any question which call for further consideration—and there are always some questions which are either genuine or are the creation of the fertile imagination of ingenious men and perhaps women also —they will always be there, but first things must come first. So, we have for the time being to concentrate on the vast problems which we have to face as a result of the reorganisation of the States, and when we have completed this job and made good of it, then we can attend to other minor and small matters.

Then, as hon. Members are aware, the Zonal Councils have been authorised to deal with border disputes. They will be able to settle them. But even if you were to appoint a Boundary Commis sion, what will be the result? There will be, I think, enough of wrangles before the Commission and ultimately their recommenda-

[Shri Govind BalJabh Pant.]

tions would again be disputed and they would have to come to the Parliament, and here we will see the wrangle over again. So, that would not be the final solution any way. The best course lies in settling these matters amicably in an informal way, and I hope attempts will be made in that direction. We all will see that so far as it is feasible these minor questions at least are settled between the contending parties with goodwill and without any rancour.

Sir, in the notes that I have before me there are still certain items, but I feel that it would not be proper for me to take more of the time of the House because this subject has been discussed for days and days and howsoever much we may try one has to a certain extent repeat what one has already said. I can only hope that this Bill, which has come to this House with the recommendation of the entire Lok Sabha and which today more or less embodies the agreed proposals that have been hailed by the entire country, will receive similar support from this House, and that this scheme will be launched on the 1st of November with the goodwill and blessings of every hon. Member and of every patriot, statesman and common man in the street in our country.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

That the Bill to provide for the re-organisation of the States of India and for matters connected therewith, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration.

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN : No 'Noes' at all.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It will come later.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, we pass on to clause by clause .consideration of the Bill. Regarding clause 2, I think we may postpone consideration since it is a matter of definitions and some of these things might come up later as we discuss.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

Clause 3—*Transfer of territory from Hyderabad to Andhra and alteration of name*

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad) : Sir, I move :

7. "That at page 3, after line 25, the following be inserted, namely •—

'(h) Sironcha taluk of Chanda district ;

(i) southern part of Bastar district inhabited by Koya people -*r*

(j) all that part of Raichur district which lies to t he est of railway line'."

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : Sir, I move :

100. "That at page 3, line 26, after the word 'territories' the words mem-tioned in sub-section (1) be inserted."

I also move :

101. That at page 3, after line 28, the following be inserted, namely :—

"(1A) As from the appointed day, the following territory shall cease to form part of the State of Andhra, namely :—

'Madakasira taluk in Anantapur district'."

MR. CHAIRMAN : The clause and) the amendments are before the House. I would like you to be as brief as possible because we have got such a large number of clauses. I give not more than, half an hour for each of these controversial clauses.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Mr. Chairman, Sir, after the assurance given by hon. the Home Minister it is rather difficult for anybody to rake up again the question of the border disputes. But I submit, Sir, that in this matter there are two aspects. Where a State has been broken up and its area has been distributed among other States, that question has to be considered differently from where certain areas are to be transferred! from one State to another State by the readjustment of boundaries. My amendment is very simple. Sir, Hyderabad State has been broken up and it is being split up into three parts; one part is. Telangana, the other part is Marathwada and the third part is Karnataka which is going to join Mysore. In this partition, Sir, I submit that in the part given to. Karnataka a certain area is entirely inhabited by Telugu-speaking people.. When the Hyderabad State Assembly was discussing this question of the partition of Hyderabad, the representatives, of the three areas who were Members of (he Assembly jointly and mutually objection of the Home Minister that alt agreed on a formula. Therefore, Sir the

boundary disputes should be adjusted by mutual agreement does not apply to this case. It is not a question of certain territory being taken away from Hyderabad, but it is a question of the distribution of Hyderabad territory, and I submit, Sir, that the verdict of the Hyderabad Assembly should have been accepted by the Home Minister. He has wrongly applied a principle to this question where it is not applicable.

Sir, without saying anything further on this matter I come to the second point of my amendment where- I have asked that the southern part of Bastar district should be joined to Andhra Pradesh. Here I agree that the injunction or the suggestion made by the Home Minister is applicable. Here it should be decided by mutual agreement, and I appeal to all the representatives of Madhya Pradesh that they should agree that the southern part of Bastar which is inhabited by the Koya tribes should be transferred to the Telangana area, later-on to be merged in Andhra, so that the Koya tribes may become one homogeneous unit and the tribal people who are living in that area may fully develop and advance in as short a time as possible.

Just one word more about Sironcha taluk of Chanda district. That was also mutually agreed upon between the representatives of Marathwada and those of Hyderabad. The remaining part of Chanda district is entirely populated by Marnthi-speaking people while this area is inhabited by Telugu-speaking people. Therefore the Marathi repre sentatives of the Hyderabad Assembly agreed to transfer this part to Telan gana. *

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Therefore. I submit, Sir, that all my amendments are most reasonable amendments and they should be accepted by the Home Minister as they are not against any of the principles laid down by him. By mutual agreement all the' representatives have previously agreed to that.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : Mr. Deputy Chairman, my amendment relates to clause 3, which says that the present State of Andhra will get additional territories—the Telugu-speaking areas of Hyderabad. Sir, the purport of my amendment is that while this large territory of Telangana is going to be added on to the Stafe of Andhra, there is just a very small enclave in the Mysore State which belongs to Andhra, but which can very conveniently go into the new State of Mysore, and that is the Madakasira taluk. I referred to it in my observations previously. This taluk is completely enclaved in the Mysore State, except for a small bottleneck of probably 5 per cent, of the area, and the majority of the population speak Kannada. Really, Sir, I do not know how this question was overlooked by the Commission. I am sure, Sir, there is nobody who can dispute the fact that I have now placed before the House. The two sovereign conditions that should necessarily go to decide which way a particular area should go are duly fulfilled in this case, namely, the majority of the population speak Kannada and the area is more or less an enclave. All their economic relationship is with Bangalore. It is just hardly 60 miles from Bangalore, or even less, whereas the people have to perform really a pilgrimage in order to reach Hyderabad. I would, therefore, suggest that this point may kindly the considered by the-House and Madakasira added on to-Mysore. And Sir, my other amendment is only a consequential one.

SHRI A. S. RAJU (Andhra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, if any people are-more than satisfied in this country, it is the Kannadigas who have gained all round from the proposals of the States Reorganisation Commission and the decisions of the Government. Yet my friend is thirty and he wants other's territories. I am very sorry that he says that Madakasira should go to Mysore He conveniently forgets that....

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : It is not my request. It is the request of the people concerned.

SHRI A. S. RAJU : Sir, he forgets that Pawagada is an enclave in the Mysore State. He conveniently forgets that fact, and also he wants the House to forget it. He says that the people of Madakasira are very anxious to go to the Mysore State. In that case, I can say that people of Pawagada are equally anxious to come back to the Andhra State. He says that perhaps the Com-mision has forgotten that point, the Joint Select Committee has forgotten that point, the Lok Sabha has forgotten that point, as if it is only Mr. Dasappa who remembers it. I, therefore, strongly oppose this amendment. It is most unreasonable and it should not be-accepted by this House.

THE MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI B. N. DATAR): Sir, SO far as the Sironcha taluk is concerned, the Telugu-speaking population is 51:2 per cent. Now, Sir, 51 per cent, is not the criterion laid down.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO (Hyderabad): Is it not a fact, Sir, that in the Hyderabad Assembly it has been unanimously accepted that Sironcha taluk should go to Andhra Pradesh ? Is it also not a fact that even Mr. Deogirikar and other Maharashtrians did accept the suggestion that Sironcha taluk should go to Andhra Pradesh ?

SHRI B. N. DATAR : May I point out to the hon. Members that so far as both these points are concerned, these can better be left to the Zonal Councils which would discuss these questions ? *(Interruption).* It is not a question of mere acceptance of the wishes of the people. There are numerous other factors also to be considered. So far as the Sironcha taluk is concerned, the Telugu population is 51:2 per cent. *(Interruption.)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : So, Sir, I would submit to this House that it would not be possible to deal with stray cases here. All these cases will be duly considered by the Zonal Councils. And we had also offered to the various people concerned to come to certain agreements, and such agreements were reached so far as certain tehsils in the Bidar district were concerned. Now, Sir, in the absence of any agreement, either so far as Sironcha is concerned, so far as Madakasira is concerned, it might be difficult for the Government at this stage to accept any amendment. So far as Madakasira is concerned, the Kannada population is 63:6 per cent, and the Telugu population is 30:3 per cent, and other is 6:1 per cent. Here also the same difficulty arises. The question has to be considered by the Mysore Government, as also by the Andhra Pradesh Government together, and if they come to any conclusion, that question can be solved. Otherwise, the question can be raised in the Zonal Councils concerned.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : Does it mean that there should be a meeting of the Zonal Councils—the Western Zone and the Southern Zone ?

SHRI B. N. DATAR : So far as the present Bill is concerned, we have provided for the meeting of two Zonal Councils.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

7. "That at page 3, after line 25, the following be inserted, namely : —

'(h) Sironcha taluk of Chanda district ;

(j) southern part of Bastar district inhabited by Koya people ;

(j) all that part of Raichur district which lies to the east of railway line'."

The motion was negatived.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Sir, I beg leave to withdraw my amendments.

'Amendments Nos. 100 and 101 were by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY. CHAIRMAN : The. question is :

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 4—*Transfer of territory from Travancore-Cochin to Madras*

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN (Madras) : Sir, I move :

8. "That at page 3 line 36 for the words "Shencottah taluk of Quilon district' the words 'Shencot tah taluk (excluding Puliyara Hill Pakuthy) as it existed on the 1st March, 1956, of Quilon district' be substituted."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir. I move :

9. "That at page 4, at the end of line 7, after the word 'Madras', the words 'hereinafter called the State of Tamilnad' be inserted".

(The amendment also stood in the net;; of Dr. R. B. Gour, Shri Perath Narayanan Nair, Shri S. N. Mazumdar, Shri V. Prasad Rao, Shri Satyapriya Baner-jee, Shri N. C. Sekhar and Shri Abdur Rezzalc Khan.)

*For text of amendments, *vide* col. 52 *supra.*

SHRI S. C. KARAYALAR (Travan- i core-Cochin) : Sir, I move :

102. "That at page 4, for lines 5 to 7, the following be substituted, namely :—

'(c) the territories comprised in the Shencottah taluk as on the 18th day of April, 1956, shall be included in and become part of Tirunelveli district in the State of Madras and shall form a separate taluk known as Shencottah taluk'."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The clause and amendments are now before the House.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN : Sir, I had already said during the speech that I made at the consideration stage of this Bill how this change had come about. The Home Minister, during the course of his reply to this debate, had mentioned that it was really due to the agreement between the Governments of Travancore-Cochin and Madras that this notification was issued. But I think the Home Minister has forgotten that since | the notification was issued, the Chief Minister of Madras had written to him saying that certain difficulties might arise. Therefore, Sir, I would like the Home Minister to consider this point and see how what the Madras Government wants can be achieved by a suitable amendment. Not that my amendment should necessarily be accepted, but the Government might think of some other amendment by which this position can be rectified.

SHRI S. C. KARAYALAR: Sir, I seek to substitute the following in place of clause 5(c):

"the territories comprised in the Shencottah taluk as on the 18th day of April, 1956, shall be included in and become part of Tirunelveli district in the State of Madras and shall form a separate taluk known as . Shencottah taluk."

In order to understand the implications of my amendment, it is necessary to bear in mind the history of this matter. The Report of the States Reorganisation; Commission said that the whole of this taluk as it existed at the moment should' be. transferred to Madras' State. They said that itwas a 'very' clear case for transfer of'the whole taluk. That was the' first' stage.'' Then the people of that taluk were satisfied with the recommendation of the Commission. The second stage was reached when the Government issued a *communique* on the 16th January 1956. That was supposed to be based upon the agreement arrived at between the Governments of Madras and Travan-core-Cochin. When this agreement was arrived at, the people concerned, namely the people of Shencottah, were kept absolutely in the dark. They did not know what had happened. All of a sudden the Government issued a *communique* saying that a certain portion of Shencottah taluk would be retained in TravancoreCochin State and only the rest would be transferred to Madras. It is very unfair to the people of Shencottah to have been denied an opportunity to say what they had to say in the matter. That was the second stage. The third stage was reached when the Bill providing for the transfer of certain portions to Madras and retention of certain areas of Shencottah taluk in Travancore-Cochin was introduced. There, there was a reference to the retention of what is known as Puli-yara Hill Pakuthy in TravancoreCochin State. It happens that what was known as Puliyara Hill Pakuthy, never existed. That was only a name which was assumed for the sake of drafting the Bill. So, a difficulty arose. The Madras and the Travancore-Cochin Governments are supposed to have demarcated the boundary line between the Tranvancore-Cochin and the future Madras State in Shencottah taluk. It so happened that the demarcation line did not follow the provisions of the Bill. Instead of only separating what is known as Puliyara Hill Pakuthy, the demarcation line passed through two other *pakuthies* also. So, again the difficulty arose as to how the boundary line should be demarcated. That was the third stage. Then the fourth stage arose after the Bill had been introduced and the matter was receiving the consideration of the Joint Select Committee. Haying seen all these difficulties regarding' the demarcation of the boundary line, the Travancore-Cochin Government seems to have taken unilateral action in the matter. They said that a certain portion' of Shencottah taluk would be transferred to the adjoining taluk of Travancore-Cochin State and the rest would be treated as Shencottah taluk and that portion would b^e transferred to Madras. This is a case in which | the Travancore-Cochin Government seems to have taken unilateral action

[Shri S. C. Karayalar.]

without reiejence to the Madras Government. It was by agreement between the two Governments that the demarcation line was first agreed upon. Then later on the Travancore-Cochin Government unilaterally decided the matter. Not only on the ground of want oi agreement do I object to this, but I say that this is a serious matter for which there is no precedent. When the Bill was introduced in Parliament, the whole question of territorial distribution—whether it was on a big or small scale—was before the Parliament. It was Parliament and Parliament alone that was competent to decide the question of redistribution and not either the Government of Madras or of Travancore-Cochin. The fact that the Travancore-Cochin Government took the matter up and added certain portions of the Shencottah taluk to the adjoining taluk is something that has no parallel. The whole matter is before the Parliament. How could one Government, by taking unilateral action, transfer a certain portion of a particular taluk which was the subject-matter of re-distribution ? How could they transfer a portion to another taluk and say of the remaining portion, 'This is Shencotta taluk.'

When I refer to this matter, I am reminded of a certain story. There was a dispute between two parties who were the seller and purchaser, of some corn. The dispute was as to how to measure the corn. The unit of measure was *nazhi.* The *nazhi* is a cylindrical unit. The seller said that corn should be measured with the mouth turned downwards and the buyer said that it should be done with the mouth upwards. So the question was referred to arbitration and the arbitrator decided that it should be done by the *nazhi* being set in a horizontal manner. That was how the arbitrator decided. It is exactly on the same lines that this decision has been reached by the Travancore-Cochin Government. How were they competent to say 'This is Shencottah taluk', particularly when the matter was before the Parliament ? They were absolutely incompetent to decide the matter. The matter cannot be decided that way— it is like cutting the Gordian knot. It is on this ground also that I object to the incorporation of the sub-clause (c) as it is worded, in the Bill. These are preliminary matters and technical in character.

Now, I shall deal with the matter on I its merits. The proposal is to cut up Shencottah taluk into two parts—one to the west of the Ghats and another to the east of the Ghats. Now the taluk is having an absolutely agricultural economy. The whole economy is an integrated one for the whole taluk. It is essential for the life of the community in Shencottah to have the benefit of the adjoining forest area which is being cut off and retained in Travancore-Cochin State. The economy of the taluk being purely agricultural, it is necessary for them to have the adjoining forest area. The sources of irrigation for the agricultural lands in the taluk are in the forest areas. The agricultural people have to graze their cattle in the adjoining forest areas. The forest areas are the source of livelihood for thousands of people who depend upon the forests for collection of fuel ; they sell it in the open market and live by it. All of a sudden when this whole taluk is cut up into two areas, these poor people will be completely thrown out of employment and they will have no source of livelihood. On this ground I say that it is essential for the life of the community in Shencottah taluk that the people should have these forest areas so that the economy of the place may be sustained. Otherwise, the economy will not only be disrupted but will be ruined. This is on the merits of the matter. I say that the whole taluk, as it was on the day the Bill was introduced in Parliament should be kept intact. I would even go to the extent of saying that the entire taluk should be preserved either in Travancore-Cochin State or in Madras State. The people feel so sore about it that they would like to have the whole of the taluk preserved intact, as it was before this Bill was introduced, even as a part of Travancore-Cochin State.

1 P.M.

Now, it transpires that the so-called agreement between the Government of Madras and the Government *of* Travancore-Cochin was brought about on erroneous data and I understand from paper reports and also reliably from some of my friends that the Chief Minister of Madras has addressed a communication to the Home Minister here saying that the agreement should be revised because it was based on wrong and erroneous data. There is a lot to be said, Sir, because as I said, this is a very curious case. It has passed through four stages—the report stage, then the Government *communique* and then the

Bill and finally the decision of the Government of Travancore-Cochin. All these, you will find, are conflicting with one another. Therefore, this is a fit case which should be reviewed in the light of all the factual data now brought to light and the whole matter, I submit, should be reconsidered. I would suggest that the entire taluk of Shencottah should be kept intact. For the sake of administrative convenience also the whole taluk should be transferred to Madras State and it should not be split up into two areas.

Sir, I commend my amendment to the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, mine is a very simple amendment. I only want that the name "Madras" should be changed to "Tamilnad." I am a little surprised why such an amendment did not come from hon. Members on the opposite side who come from Tamilnad. Of course, in the Indian Constitution you have got names of States the nomenclature of which is not according to certain principles. Some of these States bear Indian names and others do not. And whether you like it or not, you are having a majority of the States in this country on the basis of language. They are linguistic States. So it is necessary also to follow the same rule with regard to their names. Therefore, I sav that this State should be called Tamilnad. The same should apply to other similar -cases. I would indeed like to know what the word '"Madras" means. The British gave us a lot of names and some of them we still have. Sealdah is there for instance, though I don't know what it means. In the Bengali language we do not have such a word. I would like to know from hon. Members from Tamilnad, especially from an old school tie like Dr. Subbarayan, why they would not be in favour of a change from the English name, or rather the name given by the Englishman, to the name Tamilnad. And what is more, the name Tamilnad is already there. We are having a compact linguistic State there and the name of the State should accordingly be Tamilnad. I do not know if the instance •on the name "Madras" is because they feel that some day, some kind of an amalgum, some bilingual or trilingual State might come. But I say, Tamilnad is a fine expression. They have a fine culture and a fine literature and, therefore, I submit that this State should bear the name Tamilnad. I hope this will be supported by all the hon. Members opposite.

SHRI S. VENKATARAMAN (Madras) : Sir, none of the Members from Tamilnad approve of this amendment. For reasons best known to them, our Government have decided not to have this change and they want the name Madras to be retained. Therefore we oppose this amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Is this any reason ?

SHRI B. N. DATAR : Sir, I am going to oppose both the amendments.

So far as the latter amendment is concerned, Madras is a very good name. It has continued as the Madras Presidency for nearly a hundred years. Madras is a good name where there may be Tamilians and others as well. • So, it imparts a cosmopolitan character. Also, it is perfectly open to people to use the popular name Tamilnad as also the official name Madras. In the case of Mysore also, Mysore is the official name and as Kakasaheb Kalelkar has pointed out, Karnataka is the popular name. So, both the names can be used. After all, as Shakespeare has said, what is there in a name ? Ultimately, we should get the substance of what we desire. Why should we quarrel about names ?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Hyderabad) : You are poetic today.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : In the hon. Member's company, sometimes it is possible for me to be poetic.

As regards the other amendment referring to Shencottah, I may point out to this House that when the draft of the States Reorganisation Bill was prepared and sent out to the various State Governments including the Madras Government, we had clearly stated it in clause 4 that Shencottah taluk excluding the Puliyara Hill Pakuthy of Qui-lon district would be there. Then, subsequently, the Madras legislature—the Council and the Assembly—accepted this that from the Shencottah taluk the Puliyara Hill Pakuthy was to be deducted. Subsequently, the question arose, after this Bill was introduced, whether it would not be more advisable and more practicable to have the actual area demarcated. Therefore, the question of the actual demarcation so as to leave DO

[Shri B. N. Datar.]

scope for any confusion was taken up. My hon. friend Shri Karayalar is not correct when he stated that all this was only a unilateral business. This was no unilateral business at all. I may point out to this House that after this question was considered as to what ought to be the natural boundary between Kerala and Madras, the Travancore-Cochin Government undertook a detailed survey of the Shencottah taluk in order to define and demarcate the boundary on the lines of the decision contained in the press *communique.* The result of that survey was subsequently checked by the Government of Madras. Let the hon. Member kindly note that. The results of the survey prepared by the Travancore-Cochin Government were checked by the Madras Government which deputed a party of three officers consisting of the Collector of Tirunel-veli, the Conservator of Forests, Madras and the Deputy Director of Survey, Madras. They visited the area and submitted a detailed report. The report of this survey party from Madras was submitted to the Government of Madras on the 30th April, 1956 and subject to three minor corrections which were non-controversial and proved to be acceptable to the Travancore-Cochin Government, the results of the earlier survey were accepted by the Madras survey party. So, you will see that the whole thing has been done very....

SHRI S. C. KARAYALAR : May I know, Sir, whether the boundary line as demarcated now conforms to the provisions of the original Bill ?

SHRI B. N. DATAR : It does, it does. That is exactly my contention.

SHRI S. C. KARAYALAR : May I point out that the original Bill referred only to the Puliyara Hill Pakuthy, but the boundary line now passes through two other *pakuthies.*

SHRI B. N. DATAR : May I point out to the hon. Member that when the draft Was prepared and accepted, the position was accepted by the Madras Government, that, this Puliyara Hill Pakuthy was to be excluded from Shencottah taluk. So that was accepted. Then the \ Travancore-Cochin Government and the Madras Government had a survey mad.

SHRI S. C. KARAYALAR: But the:..':

SHRI B. N. DATAR : Let my hon. friend allow me to point out what was actually done. Then after that survey party from Madras had accepted the position, it might be pointed out that the Travancore-Cochin Government issued on the 23rd June, 1956, a Notification, excluding from the Shencottah taluk, the areas lying to the west of the watershed. This may kindly be noted. This excluded area was attached to the neighbouring Pattana-puram taluk. It should also be noted that the terms of that draft Notification were shown to the Madras Government before issue and that Government had no change to suggest.

SHRI S. C. KARAYALAR : Do they not now complain that the decision arrived at was on erroneous data ?

SHRI B. N. DATAR : I am afraid we should not call it erroneous data, when officers like the Collector, the Conservator of Forests and the Deputy Director of Survey had gone there. I am afraid my hon. friend's opinion is likely to be erroneous in the face of the clear opinion given by experts.

SHRI S. C. KARAYALAR : 1 am only putting a very, simple question, namely, whether the Madras Government have made such a complaint or not.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN : The Chief Minister of Madras has since written to the Home Minister to say that the decision made does affect the boundary.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : Here are the two parties who clearly came to an agreement after a survey was made. I know that the Chief Minister of Madras has raised this question as the hon. Members of this House and of the other House have raised it. We considered the whole matter so far as the present position is concerned. The boundary that has been fixed by this survey party and accepted by both the Governments is a natural boundary. You have got two rivers on both the sides. They are the natural boundary lines so far as the demarcation of the portions to be retained in Kerala and the portions to be given to Madras are concerned.

SHRI S. C. KARAYALAR : They have' demarcated the boundary line on What is known as the watershed line, but what is the definition of d'watershed ?

SHRI B. N. DATAR : It is a thing which may be very clearly understood. This is a portion of the West Coast Hills and the hill is a natural boundary. Water on one side goes in one direction and water on the other side goes in the reverse direction. That is the reason why this was selected. Assuming for the sake of mere argument—I doubt whether it is possible to do anything at this late stage —I would point out that, if the matter were to be left as it is, a new enquiry has to be ordered, a survey has to be made and all this cannot be done soon. There is no question of reopening the matter at all because reopening would require a further enquiry, a further agreement and a further decision by Government. All this would involve time.

SHRI S. C. KARAYALAR : May I say that there would be no difficulty if my amendment is accepted ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : All these things would involve a needlessly laborious process without any significant gain either to Madras or to Travancore-Cochin. The whole thing has been worked out very well and the hon. Member will know that this portion is a reserve forest. It is not a portion which is very thickly populated so that the interests of some people would suffer. It is not such a case at all. It is mostly a hilly portion and is only very sparsely populated with a few villages here and there. Therefore, Sir, I would point out that the division that is demarcated now is the natural division which does not cause even the least harm to the Madras State. I submit that I will not be able to accept this amendment.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: In view of what the hon. Minister has said and in view of the conversations that I have had with the Home Minister himself wherein he said that something might be done, if it could be done, I want the permission of the House to withdraw my amendment.

"Amendment No. 8 was, by leave withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

9. "That at page 4, at the end of line 7, after the word 'Madras' the words Hereinafter called the Mate 01 Tamilnad' be inserted."

The motion was negatived.

SHRI S. C. KARAYALAR : In view of what Dr. Subbarayan has said that the Home Minister has promised to look into the matter, I do not want to press my amendment.

♦Amendment No. 102 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

"That clause 4 stand part of the BUI."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

New Clause AA

CAPT. AWADHESH PRATAP SINGH (Vindhya Pradesh) : Sir, I am not moving my amendment No. 10. I move only amendment No. 103.

Sir, I beg to move :

103. "That at page 4, after line 7, the following new clause be inserted namely :—

103. '4A. As from the appointed day, there shall be added to the State of Uttar Pradesh the territories of Rewa, Sindhi and Satna districts comprised in Vindhya Pradesh and thereupon the said territories—

(a) shall cease to form part of the existing State of Vindhya Pradesh ; and

(6) shall be included in and become part of Uttar Pradesh'."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The amendment is open for discussion.

कैप्टेन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह : उपसभापति महोदय, इस समय मुझे बहुत ज्यादा कहना नहीं है । यह बात लगभग साबित हो चुकी है कि कम से कम इन जिलों का, जिनका नाम मेरे इस संशोधन में लिखा है, या नी रींवा, सतना और सीधी, इनका सम्बन्ध उत्तर प्रदेश से अधिक है । कहा यह जाता है और कल इस बारे में काफी वाद-विवाद हुआ, कि वहां के लोग यह नहीं चाहते कि ये जिले उत्तर प्रदेश में मिला

* For text of amendments, *vide* col. 56 *supra.* 5—17 Rajya Sabha/56

* For text of amendments, *vide* col. 57 *supra.*

[कैप्टेन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह]

दिये जायं । कल जब मैंने इस बात का खंडन करते हुए कहा था कि वहां के बहुत से लोग मिलना चाहते हैं तो मेरे एक मित्र ने कहा था कि यह गलत है । अब मैं केवल दो मिनट में इस बात को साफ कर देना चाहता हूं कि कितने लोग इस वक्त चाह रहे हैं उत्तर प्रदेश के साथ मिलना । रीवां जिले के आठ एम० एल० एज० के नाम इस प्रकार हैं : श्री यादवेन्द्र सिंह, श्री बृजराज सिंह तेवाड़ी, श्री सोमेश्वर सिंह, श्री बैकुंठ प्रसाद, श्री शत्रुसूदन सिंह, श्री राजेश्वर प्रसाद और श्री नर्बदा प्रसाद सिंह । इन लोगों ने यू० पी० में मिलने के बारे में राय दी । सतना जिले के एम० एल० एज० ने भी उत्तर प्रदेश में मिलने के बारे में राय दी थी । श्री राम सजीवन गौतम, श्री केशव प्रसाद, श्री गोविन्द नारायण सिंह, श्री लाल विहारी सिंह, श्री बलवन्त सिंह और श्री कोशलेन्द्र प्रताप सिंह । सीधी जिले के श्री जगदीश प्रसाद ने भी अपनी राय उत्तर प्रदेश में मिलने के बारे में दी थी ।

जिन लोगों ने मध्य प्रदेश में मिलने के बारे में राय दी थी उनके नाम इस प्रकार हैं : श्री राना शमशेर सिंह, श्री भुवनेश्वर प्रसाद और श्री शिवानन्द । इस सम्बन्ध में ध्यान में रखने की बात यह है कि जिस समय यह बिल विधान सभा में बहस के लिये गया था उस समय ए० आई० सी० सी० से इस तरह की आज्ञा गई थी कि इस बिल को हर सदस्य को सपोर्ट करना चाहिये । अगर कोई अमेन्डमेंट करना चाहता है तो अपनी स्पीच में कह दे । इन लोगों ने अपनी स्पीच के दौरान में तो यह कहा कि हम उत्तर प्रदेश के साथ मिलना चाहते हैं लेकिन उस आज्ञा का पालन करते हुए अंत में यह कहा कि हम इस बिल को सपोर्ट करते हैं । चूंकि इन लोगों ने अन्त में यह कह दिया था कि हम बिल को सपोर्ट करते हैं इसलिये उनके इस कहने का यह अर्थ लगा लिया गया कि ये लोग भी मध्य प्रदेश के पक्ष में है । मेरे कहने का अर्थ यह है कि जब इन लोगों ने अपनी स्पीचों में यह कहा कि हम उत्तर प्रदेश के साथ मिलना चाहते हैं लेकिन केवल कांग्रेस हाई कमान्ड के आर्डर के मुताबिक हम बिल के पक्ष में सपोर्ट करते है, तब ऐसी हालत में यह मान लेना कि वे लोग उत्तर प्रदेश के साथ मिलना नहीं चाहते वस्तु स्थिति का गलत अर्थ निकालना है । यह झगड़ा पहले भी उठा था तो इस सम्बन्ध में उन लोगों ने रिप्रेजेन्टेशन सिलेक्ट कमेटी के नाम और होम मिनिस्टर के नाम भेजा था । मेरे पास इन लोगों की बहुत सी चिट्ठियां आई हैं जो कि इस वक्त मेरे पास हैं । होम मिनिस्टर साहब के पास भी ये चिट्ठियां भेजी गई हैं । मेरे पास इतना समय तो नहीं है कि इन सब चिट्ठियों को यहां पर पढ़ू लेकिन अगर आप की इजाजत हो तो मैं एक को पढ़कर सुना देता हूं ।

श्री राजेश्वर प्रसाद मिश्र अपने पत्र में इस प्रकार लिखते हैं : "मान्यवर, निवेदन यह है कि मैंने जो भाषण वि० प्र० की विधान सभा में राज्य पुनर्गठन के मसौदे पर दिया है उसका संक्षिप्त भाव (समरी) मेरे कथनानुसार नहीं है । मैंने अपने भाषण में प्रथम रूप से वि० प्र० की इकाई और पर्याय रूप से उत्तर प्रदेश में विलयन चाहा है । अन्त में हाई कमान्ड के आदेश के अनुकूल विधेयक का समर्थन किया है इसके पूर्व भी एक पत्र जो विन्ध्य प्रदेश की ओर से गृह-मंत्री महोदय के पास भेजा गया था उसमें मैंने हस्ताक्षर अपनी तथा निर्वाचकों की इच्छानुसार किया था । इसका जिक्र मेरे भाषण में है ।

अन्त में इतनी प्रार्थना है कि मेरी तथा मेरे निर्वाचकों की इच्छा को जानने के लिये मेरा पूरा भाषण जो विधान सभा में हुआ है, देख लिया जाय "।

इसी तरह से और लोगों ने भी पत्र भेजे हैं और इस चीज को दोहराया है । मैं और लोगों के पत्र पढ़कर सदन का समय नष्ट करना नहीं चाहता हूं ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have said sufficiently on this point, Mr. Singh. You need not read all that.

कैप्टेन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह : मैं केवल श्री राजेश्वर प्रसाद के उन वाक्यों को सदन के सामने पढ़ना चाहता हूं जो उन्होंने विन्ध्य प्रदेश की विधान सभा में कहे थे । उनके वाक्य इस प्रकार हैं :

"दूसरी चीज मुझे यह कहनी है कि माननीय सदस्य ने अभी कुछ सदस्यों के नाम बताये और यह कहा कि उन्होंने दस्तखत बनाये थे उत्तर प्रदेश में जाने के लिये और उसमें मेरा भी नाम था; मैंने जरूर कबूल किया था कि यह सब चीजें मिलती हैं । इसलिये मैं जरूर चाहता था कि एक हिस्सा उत्तर प्रदेश में चला जाये । "

उपसभापति महोदय, मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि इन सात मेम्बरों में से छः नेतो यह अवश्य

कहा कि हम उत्तर प्रदेश में मिलना चाहते हैं। जो सातवें मेम्बर थे, उन्होंने पहले ही साफ-साफ कहा था कि पहले तो हमारा प्रान्त बना रहे, अगर वह अलग इकाई के रूप में नहीं बना रहता है तो हम उत्तर प्रदेश में मिलना पसन्द करेंगे। अब आप यह मानते हैं कि रीवां जिले के जो एम० एल० एज० कहे गये हैं, उन सबने उत्तर प्रदेश के पक्ष में राय दी और केवल एक सदस्य जो कि बहस के समय उपस्थित नहीं थे, उन्होंने अपने पत्र द्वारा उत्तर प्रदेश के पक्ष में मिलने की राय दी है। सतना जिले के जो छः मेम्बर हैं उनकी राय के बारे में कोई विवाद नहीं हो सकता है। केवल सीधी जिले के श्री जगदीश प्रसाद जी ने जिन्होंने मीटिंग एटेन्ड नहीं की थी, अपने पत्र में उत्तर प्रदेश के पक्ष में राय दी। बाकी जो दूसरे प्रजा सोशलिस्ट और सोशलिस्ट मेम्बर हैं, वे यह कहते हैं कि हम न उत्तर प्रदेश में मिलना चाहते हैं और न मध्य प्रदेश में मिलना चाहते हैं। तो कहने का मतलब यह है कि सतना जिले में बुन्देलखंड का जो हिस्सा है उसमें तीन प्रतिनिधि हैं, अगर वे भी जोड़ दिये जायें तब भी छः सदस्य मध्य प्रदेश के पक्ष में रहते हैं जब कि चौदह सदस्य ऐसे हैं जो कि उत्तर प्रदेश के पक्ष में हैं।

दूसरे उन्होंने यह खंडन किया है।

(*Time bell rings.*)

Just one minute and I shall finish.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken five minutes.

कैप्टेन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह : एक आध मिनट और .....

श्री उपसभापति : आपने कहा था कि दो मिनट में खत्म कर देंगे।

कैप्टेन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह : एक आध मिनट और दे दीजिये। उन्होंने यह कहा है कि पी० सी० सी० के मेम्बर्स को इत्तिला नहीं दी गई। मैं यह चैलेज करके कहता हूं कि इस एरिया से १६ पी० सी० सी० के सदस्य हैं और एक लाख पर एक सदस्य होता है। अगर उन पी० सी० सी० के १६ मेम्बर्स में से एक भी यह कह दे कि हम उत्तर प्रदेश में नही जाना चाहते हैं। मध्य प्रदेश में जाना चाहते हैं, तो मैं अपना पूरा केस वापस ले लेने के लिये तैयार हूं। एक सदस्य भी यह नहीं कहता है कि हम मध्य प्रदेश में जायंगे। जहां तक पी० सी० सी० का मामला है, दूसरी पार्टी वाले यह कहते हैं कि हमारा प्रांत बना रहे।

मैं आपका और अधिक समय नहीं लूंगा। मैं आशा करता हूं कि इन सब बातों को देख कर होम मिनिस्टर साहब मेरे इस संशोधन को स्वीकार करेंगे।

श्री मुहम्मद अली (विन्ध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदय, यहां यह बात कही गई कि सीधी, सतना और रीवां इन तीन जिलों के विधान सभा के सदस्य इस पक्ष में थे कि उत्तर प्रदेश में जायें। मैंने भी जो वहां की विधान सभा की रिपोर्ट है उसको पढ़ा है और मेरा विश्लेषण इस तरह है कि सीधी जिला के किसी सदस्य ने यह नहीं कहा कि वे उत्तर प्रदेश में जाना चाहते हैं। सीधी बिलकुल उत्तर प्रदेश से मिला हुआ है जहां कि रिहंड डैम बनाया जा रहा है।

कैप्टेन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह : उन्होंने मध्य प्रदेश के लिये भी नहीं कहा। वे अलग रहना चाहते हैं।

श्री मुहम्मद अली : सतना जिले के दस सदस्य हैं जिनमें से चार सदस्यों ने मध्य प्रदेश के पक्ष में अपनी राय दी है और एक सदस्य ने भाग ही नहीं लिया। रीवां जिले की हालत, जहां के माननीय सदस्य खुद रहने वाले हैं, यह है कि सिर्फ दो सदस्यों ने उत्तर प्रदेश के पक्ष में मत दिया।

एक बात और कही गई कि ए० आई० सी० सी० की चिट्ठी गई थी जिसकी वजह से स्वतंत्र रूप से राय नहीं दी जा सकी।

कैप्टेन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह : यह मैंने नहीं कहा.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please don't disturb him, Mr. Awadesh Pratap Singh.

श्री मुहम्मद अली : मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि उस चिट्ठी में यह साफ था कि सदन के लीडर से आज्ञा लेकर कोई भी सदस्य किसी तरह का अपना मत दे सकता है। चूंकि वह पत्र अंग्रेजी में था और वहां के बहुत से सदस्य अंग्रेजी नहीं समझते थे, इसलिए वहां के लीडर ने उसका हिन्दी तर्जुमा करवा करके सब सदस्यों को दिया था और स्वतन्त्र रूप से सब सदस्यों ने अपने विचार व्यक्त किये थे।

मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि यह **अमेंडमेंट नामंजूर** होना चाहिये।

SHRI B. N. DATAR : Sir, my friend has been answered by another friend so far as this question is concerned. I am afraid there is also a technical objection. It would be found, Sir, that this question was considered by the States Reorganisation Commission in Chapter IX of their Report and therein they say that Vindhya Pradesh would greatly benefit by merging itself in the richly endowed new State of Madhya Pradesh.

कैप्टन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह : वह तो मैंने कल ही बतला दिया कि क्या हमारे साथ होगा ।

SHRI B. N. DATAR : That was how they put it and then afterwards Government took a decision that all the three States plus 14 districts from Madhya Pradesh should form a new Madhya Pradesh. So, a decision was taken and when the draft of the Bill was sent out to the legislatures, there was no question of the transfer of any areas, like the ones that the hon. Member has suggested, to U.P. and, therefore, this question was not referred to U.P. Neither was this question in this particular form sent to Madhya Pradesh, Vindhya Pradesh and others. Under these circumstances, Sir, at this late hour or rather at this belated stage it would be very difficult to accept this proposal because it would go against article 3 of the Constitution itself. And lastly, Sir, I would appeal to my hon. friend—it is immaterial whether they would be in Madhya Pradesh or in Uttar Pradesh ; U. P. is a fairly large State by itself and perhaps....

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : Fairly large !

SHRI B. N. DATAR : Yes, because Bombay now becomes the largest State. That is the reason why I used the words "fairly large", and perhaps the interests of the area sought to be served by my hon. friend %ould better be served by its inclusion in Madhya Pradesh.

CAPT AWADHESH PRATAP SINGH : I would like to know one thing. I want your ruling whether this amendment according to article 3 of the Constitution is in order or out of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There is no question of a ruling. Do you want to press it to a vote ?

CAPT. AWADHESH PRATAP SINGH: No; Sir, but I want to know the ruling of the Chair on this question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No ruling is involved there. Shall I put it to the vote?

CAPT. AWADHESH PRATAP SINGH : As has been ordered, because I am a disciplined soldier I first obey the order of the High Command. So, I shall withdraw it; I shall have to withdraw—no other alternative.

♦Amendment No. 103 was, by leave, withdrawn.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN : There is n» order of the High Command. There is no such order in Parliament.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : But he is telling the truth because he functions under the High Command's order.

DR. R. P. DUBE (Madhya Pradesh): I do not think there is any order of the High Command.

Clause 5—Formation of Kerala State

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: Sir, I move:

11. "That at page 4, for line 17, the following be substituted, namely:—

'(ii) the portion of Kasaragod taluk of South Kanara district situated to the south of the Chan-dragiri river and its northern tributary the Payaswani river;'."

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY : (Mysore) : Sir, I move :

67. "That at page 4, for line 17, the-following be substituted, namely :—

'(ii) Kasaragod taluk south of Chandragiri river in South Kanara district;'."

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : Sir, I move:

. 104. "That at page 4, ine 17, after words 'Kasaragod taluk', the words 'excluding Manjeshwar and Kumbla firkas' be inserted."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The amendments and the clause are open for discussion. Yes, Mr. Govinda Reddy.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : Shall we take this up after lunch ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : We have to sit through the lunch hour.

* For text of amendment, *vide* col. 66 *supra:*

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: My humble submission to the Chair is this. It loojts to me from the rate at which we are proceeding that the most important provisions of the Bill will be all over very soon and there will remain very little today for us to do. We have got ten hours now before us and, therefore, I think a little respite would be greatly appreciated by the House if you can kindly grant it, and I do not think the hon. Minister will object to it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I have an objection to this extent that it should not be at the cost of the amendments. There must be ample time for moving amendments. I think it may be possible provided we economise on the minor amendments, and give a little more time to the important amendments. Let there be half an hour.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Here is an objection.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Are you opposed ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am not opposed, but if there is a respite and then we do not get any time to deal with the amendments it would not be good. Therefore, I say : Let us have the respite provided we have ample time within the ten hours, of course, to deal with all the amendments which are important. The hon. Member seems to be very hungry and, therefore, I agree.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : If the House agrees that we can finish this by Saturday 1 o' clock I have no objection. We shall sit till 6 o' clock today.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Why 6? 5 o' clock. We have ample time on Saturday.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have to sit today and tomorrow till 6. We also sit on Saturday and by Saturday 1 o' clock we have to close this. If the House and all Members agree I have no objection.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Half an hour, Sir.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND : (Madhya Pradesh) : Half an hour.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : One hour, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will meet at 2.30 then. The House stands adjourned till 2.30.

The House then adjourned for lunch at half past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY : Sir, clause 5(1) (b) (ii) provides that the Kasaragod taluk of South Kanara district should go to Kerala. In this matter if we take into consideration the aspects which should entitle any area to be assigned to any particular State, I beg lo submit that all such considerations are in favour of at least the portion north of Chandragiri river going to Mysore. That is my amendment. Instead of the entire taluk going to Kerala, my amendment suggests that only the portion sought of Chandragiri river should go to Kerala. In this matter, the Commission, I beg to submit, had not got the time and had not got the chance to go into details. As I was submitting yesterday in the course of the general discussion, langauge is not the only consideration which should weigh in assigning any particular area to any State. In all border areas the people learn to speak the languages both of this side and of the other side of the border. Here, peculiarly, it is Tulu that is spoken by most of the people. If you take the history of the area into consideration, it is belonged to Karnataka ; if you take the wishes of the people into consideration I am sure the Home Ministry has received numerous representations from the people there, from the village panchayats, from even the schools there, from the revenue authorities and from M.P.s and M.L.A.S of that area favouring that area going to Mysore. Among the villages, excepting seven, all the villages, according to my knowledge, have favoured this area going to Mysore. Not even the entire portion south of .the Chandragiri river is Malayalam-speaking area. Strictly speaking only 33 villages south of Chandragiri river should go to Kerala, but knowing that the river forming a natural boundary separating the north and south, I have tabled an amendment that only the area south of Chandragiri river should go to Kerala. I am also conscious in this connection of the case presented here by the hon. Mrs. Bharathi. She gave

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]

figures; of course, if we take the figures they are indicative only of the language whereas we have to take into consideration the relationship that the people have. Have they got much to do with Kerala or have they got much to do with Karnataka, with the northern districts? In fact, all their commercial and business transactions and all their social relationship is with Mangalore, the area north of the Chandragiri river and not with the south. If we take the revenue records— at least the revenue records should be a sure indication as to how things stand —almost all the revenue records and all the documents registered are in Kanarese. All these facts go to show that in fairness the portion north of Chandragiri river should go to Mysore and only the portion south of that river should go to Kerala. The hon. the Home Minister has suggested that we need not make these small distinctions now ; these questions could be settled by a Boundary Commission—I am sorry not by a Boundary Commission because he was against Boundary Commission—but by Zonal Councils. I believe that Mysore as it is placed now has very little chance of succeeding in the Zonal Councils because Mysore is tagged on to the Western Zone. Even if we agree to Mysore being in the Western Zone, there will be very little chance of Mysore settling this question with the Southern Zonal Council and, therefore, I would plead with the Home Minister to accept my amendment.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN : Sir, my amendment is similar to the one moved by Mr. Govinda Reddy. As a matter of fact, if population is taken into consideration of which a great play has been made, Manjeshwar, Kumbla and Kasa-ragod firkas are the only three firkas concerned here. There is a history behind this also. People perhaps are not aware that Kanara was one district belonging to the Presidency of Bombay as it then existed and when it was divided into North and South Kanara— South Kanara district was not formed by the then Madras Administration about 1850— Malabar was a very big district as far as the Madras Administration was concerned and for administrative purposes some part of Malabar was added to the new South Kanara district to which these three firkas came and they were made into one Kasaragod taluk. If you go by population which I have looked into, Manjeshwar, for instance, has 57 per cent, of non-Malayalam population. They do speak Kanarese I admit because Kannadigas do not from a majority in these firkas, but I may mention that the people who form a majority are the Tulu people. Tulu, of course, is an allied language to Malayalam and is more allied even to Kannada and Tamil, if I may say so. I know they have the same system of law as in Malabar. They follow, what they call, the *aliyasantanam* law while the Malabar people call it *'marumakkattayam.* They have common customs no doubt but still they themselves want to remain with Karnataka, because, as Mr. Govinda Reddy has pointed out, their commercial and other relations are with the area north of the river. There are no bridges and it is very difficult to go to the south and, therefore they want to remain with Karan-taka, that is, with Mysore.

Now, there are quite a number of Moplahs in this area and I have a telegram in my hand from the Moplah Association of Kasaragod demanding that they should belong to South Kanara and hence to Mysore and not to the new Kerala State. I have also got a telegram from the Mahila Sabha—the women of Kasaragod taluk—demanding that they should remain with Mysore State. There are other telegrams here from the Merchants' Associations, various panchayats etc. of that area, all of them demanding that they should belong to Karnataka. And I am sure my friends from Malabar will admit—I know those who sit opposite will not admit—that the people there wish to remain with Karnataka. I know they will not admit because they think it is to their advantage that this part of South Kanara should go to Kerala because electorally they think they might get an advantage. I do not deny it for a moment but I do not think they will benefit eventually. They will find that they are mistaken in their anticipation of electoral victory. Apart from that, considering geographically the river boundary and the cultural connection which the Tulu people have had with the Kannadigas, now, for over 50 years. I think they should be with Mysore and not with Kerala. So, I have proposed this amendment.

Sir, I am handing over these telegrams to the Secretary.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Anything to add ?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Yes, Sir. I have got a separate amendment. I do not go so far as my friends. That is why I wish to speak. My amendment is slightly different from those which were moved by my two friends to my right and to my left. I take a middle path, the golden mean as they call it. My friends, Mr. Govinda Reddy and Dr. Subbarayan, have said that all the areas to the north of Chandragiri river should necessarily and naturally belong to Kanara, which means Mysore State. Now, personally I would whole-heartedly support them. There is no question of any dispute. I have no disputes with them at all, and it is a perfectly natural thing to do. And I will reinforce that stand by this additional argument. The Communist Party there on the spot have said that the dividing line so far as Kasaragod taluk is concerned was between Chandragiri and Mogral rivers, ll is not my statement. It is the statement of my friends opposite, that is, those mainly belonging to Kerala. They have agreed to this that the dividing line between the Kannada-speaking areas and the Malayalam-speaking areas should be somewhere between Chandragiri and Mogral rivers, which is slightly to the north. Therefore, in order to go to the rock bottom of the demand and armed as I am with the support of my friends there, the Communists, I have brought forward this modest proposition. And there is this additional point to support my stand. Now, it is true that the population of Kasaragod taluk taken as a whole has 72 per cenf. Malayalam-speaking people. I do not deny it. But you will see in this that south of Chandragiri river the Malayalam-speaking population is more than 95 per cent, and, therefore, when an average is struck, the whole average become 72 per cent. Even in the north of Chandragiri river, our Malayalee friends are just on the border line, and the majority is in their favour, that is about 51 per cent, or 52 per cent. I concede that point. Therefore, my demand is not even above Chandragiri river, but only these two firkas, where the non-Malayalam speaking people are in a distinct majority. That cannot be disputed by anybody ; that is to say, in Manjeshwar and Kum-bla firkas the non-Malayalam speaking people are in a majority.

There was just one point which Dr. Subbarayan made out. I really do not know why. That was not germane to the issue. About Tulu he was himself doubtful whether it has more affinity with Malayalam or with Tamil or with Kannada.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR (Travan-core-Cochin): He should be a better authority on that.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I am the best authority on that. So far as Tulu is concerned, Tulu is a dialect which has no script. The whole of South Kanara is Tulu-speaking practically except possibly a few people up in the north towards Udipi and Kundapur. All of them have Kannada script and Kannada language. Is that a matter in dispute today that anybody should raise and make an issue of this, namely, that Tulu has great affinity to Tamil or Malayalam ? If Tulu has great affinity to Tamil or Malayalam, they should have adopted Malayalam script or Tamil script. But here in the north of Chandra-giri river, 85 per cent, of the primary schools are in Kannada. All revenue documents, registration, everything goes, on in Kannada. Therefore, I say... .

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: That is because the State was under Karnataka.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : Under Madras or Tamilnad—what my friends wanted to be renamed as Tamilnad.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: The district was under Karnataka.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : And, therefore, my point is this. I will not take much time. Now, what is to be the future relationship between State and State and between citizens of India as a whole ? Is it to be based on friendliness, goodwill and camaraderie spirit or is it a question of bitterness and trying to overrule people by sheer virtue of majority ? I ask that question. And, therefore, I say it is better that our friends from Kerala should adopt a more conciliatory and accommodating spirit and let go these two firkas. I am almost asking like Shri Krishna, give us at least five villages. I ask no more. And yet if they adopt a mulish attitude, well I am afraid the relationship will not be good. I am thinking far ahead. Now, we have provisions for bilingual States. We may have multi-lingual States. Then, who are in greater need of the support and cooperation of all neighbours? I think because of pressure of population our Kerala friends are perfectly justified in holding on to this area. I do not deny.

[Shri H. C. Dasappa.]

They are earnest. I do not think that it is anything wrong. They must have a little elbow room to develop right round and the only two places are Tamilnad and Karnataka. No, I do not know about the responsiveness and friendliness of Tamilnad towards Kerala. It is for them to say. I am not going to comment on it. For aught I know they may be in the friendliest of terms. But anyway the way the dicsussions went on about Madras may have lent a different com-plexsion altogether to that relationship. So far as we are concerned, we shall think in future of so many ways of co-operating'between ourselves. And, therefore, by just conceding this tiny, little bit of land, they will get a large volume of goodwill from the people and I think that is an asset which is worth having for my friends. And I would beg of my Kerala friends to be generous here to say they have no objection, if not to the north of the Chandragiri river, at least to Manjeshwar and Kumbla fir-kas going with Kanara district.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN : Sir, on a point of personal explanation, I want to state that Mr. Dasappa entirely misunderstood. What I said was that Tulu was an allied language to Malayalam, Tamil and Kanarese and as he himself said because of the circumstances Tulu today is written in the Kannada charac-ter and most of the text books of Tulu are in Kannada, no doubt. But I was not claiming these parts to Madras, and it is not possible either geographically or otherwise. Mr. Dasappa will understand that.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR (Madras) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Shri Dasappa and others have been quite persuasive, but I have to point out to this House that the facts are very much against them.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : Not yet.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR : Now, the facts are unfortunately against my friends there. They have advanced mostly three arguments—first population, second the wishes of the people and third history and geography. Now, regarding population I have got the census figures compiled by the Madras Government. They have given figures village-wise of those border areas. The dispute relates mainly to the two. firkas Manjeshwar and Kumbla, the northern most firkas of Kasaragod taluk. These two firkas together comprise of 21 plus 16, that is, 37 villages, out of which the vast majority are Malayalees village-wise. There is no difference between us, Communists, on this side or the other side. We take the village as the basis. If on the village basis, on the basis of a clear majority of population, our Kannada friends are entitled to a few villages, we won't grudge them. These 37 villages together have a population of 1,85,000. I have taken the trouble to add village-wise. So, the total population of these two firkas together comes to 1,85,000, out of which Malayalees alone—Tulus are not included—comprise 1,01,000, which comes to 55 per cent. These are facts. Government have records with them. So, on this question of population alone we are entitled to these two firkas. If you take village as the basis, I would point out that even among the eight or nine vil-I ages where there is a considerable section of Tulu-speak-ing people, we are not on the border region. If those villages are taken away they would form a sort of enclave, and I may also point out that not only on this side but even in Mangalore there are thirteen villages bordering on the Netravati river where they have a majority. It is a question of fact. My friends can verify this from their own census figures.

Sir, much has been said about the wishes of the people. OI course, I know that a certain section of the people there has been vociferous. From 1923 onwards an amalgamation committee called the Kasaragod-Malabar Amalgamation Committee has been functioning there for the last thirty years or more, because the majority of the people in this area are Malayalees. They have been carrying on the agitation not only at the time of the Commission but long before that. Dr. Subbarayan just referred to certain telegrams he has received. I have got here a bundle of memoranda which have been submitted by not only the Kasaragod Aikya Kerala Committee, not only by the Amalgamation Committee, not only by a number of Young-men's Associations, but I have received a number of telegrams even now which go to show that the majority of people want to go back to Kerala. Of course, history has been against us. For the last thirty years or more that portion has been under the district administration of South Kanara and because the hold of the majority has gone, they have made

Kanarese the language even in the primary schools and even in regard to registry and other things. All these things have gone on for the last so many years. But that only proves my case. It is not a question of a linguistic minority being denied their rights there. Here is a case of a linguistic majority who have been denied these facilities— I won't call it oppression because nobody is responsible for it ; we have inherited it from the period of the British administration. But that has been there. The schools are running in a different language and in the registry office also it is done in a different language. It is also the case with regard to revenue administration. That is the very reason why all these people have been agitating to go back to Malabar.

In regard to customs and other things, there is much affinity between the Tulu community and the Malayalee community. On the point of history or the wishes of the people, it is a clear case. But if on the basis of facts it can be proved that there are a few villages on the border with Tulu majority or Kanarese majority being contiguous to the Mangalore district, well, the Communist Party are not against that. But my present information is—and I have verified that from the official records— that such villages are very very few.

JANAB M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL SAHEB (Madras) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I oppose the amendments moved by my three friends. I do not think that their amendments can be justified on any account, whether on the basis of population as has been pointed out by a previous speaker, or on the basis of administration or on the basis of history or on the basis of the wishes of the people. Sir, the village *pancha-yats* have been expressing certain views. But when the elections to these *pan-chayats* took place this question was not agitated at all. The matter has been taken for granted by the people, as has been pointed out by the previous speaker that Kasaragod taluk as a whole must go to Malabar. People have been taking it for granted that this will be amalgamated with Malabar when there is an opportunity. Therefore, that question was never agitated during those elec- i tions. Therefore, what the people did ! was that they elected whomsoever they j pleased irrespective of this question I They did not consider that this question | would come up in this form. My friend i Dr. Subbarayan has produced certain i telegrams in the name of a Moplah Association. I have not heard of this Association at all. Perhaps, this is a growth for the occasion. I know the wishes of the people. I know that the people of Kasaragod irrespective of caste, creed or community are for amalgamation with Kerala. This I know for months and months when this question was being agitated. Sir, take the population of the whole taluk or even the taluk north of the Chandragiri river. There is no controversy about the fact that the majority is speaking the language of Malayalam. It is admitted that the people south of the Chandragiri and Payaswani rivers to the extent of 90 per cent, speak Malayalam. Take the northern part. 55 or 56 per cent, of the people there speak Malayalam. They have expressed their desire, and then these honourable friends in the House representing 9 per cent, of the Kannadiga people have expressed another desire. Whose desire must count and be fulfilled is the question. The people in between the two have expressed their view in favour of Kerala. There may be a few people, as is shown by Dr. Subbarayan— there will always be such cases—who would say things contrary to what the vast majority of the people might say. Therefore, Sir, all these things when taken together are for the clause standing as it is now. Therefore, I do not think that any change is justified. It is already a taluk, and the unit of administration should not in any manner be disturbed.

Sir, another consideration is that language is not the main criterion, it cannot be the sole criterion. One honourable friend says that marriages and other relationships take place between the northern part of Kasaragod and the rest of the northern part of South Kanara district. It may be so. Now, this division cannot in any way prevent them from these relationships—marriage relationship or trading relationship or commercial relationship. They cannot speak as if independent States are being formed and that therefore they are seeking natural borders in the shape of mountains and rivers.

Therefore, on any ground their amendments cannot be justified. I very strongly oppose them.

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI (Tranvan-core-Cochin) : Sir, I do not wish to repeat all I said on the floor of this House while I was defending the cause of

[Shrimati K. Bharathi.]

Kerala against Mr. Hegde's very violent attacks. Sir, I can understand the difficulties of my friends, my esteemed friend Dr. Subbarayan, being carried away by emotions. Friendship and love are certainly high sentiments but sometimes they will lead people astray. The same sentiments tempt me also from defending this cause, but I fear that I would be failing in my duty if I do not oppose these amendments. Sir, when we decide major policy issues, we must rise above such emotions and considerations. This is a major issue or rather a vital issue as regards the people of Kasaragod. I am also receiving telegrams after telegrams from different organisations in Kasaragod, and if you want, I can place them on the Table.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: HOW many please ?

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI: One I can just now place.

AN. HON. MEMBER : It does not matter so long as it is there.

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI : They sent these telegrams in order to defend them against Dr. Subbarayan and Company. *(Interruption.)* Of course, when persons of such eminence as Dr. Subbarayan and Shri Dasappa sponsor such *a* case, of course, the people of Kasaragod have sufficient ground to become panicky, and when they feel that I am no match for them to defend their cause, there is ample ground for them to fear. I have stated on the floor of the House statistics regarding the population of Kasaragod, their aspirations and affinities. Now it is left to the good judgment of this House to decide the merits of the case.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : We don't deny that.

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI : I do not think there is any case for the 9 per cent. Kannadigas against the 50 per cent. Malayalees. I also do not forget that there are 27 per cent. Tulu-speak-ing people, and I know that Tulu is more akin to Malayalam than to Kannada.

3 P.M.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : Sir, the question of Kasaragod presents certain difficulties. Now, Sir, so far as the entire taluk is concerned, it will be found that the Malayalee population is 72 per cent, and so far as the area north of the Chandragiri river is concerned, the Malayalee population is 51 per cent. Now, this is a point which naturally is in favour of Kerala. On the other hand, so far as the Karnataka people are concerned, they lay their claim on certain affinities. Their contention is that this Chandragiri river is a natural boundary between the north and south of Kerala. They consider that as a traditional boundary between the Tulu people on the one hand and the Malayalees on the other hand.

Now, so far as the other points on which reliance is placed by the Kannadigas are concerned, they rely upon the number of Kannada schools in this area. There are 164 schools north of Chandragiri river, and Kannada is the medium of instruction in 144 schools. Secondly, their contention is that out of 34 Panchayat Boards north of the Chandragiri river 34 have passed resolutions against the transfer of this area, and out of 4,000 documents registered every year in this area, only 10 percent, are registered in Malayalam. Another ground on which reliance is placed by Karnataka is that the hereditary village officers north of the Chandragiri river are mostly Kannadigas. And they also place their reliance on the way in which the Malabar Tenancy Act has been made applicable only to the villages south of Chandragiri river. Now, under these circumstances, Sir, it would be found that so far as the Government are concerned, they have naturally to take into account a number of circumstances, and the first circumstance to be noted here is that the Commission have dealt with this question in their Report, so far as the formation of the Karnataka State is concerned. In that Report they have pointed out that there are certain difficulties in keeping Kasaragod in the Karnataka area. They say that it would not be proper to split up the whole taluk into two areas, though they have noted that the Karnataka Pradesh Congress Committee conceded that the portion below the Chandragiri river ought, in any case, to go to Kerala and the upper portion should only be retained in Karnataka or Mysore. The Commission have stated that administratively it would be very difficult to divide or split up the taluk. They have stated in paragraph 306 of their Report that "Though Kannadiga opinion in South

Kanara concedes the claim of Kerala up to the Chandragiri river, administratively it will be more expedient to join the whole taluk to Kerala than to break it up purely on linguistic grounds." Thus you would find, Sir, that there is public opinion naturally on both the sides, and that also has to be accepted. Sir, the Government have been receiving, in fact, sheaves of representations, telegrams and other things all along since the Commission's Report was published in October 1955, and it is not necessary for me at this stage to go into that question. But there are a number of parties which are in favour of the retention of the northern portion in Karnataka. There are certain political parties, especially the three political parties—the Praja-Socialist Party, Malabar, the Muslim League Committee and the Nur-ul-Is-lam, Kasaragod—which are in favour of the whole of Kasaragod taluk going into Kerala State. It may be conceded in fairness to the Kannadigas that they have not asked for the retention of the whole of the taluk in the South Kanara district, and all that they desire is that the portion to the north of the Chandragiri river should be retained in Mysore or Karnataka and the other portions should be allowed to pass on to Kerala. In this connection, Sir, we have received a number of representations from the South Kanara District, Congress Committee and the Praja-Socialist Party, Kasaragod, and also a number of Members of Parliament as also Members of the Legislative Assembly have submitted their representations. And the point on which reliance is placed by the Kannada public is that the Madras Assembly has recommended by 104 as against 18 that the portion of this taluk which is to the north of the Chandragiri river should be included in Karnataka. So, this is the position. Sir, I have analysed, as fairly as possible, the opinions as also the points in favour of Kerala on the one hand and in favour of Karnataka on the other hand.

Now, Sir, so far as the Government are concerned, they are faced with a real difficulty. Now, that difficulty is that the Commission have recommended, and the Government have accepted that position,' that a taluk or a tehsil should not be split up.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND : What about Shencottah ?

SHRI B. N. DATAR : So far as Shencottah is concerned, there is only a small reserve forest, and the portion that has been taken out is extremely small. It is very sparsely populated, as 1 told you. Only a portion of the reserve forest was allowed, because it was felt that some portion should remain with them,, so far as the forest area was concerned. Beyond that there was no other point. *(Interruption.)* It cannot be considered as an exception to the general rule, which has always been followed, that a taluk or a tehsil should not be broken up. In such cases, Sir, therefore, the Government are anxious not to take sides, and they are convinced that so far as this question is concerned, it would not be a very big sacrifice on the one side, and it would not be a very large gain on the other. Under these circumstances, Sir, we should see that a good feeling of neighbourliness prevails. After all. Kerala and Karnataka are one, and we are all Indians first. And if there are some small slices or pieces going here or there, I would appeal to our Kerala friends as also to our Karnataka friends not to use any harsh words. And I would also appeal to our Kerala friends to be generous. After all, Sir, a time might come—I am speaking without, of course, committing Government or without making it necessary for others to follow it—when perhaps we might have larger administrative units, and one of the great objectives of the reorganisation of States is that in spite of all the rationalisation of boundaries, we ought to maintain good relations, and extremely good relations have got to be maintained, because even in the Karnataka area there would be a number of Malavalees, Marathi people and Telugu or Tamil people. In Kerala also I have got figures to show that there would be Kannada people and, therefore, these relations we ought to maintain. It is not a question of a race for either getting territories or for retaining territories.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : The hon. Minister referred to the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission, and said that administratively it would be more convenient if we followed it. 1 would like to know whether there would be any administrative inconvenience if north of Chandragiri river or the two firkas are transferred to Kanara.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : So far as administrative convenience is concerned, I would point out to my hon. friend that if for example, the whole area was retained as a tehsil, then naturally it

[Shri B. N. Datar.] would be administratively more convenient. If, for example, any area has been divided, then you cannot have one tehsil. Therefore, the portion to the south of Chandragiri river will have to be added on to Malabar and the portion to the north has to be added on to some taluks for tehsils in the South Canara district. So that constitutes an administrative inconvenience which the framers of this Report had in mind. In all such cases, as I have pointed out on a number of occasions, the best course would be to have an agreement. Now, so far as Government are concerned, Government are naturally bound by certain considerations, which they have accepted and which have been recommended by the Commission. Therefore, the Government feel that it would be more advisable for the Members of both these States to meet together and arrive at an agreement on the lines that my friend Dr. Subbarayan knows. He was Home Minister of Madras for a number of years and I would appeal to Dr. Subbarayan to bring these two people, allegedly warring, they are not really warring at all,—and to evolve an agreement, so that ultimately there would be satisfaction in Kerala as well as in Karnataka. I, therefore, request my hon. friends to withdraw these amendments because the graceful withdrawal of these amendments themselves will pave the way for absolutely satisfactory solution of this question on , which there is certain vehemence of opinion but all that will surely go. I would, therefore, request all my friends to withdraw these amendments.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN : In view of the conciliatory statement made by the hon. the Minister in ihe Ministry of Home Affairs, I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

*Amendment No. 11 was, by leave, withdrawn.

*Amendments Nos. 67 and 104 were also, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That clause 5 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted. Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

♦For text of amendments, *vide* col. 72 *supra*

Clause 6—Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, I beg to move :

12. "That at page 4, lines 23 to 28, for the existing clause 6, the following be substituted, namely :—

'6. As from the appointed day, the Islands of Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi shall form part of Kerala State'."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The clause and the amendment are open for discussion.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND : Sir, I would point out that ours is a federal Constitution. If you examine the federal Con-situation of any country, you will find that unless any particular part is required by the Union Government for reasons of defence or other such reasons, it is always included in some State. You are aware that when the United States of America purchased Alaska for the time being it was considered as federal territory and then it was formed into \ State. Now. there is the question of Puerto Ricco. There also it is going to be formed into a separate State. Australia also has a federal Constitution and there is no part of Australia except Canberra, the Union capital, which is under Central administration. I submit that in our country when the framers of our Constitution, made the Constitution except for Andaman Islands, they did not keep any Union territory. Everything was either divided into a Part A or Part B or Part C State. Now, we are going to introduce a new idea of Union territory. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what changes have taken place in our country and why he feels that it is essential that the Constitution should be amended in such a way that we introduce Union territory. Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi are very small islands on the west coast of India. Two of these formerly used to be under the Malabar district and one was under South Canara district. They were really part of the Madras State. Now, I have suggested that these islands—because Malabar has gone over to Kerala —all these three islands should become parts of Kerala. During the concluding remarks on the first reading of the Bill the hon. Minister pointed out that nobody wants these islands as these islands are economically backward. They

must be developed and it is only the Central Government that can do it, so it should be under the Centre. May I point out that this type of argument can be advanced not only about these islands but about so many other parts of the country. If that is the only argument, namely, that people don't want it and as it is economically backward, it should be Centrally administered, I suppose that half of India will become Centrally administered area. This is not a correct argument. The argument should be as to what are the compelling reasons why we want to make it into a Centrally administered area. As these compelling reasons have not been given by the hon. the Home Minister, I submit that it is far better to add them to the Kerala State.

JANAB M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL SAHEB : Sir, I support this amendment.

The people of these islands, namely, Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi, are a natural part of Kerala. By culture by customs and customary law and by language most of them belong to Kerala. Therefore, it is only fair that these islands should be added on to Kerala State. My friend referred to the question of defence. There is nothing to prevent the Central Government from making use of these islands for defence purposes even though they may form part of Kerala. There are other places and ports in the other parts of the country belonging to particular States of which we cannot say that simply because they form part of any State, they cannot be made use of for defence purposes. The same thing can be done with regard to these islands also. These-islands as they are, have a pitiable history. They have been kept away from the picture of the country—for how many years I don't know ; it may well be for ages and even now they are being ruled by outmoded and antiquated 1912 regulations which give no manner of democratic right to the people and people are placed under the despotic rule of what are called 'Amins'. Therefore, now, when the country has got freedom and independence, it is only natural that those people also want to enjoy freedom and want to come into intimate touch with the rest of the country, want to come into the picture and want to possess as good a democratic right as the other people. It is a natural ambition, a justifiable and natural desire. Therefore, it is but right that they should.be included in the Kerala State.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : Sir, I would first of all like to point out certain circumstances to the hon. Members for then they would appreciate why the Government have taken the decision of placing these islands under Central administration as Centrally adminstered territories. Sir, it will be found that the population of these islands is not very much. It is only 21,000. These islands have got to be developed especially in the matter of means of communications between the mainland and these islands.

JANAB M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL SAHEB: Their population is 21,000.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : Yes, that is what 1 have said. Their population is 21,000. I may point out that all these islands require a very considerable degree or measure of development and one of the things that has to be immediately attended to is the means of communications between the mainland and these islands. These have got to be established. Secondly, we have also to take a number of measures for improving the public health in these islands. These are all matters which involve considerable expenditure. Kerala would be a new State and KSrala, as we know, has a number of its own problems. The question is whether Kerala will be in a position to see to the proper development of all these islands, including the establishing of proper means of communications. It was felt that so far as these islands were concerned, they have also strategic importance which should not be lost sight of. When this question of strategic importance comes into operation then naturally it would be more advisable to place them under Central administration than under the State administration. So, on account of all these circumstances, namely, considering its strategic importance, the proper development of the islands and the need to spend large sums of money on their development, especially the development of means of communications, etc., I am sure the House will agree that all these islands ought to be Centrally administered so that the Centre could attend to all these requirements and all these islands could be brought together so far as the mainland is concerned.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

> 12. "That at page 4, lines 23 to 28, for the existing clause 6, the following be substituted, namely :—

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.] '6. As from the appointed day ; the Islands of Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi shall form part of Kerala State'." The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That clause 6 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 6 was added to the Bill.

Clause 7—Formation of a new Mysore State

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Ten amendments have been given notice of to this clause 7. Of these amendments Nos. 15, 69, 106 and 107 and 108 are barred. The last portion of amendment No. 109, after the words "Bijapur district" is also barred.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I move :

13. "That at page 4, line 30, for the word 'Mysore' the word 'Karna taka' be substituted."

(The amendment also stood in the names of Dr. R. B. Gour, Shri Perath Narayanan Nair, Shri S. N. Mazumdar, Shri V. Prasad Rao, Shri Satyapriya Benerjee, Shri N. C. Sekhar and Shri Abdur Rezzak Khan.)

SHRI B. M. GUPTE (Bombay): Sir, I move :

14. "That at page 4 for lines 33-34, the following be substituted, name ly :-

'(b) Belgaum district except Chandgad taluk, Khanapur taluk and predominantly Marathi speaking area of Belgaum taluk to be determined by the Zonal Council for the Western Zone provided for in section 15, and Nipani Bhag of Chikodi taluk and the predo-minantly Marathi speaking villages contiguous to the State of Bombay in Athni and Hukeri taluks, to be determined by the same Zonal Council, and Bijapur, Dhar-war districts and Kanara district except KarwaT and Halyal taluks and Supa Peta in the existing State -of Bombay;'."

DR. P. V. KANE (Nominated): Sir, I move :

68. "That at page 4, for lines 33, 34, the following be substituted, namely :—

'(b) Belgaum district except the taluks of Belgaum Khanapur, Chandgad and Chikodi including the towns of Belgaum and Nipani, Bijapur and Dharwar districts and the Kanara district except the taluks of Karwar, Halyal and Supa Peta in the existing State of Bombay ;'."

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : Sir, I move:

105. "That at page 4 line 34 after the words 'Kanara districts' the words and Akalkot and South Sholapur taluks of Sholapur district' be insert- ♦ ed."

I also move :

109. "That at page 5, line 11 after the word 'district' the words 'and the said Akalkot' and South Sholapur taluks shall be included in and become part of Bijapur district' be inserted."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The clause and the amendments are now open for discussion.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR (Travancorc-Cochin) : Sir, we have moved this amendment because when our great country is being reorganised, when it is undergoing a reorganisation in order to give facilities to the people to develop, we want to remove all the old relics of feudalism so that a new era development should set in. Here the word "Mysore" is an old feudal relic whereas in the new State Karnataka people will all be coming together. If hon. friends like Mr. Dasappa insist on the name Mysore being retained for the State, because that happens to be the name of the capital of this State, following the same logic, we will have to change the name of our country from India to Delhi. After all the capital of this great country is in Delhi and so the whole country should be called Delhi. That obviously is not the intention. So what we say is, we should do away with the relics of the past feudal system and the feudal States. Let us have a new name to this State as also for other States, Kerala, Karnataka and so on. So I say, the whole of this new State where the people speak Kannada should be called Kannada.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : Sir, he says Kannada. He is opposing his own amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : No, he means Karnataka. It is there in his amendment.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR: TO strengthen i my case, I may say that even the Prime Minister and the Home Minister keep on saying Karnataka and not Mysore, when referring to this State.

SHRI B. M. GUPTE : Sir, my amendment refers to the border problems between Karnataka and the Bombay State. I have listened to the hon. the Home Minister and also to Shri Datar when he spoke about the appointment of a Boundary Commission. I do not want to press for such a Commision. But there are certain parts which are so obviously peopled those who speak one language that a Boundary Commission or even the intervention of a Zonal Council is not necessary to decide the matter. My present amendment refers to one such tract. There is a large area consisting of about 2,500 square miles and having a population of over six lakhs which is predominantly Marathi-speaking. Yet it is kept out of the Bombay State. Sir, I may point out that the main purpose of having this bigger bilingual State of Bombay is to bring together all the Marathi speaking and all the Gujarati-speaking areas in one Slate. But here a very large tract and a very large population of people are excluded from this Marathi State. Therefore, I submit that to that extent this will defeat the very purpose for which this bilingual State was formed. I do not agree to the test that for transfer there must be a population of 70 per cent, speaking one language. I do not agree to this test. But even this test has been satisfied in so many cases. Take for instance the Belgaum district. Take Khanapur taluk and the percentage here is 77 in the case of Marathi and I think 12 or 13 in the case of Kannada. Even this is excluded from the Bombay State. So also Nipani Bhag which has 75 per cent, of the population speaking Marathi and only 16 per cent, speaking Kannada. This also is excluded from Bombay. Take Belgaum City itself. Fifty two per cent, of the people speak Marathi and only about 25 per cent, speak Kannada and yet this is excluded. I say that this is very unjust. I am sorry to say that our Karnataka friends .are having it both ways. If Bellary could be given to Mysore, with greater justice, Belgaum must be retained in the Bombay State but they want to keep Bellary and also want Belgaum. I submit, Sir, that this is not fair. I do not say that there should be perpetual border disputes but what is obvious injustice should be mended. All along Government have been insisting that there should be mutual agreement, but if the contesting parties were to come to mutual agreement so easily, then there would be no law courts at all. Therefore, somebody must intervene and the Government must take a more active interest in the matter. I will request the Government and the Minister to see that the Union Minister who will be the Chairman of the Zonal Council takes more active interest in the matter and settle these border disputes justly. But I cited examples where there are no disputes at all. My hon. friend the Minister, knows about Belgaum taluk better than I do ; and so, I am speaking subject to correction, but I find that here out of 146 villages 55 have over 70 per cent. Ma-rathi-speaking population and in 5 villages there is not a single soul speaking Kannada and this whole taluk is going to Karnataka. therefore, submit that this injustice should be corrected and the necessary amendment accepted.

DR. P. V. KANE : I want to support the amendment of Mr. Gupte. As it is nearly the same as mine, I do not want to take the time of the House by repeating whatever he said. I am requesting the Minister to accept this. He should accept it because it is so obvious as my learned friend was saying. If it is not obvious, we will find some other remedy but it is obvious to us at least. I say that Belgaum and some other taluks along with Karwar should go to Maharashtra. It will be a contiguous whole. I should know whether Government is going to accept it; otherwise, I will not say anything.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND : I would like to speak on this amendment. I would not like to repeat all the arguments which Mr. Gupta has put forward because they were the same arguments that I would have put forward. In addition to what he said, I would like to say that the Home Minister, when replying to the debate on the first reading, somehow referred to even smaller problems but forgot to give his opinion on this particular vexed question of Belgaum and this vast area which is a contiguous territory. My

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]

point is this. Whatever is the nature of unilingual States, there are bound to be some pockets here and there where the majority of the people may not be of those who speak the language of the State. Nobody would raise that question because that would raise a new problem, but when an area is contiguous the main object of dividing the country into linguistic States will be defeated if the contiguous areas which have the same language are not put together. From this point of view, Belgaum taluk, Khanapur taluk and Chandagad taluk should go to Bombay State. Part of Belgaum district is given to the Bombay State by the States Reorganisation Commission itself. I would also like to say that though this question is being left to the Zonal Councils, it would have been better if this could have been decided by Parliament. The Home Minister, in his reply, was good enough to say, at the end of his speech, that he hoped that this Bill would be passed by this House as was done in the other House, namely, passed as it was introduced. I would like to point out that the other House was given a chance to make some changes and I do not see any reason why this House should be expected to ditto every word and comma. If there is something which meets with the approval of all the Members or of a majority of the Members, we should be given a chance to make that change. In the case of the previous clause, the hon. Minister was saying that the majority of the people wanted a certain change. Similarly, in the case of Belgaum, people want that that portion should become part of Bombay. So, it should be given to Bombay and this House should be given the chance to make one or two such changes. I hope the Minister will accept this amendment.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I have got to support my own amendments and, at the same time, speak on the amendment moved by Mr. Sekhar about naming the new State and, if possible, I will also speak a word or two about Mr. Gupte's and Dr. Kane's amendments.

Sir, in the first place, about the question of the name....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Start speaking.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I am rather surprised that this matter has interested my hon. friends from far South, virtually.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO : May I point out that with the formation of Karnataka, Mysore will become fifth in rank, instead of eighth?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : I very much thank them for the great interest they are evincing in Mysore. It really speaks very well of them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They have got two very important assets in Mysore, the gold mines and Mr. Dasap-pa.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: May I just submit, Sir, that so far as this new State of Mysore is concerned, though there were certain differences in the beginning as regards unifying all the Kannada areas, later on, we have all reconciled ourselves to this unified Karnataka and want to make it a success.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO : Name it as Karnataka. That is all.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR : There were amendments in the other House bv a Karnataka friend.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : Now, what is the idea of our friends here in talking about this ? We are all going on so peacefully; we are, perfectly happy. There has been a kind of give and take. The friends from other parts of the new Mysore State to be, who have come into this State, have been good enough to see that the name of Mysore is retained for this new and enlarged State and the Mysore friends, some of them, at any rate a section of them, who were not willing for this unification have generously agreed to work this new State. Now, these friends, mostly from far South want to just throw in a bone of contention. One wee bit of sour drop is enough for a whole pot full of milk and the milk will turn sour. I ask and I beseech my friends just to hold on for some time and to give this new State a trial. There will be time enough for other friends who are directly concerned to think about the name.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR : Will the hon. Member kindly explain why he objects to the name of Karnataka being given to the Mysore State ?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : Certainly. I have already given a part of the reason. I thought that that was enough. The Mysore friends who were not for unification wanted that name because there

is a lot of sentiment in its favour. It is a question of what is known as the psychological. reaction to the whole thing. They would be very happy if that name was retained. Shall I give some more reasons, if the hon. Member is particular ? We have never considered Mysore as a linguistic or a unilingual State. Right from the beginning we have contended and maintained, and successfully done so, that this is a composite State composed of people of more than one language. We have got a whole district of Kolar which if the idea of linguism was taken as the basis, should have gone to Andhra, but those people do not want it.

(Interruption.)

I am not going to yield. He has put a query and 1 am answering him and he has not got the patience to listen to me. He ought to have patience. Now he asked me: Why? I say because we do not want to drive in this idea of linguism into the affairs of our State. If you say Karnataka, there will be the disease catching hold of all the people that we must only think in terms of Karnataka and Kannada language and all that. We wanted to be more liberal-minded, more large-hearted and more cosmopolitan in our outlook and feeling and character. That is the shape of things to come and if Mysore can contribute howsoever little to that consummation of having a kind of a fraternity among all the people speaking different languages. I think that is a matter which our friends ought to welcome. Now they are trying to throw in this bone of contention where there has been none so far. So, Sir, I think I have said enough about that.

Then, Sir, about Belgaum. Sir, on that the hon. the Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs, who hails from Belgaum, is a better judge and I shall not trespass into his field. I do not deny that there are people earnestly feeling that portions of it must go to the new State of Bombay, I have a notion that possibly this idea gained ground because we were thinking of unilingual States, of a Maharashtra State, we were thinking of a Gujarat State. Therefore, these Maharashtrian friends were very eager to have all those areas, even half of a village if possible where there were Maharashtrians, to come into uiis Maharashtra State. I do not deny them their ambition ; I do not say it is a wrong thing but, Sir, when my Maharashtrian friends have recon-4—17 Rajya Sabha./56.

ciled themselves to this grand idea of a bilingual State, why should they not leave a few Maharashtrians in other States ?

SHRI B. M. GUPTE : They were being brought into one State.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: May I just finish? Basically they will be promoting that very idea which they themselves have accepted as a cardinal creed of this new State of Bombay. Therefore, I would beg of them—I don't say it is wrong ; let them by all means continue and persevere in their task but—let them not make a grievance of it. That is what I say.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR (Bombay) : It is not we Maharashtrians who want Belgaum : It is the people in Belgaum who want to go to Maharashtra.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : I will come to that. I am thankful to Mr. Deogirikar whose authentic voice is in support of this amendment. Sir, I do not deny there is force in it because you will remember, Sir, that is what I laid down as a cardinal principle. The other day when I was speaking I said I would not willingly let go any section of people who want to remain in my State and I am not willing to force anybody who is not willing to stay in my State to remain in it. I suppose I made it very clear the other day. So, I do not force anybody. It is a question, as my hon. friend, Mr. Datar, said of mutual reconciliation and good neighbourliness. Now, I am very thankful to the hon. the Minister for Home Affairs for having allowed this position stand as it is and if necessary, to be settled by these Zonal Councils and joint Zonal Councils. I have just now said how we are having a Telugu population in Mysore State. They do not want to leave Mysore State, and why ? I ask my friends : Why ? It is because they feel that they get fair and just treatment in Mysore. May I say, Sir, that the first Chief Minister after freedom was not a Kannadiga. He was an Andhra man, a Telugu man, Mr. K. C. Reddy. You just see, Sir, how we are trying to tackle these vast and big questions of a national character. That is how we are getting on. Sir Visweswarayya was a Telugu man. He was not a Kannadiga. Shri Rangacharlu was a Tamilian ; he was not a Kannadiga. Shri Seshadri Iyer was a Tamilian ; he was not a Kannadiga. Shri K. C. Reddy is the man who was chosen as the accre-

[Shri H. C. Dasappa.]

dited leader of the people of Mysore Shri Mirza Ismail was a Muslim. This is how we have built up Mysore and I want my friends not to be little this conception, this lovely beautiful conception that we have had before us all these years, and let us not permit our personalities to shrivel and shrink into being just men of one State or another. Therefore, I say to my hon. friend, Mr. Deogirikar, that it may be desirable for him to wait for some time and see how our Maharashtrian friends who might now get into this new State of Mysore would be treated by Mysore. Well, if for instance they feel that they would be perfectly happy, even more happy perhaps than would be the case if they were linked to the huge State of Bombay, they can play their part in Mysore. My friend, Mr. Datar, who hails from there, he could be a top-ranking leader in the new Mysore. Why should he not be given the privilege ? Why should not a Maharashtrian who is in Belgaum become the Chief Minister of Mysore State ? A Maharashtrian in Belgaum may become the Chief Minister of Mysore State just as Shri M. Visweswa-rayya, Shri Rangacharlu and Shri Seshadri Iyer were Diwans in the old days and Shri K. C. Reddy, the first Chief Minister after independence. Why should they be prevented from playing their constructive role in the building up of this State ? So, that is so far as the point of Mr. Deogirikar is concerned.

Now, let me come to my own amendment, that is, with regard to South Sholapur and Akalkot; I am only taking their very principle which was....

(Interruptions.)

Sir, I am going to be fair to all parties; I will be unfair to none. With regard to South Sholapur and Akalkot may I just give certain figures ? Will my friends bear with me for just a couple of minutes ? You will find, Sir, in South Sholapur Kan-nadigas are 49 5 per cent; the Maha-rashtrians are 33-8 per cent; others 16 • 7 per cent, and may I add to this that they were the »people—I did not know so much—who flooded the Central Hall here and carried on propaganda in favour of joining new Mysore. I did not force them. Sir, shall we pass on to Akalkot ? In Akalkot the situation is even stronger. The Kannadigas are 53*4 per cent; Maharashtrians 28 per cent; others 18-1 per cent. Now, it should not be a case of : Heads I win; tails you lose. Let us be fair to all. I think even Mr. Chintaman Deshmukh, our ex-Finance Minister while making a speech in the Lok Sabha freely conceded that these taluks may go to new Mysore....

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAN D: And Belgaum and Karwar may come here....

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: and therefore, Sir, these are matters eminently fit for the Zonal Councils to take up. We can there consider these issues dispassionately and see what the advantages and the disadvantages would be. Meantime, I may say, all these peo-ple would have had a chance to know how the new Governments treat them. Therefore, Sir, I am very very strong-ly opposed to my friend, Mr. Sekhar's suggestion that the name should be changed and as regards this I would say there must be a chance given to them, and let the issues be settled, as I say, in the Zonal Councils where I think you will have a better atmosphere. I would in any case, say, Sir, let nobody make a great grievance of these things.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY : Sir, without repeating the arguments which have been so ably advanced by Mr. Dasappa I would like to add a new argument. As far as the change of the name is concerned, our friends opposite, all at once have fallen in love with the name of Karnataka. I would like to ask them : why have they not changed the name of Kerala into Malayala ? In fact it was known as Malayala since long. Why are you so fond of Kerala ? Why have you not tabled and amendment seeking to change Kerala into Malayala? So, we can see through the hollowness of their argument. That is one point.

Secondly, one other consideration which should weigh with anybody who knows the history of Mysore is this : Mysore has an international reputation. Mysore has been known to be a very progressive State and, as Mr. Dasappa very rightly pointed out, Mysore is the most cosmopolitan State in the whole of India. Mysore is known in England very well; in America it is known very well; in Canada too. In fact all the foreign countries know Mysore very well. If there is any value which is known as goodwill and if there is any benefit to be derived from what is known as goodwill, certainly we have a lot of

gooawiil to be gained by retaining this name of Mysore. After all, there is no difference between Karnataka and Mysore and as the hon. Mr. Datar said, we can call it officially Mysore and non-officially it can be called Karnataka. In fact, it is being called so and therefore, that name should remain for obvious advantages.

As far as amendments Nos. 14 and 68 are concerned, it is true that in some of the areas mentioned by Mr. Gupte there are Marathi-speaking people but we should know that — it is a very interesting feature—they are not Maha-rashtrians. They do not come from Maharashtra, still they are entered in the Census as Marathi-speaking people. There is a slight majority in Belgaum down and a slight majority in Belgaum taluk. I do concede that, but how has it came about, let us see. Sir, as you know very well, and as the hon. Mr. Datar knows very well, Kannada was not a developed language in these areas and it was not a language which was officially used. It was only recently since a decade or a decade and a half that Kannada came to be used in a little way as an official language. Before that Maharashtra was the official language and more than anything else Maharashtra was the popular language or fashionable the language, just as....

DR SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND : There is no such language as Maharashtra.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: 1 mean Marathi. Just as we considered English as a very fashionable language till about a decade or a decade and a half ago and just as we considered English-speaking gentlemen as the gentlemen, in the Kannada areas of the Bombay Presidency, Marathi-speaking men were considered to be the gentlemen. It is within my experience and I am sure it is within the experience of Mr. Datar and yourself also that people were afraid of speaking Kannada in Belgaum. When we used to go to oui friends' houses they would say, if there was any Maharashtrian outside, only *kai ho;* they would not speak Kannada. That was because Kannada was considered to be not a decent language, because Kannada was not an official language. Kannada was spoken only by the rural masses. All the urban gentry— of course, as far as fashions, respect, dignity and other artificial things were concerned, it was the urban gentry that counted—spoke Marathi and, therefore, though things have changed after the appointment of the States Reorganisation Commission, but till that time, anybody speaking Kannada in Belgaum and other surrounding areas was considered to be something like a *coolie* or a *hatnal.* That was the reason why these people were speaking Marathi and when the Census figures were compiled— naturally who were the enumerators ? They were all Maharashtrians; there were no Kannada enumerators—they came to be entered as Marathi-speaking although they were Kannada people. Because Marathi was considered to be a fashionable language, because it commanded respect and status in urban areas, Kannada was not being spoken and they did not learn Kannada in schools because there were very few Kannada schools and because of all these they came to be entered as Marathi-speaking people. Then when we take the Provincial Congress into consideration, nobody has objected to these areas being included in the Karnataka Pradesh Congress Committee and when the resolutions on the linguistic question was being discussed, there was no objection by the Marathi-speaking people about these Belgaum and other areas, All at once now this claim has come up. Sir, there is no end to the ambition of Maharashtrians. As Kannadigas we are prepared to abide by any impartial arbitration tribunal as far as this is concerned. I am quite sure that all these areas which now want to join Mysore are really areas which should go to Mysore, areas where the people are Kannada-speaking. Sir, I am speaking English now. Now, because I speak in English, can any Englishman come and claim me to be an Englishman ? I cannot be an Englishman because I only speak the tongue which I have learnt and which is considered to be fashionable. It does not mean that simply because I speak English, I am an Englishman. Similarly, these people who are speaking Marathi have nothing to do with Maharashtra. I am prepared to throw a challenge tomorrow when the Zonal Councils will consider this question. Let them go into this question and I am sure that these areas will, even according to their own judgment, go to Karnataka and, therefore, I would request my friends not to press their amendments.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it was stated in the course of the debate that I come from Belgaum and that, therefore, I am likely to take a view which may not be impartial. I should like to point out to this House that so far as the question of Belgaum or the question of other areas referred to in these amendments is concerned, I shall try to place before the House the correct position in as objective a manner as possible, because in all these cases we have always *to* remember that we are Indians and that if I belong to Karnataka area I ought not to be an enemy of Maharashtra or any other linguistic area. All of us have to find out what the correct position is and then have to take all the circumstances into account so far as the larger question like reorganisation is concerned.

In the first place I should like to point out to my hon. friends from Maharashtra and others who have contended that Karnataka has won on all the fronts that it is not a correct statement at all. 1 would like to point out in all humility that we have not won on the Kasaragod issue. Just now I myself requested my own friends to withdraw the amendments that were for the purpose of including Kasaragod—the area north of Chandragiri river—in Karnataka, because we have to take the larger interests into account. Then there are a number of areas which are groups of villages, groups of compact villages in Maharashtra. Take for example the Kolhapur district. Take for example the South Satara District. Take the South Sholapur area. There are also other areas which are compact Kannada ajeas but we have not laid a claim to them at this stage for the reason that the criteria that have now been placed before us prevent us from raising all these questions. Therefore, it should not be supposed that Karnataka has won on all fronts and the analogy between Bellary and Belgaum is absolutely fall fallacious. Belgaum has been within the jurisdiction of the Karnataka Pradesh Congress Committee since 20 years. And so far as Bellary is concerned, you are aware and the House is aware, that the question was considered by high judicial authorities and the Government of India in 1953 took a decision that Bellary ought to go to the present Mysore and. therefore, it would not be proper to bring in the case of Bellary and to tag it on to the question of Belgaum.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: The Commission has recommended against it.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : The Commission has recommended against it for other than valid reasons. They added it on to Andhra for other than valid reasons. They stated that because Tungabhadra project was there, not only Bellary town and taluk but also other taluks which were admittedly predominantly Kannada areas should also go to Andhra. Fortunately, the whole question was considered and Bellary and all these areas remained where they are. I would not speak more about Bellary because I am anxious that we should always maintain good relations with Maharashtrians in the north and Andhras and other friends in the south because all of us have to go together. The Tungabhadra project has to be developed by Mysore and Andhra together. And,

P.M. therefore, there should not be the slightest misunderstanding or bitterness between these two great peoples especially Andhras and Karnatakas who were once under the Vijayanagar empire, of which the present Mysore was one part. This is what we have to understand correctly.

Coming to Belgaum, oftentimes we have been told in this House and the other House that there is a very large area from Belgaum and Karwar districts, which some say comprise 2,500 square miles, some say the population is 11 lakhs and then the hon. lady Member says that injustice is being done. Therefore, I would give to this honourable House the population figures so far as the different taluks are concerned. Here we have to take into account one fact, that we go by taluks. We do not go by groups of villages. If we were to go by groups of villages, compact villages, then Karnataka and Maharashtra can exchange a number of areas. That Can be done subsequently, but at present we swear by the taluk as the unit and I would place before this House the population figures of five taluks in respect of which claims have been made by Maharashtra. Take for example Athni taluk. So far as the northern area is concerned, in the Athni taluk, the Marathi population is 18-6 per cent. So far as Athni taluk is concerned, the integrity of this taluk cannot be broken for the purpose of satisfying the claims of Maharashtra. The Marathi people are only 18-6 per cent.

50 far as Belgaum taluk is concerned, the percentage of Marathis is 49 8 per cent.—not even 50 per cent. So far as Belgaum municipal area is concerned, the percentage is 51 and there also 54 is wrong. I purposely said Belgaum municipal area. There is one village about six or seven miles from Belgaum called Yellur. Yellur is purely a Kannada name. There the Marathi population is large because round about you are aware that till about 1947 there were Indian States and most of these States were Marathi-knowing States on account of the influence of Marathi-knowing rulers. Naturally, Kannada did not develop and Marathi developed. So what has been done is this Yellur has been wrongly included as one of the suburbs of Belgaum. Now, leaving that alone, take Belgaum cantonment or Bel gaum municipal area. The Marathi population is 51 per cent. Then, take Chikodi taluk....

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND : What is the population of Yellur village ?

SHRI B. N. DATAR : I shall give that.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR : Will the hon. Minister be pleased to give the percentage of Kannada-speaking people in this Place?

SHRI B. N. DATAR : It is absolutely unnecessary for this purpose.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: It is necessary for us.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : I am prepared •^ to give it to him. So far as my point is concerned, unless the population of any other language is more than 70 per cent, that population cannot be transferred from the place or area or State where it is. If this principle is laid down, it is entirely immaterial what the particular position is. So far as Belgaum municipal area is concerned, the percentage is 51 per cent. My hon. friend wanted to know the population of Yellur. The population of Yellur was about 5,000 and there the Marathi population was larger. Now, that was included along with other surrounding villages, about four or five, and the percentage was raised not very much, but from 51:9 to 53 per cent. That is all that was done so far as Belgaum municipal area was con cerned. So far as Belgaum taluk is con cerned, the total population of Marathi people is 49:8 per cent. So far as Chikodi taluk is concerned, what is now claimed is Nipani Bhag. Nipani' Bhag means a portion; possibly what they have in view is a firkaS or a group of certain villages. Now we are not recognizing firkas at all. Otherwise, it would have been possible for me to accept Dr. Subbarayan's amendment to take two or three firkas from Kasaragod taluk to Mysore. That we have not done. So, it is not proper in view of the criteria or the standard that we have laid before ourselves to think of an area less in extent than a taluk. All the same let us take Chikodi taluk. In Chikodi taluk the Marathi population is 42T percent. In Hukeri taluk the percentage isl6 0 percent. So far as Khanapur is concerned, the Marathi population is 54-3 per cent. Taking all these taluks together, it will be found that these are the only five taluks from which some areas are claimed by Maharashtrians. Now, take all these five taluks together. If they are taken together, the total population would be ten lakhs and odd. The Marathi population would be 3,69,000, leaving a percentage of 36:2.

Now, take the case of Karwar also. So far as Karwar is concerned, we have the authoritative opinion of a great Maharashtrian and an hori. Member of this House, namely, Kakasaheb Kalelkar Kakasaheb Kalelkar has stated that so far as the Konkani language is concerned, Konkani is not a dialect of Marathi But it is parallel to Marathi. That is what he spoke the other day here in this House. Now, it should be noted that if there are any dialects, then there would be no enumeration dialectwise, unless it is found that that particular dialect is more or less a language by itself. That is the reason why in the census of 1951, and possibly in the earlier census also, so far as these areas where the Konkani language was being spoken was concerned, there Konkani has been shown as a separate language—separate from Kannada, separate from Marathi....

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND : It is parallel to Marathi.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : If two lines are parallel, then my hon. friend knows they would not meet. Parallel is entirely different from two lines which would meet. I have the authority of my hon. friend who is a great scholar. As regards the origin of language, the following extract from the Census Report

[Shri B. N. Datar.]

of 1931 of Bombay State is reproduced :

> "KONKANI:—Konkani is properly the language spoken in Goa and in parts of the Western littoral. It is considered by scholars to be derived, not from Marathi, but separately and earlier from another Prakrit. It varies with the kind of speaker...."

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND : Kanarese or Marathi-speaking people ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : Let the hon. Member hear me and then if she has any questions to ask, I am prepared to answer.

> "....High Class Goanese speak it with Portuguese words, Kanara Mussulmans with Urdu and Arabic words, and Chitpawan Brahmans with Sanskrit words. The language is not to be confused, as was the case formerly, with a Bhil dialect spoken by Koknas."

Then, it might also be noted that so far as the Konkani population is concerned, it is not confined to the Bombay State alone. In Bombay we have got 3,13,000 Konkanis; in Madras 2,45,000; in Travancore-Cochin 46,395 : in Mysore 27,226; and in Coorg, 3,515 Konkanis. That would show that so far as Konkani is concerned, it should not be considered necessarily as the same language. In Bombay, for example, when we go to Ratnagiri or Kobala, a kind of Konkani is spoken which is to a certain extent different from the Konkani which is spoken, say, in Karwar, in Kanara—North Kanara and "South Kanara....

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND : Now, I would ask a question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please sit down.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : I have yet to finish. After I have finished with Konkani, she may ask. I have not yet finished with Konkani. I would point out, Sir, that so far as Konkani is concerned, it is a dialect, and in legitimately Marathi areas Konkani is also spoken and Konkani might be considered allied to Marathi. Take, for example, Cochin. There also they have got Konkani. They speak a language which is more or less allied to Malayalam. In Kanara, not only in North but in South, we have got a Konkani population. What I am trying to point out is, if any one says that Konkani should be equated with Marathi, that is an entirely wrong view to take.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND : Sir, I want to have a clarification because he might go to another subject.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : I shall sit down soon and give as much time to the hon. lady as necessary. So far as North Kanara is concerned, we have a considerable Konkani population, and it will surprise you, Sir, to find that so far as these Konkani people are concerned almost all of them, more than 90 per cent, know Kannada, and Marathi population is extremely small. So far as the claim to Karwar area is concerned, we are told that one *mahal* is taken away. Do my friends know that in Supa Petha the population of Konkani people is 15,000 ? Under these circumstances it would not be proper to equate Konkani with Marathi and then make a claim on Karwar of North Kanara district. It should also be understood that so far as these districts are concerned the Konkani population is not so large. If all these things are taken into account, then the Marathi population by itself or the Marathi population with the inclusion of the Konkani population is not so large as to entitle us to take up this question for solution at this time in view of the criteria that we have placed before the '• House.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND: Sir, I would like to ask a question. If a Konkani person were to speak in front of a Malayalam-knowing person, or a Kanarese-knowing person or a Marathi-knowing person,. who would understand that Konkani language out of these persons ?

SHRI B. N. DATAR : It depends upon the area and the degree of contact between them. In Karwar, for example, the Konkani population is larger and the Kannada population is more than the Marathi population. I think the hon. Member will understand that clearly. In that case, in Karwar town and other areas, the Kannada people will understand Konkani.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND : I think I did not make myself clear. They will not understand....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You cannot make a speech now.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : The difficulty is that so far as the Maharashtrian brethren in Bombay are concerned, they think of Konkani in the Konkan Districts of Bombay State. They do not think of Kannada districts nor of other areas. So far as this question is concerned, may I point out to my hon. friend that before 1861 the North and South Kanaras together formed one district of Madras State, not of Bombay State ? This district which is called Kannada district—Kanara is a corruption of Kannada, Uttara Kannada and Dakshina Kannada—is there, and can we think of that district or a portion of it as being legitimately Marathi ? We have to take into account all affinities, the langauge affinity, etc., I am pointing out all these things because I desire that our Maharashtrian brethren and the Kannada people also should understand the position clearly.

AN HON. MEMBER : The hon. Minister is also Kannada.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : I would concede that after the present passions have cooled down and after this question is considered at Government level and also at private level on the lines on which my hon. friend Shri Dhage has been trying hard, it is quite possible that certain conclusions or agreements can be had because those agreement will be profitable to both. Kannada areas in Akal-kot and Sholapur and other places would come to us, and whatever principles we may lay down according to which Marathi areas have to go, ordinarily we will have no objection.

The last point I would make in this connection is that language is only one factor. Language is not necessarily the complete factor. Take, for example, the case of Chandgad taluk. May I point out to my hon. friends that this Chandgad taluk has always been a Marathi area and we have agreed to its being part of the Kolhapur district ? Now, for the sake of only language, should we force upon the people or impose upon the people a number of other considerations which may be of greater import than the question of language ? Some of my hon. friends desire to take language alone as the basis. If you form a small or lengthwise taluk, will that be proper so far as the interests of those people are concerned ? I should like to suggest to my hon. friends that they can be at the head of the new Mysore or Kar-nataka State rather than be at the tail of the Bombay State, and they are likely to benefit more because for economic reasons we have got the Malnad area which has not been properly developed at all. The Government of India had in 1952 appointed a committee but that committee was disbanded. All these areas are of the same kind. They have not been developed. Therefore, it would be more advantageous to these areas which can lay a plapable claim to Marathi if all these areas are kept together, if the linguistic rights of the Marathi people and others are properly safeguarded. Sir, in view of the higher economic interests, in view of the desire for developing economic interests properly, would it appeal to my Maharashtrian friends, would it not .be proper to allow this area to remain where it is ? Because the higher interests are not necessary served only by the consideration of language. Economic considerations have always to be taken into account.

Lastly, in all such cases, I personally have absolutely no bias either way. The question can be considered but there are limits to the consideration of such questions. You cannot bring in all these questions, you can never have village as the unit. You cannot divorce the headquarters of the district from the other portions. All these are restrictions which have always to be taken into account. It might be possible, if this question is raised before the Zonal Council, to come to agreed conclusions, and if there are agreed conclusions, then naturally there will be no difficulty at all. That is the reason why the Home Minister today pointed out that there are certain outstanding questions, not only the question of the border disputes but other questions also. There might be irrigation projects which might be common to Maharashtra and Karnataka or Mysore. There might be other problems also. All these have to be tackled in the Zonal Council at the Government level or at the private level to the extent that we can. In all these matters let us have a proper perspective. After all in all these things the interests of the parties con-cerned or the persons concerned are

[Shri B. N. Datar.] taken into account. If the taking away of a particular portion from one area to another would be in the highest interest of the people concerned, apart from the question of language, then naturally that can be done. It is not difficult at all and that can surely be done.

Lastly, Sir, I would appeal to my Maharashtra and other Karnataka Members to understand that after the States are formed, all of us have to live cordially—Marathi people in Mysore State, Andhra people in Karnataka, Kannada people in Andhra, and so on. All of them have to remain as brothers as they have been over centuries. Whenever the interests of minorities require some special protection or safeguarding, then that ought to be allowed. But apart from such safeguards as they desire— linguistic safeguards or administrative facilities as they require and such others which the Government of India are now considering and in respect of which the circular which the Government of India had issued has already been placed before the Joint Select committee—I would request that instead of always thinking territorially let us think economically, let us think in a neighbourly manner, and it is only thus, Sir, that all these States would come up.

And so far as the name is concerned, Sir, I have already explained that out of consideration for the feelings of our Mysore friends we agreed that it should be called 'Mysore', although we would have preferred Karnataka. I can tell my hon. friend that the name of Karnataka is not a parochial name at all. In fact, the Mysore kingdom itself has taken its birth from the name of Karnataka. Also, Sir, the Maharaja of Mysore is known as 'Karnataka Simhasanadheeshwar'. Out of consideration only for our friends we decided to work together in the highest interests of the nation, and therefore, Sir, we have surrendered our desire to have the name of Karnataka. Let us work well. And so far as Akalkot and South Sholapur are concerned, I have already replied to that point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

13. "That at page 4, line 30, for the word 'Mysore', the word 'Karnataka' be substituted."

The motion was negatived.

SHRI B. M. GUPTE : Sir, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

* Amendment No. 14 was, by leave, withdrawn.

DR. P. V. KANE : Sir, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

†Amendment No. 68 was, by leave, withdrawn.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : Sir, I beg to leave to withdraw my amendments.

†Amendments Nos. 105 and 109 were, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That clause 7 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 7 was added to the Bill.

Clause 8— *Formation of a new Bombay State*

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: Sir, I move :

16. "That at pages 5 and 6, for the existing clause 8, the following be substituted, namely :—

8. *'Formation of a new Maharashtra State.*—As from the appointed day, there shall be formed a new Part A State to be known as the State of Maharashtra comprising the following territories, namely :—

(a) Greater Bombay district, Thana, West Khandesh, East Kandesh, Nasik, Dangs, Ahmednagar, Sholapur, South Satara, North Satara, Kolhapur, Ratna-giri, Kolaba and Poona districts and Chandgad taluk of Belgaum district, in the existing State of Bombay ;

(b) Aurangabad, Parbhani, Bhir and Asmanabad districts, Ahmedpur, Nilanga and Udgir taluks of Bidar district, Nanded district except Bichkonda and Jukkal circles of Deglur taluk ;ind Mudhol, Bhiansa and Kuber circles of Mudhol taluk, and Islapur circle of Boath taluk,

♦For text of amendments, *vide* col. 91 *supra.*

†For text of amendments, *vide* col. 92 *supra.*

Kinawat taluk and Rajpura taluk of Adilabad district, in the existing State of Hyderabad ; and

(c) Buldana, Akola, Amra-vati, Yeotmal, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara and Chanda districts in the existing State of Madhya Pradesh ;

and thereupon the said territories shall cease to form part of the existing States of Bombay, Hyderabad and Madhya Pradesh, respectively.' "

(The amendment also stood in the names of Shri N. C. Sekhar and Shri Bhupesh Gupta.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The clause and the amendment are now before the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, this amendment relating to clause 8 is most important, and it affords us yet another opportunity to explain to the Government and to all those friends who do not still see eye to eye with us, that clause 8 is perhaps the blackest clause in the Bill. We have made it very clear, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that we have very many clauses in this Bill to support. That is a matter of great satisfaction to us. Now, Sir, whatever the Government may be saying, whatever the Prime Minister may be theorising, whatever new discoveries may be made by him with regard to the proposition of linguistic States, and whatever accusations may be made against the other parties of breaking the unity of India, the fact remains that the States Reorganisation Bill, as we have it before us, recognises in practice the reorganisation of India largely on the basis of language. Nothing can detract this outstanding fact with regard to this Bill. Therefore, Sir, let us be very clear about it. It is not something that we are saying for the first time and it is not something which is very extraordinary. The whole Bill is based on the acceptance of the underlying principle of linguistic reorganisation of States. A number of States on this basis are going to come into existence. But when we come to that region of Maharashtra and Gujarat, we find a different type of dispensation meted out to them. There is no logic in it, there is no reason in it, and there is no principle in it, except that the ruling party, because of certain reasons, suddenly decided upon taking this preposterous course. Mr. Deputy Chairman, clause 8 creates a bilingual State of Bombay. But I can tell you straightway that when the Bill was circulated to the various State Legislatures, it did not contain the provision of the kind that we have before us. Thus the people in the State and their legislators in particular were denied the opportunity -of addressing their mind to this particular clause which we have before us. They discarded certain other things too. It was open to them to discard this matter also. They could not foresee that the Government would suddenly so change its mind that it would be necessary to discuss it. They concentrated on the provisions of the Bill based on the recommendations of the Commission. They had before them two important documents, one the Commission's recommendations with regard to Bombay, and the other the proposals contained in the Bill that went to them. They concentrated only on those things, and they could never have seen that certain hon. gentlemen would collect together in the lobbies signatures of various Members on a little piece of paper and flaunt them before the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister who has not been easily changeable in regard to this matter would suddenly change and accept the suggestion for the creation of a bilingual State. That is how this clause came into existence. And today, Sir, in this House we are called upon to support this clause regardless of what the Maharashtrians think about it and regardless of what the Gujaratis think about it.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, it pains us when we hear the hon. Minister talking in one breath with regard to Hima-chal Pradesh and other States about the people's will, and yet when it comes to the question of Gujarat, that right is denied to it. We find today before our eyes the mighty upsurge of the people of Gujarat demanding a linguistic State, and it is perfectly known to the Government as to anybody else in the country that the people of Gujarat, to a man, are opposed to this provision of the Bill. And also, Sir, the people of Maharashtra are opposed to this Bill. Are these not facts ? Can you explain why you are ignoring them ? I found grave silence on the part of the Home Minister when he sopke in reply to the debate. He had nothing to say about the situation obtaining in Gujarat, except to express his feelings for Shri Morarjibhai Desai. All of us have got feelings for him. But greater are the people of Gujarat. I

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

should have thought that the tumultuous development which is shocking Gujarat to its very depth would have stirred the conscience of the hon. Ministers. They should have told us as to what is this thing that is happening there. They should have told the House why they are ignoring the feelings that are coming from Gujarat that this particular provision has got to be amended. They did nothing of the kind. They remained silent.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, in the course of the debate you know-that I tried to find out as to how the Government's mind was reacting to the developments in Gujarat. Hon. Members of the Treasury Benches thought that silence was golden in this case. How ? Is this the way for a responsible Government to function ? Is this the way to establish the authority of democracy ? Is this the way to present to the Parliament, to the people, this question ? I should have thought that hon. Ministers would give the best of thoughts to the developments in Gujarat even at this late hour —not remain in their positions sitting back—and see whether that situation could be met. We wished certain changes in the Bill which would be acceptable to the people of Gujarat. Nothing of the kind. A dogmatism has taken possession of them. Once they have decided that a bilingual State should come, like King Canute they decided that it shall remain. I tell you that you are swimming against currents. You are fighting against the forces of history. This is not right.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, we were absolutely surprised to hear the hon. the Home Minister talking about the unanimous verdict of the Lok Sabha. It is true that when the Bill was put to the vote finally, there was not a dissenting voice. How could there be because there are many provisions in the Bill which negate their stand with regard to Gujarat and recognise the linguistic reorganisation of States ? There are many provisions which embody the aspirations of the people. How could the Lok Sabha then raise a dissenting voice when the entire Bill was placed before them ? But he should have told the House in all fairness that when that particular clause or the bilingual clause was to put vote, there was a dissenting voice. If that had been a feeble voice, numerically speaking, that voice today, let us recognize, has the backing of the entire people of Gujarat. That voice today echoes in the streets of Bombay and in the mills and factories of Maharashtra. That was the voice of the people. By steam-rollering, you can ignore the people's urges. By having a brute majority in the Parliament you can brush aside what life is surging outside but that is not the way of democracy as we understand it.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, today we have given these two amendments proposing that two States should be created—one Maharashtra with Bombay City and the other Maha Gujarat. Even the other day the Prime Minister was saying that he would be very happy if Bombay went to Maharashtra—Samyukta Maharashtra. Perhaps, the Maharashtrians who, with hopes in their hearts, listened to him did not know the conspiracy that was afoot somewhere else. They did not know that the Prime Minister would be soon changing his mind and writing the death-warrant of the national entities in those two parts of India. It is the most regrettable part of the whole story. It blackens the S.R.C. personality. Much has been said about the recommendation of the S.R. C. and the Government has not spared a word against even the Members of the Commission. I think hon. Pandit Kunzru today recognises that perhaps they committed a mistake in suggesting a bilingual State. I don't know whether he will agree with me but today he will see how that recommendation had been taken advantage of by the traducers of the national cause in order to deny the very cherished rights and liberties and the desires of the people of Gujarat and Maharashtra. I wonder what he would have done had he known that lobby signatures would be collected and this whole thing would be prostituted in such a manner as to do a great injustice to the people of Gujarat and Maharashtra. I don't know his mind but today, I think honourable as he is, learned as he is, he would think about this matter, may be some day his wise counsel will prevail upon those quarters which still listen to him—at least feign to listen to him....

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU : Fail to listen to ___

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, as I told you before, we never took it as a national solution. What national solution have we ? Newspapers are full of news of national

solution. Whenever the Congress propagandist of the bilingual State picks up the news, the formula becomes a national solution. This is not a solution. It does not solve the problem for the simple reason that it sows dissensions among the people, it tries to undermine the feelings that are there for linguistic States. It makes it possible for those people who flourish on the dissensions and divisions of the people. They carry on their nefarious intrigues to the detriment of the people of Gujarat and the people of Maharashtra. It is not a national solution for the simple •reason that the part of the nation which is directly concerned by this provision, namely, the Gujarati people and the Maharashtra people are rejecting it before your eyes. The Congress Party is of course supporting it. We heard the Maharashtrian leader saying that he wants police protection in our land. I should have thought that these popular leaders, after supporting this proposal, would find themselves in festival among the people instead of complaining against the Government that they were having sleepless nights and were not "having police protection. As far as Congress leaders in Gujarat are concerned, Shri Morarji Desai has travelled all the way from Bombay to Ahmedabad and he is on fast. I am very sorry for the gentleman. I would like nobody to go without his food, if he can afford fo have food, but I tell, with all humility, that Shri Morarji is now like a boy on the burning deck, fighting a lone battle. He has got, of course, some sycophants, some people, who always get on to the band wagon of the ruling party and beat their drums but that does not mean that the people of Gujarat support it. It is clearly demonstrated in the demonstrations of the 13th of this month how they don't even like the man in whom they placed great confidence before. Shri Morarji Desai cannot get a simple audience to talk to and he is very much cut up for this thing. I can understand his resentment but may I tell him through you and through House that he should have accepted his political defeat when the meeting place was absolutely without any people. He should have known that the people of Gujarat do not share his views and have rejected his proposal. If he claims to be a leader of the people, he should have yielded to the will of the people and that is what we learn from our struggle. That is what we learn from our history and from our great men. Shri Morarji Desai would have been a greater personality by taking this course rather than the course he has taken.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I tell you very frankly that Shri Morarji Desai has been ill-advised to take this step to brush aside, more or less, the people....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please speak on your amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : My point is that the Gujarati people are against him.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Shri Morarji Desai knows what to do and he knows what is best for himself. You can leave him alone and come to the amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : He is an important factor. I would like to leave him alone but as you know, he is the Chief Minister of Bombay and a great personality how can I not be concerned about him when I have a chance to amend the Bill and get him a chance *to* speak ? Therefore, I say that I am a little concerned about this matter. I know the ruling party is not concerned about Mr. Gopalan. When he was on hunger strike, not a word was uttered. But I am concerned about Morarjibhai,

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Speak on your amendment. Leave alone Mr. Morarjibhai for the present.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Therefore, Mr. Deputy Chairman, what I say is that the people of Gujarat oppose it. The P. S.P. opposes it. The Communist Party opposes it. All the other parties except the Congress Party are opposed to it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Your amendment is about Maharashtra.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am coming to Gujarat. Both these I am taking together.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You are speaking on the next amendment also?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Yes. As far as Maharashtra is concerned, except the Congress all the other parties oppose this arrangement, this bilingual formula. I do not deny that the influence and importance of the Congress in Maharashtra are still great, that the Congress is a powerful organisation there, although its influence has been lessening in recent months, still it is a powerful

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

organisation because it has the backing of the State behind it. But the Congress is not Maharashtra. Do you say so ? Is it your contention that Congress is Maharashtra ? If the political party is the reflection of the public opinion, then it stands to reason that you should recognise that the opposition parties which between them represent the majority of the voters are opposed to the proposal of a bilingual State , and that is so even in Maharashtra. You must have come across a statement, Sir, issued by the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti that they have decided to call a general strike on the day on which these reorganised States are supposed to come into existence, and I have not the least doubt in my mind that that strike will be a successful one.

How can Government be so absolutely callous about it, talking about democracy and forgetting the people ? What sort of double standards are set up. Democracy when it suits you and the negation of it when it does not suit you. Therefore, as I told you, let us be very clear about it. The Maharashtra people are opposed to this present formula.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Question.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : But you have in your mind certain schemes. You think you can wean away a section of Maharashtra by dangling before them the carrot of the majority or the bigger power they will have in this bilingual Bombay State. That sort of horse trading in politics we do not believe in. Previously, you were trying to get the Gujarati people that way. Now, you are. by your words and by your deeds telling the Maharashtrians to accept this thing because in the bilingual Bombay State it is they who will have the decisive and unassailable majority. The very approach is nauseating. The very approach is provoking. The very logic is dangerous. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I say that the Congress has no case to make. The Congress Government has got no case to make before the public, except that it can assert with the power of the State that whatever it wills shall go. That is what they are doing.

Now, we are told about the unity of India, that this bilingual State is being supported and this clause 8 in particular, because that way we are trying to assure the strength and unity of India If that is your logic, if we are to accept that as your logic then tear up this States Reorganisation Commission Report. Take away the Bill, because in this Bill you have recognised the linguistic formation of the States of India. You cannot have two logics, one type of logic when you deal with a particular clause and another type of logic when you come to the Bill. The latter we support because in this particular case it is the right type of logic. Therefore, to say that the unity of India is threatened by the demand for linguistic States is a colossal falsehood, that one could ever utter.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, you come from the South. So does Mr. Govinda Reddy and also Mr. Dasappa who has now disappeared from the House. Yotf look at your part of the country. What do you see ? Don't you see there peace and calm ? Don't you see there a complete absence of tension ? Why is it so ? There was a time when there were rumblings in the South also. There was trouble in Madras. There was trouble in that area, in Karnataka, in Kerala, in Mysore. But today we find calm reigning all over these areas. Why ? It is because we have accepted the linguistic principle and we have conceded the demand for the linguistic reorganisation of these States. After this life's current experience, I tell you, once you accept the principle of the linguistic reorganisation of the States, you strengthen the unity of India. You strengthen the forces of friendship and fraternal relations between the various groups. That is the experience before us.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Yes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Deputy Chairman, You had recently the experience also of Bengal and Bihar. I do not want to go into that story now. I am only reminding you that the moment you sought to depart from the linguistic principle there was trouble. That trouble was of your creation. But the moment you took that back, this invidious, this hideous proposal of the merger, peace and tranquillity returned there. That is what we find. That is the picture of life that India presents us today. Therefore, I say it is an utter falsehood, it is a political deception, it is misleading the people to say that linguistic reorganisation of States or the demand for such reorganisation cuts at the fundamentals of the unity of the

whole country. We, Mr. Deputy Chairman, stand for the unity of our country. We agree with the Prime Minister and with the Home Minister that when you strengthen India, you strengthen all. But at the same time, how can we ignore the fact that the unity of India is not something which falls from the blue ? It is something that grows out of the life of the people. It is in that great collection of the various national entities speaking different languages and having their own cultures, bringing into the common pool of our civilisation their contributions, their culture, their aspirations and their strivings and their constructive efforts to make India great today and to build the foundations of the unity of our great country. So, we want that process to be strengthened today. We want India to be a' mansion in which everyone of us in his rightful place can strengthen himself and herself and strengthen the national entities and thereby lead to the strengthening of the whole nation. That is how we view the matter. Our stand is not against the unity of India. But where is the unity of India being built ? Not in the lobbies of the Lok Sabha or the Rajya Sabha. But the unity of India is built in the voluntary unity and in the fraternal relations of the various people who are today devoted to the common task of remaking our country. Therefore, let us not make use of that argument. It is a pity, Sir, that the Prime Minister of all persons should today make use of this argument. I can understand that of little ones in the Congress Treasury Benches, their knowledge of affairs is so little and they can be pardoned for saying things like that. But the Prime Minister is a knowledgeable person, a learned person, a great historian who has at least tried to understand the....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have already taken half an hour on one amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Sir. As I was saying, the Prime Minister who has at least tried to understand....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Please do not disturb me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, Sir. The Prime Minister has tried to understand things in his own way. Sir, this is the last time we can get a chance to speak for Bombay and for Gujarat, especially when the people feel that they have been let down by their own leaders.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have taken more than half an hour.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, I hope you at least will be kind to me. Sir, the unity of India is another ground. I say the unity of India will be strengthened. I will not be weakened. I tell you Mr. Deputy Chairman, I tell the Government and I tell everybody who is interested in listening to this that had we thought that this proposal we place before you of two separate States would weaken the unity of our country, we would be the first persons to tell before the world that we had been mistaken and that we were prepared to retrace our step.

We have not been convinced by the argument of the Government nor by the facts of life that the unity of India would be weakened by the suggestions that we have placed before you. On the contrary, everything that we know of, whatever experiences are before us, point to the singular and solitary fact, the outstanding fact, that by giving the people their right to form a linguistic State, you strengthen the unity of India, you promote fraternal relations and you strengthen the very foundations of our country.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : He ought to address the Chair, Sir. He is addressing the gallery.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I can understand Mr. Dasappa's agitation. He is a little Cinderella champion of the bilingual State and naturally, when he is a Cinderella, he feels a little more elevated but the towering personalities like Pandit Pant or the Prime Minister can hold their own.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : But the Maharashtrians and the Gujaratis do not agree with him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Well, Sir, he comes from a disintegrated State and I suppose that he is in a state of mental disintegration. I sympathise with his feelings.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, as I was saying, we would never have supported this thing had we thought that this would go

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

against the unity of India. Why are they making this one exception ? I know that you have not been able to solve the problem fully in Punjab but, with regard to the other States, more or less you have solved the problem on the linguistic basis. Whether we agree or not is a different matter but it has been solved, but why on earth has an exception been made in the case of Maharashtra and Gujarat ? Give us a little of the secrets; take us into confidence and tell us as to why such a thing happened. Many things happened behind closed doors. We do not know all of them but we would like to know from the Government as to why and on what grounds, they are making this exception with regard to this State. What crime did the people of Maharashtra and Gujarat commit before you that they are to be punished in this matter ? I would request them to accept this suggestion of mine; let us hold over this clause. I never claimed that my argument will be such as would melt the heart of Government or put sense into heads of the Treasury Benches because I know, as far as some Ministers are concerned, that it requires nothing short of dynamite to press sense into their heads. At the same time, I believe there are Ministers in the Government who would at least try to listen to the people, try to see the writings on the wall and see whether a change of attitude and policy is called for or not. It would, therefore, request, even at this late hour, that we should postpone discussion on this clause. Let us hold it over. I do not know what the Prime Minister said yesterday in the party meeting but I would like to say that he is the person today who should rise above pettyfoggeny and dogmatism and see how we can meet the situation that the policies of the Government have created in Gajarat. There is yet time and there will be no cause for repentance if we act even at this late hour. Let it be said to the credit of the Rajya Sabha, which is jeered at by some people, that we are going to alter an arrangement which did not find acceptance of the people. We can after this, change this particular clause if we approve that it is bad. I think we represent the various States in India and we are also an important assembly in this Parliament House. I think that we should give a little more attention to this matter. It is not a question of arguments but it is a question of human sympathies; it is a question of loyalties and a sense of attachment to the principles of democracy. It is a question of standing by the traditions that we have been fighting for. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I hope that my amendment with regard to clause 8 will be accepted by the Government even at this late hour. It will be to the glory of all and apart from that, Mr. Morarji Desai will get his peace.

PROF. G. RANGA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to a point of order. Is it Parliamentary for any Member to say that in the case of certain Ministers nothing short of dynamite which explodes them or something like that. ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN-: That is the langauge that Mr. Gupta usually uses.

PROF. G. RANGA : I would like it to be examined.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA (Bombay) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I did not • propose to participate in the discussions on this clause but when I heard the new champion of Maharashtra and Gujarat, I thought it my duty to participate in this debate. For his information and enlightenment I may inform him that I was born and bred up in Saurashtra and I still continue to be a person who speaks the Gujarati language. I know the Gujaratis much better than he does; probably he and his party never thought of Saurashtra or Gujarat for a number of years but today when Gujarat is undergoing agony, when it is passing through a crisis, one of the leaders of his party, with a professed motive to establish peace in that city of Ahmeda-bad, goes all the way from Delhi for the purpose of establishing peace. Their hearts do not move when the country— other parts of the country—suffers from various types of calamities. Their attitude has always been to cash in on the miseries of the people. WTierever they find a crisis, wherever they find disorder, they want to take advantage of the situation and they want to build up their own party. I know that their motives are quite clear; it is not for the love of the Maharashtrians or the Gujaratis that they are raising this claim today. So far as the question of Gujarat is concerned, Dr. Kunzru has already stated yesterday that before the Commission itself—and it is recorded in the Report of the Commission—the Guja-

ratis never pressed their claim for a separate State of Gujarat. That is recorded in the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission. It is not a new thing that the Gujaratis are claiming. Gujarat always stood for a bilingual State of Bombay ; it never wanted to part company with Maharashtra. They have lived with the Maharashtrians for a number of years. Probably, the memory of my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, is rather short and very weak. He does not remember the evidence before the Commission and he does not remember the judgment of the Commission based on the evidence submitted before it. He does not even remember the public feeling in those days. No one seriously pressed forward the claim that Gujarat should be a separate State. Gujarat always stood for a bilingual State but then here comes my friend who says that the people in Gujarat are demanding a separate State for themselves. If those feelings were in existence why were they not expressed before the Commission ? Everybody was free to express his own opinion before the Commission. Knowing fully well that the people of Gujarat were in favour of a bilingual State, the Commission gave its decision but certain things happened after that which resulted in the passing of a resolution by the Gujarat Pradesh Congress Committee. My hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, must be keeping a very good record of the political happenings in this country. He is even reading the "Eastern Eeconomist" which is run by a capitalist. So, he must have gone through the resolution passed by the Gujarat Pradesh Congress Committee. If you go through it, you will come to the conclusion that the spirit of it was that Gujarat was not opposed to a bilingual State whether big or small but that they were not in a position to accept the resolution of the Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee in view of certain things that had happened. This, however, has been the stand of the Gujarat Pradesh Congress Committee from the very beginning, even before the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission was released and wherever there has been an opportunity of expressing any opinion it has always said that it would be in the interests of the Bombay State that Bombay should be a bilingual State.

5 P.M.

Now. what is the necessity of having a bilingual State of Bombay ? For this purpose, Sir, I will discuss the question on two basic principles. One is whether for the country as a whole a composite State of this character would be fruitful or not and secondly, coming down to the Bombay State as such, whether this present formula of a composite State of Bombay would lead to the prosperity of the State or not. Sir, if you remember aright, while speaking at the time of the discussion on the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission I had expressed an opinion that I am a firm believer in one thing, namely, that the unity of this country will not be strengthened unless and until there is one language, and the happenings in the course of a year, specially during the last ten months have convinced me of the reasons for the ills from which we are suffering today—we are fighting for small territories here and there—and they have convinced me that so long as this country does not adopt one language, the unity of this country will never be built and I believe that, in order to come nearer to each other and to understand the thoughts and ideas of others, you must speak and understand the language of the other man. That is the reason why I hold that opinion that this country should adopt one language for all its purposes. I have no love for any regional language. We had so many types of divisions in this country. We had communal distinctions, divisions based on different languages, different States, different communities, and why should we now perpetuate this division based on language ? Therefore, Sir, on that basic principle I believe that wherever possible, composite States of the nature as proposed in the States Reorganisation Bill must be fostered and encouraged. I do not mean to suggest that if there are no bilingual States in existence in the country you create one. I do not say that, but if there are composite States each of which has got an economy of its own, and whose people have worked together for a number of years, why bring in forces of disruption? Why create bitterness? That is the reason why I said, 'If there is any composite State in existence, don't disintegrate that State and wherever possible try to work that composite State.' The States Reorganisation Commission itself in its Report has stated it. They have favoured that wherever possible composite States should be continued if there are no major factors against it and in that connection, Sir, they had to review the question regarding Kannada,

[Shri P. T. Leuva.] Andhra and everything, but they came to the definite conclusion that so far as Bombay is concerned, it should be a composite State of Bombay. Now, why did they say that ? It was for the simple reason that the Bombay city is such an industrially developed city and the economy of the two parts of that Bombay State, Gujarat and Maharashtra, are so dependent on the city of Bombay that if the State is disrupted there would be the economic effects, which will be detrimental to the interests of the whole State. As you know, Sir, Bombay city has got the largest number of textile mills. Cotton to feed the textile mills comes from Vidarbha as well as Gujarat. The export and import trade of the whole State, nay the whole country, passes through Bombay city and when that question was being considered regarding the hinterland of Bombay I was always feeling that we were taking a very narrow view of the concept of hinterland so far as Bombay city was concerned. What is the hinterland of Bombay ? Import trade to the extent of 55 per cent, of this country passses through the Bombay Port. In Bombay city there is a lot of engineering works. You have got iron works. You have got the textile industry. Now, do you personally believe that the 55 per cent, of the import trade is meant for Maharashtra and Gujarat only ? If your concept of the hinterland is confined to Maharashtra, surely 55 per cent, of the import and export trade of Bombay will not be brought over to Bombay by Maharashtra and Gujarat put together. Therefore, in order to preserve the prosperity of this whole State it was thought necessary that in the interests of both the parts, Maharashtra and Gujarat should live together.

Now, Sir, for some time there were no doubt, expressions of opinion disapproving the idea of a bigger bilingual State from parts of Gujarat, and I have related to you the history wjhy the Gujarat Pradesh Congress Committee did not accept it. Subsequently, when the Bill was pending before the Lok Sabha it was not the move made by the Government for the establishment of this bilingual State of Bombay. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta may listen to this and he must refresh his memory that this move was started by Members of the Opposition. A number of people signed a memorandum to the Prime Minister requesting him to accept this particular demand. I am prepared for an interruption.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : No. Out of those who signed it the Opposition has got very few Members. The signatories are mostly belonging to your Party. I know that.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA : I am telling you. As far as I remember, the memorandum was signed by 230 Members. Surely, Sir, Shri Asoka Mehta and Acharya Kripalani do not belong to the Congress Party. So far as Shri Asoka Mehta and Acharya Kripalani are concerned, they too head a party which has got some following in this country. Now, Sir, it may be that as in other respects the Communist Party is isolated now and again. They might be isolated in this move as well. But when they found that they were being isolated, that they were losing ground in Maharashtra, which they had gained during the time when the disturbances were there because they always thrive on disturbances and nothing else, they wanted to find out some opportunity to crea,te a situation in which they might be able to cash in. Today whom do we find in Ahmedabad ? They are the bed-follows of Shri Bhupesh Gupta in Ahmedabad; the Hindu Mahasabha, the Jan Sangh and last but not the least—he is supposed to be the enemy of capitalists and capitalism—his own men have joined hands wjth some capitalists and are creating disturbances in Ahmedabad. This is the policy which he is backing and is trying to preach the principles of democracy to us. Now, those people who are talking about the feelings of Maharashtra and Gujarat, that Gujarat would be ruined, those are the people who are trying to come to our help, to our succour ! What I say, Sir, is this that this move was based on the sole desire that a big State like Bombay would lead to the prosperity of this country. The State will have a population of five crores. It will have a revenue budget of Rs. 102 crores. It would be no doubt a very prosperous and industrial State but, as you know, Sir, the Communist Party cannot thrive when people are prosperous, when people are happy and contented. How can they bear this idea that these people belonging to Maharashtra and Gujarat should come together, weld themselves together and ask for a bright and prosperous State ? They cannot bear this idea. That is the reason why they have now taken up this attitude, "Look at this. The Government has changed its mind overnight." The hon. the Home

Minister in the morning has given a very careful and logical answer to it. But my friends sitting opposite are miles away from logic. The hon. the Home Minister said that it was the desire of the whole Parliament, their unanimous desire, with the solitary exception of a few Members of the Communist Party, that there shall be a bilingual State of Bombay.

We must understand one thing that in this Parliament we are representing national interests. Every interest, territorial or otherwise has to be subordinated to the national interests. We do not come here for the purpose of advancing the cause of one State or the other. Our only consideration is what is in the interests of this country, what will advance the cause of this country and what will lead to the prosperity of this country. If we are satisfied that a particular decision is necessary in the national interests, it is our duty—it is our bounden duty, I would say—to implement that decision and to implement it bodly and not to worry about the future prospects. People in a momentary frenzy might feel one way or the other because they are not fully conversant and they are not in a position to appreciate all the facts in their proper perspective. For some time they may feel that some injustice had been done to them but when the full picture is presented before them....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : By the artist, hon. Mr. Leuva.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA : It is not a question of artist. If my hon. friend wants to know the reason why the meeting in Ahmedabad was not held, I am prepared to give it because in their heart of hearts they know that they have got a weak case in Gujarat and they feel that if Mr. Morarji Desai is allowed to address a meeting in Ahmedabad probably they will have to pack up and they will have to go somewhere else. I am dead certain about it and Gujarat knows what services have been rendered by Mr. Morarji Desai. He has spent his whole lifetime in the service of Gujarat. Even before the name of Mr. Gopalan or anybody was heard in the streets of Ahmedabad, Mr. Morarji Desai was sweating in Ahmedabad to serve the cause of Gujaratis. The people in Gujarat will realise that he is the last man to betray the cause of Gujarat, bin today the students, young people, impulsive as they are, have been taken hold of my hon. friends sitting opposite and they have aroused their passion. Now, what do these students understand about linguistic States or reorganisation of States on linguistic grounds ? Gujarat does not claim to have any State of its own. As a matter of fact, in Gujarat we had a Mahratta King. 1 myself belong to a State where a Mahratta King was ruling, because I come from Baroda State. But these gentlemen wanted to utilise this heaven-sent opportunity. They have collected signatures. Sir, I have seen people signing without knowing the contents. Those petitions....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Were you in Ahmedabad 7

SHRI P. T. LEUVA : They were printed petitions. Sir, petitions can be got printed and you can get them signed by any person without his coming to know the contents. That cannot be a true gauge of the feelings of the peo-

pie. Sir, the people there had an opportunity of expressing their opinion barely one year back regarding the future of Gujarat. If they had really wanted a State of their own, they would certainly have gone before the Commission and asked for it. Today who is asking for a State of Gujarat ? It is our hon. friends "sitting there, and surely my friend knows that the moment this cools down, they will have no legs to stand upon in Ahmedabad. I have remained in Ahmedabad and I know for twenty years they have been trying to establish one union but they have not succeeded. In Ahmedabad the Labour Union has been working since 1921 and not one iabourer has joined this movement. Those persons represent the working class of this country and my friends could surely have got the support of the working class in Ahmedabad but they did not get any support from them because the working class in Ahmedabad knows what Communism is and what Communists are. Now, Sir, here comes from the mouth of my hon. friend Shri

Bhupesh Gupta, that there shall not be a bilingual State of Bombay. I wonder at his logic. If you remember, Sir, they believe in one motto that the working

class of the world should be united together. This is their motto. They shout it from the housetops but when it comes to the question of Bengali and Bihari brethern uniting together, I do not know what happens to them. They throw away their principles like anything. Of course,

I know that they are people of expediency ; they have no principle; they have no policy, I submit, Sir.that it is in

[Shri P. T. Leuva.] the interests of this country and it is in the interest of the Bombay state that there should be a composite State of Bombay and when the situation becomes normal, when the people are in a mood to listen to reason, I am quite definite that the formula which has now been embodied in this Bill will be accepted by Gujarat as a whole.

Sir, my friend referred to the question of Maharashtra. Probably, he does not understand the Marathi language. I can speak Marathi as well as understand Marathi. If he had been to Bombay State recently, he could have taken the opportunity to tour in Maharashtra and he would have found that there is overwhelming support for the bilingual Bombay State. And I submit, Sir, if he has got any sense of responsibility, let him ascertain the facts and then make a statement before the House. It is no use delivering a speech based on imagination, so far as Maharashtra is concerned.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I cited a resolution passed by the Samyukta Maharashtra Parisad.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA : Sir. there have been several revolutions in Maharashtra and....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know there have been revolutions but I referred to the resolution passed by the Samyukta Maharashtra parishad.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA: Yes; I know the people who belong to this Samyukta Maharashtra Parishad. There are two or three friends from the P.S.P., and the rest belong to my hon. friend's party. Of course, at a meeting in Poona it was a very strange sight to see some time back Mr. N. C. Chatterjee, Mr. A. K. Gopa-lan and Mr. H. V. Kamath addressing the meeting from the same platform. It was a strange combination. No doubt, those friends who talk about high principles, democracy, people's democracy and all that....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I shall be only too glad to address a meeting with Mr. Datar from the same platform if only he would give up his stand.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA: But Mr. Datar may not like to address the meeting which you are likely to address.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That is a different matter.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA : So far as that party is concerned, there is no question of any principle or any policy. It is only a question of catching hold of any opportunity to advance their cause. Sir, history will pass judgment on what they have done. Right from the days of Telangana till today....

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR : Is not Mr. N. C. Chatterjee a national of this country ?

SHRI P. T. LEUVA : I do admit that Mr. N. C. Chatterjee as well as you, both of you, are citizens of India. I do not dispute that. But from the days of Telangana what have they been doing ? Their sole motive has been not the prosperity of the country ; not that they want to advance the cause of any particular section of the people. Their whole idea is that whatever might be the result their party must be strengthened; at any cost they want to build up their party on the blood of innocents. That is their record and I am quite sure history will pass this judgment that when this country was on the road to prosperity, was moving towards unity, these were the people who stood in the way and who obstructed the way and I am sure that in times to come they will learn the lesson. At least, Sir, I must congratulate my friends from Andhra that they at least taught them a lesson in the Andhra elections.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am very grateful to the hon. Member for making a very nice provocative speech and he shall get it back.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : Sir, my hon. friend, Shri Leuva, has already answered most of the points that Shri Bhupesh Gupta has placed before us. I do not desire to go into this question except to point out only a few circumstances which would show that the people in Maharashtra, as also the people in Gujarat, are in favour, decidely in favour, of a bilingual State as it has now been evolved.

Now, much is made of the case of Gujarat and" we are told that Gujarat has always been in favour of a separate Gujarat State and that inasmuch as such a separate State of Gujarat has not been given, that is why all this confusion has arisen. I would invite the attention of hon. Members to paragraph 435 on page 20 of the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission wherein they have pointed out that when they recommended a bilingual State of

Bombay they took into account the case made out by a section of Gujarat for a Maha Gujarat State and after considering all the circumstances, they stated that they had rejected the case of Maha Gujarat. This is what they say:

> "What we have stated in the preceding paragraphs might seem to be unsatisfactory, from the point of view of the Gujarati-speaking people. These proposals, it may appear, constitute a total and summary rejection of the case for Maha Gujarat. It is not that we have not weighed carefully the merits and demerits of our proposals regarding Bombay from the point of view of the Gujarati people. Our assessment of Gujarati sentiment, as has been mentioned earlier, however, is that influential sections amongst the Gujaratis would prefer to stay in a composite State even after the separation of the Karnataka districts. We are strengthened in this belief by the categorical assurance of the Gujarat Pradesh Congress Committee to the effect that important elements amongst the Gujarati-speaking people would be prepared to live and to work together in one State with their Maharashtrian brethren in the larger national interests, as also in the interests of the city of Bombay, to which they seem to be greatly attached."

Therefore, it would be very clear that when this Report was published there was a total rejection of the claim for Maha Gujarat. I would invite my hon. friend's attention to the fact that after the publication of this Report — till only almost last week—there was absolutely no claim made, no dissatisfaction expressed, no discontent against the rejection of Maha- Gujarat claim by a section of the Gujarati population. In other words, we have taken this into account. So far as Gujarat is concerned, Gujarat was, as my friend has rightly pointed out, principally for a bilingual State. But if for example that State was not given to them for certain reasons, then they stated that they should have a claim for a separate Gujarat State. That is the purport of a resolution which was passed immediately after the publication of the States Reorganisation Commission Report. They stated that they wanted a bilingual State and in case this proposal was not acceptable Bombay State should be divided into three States— Maharashtra, Gujarat and Greater Bombay. Therefore, if for example it was the view not only of the leaders but of the population of Gujarat that they should have a larger State, then naturally we ought to understand that the present agitation against such a larger State must have been started by certain sections who were not happy with this happy solution of the Bombay question.

Now, so far as Maharashtra is concerned, we should also take into account this great fact that after the publication of the States Reorganisation Commission Report, the Maharashtra Provincial Congress Committee met in Poona and they passed a resolution the terms of which have been literally fulfilled in the present plan for a Bombay State consisting of Gujarat and Maha-rashtra. The hon. Member will also note that afier this Bill was passed in the Lok Sabha, when this important proposal was accepted has there been any agitation anywhere in Bombay, except in the smaller quarter represented by the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti? There also it will be found that the agitation is being kept up more or less for the sake of keping it up. But in the whole of Bombay, in the whole of Maharashtra, there is absolutely no agitation. On the other hand, as my friend has pointed out, there is a great measure of satisfaction with the evolution of a greater Bombay State, including Maharashtra and Gujarat. If this is the position so far as Maharashtra is concerned if this is the correct position so far as Gujarat is concerned, I am afraid my hon. friend has no case at all even as regards Gujarat.

Now, so far as Gujarat is concerned, the agitation is extremely recent. In fact, as it was pointed out, the question is whether this agitation has not been brought forward or reared under a sense of intimidation. The question is whether Gujarat has been denied the opportunity of a Gujarat State, whether the present agitation is or is not due to a feeling or an atmosphere of intimidation that has been created there by certain agencies which are not working in the highest interests of the nation. That is the reason why the great leader not only of Gujarat but of India, Shri Morarji Desai, had to take to fast for the purpose of purifying the whole atmosphere. He does not want anything so far as he is concerned. But he believes that the soul of Gujarat is likely to suffer if some such false agitation, such an unfounded agitation is being carried

[Shri B. N. Datar.]

on there. Therefore, it is that he has submitted himself to the fast and let us hope that the soul of Gujarat will rise and will make it possible for him to make a direct appeal to the people and that that appeal will be quite effective so far as the Gujarat population is concerned. I am quite confident that there would be this dawn of a new era in Gujarat....

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: Sir, I rise on a point of order....

SHRI B. N. DATAR : So far as Gujarat is concerned, Gujarat is a great place where Gandhiji was born. . . .

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: This amendment is not about Maha Gujarat. There is another amendment.

SHRr AKBAR ALI KHAN : He is not yielding.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : I am not yielding.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR : 1 am on a point of order. . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Nair, your leader has spoken on both the amendments. *(Interruption.)* Please hear me. He has spoken. When I called him to order, he said he was speaking on both the amendments.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I did not say that.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : My hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, spoke mostly on Gujarat and when you Sir, brought this particular amendment to his attention then he switched over to Maharashtra. So, I shall take both these things together.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR : Sir, there is a misunderstanding. I say there is another amendment, clause 8A, which he is discussing.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I know that. 1 brought it to the notice of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. He said this was the only opportunity to speak about Bombay. *(Interruptions.)* Please hear me. The House has heard the argu ments on both the amendments and he is replying. And if this is not accepted, that amendment is barred. New clause 8A will be barred.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR : I was also one of those Members who moved this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That is why he is replying.

SHRI B. N. DATAR : And, therefore, Sir, we are interested not only to have a larger bilingual State as such but we arc interested that the great province of Gujarat retains its own soul. That is a very important point from which Mr. Morarji Desai has been approaching this question. And, therefore, Mr. Morarji Desai has our good wishes and we hope that the situation would be cleared up very soon and that normalcy will reign, in the sense of the people understanding in the correct perspective the significance of the new proposal of a bilingual State which is entirely in accordance with their interests as pointed out by Shri Leuva.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

16. "That at page 5 and 6, for the existing clause 8, the following be substituted, namely : —

8. *'Formation of a new Maharashtra* State.—As from the appointed day, there shall formed a new Part A State to be known as the State of Maharashtra comprising the following territories namely :—

(a) Greater Bombay district, Thana, West Khandesh, East Khandesh, Nasik, Dangs, Ahmed-nagar, Sholapur, South Satara, North Satara, Kolhapur, Ratna-giri, Kolaba and Poona districts and Chandgad taluk of Belgaum district, in the existing State of Bombay;

(b) Aurangabad, Parbhani, Bhir and Asmanabad districts, Ahmedpur, Nilanga and Udgir taluks of Bidar district, Nanded district except Bichkonda and Jukka] circles of Deglur taluk and Mudhol, Bhiansa and Kuber circles of Mudhol taluk, and Isla-pur circle of Boath taluk, Kina-wat taluk and Rajpura taluk of Adilabad district in the existing State of Hyderabad ; and

(c) Buldana, Akola, Amravati Yeotmal, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara and Chanda districts in the existing State of Madhya Pradesh ;

and thereupon the said territories shall cease to form part of the existing States of Bombay, Hyderabad and Madhya Pradesh, respectively'."

The House divided: Ayes—5 ; Noes —43.

AYES—5

Bodra, Shri T.
Gupta, Shri Bhupesh
Nair, Shri Govindan
Nair, Shri Perath Narayanan
Sekhar, Shri N. C.

NOES—43

Adityendra, Shri
Ahmad Hussain, Kazi
Anis Kidwai, Shrimati
Bharathi Shrimati K.
Bisht, Shri J. S.
Chatterjee, Shri J. C.
Chauhan, Shri Nawab Singh
Dassappa, Shri H. C.
Dharam Das, Shri A.
Doogar, Shri R. S.
Dube, Dr. R. P.
Hans Raj, Shri
John, Shri M.
Kapoor, Shri Jaspat Roy
Khan, Shri Akbar Ali
Khan, Shri Pir Mohammed
Lall, Shri Kailash Bihari
Latif, Shri Abdul
Leuva, Shri P. T.
Mahesh Saran, Shri
Maya Devi Chettry, Shrimati
Mazhar Imam, Syed
Nair, Shri Perath Narayanan
Sekhar, Shri N. C.
Misra, Shri S. D.
Nagoke, Jathedar U. S.
Rajagopalan, Shri G.
Raju, Shri A. S.
Rao, Shri V. C. Kesava
Reddy, Shri S. Chanda
Reddy, Shri K. C.
Reddy, Shri M. Govinda
Sahai, Shri Ram
Sarwate, Shri V. S.
Sharda Bhargava, Shrimati
Sharma, Shri Purna Chandra
Singh, Capt. Awadhes Pratap
Singh, Sardar Budh
Singh, Babu Gopinath
Singh, Shri Ram Kripal
Singh, Shri Vijay
Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
Valiulla, Shri M.
Varma, Shri C. L.
Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That clause 8 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 8 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : New, clause 8A is barred.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Why, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Because we have passed clause 8 which includes those portions of Gujarat.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I can quite understand that the areas which are there are included in the clause that we have passed. But there is also the question of the formation of a new State of Gujarat. It is at least not covered by the clause that we have passed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is covered by the inclusion of the Gujarat areas in the composite State. The House has practically rejected that amendment; it is barred.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Here, Sir, we are going by the text of clause 8A. Since these are areas which have already been included by clause 8 which is passed, to that extent it is barred. But within the text of the clause there is the question of the formation of a new Gujarat State. The clause that we passed does not say that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, there is nothing left to form a new Gujarat now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : We will find out what. .. .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : No. I have given my ruling.

Now we take up clause 9 of the Bill.

Clause 9—Formation of a new Madhya Pradesh State

SHRI K1SHEN CHAND: Sir, I move:

23. "That at page 6, at the end of line 8, after the word and figure 'sec tion 8', the words 'and the districts of Suraguja and Raigarh which shall be transferred to Bihar' be inserted."

CAPTAIN AWADHESH PRATAP SINGH : Sir, I move :

24. "That at page 6,—

(a) line 14, be deleted; and

(b) in line 17, for the words 'Bhopal and Vindhya Pradesh, res pectively' the words 'and Bhopal, respectively' be substituted."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The clause and the amendments are now before the House.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, if you look at the map of the new Madhya Pradesh, you will find that it contains two districts of Surguja and Raigarh. At one time, when Bengal was a very big province and when Orissa and Bihar were parts of it, these two districts were included in native Stales under that big Bengal. When Bengal was split up, a new State of Bihar was created and a new State of Orissa was created, and at the time of merger of States these two districts were incorporated in Madhya Pradesh. 1 submit, Sir, that linguistically and for various other reasons, these two districts are very much allied to Bihar, and therefore, if these two districts are transferred to Bihar, it will greatly help in the rehabilitation of the tribal areas. Right across Bihar up to Santhal Parganas there are tribal people, and it will be in the fitness of things if these districts are added on to Bihar so that the tribal people come under one Government.

कैप्टेन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह : उपसभापति महोदय, जब मैंने अपना पहला अमेंडमेंट मूव किया था उस समय मेरे मित्र दातार जी ने कहा कि हम लोग बड़े आराम से मध्य प्रदेश में रहेंगे, इसलिए हमको स्वीकार कर लेना चाहिये । उनकी आज्ञा मानने के लिए मैं सर्वदा प्रस्तुत हूं । परंतु मैं उनके सामने कुछ बात रख देना चाहता हूं जिससे उनको यह विदित हो जाय कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश के साथ अथवा बघेलखंड के साथ क्या बर्ताव किये जाने का भय है । जो कुछ मैं कल कह चुका हूं उसको दोहराने की आवश्यकता नहीं है । यह बात जरूर है कि अभी वहां पर फाइरिंग शुरू नहीं हुई है । पहले जब मध्य प्रदेश की पुलिस गई थी तो उसने फाइरिंग की थी और उसमें नहीं मालूम कितने आदमी जान से मारे गये और नहीं मालूम कितने घायल हुये । फिर किसी तरह से मध्य प्रदेश की पुलिस वापस गई और विन्ध्य प्रदेश कुछ दिनों के लिए हत्याकांड से बचा । अब फिर से हम वहीं भेजे जा रहे हैं । अभी नर हत्या नहीं प्रारम्भ हुई है, परन्तु हमारी आर्थिक हत्या प्रारम्भ हो चुकी है । वहां अभी जो नया बटवारा हुआ उसमें करोड़ों रुपया दूसरी जगहों को दिया गया । लाखों रुपया रायपुर के लिए दिया गया जो कभी कहीं की राजधानी भी नहीं थी । जबलपुर के लिए भी बहुत सा रुपया दिया गया । बेशक मैं भोपाल के लिए कुछ नहीं कहता क्योंकि उसको राजधानी बना दिया गया है । अगर उसको रुपया दिया गया है तो उसकी बाबत मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है । परन्तु जब दूसरी जगहों को बिल्डिंग बनाने के लिये रुपया दिया जा रहा है जिसमें नये आफिसेज खुलेंगे तो रीवां को अधिक रुपया क्यों नहीं दिया जा रहा है । रीवां को केवल तीन ही आफिसेज दिये गये हैं । यहां तक कि रीवां में जो अभी जगह है उसके लिये भी आफिसेज नहीं दिये गये हैं । इस तरह जहां तक हमारी राजनीतिक हत्या और आर्थिक हत्या का प्रश्न है, वह प्रारम्भ हो चुकी है । इसलिये मैं यह कहता हूं कि अगर आप हमें यू० पी० में नहीं भेजना चाहते तो जिस तरह से आपने हिमाचल प्रदेश को बचाया, उसी तरह से हमें भी बचाइये । जैसा होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा कि हिमाचल प्रदेश के लोगों ने यह कहा कि हमें पंजाब के मित्रों से बचाइये और इसलिये वे बच गये, तो हमें भी अगर मध्य प्रदेश के मित्रों से बचाया जाता तो शायद हमारे लिये बहुत अच्छा होता । हम यूनियन टेरीटरी की तरह रहने के लिये तैयार हैं जैसा कि हिमाचल प्रदेश के लिए प्रबन्ध किया गया है । हमारे यहां जितनी बार असेम्बली बैठी, हर बार उसने यह कहा कि हम अलाहदा रखे जायं । उत्तर प्रदेश या मध्य प्रदेश में मिलाने के सम्बन्ध

में जब सवाल आया तब वहां दो रायें अवश्य हुईं । परन्तु जहां तक इस यूनिट के कायम रहने का मामला है, वहां की बहुत बड़ी मेजारिटी इसके पक्ष में कहती आई है । दूसरी पार्टी वाले तो यह कहते ही आये हैं, प्रांतीय कांग्रेस कमेटी भी यही कहती चली आ रही है । तो जहां तक वहां की राय का मामला है, जब वहां के लोग यह चाहते हैं तब कोई कारण नहीं है कि हमारा विन्ध्य प्रदेश अलाहदा न रखा जाय ।

एक यह बात कही जाती है कि शायद इतना छोटा प्रांत चल नहीं सकेगा । एरिया में विन्ध्य प्रदेश केरला से बड़ा है जो कि एक प्रदेश बनाया जा रहा है । जहां तक हिमाचल प्रदेश का प्रश्न है, उससे एरिया में, पापुलेशन में, आमदनी में, जहां तक कि हर चीज में विन्ध्य प्रदेश बड़ा है । इसलिये मेरी यह प्रार्थना है कि अगर विन्ध्य प्रदेश को अलाहदा रखा जाता है तो अधिक अच्छा होता । इससे सेंटर को कोई तकलीफ भी नहीं होगी और उसका कोई खर्चा भी नहीं होगा बल्कि उसकी आमदनी बढ़ जायगी । अगर हमारे यहां के मिनरल आप काम में ले आयें तो करोड़ों अरबों की आमदनी सेंटर को मिल जायगी । अभी हमारे यहां डाइमंड माइंस को नैशनलाइज किया गया है और उससे कम से कम आठ दस करोड़ रुपया हर साल गवर्नमेंट को मिल जाया करेगा । जब एक माइन से सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट को इतना रुपया मिल जायगा, तो मैं नहीं समझता कि.....

(*Time bell rings.*)

एक मिनट में मैं खत्म कर दूंगा । अब मैं यह बतला दूं कि क्या क्या वहां पर हो सकता है । coal के अतिरिक्त iron-ore, lime-stone, bauxite, ochres, ceramic and refractory clays, sillimanite, corrundum ये सब चीजें वहां पर हैं । अलावा इनके और भी बहुत से मिनरल्स वहां पर हैं जैसे कि monazite और uranium जिनकी बड़ी भारी आवश्यकता है ।

(*Time bell rings.*)

Gallium, venadium, gem-stone, mica, copper, iron ore, quartz, felspar, gypsum, fireclay, ball clay, marble deposits आदि बहुत से मिनरल्स वहां पर हैं । अगर सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट इनको काम में ले आये और वहां काम करे तो बहुत कुछ फायदा हम लोगों को भी हो जायेगा और इनके नैशनलाइजेशन से सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को भी डाइरेक्ट आमदनी का एक जरिया मिल जायगा । इसके अलावा भारतवर्ष के मध्य में होने की वजह से इमरजेंसी के लिये यहां पर एक अच्छा कैपिटल भी बन सकता है । दिल्ली एक किनारे में है और मैं समझता हूं कि इस दृष्टि से वहां पर एक कैपिटल बनाया जाय । वह जगह कैपिटल के लिये बहुत ही अच्छी होगी ।

(*Times bell rings.*)

श्री उपसभापति : यह सब सोच रहे हैं । आप खत्म कीजिये ।

कैप्टेन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह : अगर यह सब नहीं हो सकता है तो कम से कम हमको यह विश्वास दिला दिया जाय कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट हमारी रक्षा करेगी ।

(*Times bell rings.*)

अगर आप हमको जबरन मध्य प्रदेश में ही भेजना चाहते हैं तो कम से कम हमें यह विश्वास तो दिला ही दिया जाय ।

SHRI T. BODRA (Bihar): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the amendment put forward by Shri Kishen Chand. I would like to submit that Surguja, Korea, Changbhakar, Jas-pur and Udajpore were small native States prior to independence and when India got independence, they were merged into Madhya Pradesh. Now these five Stales have been divided into two districts—Surguja and Raigarh. What I want to convince the Home Minister is that this is a part and parcel of Chota-)ur plateau. Chotanagpur Division is confined 1o Ranchi, Hazaribagh, Palamau, Singhbhum, Santhal Parganas and Manbhum districts only and just by the side—on the other side of the river Sankh—there are these Surguja and Raigarh districts. The Chotanagpur Tenancy Act is applicable to the Chotanagpur Division only and the Uraons, Munda. Kharia, Jowang, Hoe and other aboriginals who are inhabitants of these districts, *viz-*, Surguja and Raigarh, are not being protected under this special Tenancy Act which is known as the Chotanagpur Tenancy Act, with the result that they are subjected to exploitation.

Then second point is that the people of Surguja and Raigarh, if they are attached to Bihar, then Patna High Court will be nearer to them. Now the capital of Madhya Pradesh has been

[Shri T. Bodra.]

shifted to Bhopal and it will be more than 800 miles from Surguja and Rai-garh. I want to submit that it will be very difficult for the tribals to make a trip of 800 miles or to find sufficient finance to engage lawyers after travelling 800 miles. Therefore, I support the amendment of Shri Kishen Chand.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : (Bihar) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, on behalf of the people and the State of Bihar 1 must express my sense of deep obligation to the hon. Member from Hyderabad who wants these two districts of Madhya Pradesh to be transferred to us.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Though you are not very keen on it?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : I would rathei disappoint him. For, we never covet the land of others and we don't covet these two districts. We don't want that these two districts should come to us. Moreover, I feel that his amendment is constitutionally improper. For, article 3 says that when a territory is to be added to a State or subtracted from a State, the opinion of both the States has to be sought and the opinion of the State of Bihar was not sought to this proposal of transfer.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI KISHEN CHAND : On a point of explanation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That is his opinion.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : On these grounds, I feel that there is no justification for the amendment of the hon. Member which is so generous to us but generous at the cost of others.

श्री राम सहाय (मध्य भारत) : मैं बहुत ही संक्षेप में कहूंगा ।

उपसभापति महोदय, अभी कैप्टेन साहब ने विन्ध्य प्रदेश को मध्य प्रदेश में सम्मिलित न करने के बारे में जो बात कही है उसके सम्बन्ध में ही दो शब्द कहना चाहता हूं । अभी उन्होंने यह शिकायत की है कि बहुत सा रुपया जगह-जगह बांटा गया लेकिन अभी तो मध्य प्रदेश स्टेट एक्जिस्टेंस में ही नहीं आया है तो फिर रुपये बांटने का सवाल ही कैसे पैदा हुआ ?

कैप्टेन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह : प्रपोजल सब छप गये हैं ।

श्री राम सहाय : शायद उनको कुछ गलत फहमी है । जहां तक डिपार्टमेंट्स के बटवारे का सवाल है उसके बारे में बहुत सोच समझ कर और दानिशमन्दी के साथ फैसला किया गया है और उसमें उनके चीफ मिनिस्टर भी शरीक थे । मैं सिर्फ उनको यह विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूं कि जैसी अन्याय की आशंका उन्होंने मध्य प्रदेश के लोगों से की है वैसी आशंका नहीं करनी चाहिये । अगर किसी वजह से उनके ख्याल में ऐसी बात हो और मध्य प्रदेश से कोई अनुचित व्यवहार की आशंका हो तो मैं मध्य भारत की ओर से उन्हें विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूं कि ऐसा कभी नहीं होने दिया जायेगा । हमने और विन्ध्य प्रदेश वालों ने कांग्रेस के तहत सेंट्रल इंडिया एजेंसी के समय से बहुत अर्से तक आल इंडिया स्टेट पीपुल्स कांग्रेस के तत्त्वावधान में एक साथ मिल कर काम किया है । मैं उनको यकीन दिलाता हूं कि हम लोग कोई ऐसी इंजस्टिस कदापि नहीं होने देंगे । उनको अपने अमेंडमेंट को वापस ले लेना चाहिये ।

SHRI B. N. DATAR : Sir, I oppose both the amendments.

* Amendment No. 24 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

23. "That at page 6, at the end of line 8, after word and figure 'section 8' the words 'and the districts of Surguja and Raigarh which shall be transferred to Bihar' be inserted."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That clause 9 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted. Clause 9 was added to the Bill. Clause 10 was added to the Bill.

Clause 11—*Formation of a new Punjab State.*

SHRI KISHEN CHAND : Sir, I move:

25. "That page 7, after line 6, the following be inserted, namely :—

'(c) the territories of the existing Part C State of Himachal Pradesh ;'."

*For text of amendment, *vide* col. 139 *supra,*

SHRI C. L. VARMA (BiJaspur and Himachal Pradesh) : Sir I move :

112. "That at page 7, line 4, after the word 'Punjab', the words 'except Simla district, the township of Dal-housie and Baklot of Gurdaspur dis trict and Kulu sub-division of Kangra district' be inserted."

I also move:

113. "That at page 7, at the end of line 6, after the word 'Union', the words 'except Kohistan district' be inserted."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The clause and the amendments are before the House.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have already stated that under our Constitution 1 cannot see any justification for having any Union terri tories and eventually though it is now called Part C. State _____

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The same arguments ?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Yes.

श्री चरनजीलाल वर्मा : उपसभापति महोदय, जहां तक श्री किशन चन्द जी के अमेंडमेंट का सवाल है और हिमाचल प्रदेश के लोगों का सवाल है मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि हिमाचल प्रदेश के लोगों ने यह आज नहीं कहा है बल्कि सन् १९४८ ई० में ही कह दिया था कि वे कहां रहना चाहते हैं । इस वास्ते मैं इनके अमेंडमेंट को अपोज करता हूं ।

जहां तक मेरे अमेंडमेंट का सवाल है, जैसा कि मैंने पहले ही जनरल डिसकशन के वक्त में कहा है कि ये जो डलहौजी और बकलोट के छोटे छोटे स्थान हैं और उसी तरह से कालका से चलते हुए जो छोटे छोटे स्थान आते हैं उन सबको एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव कनवीनिएंस के वास्ते हिमाचल प्रदेश के साथ लगा देना जरुरी है । एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव कनवीनिएंस के खयाल से यह जरूरी होगा कि इनको हिमाचल प्रदेश के साथ लगा दिया जाय । मैं उम्मीद करता हूं कि मिनिस्टर साहब इस पर गौर करेंगे ।

SHRI B. N. DATAR : Sir, I oppose these.

* Amendments Nos. 112 and 113 were, by leave, withdrawn.

*For text of amendments, *vide* col. 145 *supra.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

25. "That at page 7, after line 6, the following be inserted, namely :—

'(c) the territories of the existing Part C State of Himachal Pradesh;'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That clause 11 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 11 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 12 and 13 were added to the Bill.

New Clause 13*A*

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir. I move :

33. "That at page 9, after line 33, the following new clause be inserted, namely :—

T3A. (1) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this Part, one or more Boundary Commissions shall be appointed by the Central Government to go into, various disputes about boundaries' and their inclusions and exclusions from the various States.

(2) The Boundary Commission or Commissions shall decide on the basis of the principles of—

(i) linguistic majority; (ii) village as a unit; and (iii) contiguity of area.

(3) Regarding tribal areas people belonging to the same tribes should not, as far as possible, be arbitrarily divided but attached to those States where it is most conducive for their speedy economic, social and cultural progress.

(4) The decisions of the Boundary Commission shall be binding on the States concerned and will have effect as included in this Part'."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is open for discussion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I don't think that we can finish with this clause today. We

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] have one minute unless you are prepared to sit late. Now we want to make a provision here for a Boundary Commission and the ideas tor such a thing are given in the text of the amendment that you have before you. It is argued by some Members opposite and by some people outside that there should not be any Boundary Commission in the country. Their reasoning is that once you have a Boundary Commission, there will always be disputes, controversies, arid all these things will be kept alive.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You can continue on the next day.

PETITION ON THE STATES REORGANISATION, BILL, 1956

SHRI HANS RAI (Punjab): Sir, I beg to present a petition signed by 100 inhabitants of the town of Dalhousie with respect to the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956.

*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 24th August 1956.

GIPN—SV—17 Rajya Sabha/56—2-8-57—470