

THE STATES REORGANISATION BILL, 1956—continued

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we go back to the discussion on the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, since the last debate in the Rajya Sabha on the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission took place, much has been said on the subject in Parliament and outside. However, so far as I can see, no new or original arguments have been advanced by the protagonists of either side. The same old arguments and the same old, old accusations are repeated and with your permission, Sir, I shall summarise them in this way.

The question is asked: Does Bombay belong to Maharashtra? One side says it does and the other side says it does not.

Is Bombay, geographically and historically part of Maharashtra? Again one side says it does form part of it and the other side says it does not.

Who depend more for their subsistence on Bombay, the Gujaratis or the Maharashtrians? To this question, both sides give arguments which suit them. But the truth is that not only Gujaratis and the Maharashtrians, but many others depend on the city of Bombay.

Will the streets of Bombay decide the issue? Well, attempts have been made to get it decided that way.

Will the Prime Minister give way to violence or pressure tactics? Some say he must and others say that he must not.

Sir, so far as I am concerned I am a Bombayite and I like to remain a Bombayite. Bombay is not going away from India and if it is centrally administered, all Maharashtrians, all Gujaratis as well as all the other people who are staying in Bombay

today, will continue to live there, earn there and will be at liberty to send their earnings to their families who may be living in Maharashtra or Gujarat or any other part of the country or even outside the country. But the chief thing is that no group will discriminate or dominate over the other. And, Sir, in my opinion, in many respects, that would be better for the Gujaratis, the Maharashtrians and all the others concerned, in the absence of a bilingual State, than being a part of one linguistic group or a State.

I do not want to repeat all the arguments against the claims of Maharashtrians because I had an opportunity of doing so last time when the debate took place here on the subject. No new factors have come to light, except threats, threats of resignation, violence and misbehaviour, although the last is disclaimed by the leaders. Sir, the leaders themselves do not commit violence. They merely make speeches showing the way, suggesting that this will happen and that will happen, meaning what should happen; and then they become very pious and say that they did not preach violence. Then the question is, who incites the masses? I have no quarrel with the other political parties, because they are here to fight the Congress Government and the Congress Party in every possible way, and this provides them an opportunity to do so. But when such things are done by Congressmen, I am most certainly pained.

Sir, Congressmen in Maharashtra said that they will not fight the elections as Congressmen if the city of Bombay is not given to them. Having incited the masses, probably they cannot go to them. Or is this a clever device to impress upon the Prime Minister so that the High Command might submit to these threats?

If the high command submits to them, they promise to be good Congressmen but if the high command decides things impartially, they will be sullen and threaten to quit. I can tell you this that if the high command

[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.]

gives way to pressure tactics, it will be difficult for it to resist such tactics anywhere else. What will happen in Orissa which is ready for trouble? What will happen in Bengal? What will happen in Bihar and in many other places? As soon as people in other areas find that the high command can be coerced, mischief will be let loose everywhere. If the Maharashtra Congressmen say that they will not fight the elections unless you concede their demand, Orissa can say the same thing that unless you give Seraikella they will not fight the elections. It will really be a sad day for India if such tactics are allowed to rule the day and you will be doing wrong to those people who, against their wishes, accepted the decision of the high command. People of Vidarbha, people of Telangana, people of Punjab and others accepted the decision given by the high command for the sake of discipline, not because they were willing to merge themselves with some others. What about them? Would they not feel that they should also have stood out? If violence and threats could alter the decisions of the high command, where will be the rule of law?

There are always two sides to every question. To the leaders of Samyukta Maharashtra, the prosperity of Maharashtra is paramount but not the prosperity of Gujarat. The cause of the poor people in Maharashtra is sacred but not the cause of the poor people in Gujarat; they are not even to be mentioned. The Gujaratis are capitalists and Jews who are to be suppressed. With the exception of a handful of capitalists in Ahmedabad, the poor people in Gujarat are as numerous as they are in Maharashtra. In Maharashtra also, there are capitalists. Are they even mentioned here? Maharashtrians must have a territory wherever they are in a majority; wherever they are not in a majority, they must have it too as the single largest group. Even where they are in a minority they must have it and force people to learn their language.

Take Umbergaon. This is what is happening there. Take Dang. This is what is happening there. They are poor people but their cause is not pleaded. Nobody knows about them even.

Now, coming to the language, what will be the language of Bombay if it goes to the Maharashtrians? In Bombay today, all the Indian languages are spoken and schools are run in every Indian language for almost every language group. Once Bombay goes to Maharashtra, the language of the State will be Marathi; the language of the High Court will be Marathi; the language of the University will be Marathi. It will never remain a State where people from all parts of India speaking different languages will get a fair deal.

The leaders of Maharashtra are masters of effective language and epithets. We have seen it here, day in and day out. They are also masters of propaganda and know how to press their point if necessary even at the point of the bayonet. If anybody speaks his or her mind which is not to the liking of the leaders of Samyukta Maharashtra, the leaders will try to brow-beat the person by abuse. I have known in Bombay the protagonists of Samyukta Maharashtra threatening the wife and children and even the property of any person who dares to speak against the claims of Samyukta Maharashtra. Nobody knows whether his wife will come intact or whether his children will come intact. You know, Sir, in Bombay people live in mixed localities. The telephone will ring giving threats. The letters will come giving threats. If a prominent Marathi lady speaks against women's molestation, she is abused in the Marathi papers and she is threatened with disclosures of invented secrets about her. One can always say that she had so many lovers and it will be very difficult to go and refute such an argument. It is not very easy for any such person to go to the courts and get redress. On

account of such tactics, naturally people get scared but if any one dares to speak against such tactics and against the misbehaviour of the masses, they abuse these people and threaten them. The art of bullying is used to perfection.

Then there are threats of strike, picketing, morchas, adjournment motions, etc., which we are seeing. We are seeing some of the picketing here also. It has come to Delhi even. I ask this august House, are we here to be carried away by threats or by such tactics? Or are we here to decide this issue dispassionately and do justice to all our countrymen? Are we going to be carried away in this way? Are we going to throw those who did not use pressure tactics to the wolves? This is a very grave question.

The judgment of the three Commissions is against giving Bombay to Maharashtra. The sound judgment of our elder statesmen also is for the keeping of Bombay as a separate unit. So far, Bombay was not a unilingual State and so, no single group could discriminate against or dominate over others. Even now, when the Gujaratis and the Maharashtrians will be separated, Bombay City will remain bilingual and nobody will be able to dominate over the other. The protagonists of Maharashtra say that they speak in the name of justice but then justice should be for both, not for one side or the other. Justice should be done to both the Gujaratis and Maharashtrians and the Centre should hold the scales even for both. They cannot say that the decision of the high command could be just only if it is according to their wishes and not otherwise. There should be some finality. Nobody wants to be unjust to the Maharashtrians; on the contrary, the high command has taken great pains to satisfy the leaders of Maharashtra. They had even persuaded Vidarbha to join with Maharashtra although it was reluctant to do so. I should say to the Maharashtrian leaders, "By your words and

deeds you should inspire confidence in the others. Some of you have quoted Vinobhaji but you leave away one important proviso and that is that you should get Bombay only with the consent of the Gujaratis, consent not by coercion but by love". You know, Sir, what sort of love is shown to the Gujaratis. That is self-evident and I need not go into that question. When you quote Vinobhaji, do you always follow him in everything, in whatever he says? How many of you do that, may I know? If we submit to threats and pressure tactics of this kind, very soon we shall see the disintegration of the whole of India. Those who believe in violent agitation will know that by pressure tactics, threats and violence they can get everything and we shall be unjust to the people who loyally abide by our decision and shall lose their confidence. There is one more thing in the Bill about which I should like to say a word. Only five seats are given to Bombay in Parliament. Bombay's population is double that of Delhi which gets four seats according to the Bill. Bombay is not less important and the people of Bombay are a live democracy. Bombay has not been allowed to be a State and so it will not have any legislature and so I think, Sir, that it would be fair if 8 seats are given to the city of Bombay. I hope, Sir, even at this late stage better sense will prevail and the leaders of Maharashtra will act up to the saying, "Do unto others what you like to be done unto yourself."

Thank you very much.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): My main purpose in intervening in this discussion today is to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the case of the much-suffering and much-sinned against State of West Bengal. Bombay has monopolised the discussion on this subject. I have no quarrel with Bombay Members for having stolen the limelight, for I am convinced that they have a reasonable case. The more I have heard the discussion on the Bombay issue, the

[Shri B. C. Ghose.]

more I am convinced of the claim of Maharashtra to the Bombay city.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad):
Hear, hear.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Just now we found Shrimati Munshi arguing the case against the inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra. I am afraid there was not one single argument that was advanced against it. I do not intend to say that anybody should be coerced into making any decision, but the fact whether there has been violence or not, does not, to my mind, affect the merits of the case. The merits of the case should be considered as they stand. The very fact that the Government and the Congress High Command have been reconsidering this case from time to time shows that the claim of Maharashtra to Bombay cannot be just brushed aside, and I do hope that prestige will not stand in the way of coming to a reasonable, equitable and satisfactory decision on this issue. It has however to be remembered that injustice has been done not merely to Maharashtra but to other parts of India as well for example, to Orissa and to West Bengal. The disappointment and discontent of the people there are as wide and as deep as they have been in the case of the people of Maharashtra in regard to Bombay. It is not my purpose here to repeat the arguments that I advanced when the S.R.C. Report was under discussion to show how the Commission had not done full justice to the claims of Bengal. Now that is past history. Then the Commission's recommendations were out and the Government also came to certain decisions modifying the recommendations of the S.R.C.

As you know, Sir, the people of Bengal were extremely dissatisfied not only with the recommendations of the S.R.C. but more so with the decisions of the Government of India further truncating the territory which was to be given to Bengal. At that moment, Sir, came this proposal—I do not know

how you would describe it, whether it is merger or union or amalgamation or whatever you call it. From the outset it was apparent that the people of Bengal were against that proposal. The question was how were they going to apprise the authorities that the people of Bengal did not favour the proposal. It has become a fashion today Sir, for people, who themselves had resorted to that tactics in former times, to decry Satyagraha or hartal even though they are most peaceful. I would ask the hon. Minister to indicate the ways and means by which the people who were dissatisfied with Government measures may ventilate their grievances and may carry conviction to the authorities that what they want to ventilate is the true state of affairs, is what the people want. The Satyagraha that has been going on in Calcutta has, as everybody knows, been peaceful. The Hartals that took place there were the most successful ever witnessed in India. When these facts were brought to the notice of the Government, the Government said that they were not satisfied and that they felt that not only the people acted under a misconception, which is a different matter, but that these demonstrations did not reveal the wishes or the temper of the people. The fact that 10,000 people have so far courted arrest and have been imprisoned is sought to be explained away. The fact that there have been demonstrations and hartals is also sought to be explained away. The fact which carries weight with the Government is what the Chief Minister of West Bengal says, whether he carries the support of the people with him or not. It has to be realised that the West Bengal Assembly was elected in 1952 on issues which were vitally different. If the Government had only stated that they would democratically ascertain the wishes of the people as to whether they were in favour of this proposal or not, certainly there would have been no Satyagraha, no Hartal. It has become a fashion, as I said, to condemn these practices as it is becoming the fashion to condemn

unilinguism as an enemy of the people or as endangering the security and integrity of the country. Nothing could be farther from the truth, Sir. Unilinguism does not in any way endanger the unity or the security of the country as the partition of Andhra from Madras did not. I think there has been better relationship after that partition.

Now, Sir, the fact about the Bengal situation is this that certain proposals were adumbrated—what the proposals were the people were not told in detail. Now could you think of any measure in a democratic country about which the people are not taken into confidence and at the same time they are asked to support? I ask the hon. Minister here to tell us in precise terms as to what is the proposal that has ever been put before the people to which they were asked to signify their support. Now, whatever that may be, there was a merger proposal once. Then that was diluted to a union. Now it has come to a loose union. I do not know what it is, what the contents of the proposal are, and it is extremely surprising that when the Chief Minister of West Bengal returned to Calcutta after he was last time in Delhi and he was asked about the fundamentals on which he had come to an agreement with the Chief Minister of Bihar, he said, he was not going to give any details at that moment and that it would be only after the 2nd of May, by which time the by-election results would be out, that he would take the people into confidence. Could you conceive, Sir, of anything more undemocratic? Why should the people of Bengal be denied the right of knowing what the proposals are, particularly if there was any agreement on fundamentals. Probably there was no agreement on fundamentals and the Chief Minister was bluffing the people or, if there was any agreement on fundamentals he had no right to keep them away from the people so that the people could discuss the proposals and give their opinion. That also, Sir, is past

history. Today you might have noticed that both the President of the West Bengal Pradesh Congress Committee and the Chief Minister of West Bengal have demanded that the territories of Bihar and West Bengal should be redemarcated in accordance with the decision of the Central Government on the recommendations made by the S.R.C.

12 NOON

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Sir, May I know the relevance of the remarks of the hon. Member because this Bill contains no provisions about Bengal and Bihar union?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: There is reference to that if the hon. Member will refer to the Objects and Reasons.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: His complaint is that even the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission have not been accepted.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: If he refers to page 56 of the Bill to which, I am sure, he has not referred.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all right. You go on.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: It says here, "in view of the proposals for amalgamation of Bihar and West Bengal....." I say that this is a mis-statement of facts. There is no proposal for the amalgamation of the two States. The Chief Minister of West Bengal has stated that there is no such proposal and the last proposal that he had put forward was one of a loose union. I was going to say that the Chief Minister of West Bengal—let alone the President of the West Bengal State Congress—has demanded that the territories of the two States should be redemarcated and it appears that nothing is now going to happen in regard to this proposal of merger or amalgamation because already the two Congress Presidents of Bihar and West Bengal have started quarrelling. It has now become absolutely clear what was the purpose which underlay

[Shri B. C. Ghose.]
that proposal. On the Bihar side it was their wish and hope that there should be no redemarcation of the territories of the two States; on the West Bengal side it was their fear—hon. Members may not agree with me—of the rising force of the Opposition parties and it was the hope that the United State would give a permanent majority to the Congress. Now, anything which is approached with a political motive or is not based on sound foundations or on good logic can never carry conviction with the people and that is what has happened in this case as well. Sir, I want a clear and categorical answer from the hon. the Home Minister as to what the intention of the Government is with regard to West Bengal today now that the amalgamation proposal has completely fallen through and the Chief Minister of West Bengal has demanded that a redemarcation of the boundaries should forthwith be done. That is the first question that I should like the hon. Minister to bear in mind.

Sir, the way in which this question has been tackled so far shows the Government's utter disregard to public opinion in that part of the country. The Government was hoping that a few by-elections would indicate the trend of public opinion. If that is so, that also is now almost over. One of the by-elections to the local Assembly has been over and the result is also out. In that the Congress has been defeated. In the other by-election also, although it was a constituency where there were 40% of non-Bengali votes, indications are that the Congress is likely to lose. Will the Government take these facts as sure evidences of the people's wish and desire and now say as to what their intentions are with regard to Bengal?

The second question that I should like to ask the hon. Minister is this. When will the arrangements with regard to West Bengal be completed? The Home Minister had stated that the reorganised States will be brought into being on the 2nd October. Will

he adhere to that date so far as West Bengal is concerned also or will there be any changes? If so, when does the Government intend to bring in a Bill in regard to West Bengal and Bihar? I do not think it will be possible in this session but will it be done in the August session. When does the Government of India intend to circulate the proposed Bill to the States concerned? I do not want to say anything more on Bengal. These are the two questions to which I should like a direct answer and I repeat them.

Firstly, I want to know whether the Government of India agree that the decision that they have taken on the States Reorganisation Commission's recommendation will stand, now that the amalgamation proposal has been dropped. I may here add that West Bengal is not satisfied with that recommendation. West Bengal feels that she has been very shabbily treated and her just claims had been ignored both by the Commission and the Government of India. However that may be, the question that I asked and the answer that I wanted was in regard to the recommendations of the Commission and the decision taken by the Government. The second question is, when will the readjustments in regard to Bengal take place?

Sir, there were many other matters to which I wanted to refer but as you expressed a desire that I should cut my observations short, there are only two or three things that I should like to ask the hon. Minister. One is in regard to the Zonal Councils. The Zonal Councils can be a machinery for doing much good, but one possibly has to suspend judgment today until one has seen it working for sometime. One thing can be stated that the distribution of the States does not seem to be very rational because some of the States which were interlinked had been assigned to different zones.

Secondly, I wish that Andaman and Nicobar Islands should have been included in the Eastern Zone. Although that is union territory and

is administered by the Centre, those islands are closely associated with West Bengal. Even today the High Court of Calcutta has jurisdiction over Andaman and Nicobar Islands and there is also the question of refugee rehabilitation. A very large number of East Bengal refugees have been sent over to Andaman and Nicobar Islands for rehabilitation. It would be in the fitness of things if these islands were also to be represented on the Eastern Zonal Council.

I feel, further, that provision should be made here for the rules of procedure for conduct of business by the Zonal Councils. Everything seems to have been left to the Zonal Councils themselves. It may not function properly unless the Central Government were to lay down the rules of procedure for the conduct of business in those Councils.

Finally, I should like to draw the attention of the hon. the Home Minister to certain observations which were made by the Commission in regard to safeguards for linguistic groups. In particular, I would refer him to the two recommendations made by the Commission. One was in regard to instruction in their mother-tongue at the primary school stage subject to sufficient number of students being available and this the Commission recommended should be done on the lines of the provisions contained in article 347 of the Constitution. I should like to know what the Government intends to do or has done in this matter.

Similarly, in regard to the recommendation about domicile tests in force in certain States which operate to the disadvantage of the minority groups, the Commission had recommended that the Government of India should undertake legislation under article 16(3) of the Constitution in order to simplify and liberalise the requirements as to residence. I should also like to know as to what the Government intends to do in this regard.

I hope that the hon. Shri Datar would convey the questions that I had asked to the hon. the Home Minister so that I can get a categorical answer. If he wants I may repeat the two questions to which I wanted answers from the Home Minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They will be conveyed to him. It is not necessary.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: If I may repeat the points on which I wanted answers from the Home Minister were these. (1) Now that the proposal for amalgamation, which is referred to in this Bill, has been completely dropped and further the Chief Minister of West Bengal has demanded a redemarcation of the boundaries of West Bengal based on the decision of the Government of India taken on the recommendations of the S.R.C., what do the Government propose to do? (2) What will be the time when the redistribution of territories of West Bengal and Bihar—which we hope will take place—will be given effect to?

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the storm centre of the debate on this Bill as I see it from the papers is the position assigned to the City of Bombay. As is obvious from the Bill this City which was a premier city in the civic affairs of this country has been brought down to the level of Andaman and Nicobar Islands—what has been described in our Constitution as the territories of India. That means that these territories and now the City of Bombay will not have any Legislature or Executive. Nobody in his widest dreams could have conceived of such a madness. A city which has been in the forefront of India, which has taught politics to India, is now placed on the level of the Laccadive and Maldiv Islands and the Nicobar Islands. I am sure that the Government which has fostered this proposal must have the strongest reasons, incontrovertible reasons, in order to justify the decision that they have taken. There have been contestants to the claim for

[Dr. B. R. Ambedkar.]

the City of Bombay. There are the Maharashtrians who claim that the city belongs to them. There are our Gujarati friends; I do not know on what basis they lay their claim, but they claim a kind of an easement over the city. They say that they will not allow the city to go into the possession of the Maharashtrians and the quarrel is going on. It has been admitted by no less a person than Mr. Morarji Desai that Bombay belongs to Maharashtra. I have read his speech which he delivered to the Gujarat Maha Pradesh Congress, or something like that, in which he categorically made this statement that Bombay belongs to Maharashtra. If that is so, I am quite unable to understand what objection there can be for the city of Bombay to be given to Maharashtra. Under the British regime when citizenship was common, any man could go anywhere and reside and the local people could not object. Under those circumstances various people from various Provinces have gone to cities located in other Provinces. They built up their interests and have lived there for generations. But in the redistribution that we are now making, I have not seen anybody—non-Madrasi living in Madras—raising objection to Madras being given to the Tamilian. Calcutta is equally a cosmopolitan city. When I was the Labour Member, I had often to visit Calcutta in order to see the labour conditions there and I found that the Bengal people did not call the people living in Calcutta as 'Bengali'. Their word was "*Calcuttiya*". These are "*Calcuttiyas*". That shows that they were not part of Bengali population, and it is a huge population. Notwithstanding this, our friends, the Congress Party people, have never raised any objection; nor the "*Calcuttiyas*" have ever raised any objection to Calcutta being handed over to the Bengali. My first question to my friend, Mr. Pant, is this. If Calcutta can go to Bengali and Madras can go to Tamilian, what objection is there for Bombay to go to Maharashtra? That, I think, is a fundamental question which he must

satisfy the Maharashtrians about. Yes, it is said that there is in Bombay a Gujarati population which amounts to not more than 15 per cent. and that the Maharashtrians do not form a majority of the population. It is said that that is the reason which vitiates the claim of the Maharashtrians over Bombay. I wonder whether there are any cities in this country where the foreign population in the city is not 15 per cent. and the position of Bombay, it is said, by reason of the fact that 15 per cent. are Gujaratis is in a sense peculiar. How is it peculiar? One can give any number of illustrations to show that our cities are always a mixed quarter. No city can claim to have a uniform population of its own. And if notwithstanding this fact the other city can claim to belong to West Bengal, I am quite unable to understand why Bombay City should not make a similar claim. There are some people who have said that Bombay never belonged to Maharashtra. Well, I am surprised at the knowledge of those who made the statement. I am very much surprised. Who were the first inhabitants of Bombay? They were the *kolis*—the fishermen—and do the fishermen say that they are not Maharashtrians? I would like any one to go and make enquiries and find out what is the opinion of the *kolis* who were the original inhabitants of Maharashtra. If those ladies and gentlemen who have indulged in these wild allegations want to know a little bit of its characteristics, I should like to tell them that even before the Portuguese acquired Bombay, Bombay belonged to a dowager queen called Lakshmi Bai and the Portuguese took it as a tenancy from her. It did not even belong to the Portuguese. The Portuguese never conquered it. They took it. The poor queen subsequently could do nothing. Ultimately, it was transferred to the British as a dowry to the wife of Charles II. It was so small that the dowry was not more than £10. That was because Bombay was what I shall call a place occupied by a few *kolis*. I have got with me the original print of the original Bombay when it transferred itself from the

Portuguese to the British. Therefore, historically, geographically and logically—the logic which we have applied to other cities—I cannot see how anybody can dispute the claim of the Maharashtrians to have the city to themselves.

Of course, there is a wide difference of opinion between myself and the rest of the Maharashtrians. The rest of the Maharashtrians want Bombay as part of a United Maharashtra. Now, I am very much against this United Maharashtra. I do not understand why Maharashtrians should want a United Maharashtra and I am sure about it that in the course of future history, we are not going to war with U.P. nor are we going to war with any of the northern territories like Rajasthan. Why do you want a United Maharashtra? I am at ~~and~~ with Maharashtrians that Bombay belongs to Maharashtra. On that, I will fight tooth and nail. There can be no doubt on that point at all. And therefore I had suggested that the Government might give Bombay a separate status as a City State and call it the 'Maharashtra City State' so that it will be part of Maharashtra and at the same time, it will enjoy the status of an 'A' class State. But since the Government, for some reason which it is very difficult for me to understand, is going to reduce the status of Bombay City to that of the Nicobar Islands, I tell them right now that I will reverse my position and fight with them along with the rest of the Maharashtrians. Now that is what I want to say about Maharashtra.

With regard to the question that the Maharashtrians in Bombay City do not form a majority, I like to clear that idea. I think that there is a lot of misunderstanding. Some census figure has been dug out which said that the population of Maharashtrians in Bombay is 46 per cent. or something like that. Therefore they are not in a majority. Sir, it is a complete misunderstanding. Any man who knows the census operation, who knows statistics and who knows the peculiar statistics of Bombay City would pay no attention to that figure.

The census figure records the state of affairs on a particular day on which the census is taken. It does not indicate the common state of affairs. What happened on a particular day is taken as the typical example, but it is not typical at all. Secondly, the important point to be noticed is that Bombay City is one of the cities which is most subjected to immigration and emigration. Unfortunately, in the year 1941 when the new census was taken, the Government of India, in order to shorten their labour, did not repeal the immigration and emigration report figures for the year 1931. But if one were to go into the figures given on immigration and emigration in the census of 1931, he will find what violent changes there are in the immigration and emigration position. I do not think that even the non-Maharashtrian population which appears to be in a majority is permanently there in a majority. Most of them come for seasonal labour. If they happen to be there on the day of census, their existence is recorded as 'residents of Bombay'. On the next day, they might as well leave for their native places, because they have made enough money for their living. In these circumstances, can anybody accept the census figures as true figures of the citizens of Bombay? I deny that conclusion altogether. I have been a student of the census statistics. I have studied them considerably. I know what they mean. Therefore, the claim that these figures show that the population of the Maharashtrians is less is absolutely ambiguous, ~~of~~ not bogus. It has no value. It only indicates what happened to be on a particular day on which the census was recorded.

Now, I have said that I did not agree with the majority of the Maharashtrians, if I may say so, that there should be a united Maharashtra. My contention is that there should not be. I am going to say the same thing about U.P., about Rajasthan and about these huge Hindi reptile provinces, which have been looming large before us. I shudder to see U.P. standing before me in that shape.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): God save your soul.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR: Do not pray for my soul. I have no soul. I am a Buddhist. Nobody need take the trouble of praying for my soul. I do not believe in God. I have no soul. I have spared you that trouble.

Now, I am surprised, I must say, that the Commission should have retained U.P. as it is, should have retained Rajasthan as it is, and should have linked up the two provinces of Vindhya Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh into one.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras): Madhya Bharat.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR: What does this mean? I have made a little calculation. The area of U.P. is 1,14,323 sq. miles. Its population is 6,32,54,118. Bihar: The area is 70,368 sq. miles; its population is 4,02,18,916. Madhya Pradesh: Area is 2,01,633 sq. miles; its population is 3,28,46,971. I know I have to deduct something here for Vidarbha. Rajasthan: Area is 1,28,424 sq. miles; population is 1,52,97,979. The total area is 10 crore sq. miles and population is about 15 crores.

SHRI T. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): Ten lakh sq. miles.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR: That does not matter very much to my argument.

The question that requires to be dealt with in my judgment is a very serious question. Are we to have one State for one language, or are we to have one language for one State? If this question had no political consequences, nobody would bother about it, but the trouble is that this question has very serious political consequences. In the United States, the population of the various States differs. In some States it is small, and in some States it is big. But the Americans do not mind it, on account of the fact that the States have equal powers. The Lower House has the same power as the Upper House, and all the States have equal representation in the Upper

House without reference to population. In the Senate they have equal representation. Here, what is the position? Under our Constitution, there is no such equality at all. Every State has not the same power, and the Upper Chamber has no powers at all, so far as finance is concerned. It may happen—it is very likely—that the States in the northern area may combine together on an issue on which the southern States of India do not agree. What is likely to happen in that event? In that event, the north, if I may say so, will over-ride every proposition in which the southern States are interested. If that happens, I fear that there may be civil war. I may be using some exaggerated sentiment, but such a thing has happened. It has happened in the United States. In the United States the origin of the Civil War was this inequality of power. In the earlier stages it was agreed that up to a certain latitude the slave States might exist but that there would be no slavery above that latitude. It happened, I believe, that California was at one time a territory; it was not a State. It was later on decided to make it a State. The Southern States quarrelled, because they felt that if California became a State, it would acquire the power of voting and that it would change the balance of voting. Notwithstanding that, the Northern States decided to convert California into a State. Thereby they got a majority of voting, and then with this majority of voting, they decided not to have slavery in the United States at all, which affected the political and economic interests of the Southern States. At once, the Southern States resisted. They said, 'We would not remain part of the Union, if you are going to exercise that power for the abolition of slavery.' Then, there was the Civil War. There are people here who fear the influence of the northern people. One important example you could recently see was.....

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL (Bihar): Because the Southern States wanted slavery.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR: The hon. Member is right. Mr. Rajagopalachari had long been expressing this fear that this Union will break down.

HON. MEMBERS: No.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR: There are plenty of slaves who keep it up.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ (Madhya Pradesh): Independence is kept by the united people, not by slaves. Therefore this country will have its independence through unity and not through slavery.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR: I am very glad to have your assurance.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ: Thank you.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR: Now there are plenty of things one can imagine on which the issue may be between the north and the south and if that happens and if the matter is taken to bloody conclusions, well, all the efforts that we have made in order to bring about unity will have been in vain. I therefore suggest that the United Provinces should be cut down into three provinces. Bihar should be cut down into two and Madhya Pradesh also should be cut down into two.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ: You should have 600 States.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR: Nothing is lost. It does not affect the linguistic principle at all. They all have the same language. What does it matter if U.P. is divided into three States, or if Madhya Pradesh is divided into two? I see no difference at all. My friend Mr. Pant, I remember to have read once his statement, had stated that he would have no objection to dividing the U.P. but he has never said a word about it in the course of the debate nor has he voluntarily suggested this self-sacrifice on his part. But I give a warning, I know the House is not going to listen to me, but it is my duty to say what I feel. With

regard to Marathwada, I have very strong feelings and I very vehemently resist the United Maharashtra. I can speak more authoritatively about the Maharashtra than I can speak about other areas. What has been the state of affairs of the United Maharashtra? In Maharashtra I find that only the Marathas from the Satara district or that area are able to capture political offices. The rest of the people are just where they are. I do not understand how a Minister drawn from Satara can have any interest in, for instance, the Ratnagiri district. I do not think any Minister has ever visited the Ratnagiri district.

AN HON. MEMBER: So many have.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR: For the sake of drawing allowances, I think. Not for doing service.

AN HON. MEMBER: Still they have visited.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR: Areas and areas are completely neglected. What interest has a Maratha from the Satara district in the Ratnagiri district? What interest can a Brahmin for instance from Mahavidarbha have in the Satara district? I do not quite understand this mentality of huddling together. Is it like Bharat Milap? When Ram came from Lanka, Bharat embraced him. What for—for brotherly love and affection. Nothing more than that. Why not allow such areas to develop their own interests, to pay attention to their own interests? Besides, as my friend Mr. Pant knows—I may be wrong—I suppose he is the last of the veterans. Who will succeed him—can he tell me? Who will succeed him as a Minister? I don't see anybody. Certainly I don't see anybody in the rank and file of the Congress. If any Minister of the towering personality of my friend Mr. Pant has to be looked for, it would have to be someone outside the Congress ranks. I am sure of that.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: You, for instance.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR: I shall die pretty soon. Don't enrol me. This country, by this kind of thing, is going to dogs. Our primary concern is to raise and train politicians so that they can learn to take responsibility upon their own shoulders. We ought not to sit tight on one thing for ever. We ought to allow other people to take responsibility while we are alive so that if they commit any mistake, we may rectify it in time. If you have U.P. divided into three provinces, you will have probably 30 ministers trained in the art of administration, while if you have one, you will have just 10 ministers—nothing more than that. The same thing will happen in Bihar and the same thing will happen in these big provinces. Therefore, in my judgment, there is a great disadvantage to this country in keeping these large provinces as they are. My friend may perhaps listen to this argument if he does not listen to the other. His argument, if I have heard correctly, is 'Oh! in a country where Ram and Krishna were both born, do not divide it.' That is the argument, I think, he used sometimes. But that is not an argument of a statesman. Now Sir, I was saying about the Marathwada people, I mean the Maharashtrians, that the same thing is true of this Maharashtra. Maharashtra, except for a few Brahmins, is politically not upto the mark, I am sorry to say. I am not speaking with any personal venom of any kind. I know very well that I have had my full share of public life and I do not desire to compete with any one for more. But I like that my State should be well administered and in order that it may be well administered, it must have competent people. Now in a united Maharashtra you will not have more than five or six ministers. Some of them may be Brahmins and some of them may be non-Brahmins. Is that going to be enough for the future of Maharashtra? Here you have a territory called Marathwada which has just been released from the reins of the Nizam. But you have only to just go and see the area in order to see its wretchedness, the condition of the

people, with no clothes, hardly any food, no education. There is no primary school even there. I was told that there was one primary school in which there was only one chair and all the teachers ran early in the morning in order to capture that chair so as not to allow any other teacher to sit on it. I like to know whether this most backward area which has no irrigation, no food, no clothes, no school or anything of that kind, will fare better? For some reason or other, the Nizam spent all his love and affection on other people, not on Marathwada. I like to know whether my friend Kaka Gadgil, if he became the Chief Minister of United Maharashtra would pay attention to the condition of the people of Marathwada or whether he would pay his attention to Poona and its inhabitants. Let us not talk nonsense. Let us see plain things as they are. Why not allow Marathwada to have a separate province or State and let Marathwada rule itself? It knows its interests best I have been connected with Marathwada for the simple reason that I established a college there. But it is not a flourishing college and I am every year bearing a huge loss. I know that the Marathwada people would look after themselves much better than any of the Bombay people who talk about them. Particularly there is no education there at all. There is the danger that Marathwada may be attached to the Poona University. God only knows what will happen.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): So you believe in God?

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR: I cannot hear what you say. If you want a reply from me, you must talk audibly.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Whose God is that?

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): Don't hear inconvenient questions.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Who is your God?

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR: To me the people are God.

Sir, in the case of Marathwada it is absolutely necessary that they should have a separate autonomous body to look after their education and they should not be tied down hand and foot to the Poona University. We won't have that at all.

There is one other point to which I would like to refer. As I have said, I may be wrong, but I have a feeling that there are many holes in this federation and it may crack. We are a cracking society. We have no union. We have no unity and any time this whole thing may crack. Therefore, we should, in time, take steps to see that it does not crack. I suggested one way and that was to reduce the northern provinces to smaller areas so that the southern people may not suffer any heavy pressure. I also suggest another remedy and that remedy is to have two capitals for this country. I suggest that Hyderabad should be made the second capital of India. You can have your Delhi and for some seasons it may be good. But you must have a capital in Southern India, where people may feel that their Government is nearer to them. I suggested at one time that Hyderabad should be made the second capital of India. It is one of the most beautiful towns that I have ever seen in India. It has got all the necessities and amenities which a capital may require. All that may be necessary would be to have a sort of Legislative Assembly and Council of State. If that is done, then the people in the South with whom I have had many talks, would feel that their Government is nearer, that it is not so far away as Delhi. Delhi to the Southern people is a kind of a foreign territory. It is hot and they do not want to stay for long. I hope my hon. friend will take these points into consideration.

Sir, I am not in a condition to speak very long, nor have I got many other points to urge. But there is one thing that I would like to say. I had hoped that this Report of the S.R.C. would

have been placed before, not merely the party people, but generally before all, and they should have obtained the common advice of all the citizens of India and should have given effect to their decision. Sir, it was my hope that what we would settle now, we would settle for ever, because it is a very foolish thing for a gardener to plant a tree today and to uproot it tomorrow, to see whether it has taken root. That way the plant will never live. I cannot help reminding my hon. friend of the statement of Tom Paine that whatever is wrongly settled is never permanently settled; it has to be resettled. If you are going to settle these things with the help of your party, remember that your party is not perpetual. You can see the signs of waning even now before your eyes.

If whatever you do you do without the consent of the Opposition, I have not the least doubt about it that when the Opposition would come into power, they would uproot the thing and replant it. Such a thing would be most dangerous for us. Sir, I have done.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH (Bombay): The hon. Member made an incorrect statement when he said that Shri Morarji said at any time categorically that Bombay belongs to Maharashtra. I think the hon. Member should make such statements with a sense of responsibility.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR: It is in the 'Times of India'.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I should, first of all, like to say a few words about the manner in which the problem of the reorganisation of States has appeared to the public to have been handled by Government. All through, that is, since the publication of the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission, the impression has been created that it was not the Government but the Congress organisation that was dealing with the Report. I know that there was a sub-committee of the Cabinet appointed to

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

consider this matter but the fact remains that so far as the public is concerned it heard much more of the sub-committee appointed by the Working Committee of the Congress than of the Cabinet sub-committee appointed to examine the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission. There is no doubt three eminent Cabinet Ministers were members of the sub-committee appointed by the Working Committee, the Prime Minister, the Home Minister and the Education Minister but it is, I think, very regrettable that Government proceeded in such a way—the prominent Ministers connected with the Government proceeded in such a way—as to create the impression that the problems raised by the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission would be considered and finally decided by the Congress organisation. Take even, Sir, the Communique issued by Government on the 16th January. That too appeared only to be a replica of the decisions—was a repetition of the decision—arrived at the sub-committee appointed by the working Committee of the Congress. It can no doubt be said in theory that the Government considered every question with due regard to the interests of all the sections concerned but I think that any one who has carefully followed the daily press and knows the things that appeared about the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission will agree with me that rightly or wrongly, the public is under the impression that the Congress organisation was the final arbiter in the matter.

There is another thing that I should like to draw the attention of the House to in this connection. The sub-committee of the Congress Working Committee consulted—and quite naturally consulted—only the Congress organisations but neither the Cabinet sub-committee nor the Government as a whole, so far as I can judge from what has appeared in the newspapers, invited non-Congressmen to meet

them in order to express their points of view. Now, in many matters there might not have been any difference of opinion between the people belonging to the Congress and those who did not but taking into account the fact that a sub-committee appointed by the Congress Working Committee, containing three eminent Cabinet Ministers was considering the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission on behalf of the Congress, it was, I think, not merely desirable but necessary that Government should have invited non-Congress individuals, organisations and institutions to place their views before the authorities. I am not aware that any such action was taken by Government.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Is there any bar on any party presenting its views before Government?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: We must take things as they are. The manner in which the problem has been handled required, in my opinion, for the satisfaction of the public, that non-Congressmen should have been invited by the Government to offer their views on those recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission in which they were interested.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: The Akali Dal presented its views.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: It was invited to do so by no less a personage than the Prime Minister of India.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: The invitation was open to all.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I cannot go on dealing with persistent interruptions

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Especially when they are inconvenient.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member need not take note of those interruptions.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I am thankful to you for your advice.

I should like to say a word about the drafting of the Bill. Under article

4 of the Constitution, matters referred to in articles 2 and 3 can be dealt with by means of a Parliamentary statute. Now, such a statute must make the necessary amendments in Schedules I and IV. The First Schedule contains a list of the States and territories of India and the Fourth Schedule deals with the representation of the various States on the Council of States. Now, what has been done is that the Schedule has been altered not by the States Reorganisation Bill but by the Constitution Amendment Bill. According to article 4, that matter ought to have been dealt with by the States Reorganisation Bill and I think there is still time for the rectification of the mistake that has been made in this connection. There ought to be a Schedule in the S.R. Bill which deals with the new States created by Government.

There is one other matter in this connection, which must also be properly considered. Article 4 of the Constitution allows only new States to be created or the boundaries of existing States to be altered by means of an ordinary law, but it does not permit the territories that are mentioned in Part D of the First Schedule to be added to it; nor does it permit the nomenclature to be altered. Now what has been done, Sir, is to make

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Would you kindly refer to article 3(e)?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I have repeatedly referred, Sir, to articles 2 and 3. They all refer to States, not to territories.

I have just said that article 4 allows Parliament to alter the First Schedule and the Fourth Schedule by passing an ordinary law, but it does not allow Parliament to add new territories to Part D or to alter their nomenclature. Now what has been done by the S.R. Bill is to call certain territories Union territories and to describe Bombay, and the Lac-

cadive, Amindivi and Minicoy islands as Union territories. If these are to be treated as Union territories in accordance with the recommendations of the S.R.C., they ought to be dealt with in the Constitution (Amendment) Bill and not in the States Reorganisation Bill. Two things will have to be done. The Territories will have to be called Union Territories and then Bombay, and the islands I have referred to will have to be included in the category of Union Territories. Now the Constitution (Amendment) Bill does call the areas now known as Territories, Union Territories and it deals also with Delhi, Manipur, Tripura and Himachal Pradesh, which is quite right. But it should include also Bombay and the islands that I have just mentioned. Perhaps the best way of dealing with this matter will be to say in the States Reorganisation Bill that these areas will be Part C States and then to say in the Constitution (Amendment) Bill that, notwithstanding anything said in the States Reorganisation Bill, these States shall be treated as Union Territories.

Now, Sir, I shall proceed to refer to a few matters in connection with the Bill. I should first of all like to refer to Bombay. It has been referred to by many other speakers, but the importance of the question requires that I should bring out certain aspects of this question which have not received adequate attention so far. According to the S.R.C. Bombay should have been the capital of a bilingual Bombay State. In that case it would not have belonged either to Maharashtra or to Gujarat. It would have served the common needs of them both and would have been a meeting ground for the people of Gujarat and Maharashtra. But, on account of the unwillingness of the Maharashtra Provincial Congress Committee to accept the recommendation of the S.R.C., Government tried to alter the recommendation of the Commission in various ways in order to give satisfaction to the Maharashtra P.C.C.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Do you mean to say that other political parties were for accepting the recommendation?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: My hon. friend's remarks should be a little more relevant than they are.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: You are emphasising that it is only the Maharashtra P.C.C. that demanded it.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I am dealing with the case of Bombay. Government at first or the Congress organisation at first put pressure on Vidarbha to agree to join Maharashtra and it succeeded in its efforts because it really meant business. It wanted that Maha Vidarbha should throw in its lot with the rest of the Marathi-speaking area. Then the Prime Minister in one of his speeches said that Bombay was geographically a part of Maharashtra. It was thought, Sir, that these decisions and pronouncements would satisfy the people of Maharashtra, but I am afraid that both the Government and the Congress showed there a complete lack of understanding of the psychology of Maharashtra and the demands of the people. It should have been plain to them that Maharashtra attached much more importance to Bombay than it did to Vidarbha. I understand from some statements that have been made in public that the Congress was assured that if Maharashtra made to become a part of Maharashtra, Maharashtra might be satisfied with this arrangement. I do not admire the moral courage of those who, if my information is true—
 for—having given this assurance to Government, did not support Government publicly after it had taken the step recommended by them, but all the same, both the Government and the Congress should have realised that such a step could not satisfy the Maharashtrians and that the division of Bombay into two unilingual States made the inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra almost inevitable.

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa): Hear, hear.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Sir, in January last some events happened in Bombay which every well-wisher of Maharashtra and India must regret. Those events have served only to widen the gulf between the Maharashtrians and the non-Maharashtrians. I think that we cannot too strongly condemn those leaders or those persons, whoever they may be, who followed a course of conduct which drove people with less education and understanding than themselves to follow a violent course. But Government also must accept its responsibility for what happened in Bombay. After the weakness and the want of understanding that it had shown, it cannot throw the blame for what happened in Bombay entirely on others. It itself must also accept a part of the responsibility for the deplorable happenings of January last. We hear that discussions are still going on with regard to the future of Bombay. The Prime Minister has said *ad infinitum* that no decision can be regarded as final. It is quite possible therefore that Bombay may be included in Maharashtra now or after the expiry of a prescribed period. But if such a step is not taken, I think though the Government may make it appear that it cannot yield to force, it will only be delaying what is inevitable. If the Government want to reconsider the decision that they have already arrived at, they have only two alternatives open to them—either the acceptance of a bilingual State or the transfer of Bombay to Maharashtra. I do not think that there is a third course open to them. Maharashtrians, it seems, will be satisfied for the present if they are allowed to treat Bombay as their capital in practice. Well, the need for such a course is obvious. Unless Bombay is made the *de facto* capital of Maharashtra; the rivalry between Nagpur and Poona will prevent the people of Maha Vidarbha and the rest of Maharashtra from working together amicably. This

may seem to the Government to be the easiest course to follow; if so, they ought to realise that this will hasten the day when Bombay will have to be made a part of Maharashtra.

Now, I should like to say a word about the Punjab. We understand that an agreement has happily been arrived at at present between the different sections of the population there but I think it has been officially stated that Himachal Pradesh, though it will be a Central territory for some time, cannot remain in that position indefinitely and that ultimately it will have to be merged in the Punjab. Now, I should like to know what the Government means by saying that ultimately Himachal Pradesh should be included in the Punjab. Can they prescribe any period after which Himachal Pradesh will become a part of the Punjab or is this thing to be left indefinite to be settled in the course of five, ten or fifteen years or even longer? I find that in the Himachal Pradesh Vidan Sabha it was stated by the Chief Minister that their effort would be to amalgamate Himachal Pradesh with Jammu and Kashmir. Now, statements like these do not seem to me to be very desirable. I am sure the Government themselves therefore realise the desirability of dealing with this matter in such a way as not to create more misunderstandings.

I should like to refer here to the recommendation made by the States Reorganisation Commission with regard to the creation of certain all-India Services. No change in the Constitution is needed to create these Services. Under article 312 of the Constitution Government can with the support of the Council of States create new all-India Services. I should therefore like to know what decision Government have arrived at with regard to this matter. Are they still examining the question along with the Governments of the States or have they dropped the matter altogether? I hope that they have not dropped it because

it is necessary when reorganising the States to take such steps also as will draw them closer together. Certain steps must be taken in order to strengthen the unity and solidarity of India and the proposal with regard to the creation of certain all-India Services, I think, is one of those things that will keep the Union constantly before the public and make it realise that the States are only parts of this larger whole.

So much has been said about Zonal Councils that although I had intended to refer to them, I shall not say anything about them on this occasion. Experience alone will show their utility but it must be recognised that whatever zones may be created, every State will have some relations, economic and other, with neighbouring States even though they may not be in the zone to which it belongs. I think it is desirable that if questions that are likely to cause friction between the States or questions of common interest should be speedily and amicably settled then the Government have to devote more attention to this question than they have so far done.

Take the case of the U.P. There are certain economic matters in which the U.P. and Madhya Pradesh are deeply interested. But it must also be realised that there are common economic interests between the U.P. and the Punjab. The creation of Zonal Councils, therefore, will not enable the settlement of all questions between States that are close neighbours of one another.

There is one other matter that I should like to refer to. The Zonal Councils will have a staff of their own. Now, I have heard some competent people, people with experience of administration, say that unless proper vigilance is exercised, people who are about to retire may be employed by the Zonal Councils and it may become a place where virtually retired officers of Government—say retired Accountant Generals and

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

other persons—may be able to get employed. If it is desired that the Zonal Councils should work properly, I think that this matter will have to be kept constantly in view.

There are two other matters that I should like to refer to before I reply to what was said by Dr. Ambedkar with regard to the supposed antagonism between the north and the south and the remedy proposed by him. I find from clauses 46 and 110 of the Bill that the Judges of the abolished High Courts and Members of the abolished Public Service Commissions have been differently dealt with. The Chairmen and Members of the Public Service Commissions that are to be abolished will—they are assured—be so to say re-employed. No such assurance has been given with regard to the Judges. I think some caution in this respect was necessary. It may not be desirable to nominate all the existing Judges of the High Courts that are going to be abolished as Judges of other High Courts. But some assurance ought to be given to them that they will be re-employed. At present Government can simply say to a Judge who has been serving, say, for five years that it has no more use for him. Now, it may be very difficult for him, if he was a lawyer, to resume his practice. I think, therefore, that Government, without going so far as to re-employ the Judges of the High Courts that are going to be abolished as Judges of other High Courts, should say something which will make them feel that they will continue to be employed in some capacity or other.

Then, the second point that I should like to deal with is the manner in which the finances of the two States of Gujarat and Maharashtra are going to be dealt with. So far as can be seen, both will be deficit States. But it has not been said in the States Reorganisation Bill that their deficits will be met from the surplus of Bombay. Now, I know that provision

has been made in the Bill for making ways and means advances to the new States. I also know that the Finance Commission will consider this matter and that a final settlement of this problem will be possible only after a consideration of its recommendations. But the consideration of the Finance Commission's recommendations will not have been prejudiced had provision been made for meeting the deficits of Maharashtra and Gujarat. There is one matter in this connection which seems to have been overlooked by Government. Maha Vidarbha which in future will be a part of Maharashtra is believed to be a surplus area. I do not know whether the Government, in making ways and means advances to the Maharashtra State, will consider the surplus of Maha Vidarbha to be a part of the ordinary revenues of the Maharashtra State. If this is done, it will create great dissatisfaction in Maha Vidarbha. I think it is part of statesmanship—after having compelled Maha Vidarbha to join Maharashtra—to make it feel that its surplus will be used for its own development. Government may make large development grants afterwards. But let not an impression be created initially that even for a short time the surplus of Maha Vidarbha may be used to meet the deficit of the new State of Maharashtra. Even if no alteration is going to be made in the provisions of the Bill, Government ought to make a public statement to reassure the minds of the people of Maha Vidarbha on this point.

Lastly, I should like to refer to the Services. This question was referred to by one of the speakers yesterday. It has been stated in clause 107 "that the conditions of service applicable immediately before the appointed day to the case of any person who is required under this section to serve, as from that day, in connection with the affairs of any State shall not be varied to his disadvantage except with the previous approval of the Central Government." Now, what is the

significance of these words "with the previous approval of the Central Government"? Suppose in the States of Mysore and Travancore-Cochin, if the existing scales of salaries are raised so as to reduce the gap between the scales in force there and the scales in force in the territories that will be transferred to them, will the Central Government be satisfied and recommend to the President that the protection contained in the proviso that I have read out ought not to be continued? I say this because the Chief Minister of Mysore has referred to this matter explicitly. I do not think it necessary to go.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Hyderabad): Same salary.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I mean he has hinted at the possibility of what he calls a compromise between the higher scales outside and the lower scales in Mysore. Now, as this is not merely a distant possibility, but a probability, I think it is necessary for Government to state their position clearly on this vital point. I hope, Sir, that the protection that has been given to the public servants in the areas that are going to be transferred to other States has done a great deal to reassure them. If this reassurance is continued, the new States will have the benefit of having a contented body of public servants whose existence, zeal and integrity will be necessary for the complete integration of the new States. But if discontent is created among an appreciable section of meritorious public servants whose future may be endangered for no fault of their own, it will be as harmful to the States concerned as it will be to the Central Government itself. I hope that the Home Minister will be able to say that the protection contained in the proviso is real and that Government do not mean to depart from it.

The question of promotion to higher grades may require consideration. But there ought to be no yielding on the part of the Central Government in

regard to this incremental scales provided for the services concerned.

Now, Sir, I shall say a word about what Dr. Ambedkar has said regarding the differences between the north and the south and the remedy suggested by him. He seemed to think that it was the States Reorganization Commission that created differences or intensified differences between the northern and the southern States. This is far from being a fact. Look at the recommendations made by the States Reorganization Commission with regard to the Southern States. It is under its recommendations that the State of Mysore will be enlarged and its population will be doubled. The Commission cannot, therefore, be accused of having followed a policy of Balkanisation in the south. Again take Andhra. The Commission recommended that five years after effect has been given to its proposal about Telangana, it should be merged in Andhra. That merger is going to take place immediately. This means that the population of Andhra which is at present about 2 crores will become three crores. It will thus be seen that the charge brought by Dr. Ambedkar against the Commission both in his speech and in a pamphlet written by him towards the end of last year is not based on facts.

Now, I come to the Northern States. Dr. Ambedkar called the population of Northern India a reptile population. I do not know whether he meant only to be offensive or used these words in a special sense. If he meant only to be offensive, I can forgive him because of the sad condition of his health. But as regards the remarks made by him in connection with Madhya Pradesh, he seemed to be labouring under a serious misapprehension. The total population of the new State of Madhya Pradesh will be about 2.6 crores which is the population of West Bengal also. It will thus be seen besides that the new State has been created for economic reasons which have been stated in the Commission's Report. It cannot be

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

said by any person who has any regard for facts that the Commission recommended the creation of a new State of Madhya Pradesh in order to consolidate the North *vis-a-vis* the South.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Bilingual Bombay and Gujarat.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I am going to say that. I will just refer to it.

Now, Sir, take the case of Bihar and U.P. Bihar has a population of about four crores. But the Commission recommended the creation of a bilingual State of Bombay with almost the same population. That again gives the lie direct to the accusation that the Commission tried to break up the south into small bits while increasing the size of the northern States. Sir, such changes as have led to the breaking up of large States are due to the insistence of the people there and not to any Machiavellian designs on the part of the Commission.

Now a suggestion made by Dr. Ambedkar, for the evils that he sees, is the breaking up of U.P. into three States and of Bihar into two States. Now, this means that each new State in U.P. will have a population of about 2 crores. Andhra may have a population of 3 crores. Some other States may have a larger population. The new State of Tamil Nad will have, I think, a population of almost the same size. But U.P. must be broken up into three States. Why? Because it has done nobody any harm as yet. I have heard a good many arguments in favour of the division of U.P. into two or more States. But none of those who placed such a proposal before the Commission ever bothered to come to grips with the common economic problems between the various parts of Uttar Pradesh particularly its western and eastern parts.

If they were familiar with the river systems and with the canal

systems of U.P., they would see how impossible at least how undesirable it was even to suggest the breaking up of U.P. into a number of States. We are already realising the difficulties of having a number of States connected with the same river valley. Having these difficulties before us, we should not deliberately create States in such a way as to give rise to new problems of this character. I do not think the remedy suggested by him is of the slightest use. It must be remembered, that, whatever the Constitution of America or any other country may say, the party system that is in force in democratic States has completely altered the significance of those legal provisions which gave protection to small States or to certain communities. So long as each State or each community regarded itself as a separate entity, these legal provisions afforded real security, but when parties cutting right across States and communities came to be established, these legal provisions ceased to have any meaning whatsoever. Whether you take America or Australia or any other country, it is found that people vote not according to the States from which they come but according to the parties to which they belong. If this matter were properly understood, I am sure that much of what is said about the size of certain States or about equal representation for States in the Council of States will cease to have any meaning whatsoever. India is not in the position in which America was in the 1780s. There was no party system in existence in America then, but in India there is a full-fledged party system. It is therefore completely unrealistic to place before us the constitutional provisions of America or of Australia and ask us to follow them in completely altered circumstances. I do not think I need say more than this about what fell from my hon. friend Dr. Ambedkar. I have given a great deal of thought to this matter, and it was only after a careful examination of all the factors involved that, as a member of the States Reorganisation Commission, I came to the conclusion that, if we

wanted to assure the States, both big and small, of their future, it had to be done not by means of constitutional provisions but by the course of action followed by the important political parties and by the governments that might follow one another.

जत्थेदार यू० एस० नागाके (पंजाब) : श्रीमान् उपसभापति एस० आर० का जो बिल हाउस के सामने हैं, मैं उसका समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। जिस मिहनत और बुर्कबारी, दूरदर्शिता, दृढ़ता और खुशीदली से काम लिया गया उसी का यह नतीजा है कि आज इस रूप में यह बिल हाउस के सामने आया है। इसके लिए मैं पंत जी और उनके साथी नेताओं को धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट जिस वक्त बाहर निकली तो उससे सारे देश में तरह तरह के भगड़ और तरह तरह के आंदोलन पैदा हुए। ऐसा जान पड़ता था कि शायद इस रिपोर्ट पर अमल होना नामुमकिन हो, असम्भव हो। लेकिन आज हमें खुशी है कि इस रिपोर्ट की थोड़ी बहुत कमियाँ को दूर करने के बाद आज हमारे सामने जो बिल पेश है, इसको भारत के बहुत से हिस्से ने अब तक काफी मान लिया है। कुछ दो तीन हिस्से अभी बाकी हैं जहाँ पर कुछ गुस्से और कुछ मुस्तलिफ किस्म की बातें भी शुरू हुईं जो भगड़ा पैदा करने वाली थीं। उन भगड़ वाली जगहों में एक पंजाब भी है जहाँ का मैं रहने वाला हूँ और उसकी बाबत ही कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ।

पंजाब का सूबा एक सरहदी सूबा है। सरहदी सूबा होने की वजह से पंजाबियों के सिर पर जो ज़िम्मेदारी है, मैं उसे ठीक तौर पर समझता हूँ। मैं यह भी जानता हूँ कि पंजाब से दूर रहने वाले भाई पंजाब की छोटी छोटी आपस की खींचतान और रगड़ से कुछ घबरा जाते हैं, वे यह महसूस करते हैं कि शायद पंजाब में कोई तूफान आने वाला है। आप जानते हैं कि आज से एक साल पहले इसी महीने की १० तारीख को पंजाब में एक बहुत भारी आंदोलन शुरू हुआ

था। उस आंदोलन में हजारों आदमी जेल में गए और उसके बाद ऐसी सुरत थी कि लोगों को डर था कि शायद पंजाब में कहीं अमन भंग न हो जाय। लेकिन पंजाबी ऐसी मिट्टी का बना हुआ है कि जब कोई ज़िम्मेदारी वाली बात उसके सामने आती है तो बड़ी से बड़ी बात भी छोड़कर आपस में एक जगह बैठकर देश और सब की उन्नति के लिए और सब बातों को भुला सकता है। इसमें संदेह नहीं कि जो चीज उस आंदोलन के पीछे थी वह बहुत पुरानी थी। जब सन् १९४५ में, अंग्रेजी साम्राज्य के वक्त, हमारा देश अंग्रेजों के खिलाफ भारी जंग लड़ रहा था तो उस वक्त यह चीज पैदा हुई थी। उसका नाम "आजाद पंजाब की तहरीक" था। आजाद पंजाब की तहरीक के बाद जब कैंबिनेट मिशन हिन्दुस्तान में आया तो उस वक्त यह बदल कर ६ स्टेट्स के रूप में हो गया। आजादी के बाद सिक्स स्टेट्स का नारा कुछ अच्छा नहीं जान पड़ता था, इसलिए यह बदल कर पंजाबी सबे के नाम पर चला। जैसा कि मैंने पहले अर्ज किया, एक साल पहले जो बड़ा भारी आंदोलन शुरू हुआ वह था पंजाबी सबे का। उन भाइयों ने बहुत शोरशरा किया, बहुत से लोग उस वक्त जेलों में गए, लेकिन कोई बात किसी भगड़ से खत्म नहीं होती थी, और न ही कोई काम भगड़ से सरंजाम होता है। जब हमारे नेताओं ने उन भाइयों से पूछा कि कहाँ, आप चाहते क्या हैं, आपकी मांग क्या है और किस तरह से आप कहाँ क्या चाहते हैं, तो चौंक पहले वे जोश में थे इसलिए उन्होंने कहा, "हम तो पंजाबी सूबा चाहते हैं"। लेकिन पंजाबी सूबा एक सबे में, एक स्थान में चलने वाली बात नहीं थी।

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री राजगोपाल नायडू) पीठासीन हुए]

इसलिए वह बात टाल दी गई। इस तरह आखिर में उन भाइयों को समझाने के बाद यह नतीजा हुआ कि उन्होंने अपनी उस मांग को छोड़ दिया और एक साथ बैठकर एक स्कीम तैयार की और पंजाब के हर ख्याल के नेताओं ने बैठकर, हर ख्याल के नुमाइंदों ने बैठकर जो स्कीम तय की उसे उन्होंने

[जयधरदास ५० एस० नागोके]
मान लिया। मैं इसके लिए उनका धन्यवाद करता हूँ कि जिन्होंने बहुत पुरानी जद्दोजिहद के बाद आपस में बैठकर जो फैसला किया उसे मान लिया। उसको मानने के बाद एक दूसरा आंदोलन इस वक्त जो पंजाब में चल रहा है वह आंदोलन बहुत सी छोटी बातों को लेकर चलाया गया मालूम पड़ता है। इसकी तह में क्या है, मैं इसमें ज्यादा नहीं जाना चाहता क्योंकि मैं किसी भगई की तजवीज करना पसन्द नहीं करूंगा। भगड़ा तजवीज करना आसान बात है लेकिन भगई को खत्म करना, यह मुश्किल बात है। तो इसीलिए जरूरी बात यह है कि हम इस भगई को निपटाने की बात करें। मैं तो उनसे यही कहूंगा कि आप पंजाब के इधर उधर के शहरों में जाकर गैर जिम्मेदारी की बातें न कहें। एक सज्जन ने तो किसी जलसे में यह भी कह दिया कि गान्धी जी के चले जाने के बाद भी देश चलता ही है और जवाहर के चले जाने के बाद भी देश चल सकेगा।

मैं इसको अहिंसित इसलिए नहीं दूँता कि यह गैर जिम्मेदारी की बात है और मैं निश्चय से कहता भी हूँ कि कोई पंजाबी इस बात को पसन्द नहीं कर सकता कि वह इस किस्म की गैर जिम्मेदारी की बातों को स्ट्रेंज पर आकर कहे। आमतौर पर इस तरह की बातें अखबारों में लिखी जाती हैं जिससे लोगों के दिलों में गलतफहमी पैदा होती है। अखबारों में यह लिखा जाता है कि इससे सिखों को बहुत कुछ मिलेगा जो कि एक गलत बात है। मैं यह बात पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस स्कीम से सिखों को क्या मिला? इस स्कीम से पहले सिखों की पोजीशन यह थी कि उनकी आबादी पंजाब में २० फीसदी थी, पेंप्सू में उनकी मेजॉरिटी थी, बहुमत था, वहां पर बहुमत का उनका एक सजा था और राजप्रमुख भी सिख ही था। लेकिन पेंप्सू और पंजाब के आपस में भर्ज हो जाने से, आपस में मिलने से तनासुब के लिहाज से उनकी गंजीशन यह हो गई कि जहां उनकी आबादी पहले २० फीसदी थी, अब २४ फीसदी हो गई है। पेंप्सू सिखों का सबा था। महा पंजाब के

लांग जो यह कहते हैं कि इस स्कीम से सिखों की बात चलेगी, बिल्कुल गलत है। जिस सब में यानी पेंप्सू में सिखों का बहुमत था वहां पर पंजाबी और हिन्दी का किसी तरह का भगड़ा नहीं था। वहां पर इस तरह की कोई बात नहीं थी कि हिन्दी और पंजाबी भाषा के बारे में किसी तरह का कोई भगड़ा हो। उन्होंने आपस में बैठकर हिन्दी और पंजाबी का फैसला कर लिया था। उसका अमल अब भी कायम रखा गया है, यह एक बात है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि एक सब में जिसमें सिखों का बहुमत था, उसकी जगह उन्हें एडवाइजरी या मशविरा देने की पोजीशन मिल गई। जोन की तो बड़ी बात है, रीजन, वह भी मैं समझता हूँ कि इन हिन्दू भाइयों की गलती का नतीजा है, उन्होंने वहां बहुमत बना दिया है। चूंकि वह इस लिहाज से रीजन का फैसला नहीं करना चाहते कि रीजन इस आधार पर बने कि कौन कहां पर कौन सी बोली बोलता है। वे इस चीज को लेकर चलते हैं कि हिन्दू कहां पर ज्यादा गिनती में हैं, सिख कहां पर ज्यादा गिनती में हैं। यदि हिन्दू भाई हिन्दू सिखों की गिनती के लिहाज से रीजन में गड़बड़ी करना छोड़ दें तो यह माइनारिटी और मेजॉरिटी की बात खत्म हो जाती है। यह जो कुछ हुआ है, सब उनकी गलती का ही नतीजा है।

इसके अलावा मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे इन हिन्दू भाइयों की यह तंगीदली है कि वह इस तरह की बातें सोचते हैं कि सिखों को कहीं पर भी रहने देना नहीं चाहते हैं। उनकी यह इच्छा है कि सिख किसी भी रीजन में जिन्दा न रहें। हिन्दू भाइयों को हमारे साथ रहना है और हमें उनके साथ रहना है, उन्हें इस तरह की बातें नहीं सोचनी चाहियें। मैं उन से कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह की छोटी बातों को सामने लाकर भगड़ा पैदा करना किसी के लिए भी लाभदायक नहीं हो सकता है। हम सबों का यह फर्ज होना चाहिये कि पंजाब की किस तरह से तरक्की और उन्नति हो। जिस तरह से वह तरक्की कर सकता है वही बात हम सब को मिलकर करनी चाहिये। जब एस०

आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट निकली तो हिमाचल प्रदर्श कहता था कि हम किसी के साथ नहीं मिलेंगे, वह आखिर तक नहीं मिला। इसका मुझे डर भी था। पेंप्सु वाले कहते थे कि हम भी अलग ही रहेंगे। पंजाब वाले कहते थे कि पंजाब के दो हिस्से कर दिये जायें। अगर इस तरह की पोजीशन हो गई होती तो शायद सरहद्दी सूबे अपने आपको नहीं बचा सकते। मैं सरहद्दी सूबे में रहने वाले उन लोगों की बहादुरी को नहीं भूल सकता हूँ जो रात दिन अपनी बन्दूक सम्हाले मकानों की छतों पर बैठकर जागते रहते हैं और दुश्मन का मुकाबला करने के लिए तत्पर रहते हैं। इन लोगों को इस तरह के भगड़ों के लिए कहाँ फुरसत है, उनके सामने तो एक ही बात है और वह यह है कि वह किस तरह से तरक्की कर सकते हैं। लेकिन कुछ लोग ऐसे हैं जिनको गलतफहमी पैदा करने की आदत है और अपनी आवाज दूसरों लोगों पर लादने की आदत है। आप कहेंगे कि आवाज का क्या मतलब, तो यह आवाज उस तरह की है जिस तरह अंग्रेजों के जमाने में फिरकापरस्त जमातें उठाया करती थीं। यहाँ पर भाषा का भगड़ा तो नहीं है बल्कि "आवाज" का भगड़ा है। उन्होंने एक आवाज बुलन्द की है जिसकी आड़ में वह भाषा का भगड़ा खड़ा किये हुए हैं। क्या भाषा का भी भगड़ा हो सकता है? हमें अपनी मादरी जबान में बोलने से कौन रोक सकता है? इस समय हमारे हिन्दू भाई जो जबान का भगड़ा उठा रहे हैं यह उनकी ही गलती का नतीजा है। इसका कारण यह है कि पिछले सैंसस के दिनों में इन लोगों ने जान-बूझकर लोगों से यह झूठ बुलवाया कि हमारी जबान पंजाबी नहीं है। हमारी केंद्रीय सरकार ने भी इस बात को महसूस करके कि कुछ लोगों ने झूठ बोला है सैंसस से पंजाब के आंकड़ों को निकाल दिया है। इस तरह से हिन्दू भाई पुरानी बातों को लेकर एक नई आवाज पैदा करके भगड़ा खड़ा करना चाहते हैं। जो चीज गलत है, उसको सही मानना कहाँ तक मुनासिब है। मैं उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब वे यह कहते हैं कि हमारी भाषा पंजाबी है,

हम पंजाबी भाषा बोलते हैं, तो फिर इसमें जबर्दस्ती का सवाल कहाँ पर पैदा होता है। जब वे मानते हैं कि हमारी बोली पंजाबी है तो पंजाबी लिपि से उनको क्यों दुश्मनी है। यह तो इस तरह की बात हुई कि एक आदमी बंगाल में रहता है और कहता है कि मैं बंगाली बोली जानता हूँ मगर बंगाली लिपि को नहीं मानता हूँ। कोई आदमी कहता है कि मलयालम मेरी बोली है मगर मैं मलयालम लिपि नहीं मानता हूँ। इसी तरह से हमारे इन भाइयों की यह बात समझ में नहीं आती कि पंजाबी बोली को तो वह बोलते हैं मगर लिपि के बारे में कहते हैं कि हम इसे नहीं मानते हैं। लिपि मानने से क्यों इंकार करते हैं? इसमें सिखाँ के मुत्बारीक पूज्य गुरु गूँथ साहब के लिखे जाने की एक वजह बतलाते हैं। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि महापुरुषों की वाणी को बीच में लाना अच्छा नहीं है। महापुरुषों की वाणी एक इलाके, एक सूबे और एक मुल्क के लिए नहीं होती है। महापुरुषों की वाणी कुल दुनिया के लिए होती है, सब दर्शों के लिए होती है। प्राणी-मात्र के लिए होती है। गुरु गूँथ साहब के पढ़ने वाले और जानने वाले जानते हैं कि उसमें सिर्फ पंजाबी नहीं है। उसमें पंजाबी है, हिन्दी है, मराठी है, फारसी है, सिंधी है, यानी जहाँ जहाँ सतगुरुओं ने उस वक्त अपने चक्कर में दौरा किया, जैसे लोगों को उपदर्श दिया, वैसे उन लोगों की उस वक्त की वाणी उसमें दर्ज की। खैर, मेरा यह कहने का मतलब है कि लोगों को धार्मिक तौर पर गुमराह करने की जो यह बात सांची जाती है कि हम ऐसी बातों को बीच में लायें यह मुनासिब नहीं है। मुझे इस बात का निश्चय है कि जिस वक्त भी आन्दोलन करने वालों के प्रतिनिधि यहाँ आकर और बैठ कर हमारे नेताओं से बात करेंगे तो उनके पास इस स्कीम से इंकार करने की कोई दलील नहीं होगी। उनको मालूम था कि क्या होने वाला है और क्या होगा। वे आये और पीड़ित जी से मिले, पंत जी से मिले, मौलाना साहब से मिले, डेवर साहब से मिले और जो उनकी खास दलीलें थीं उनको पेश किया। सब की मौजूदगी में उन्होंने

[जयधर यू० एस० नागोके]

यह बात मानी कि काफी मुद्दत से पंजाबी सूबे का जो एक बड़ा भारी आन्दोलन चल रहा था उसके लिए अगर कोई ऐसी चीज निकलती हो जिससे हम मिल कर बैठ सकें तो वह ठीक होगा। एक बात निकली और वह यह रीजनल स्कीम है जो कि हमारे सामने पेश है। पंजाब और पेषू दोनों मौजूदा शकल में आपस में मिला दिये गये हैं। एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट में लाहौर की तहसील निकाल दी गई थी लेकिन अब फसले में वह फिर पंजाब में मिला दी गई है। इसलिए मौजूदा जो आन्दोलन है वह बिल्कुल बेमानी मालूम पड़ता है। अब आखिर क्या किया जाय ? अब पंजाब का भगड़ा कुछ बदल गया है। पहले वे कहते थे कि हम इस स्कीम को नहीं मानते। लेकिन अब वे कहते हैं कि हम पंजाब की सरकार को नहीं मानते। शायद आगे चलकर यह फसला और भी जाहिर हो जाय और यह प्रकट हो जाय कि उनका मतलब क्या है। अगर पंजाब की सरकार से किसी किस्म का भगड़ा है तो उसको इस रूप में लाने का क्या मतलब है। खैर, ऐसी बातों से घबड़ाने की जरूरत नहीं है। मैं यह मानता हूं, समझता हूं और ऐसा निश्चय रखता हूं कि जब यह बिल सिलेक्ट कमेटी से वापस आ कर कानून की शकल अख्तियार करेगा तब तक पंजाब का वायुमंडल बदल चुका होगा। पंजाब का वायुमंडल जिन बातों से धुंधला हो गया है वे बातें बहुत पायदार नहीं हैं। वहां की बातें जोशीली हैं, उनमें एक्सप्लायटेशन है, लोगों को वरगलाने की बात है, तरह तरह की बातों से, तरह तरह के जोश से लोगों को भड़काने की बात है, लेकिन जिस वक़्त भी बैठ कर, सोच कर और ठंडे दिल से इस बात पर विचार किया जायगा, उस वक़्त यह मामला बदल जायगा। एक अर्ज मैं यह करना चाहता हूं कि हम यह बात भूलें नहीं हैं और न भूल सकते हैं कि बटवार के दिनों में जो कीमत पंजाब ने दी है वह इन सब बातों से ज्यादा है। उसके मुकाबिले में ये सब बातें छोटी हैं। इन छोटी बातों की हम परवाह नहीं करेंगे। हम पंजाबी हैं और पंजाब को हर सूरत में ऊंची

करना है। हम यकीनन कह सकते हैं कि हम भारत के सच्चे सिपाही हैं और हम अपनी जिम्मेदारी को अच्छी तरह से समझते हैं। पाकिस्तान जो तरह तरह के मसूबे बांध रहा है, अगर उसका कोई मौका आया तो हम असली रूप में अपने आपको प्रगट कर सकेंगे कि हम सही मानों में भारत के सिपाही हैं और भारत की उन्नति के लिए पूरी तरह से हम अपने आप को लगायेंगे। तो मौजूदा हालत में मैं मिनिस्टर साहब को और हाउस को यह यकीन दिलाना चाहता हूं कि पंजाब के छोटे छोटे भगड़ों से घबड़ाने की जरूरत नहीं है। ऐसे भगड़ों से हम आपस में निपट लेंगे। एक पंजाबी में भगड़ा करने का स्वभाव होता है, भगड़ा करने की आदत होती है और ऐसी आदत वाले ही एक दूसरे को समझ सकते हैं। इसके अलावा हम सब बातों में इक्कटू हैं और इक्कटू रहेंगे। हम किसी तरह से अपने आपको जुदा नहीं कर सकते। जो पहले यह कहते थे कि हिन्दू हमारे दुश्मन हैं, वे अब कहते हैं कि नाखून से मांस अलाहदा नहीं हो सकता, हम भाई भाई हैं। जो आज तरह तरह की बातें कहते हैं, वे भी कल इसी स्टैंज पर आ जायेंगे। मैं इतना ही कह कर समाप्त करता हूं।

SHRI MAHESH SARAN (Bihar):
Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am glad that this Bill is going before a Joint Select Committee, because I feel that there are certain matters which do require a little more consideration. Sir, this question of linguistic provinces is a good thing in its own way, but if it becomes a craze, then it does more harm than good to the country. Some people forget that the primary consideration in forming linguistic provinces must be the security, the unity and the economic prosperity of India and every separatist and disruptive tendency must be suppressed and we should also bear in mind that language can not only be a binding force but it can also be a separatist force. Sir, people know what ugly incidents occurred because some people wanted to have provinces of their own choice.

Can reorganisation of States come through violence and threats?

With these few preliminary remarks, I wish to make the following suggestions. I take up the question of Bombay first. Sir, Bombay City is essentially a cosmopolitan, multi-lingual city. The population is a mixed one and Maharashtrians are not in a majority. It is one of the great cities of India and it has been built up by the labours of all kinds of people and communities, therefore, it should not be attached to a purely linguistic State. I, therefore, welcome the reconstituted State of Bombay as suggested by the Sub-committee. But our Maharashtrian friends did not like that recommendation and most unpleasant things happened with the sole intention of forcing the hands of the Government. Such tactics should not be allowed to thrive. This is a point which I wish the Government and the Joint Select Committee to take into consideration. If our Maharashtrian friends want a State of Marathi-speaking people, then let them have it, but they should not attempt to have Bombay City where they are not in a majority. They should accept the formula presented before them.

There is an other point which I wish to make, namely, that Bombay City should have the privilege of having a Legislature. The people are advanced and they are well-versed in administrative matters. Therefore, to take away that right from them and place them under the Centre, is, I think, a retrograde step. I would very humbly submit that this portion of the proposal should be deleted and they should get a Legislature.

Next I come to the question of Bengal and Bihar. Sir, I come from Bihar and so I feel it my duty to publicly say that so far as Bihar is concerned, we welcome this merger move. As a matter of fact, it came from the Chief Minister of Bihar who was very keen that there should be a merger. Merger is no new thing, for Bengal and Bihar were together even before. But merger with reservations

is a thing which nobody would like. It should be pure and simple merger. That certain territories should be transferred from one to the other is a thing which is not liked by the people of Bihar. All the difficulty has arisen because months have passed and nothing has come out of the conferences of the two Chief Ministers. This has created a lot of confusion in the minds of the people.

We should not allow people to remain in suspense because suspense creates all sorts of difficulties and Government must realise that this matter should be decided once and for all and as quickly as possible.

I now come to Madhya Pradesh, the Madhya Pradesh that is to be formed. I welcome very much this proposition but there is one point which has to be taken into consideration. If the people of Vindhya Pradesh want to merge with Uttar Pradesh.....

DR. R. P. DUBE (Madhya Pradesh): If wishes were horses, beggars would ride?

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: If they wish to join Uttar Pradesh, I do not think anybody should have any objection. This has been the opinion expressed by the people as well as by the Assembly of Vindhya Pradesh. If the whole of Vindhya Pradesh cannot be merged, then at least Baghelkhand which is geographically, economically and culturally similar to Uttar Pradesh may be merged with Uttar Pradesh. Uttar Pradesh is a purely agrarian State and is deficient in mineral resources. By merging Baghelkhand area, this deficiency will partly be made up. I suggest that this is a good idea and as far as possible, attempts should be made to merge the Baghelkhand area with Uttar Pradesh.

DR. R. P. DUBE: Who will have the mineral rights? Will the State have it or the Centre? I can say for the information of the hon. Member that the Central Government will look after the exploitation of these minerals.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): Let there be no interruption, Dr. Dube. Let the hon. Member proceed.

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: So far as Himachal Pradesh is concerned, I hold the view that States and Territories should be compact ones; one portion of a State should not intervene in another State or Territory. Now, so far as Himachal Pradesh is concerned, I had the occasion to go to Simla many times and this is what I find. We get down at Kalka which, of course, belongs to Punjab as also upto a distance of three miles. From there to Dharampore, a distance of five miles, belongs to Himachal Pradesh. From Dharampore to Solan belongs to PEPSU. Then the eight miles from Kandaghat to Solan belongs to Himachal Pradesh. From Solan to Soghi, a distance of six miles, belongs to PEPSU and from Soghi to Simla belongs to Himachal Pradesh. This state of affairs should now cease to exist. You cannot have things in this way. When you are re-organising the States, you must try to create compact areas which could be easily administered and where there will be no difficulty. There is another point regarding Himachal Pradesh to which I wish to refer. Although Simla proper belongs to Punjab, the seat of the Himachal Pradesh Government is there, while the capital of Punjab is at Chandigarh. As the people of Himachal Pradesh carry on all their major activities in Simla, I do not see why this small territory of Simla should not be given to Himachal Pradesh. These are the few remarks that I wanted to offer so far as Himachal Pradesh is concerned.

There is one more suggestion that I have to make. Let us go forward and not backward. Those areas which enjoyed self-Government, that is to say, States which had Legislatures of their own, should continue to enjoy that privilege. Do not dissolve those Legislatures; do not make them Territories without any responsibility. We

learn and go on learning. It is not as if we learn something and then we are asked to go back and start with the alphabet. Therefore, my suggestion is that you may, for convenience, keep any name you like but those areas which enjoyed self-government before should continue to enjoy that right, especially in the case of Bombay, as I have already said. You want to have it as a Centrally administered territory without any Legislature there. All this is not going forward but is going backward. Therefore, my submission is that careful consideration must be given to this aspect of the question.

Now, I am against temporary arrangements. I hear that in some cases this re-organization is an experiment for five years or for ten years. It must not be so. When we are re-organising States, let us do it on a little more permanent basis. Let there not be a feeling amongst the people that after some time it may be that things will change. This feeling of uncertainty creates trouble and efficient administration becomes absolutely impossible. Whatever you decide, decide it on a permanent basis. Of course, I do not say that it should be permanent for ever but it should be an arrangement which can only be changed by very special reasons because, I have a feeling that our people are being perplexed by different statements in the press, statements by the Chief Ministers and things of that sort. People feel bewildered and they do not know what is going to happen. When you are re-organising the States, let the people have the feeling that what you are doing now is on a permanent basis and that easily there will not be any change. You know that this re-organisation of States has entailed a lot of suffering to some people: it has created bad blood. Elements which are not desirable have joined together in order to create disturbances. For God's sake, I would appeal to the Home Minister not to allow such occurrences to be the order of the day. If you do not make things permanent, I am sure you will have

trouble when you intend to have a change a little while later. So, my submission is that the Joint Select Committee should sit down and go into this Bill clause by clause, go into the different aspects of the question and see that one view unduly does not predominate the others. All the aspects should be carefully considered and we should try to build a beautiful, strong and united India.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have heard eloquent speeches on the States Reorganisation Bill from Dr. Ambedkar and Dr. Kunzru. As Dr. Ambedkar is not here, it would not be right for me to take up for answer what he said and as my time is limited, I shall not go into the interesting questions which he raised.

This question of States Reorganisation has been discussed in the country in an atmosphere of heat and passion. It has proved to be highly contentious and has even led to trouble, as was hinted at by a leader of the Maharashtrian party in a speech where he said that it would be fought out in the streets of Bombay. Now, it is a tribute to the skill and statesmanship of the Prime Minister and the Home Minister that passions have cooled down and we are discussing it in a comparatively calm atmosphere.

A casual reader of the Constitution would go away with the idea that the term "States" occurring therein refers to sovereign State in the sense that the States of the United States or for the matter of that even the States of Australia are. In point of fact the word "States" used with reference to the units of our quasi-Federation, which has a strong unitary bias, is a misnomer. Some other suitable word or the expression "Provinces" should have been used for the word "States". These States did not frame their Constitution. Their constitution can be changed, altered and amended in the manner indicated in the Constitution

by Parliament. The boundaries of these States can be changed by Parliament in the manner indicated by the Constitution. Even the States can be made to disappear if we so desire by a change in the Constitution. They are merely administrative units with limited powers and, therefore, their status is not that of States in the sense in which that term is used in political terminology. The reason for the unitary bias of our Constitution is quite apparent. The Constitution was framed just after the partition of the country and we were apprehensive of the fissiparous tendencies which had played havoc in the past in our national life. Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is possible to carry this fear of fissiparous tendencies gaining strength a little too far. I think within limits the linguistic principle is all right. I say "within limits" because there are other considerations which have also to be borne in mind—economic viability, geographic contiguity and possibly historic associations and if these considerations are borne in mind, it will be found that the States Reorganisation Commission did a good piece of job. I shall not go into all the controversial issues dealt with by the States Reorganisation Commission's Report. Take, for example, Bombay. It suggested a bilingual State for the Maharashtrians and Gujaratis. Unfortunately that recommendation was not acceptable to the parties concerned, and the position today is: What are we to do with Bombay? Now, when you are faced in life with a position like that I think it is best to draw inspiration from First Principles. The moment you depart from First Principles you take a wrong step and a wrong step taken to-day may have vast repercussions so far as the future is concerned. The fact of the matter is that Bombay belongs to the hinterland of Maharashtra. Bombay is vital for the economic life of Maharashtra and so far as Bombay is concerned the majority of the working class population in Bombay city are all Maharashtrians. Gujarati capital may have contributed to the building up of Bombay. Parsi capital may have con-

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

tributed to the building up of Bombay. European capital may have contributed to the building up of Bombay, but it is the toiling workers in the factories of Bombay who constitute the backbone of Bombay's population.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): There the workers are mostly the Bhaiyas of Uttar Pradesh.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Speaking quite frankly my stand on this question is that Bombay should go to the Maharashtrians. Unfortunately the Maharashtrians have spoiled a good case by the violence of statements. Unfortunately they have spoiled a good case by indulging in a language which they should have better avoided, but I hope, Sir, that now that tempers are cooling down a way will be found by our wise Prime Minister and our wise Home Minister to settle this controversy about Bombay. Let the people of Bombay be given an opportunity in some way or other to decide the issues for themselves. It is rather tragic to think of Bombay as a Central enclave, like the Andamans and the Nicobar islands, for we cannot forget that Bombay is one of India's two foremost cities. Bombay has made great contributions to the cultural life of this country; it has made contributions to the economic life of this country; it has made contributions to the political life of this country, and surely a city of the size and magnitude of Bombay cannot be treated for all time as a Central enclave. As a matter of fact I remember to have read the Prime Minister suggesting a city State for the people of Bombay, and that would have been a much better solution. But, in any case some solution which satisfies the aspirations of the people of Bombay and which gives scope for their political expression should be found.

I shall come now to the question of the Punjab. It is a tribute to the marvellous statesmanship of our Home Minister and our Prime Minister that we have solved the problem there.

Tribute is also due to the moderation exercised by the Akali and other Sikh leaders in regard to their claim for a Punjabi-speaking State. I think the Commission's case for a Punjab integrated with Himachal Pradesh was rather a weak one, and I am glad that that has not been accepted. Himachal Pradesh has a distinct culture of its own. It is a backward area and it is right that it should be Centrally administered. The Regional Committees which the Bill visualises will give some assurance and some protection to both the communities, the Sikhs and the Punjabis, to help them to develop both Hindi and Gurmukhi because as far as I can understand the position, it is not a battle of languages that we have in the Punjab; it is a battle of scripts.

Then, Sir, from the Punjab I shall proceed to the question of Zonal Councils. Now, Sir, I have read the provisions in regard to the Zonal Councils with care. I think the idea behind these Zonal Councils is a good one and if we are going in for economic planning and for social planning, it is desirable that from time to time our Chief Ministers and our Chief Secretaries and other Ministers should meet and confer on questions of common interest affecting a particular zone. There are, however, one or two dangers which have to be avoided.

These Zonal Councils are of an advisory character. My first point is this. Is it necessary for us to make a specific provision for them in a complicated Constitution? Ours is the most complicated Constitution in the world; it is the biggest Constitution in the world. Is it necessary for us to overload the Constitution by provisions for such advisory councils which can be constituted by an Executive Order or by agreement among the States? That is a point which I hope the Joint Select Committee will consider.

Another question is this. We do not know how these Zonal Councils may develop in future. These Zonal

Councils might come to regard themselves as competitors with the Centre and the Centre may have to put up with the pressure of an entire zone. That is a danger which will have to be guarded against.

The third thing I would like to say in regard to these Zonal Councils is that not only should the work of economic planning and social planning be entrusted to them but also educational planning in its higher aspects because I think there is a case for the reorganisation of university education on a regional basis in this country. So that question too should be taken up by these Zonal Councils.

I shall now venture to make a few remarks on the provisions of the Bill relating to High Courts. The House will agree with me that the reputation of our High Courts should be very dear to us. They are the bulwarks of Democracy. Personal freedom depends largely upon the way they function and it is of importance that the men who are appointed to our High Courts should be lawyers of ability, of integrity, of character, of independence. Now, I do not doubt for a moment that in Mysore, in Kerala and in Rajasthan you can get a good number of judges on the salaries which you are offering but then you are doing away with the distinction between Part A and Part B States. Just consider what the attitude of the judges of Part A States will be towards those in Part B States or how the mind of a Part A judge will work when a judgement of Kerala or Mysore or Rajasthan is cited. (*Interruptions.*)

For several years I was a Judge of the High Court and it used to be a principle with me—I do not hesitate to say so here publicly—not to look into cases from Part B or Part C States. We never looked into them. If such judgments were cited, it was generally asked, 'can't you cite cases from Madras, from Calcutta, from Bombay or from Patna?' That

mentality ought to be made to disappear; and it will not go unless and until these High Courts are brought to the same level as the other High Courts. And that you cannot do unless you pay your High Court Judges in these States the same salary as is allowable to Judges of other High Courts. The hon. the Home Minister was sympathetic to this point of view. In fact, he was almost apologetic in the reference he made to this difference. He said that the position is that the State Governments do not want to pay more. They can get good and.....(*Time bell rings.*) I shall be finishing very shortly.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): You have already exceeded your time. Please wind up.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: The Home Minister was quite apologetic about it. So let us now try and persuade these States to fall in line with the other States so far as salary is concerned. Let us even impose a decision if they are not agreeable.

The last point which I wanted to make—and it is important that I should make it—was with regard to the transfer of judges. I do not like this provision about the transfer of judges at all. I am not in favour of compensatory allowance but that is neither here nor there. The compensatory allowance has some restraining effect, that is all. The point is the Judges should not be looked upon as Civil Servants.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): It is there in the Constitution.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: The provision for transfer is there but I say that I am not in favour of that. Whatever is in the Constitution is not binding upon me. I can express my personal opinion.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): Is it your view that the Constitution should be amended?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I think the proposition about the transfer of judges is fundamentally from a juristic point of view based on a wrong principle. A Judge is appointed to a court; a Judge is not a Civil Servant. He should not be treated as a Civil Servant. In the interests of judicial independence thought should be given to this question of transfer of judges.

Sir, one last word and I have finished. And that is with reference to Delhi State. I make a reference to Delhi State because I was born in Delhi. We have connections with Delhi and I greatly regret the disappearance of what is called democratic rule in Delhi but the States Reorganisation Commission's recommendations were in strict accordance with the principle which governs the Government of Capital cities in all the important capitals of the world, as for instance, Paris, London, Washington and Canberra.

Sir, my time is up and I have nothing more to say except to express the hope that this Bill will come to us in an improved form. Sir, I thank you for allowing me some more time.

श्री राम सहाय (मध्य भारत) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे कुछ ज्यादा नहीं कहना है। कल के डिबेट में कुछ थोड़ी सी बातें बघेलखंड और बुंदेलखंड के बारे में कही गई हैं। उसी सम्बन्ध में निवेदन करना है। मैंने विन्ध्य प्रदेश की प्रोसीरिडिंग्स देखीं और वहां के चीफ मिनिस्टर का स्टेटमेंट देखा। मैं समझता हूं कि कल यह जो बात कही गई थी कि वहां के लोग यह चाहते हैं कि उत्तर प्रदेश में उनको मिलाया जाय, यह सही नहीं है।

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Would he please agree to a plebiscite?

SHRI RAM SAHAI: No. I have got the Proceedings (Interruption.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): Order, order.

श्री राम सहाय : मर पास प्रोसीरिडिंग्स हैं और उन प्रोसीरिडिंग्स को मैंने सार्ट आउट किया है। उसके आधार पर मैं बता सकता हूं कि मेजरिटी ऑपिनियन यह है कि बघेलखंड.....

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Will the hon. friend please refer to all the Proceedings of this discussion? I would like him to refer to that also.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: Please leave it to him, whether to refer to the entire Proceedings or only a part of them.

श्री राम सहाय : मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा हूं कि उन सारी प्रोसीरिडिंग्स को देखने के बाद यह बिल्कुल डीफिनिट नतीजा निकलता है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश के लोग मध्य प्रदेश के साथ रहना चाहते हैं। अभी हाल में वहां के चीफ मिनिस्टर का जो स्टेटमेंट निकला है उसमें भी उन्होंने बताया है कि ५५ में से केवल ११ सदस्य ऐसे थे कि जो यह चाहते थे कि उत्तर प्रदेश में उनको मिलाया जाय। अब आप गौर कर सकते हैं कि ५५ में से ११ की बात कहां तक मानने योग्य हो सकती है। विन्ध्य प्रदेश के सम्बन्ध में जो कल बात कही गई थी वह बिल्कुल निराधार है, यही मैं आपके सामने अर्ज करना चाहता था।

दूसरी एक बात मुझे और अर्ज करनी है और यह है कि स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन कमीशन के मेम्बर साहबान और इस बिल के बनाने वाले साहबान ने मालूम नहीं किस ख्याल से भांसी डिवीजन को जो कि मध्य प्रदेश में आवश्यक रूप से आना चाहिये था और जो एक एनक्लेव की तरह मध्य प्रदेश और मध्य भारत में हैं, क्यों नहीं शामिल किया। जिन सिद्धांतों और जिन उद्देश्यों की बिना पर उन्होंने मध्य प्रदेश को मध्य भारत, भोपाल और विन्ध्य प्रदेश को मिला कर बनाया, उन्हीं सिद्धांतों की अवहेलना करके उन्होंने भांसी डिवीजन यानी भांसी, जालौन, हमीरपुर, बांदा ये चार जिले जो जमुना के इस तरफ हैं उनको क्यों मध्य प्रदेश से अलग रखा इसके बारे में कमीशन ने कोई कारण नहीं बताया है और न बिल में ही इस ओर ध्यान दिया गया है। ऐसी ज़ात में सिलेक्ट कमेटी के मेम्बरों

से मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि वे इस बाप पर जरूर गौर करें कि दरअसल बुंदेलखंड और बघेलखंड से बिल्कुल मिलता जुलता जो हिस्सा है भांसी डिवीजन का वह सार का सारा मध्य प्रदेश में अवश्य मिलाया जाए। रिआर्गनाइजेशन आफ स्टेट्स के सम्बन्ध में जो कमेटी हमारे प्रदेश में प्रदेश कांग्रेस की ओर से कायम की गई थी उसका मैं चयरमैन था। मेरा स्वयं का बयान कमीशन के सामने हुआ था उसमें मैंने जो मध्य प्रदेश का नक्शा उनको बताया था उसमें से केवल यह भांसी डिवीजन ही अलग रखा गया है और बाकी सब उन्होंने जैसे का तैसा माना है। लेकिन भांसी डिवीजन को अलग रखने का कोई कारण उन्होंने नहीं बताया है। इस लिए मैं नमूनापूर्वक यह निवेदन करूंगा कि जरूर इसके बारे में गौर किया जाय।

एक बात मुझे यह भी अर्ज करनी है कि कल मेरे एक मित्र ने यह बात कही थी कि मध्य प्रदेश में लीजस्लीटिव काउंसिल बनाने का जो तरीका इस बिल में अस्तित्व दिया गया है वह वैधानिक नहीं है। उन्होंने कांस्टिट्यूशन के आर्टिकल १६६ का हवाला दिया था। मेरा यह निश्चित मत है कि आर्टिकल १६६ सिर्फ उस सूरत से मूताल्लिक है जब कि हम मौजूदा स्टेट्स जो हैं उनमें कहीं लीजस्लीटिव काउंसिल कायम करने की बात सोचें। लेकिन जब हम रिआर्गनाइजेशन कर रहे हैं और नई स्टेट कायम करके उस में लीजस्लीटिव काउंसिल बनाने की बात पर विचार कर रहे हैं और अलहदा बिल तैयार कर रहे हैं तो आर्टिकल १६६ उस पर लागू नहीं होगा। इस लिए जो बात कल कही गई वह उपयुक्त नहीं है।

दूसरी बात मुझे यह भी अर्ज करनी है कि हाई कोर्ट के बारे में अभी कई साहबान ने निवेदन किया। मुझे भी यह अर्ज करना है कि मध्य भारत और मध्य प्रदेश दोनों में हाई कोर्ट थे। मध्य भारत का हाई कोर्ट जो प्रस्तावित मध्य प्रदेश है उसके अन्तर्गत आज भी मौजूद

है लेकिन बिल में उसका हवाला न दते हुये इसमें न मालूम किन कारणों से मध्य प्रदेश के हाई कोर्ट को जो नागपुर में है उसका हवाला दिया गया है। हो सकता है कि इसके कोई कारण हों लेकिन मेरा यह निवेदन है कि हाई कोर्ट जजों के बारे में और वहां के स्टाफ के बारे में किसी प्रकार का भी कोई उल्लेख इस बिल में नहीं है। इससे वहां के जजों में और वहां के हाई कोर्ट के स्टाफ में बहुत कफ़युजन है। मैं होम मिनिस्टर साहब से अपील करूंगा कि वे इस बारे में उनको सात्वना देने के लिए कोई रास्ता सोचें। अगर जैसा कि बिल में है मध्य भारत हाई कोर्ट एबालिश कर दिया है और उसका कोई रास्ता बाकी नहीं रहा है, तो कम से कम यही बतला दिया जाय। बात स्पष्ट होनी चाहिये ताकि लोगों को तरह तरह का इंटरप्रिटेशन करने का मौका न मिले।

मैं और ज्यादा न कह कर एक बार फिर ज्वाइंट कमेटी से यह रिक्वेस्ट करूंगा कि जो मैंने भांसी डिवीजन के बारे में बात कही उस पर वह विचार करें।

श्री एम० अब्दुल शक़र (अजमेर एंड कुरग): वाइस चयरमैन, मैं एस० आर० बिल की ताइद करते हुये अजमेर के मूताल्लिक कुछ कहूंगा। अगर्चे एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट में अजमेर के साथ नाइंसाफी की गई है, अजमेर को जो एक महत्व और अहमियत हासिल थी उसको घटा कर दिखलाया गया है। हिन्दुस्तान के प्रांतों में से एक छोटा प्रांत था, लेकिन वह हर तरीके से एक तरक्की चापता प्रांत था। पिछले जमाने में जब हमारे देश के अन्दर आजादी की जंग चल रही थी, तब हम मध्य प्रदेश में और राजस्थान में, अजमेर में, बैठ करके जंग आजादी को चलाया करते थे। लेकिन एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट में अजमेर को राजस्थान में शामिल कर दिया गया है जो कि हर तरीके से अजमेर से पिछड़ा हुआ है। अजमेर की जनता ने देश के मुफ़ाद को सामने रखते हुये देश की एकजाई और सलामती को

[श्री एम० अब्दुल शकूर]

मद्द नजर रखते हुये इस कड़वे घुंट को पी लिया। एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट के पब्लिश होने के बाद हमारे देश के मुस्लिम हिस्सों में जो वाक्यात रूनुमा हुये हैं और जिस तरह के हालात पैदा हुये हैं उन तमाम चीजों को सामने रखते हुये मैं यह अर्ज करूंगा कि वे एंसी चीजें थीं जिनकी कोई समझदार इंसान तार्इद नहीं कर सकता, लेकिन अजमेर वालों ने उन तमाम चीजों को जो एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट से सारे देश के अन्दर पैदा हुई थीं नजर अन्दाज करके मुल्क के मुफाद को सामने रखते हुये राजस्थान में शामिल होना कबूल किया। हमने देखा कि अजमेर के छोटे से मुफाद के सामने सारे देश का मुफाद मुकद्दम है और वह ज्यादा अहम है। इस लिए हमने उस चीज को कबूल कर लिया। अब हमारी सरकार का यह फर्ज है कि अजमेर जैसे तरक्की गाफूता प्रांत को, जो उन्होंने राजस्थान में शामिल कर दिया है, मुनासिब जगह दे और मैं आनररीबल मिनिस्टर साहब से यह दख्खास्त करूंगा कि वे राजस्थान का कैपिटल अजमेर को बनायें, राजस्थान का केंद्र अजमेर को बनायें ताकि अजमेर की जो हैसियत है वह बाकी रहे। अजमेर की यों भी अहमियत बढ़ जाती है कि वह अपने महले बकू के एतबार से राजस्थान के बीच में है और जोधपुर, उदयपुर, जयपुर, बीकानेर के एतबार से, हर एतबार से, वह राजस्थान के बीच में है और अगर अजमेर को राजस्थान का कैपिटल बनाया जाता है, राजस्थान का सेंटर बनाया जाता है, राजस्थान का केंद्र बनाया जाता है तो उससे राजस्थान के तमाम लोगों को हर तरह से सहूलियत होती है। दूसरी चीज यह भी है कि राजस्थान में जो आपस में मतभेद हैं, जो आपस में कशमकश हैं, वह सारी चीजें अजमेर को केंद्र बनाने से मिट सकती हैं। अजमेर को राजस्थान का केंद्र बनाने की वजह से राजस्थान शक्तिशाली बन सकता है। आज राजस्थान की बड़ी अहमियत है क्योंकि वह एक सरहद्दी सूबा है। वहां पाकिस्तान की तीन सौ, चार सौ मील लम्बी सरहद्द लगी हुई है। पाकिस्तान में जो भी वाक्यात हो रहे हैं, पाकिस्तान में इस वक्त

जो हालात पैदा हो रहे हैं, उन सब चीजों को भी अपने ध्यान में रखना है।

इतना कहते हुए, मैं फिर यह अर्ज करूंगा कि हमें राजस्थान को इतना मजबूत करना है, राजस्थान के इंतजाम को इतना संगठित करना है, उसको इतना ताकतवर करना है कि वह हमारे लिये एक लोहे की दीवार का काम दे और राजस्थान हमारे लिये एक जबर्दस्त किला बन जाय। मैं इस सिलसिले में इतना ही अर्ज करूंगा और फिर यह कहूंगा कि देश की तरक्की के साथ साथ, देश के मुफाद के साथ साथ, राजस्थान की तरक्की और राजस्थान का मुफाद इसी में है कि अजमेर को राजस्थान का केंद्र और कैपिटल बनाया जाय।

श्री अब्दुर रज्जाक खान (पश्चिमी बंगाल) :-

जनाब वाइस चेंबरमैन साहब, मुझे ज्यादा वक्त नहीं लेना है। मैं सिर्फ बंगाल बिहार मर्जर के मुताल्लिक एक दो लफ्ज कह कर अपनी बात खत्म करना चाहता हूं। मुझे अपने आनररीबल मिनिस्टर साहब की तकरीर से बड़ी नाउम्मीदी हुई। उस तकरीर में इसका कोई रफरेंस ही नहीं था कि बंगाल बिहार मर्जर के मुताल्लिक मौजूदा पोजीशन क्या है और वह इसके मुताल्लिक क्या करना चाहते हैं। इसके बारे में कोई बात नहीं कही गई है। इसका मुझे बहुत ही अफसोस है। अफसोस इसलिये है कि गालिबन वह इस बंगाल बिहार मर्जर के बारे में ज्यादा सोचना नहीं चाहते हैं या उनके नजदीक इस मसले की कोई अहमियत नहीं है। आप जरा बंगाल की हालत पर गौर करें। वहां इस मर्जर के सवाल पर ऊधम मचा हुआ है। मुझे अफसोस है कि वहां इस मामले में जो तहरीक चल रही है उसको बढ़ने दिया जा रहा है। यहां से एक लफ्ज कह कर के उस मामले को खत्म किया जा सकता है लेकिन उसको नहीं किया जाता है चाहे वहां कितना भी ऊधम मच जाय, इसका मुझे अफसोस है। आज जो इस वक्त हमारे मुल्क की पोजीशन है उसमें इस समय हिन्दुस्तान का हर बाशिंदा यह महसूस करता है कि इस वक्त सब से ज्यादा जरूरत

एक की हैं। मुल्क के आस पास हम देख रहे हैं कि एक तरह जेहाद का नारा लगाया जा रहा है, चारों तरफ से साजिशें सिर उठा रही हैं। ऐसे वक़्त में मुल्क में ऊधम मचाने का मौक़ा ज्यादा कर दिया जाय इसका मुझे सख्त अफ़सोस है। आज दो महीने से वहाँ यह तहरीक चल रही है और सत्याग्रह चल रहा है, आठ हजार से ज्यादा आदमी जेल में जा चुके हैं। ऐसी हालत में क्या यह मामला कोई अहमियत नहीं रखता है और क्या इसके बारे में एक लफ़्ज़ भी कहना मुनासिब नहीं है? मैं तो यही इसरार करूंगा कि जिस तरह से बम्बई के मुताल्लिक आपने एक फैसला कर दिया है और इस बारे में मैं समझता हूँ कि आम राय भी यही है कि बम्बई महाराष्ट्र का है उसी तरह से बंगाल के मुताल्लिक भी फैसला कर दें। बंगाल के जो इलाक़े बिहार के अन्दर हैं उनके मुताल्लिक भी यह फैसला हो गया है कि वे बंगाल के इलाक़े हैं। कितना है और कितना नहीं है उसका आप फैसला करें लेकिन इसमें तो कोई शक नहीं है कि कुछ इलाका बंगाल का उसमें है। जब कि यह फैसला हो चुका है, जब कि एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट में और गवर्नमेंट के निज़ के फैसले से यह तय हो चुका है तो फिर उसको अमल में लाने में और उस फैसले को बिल में पेश करने में क्या रुकावट है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। कहा जा रहा है कि साहब मर्जर का प्रस्ताव सामने है चुनावों उसको हम अभी पीछे हटा रहे हैं। मर्जर का प्रस्ताव है कहां? आप जानते हैं कि हमारे सभी बिहार के भाई यहां कह रहे हैं कि जिस तरीके पर मर्जर की बात कही जा रही है उसको वे मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं, उसको खुद बिहार के लोग मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं और न बंगाल के लोग मानने के लिये तैयार हैं। तो फिर उसका कौनसा सवाल है, मर्जर का सवाल है कहां। जो मर्जर का प्रस्ताव है उस पर कोई राजी नहीं है, जो उसकी स्कीम है उस पर कोई राजी नहीं है। राय सिंहा की जो स्कीम थी वह तो अब हवा में मिल गई है और अब तो उसकी कोई हकीकत नहीं रही है। ऐसी हालत में, मेरे ख़्याल में बंगाल के ऊपर यह एक जुल्म किया

जा रहा है, उनके साथ नाइंसाफी हो रही है और वहां के लोगों को यह समझने का मौक़ा दिया जा रहा है कि बंगाल के मुताल्लिक नाइंसाफी की जा रही है। गवर्नमेंट को ऐसा काम नहीं करना चाहिये। मैं गवर्नमेंट को यह मश्विरा देना चाहता हूँ कि उनका जो बंगाल के इलाक़े के मुताल्लिक फैसला है उसको वह इस बिल में दर्ज करें और मामले को सुलझा लें, इस मामले को और आगे बढ़ने का मौक़ा वह न दें। अगर बग़ैर किसी कंडीशन के मर्जर हो तो उसको बंगाल के लोग मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं और अगर कोई कंडीशन लगाई जाय तो उसके लिये बिहार के लोग राजी नहीं हैं, तो फिर मर्जर का प्रस्ताव क्या रहता है? दोनों चीफ़ मिनिस्टर्स उस पर राजी नहीं हो सकते हैं ऐसी सूरत में लोगों में बढ़गुमानी पैदा करने की क्यों कोशिश की जा रही है। लोग ऐसा समझ रहे हैं कि चूंकि कुछ इलाकों को बंगाल में शामिल करने का सवाल है इसलिये उनको न देने के लिये यह बहानाबाजी हो रही है। बंगाल को उन इलाकों से महरूम रखने के लिये, उन इलाकों को न देने के लिए एक बहाना किया गया है और वह मर्जर का बहाना है। मर्जर की गुप्तगू आज तीन महीने से चल रही है और ऐसा कुछ पता नहीं चलता है कि आइंदा तीन या छः महीनों में कोई फैसला कौन बात सामने आने वाली है। ऐसी हालत में इसके सिवाय और कोई अमली सूरत नहीं है कि आपके फैसले के मुताबिक जो भी इलाका बंगाल को दिया जाना है वह उसको दिया जाय और इस बिल में उसको शामिल किया जाय। भाषाई भित्ति पर जो इलाक़े बंगाल को मिलने चाहिये वह उसको दें देने चाहिये। बंगाल के सब लोग यही आवाज उठा रहे हैं कि जो इलाके भाषाई भित्ति पर हमें मिलने चाहिये वे हमें मिलें, इसके सिवाय और कोई इलाका वे नहीं मांगते हैं। भाषा भित्ति के ऊपर जो इलाका हमें मिलना चाहिए वह हमारे साथ जोड़ दिया जाय, बस मामला ख़त्म हो जायगा और इसके लिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे सेलेक्ट कमेटी के मेम्बरान भी इस पर गौर करें और अगर कुछ कमी बिल में हो तो उसको पूरा कर दें। बिहारी:

[श्री अब्दुर रज्जाक खान]

भाइयों से मेरी अपील यह है कि मौजूदा सूरत को देखते हुए बंगाल में बिहारियों के साथ पूरा पूरा इतिहाद है, पूरा पूरा एका है और बढ़ता जा रहा है। बंगाल और बिहार के मर्जर का सवाल वहां बंगाली और बिहारी के भगई में पैदा नहीं हुआ, वहां कोई भगड़ा होने नहीं पाया और न कोई बदगुमानी पैदा हुई। आप जानते हैं कि जिस तरीके से मर्जर का सवाल पेश किया गया है उसमें हमारे दो चीफ मिनिस्टर किस तरह से काम करते रहे। आपको याद होगा कि दामोदर वैली कांफरेंशन में बिहार और बंगाल के मिनिस्टर मिल कर काम नहीं कर सके। जो यह बंगाल और बिहार के मर्जर का सवाल पैदा हुआ उसमें भी देखा गया कि इलाके के बारे में जो सवाल उठा उसमें भी दोनों इतिहाद नहीं कर सके, अब भी मर्जर का सवाल सुलभाने के लिए वे कोई प्रपोजल नहीं रख सके। मौजूदा गवर्नमेन्ट के निजाम में उनको इतिहाद के साथ काम करने की सूरत मुमकिन नहीं दिखाई देती। भगई ही पैदा होंगे और वह बंगाली और बिहारी का भगड़ा पैदा होगा जिससे हम बचना चाहते हैं। वह ज्यादा से ज्यादा पैदा हो जायगा, इसका खतरा है। इसलिए हम चाहते हैं कि बिहार अपने इलाके में अपनी उन्नति करता रहे और उन्हें बेहतरीन मौका दिया जाय और बंगाल को भी अपना अपना इलाका देकर आगे बढ़ने दिया जाय।

सैय्यद मजहर इमाम (बिहार) : बिहार का इलाका तो निकल रहा है।

श्री अब्दुर रज्जाक खान : मैं बंगाली स्पीकिंग एरिया का जिक्र कर रहा हूँ। उसकी तहकीक और जांच हो चुकी है। मेरे ख्याल में गवर्नमेन्ट ने और एस० आर० सी० ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में भाषा भित्त का इलाका उसमें पेश कर दिया है, और अगर इस पर भी आपको तसल्ली नहीं तो कह दीजिए कि सब बातें गलत हैं, फिर तहकीक करने की जरूरत है और यह काम पन्द्रह दिन में हो सकता है।

सैय्यद मजहर इमाम : और किशनगंज का इलाका ?

श्री अब्दुर रज्जाक खान : आपको तो सिर्फ किशनगंज का ही ख्याल है, लेकिन मैं बार बार यह कह रहा हूँ कि भाषा भित्त पर जो इलाके हैं उसी को बंगाल में मिलना चाहिए। भाषा भित्त के सिवा दूसरा इलाका मैं नहीं मांगता। अगर वह एक इंच भी हो तो वह दे दिया जाय। बस, यही बात खत्म हो जाती है और इसमें कोई ऐतराज नहीं होना चाहिए। जो बंगाली इलाके हैं वे बंगाल में जायें, जो बिहारी इलाके हैं वे बिहार में रहें और इस तरीके से हमारी उन्नति बढ़ती जाय।

काजी अहमद हुसैन (बिहार) : क्या आपका मतलब कमीशन बिठा दिया जाने से है ?

श्री अब्दुर रज्जाक खान : जी नहीं, कमीशन तो बँठ चुका है। उसकी राय हमारे सामने है। कोई और कमीशन बिठाने से कोई और नतीजा नहीं निकलेगा।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU) : You have only two minutes. Please wind up.

श्री अब्दुर रज्जाक खान : मैं यही अर्ज कर देनी चाहता हूँ कि साहब, इस हंगामे को खत्म कर दिया जाय और इस पर फैसला कर दिया जाय, इस नाइंसाफी की बुनियाद को हटा दिया जाय। मर्जर के सवाल को लेकर यह जो हंगामा हो रहा है उसको रोकिये। यह सवाल, मैं तो समझता हूँ, एक बहाने की सूरत है और बहुत से दूसरे लोग भी ऐसा सोच रहे हैं। सत्याग्रह चल रहा है, आठ हजार से ज्यादा आदमी जेल जा चुके हैं और अब तो आप जानते हैं कि लोग बिहार के इलाके से जा रहे हैं सत्याग्रह करने के लिए। क्या आप चाहते हैं कि यह सूरतहाल बढ़ती जाय या आप चाहते हैं कि तीन महीने, छः महीने तक यही सूरत रहे। मेरे ख्याल में तो यह बहुत खतरनाक सूरत है। इसलिए मैं हर शख्स से अपील करूंगा कि इस पर गौर करें। सेलेक्ट कमेटी खद इस पर फैसलाकून तसफीया करें।

KAZI KARIMUDDIN (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I congratulate the Government of India for solving the stupendous problems of the reorganisation of States. Particularly, it is a miracle that, when there were so many complications in this matter, a Bill has been produced in which there is controversy only in regard to Maharashtra and Bombay and all the other questions have been settled except that of the merger of Bengal and Bihar. It is because of the sincerity, honesty and political sagacity of the national leaders like Pandit Nehru and Pandit Pant that these problems have been settled. It has been said that this is the time for national solidarity and national unity and that strifes and conflicts in our society are not desirable when we are faced with very grave dangers to the security of India. I assure everybody that those who are asking for Bombay to be included in Maharashtra are entirely in support of national solidarity, and they would be in the front line to defend India.

If, in spite of all our arguments for Bombay to be included in Maharashtra, the verdict of the House is different, it will be acceptable to the whole country. In my opinion, Satyagraha in support of such a move is most undemocratic, because it is the national Government, which has taken the decision. It is a majority Government. Those who want to oppose this can defeat that party at the next elections. The offering of Satyagraha in order to coerce the Government is most undesirable. It has been said that our energies should not be wasted in these conflicts because there is the Second Five Year Plan before us and that there are some nations who are hostile to us, only because we are a peace-loving nation and they differ from us. I entirely agree with this assertion that there are some nations of this kind.

In view of this, we are entirely with those who think that we should not waste our energies in fighting against

the decisions of the Government, but it must be remembered that in a democracy the people are given the right to persuade others to their own point of view, and this is exactly what we are doing here. Freedom of speech is the backbone of democracy. The majority of the chosen representatives of the people of Maharashtra, with the exception of one or two, are of the opinion that Bombay should be included in Maharashtra. Not only that, a member of the States Reorganisation Commission, Mr. Panikkar, is reported to have said in one of his speeches that Bombay belongs to Maharashtra and that it must be given to Maharashtra, and that the Gujaratis have only trade interests there and that they have not got industrial interests worth mentioning. In the Amrit Bazaar Patrika, it is reported that 'the Commission wanted Bombay to be a bilingual State for the transition period only'. The Prime Minister and the Home Minister and many others in this House have expressed the view that Bombay is part of Maharashtra and that Bombay should be included ultimately and finally in Maharashtra. I agree that no Government can be coerced by violence. I condemn the acts of violence perpetrated by the mob and I entirely agree with those who disagree with such acts being carried on for this purpose. But in the new set up, it is most undemocratic to enumerate acts of violence by goondas and to say that a just cause has been spoiled. Let there be elections on this point. You will see that the majority of the voters will be in support of the fact that Bombay should be included in Maharashtra. Now a just cause to be spoiled by goondas or by riots is a very peculiar argument to advance. This was the argument that used to be advanced by the Britishers. There was a riot in Chauri Chaura, there was rioting in Bombay and it was said that the people were not fit to govern themselves. It is exactly the argument of the Gujaratis in Bombay. If the cause of Bombay to be included in Maharashtra is just, how can it be spoiled by goondas? It

[Kazi Karimuddin.]

people agree that it is situated in the heart of Maharashtra, how can it be separated from there? It is said, let there be referendum regarding Bombay. It is a very very peculiar argument. Why should there have been no referendum in Madras? Why should there have been no referendum in Hyderabad and why should there have been no referendum for the other cities of India and why should there be referendum for Bombay? It is just like an argument.....

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras): Nobody has asked for it.

DR. D. H. VARIAVA (Saurashtra): Madras was never separated from the Province and Bombay is being separated and going to another State. That difference must be conceded.

KAZI KARIMUDDIN: Bombay is situated in the heart of Maharashtra. If people from Gujarat have come to have a trade in Bombay, then have they become the owners of that place? Suppose if Englishmen come and settle and create an industrial town, can it be an English town? That is absolutely no argument that because Gujaratis have trade, because they are afraid, therefore Bombay should be denied to Maharashtra. That is absolutely no argument. Therefore my submission is that if Gujaratis feel that there is any apprehension from rioters, then, there is the Constitution of India. This is the Constitution of our country in which it is laid down that trade will be free, that every citizen of India will have a right to have trade anywhere, in any part of the country. Not only that. There are two sections that if the chosen representatives of the people do not behave properly in the Bombay Assembly, then the relevant provisions of the Constitution can be suspended and now if, for the action of the goondas, if, for the action of the mob, Bombay is denied to Maharashtra, it will be a great injustice because it is not the verdict of the people. If some

people commit riots, if some people commit violence or if there is fury of the mob, then how can Bombay be denied? Let Bombay be given to Maharashtra and if the chosen representatives of the people misbehave in the Assembly and in the administration of the State you have a section in the Constitution of India that even for internal violence, the Union Government and the President can supersede the State Administration. When these rights have been guaranteed to you, why are you afraid of this? When the Constitution guarantees the right to you, there is no occasion for being afraid.

It is further said by Dr. Kunzru that in the beginning the bilingual proposal was rejected by the Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee. It is not so. The first suggestion of the Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee was that bilingual State was acceptable to them with the inclusion of Vidarbha. Now it has been repeatedly said on the floor of this House that Vidarbha was unwilling. The resolution of the Vidarbha Congress Committee was that Vidarbha should be included in Maharashtra which was not acceptable to Gujaratis because exclusion of Vidarbha was only to out-balance Maharashtra against Gujarat. Therefore this proposal was not accepted. But the inclusion of Vidarbha in the biggest bilingual State was acceptable to Maharashtrians.

Then a referendum on Bombay will be just like this. Supposing I construct a huge building and allow the tenants to come and live on my side and if there is a question of ownership, there should be referendum between the tenants and the owner. It is my land and you have come and settled down to live as free citizens. You cannot claim referendum. What justice they want is like this. If a suit is filed for the possession of a chair—for ownership—the decree of the Court that they want is that the chair belongs to the plaintiff but it must be used by the defendant for 12

years when it will be broken. This is exactly the position taken by those people. What is the dispute? The dispute is that those who are capitalists of Bombay think that if this town is included in Maharashtra there will be cooperatives and socialistic pattern as early as possible and therefore they are afraid and want that they should be under the Central Government under the Statute. What is the use of keeping a city consisting of people who are more advanced, politically advanced, economically advanced, and from the point of view of education also they are advanced—how can these people remain without any representation in the Assembly? How can they be governed by the Central Government when they have such an advanced population? Therefore, as Dr. Kunzru has said, now there is only one alternative and that is that Bombay should be given to Maharashtra with all the restrictions on trade, commerce, etc. Suppose, if they are afraid, in the Bill you may embody such provisions that the trade of those people will not be affected. When India requires the Englishmen to come here, Americans to come here and invest capital in India, the Maharashtrians are mad men that they should drive away the Gujaratis and they would welcome Englishmen and the Americans to trade in India. These are false apprehensions. There are different reasons for what they want to do. Those reasons are that the capitalist system or structure of society in Bombay should not change and should remain as it is for some years and they expect a socialistic and cooperative pattern of society there if Bombay is included in Maharashtra.....

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ: Don't you think that the Central Government would have a socialistic pattern of society and Bombay would not be out of it?

KAZI KARIMUDDIN: They will have absolutely no popular body there. They are a politically advanced people and they must have represen-

tatives in the Assembly and there must be an Assembly, there....
(Interruptions.)

Therefore my submission is that there is absolutely no logic, no sense in saying that Bombay should be Centrally administered and what would be the effect of Central administration? It means, the Maharashtrians will be hoping that on some future date Bombay is to be given to them. What would the Gujaratis think? They will be winding up their business thinking that at some future date Bombay would be going to Maharashtra and the conflict will not abate. The conflict will go on. They cannot be reconciled by the introduction of Central administration. Therefore my submission is this. What are those reasons on account of which you don't want to give Bombay? It is because there are riots, or because some people have been looted or because some violence has been committed. For the action of rioters and the action of mob, Bombay cannot be denied to Maharashtra. Another thing that I wish to say is about the Regional Council, for which people are clamouring, for Vidarbha. There is a Nagpur Pact by which our rights have been defined. We don't want any Regional Council for Vidarbha and there will be fight unnecessarily between Vidarbha, Marathwada and Bombay. We have invited and our terms are settled in the Nagpur Pact and if they are embodied in this Bill, we don't require any Regional Council in order to have more conflicts.

Therefore my submission is that there is no justification at all for Central administration for Bombay and it should be included in Maharashtra and the Maharashtrians are sufficiently national minded to support the national unity and solidarity of India.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, being very happy at getting this opportunity of speaking in the genial and congenial atmosphere under your chairmanship, I

[Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor.]
would at the very outset like to express my appreciation and offer my sincere congratulations to the hon. the Home Minister in charge of the Bill.....

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Where is he?

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: and to his two learned and able colleagues on the committee appointed by the Union Government to solve this problem, for the very able and statesmanlike manner in which they have dealt with this question so far. This achievement of theirs will go down in history as one of their greatest achievements. They have adopted a thoroughly democratic way in solving this question. They invited opinions from all quarters. They tried to persuade the people to come to an agreement. Where they failed they tried to persuade them to come round to their views and tried to obtain their willing co-operation and agreement. I was very much surprised this morning, Sir, to find my hon. friend Dr. Kunzru say that it would have been better if non-Congress parties had also been consulted. I do not know why or how he could think that non-Congress parties were prevented from placing their viewpoints before the sub-committee of the Government consisting of these three Ministers. It was open to anybody to go before them and place their viewpoints. The Akalis came and freely expressed their views. Any other non-Congress party might well have placed their views before the sub-committee. That being so, that accusation of Dr. Kunzru appears to me to be absolutely without any foundation.

Sir, this sub-committee of the three learned Ministers, as I have already stated, tackled the problem virtually to the satisfaction of most of the people concerned. Of course, it is impossible to satisfy everyone and if they failed in such an attempt to some extent, there is nothing to be surprised. But what they have suggested to us in this Bill represents the

greatest common agreement among the people. Only in respect of one or two States am I constrained to submit that they have not given proper consideration and these two States are the States of Uttar Pradesh and a part of the State of Vindhya Pradesh. I would beg of this House to very seriously consider the few suggestions that I am going to make in this connection.

Sir, they say that charity begins at home. But in the case that I have just now referred, not only charity has not been extended to Uttar Pradesh the home of the two members of the Sub-committee and the constituency of the third member and to our neighbours in Bhagelkhand but even what is due to us has not been given to us. Let not hon. Members here think that if people do not agitate in a very rough manner, if they do not try to settle problems in bazaars and in the streets, they have simply no problem. That is not the case. We of Uttar Pradesh and our neighbours in Bhagelkhand have silently and quietly and in a very docile and humble manner been trying for the last several months to place our views before the country, before the Government and before Parliament and this Union Sub-Committee. But it seems that nuisance value is probably the only value that is given adequate consideration and that humble representations, however just, however reasonable they may be, are not given due consideration.

Sir, what is the position with regard to this portion of Bhagelkhand? It is an admitted principle that the wishes of the people shall be respected. What is the wish of the people of Bhagelkhand, which means the three districts of Vindhya Pradesh? If Vindhya Pradesh were to remain as an entire and separate entity, it would be an entirely different matter. But when you are going to abolish this State altogether, should not the views of the people of these three districts, which form about half the area of Vindhya Pradesh and which

have a population of a little less than half the population of Vindhya Pradesh be taken into consideration? Sir, times without number it has been said that the wishes of the people shall be taken into consideration and they will be accepted, unless, of course, those wishes are contrary to the unity of the country or to the well being of the country as a whole. But what is the case here? The view of the people of these three districts is that they should be merged with Uttar Pradesh. What is the harm in that to either the country as a whole or to Madhya Pradesh or for the matter of that, to anybody else? Are not these people being coerced into submitting to be merged into the State of Madhya Pradesh? Has any reason whatsoever been advanced as to why their wishes should not prevail? Sir, their language is the same as that in Uttar Pradesh. They are geographically connected with the people of Uttar Pradesh. So far as these three districts are concerned, their educational institutions are affiliated to the Agra University or to the U.P. Intermediate Board. Then again, so far as economic questions are concerned, the trade and commerce of these three districts are very much allied to those in the neighbouring State of Uttar Pradesh. That being so, there seems to be no reason why, against their wishes, against their expressed wishes, wishes expressed in their Legislative Assembly, expressed in the Congress Committee—for the Congress Committees of two of these three districts have expressly stated that they want to be merged with Uttar Pradesh—this area be merged with M.P. Is it fair, is it just, is it reasonable, is it proper to make this present proposal? Should it not rouse the conscience of the hon. Members of this House to the fact that the wishes of these people are not accepted, that they should be forcibly asked to merge with Madhya Pradesh?

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

There is another reason. There are minerals in this part of Vindhya Pradesh. Of course there are enough

minerals in other parts in Madhya Pradesh also which it can exploit. But so far as the mineral deposits in Bhagelkhand are concerned, they can be developed to the advantage of the Uttar Pradesh and Bhagelkhand, and also to the advantage of the entire country. If all these deposits are with M.P. it will take long to develop them, whereas if they are divided, as suggested between U.P. and M.P. both States will take up their development simultaneously and they will be exploited much sooner to the advantage of the entire country. Even without these Madhya Pradesh has enough mineral deposits for development.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ: अभी जो डेवलपमेंट हो रहे हैं वे क्या यू० पी० के फाइनेंस से हो रहे हैं ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. You may continue, Mr. Kapoor.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: अगर आप शांति रखें तो बहुत अच्छी तरह से बात समझ जायेंगे ।

I do not know why my friend from Madhya Pradesh should get excited over it. They have got a large area of not less than one lakh and seventy one thousand square miles. This is a very important point which I would like to urge before this House with all the emphasis at my command and I would expect hon. Members to give very serious and sympathetic consideration to that. In Madhya Pradesh they have 1,71,000 sq. miles and what is their population? Their population is only a little over two and a half crores. What is the density of population? So far as Uttar Pradesh is concerned it has an area of 1,14,000 sq. miles and a population of over six crores. Just imagine what is the density of population there. In Madhya Pradesh it is 153 per sq. mile whereas in Uttar Pradesh it is as much as 559 per sq. mile. Is it fair that over six crores of people should have land only to that extent, namely,

[Shri Jaspal Roy Kapoor.]
1,14,000 sq. miles, while two and a half crores of people should have land to the extent of 1,71,000 sq. miles? Is that fair? (Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Let him go on.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Why is the density of population so great in Uttar Pradesh? It is because the doors of Uttar Pradesh are open to everybody. Biharis have come and settled there. Bengalis have come and settled down there. People from Andhra have come and settled down there. People from Punjab have come and settled down there. People from the neighbouring States have come and settled down there. Punjabis in large numbers from West Pakistan have come and settled down in Uttar Pradesh. That being so, our population is ever increasing. Should you not give credit to the Uttar Pradesh that its doors have always been open to everybody, that it allowed its population to grow and without any provincialism about it? Now, do you want to give credit to us or do you want us to shut our doors against everybody else who does not permanently belong to Uttar Pradesh? When the population has grown, when we have allowed other people to come and settle down here within the limited space available, is it not fair that you should give us some land? Why should you not? I beg of you to seriously consider this question and not to be swayed by the consideration that our population is over six crores. That is exactly our problem. We have got such a huge population within that limited space. Is it not fair then that these two States, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh, should have an equal and fair distribution of the available land? Is it not fair that the density of population in one State should not be so high as it is now whereas in the other it is very low? Is it not fair that the densely populated State should have a bit more of land than the sparsely populated State? Is it not fair? Is it

not just? I ask humbly and in all humility.

There is one more thing. We in Uttar Pradesh have been allotted, during the second Five Year Plan, only about 11 per cent. of the total amount which has been allotted to the various States. Our population is 17 per cent of the whole of India, when we wanted more money, we were told, "You do not contribute very handsomely to the Central revenues". Bombay has been given a very handsome sum and the reason that has been given to us by the Planning Commission is that the State of Bombay contributes handsomely. True, but when you are after the establishment of a socialistic pattern of society—I ask the Government and the Planning Commission and others who are concerned with this affair—is it the elementary principle of socialism that he who earns more should be given more? Everybody must contribute according to his capacity and must get according to his requirement. The State of Bombay contributes according to its capacity and we must get according to our requirements but then we are told that we must stand on our own legs. We must develop industrially. Accepted, but then give us the scope, give us the opportunity to stand on our own legs. If you give us these three districts of Vindhya Pradesh, we shall be able to develop our State industrially and we will be able to stand on our own legs. We shall not then be in need to beg of the Central Government to give us more. We are only asking you to give us the opportunity to earn more, to industrialise ourselves and then we shall not ask for anything more. It will be a solution of the problem of Uttar Pradesh vis-a-vis the Central Government if you let us have these three districts. We will develop our State industrially and we shall stand on our own legs.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kapoor; there are still fifteen more Members to speak and we have just one hour and a quarter.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I knew that. In fact, when I gave my name, there was only one member. I gave my name on Friday last.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So, please wind up.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I was submitting that I was conscious of this fact. My humble and earnest submission is for the Members of this House to consider this question dispassionately, impartially and not to be swayed away by the things that have been said about Uttar Pradesh by Mr. Panikkar in his Report. In fact, Sir, I take my stand on what Mr. Panikkar has said. He has said that we are industrially backward. Admitted; he says that we are educationally backward. That too is admitted, he goes on to say that our administrative expenses are high and we admit that too. What is the solution for the removal of these difficulties? Let us have more money to spend on social services; let us have more money to spend on education and let us have more area so that our overall administrative expenses may come down from 24 per cent. to about 20 per cent. It is because of the various things that Mr. Panikkar has said about us—and rightly too—pointing out our backwardness that we want to ask you to come to our help, to our rescue. That is the reason why we ask you to give us these three districts, the people of which districts themselves want to unite with us. By this arrangement, allow us to develop our State industrially, have more money to spend on education and all that. All the arguments are in our favour and the wishes of the people are also in our favour. I would not take much time of the House but would simply say that the position of these three districts in Vindhya Pradesh is very much like that of a fair damsel, a fair and wealthy damsel, for whose hand there are more than one suitors. She wants to come over to Uttar Pradesh whereas the Madhya Pradesh people want to drag her away forcibly to their home. I ask, should you be a

party to this forcible dragging away of that Lakshmi—the three districts of Vindhya Pradesh which I would call the Lakshmi of Vindhya Pradesh? Must she be dragged forcibly by Madhya Pradesh and not be allowed to choose her own home?

I will not take more time lest I incur the Chair's displeasure but I would only submit one or two things with regard to the other States very hurriedly. There is one thing with regard to the State of Bombay, Maharashtra and Gujarat. I for one along with many other friends of mine, would have welcomed the idea of that State remaining as a composite entity. In this connection, I was happy to find today a very constructive suggestion coming from my hon. friend. Dr. Ambedkar, for whom I have very great regard. I have always associated him with constructive suggestions and he has said that the State of Bombay should be made a City State. If one eminent Maharashtrian like Dr. Ambedkar is agreeable to such a proposition and if this could satisfy the aspirations of the Maharashtrians and would be acceptable to the Gujaratis also and others in Bombay I see no reason why it should not be acceptable to all of us. This is a suggestion worthy of consideration.

I have one word to say with regard to Bengal and Bihar and that is because I have got a very soft corner for both Bengal and Bihar, having lived in these two States for no less than sixteen years. The whole country is looking up to the people of Bengal and Bihar to unite together so that they may set a very fine example to the rest of the country. So far as one political party—the Communist Party—is concerned, I am not surprised at their attitude. They do not like Bengal and Bihar to combine; they do not like to see anything done in this country which may bring about the unity of the country and make it stronger and stronger but then, so far as the others are concerned, I see no reason why they should not agree. Bengal and Bihar—even Assam and Orissa—were one once. At one time when there was

[Shri Jaspal Roy Kapoor.]

partition of Bengal, there was a hue and cry and the whole country was against the partition of Bengal, and now, when some people, particularly the Chief Ministers of Bengal and Bihar, want to unite, we should welcome it and we should help them to the best of our ability and capacity. It is all in the interests of Bengal and not so much in the interests of Bihar though Bihar will also benefit. If we want to solve the problem of refugees coming from East Pakistan, if we want to solve the difficult problem of ceding some areas of Bihar to Bengal and so on; the only solution and the best solution is for these people to merge preferably in entirety. If they cannot merge entirely, then let there be a union of these two States. Let the whole country know that we in this Parliament are offering our best wishes and our best help.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I am in the middle of a sentence. Let me complete the sentence. I do not want to take up any more time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please complete it and finish.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: So the remaining portion of my sentence may be taken to have been said.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I associate myself with all the hon. friends who have expressed their high appreciation of the wonderful statesmanship which our leaders have exhibited in trying to tackle this great, complex problem. It looked to us, Sir, at the beginning that this was a question bristling with problems and difficulties and there were wise men and true, who even suggested that this question of States reorganisation might be shelved for the moment, for some years to come and be taken up when times were more propitious for it.

Sir, it is no use now going to the past and finding fault with the circumstances and the historical background of this question and trying to find fault with the constitution of the States Reorganisation Commission. The thing is all over and to-day we have a Bill before us. And so, Sir, we have every reason to congratulate ourselves that by and large the many difficult problems and complex situations have been got over and what remains now awaiting our further solution after all forms a microscopic minority of them. So, Sir, I think a very good job has been done now, and looking at the circumstances it seems to me that we are launching on this great reform under very good auspices.

Sir, I do not want to dwell on the controversial question that remains now, namely, with regard to Bombay and, to some extent, Bengal and Bihar and I think it would be a case of fools trying to enter where angels fear to tread. I think it is best that this matter is left to those very leaders who have solved the various other problems arising from these recommendations of the S.R.C. and we can trust them, those who have led the country in the past on successful lines. It will be best to trust them to solve this problem also. It is a most unfortunate thing, Sir, that this question has given rise to high passions and strong, bitter feelings which we hardly ever dreamt of in the beginning. If we take the kind of fellowship that existed prior to our securing freedom and compare it with what is now in evidence, it almost looks to me that it was unthinkable in those days that India could ever present a picture like that, of people not thinking of the country as a whole and practically everyone thinking of his own particular linguistic area. What has come upon us, I really find it difficult to understand. Is it that we who are the inheritors of this great culture and civilisation, who have come by this great legacy of a united India, who have realised our dream should be thinking as though we are aliens

so one another, that one set of people are finding it difficult to associate themselves with another set of people? I am afraid it will take a very long time for us to get over the feelings that have been engendered to-day but I am sure, Sir.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dasappa, my suggestion to you is that if we could give suggestions to the Joint Committee instead of generalising—because there is very little time—.....

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I do not know but whatever time you say I am bound to stick to it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are still about 15 to 20 speakers.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I do not know how many minutes you are giving me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: My request to you is that you may just give your suggestions to the Select Committee instead of again generalising on the main Report. It is about 10 to 15 minutes maximum. You have already taken five minutes.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: You can only tell me, Sir, as to when I should close.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can take another 10 minutes.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: The choice of the subject-matter may kindly be left to me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Because it is so wide.....

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: It is

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Anyway 10 minutes more. and since there is a large number of speakers, if the House so desires, we may sit a little longer, till 5-30 or 6, if the House is so agreeable.

Hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: You have only to tell me how much time but, Sir, let me continue in my own way.

Sir, I was referring to this question that unless we get over such narrow feelings, it will be very difficult to find solutions for the problems. That is what I was going to say, and I have hardly found any hon. Member trying to welcome the conception of a bilingual or a multilingual State. I am just trying to find out what could be at the back of the minds of friends who are reluctant to think in terms of a bilingual or a multilingual State. I was just trying to make out this case that unless we think in terms of bilingual or multilingual States, we will be crystallising these differences between these linguistic areas and it will be a difficult job for us to forge a strong united nation. That is what I was going to say, and when the question of Bihar and Bengal merger came I felt that there was some happy solution there and I was very happy that they were thinking on those lines. And when they also proposed the formation of Dakshin Pradesh that was also a matter which some friends welcomed and I for my part said that it would be very desirable if two or more linguistic areas came together under one Government and that would be the best way of developing the solidarity and the strength of the country.

Now, Sir, having said that I would like to say a word or two about the particular areas that I have in mind. Personally, Sir, it would be very good if Bombay city, instead of being a Union Territory, is converted into a City State until such time as these strong feelings are assuaged and they will be in a better mood to usher in the State of Maharashtra with Bombay. Sir, it is acknowledged on all hands that Bombay, if it is to go to any other State, it must go to Maharashtra and therefore I beseech, so far as my Maharashtrian friends are concerned, I beseech them for a little patience and give a chance to our leaders just to create the necessary atmosphere there for a happy reunion

[Shri H. C. Dasappa.]

with Maharashtra. Patience may be bitter but the fruit is sweet.
4 P.M. Instead of trying to force something on an unwilling people—it may be that they are not in a majority—it would be the path of wisdom for our Maharashtrian friends to just exercise a little patience.

Coming nearer home, with regard to the State of Karnataka or New Mysore I endorse the proposition of my friend Mr. Hegde. Not that I am anxious to have more land but if that is a better way of administering the country, I think it would be just as well we had that and I do not think that our Kerala friends would ever be too insistent that a fraction of Kasargod taluk should not go to Karnatak.

Then there is the question of representation of Coorg during the interim period. The Mysore State legislature for some reason or another has resolved that all the 24 members of Coorg need not be represented in the legislature on 1st October 1956. This is only a part of the pattern that has been adopted for the whole of the country that the term of these members who have been elected for a period of five years should not be curtailed or abridged during this period. That is the pattern that is followed all over India—not necessarily for the new State of Mysore—and therefore I think it is but right that the 24 members of Coorg should be allowed to join the new legislature of this new Mysore.

As regards Bellary, I say it is a question of *status quo* and I do not think that we should disturb the existing arrangement.

Then there was the question of these Services. In the very beginning I said that so far as the integration of the Services was concerned it was bound to create trouble. I have got here the speech of the hon. the Chief Minister of Mysore. He says that if the scales of Mysore are upgraded to those of Bombay it may mean an additional expenditure of Rs. 6 to Rs. 7 crores. He says—if this proviso

is allowed to remain very serious financial responsibility would ensue. The higher pay structure that exists in Bombay will have to be maintained and the pay structures that are existing in Mysore, Coorg and Madras will have to be increased to that level. If that is done probably the new State will have to bear an additional financial responsibility of Rs. 6 to Rs. 7 crores. And so on he goes. It may not be Rs. 6 or Rs. 7 crores; it may be even half of that but.....

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: No; it won't be even that.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: It is no use just asserting.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: He himself says that it may not be so much.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: It is no use my friend trying to intervene and say that.....

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: The Commission itself says that the additional cost would be about Rs. 1 crore.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: My friend is only just now coming into the new State and he claims to know more about it than I do. Anyway, the fact is there. And what I am suggesting is that for meeting such exceptional cases the proper thing is for some provision to be made in order to meet the situation. So I would say that if it becomes necessary the Central Government may for some period—may be a very short period—come to the rescue of the States. This is a thing which one cannot easily brush aside.

Then there is one statement made by my friend, Mr. Bimal Ghose and that is with regard to the Eastern Zone. He wanted that Andaman and Nicobar Islands should go to the Eastern Zone. Now, if the wishes of the people were to be taken into consideration, I am afraid they will not opt in favour of the Eastern Zone because I know something about them. I consider that in the matter of these territorial adjustments and boundary adjustments the best principle to

follow is to pay due consideration for the wishes of the people.

SHRI V. VENKATARAMANA (Andhra): What about Bellary then?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Yes; I quite agree. If the Bellary people—all the firkas together—decide to go to Andhra, I will not stand in the way. (Interruptions.) I know Bellary, however, better. Likewise take the question of Baghelkhand about which my friend Mr. Jaspat Roy Kapoor spoke. Now, if a small area of Vindhya Pradesh roundabout Baghelkhand desires to join Uttar Pradesh, who are you and I to prevent them from doing so? I would therefore beg of the Joint Select Committee and of the Government to keep this one sovereign principle in view that with regard to boundary and territorial adjustments the views of the people of the area should be the determining factor. If that is done I think most of these problems will be solved. And if it does affect adversely Mysore State, I assure you personally I will not come in the way but I know for a fact that it will not affect Mysore adversely.

Sir, I have nothing much to say with regard to High Courts and all that. That is a matter which comes under the other Bill, namely, the Constitution (Amendment) Bill. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL (Bihar): Sir, recently a friend of mine told me that my star does not tally. I hoped that during these days my star might have improved. But no: even today I remained sitting here for the whole day and I have got the opportunity to speak at the fag end of the day. However, I am thankful to God and to my stars also.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: And to the Chair too.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: Yes, to the Chair also if my friends insist.

At the very outset I will request my friends not to interrupt me too much. I know this is a very contentious Bill and controversial too, but people have got their own views to express. After all we are not making speeches just as it occurs to us. We have certain proposals here and we express our views. So do not raise a hue and cry and do not provoke me because I am a sick man. I admit that the views that I am going to express are my personal views.

Now, in the very beginning we have to see what is the purpose of this Bill. So far as I can see, the purpose is to obtain the unity and integrity of India, the preservation of nationalism, administrative convenience and also facilitate uniform economic and other development. I think perhaps you will agree that there was no necessity for raising this storm in the peaceful atmosphere of the country by bringing forward such a proposal before the country. From what I find today, I am reminded of a couplet in Hindi:

चले थे हरि भजन को आदंग लगे कपास

It means that we started to spend our time by taking the name of God but we are only collecting cotton seeds. That is what is happening now here. From all the speeches from all sides of the House we find that we not only do not try to consolidate but our intention is to disintegrate India as much as possible.

And you will find how things have happened. Even things have slipped away from the spirit of this States Reorganisation Commission. You could have very well found that if this was the thing in the mind of big persons, how could you expect the country to follow you and to take you at your word? We start in the name of integration of the country, but is it now a complete thing from all sides? Take for instance what the Members of the House have spoken up till now. All have spoken for this slice from this Province to their Province. If the

[Shri Kailash Bihari Lall.]

country is one and if we want unity, if we want administrative convenience and if we want uniform development of the country, then why is there so much of eagerness, anxiety, to have this slice and that slice—give us this portion of the land, give us that portion of the land. The land is not being taken away by anybody. So, without any sense of pride I may tell you that the spirit which the Chief Minister of Bihar has demonstrated before the world, before this country, is surely to be appreciated by all persons. Whereas you get so many things from so many quarters and in spite of the fact that we have had very bitter experience—Bihar had very bitter experience when Bihar was in Bengal—we said open-heartedly the country is one, we are prepared to be merged. We did not hesitate for a moment. But now you see which way the wind blows, how people are behaving. And still I was staggered to hear from those friends from Bengal who spoke this morning for a slice that the Commission has recommended. Why ask for a slice or portion of Bihar which the Commission has recommended? Why not take the whole of Bihar? The whole of Bihar is to be with you. Why are you hankering after a slice of land from Bihar? Our problems will not be solved in the Heaven, nor heavenly persons will come from Heaven to solve our problems. After all, human beings will have to solve their problems—whether they are in Bengal, Bihar or in Delhi. We will have to solve our own problems. Why think of taking a particular portion of land from Bihar to Bengal? Although I had no mind to come down to this level, I am forced to say that once you have rejected the high ideology on which this Commission was appointed, and if you have kicked the proposal of merger or union, you have no face to say: give me this slice of land or that slice of land. That is sealed for ever. If you had merged, I had no mind to speak. But

because various things were being said and I was told that Bihar is silent and silence may not be misconstrued, I took into my head to speak. If at all you want to achieve the purpose for which this Commission was appointed, and what is in the minds of our leaders—if you want that those objects should be fulfilled—then, don't talk in the language in which you have talked so far. I have always told you that so long as we speak with our tongue in our cheek, we won't be able to accomplish anything. We will not be deceiving any one in this world; we will be deceiving ourselves. That is what I am going to tell you even today. Now, you always speak about nationalism—just like once there was a cry that religion is in danger. You cry that nationalism is in danger. You have to come to reality that such slogans as 'nationalism in danger' will not deceive anybody. You will deceive the whole country if you raise the cry. Come to the realities as bold men. I am not wedded to this theory or that theory—linguistic theory or non-linguistic theory. But I say that if you find something really, don't bury your head in the sand like an ostrich. Face it. See how you are going to solve it. From the speeches delivered in this House at least today—I have not had time to read the speeches of so many Legislative Assemblies of different States. I think, perhaps the same trend exists there also I have taken it for granted and I think that I will be cent per cent true—they have given me to understand that we are not helping the solution of the problem, but we are to create problems with regard to the integration of the country, preservation of nationalism, and so on.....

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Should Bihar go to Bengal?

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: So, if you want to preserve nationalism, do not have two sorts of tongues when you speak. When you speak about high philosophy sometimes, of course, people are led away. But what happens is this. When you saw that you were

a need of one common language for the sake of nationalism and by common consent throughout the country, you came to the decision... (*Interruption.*) I would request you to hear me patiently. There was a cry for one common language throughout the country, because of the necessity we felt for our internal development, for the growth of nationalism in our country. We could not have done our business long without Hindi. So, we decided that we should have one common language, Hindi. It was by common consent. But when it came to be put into practice, you saw that even the signboards at the railway stations were pulled down and they were wiped out. Why? The reason they found out was that Hindi was going to be imposed and our leaders said, 'don't impose Hindi'. Who is going to impose Hindi? Where is the imposition of Hindi when the Constitution says that the regional language will be given free and full scope to develop in the region? There was no imposition of Hindi. It was only meant to replace English everywhere. That they could not tolerate and the cat was out of the bag when in the very discussion in the Constituent Assembly we saw people, who claimed to be big nationalists, those who were parading all the time their so-called nationalism, saying: Our loaves and fishes will suffer. We will lose our loaves and fishes in the competition if Hindi is introduced. Then, we will not receive it. So, I was saying that, if at all there was any apprehension of war between the north and the south, as Dr. Ambedkar said, if somebody wants only then there will be war between north and south. And this is bad. When you swallow the shares of others and somebody asks you about it, you say, "Oh! you are talking of parochialism; it is provincialism". But when you come face to face with real nationalism, then you get horrified and say, "Oh! if this is nationalism, we are not going to accept it." You say all those things. We are discussing the real things in this Bill. From the very discussion, you will see that 90 per cent. people in this House have

spoken about parochialism and the love of their provinces and their desire to have this slice of land and that slice of land. But who has thought of the whole country? If any one thinks of the whole country, why should there be this desire to increase this province or that province? Of course, you will have to see to the administrative convenience, just as some friends told me that Baghelkhand, a part of Vindhya Pradesh, is only 40 miles from Allahabad whereas it is 400 miles away from Nagpur. Somebody said that Bhopal should be the capital of Madhya Pradesh. If there are some such suggestions—reasonable suggestions—they are worth considering.

Similarly, I was going to tell—not with any desire to increase any territory—that there are many kinds of connections between Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. In the Gorakhpur and Banaras Divisions, people speak the Bhojpuri tongue for all purposes. They are one in their language, culture and customs. If they want to get together, there should not be any objection to that. This is a matter of convenience and it should be looked into. (*Interruptions.*) Yes. I do not say this for the love of a portion of a territory. That is not my desire.

The primary consideration before our eyes should be the integration of the country and the convenience of the people. The democratic will of the people should prevail.

I would not like to say anything more except one thing and that is also a very important point to be taken into consideration. I thought that somebody from Bihar or Bengal would be on the Select Committee. But both the States have been neglected.

The Bill contains provisions about Zonal Councils. In my last speech made in this House, I talked of Purvi Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Dakshin Pradesh and all those things. But the purpose of the Zonal Councils will be

[Shri Kailash Bihari Lall.]

been in their working. I do not exactly know their purpose. But I would very much suggest that it will not be useful for Bihar to be in the Eastern part of the Zone altogether. If Bihar is put in the Northern Zone with Uttar Pradesh, that will be more convenient to the people and it will benefit them. In the Eastern Zone, the only States that should be are Orissa, Assam and Bengal. Bihar should be in the Northern Zone because their problems are more common with Uttar Pradesh than with Bengal.

For other matters, if you are really serious to arrive at a solution about the integration of the country in a peaceful atmosphere, then you must find out the causes of this trouble growing from inside. I can tell you that the economic situation is surely at the root of all this trouble and it can be tackled only by given proper representation to all the States in the Central services. Today, many suffer because of this unequal distribution. In the industrial field, Bombay stands first; other States have not much. In the matter of services, Madras enjoys more privileges. Here in the Central Secretariat, you see only Madrasis and chhaprasis. This is the proverb here. So, I say, "Why should it be only one State?" I am speaking plainly and you should not accuse me of parochialism. I am only giving you a solution if you are really so minded to approach the problem and solve it. But if you want to conceal the evil and then wait for the evil day, then this canker will go on increasing and you will not be able to solve it. Every State should be given so much quota for services. I say that merit is not the monopoly of any particular State. There was a time when it was said of Biharis that they were not very good public servants. They could not become High Court Judges. But after separation, not only could Bihar give many judges to the State, but several Chief Justices to other States also and several Supreme Court Judges. So

you cannot say that merit is the monopoly of anybody.

In the Assembly of old days, when I moved that recruitment to the military cadre should be open to all, some Punjabi friends told me, "The other Provinces have not got military traditions. How can they come in? They are not martial people." I said, "Give them an opportunity and they will come." They also asked, "How can Bengalis be martial people?" But today, our Air Marshal is a Bengali. Anybody given the opportunity can accomplish anything.

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी (पेप्सू) : अब तक आपके कितने जेनरल्स हैं ?

श्री कै० बि० लाल : जेनरल्स जो हैं वे तो हैं ही । जब जेनरल्स का सवाल आयेगा तब आप यह दरियाफ्त कीजियेगा ।

I am speaking in general terms that the whole country is capable of being moulded in any shape according to necessity. But do not grab the share of others in the name of supporting yourself. That is my point.

If you give equal opportunity to other States, you will see that all these kinds of troubles will vanish. If you grab the shares of others, people will find some excuse for complaint. That will not help nationalism.

As my friends do not want that I should speak further, I sit down.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ten minutes each. Mr. M. M. Sur.

SHRI M. M. SUR (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, in considering the States Reorganisation Commission Report, we give all our attention to the redemarcation of territories and not keeping the main issue before us, namely, the building up of a socialist pattern of society. The redemarcation of territories is for the economic and cultural development of a particular region. The real objective before all of us should be that we should build up a socialist pattern of

society as quickly as possible and that will solve all our problems.

The real problems are unemployment, economic inequality and social injustice so that we should put this redemarcation of territories a little in the background and be more realistic and with that object in view, the Chief Ministers of Bihar and Bengal thought of the merger of the two States. Merger means that there will be no demarcation of territories. The two States will work as one, will try to build up the society that we are aiming at, so that whatever resources there are in Bengal will be available to every Bengali and to every Bihari, and whatever resources there are in Bihar will be available to every Bihari and every Bengali. In a merger there will be no redemarcation of territories and all the energies of the people will get diverted to that common objective. It was unfortunate that a certain section of the people of Bengal started an agitation and the Government could not find enough time to convince the population that merger was the solution for all the problems of Bengal. There is in Bengal a vast number of educated unemployed, both men and women, which is, in proportion to the population, more than that of any other province of India, and we have the refugee problem. Taking advantage of both the problems together and taking advantage of the political situation, a few leaders started an agitation which led to the imprisonment of several thousands of people. Given time, these people can be convinced, and in fact more and more people are getting convinced that this merger proposal is the best solution. But in order to solve the problem and ease the situation, Bengal and Bihar have to have a union. In that union, which is a modified form of merger, it will be necessary to have a redemarcation of territories so that the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission are given effect to. It has been mentioned by the hon. Mr. Ghose that 10,000 people have gone to jail. I do not know the exact number, but I know it is several

thousands, but people have gone to jail not of their own accord, but because they have been misguided. They have been told that merger would bring all the benefits to Bihar and nothing to Bengal, which is not true to facts. Mr. Ghose said that every case should be decided on merits so that, if merit is to be taken, then this demarcation of territories should take place and Bengal should be given a portion so that her excess population and the refugees could be settled in the areas adjoining Bengal. There should be no political pressure from any side in deciding about the demarcation of territories. The main issue should be the economic development and the cultural development of the State. If dispassionate views are taken and everything is decided keeping in view the ultimate benefit to the country, then I think many of the problems will be solved and the disputes about some territories will vanish. I therefore appeal to the Committee to consider this Union of Bengal and Bihar and recommend the redemarcation of territories also of the two States

DR. R. P. DUBE: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I must thank you for giving me this opportunity, although I never wanted to speak.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why?

DR. R. P. DUBE: Because I did not want to indulge in controversies and because I was of the opinion that since the S.R.C. Bill has decided the issue, it is the duty of every citizen of India to follow the recommendations blindly. People talk with great respect and flattery that the three great men of ours had sat down and given us an excellent report, but then when they start talking about it, they begin criticising it. What is the use of saying that these three great men have done a good job? Why don't you follow them? I cannot understand Mr. Jaspat Roy Kapoor saying that these three people, three good people, Cabinet Ministers, have sat down and discussed everything and have given us their

[Dr. R. P. Dubey.]
 verdict, while at the same time demand, 'we must get Baghelkhand. We are poor. We have not got room.' The S.R.C. had not thought about it. The other leaders have not thought about it. Only Mr. Jaspat Roy Kapoor has thought about it. If you want to open this subject please open the whole thing *de novo*, and also follow up the rest of the recommendations. The S.R.C. has said that U.P. must be divided. Why don't you do it? Example is better than precept. (*Interruptions.*)

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Who said that?

DR. R. P. DUBE: Why don't you wait? You will have your turn. I have the possession of the House, and I am not going to yield. You know that I rarely speak and so please do not interrupt. I cannot understand the statement that U.P. is poor. They have got enough. As my friend, Dr. Ambedkar said, if you look at the map, it is spreading like a reptile. Still they want more. I cannot understand it at all. My friend, who has done great Congress work and is one of the leaders of the Congress, Mr. Mahesh Saran, a learned man and a benefactor, said that, if there are any spots which are jutting into other territories, then they should be adjusted. If you look at the map of the proposed Madhya Pradesh, you will find that Jhansi district, Hamirpur, Banda and Jaloan are just jutting into Madhya Pradesh, but we did not demand them. Legitimately, they should have come to Madhya Pradesh. Mr. Saran also said that the people of Baghelkhand want to be in U. P. and therefore it should be given to U.P. Madhya Bharat wanted to be a separate State. Vindhya Pradesh wanted to be a separate province, but they did not get it. (*Interruptions.*) You will have your time. Why jump like Jack in the box? I personally think that the S.R.C. has decided the matter. They have sat down and weighed everything. The Cabinet and

the High Command have sat down and have had so many discussions, and received so many representations. Finally they have drafted a Bill. Accept it; work it and see how things go on. If you find after a certain time that it cannot be worked, then that will be the time when you can again raise the matter. My friend Jaspat Roy Kapoor, gave a beautiful example. He said "There is a damsel who wants to come to me and these people are dragging her away." My dear good man, the father gave her to me and now you want to take her away. What is this *tamasha* going on?

AN HON. MEMBER: The father has no right to give away an adult daughter.

DR. R. P. DUBE: The S.R.C. gave it to us and our leaders gave it to us and now you want to snatch it away. This is absolute abduction—it amounts to abduction. (*Interruptions.*) I cannot change his sex. I have got one hon. Member sitting close to me who comes from Allahabad, who has been married and is for quite a long time in Baghelkhand. She now, at the old age, wants to go away to Allahabad which amounts to desertion. I say 'You please remain here, you will be perfectly happy as you have been so long.' I do not wish to say anything more on this subject. I say that the Bill has been framed after long discussions. And for the integrity, prosperity and good of the country please follow it and if you find that it works against you, then will be the time for you to grouse and change it.

AN. HON. MEMBER: What about the capital?

DR. R. P. DUBE: I have lost the capital. We have taken it very well. We wanted it at Jubbulpore. You say that the wishes of the people must be given consideration. Ours were not given. Everybody said that Jubbulpore should be the capital. The S. R. C. itself recommended that Jubbulpore should be the capital but they made Bhopal the capital. We kept

quiet. If you want to have any respect, if you have any respect for your leaders keep quiet. If you say 'He is our leader', then follow him blindly. Otherwise don't pay lip-service by saying 'Oh! He is our leader but I wish he could do this but this he did not do although he was our leader.' This amounts to criticism. This is lip service—hypocrisy. Please be true to yourself and follow your leaders. That is all that I wanted to say.

श्री रतनलाल किशोरीलाल मालवीय (मध्य प्रदेश): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस बिल का स्वागत करता हूँ, और विशेषकर उन चीजों का स्वागत करता हूँ जो जोनल काउंसिल, रीजनल काउंसिल के रूप में हर एक प्रान्त में जो कि बनाये जा रहे हैं, और जिनका कि इस बिल में समावेश हुआ है। अब मैं आपके सम्मुख कुछ बातें रखना चाहता हूँ। पहले मैं विदर्भ के बारे में कहूँगा। विदर्भ का नाता महाराष्ट्र के साथ जोड़ दिया गया है मगर बम्बई को लेकर आज जो खींचातानी हो रही है, डा० अम्बेडकर और माननीय कुंजरू साहब की तकरीर सुनने के बाद मैं यह समझता हूँ कि विदर्भ को फिर अलग छोड़ दिया जाय और उसके साथ मराठवाड़ा को मिला दिया है। महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात को मिलाकर एक प्रान्त बना दिया जाय और बम्बई शहर को इन्हें दे दिया जाय। मेरे विचार में आज की स्थिति को देखते हुए यह एक सुन्दर सुझाव होगा।

मैं मध्य प्रदेश के बारे में ज्यादा नहीं बोलना चाहता हूँ लेकिन सदन में कुछ मेम्बरों ने जो भाषण दिए हैं और यह राय व्यक्त की है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश के कुछ जिले उत्तर प्रदेश में मिला दिये जाय, उसके बारे में आपके सामने कुछ प्रकाश डालना चाहता हूँ। आन्ध्र, उड़ीसा और महाराष्ट्र मध्य प्रदेश के बस्तर और रायपुर जिले के कुछ हिस्से लेना चाहते हैं। इसके बारे में मुझे यह कहना है कि इस चीज के बारे में कहीं भी एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट में जिक्र नहीं है और न ही इस चीज के बारे में किसी तरह का सपोर्ट ही है। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि ज्वाइंट

रिलैक्ट कमेटी इन चीजों पर गौर करे और ये प्रान्त जो भाषा के आधार पर कुछ हिस्से मांगते हैं, उनका ख्याल न रखे। दार कमीशन ने यह सुझाव दिया था कि जहाँ पर ७० प्रतिशत जनता की पॉपुलेशन न हो वहाँ पर तब तक किसी हिस्से के ऊपर विचार नहीं करना चाहिये। जहाँ तक इन हिस्सों का ताल्लुक है, मैं ज्वाइंट सिलैक्ट कमेटी का ध्यान सिर्फ उस मेमोरैन्डम की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ जो अभी अभी हमारे मुख्य मंत्री श्री शुक्ला जी ने प्रकाशित किया है और जो मेम्बरों को बांटा गया है।

श्री एच० एन० कुंजरू : क्या मेम्बरों को बांटा गया है? कहां के मेम्बरों में वह बांटा गया है? स्टेट असेम्बली के।

श्री रतनलाल किशोरीलाल मालवीय : यहां के कुछ मेम्बरों में बांटा गया है। मैं विन्ध्य प्रदेश के सम्बन्ध में बोलना चाहता हूँ उसका कारण यह है कि मैं उसका पड़ोसी हूँ और चार मील की दूरी पर रहता हूँ। वहां की स्थिति के बारे में कहने से पहले मैं यह कह देना चाहता हूँ कि एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट से जो सब से बड़ा फायदा हुआ है वह यह हुआ है कि देश में जो छोटी २ रियासतें थीं उन्हें प्रान्तों में मिला दिया गया और इन प्रान्तों को बड़े प्रान्तों में मिला दिया गया है। मैं आपका ध्यान कुछ पीछे के इतिहास की ओर आकर्षित करना चाहूँगा। आजादी प्राप्ति के बाद इन स्टेटों में जिस तरह की कार्रवाई हुई और जिस तरह से इन रियासतों ने अपना राज्य फिर से हासिल करने के लिए कदम उठाये, वह सब को अच्छी तरह से मालूम है। मैं इन सब बातों को बताने में आपका समय नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ। जब वे लोग अपनी कार्यवाहियों में कामयाब नहीं हुए तो हाउस को अच्छी तरह से मालूम है कि इन स्टेटों में डकैतियों का तांता बंध गया। इस तरह की डकैतियां ज्यादातर पुरानी स्टेटों में हुईं। पहले इस तरह की ५६२ रियासतें थीं जिन्हें प्रान्तों में मिला दिया गया या उनके अलग प्रान्त बना दिये गये। लेकिन वहां पर जो प्रतिक्रियावादी लोग हैं, जब उनकी किसी तरह

[श्री रतनलाल किशोरीलाल मालवीय]
 से नहीं चली तो उन्होंने डकैती और दूसरी तरह की कार्यवाही बढ़ा दी। मुझे खुशी है कि एस० आर० सी० ने अपनी सिफारिश में इस तरह की स्टंटों को बड़े प्रान्तों में मिला देने को कहा है। आज जिस तरह से इन स्टंटों में डकैतियों का तांता बंधा हुआ है, आशा है कुछ दिनों के बाद वह अपने आप खत्म हो जायेंगी। विन्ध्य प्रदेश के बारे में यह दोहाई दी जाती है कि रीवा, सतना और सिड्डीह की जनता यह चाहती है कि उनका हिस्सा उत्तर प्रदेश के साथ मिला दिया जाय। मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि उसके पीछे प्रजातंत्र नहीं है, उसके पीछे जनता का विश्वास नहीं है बल्कि उसके पीछे प्रतिक्रियावादी लोग हैं जो उस हिस्से को उत्तर प्रदेश में मिलाना चाहते हैं। ये प्रतिक्रियावादी लोग अपना भला करने के लिए इस समय वहां पर ज़ोरों के साथ इस तरह का आन्दोलन शुरू किये हुए हैं। मैं ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ खास तौर से विन्ध्य प्रदेश की उन घटनाओं की तरफ़ जो कि आजादी के बाद वहां हुई और किस तरह की बातें वहां हुईं जिनसे दश की, पार्टी की और गवर्नमेंट की गर्दन नीची हुई। आजादी के बाद जब विन्ध्य प्रदेश बन गया तो उसके बनने के बाद से आज तक जितनी घटनाएं हुईं उनमें पहली घटना वह हुई जब कि वहां के कोई मिनिस्टर दिल्ली में बाइबरी में पकड़े गये। दश में आज तक हमें कोई ऐसी घटना नहीं मिलती है। अभी अभी एक और एकस मिनिस्टर अंडर गाउंड चले गये हैं किसी इन्शोरेंस कम्पनी का पैसा मार के।

श्री रामेश्वर अग्निभांज : वे इलाहाबाद में हैं।

श्री रतनलाल किशोरीलाल मालवीय : पता नहीं है कि कहां है। उसके बाद वहां प्रजातंत्र का किस तरह गला घोंटा गया वह भी हाउस को मालूम है। इस सम्बन्ध में जब विन्ध्य प्रदेश का असम्बली में बहस हो रही थी, तो उसका नतीजा वही होना था जो अब हुआ है कि मध्य प्रदेश के पक्ष में वोट होना था। लेकिन जब

प्रति क्रियावादियों ने यह देखा कि यह मर्जर मध्य प्रदेश के पक्ष में हो कर रहेगा और यू० पी० के पक्ष में जाने वाला नहीं है, तो उन्होंने एक आतंक फैलाया, असम्बली भवन में घुस गये और मिनिस्टर्स को पीटा। यह ऐसी शर्मनाक बात है जो दश के किसी कोने में सुनने में नहीं आई।

श्री ह० प्र० सक्सेना : क्या ये सब शर्मनाक बातें यू० पी० ने करवायीं? मैं जवाब चाहता हूँ।

श्री रतनलाल किशोरीलाल मालवीय : मैं यू० पी० की बात नहीं कह रहा हूँ। जो फैक्ट है, जो बात हुई है वह मैं बतला रहा हूँ।

श्री ह० प्र० सक्सेना : यह कहना बिल्कुल गलत है कि यू० पी० ने ऐसा किया।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Saksena, please let him go on.

श्री रतनलाल किशोरीलाल मालवीय : मैं किसी पर इल्जाम नहीं लगा रहा हूँ। मैं फैक्ट बतला रहा हूँ।

श्री टी० पांडे : मैं एक जानकारी चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे खतरनाक प्रतिक्रियावादियों को लंकर.....

श्री रतनलाल किशोरीलाल मालवीय : मुझे कृपया बोलने दीजिये। यह वहां की हिस्ट्री हुई।

डिप्टी चैयरमैन महोदय, मैं अब आपको यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि वहां वोटिंग किस तरह से हुई। वहां कुल साठ मेम्बर हैं और ६० में से केवल ५५ मेम्बर बोले। २५ मध्य प्रदेश के पक्ष में बोले, ११ यू० पी० के पक्ष में बोले और ६ ने यह कहा कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश अलग रहे।

अब मैं उन डिस्ट्रिक्ट्स के बारे में बोलना चाहता हूँ जिनका यू० पी० में लेने की कोशिश की जा रही है। उन तीन जिलों में २८ मेम्बर

इं । २५ मेम्बरों में से चार ने हिस्सा नहीं लिया, ६ ने मध्य प्रदेश के पक्ष में वोट दिया, ८ ने अलग विन्ध्य प्रदेश कायम रखने के पक्ष में वोट दिया और ७ ने उत्तर प्रदेश के पक्ष में वोट दिया ।

श्री ज० रा० कपूर : जी नहीं ।

श्री रतनलाल किशोरीलाल मालवीय : आप फिर खड़े हो जाइयेंगा बाद में ।

श्री ज० रा० कपूर : गलत बात कहने से क्या फायदा ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Mr. Kapoor, he has not sat down. Please do not disturb him.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: But he is giving wrong facts.

श्री रतनलाल किशोरीलाल मालवीय : इन तीन जिलों में जहां तक रीवा का ताल्लुक है, रीवा जिले के ११ मेम्बर हैं । ११ में से एक ने भाग नहीं लिया, दो यू० पी० के पक्ष में बोले, ६ मध्य प्रदेश के पक्ष में बोले और दो विन्ध्य प्रदेश को अलग रखने के पक्ष में बोले । सीधी के ७ में से एक मेम्बर भी यू० पी० के पक्ष में नहीं बोला । दो सिर्फ यह बोले कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश अलग रहे ।

(समय की घंटी)

यह इतिहास है उस प्रजातंत्र का जिसकी दुहाई देकर यह कहा जाता है कि यदि किसी जगह के लोग कहीं मिलना चाहते हैं तो उनको क्यों न मिला दिया जाय । मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि इसके भीतर एक रहस्य है । मैं इस सम्बन्ध में बहुत ज्यादा बातें नहीं बतलाऊंगा, मगर मैं यह कहता हूँ कि इसमें प्रजातंत्र नहीं है, इसमें प्रतिक्रियावाद है । जो लोग शासन में से ठकेल दिये गये हैं, जो लोग शासन में नहीं आ सकते, जिनको कोई आशा नहीं है कि हम शासन में फिर पहुँच सकेंगे, फिर हमारे हाथ में पावर आ जायगी, वही यह सब कर रहे हैं । "Dog in the manger", यानी न खाये और न खाने दे वाली कहावत है ।

अगर हम पावर में नहीं आ सकते तो कोई पावर में नहीं आयेगा और विन्ध्य प्रदेश खत्म हो जायगा । मैं कहता हूँ कि इन तीन जिलों को निकाल करके विन्ध्य प्रदेश की राजनीतिक और सांस्कृतिक एकता को खतरा पहुँचाना ठीक नहीं है । हम कैप्टन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह की बड़ी इज्जत करते हैं । उन्होंने बड़ा काम किया है और बड़ा त्याग किया है । मैं उनकी भावना समझता हूँ ।

(समय की घंटी)

एक मिनट में खत्म कर दूंगा । जब वे चीफ मिनिस्टर थे तब उनकी एक स्वाहिश थी कि रीवा को एक युनिवर्सिटी दें और उसके लिए ५० लाख रुपये उन्होंने जमा किया था । उन्होंने इस बात के लिए बड़ी कोशिश की थी कि वहां एक युनिवर्सिटी कायम हो जाय, मगर उनकी वह महत्वाकांक्षा पूरी नहीं हुई । उनके हृदय में वह चोट लगी हुई है और इस लिए वे भी आज इस पक्ष में हैं कि ये जिले निकल करके चले जायें । मैं कैप्टन साहब से एक छोट भाई के नाते यह अपील करूंगा कि वे इस चीज को सोचें । मैं गवर्नमेन्ट से भी अपील करूंगा कि रीवा में युनिवर्सिटी बनाने की जो उनकी महत्वाकांक्षा है उसको पूरा कर दिया जाय । तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह प्रजातंत्र की दलील नहीं है, यह थोड़ी दलील है । अगर कोई चीज इसके पीछे काम कर रही है तो वह प्रतिक्रियावाद है ।

अन्त में एक सेंटेंस और बोलना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि कांस्टिट्यूशन में "स्टैंट" वर्ड आ जाने से बड़ा नुकसान हुआ है । इसका नतीजा यह हुआ है कि हर एक यह समझता है कि अगर हम राज्य पा जायेंगे तो हम आजाद हो जायेंगे और आजादी से जो चाहेंगे वह कर सकेंगे । आज यह भावना पैदा हो रही है । इस लिए इस बात की जरूरत है कि "स्टैंट" शब्द की जगह "प्रांत" शब्द फिर से चँज कर दिया जाय । बहुत बहुत धन्यवाद ।

SHRI S. C. KARAYALAR (Travancore-Cochin): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the motion

[S. C. Karayalar.]

for reference of this Bill to the Joint Select Committee and I wish to confine myself only to a few observations at this stage, because the time allotted is so short, I shall confine my observations only to the Kerala State that is proposed and with which I am concerned at the moment.

Sir, the States Reorganisation Commission have in the opening chapters of their Report discussed the general principles governing the reorganisation of States and they have said that a balanced approach should be made in regard to making proposals for reorganisation keeping in view considerations of language, culture, geographical contiguity, administrative convenience and such other matters. Having kept all these considerations in mind, they have ultimately recommended the creation of the States on a linguistic basis. One of the reorganised States recommended by them will be known as the Kerala State. I am mentioning the Kerala State because it will occupy a unique position in the future set-up of the country. This State will be the smallest unit in the country, comprising about 15,000 sq. miles with a population of about 13 million people. These facts have got a very great significance in regard to the set-up of the government that may be formed in that State. Sir, we have seen in the past that in the case of the Travancore-Cochin State which was a very small State, the ministry has never been stable and I am therefore of the opinion that the stability of the ministry in any State is, more or less, dependent upon the size of that State. I am inclined to take the view that in the case of the future Kerala State also—of course this is only my prognosis—I am afraid that the stability of the ministry will be undermined by the smallness of the size of the State.

I am mentioning this because we must be wise before the event and if it is at all possible to enlarge it or to merge it with a bigger State, say Madras, we should take steps in advance

so that the contingency of an unstable Ministry may be avoided in the future. The instability of a Ministry in a particular State will have repercussions on a wider basis and will also have repercussions on the adjoining State. This will undermine the unity of India as a whole. That is why I am emphasising that it has got a national importance and that we should take immediate steps to see that this State is merged in a bigger State, say in the State of Madras. I should suggest that provision should be made even at this stage for the merger, even at a later stage, of these two States, Madras and Kerala, if it is not possible to enlarge the State of Travancore-Cochin. Already disruptive forces are in action. One of the direct results of the formation of this small State of Kerala is that the Muslims of Malabar and Travancore-Cochin are trying to revive the Muslim League. The Muslim League is not in existence either in Malabar or in Travancore-Cochin now but with the prospect of the formation of the Kerala State, with the prospect of a bigger Muslim population having some say in the future set up, the Muslims are now trying to revive that organisation. That I consider to be a disruptive force which will affect the future of the country. Safeguards must be provided even now to see that disruptive forces do not come into play.

Having made these preliminary remarks, I would now make special reference to clause 4 of the Bill. Clause 4 provides for the transfer of some areas from Travancore-Cochin, that is the taluks of Agastheeswaram, Thovala, Kalkulam and Vilavancode of the Trivandrum district and the Shencottah taluk of the Quilon district, to the State of Madras. Of course, there is no difficulty in regard to the taluks of Agastheeswaram, Thovala, Kalkulam and Vilavancode but I want to make special reference to the difficulties in regard to the Shencottah taluk. The case of Shencottah was so clear—the case for its merger with Madras—that the States Reorganisation Commission disposed of this in two sentences, but subsequently, I do not know what

happened behind the scenes. Without an opportunity being given to the parties concerned and affected, a ~~por-~~
~~consent. But when it came to be put~~
tion of Shencottah talk is sought to be retained in the State of Travancore-Cochin which will ultimately go to the future Kerala State. The question of cutting up of Shencottah taluk was never before the public. It is very unfair to the parties concerned to take a decision regarding an issue which was never before the public. The only issue that was before the public was the merger of Shencottah taluk with Madras. The case for cutting up Shencottah taluk was never before the public and it is not fair for any party to take a decision in regard to its cutting up. It is opposed to the general principle of natural justice to the people that they should have been shut out from giving expression to their views on this topic. Even in regard to this proposal, there is some contradiction between the Press Communique issued by the Government on the 16th January, 1956 and the provision contained in clause 4 of the Bill. The Communique says:

"...the portion of the westernmost pakuthy of the Shencottah taluk lying to the west of the ghats will be excluded from the areas proposed for transfer to Madras".

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJGOPAL NAIDU) in the chair]

The provision in the Bill is somewhat different from what was stated in the Communique. This also is something to which objection can be taken. The provision in clause 4 of the Bill is that "Shencottah taluk (excluding Puliara Hill pakuthy) of Quilon district" will be added on to Madras. This is something different from the provisions of the Press Communique. Moreover, there is no pakuthy known as the Puliara Hill pakuthy. I do not know what significance will be attached to the exclusion of the Puliara Hill pakuthy because there is no such pakuthy. I have already stated on another occasion that the proposal is absolutely unfair to the people of the taluk; they have never been consulted

in the matter. I have also said on a former occasion and I repeat it here now that the economy of the taluk is purely agrarian and cutting up the taluk into two portions and retaining one portion in the future Kerala State and adding on the rest of the taluk to the Madras State is disrupting the economy of the place. The economy of the place being entirely agrarian, the people of the taluk have got to depend almost entirely upon the adjoining forest area and cutting of this taluk means that you are disrupting the economy of the place to the serious disadvantage of the people. I say that this question of cutting up the Shencottah taluk into two areas—one to be retained in Travancore-Cochin and the other to be added on to Madras—should be re-opened when the border question is to be settled. The demarcation that has been made, temporarily or provisionally is not along the lines indicated in the Bill so that this will be a fit case for reference to the Boundary Commission as contemplated in paragraph 9 of the Explanatory Memorandum attached to the Bill.

This is a matter on which I had to express my opinion and I hope this question of the cutting up of Shencottah taluk will be considered as a boundary question and that it will be referred to a Boundary Commission and a solution will be found acceptable to the people of the taluk.

SHRI T. BODRA (Bihar): Mr. Vice-Chairman, we the people of Jharkhand also are facing crucial days just like any other citizen of India and, in my humble opinion, the remedy provided by the Government has been most inadequate. We need a dynamic change in the administration, a dynamic change in the thoughts, minds and deeds of our administrators. It is most unfortunate that our demand for the creation of a Jharkhand State was not acceded to by the eminent Members of the Commission. Today, what we find is that there is a war going on between Bihar and Bengal and Orissa. For whose land? For Serai-kella, Kharaswan—within my own

district—and for a portion of Manbhum sub-division which is 70 miles from Ranchi. These are all territories which are mainly inhabited by the Adivasis, by the Scheduled Castes, by the Scheduled Tribes and by other backward classes. Had the Commission decided upon this question and acceded to the wishes of the people, they would not have cast to the winds the logic and acknowledged demands based on justice which our people have been putting forward. We tried our best to convince the Commission that for self-determination and development of the backward classes of people like us a separate administrative unit should be created. Anyway, Sir, I have no hesitation in commending this Bill for consideration to the Joint Select Committee. Especially I am happy to see that the hon. the Home Minister has made a provision in this Bill in Part III about the Zones and the Zonal Councils. In my humble opinion, Sir, so far as the aspirations and self-development of the Adivasis and the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are concerned, there is a small ray of hope coming forth from these Zonal Councils and, I hope, Sir, and earnestly hope that after the expiry of five years these Zonal Councils will lose their advisory character and will become Zonal States and again after the expiry of five years they would have grown into Unitary States. Now, Sir, why do I say this? It is because—perhaps the hon. the Home Minister is aware of it—of the fact of the mal-administration of Bihar, of the mal-administration of Bengal, of the mal-administration of Assam and Orissa and Manipur and Tripura. Just the other day, on the 21st April, the Prime Minister visited Muzzafarpur and made a statement that Bihar is notorious for casteism. Today on the floor of the House, Sir, Mr. Ghose said that perhaps in Bengal there is bluffing and cheating going on. Assam is notorious for corruption and this thin and hungry-looking Orissa is trying to be expert in hooliganism, trying to burn railway stations and other public properties. Even under these

circumstances the Home Minister has thought it fit that we the backward people, who are educationally and economically backward, who are inarticulate and who do not own any gigantic press to show our grievances against the administration should be kept under these mal-administered areas like Bihar, like Bengal, like Orissa and Manipur and Tripura. I humbly request the hon. the Home Minister to make a note that we, about a crore of people, are groaning under the administrations of these States and I wish and I pray to God that these States are abolished in no time and I wish the Central Government had been vested with powers to dismiss the Chief Ministers of Bihar, Bengal, Assam and Orissa. When I say this I say this with confidence because a sense of desperation has crept in my mind, which I can ventilate only here on the floor of this House. Again, Sir, when I say this I remember the words of Dr. Ambedkar who said that we should have a number of smaller States, we should have preferred smaller States to be able to govern and to be able to look well after the administration of the people inhabiting that area. When that was not possible our hon. the Prime Minister of India came out with a very good solution and he said: Let there be only five zones, East, West, North, South and the Central. This is the position, Sir, in the whole of India that though everyone of us is speaking about the unity of India and everyone of us is trying his best for the security of life and property, if you come to the eastern zone, the eastern zone comprising the States of Bihar, West Bengal, Orissa and Assam, what Your Honour will find. Your Honour will find that heinous crimes like decoities, murders, kidnapping, looting and rape are perhaps the highest. Only on the 11th of April about 100 Adivasis were coming home from the tea gardens. What happened at 10 O'Clock there? About 5,000 people of Warsaliganj attacked the train there. They pulled out the Adivasis and six of them were murdered on the spot within the station premises. When our M.L.As.

of the Bihar Assembly tabled an Adjournment Motion it was replied to "No, it cannot be allowed." Why? Because it is an incident which has taken place within the railway station premises. When I submitted my motion here the Chairman was pleased to disallow it saying that it was a question of law and order. Similarly, Sir, about two years back an Adivasi lady doctor of Sasaram was murdered in her own house, and I can tell you in detail many of the grievances, many of the incidents and many of the unfortunate happenings which we people are facing. The result is that a sense of depression and frustration has crept in us. What do we feel? We feel that our life is at stake; we feel that our property is at stake; we are not well looked after by the Government of Bihar, by the Government of Bengal and by the Governments of Assam and Orissa, and today our lands are being bartered away amongst these four States, and the only hope that I can have is the one expressed by Mr. V. V. Giri—I am at one with him—when he said, "Let us all hope that these five Zonal Councils no longer remain Advisory Councils after the expiration of five years and these Advisory Councils be developed into Zonal States and again after five years each of the Zonal States become a unitary State of the Government. So, Sir I have no hesitation in commending this Bill for the consideration of the Joint Select Committee and I implore them to make some provisions so that, just like the Tribals of Assam, when the Council meets, the tribal areas of Chota Nagpur Division, the tribal areas of Madhya Pradesh and the tribal areas of Orissa and Bengal also are represented through their tribal M.L.As. in the Zonal Council.

And lastly, Sir,.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): Your time is up.

SHRI T. BODRA: And lastly, Sir, I would speak a few words about Himachal Pradesh.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: Please be brief; your time is up.

SHRI T. BODRA: I am winding up in two minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: One minute

SHRI T. BODRA: Every word that was written by the Commission about Himachal Pradesh was equally true in respect of our case also. Anyway Himachal Pradesh is fortunate in that it retains its separate entity, but what I fail to understand is that though Dalhousie, Bakloh, Kulu, Kangra and Kohistan districts are just adjacent to Himachal Pradesh and the problems of the people living in Kangra valley and others are identical with and the same as those of the people of Himachal Pradesh, these places have not been joined with Himachal Pradesh, which they should have been, and they should also have been protected along with Himachal Pradesh and I again implore the Joint Select Committee to consider this fact.

सरदार जैल सिंह (पेप्सू) : श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं इस बिल का स्वागत करता हुआ कुछ प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ। हमारे एक मंत्री साहब ने आज हाउस में कहा कि कुछ मंत्री साहबान छोटी छोटी बातें लेकर, अपने स्वयं की और जिलों की बातें लेकर, अपनी हवाओं को बढ़ाने या कम करने के लिए कहते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ, उनका कहना दुरुस्त है। लेकिन कुछ बातें जो श्री महेश सरन जी ने कहीं, मैं उन्हें दोबारा दहराना तो नहीं चाहता, पर मैं उनका समर्थन करता हूँ।

भारतवर्ष में स्वतंत्रता के बाद सरदार पटेल ने एक बुनियाद रखी थी हिन्दुस्तान की एकता के लिए। वह बुनियाद थी दश के शस्त्री निजाम की रियासतों को खत्म करना और पार्ट "बी" स्टैंड्स का बनाना। आज उस बुनियाद को मुकम्मल कर दिया गया है और उसकी दीवार को हमेशा के लिए मुकम्मल कर दिया गया है और यह काम हिन्दुस्तान की एकता के लिए

[सरदार जल सिंह]

यह बिल लाकर किया गया है। हमारे इस बिल के पास होने से भारतवर्ष की कोई रियासत "ए", "बी", "सी" के लिहाज से नहीं देखी जायेगी। तमाम हिन्दुस्तानियों का एक जैसा दर्जा होगा और एक जैसा एड्मिनिस्ट्रेशन होगा। इसके आलावा इस बिल में जमहूरियत को मद्देनजर रखा गया है। जैसे कि पंजाब के मामले में एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट के मुताबिक हिमाचल प्रदेश, पंप्सू और पंजाब को मिलाने की तजवीज की गई थी, अगर उसमें सरकार या हमारे नेता इस मामले को अपने हाथ में लेकर कोई नई तजवीज न सोचते तो न जाने पंजाब का क्या हाल होता। आज बम्बई और बंगाल में जो कुछ चल रहा है मैं समझता हूं पंजाब में उससे ज्यादा खूबसूरती होने का खदशा था। यह हमारे नेताओं की दानिशमंदी का करिश्मा है कि लोगों की स्वाहिश को भी पूरा किया गया और सब को मजबूत बना दिया गया। हिमाचल के लोग आना नहीं चाहते थे, उनको अलग रखा गया। पंजाब और पंप्सू मिलना चाहते थे, वे मिला दिये गये। हमारे सामने एक बड़ी भारी समस्या थी जैसी कि दूसरे प्रान्तों की थी। हमारे प्रान्त में एक तरफ महा पंजाब के लोग थे और दूसरी तरफ पंजाबी सूबा मांगने वाले थे। दोनों ही फिरकंदारी को बुरा भला कहते थे, लेकिन अपना नुकतेनजर फिरकंदारी पर रखे हुए थे और यह सोचते थे कि इस ढंग से, पंजाबी सूबा बनने से सिखों को फायदा होगा, महा पंजाब बनने से हिन्दुओं को फायदा होगा। यह बात हमारे पंजाब में चलते चलते तमाम हिन्दुस्तान में इसका जहर फैल रहा था। लेकिन हमारे नेताओं ने दानिशमंदी से एक ऐसा फैसला किया कि न महा पंजाब बना और न पंजाबी सूबा बना, बल्कि एक स्ट्रांग पंजाब बना दिया गया है। आज पंप्सू और पंजाब की मिलावट के खिलाफ कोई भी आवाज नहीं उठ रही है। मैं समझता हूं कि यह लोगों की एक डरावनी डिमांड थी कि पंजाब और पंप्सू को इकट्ठा करेंगे। लेकिन जो कुछ मुखालिफत है वह इस बिना पर नहीं है कि पंजाब और पंप्सू को इकट्ठा

किया गया बल्कि इस बिना पर है कि वहां पर दो रीजन बना कर, दो टुकड़े बनाकर, वहां की काउंसिलें क्यों बनायी जा रही हैं। तो मैं इस बात के लिए आपका ध्यान इस तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूं कि पंजाब और पंप्सू में पहले से ही दो रीजन बने हुए थे, पंजाब के दो, दो रीजन और पंप्सू के दो, दो रीजन थे—एक हिन्दी स्पीकिंग और एक पंजाबी स्पीकिंग। अब दोनों का एक सूबा बना है तो उसी शक्ल में वे दो रीजन बने हैं और उसमें कोई ज्यादा फर्क पढ़ने की बात नहीं हुई है। केवल एक बात बढ़ी है, वह यह कि जितने मेम्बर होंगे लीजस्लेटिव एसेम्बली के वे एक जोन की एड्वाइजरी कमिटी के एक काउंसिल की हैसियत में बैठकर अपनी राय दे सकेंगे और दूसरे जोन के अपनी हैसियत में बैठकर अपनी राय दे सकेंगे। तो मैं समझता हूं कि इस बात के बढ़ जाने से कोई ज्यादा फर्क नहीं पड़ा। लेकिन मुखालिफत कौसी हो रही है वह भी मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूं, यह हमारे एक सूबे का सवाल नहीं है, हमारे मुलक का सवाल है और एक सरहद्दी सूबा होने के नाते तो और भी ज्यादा अहमियत रखता है। आज हमारा लैंग्वेज प्रेस, हमारा दंशी जवान वाला प्रेस इसके खिलाफ कुछ आवाज उठा रहा है। अगर गिनती की जाय तो उन लोगों की तरफ से आवाज उठ रही है जिनका एक भी आदमी पिछले जनरल इलेक्शन में कहीं डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड में, या एसेम्बलियों में या पार्लियामेंट में नहीं आ सका और वे लोग आजकल शोर शराबा कर रहे हैं। लेकिन हमें दुख होता है कि लोग क्यों इस बात की मुखालिफत करते हैं। मैं उन भाइयों से प्रार्थना करूंगा, अपील करूंगा कि वे लोग इस चीज को सोचें और उन लोगों के हाथ में न आ जायें जो लोग इलेक्शन जीतने के लिए या वहां की फिजा को कम्युनलिज्म के दलदल से निकलने न देने के लिए आज कौशिश कर रहे हैं।

मैं आपके सामने एक कानूनी बात रखना चाहता हूं। पंजाब के दो हिस्सों में जो रीजनल कोउंसिल बनेंगी उसमें लीजस्लेटिव एसेम्बली के

मैम्बर तो होंगे लेकिन पंजाब कॉमिशन के अपर हाउस के मैम्बरों को उसमें शामिल नहीं किया गया। अगर उनको भी शामिल कर लिया जाता तो यह ज्यादा बेहतर बात होती।

हमारे पंजाब और पेप्सू में एक और बात का खासतौर पर ध्यान रखा गया है और वह जवान का मसला है। अगर इन दो हिस्सों को जबानी सूबा कहें या न कहें तो कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता क्योंकि हिन्दी तो हिन्दुस्तान की जवान है और पंजाबी एक इलाके की जवान है लेकिन ताहम उसको दो खिस्तों में बांट दिया गया है। दो खिस्तों में बांटते हुए इस बात का लिहाज रखा गया है कि पेप्सू के इलाके में पेप्सू का फारमूला चलेगा और पंजाब के इलाके में सच्चर फारमूला चलेगा। यह चीज इस ख्याल से रखी गई है कि किसी तरह का भगड़ा न उठ खड़ा हो और लोगों की जो स्वाहिश हो वह किया जाय।

इस बिल में जोनल कॉमिशन बनाने का जो इंतजाम किया गया है वह हमारे नेताओं ने एक बहुत शानदार कदम उठाया है। हम समझते हैं कि इस तरह का कदम उठाना देश की एकता को बरकरार रखने के लिए निहायत जरूरी है। एकता को बरकरार रखने के लिए लोगों के दिमागों पर यह ख्याल छाया हुआ है कि हिन्दुस्तान को बड़े बड़े सूबों में यानी उत्तरी सूबा और पूर्वी सूबा, इसी तरह के और सूबों में बांट दिया जाय ताकि उसकी एकता को कायम रखा जा सके। दूसरी तरफ लोगों के दिलों में यह ख्याल भी है कि सूबों के लोगों को अपनी कल्चरल अटोनामी बनाये रखने के लिए, उन्हें फलने फूलने के लिए और अपने जजबात का इजहार करने के लिए पूरा पूरा माँका देना चाहिये। इस चीज के न होने से भी लोगों को तकलीफ होती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस बिल में इन दोनों ख्यालात को बहुत अच्छी तरह से रख दिया है। जो लोग इस हक में हैं कि लोगों को कल्चरल अटोनामी मिलनी चाहिये उसको रीजनल एडवाइजरी कॉमिशन बनाकर पूरा किया गया है। इस चीज को बिल में रख देने से लोगों की जो स्वाहिश है उसको पूरा किया गया है।

अब कोई यह नहीं कह सकता है कि सरकार ने लोगों के जजबात की कद्र नहीं की। दूसरी तरफ जो लोग यह चाहते थे कि देश में बड़े बड़े सूबे हों ताकि देश की एकता मजबूत हो सके, वह जोनल कॉमिशन बनाकर पूरी कर दी गई है। लेकिन इस सिलसिले में मैं एक बात यह कह देना चाहता हूँ कि जोनल कॉमिशन के जो मैम्बर तजवीज किये गये हैं उनमें सूबों के चीफ मिनिस्टर हैं और सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के मिनिस्टर उनका चेयरमैन होंगे। मेरी तजवीज यह है कि अगर शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट का एक एक मैम्बर हर कॉमिशन में रख लिया जाता तो उनकी बातों का ख्याल हर चीज में रखा जा सकता।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): Please wind up. Your time is up. Please be brief.

सरदार जैल सिंह : कल हमारे किसी अपोजीशन के एक मैम्बर साहब ने बहस के दौरान में यह फरमाया था कि ज्यों ही रीजनल कॉमिशन बनने का सवाल पैदा हुआ, पंजाब की वजारत ने कुछ जगहों पर, की पोस्टों पर से हिन्दुओं को हटाकर सिखों को लगा दिया है। मुझे इस तरह की बात को सुनकर ही शर्म आती है कि यहां पर हिन्दू और सिखों का सवाल क्यों उठाया गया है। लेकिन मैं यह अपना फर्ज समझता हूँ कि इस तरह की बात की तरदीद की जाय जो कि हाउस के अन्दर उठाई गई है। हमारे अपोजीशन के जिस मैम्बर साहब ने यह बात कही है वह बिल्कुल गलत है जबकि पंजाब में एक ऐसे चीफ मिनिस्टर हैं जो कि फिरकंदारी के खिलाफ लड़ने वाले हैं। जिस शास्त्र ने पेप्सू और पंजाब में शांसीलीस्टिक पैटर्न आफ सोसाइटी का नमूना पेश किया है, उसके खिलाफ अगर इस तरह का इलजाम लगाया जाय तो दुःख होता है। इसीलिए यह बात बिल्कुल गलत और शरारत से भरी हुई है।

आखिर में मुझे यह कहना है कि पंजाब और पेप्सू के बनने से चंडीगढ़ और पटियाला की एक ही जैसी पोजीशन हो गई है। मैं यहां पर यह कह देना चाहता हूँ कि इन दो शहरों पर काम

[सरदार जैल सिंह]

की दौलत खर्च हुई हैं इसलिए दोनों को बसाने के लिए यक़्सां ध्यान रखा जाना चाहिये। अगर एक जगह पर कौपिटल बनाया जाय तो दूसरी जगह पर युनिवर्सिटी, हाई कोर्ट और गवर्नमेंट हाउस बनाया जाना चाहिये। इस तरह से अगर किया जाय तो दोनों शहरों की अहमियत बरकरार रहेगी और एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन भी ठीक तरह से चलेगा। धन्यवाद।

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is clear now that the whole House is unanimous in congratulating the Government upon having waded through so many troubles that have arisen as a result of the proposals of the States Reorganisation Commission, but at the same time it is also equally clear that the House is not satisfied that the Government have given as much consideration to the settlement of the small problems of boundaries of towns, of villages and of taluks as between the different States as they have given to the settlement of the bigger problems between State and State, their mergers and so on, with the result that I think a very strong case arises for the Government themselves to give an assurance to this House and to the country that at the earliest possible opportunity they would appoint suitable Boundary Commissions to look into these matters in as much detail as is deserving by the complexity of these problems, study them and then come to definite decisions which would be binding upon all the parties concerned. If such a procedure is not followed then what is likely to happen is that while the country may be satisfied with the overall solutions found by the Government in various parts of the country, almost between every two States there would be groups of people, towns and villages which would be simmering with dissatisfaction and unhappiness and with very bad consequences indeed and all the good atmosphere that has been sought to be achieved during the last four or five months and also as a result of the Bills that are being

passed here is likely to be vitiated and it will only leave an awful trail of unhappiness in different parts of the country. It is from this point of view that I wish to draw the attention of the House and the country to the statement made by the hon. Home Minister the other day in regard to Bellary; and I have another town also in which the Andhras are very much interested and that is Parlakimedi. He has given reasons which are very important, I am sure, to the Andhra Government and are certainly embarrassing to many Members of this House as well as the other House. He gave the impression to the House and the country that Bellary was being given up so far as the Andhras were concerned, Bellary was being handed over to the Kanarese from us, or the *status quo* was being maintained or the new *status quo* was being maintained, because there was not sufficient demand from the Andhras for Bellary. I would like to have further enlightenment from the Government—whether the Pradesh Congress Committee in Andhra has not asked for Bellary, whether the Andhra Government has not supported that claim, whether there was any individual Minister or group of Ministers or and the Legislature there in Andhra not asking for Bellary, not pressing the claim of Andhras for Bellary? Whether there was even one Andhra M.P. in either of the two Houses—not belonging to the Communist Party—who could be said to have opposed or to have been indifferent to the claims of Andhra for Bellary? What is the justification for my hon. friend, the Home Minister, to have made the statement that Andhras really were not so very keen and, therefore, it was being handed over to the Kanarese friends? Now, I do not know what they mean by the demand that is being made by anybody. Do they mean by demand the kind of demonstration that we had in Bombay? Do they mean by demand the kind of 'Satyagraha' that was being organised by various people in different States and appointing their dictators and all

the rest of it? And then, again, who is to demand this Bellary—the people of Bellary or the Andhras? If it is the people of Bellary, is it not a fact that a gentleman called Kami Reddy went on hunger strike and went on fasting for more than forty days and he had to be dissuaded from continuing that hunger strike until death by various appeals that were sent from the Central Government, the State Government and also the Pradesh Congress Committee and so on? If they mean the demand of the people only from the whole of Andhra, then surely the whole of Andhra has been unanimous about it. On the other hand, if they were to say that the Andhras were so much satisfied with Vishalandhra, that they were not so very particular about this matter only are we to understand that Vishalandhra was being given, because the Andhras have asked for it or because the S.R.C. has recommended in favour of it or because the Union Government themselves were so very keen about it? I would like to take the House into my confidence by saying that more than one Minister in the Union Government had asked me to use my good offices with the friends in Telangana in order to persuade them to favour this Vishalandhra. And I did my best and in the end in my own speech here I made it perfectly clear that even a person like me, who was closest to them who was most sympathetic in their own State, was determined to have Vishalandhra anyhow. But if they were persistent about it, then they could at best ask for a benefit of five years and not thereafter. That made it clear to them that there was not even one Andhra in the whole of Andhra districts who would be prepared to support them. And that helped them to make up their mind that it is much better to have Vishalandhra here and now and ask for safeguards. Who was responsible for giving all the safeguards to Telangana? Is it not a fact that the Union Government themselves were mostly responsible for it? We are thankful that they have done it; we congratulate them also, because they

have brought about a peaceful atmosphere between Andhra and Telangana. But at the same time it was the Union Government which was so very keen about it. And under those circumstances, why should the Union Government now come forward and say because the Andhras were getting Vishalandhra, they were prepared to give up Bellary? Was there any kind of agreement between the Union Government and so called Andhras? Then, who are those Andhras? I am led to think—and it pains me to have to think like that, that all of us here—Members of Parliament in both Houses—do not count for anything, all that we say is of no use at all. Somebody somewhere in political *zanana* says something to some top people here and that holds good. Once they make up their mind they seem to think that it ought to be enough and all that we say is in vain. Is that the atmosphere that they want to create? Is that the feeling that they want to create?

They talk about this Bellary being in the Kanarese area. Then, what about Parlakimedi? Parlakimedi is an enclave of Andhra and yet it is sought to be given over to the Oriya people—and it has been there for the last twentyfive years—in spite of the people themselves, in spite of their expressed wishes repeatedly. Now should we not insist that the same rule should apply to both? Then, again, they said that Bellary is predominantly in a Kanarese area. What about Belgaum? Is it not a fact that in Bellary the overwhelming majority of the people are Telugus. Have they not been asking for it? Is it not a fact that the non-Telugus also, even the Muslims, are supporting the claim of these Telugus to be associated with Andhra? Is it not a fact that Mr. Gangappa, who has been elected there as an M.L.A., who was there till the other day as M.L.A. in the Mysore Assembly, has resigned as a protest and has challenged our friends to come and prove that the majority of the people in that area—Rupangudi,

I think, and Bellary city—on which side they would like to be associated and with whom? Then, my hon. friend, Mr. Dasappa, was good enough to propound that principle, let it be settled by the people themselves, either through the Assembly elections or through a regular plebiscite. We are prepared to accept that. And I am not bothered just now about Tungabhadra in view of Home Minister's assurances so much as I am bothered about Bellary city itself from the very beginning. The hon. Home Minister was saying the other day that since we are making the necessary arrangements in regard to the Tungabhadra project, the Andhras need not be very particular about Bellary city. But I have been insisting upon Bellary city ever since the beginning.....

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: May I point out to my hon. friend that all this and much more has already been placed before the concerned authorities like Mr. Justice Wanchoo and Mr. Justice Misra and it is not a new case?

PROF. G. RANGA: All those things are there. What happens is even in our own law? When two laws are passed, it is the latest law which holds good. The latest law is the S.R.C. Report. They have made out a case for Bellary being transferred to Andhra.....

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Not on that ground.

PROF. G. RANGA: Please don't waste my time. I have given way to my friend once. I must gain that time.....

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Not on this ground, but on other grounds, namely, Tungabhadra project.

PROF. G. RANGA: Now, my hon. friend had time to talk and now he wants to rob somebody else of his time. I cannot yield.....

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I am very sorry.

PROF. G. RANGA: On other grounds also. That is why I was saying that I have always been standing up for Bellary, not so much because of this Tungabhadra argument. The Tungabhadra project is an additional argument that was advanced by the S.R.C. Now, on what grounds have the Government of India agreed to accept the S.R.C. recommendation in regard to Belgaum where fiftyone per cent of the people are Maharashtrians? And yet they are very glad to have them—to use a colloquial word 'grabbing' it. Now, please at the same time why should my friend or anybody else get excited when we say the same rule should apply to this also and Bellary should go to Andhra.

Coming to Parlakimedi, the fact is that so long ago, the O'Donnell Committee itself said that it was predominantly an Andhra city, they talk in Telugu and they wished to go to Andhra. But at the same time to accommodate the wishes of the Raja of Parlakimedi, they were handing it over to Orissa. The S.R.C. repeated that argument. Therefore, there are very strong reasons why this case ought to be placed before a Boundary Commission, in regard to Parlakimedi as well as Bellary.

I want to take up another matter. The Kolar District ought to go to Andhra. The Commission have themselves admitted that the majority of the people are Andhras. Yet it is not being given to Andhra. They themselves said that it was because they were recommending in favour of returning Bellary and the other three taluks to Andhra. It is now said that Andhra should be willing to give up Bellary and also Kolar. Some friends say, "Everything we would have and at the same time we would oppose others." Very reasonable persons they are! Then they say, "Why should you not be content with having Vishal Andhra—the whole of Telangana?" They are happy in getting the Karnataka districts of Mysore, the Karnataka Districts of Bombay and the earlier Karnataka Indian States also. We do not begrudge them. They are

having Samyukta Karnataka. We are very happy. We do not want even one extra village from any of their areas. Similarly, we expect that the case of Bellary should be settled by the by-election caused by Sri Ganga's resignation and that should take place as early as possible—before they make their final decision, before the Joint Select Committee makes its own report and this House puts its imprimatur on the Bill. Let that by-election take place. Let it be decided at the earliest or otherwise, let them go to the Prime Minister with this plea that a Boundary Commission should be appointed in order to decide whether Bellary City and the neighbouring villages connected with Andhra should go to Andhra or they should remain in Karnataka. I will give you my last answer why I am so particular about this town. Let half-a-dozen non-South Indians—impartial-minded people—go there. Let them see how those people today are living—whether they are living or whether they are existing; whether they are languishing or they are prosperous. I am prepared to accept their decision. The fact is that they are languishing. Bellary has been connected with Rayalaseema culturally and socially. Now a large number of business people have left and are leaving it. The value of house properties has fallen. Nobody can deny that. There is a first class hospital there with about 200 or 300 beds. And the status of that hospital has come to be reduced and the whole city is languishing. Is it the intention of the Government to make reorganization in such a way that people in towns and villages become impoverished? On the other hand, the reorganization should be such that our people become more and more prosperous and happy.

Therefore, Sir, from these points of view, there is an irrefutable case for the appointment of Boundary Commissions in order to settle the fortunes of these places, or for that matter other places also. There are

those troubles between Bihar and Bengal, between Bihar and Orissa and also Bengal and Assam. We have heard of troubles between Karnataka and Malabar, Malabar and Madras. Therefore, these small problems should be referred to Boundary Commissions. Let not Government simply close their eyes and then say, "We have settled these big things" and so we will leave out the small things because they will go on fostering the body politic. I wish to conclude by saying that certainly the country is grateful to the Government and to Pandit Pant in particular and I think that I have a special duty to pay my compliments to him because I have known from inside how much trouble he has taken and how much patience he has exercised to come to a solution at every stage during all those troubled negotiations that were being carried on between people over the Vishal Andhra question and also over this Punjab question. The whole country is grateful to him and also to the Government and the national leadership, especially because they have settled these too knotty problems. There is the Bombay trouble. Such big troubles are bound to come to the Government. Therefore, I hope that the Government would find some way—some equitable way—by which they would be able to establish peaceful atmosphere in that quarter also.

श्रीमती कृष्णा कुमारी (विन्ध्य प्रदश) :
उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग की रिपोर्ट जब से प्रकाशित हुई है, तब से चारों तरफ एक उथल पुथल मची हुई है। नगरों में, गावों में, प्राणियों के घट घट में यहां तक कि पनघटों में भी इसका वातावरण छाया हुआ है। वास्तविकता यह है कि यह एक समस्या है क्योंकि हर एक प्रदश में और हमारे इस रुकन में भी यह प्रश्न दो दो बार विचारार्थ आया है। परिणाम क्या होगा इसके बारे में कुछ कहा नहीं जा सकता है ताहम हम लोगों को इस विषय पर अपने विचार प्रकट करने ही हैं।

[श्रीमती कृष्णा कुमारी]

मैं यह स्पष्ट बतला देना चाहती हूँ कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश के लोग विलीनीकरण के सर्वथा विरुद्ध हैं। सन् १९५० में जब विलीनीकरण का प्रश्न उठा था तब उस समय उसके विरुद्ध विन्ध्य प्रदेश में आयोजनात्मक आन्दोलन हुआ और तब वहाँ मध्य प्रदेश की पुलिस आई और उसने वहाँ कब्जा कर लिया। उसने उस निरीह जनता पर जो कि निहत्थी थी गाँवियाँ चलाई और बहुत से प्राणी धराशायी हुए, बहुत से ऐसे घायल हुए कि उनको अस्पतालों में भेज दिया गया। जब हाई कमांड का हुक्म हुआ तब वहाँ से पुलिस हटाई गई और विन्ध्य प्रदेश ज्यों का त्यों कायम रहा।

जब से राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग की स्थापना हुई है तब से बराबर विन्ध्य प्रदेश को कायम रखने के लिये वहाँ की जनता ने अपनी आवाज उठाई है। विधान सभा ने सर्वसम्मति से विन्ध्य प्रदेश को अक्षुण्ण बनाये रखने के लिये अपनी मांग रखी है। विन्ध्य प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी ने भी कई बार अपना यही मत प्रकट किया है और दूसरे दल के सदस्यों ने भी अपना यही मत व्यक्त किया है। पहली बार जब कि सीमा आयोग की रिपोर्ट पर विचार हुआ तब भी बहुमत यही रहा है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश की इकाई बनी रहे। इस बार भी राज्य पुनर्गठन विधायक के ऊपर जो बहस हुई उसमें भी जो सम्मति प्रकट की गई उसमें भी बहुमत यही है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश की इकाई बनी रहे। यह तो केवल श्रमिकों के सदस्यों ने कहा है कि उत्तर प्रदेश में जावे और कुछ ने यह कहा है कि मध्य प्रदेश में जावे। मैं समझती हूँ कि जब हिमाचल प्रदेश को वहाँ की जनता की इच्छा के अनुसार कायम रखा जा रहा है तब विन्ध्य प्रदेश को भी कायम रहना चाहिये। इस सम्बन्ध में आयोग ने भी जनता के मत को प्रधानतः माना है। हाँ, यदि विन्ध्य प्रदेश किसी रूप में कायम नहीं रह सकता है तो जो हिस्से उत्तर प्रदेश में जाना चाहते हैं उनको उत्तर प्रदेश में चले जाने दिया जाय और जो हिस्से मध्य प्रदेश में जाना चाहें उनको ही मध्य प्रदेश में मिलाया

जावे। अब देखना यह है कि कौन सा हिस्सा उत्तर प्रदेश में जाय और कौन सा हिस्सा मध्य प्रदेश में जाय। पहले तो विन्ध्य प्रदेश का यही मत था कि पूरे का पूरा विन्ध्य प्रदेश उत्तर प्रदेश में मिलाया जाय। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में स्थिति को विवरण सहित स्पष्ट कर देना चाहती हूँ। जब हाई कमांड का यह रुख मालूम हुआ कि वह विन्ध्य प्रदेश को कायम नहीं रखना चाहता है तब पर्याय में विन्ध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा के २२ सदस्यों ने इस प्रयोजन की एक दख्खिस्त हाई कमांड के पास दी कि यदि विन्ध्य प्रदेश का विलीनीकरण अवश्यभावी है तो वह उत्तर प्रदेश में मिलाया जाय। मैं उन सदस्यों के नाम बतला रही हूँ, जो इस प्रकार हैं :

सर्वश्री राम सजीवन गाँतम, लाल बिहारी सिंह, यादवेंद्र सिंह, गोविन्द नारायण सिंह, श्याम सुन्दर श्याम, सरजू प्रसाद, चन्द पुरिया, वृजराज सिंह, बैकुण्ठ प्रसाद, केशव प्रसाद, बाबा दीन, रतन सिंह, रघुनाथ सिंह, भूरा, चन्दी दीन, कृष्णकान्त राय, राना शमशेर सिंह, शत्रुसदन सिंह, राजेश्वर प्रसाद मिश्र, जगदीश प्रसाद खर, नरेंद्र सिंह, प्रताप सिंह, राम प्रसाद सिंह।

इन २२ सदस्यों ने अपने दस्तखत करके दख्खिस्त भेजी थी। जिस समय ये दख्खिस्त दी गई उस समय कांग्रेस पार्टी में ४३ सदस्य थे जिनमें मंत्रीगण भी सम्मिलित थे। मंत्रियों में भी मतभेद था। श्री दान बहादुर सिंह, उद्यांग मंत्री ने खुल्लम खुल्ला उत्तर प्रदेश के पक्ष में प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी की बैठक में अपनी राय दी थी। इससे वह स्पष्ट है कि कांग्रेस पार्टी का बहुमत पूरे विन्ध्य प्रदेश को उत्तर प्रदेश में मिलाने के पक्ष में था। दूसरे दल वाले विन्ध्य प्रदेश के इकाई के अक्षुण्ण बने रहने के पक्ष में थे, परन्तु जहाँ तक उत्तर प्रदेश व मध्य प्रदेश के बीच का मामला था वहाँ तक वे उत्तर प्रदेश को मध्य प्रदेश से अच्छा समझते थे जैसा कि उनके व्याख्यानों से, जो एसेम्बली में दिए गए, स्पष्ट हो जाता है :

श्री आर० पी० दुबे : मायका जो था ।

श्रीमती कृष्णा कुमारी : प्रान्तीय कांग्रेस कमेटी ने भी अपने बहुमत से उत्तर प्रदेश में विन्ध्य प्रदेश को मिलाये जाने का समर्थन किया है, अर्थात् १८ सदस्यों ने उत्तर प्रदेश के पक्ष में और ७ सदस्यों ने मध्य प्रदेश के पक्ष में अपनी सम्मति प्रगट की। इसके अलावा सीवां, सतना, सीधी जिला की कांग्रेस कमेटियों ने भी सर्वसम्मति से उत्तर प्रदेश के पक्ष में निर्णय किया।

इसके बाद आल इंडिया कांग्रेस कमेटी का इबाव पड़ा कि उत्तर प्रदेश के पक्ष में राय न दी जावे क्योंकि ऐसा करना वर्किंग कमेटी के फैसले के खिलाफ समझा जायगा तथा अनुशासन की कार्रवाई की जायगी। इससे लोग घबड़ाने लगे। बाद में श्री शम्भूनाथ जी, चीफ मिनिस्टर, द्वारा यह भी कहा गया कि सिर्फ बुंदेलखंड ही नहीं बल्कि शहडोल जिला भी जो मध्य प्रदेश के अंदर घुसा हुआ है, किसी भी हालत में उत्तर प्रदेश में नहीं जायगा क्योंकि वे इस सम्बन्ध में हाई कमांड से बात कर चुके हैं। ऐसी हालत में बुंदेलखंड के तथा बघेलखंड के शहडोल जिले के सदस्य निराश हो गए, परन्तु बघेलखंड के बाकी तीन जिलों, सीवां, सतना और सीधी के सदस्य अपनी मांग पर डट रहे, जिसका विवरण यह है :

सर्वश्री यादवेंद्र सिंह, गोविन्द नारायण सिंह, लाल बिहारी सिंह वृजराज सिंह, सोमेश्वर सिंह, राम सजीवन, केशव प्रसाद, बलवन्त सिंह, और बैकुण्ठ प्रसाद, इन सबों ने भाषण दिए। श्री जगदीश प्रसाद बीमार थे और उनका भाषण पढ़ कर सुनाया गया। श्री नरबदा प्रसाद सिंह गैर हाजिर थे, परन्तु पहली मीटिंग में वे अपनी राय प्रकट कर चुके हैं कि उत्तर प्रदेश में मिला दिया जाय। सर्वश्री शत्रु सुदन सिंह और राजेश्वरी प्रसाद ने यह कहा कि जो हाई कमांड का आर्डर होगा वह हमें मान्य होगा। पर ये लोग उत्तर प्रदेश में जाने के पक्ष में थे। उस समय वह अर्जी हाऊस में पढ़कर सुनाई गई जो कि पहले हाई कमांड के पास भेजी गई थी

जिस पर २२ आदमियों के दस्तखत थे और जिसे उन लोगों ने मंजूर किया था। श्री राना शमशेर सिंह और श्री भुवनेश्वर प्रसाद ये दोनों व्यक्ति मध्य प्रदेश के समर्थन में अपना मत दे चुके हैं। ७ आदमी इकाई कायम रखने के पक्ष में समर्थन किए हुए थे और मध्य प्रदेश और उत्तर प्रदेश की मीमांसा करके इन लोगों ने यही बतलाया कि उत्तर प्रदेश मध्य प्रदेश से कहीं अच्छा है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): Please finish. There is one more speaker.

श्रीमती कृष्णा कुमारी : एक स्पीकर श्री शिवानन्द थे। दो गैर हाजिर थे जो इकाई रखने के समर्थक थे और मध्य प्रदेश से उत्तर प्रदेश को वे भी अच्छा समझते थे।

यह जो सदस्यों की सक्षिप्त विवरण पुस्तक आई है वह गलत है क्योंकि जिस कितनी ने भी अंत में यह कहा है कि मैं बिल का स्वागत करता हूं उसके बारे में यह मान लिया गया है कि वह मध्य प्रदेश के पक्ष में है। परन्तु ऐसा मानना गलत है। ९० आई० सी० सी० की आज्ञानुकूल प्रत्येक कांग्रेस सदस्य को बिल का समर्थन करना आवश्यक था। सदस्य की सम्मति उसके भाषण से तथा पूर्वोपर सम्बन्ध से समझना चाहिए। मुझे दुख है कि अब तक सदस्यों के भाषणों की पुस्तिका विन्ध्य प्रदेश से नहीं आई, जब कि दूसरे प्रदेशों से आ गई है। खासकर जब कि यह प्रदेश छोटा है, जिसमें केवल ६० ही सदस्य हैं, तब तो इसमें देर न होनी चाहिए। परन्तु देर होने का कारण मुझे यह प्रतीत होता है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश के चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब व स्पीकर साहब, दोनों उत्तर प्रदेश के विरुद्ध हैं। वे जानते हैं कि भाषणों से स्थिति स्पष्ट हो जायगी।

अब मैं यह बतलाना चाहती हूं कि बघेलखंड को उत्तर प्रदेश में मिलाने से क्या लाभ है। विन्ध्य प्रदेश में कुछ खनिज पदार्थ हैं तथा कुछ जंगलों की उत्पत्ति है। (समय की घंटी बजती है)। इनका विकास अभी तक नहीं

[श्रीमती कृष्णा कुमारी]

किया गया। उत्तर प्रदेश में इनका अभाव है, अतएव उत्तर प्रदेश के लिए यह आवश्यक होगा कि इनका विकास करें जिससे दोनों प्रदेशों का लाभ होगा। मध्य प्रदेश में इन चीजों की इतनी बहुतायत है कि वह सौ वर्ष में भी उनका विकास पूरी तरह से न कर सकेंगे। तब वह अपने केंद्र के स्थानों को छोड़ कर एक किनारे पर बघेलखंड में उद्योगीकरण का प्रबन्ध नहीं करेंगे। अलावा इसके उनकी कोई ऐसी हानि भी नहीं है जब कि केवल उनके रकबा के 20वें हिस्से के लगभग उत्तर प्रदेश में आ जायगा।

बघेलखंड की सभी नदियां उत्तर प्रदेश की ओर जाती हैं। मान लीजिए, सोन नदी में एक बांध बंधाया जाय तो उससे बघेलखंड का सीधी जिला तथा उत्तर प्रदेश का मिर्जापुर जिला अच्छी प्रकार से सींचा जा सकते हैं। इसी प्रकार वीहर, टोंस, बेलन आदि नदियों की परिस्थिति है। उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार ने बेलन नदी से कुछ नहरें निकाली हैं जो रीवा जिला हो कर जाती हैं, परन्तु उसका फायदा रीवा जिला निवासी नहीं उठा रहे हैं।

रीवा जिला में एक चर्चाई का प्रपात है जो उत्तरी भारत में सबसे बड़ा है। पहले उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार इसमें बांध बना कर बिजली निकालना चाहती थी, परन्तु रीवा के महाराज से उस की शर्त तय नहीं हो सकी, इसलिए यह कार्य नहीं हो सका। अब यह कार्य आसानी से हो सकेगा जिससे दोनों प्रदेशों को लाभ होगा। इसी प्रकार और भी प्रपात हैं, जैसे कंदौली व पूर्वा। इन पर जो बांध बंधेंगे उनसे केवल रीवा जिले को ही फायदा न होगा बल्कि इलाहाबाद व बांदा जिले के वे हिस्से जो यमुना के दक्षिण में हैं उनको भी लाभ होगा। सतना जिला की टोंस नदी पर जो बांध बंधेगा वह सतना जिला तथा उत्तर प्रदेश के ही लिए लाभदायक होगा। इन बांधों से मध्य प्रदेश का कोई लाभ नहीं होगा।

(Time bell rings.)

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ: If the hon. Lady Member is going to be allowed

more time, I may also kindly be allowed because my name also is there. Such time as she wants may also be given to me.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: I withdraw my name, and my time also may kindly be added to her time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): Please resume your seat. There are one or two hon. Members of this House who are very particular about speaking. Is it the intention of the House to sit for at least ten or fifteen minutes more.

PROF. G. RANGA: There is no harm. We can wait for another half an hour.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: Is it the intention of the House to sit for another ten or fifteen minutes more so that they may have a chance?

HON. MEMBERS: We will sit.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): Will you please wind up your speech in one minute?

श्रीमती कृष्णा कुमारी : मेरा मेन पॉइंट तो कहने से रह ही गया है। वहां की भौगोलिक परिस्थिति यह है कि कौमोर पर्वत इस हिस्से को मध्य प्रदेश से अलाहिदा करता है, अर्थात् यही पर्वत जल विभाजित करता है।

रिहन्द नदी में जो उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार बांध बनवा रही है वह तो बघेलखंड के इन तीन जिलों के लिए एक स्वर्गीय दान सा है क्योंकि इससे इन जिलों को केवल रोशनी के ही लिए बिजली न मिलेगी बल्कि कल कारखानों के लिए भी पूर्णतया विद्युत शक्ति प्राप्त होगी। इन जिलों का आवागमन मुख्यतः उत्तर प्रदेश से ही है। इस सम्बन्ध में दो राय हो ही नहीं सकतीं। पढ़ाई लिखाई तथा सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध भी इस हिस्से का उत्तर प्रदेश से सैकड़ों वर्ष पुराना है।

कुछ लोग यह कहते हैं कि उत्तर प्रदेश बड़ा है, इससे उसमें कुछ न मिलना चाहिए परन्तु वे यह भूल जाते हैं कि रकबे में प्रस्तावित मध्य

प्रदेश ही बढ़ा है। अगर पूरे का पूरा विन्ध्य प्रदेश उत्तर प्रदेश में मिला दिया जावे तब भी मध्य प्रदेश का रकबा उत्तर प्रदेश से बड़ा रहेगा। अलावा इसके अब तो हाई कमांड ने अपना मत बड़े प्रदेश बनाने के पक्ष में दिया है।

(समय की घंटी)

डा० आर० पी० दुबे : अब आप बैठ जाइये।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): You can read the important paragraphs only.

श्रीमती कृष्णा कुमारी : मैं एक बात और कहना चाहती हूँ। मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आता कि जब विन्ध्य प्रदेश के लोग यह कहते हैं कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश बना रहे, तब कहा जाता है यह ठोटा है और जब कहते हैं कि उत्तर प्रदेश में मिला दिया जाय, तब कहते हैं कि बढ़ा हो जायगा। आश्चर्यजनक दलील है। न्याय तो यह कहता है कि उत्तर प्रदेश और मध्य प्रदेश के बीच ऐसा बंटवारा होना चाहिए कि ६ करोड़ आदिमियों को ज्यादा जमीन मिले और दो करोड़ आदिमियों को कम मिले क्योंकि इन दोनों प्रदेशों के बीच भाषा का कोई भगड़ा नहीं है। दोनों हिन्दी भाषा भाषी देश हैं। समाजवादी सरकार का उद्देश्य भी यही होगा चाहिए।

अंत में मैं एक बात और कह देना चाहती हूँ। यह प्रदेश बनने के पूर्व बघेलखंड जिला कांग्रेस कमिटी पहले महाकोशल प्रान्त में सम्मिलित थी। परन्तु जब महाकोशल वालों ने इस जिला कांग्रेस कमिटी को छिन्न भिन्न करके दूसरे जिलों में मिलाना चाहा तब हाई कमांड की आज्ञा से यह जिला कांग्रेस कमिटी उत्तर प्रदेश प्रान्तीय कांग्रेस कमिटी में सम्मिलित कर दी गई। बाद में जब विन्ध्य प्रदेश बना तब यह प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमिटी का रूप धारण कर लिया। अब जब कि प्रदेश का विलीनीकरण हो रहा है तब यह पुनः उत्तर प्रदेश में लौटा दी जावे।

आशा है प्रवर समिति में इन सुझावों पर विचार करके यदि पूरे विन्ध्य प्रदेश को नहीं तो कम से कम बघेलखंड के तीनों, जिलों, रीवां,

सतना और सीधी को उत्तर प्रदेश में मिलाने की कृपा करंगी ताकि बघेलखंड के लोग भारतवर्ष के साथ अपनी भी उन्नति कर सकें। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): Mr. Dangre, I would request you to finish speech in five minutes.

SHRI R. V. DANGRE (Madhya Pradesh): All right, Sir. सभापति जी, एस० आर० कमीशन की रिपोर्ट से जो स्थिति पैदा हुई हम देखते हैं उससे हम लोगों को यह विश्वास हो गया था कि उससे देश की जो समस्याएँ हैं वे कुछ हल हो जातीं, लेकिन जो बिल उस सम्बन्ध में पेश हुआ है वह है तो बहुत ठीक, परन्तु उससे कुछ हिस्सों में या कुछ प्रान्तों को जो नुक्सान हुआ है वह मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। यह हो नहीं सकता कि मैं ५ मिनट के समय में, जो कि मुझको दिया गया है, उसमें अपने विचार आपके सामने रख सकूँ, लेकिन अपने सब के बारे में जो मैं जानता हूँ वह बात मैं थोड़े अंश में कह देना चाहता हूँ।

एस० आर० कमीशन ने हमारे विदर्भ का एक अलग प्रान्त बना दिया था। अच्छा होता यदि उस विचार को वैसे का वैसे स्वीकार कर लिया जाता। सारा भगड़ा जो हुआ है वह बम्बई को लेकर हुआ है और हम विदर्भ वालों की इच्छा के खिलाफ हाई कमांड ने "Wishes of the people will have to be ascertained." ऐसा कहने के बाद भी विदर्भ को महाराष्ट्र में मिला दिया है। विदर्भ को मिला देने के बाद भी बम्बई का मसला अभी तक तय नहीं हुआ है। हम लोगों को महाराष्ट्र में जाना पड़ रहा है और हमें भी उनके भगड़े में शामिल किया जा रहा है। यह बात समझ में नहीं आती कि विदर्भ वालों को महाराष्ट्र वालों के भगड़े के बीच में क्यों डाला जा रहा है। विदर्भ के लोगों ने महाराष्ट्र में मिलना इसीलिए तय किया क्योंकि हमारे देश के श्रेष्ठ नेताओं ने ऐसा करना उचित समझा। देश के कल्याण के लिए हम लोग महाराष्ट्र में मिलने को तैयार हुए। लेकिन अभी हमारे माननीय अम्बेडकर साहब ने जो बात कही

[श्री आर० वी० डांगर]

उससे यह मालूम होता है कि बम्बई का मसला अभी तय नहीं हुआ है। अगर बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र में नहीं मिला दिया जाता है तो हमारे अम्बेडकर साहब धमकी देते हैं कि वह नया भगड़ा खड़ा कर देंगे। अगर इस तरह की बात चलती रही तो विदर्भ के लोग इस तरह के भगड़ा में पड़ना नहीं चाहते हैं। वे जिस तरह से पहले थे उसी तरह से अलग विदर्भ पसन्द करेंगे।

इसके साथ ही साथ यह बात भी आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे प्रान्त से पार्लियामेंट के लिए एक सीट थी और लेजिस्लेटिव असेम्बली में 5 सीटें थीं लेकिन अब नये विधान के अनुसार 6 सीटें कर दी गई हैं जिससे हमारे प्रान्त वाले नुकसान में रहते हैं। इस तरह से महाराष्ट्र के साथ मिलने से हमको नुकसान होता है। हाई कमांड ने विदर्भ को महाराष्ट्र में मिलाने का जो निश्चय किया था वह हमने दश के हित के लिए स्वीकार किया। ऐसे नुकसान के लिये नहीं।

दूसरी बात जो मुझे कहनी है वह यह है कि अभी महाकोशल (या मध्य प्रांत) की अपर कौंसिल की सिफारिश है मगर विदर्भ के लिये बिल में जो व्यवस्था की गई है उसमें अपर कौंसिल का कोई जिक्र नहीं है। अपर कौंसिल की अगर व्यवस्था हो जाती तो हमारे expert जो इंजीनियर वर्गों और दूसरे जानकार लोग हैं वे वहां जा सकते थे लेकिन इस तरह की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं की गई है। अगर अपर कौंसिल की व्यवस्था हो जायेगी तो हमारे एक्सपर्ट, इंजीनियर और दूसरे जानकार लोग वहां जा सकेंगे।

तीसरी बात जो मुझे कहनी है वह यह है, जैसा कि अभी हमारे माननीय वज्रू साहब ने भी कहा कि विदर्भ एक सरप्लस स्टेट है और वह अपना इंतजाम अच्छी तरह से चला सकता है। महाराष्ट्र के साथ मिलने से तो वह एक डीफिसिट स्टेट बन सकता है। इस बिल में इस तरह की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं कि जो बचत का

पैसा विदर्भ का है वह केवल विदर्भ के कामों में ही खर्च किया जायेगा। हम किस तरह से यह मान लें कि महाराष्ट्र विदर्भ जैसे छोट से छोट विभाग की ओर ध्यान देगा। अक्सर यह देखने में आता है कि बड़े बड़े स्टेट छोट छोट विभागों की तरफ ध्यान नहीं देते हैं। इस लिये मैं यहां पर यह सुझाव रखना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरह से क्षेत्रीय परिषद पंजाब और तेलंगाना के लिए बनाई गई हैं उसी तरह से विदर्भ के लिए भी बनाई जानी चाहिये। जिस तरह से पंजाब का मसला और तेलंगाना को आन्ध्र में मिलाकर उसका मसला हल किया गया है उसी तरह से विदर्भ के लिए रीजनल कौंसिल और अपर कौंसिल बनाकर वहां के लोगों को खुश किया जा सकता है। जब आपने महाराष्ट्र के साथ विदर्भ को मिला दिया है तो आप लोगों का यह कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि इस समय वहां की जनता में जिन बातों के लिए असंतोष है उन्हें दूर किया जाना चाहिये। लेकिन जिस तरह के भगड़ा महाराष्ट्र के साथ चल रहे हैं वे हमारी तरफ आ जायेंगे तो बहुत कुछ गड़बड़ हो जायेगी।

अभी तक हम लोगों को नागपुर के हाईकोर्ट में जाना पड़ता था मगर इस गई व्यवस्था के अनुसार हमको बम्बई के हाई कोर्ट में जाना पड़ेगा। मेरे जैसे सामान्य आदमी की समझ में यह बात नहीं आती है कि जब हमारे घर के पास कुआ है तो फिर क्यों हम दूर के कुएं में पानी पीने के लिए जायें। नई व्यवस्था के अनुसार बम्बई में हाई कोर्ट बनने से विदर्भ वालों को बहुत दूर जाना पड़ेगा। जब उनके घर के पास ही हाईकोर्ट है तो क्यों उन्हें इतनी दूर जाने के लिए मजबूर किया जाता है, यह बात समझ में नहीं आती है। इस तरह की व्यवस्था से हमारे लोगों को बहुत कठिनाइयों का सामना करना पड़ेगा। इस बिल में इस तरह की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं दिखाई देती जिससे विदर्भ के लोगों की कठिनाइयां दूर हों।

मैं एक साधारण मनुष्य और एक साधारण किसान हूँ। मैं लम्बी चाँड़ी बातें समझ नहीं

पाता और कानूनी बातें में जानता नहीं हूँ । आपने पांच मिनट का समय दिया है, उसमें सब कुछ कैसे कहा जा सकता है । हमने विदर्भ को महाराष्ट्र के साथ इसलिए मिलाया कि हमारे देश के नेताओं ने कहा कि इससे देश का कल्याण होगा और विदर्भ के लोगों को बड़े राज्य में हर तरह से फायदा होगा । मगर मैं देखता हूँ कि इस समय जो बातें हो रही हैं और इस बिल में जिस तरह की व्यवस्था है उससे विदर्भ वालों को बिलकुल फायदा होने वाला नहीं है । बम्बई का मसला अभी तक हल नहीं हुआ है अगर गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र को मिलाकर एक प्रान्त बना दिया जाय और बम्बई उसकी राजधानी हो और एस० आर० सी० ने जो सिफारिश विदर्भ के सम्बन्ध में की थी उसको वैसे ही मंजूर कर दें तो ठीक होगा । अगर आपने इस बात को मान लिया तो विदर्भ के लोगों को बहुत फायदा होगा । आप लोगों ने डा० अम्बेडकर साहब का भाषण सुना ही होगा जिसमें उन्होंने कहा कि बम्बई के बारे में वह चुपचाप बैठ रहने वाले नहीं हैं । जब इस तरह की बात है तो हमको क्यों बीच में डाला जा रहा है, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रही है । इस तरह की बातों से तो महाराष्ट्र वाले भी बदनाम होंगे और हम भी बदनाम होंगे । सरकार का यह कर्तव्य है कि विदर्भ वालों की कठिनाइयों को ध्यान में रखकर उचित कार्यवाही करें । पांच मिनट का समय आपने दिया है । इतने समय में सब बातें नहीं कह सकता हूँ, जब उचित अवसर आयेंगा तब बिस्तार से बतलाऊंगा । धन्यवाद ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): You will be the last speaker, Mr. Agnibhoj.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ: Thank you for the kindness.

श्री रामेश्वर अग्निभोज (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष, महात्मा गांधी जी कहा करते थे "सब भूमि गोपाल की" यह सारी भूमि गोपाल की है, प्रभु की है । वह संसार का समूट है और उसकी भूमि उत्पादकों के लिए है । परन्तु आज

हम देखते हैं कि हमारे देश में राजनीतिक जीवन में जिन लोगों की पॉलिटिक्स, जिनकी शक्ति बहुत सीमित और क्षीण है, वे आज जमीन के पीछे पागल होकर इतना लड़ रहे हैं और भारतीय राष्ट्रीयता और एकता के लिये खतरा पैदा कर रहे हैं और उसके साथ साथ उस आजादी के लिये भी जिस राष्ट्र ने सैकड़ों वर्षों के बाद हासिल किया है ।

मैं आपसे यह प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि अगर मैं यह कहूँ कि यह भारतवर्ष की जमीन मेरी है तो क्या आन्ध्र, क्या मैसूर, केरल, बम्बई, यू० पी०, विन्ध्य प्रदेश, अन्डमन और निकोबार, सब प्रान्तों के लोगों का यह जातीय अधिकार है कि सारे भारतवर्ष की भूमि उनकी है । अगर मुझे जमीन की जरूरत है और मेरे लिए जगह नहीं है तो भारतीय होने के नाते मुझे पूरा अधिकार है कि भारतवर्ष के किसी भी प्रान्त में जाकर बस सकता हूँ । हमारे लिए यह आवश्यक नहीं है कि हम अपने देश की जमीन के टुकड़े टुकड़े करके बांट दें और इस तरह का वातावरण पैदा कर दें कि जिससे आपस में इस तरह की भावना हो जाय कि यह जमीन हमारी है और यह जमीन उसकी है । इसीलिए मेरी प्रार्थना है कि एक ओर हमारे देश के जो अगुवा हैं, जिनके हाथ में राज्य सत्ता है वह इस तरह की बात करें कि हमारी देश की एकता कायम रहे और उसे किसी तरह का खतरा पैदा न हो । और दूसरी तरफ प्रत्येक भारतीय से, प्रत्येक जिम्मेदार व्यक्ति से यह प्रार्थना है कि वह यह सोच कि हमने भारत का भाषावार प्रान्त के रूप में विरोध किया है और आज भी करते हैं क्योंकि भाषावार प्रान्त की भावना एक पागलपन है और देशद्रोह से भरी हुई है । इसीलिए यह आवश्यक है कि हम छोटे छोटे भगड़ों में न पड़ें । हमारी देश की सरकार इन पांच छः महीनों में काफी कठिनाई उठा चुकी है । बम्बई और उड़ीसा से काफी कठिनाई हमारे सामने आई । हमें आश्चर्य होता है कि अब यू० पी० के चीफ मिनिस्टर और यू० पी० के लोग हमारी राष्ट्रीय सरकार के लिए एक खतरा बन रहे हैं और इस तरह का वातावरण पैदा कर रहे हैं जिसमें

[श्री रामेश्वर अग्निभोज]

६ करोड़ ५० पी० वासी और ३ करोड़ मध्य प्रदेशवासी यानी दस करोड़ के करीब जनता के बीच में मनमुटाव और हाथापाई हो सकती हैं।

श्री टी० पांडे : हमारी ऐसी कभी मंशा नहीं है।

श्री रामेश्वर अग्निभोज : मैं यही तो कहता हूँ कि इस तरह की भावना बहुत बुरी है। विन्ध्य प्रदेश ने पहले यह तय कर लिया था, जैसा कि २ और ३ अप्रैल की रिपोर्ट से मालूम होता है कि वहाँ की असेम्बली ने यह फैसला कर लिया था कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश को मध्य प्रदेश में मिला दिया जाय। इसके बाद ५० पी० के चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब यह कहते हैं कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश का बघेलखंड का हिस्सा ५० पी० में मिला दिया जाय। दूसरी ओर आप सलाह देते हैं कि हम पंजाब के जोन में मिलेंगे। बघेलखंड और बुंदेलखंड के लोगों का कल्चर जब आप पंजाब के लोगों से मिलाते हैं तब आपका दिमाग, आपका ज्ञान, आपकी राष्ट्रीयता और आपकी एकता की भावना कहां चली जाती है। यह पागलपन है। भक्त कबीर ने एक जगह कहा है :

“मन न रंगाये हो, रंगाये जाँगिया कपड़ा,
आसन मार मींदरवा में बैठे, नाम छोड़ भजन
लागे पथरा।”

वे राष्ट्रीयता को छोड़ कर पत्थरों की पूजा करने लगे हैं, और उन्होंने अपनी प्रान्तीयता को इतना सिद्ध लगाया है कि उसका रंग रूप ही मिट्टर में सब गायब हो गया है और केवल पत्थर ही दिखाई देता है। इसीलिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि आप केन्द्रीय सरकार की दिक्कतों को और न बढ़ाइयें और जिस तरह से हमारे सामने यह बिल आया है वैसे का वैसे ही हम उसे मंजूर करें। यदि आप यह कहते हैं कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश का कल्चर और मध्य प्रदेश का कल्चर भिन्न है तो फिर आप ललितपुर के लिये भी यही बात क्यों नहीं कहते हैं।

श्री ज० रा० कपूर : ललितपुर वाले जाना चाहें तो हमें कोई एतराज नहीं होगा।

श्री रामेश्वर अग्निभोज : मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि ललितपुर मध्य प्रदेश में जाय। अगर विन्ध्य प्रदेश के लोग भी ५० पी० में जाना चाहें तो जायें और अगर मुझे हिन्दुस्तान में कहीं जगह नहीं मिलेगी तो मैं अहमदनगर में ही जा कर बस जाऊंगा क्योंकि वह भी मेरी मातृभूमि ही है। आपको तो राष्ट्रीयता की दृष्टि से इस विषय पर विचार करना चाहिये। आपको तो यह सोचना चाहिये कि जान बची लाखों पाये क्योंकि देश के लोग बड़े उदार हैं और श्री पन्निकर की रिपोर्ट के पश्चात् भी आपका कुछ नहीं हुआ है वरना आपके तीन टुकड़े हो जाते। आप तो जानते ही हैं कि ज्यादा खाने से पेट बर्स्ट हो जाता है। अगर ५० पी० के बैली (पेट) को बढ़ायेंगे तो फिर वही हालत होगी। आप यह अपेंडीसाइटिस का मर्ज न मोल लें वरना उसमें खतरा ही है। मेरी प्रार्थना यही है कि आप कृपा कर के केन्द्रीय सरकार की कीठनाइयों को, अपने नेताओं की कीठनाइयों को और अपनी खुद की कीठनाइयों को और न बढ़ाइयें।

श्री टी० पांडे : जब विन्ध्य प्रदेश के नेता, वहाँ की असेम्बली के सदस्यगण और वहाँ के जिम्मेदार लोग हम से कहते हैं कि हम तुम्हारे साथ मिलना चाहते हैं तो हम सिर्फ यही कहते हैं कि अगर आप मिलना चाहते हैं तो हम आपका स्वागत करते हैं। इसके सिवाय हमारी और कोई इच्छा नहीं है।

श्री रामेश्वर अग्निभोज : यदि आप स्वागत हो कर तब तां ठीक है लेकिन जब आप खुराफात कहते हैं तब अफसोस होता है। खुराफात इस तरह से कहे जाते हैं कि लोगों को उभारा जाता है, इसके लिये भाषण दिये जाते हैं। इस नीति को आप छोड़ दीजिये। अगर आपने इसी तरीके से काम किया तो यह आवश्यक है कि आपका बस्ती, बलिया और बनारस बिहार में जायगा और मरठ डिवीजन पंजाब में जायगा।

अब मैं आपसे यह निवेदन करूंगा कि हमारे इस राज्य सभा में २२२ सदस्य स्टैंड्स द्वारा भेजे जाते हैं और १२ प्रेसिडेंट साहब नामिनट करते

हैं, इस तरह से कुल २३४ सदस्य हो जाते हैं। विधान के अनुसार इस राज्य सभा की सदस्य संख्या २५० तक हो सकती है, इसीलिए मंत्री प्रार्थना हैं कि आप २५० का हाउस बना दें। जिन स्टैंटों को ११ सीटें दी हुई हैं उनको १ सीट और दें दें जिससे कि रॉटेशन में चार चार का डिविजोबल नम्बर हो जाय, इसी तरह से जहाँ ८ सीटें हैं वहाँ ६ कर दें और जहाँ २३ सीटें हैं उनको २४ कर दें और जो कांस्टीट्यूशन में कहा गया है कि राज्य सभा की सदस्य संख्या २५० तक हो सकती है उसको १६ आदिमियों से क्यों कम करते हैं, उसको पूरा कर दें। इसीलिए मंत्री सेलैक्ट कमेटी से प्रार्थना हैं कि वह इस पर

विचार करें। मैं पुनः यह प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि जो बिल इस समय हमारे सामने है उसको वैसे का वैसे ही मंजूर किया जाय। यही मंत्री प्रार्थना हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): The Home Minister will reply to the debate tomorrow. The House now stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at fifteen minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 2nd May 1956.