

[Shri S. C. Deb]

This is the view of the Chief Minister of Assam. The same is also the view of the Assam Provincial Congress Committee, which adopted a resolution favouring the merger of Tripura in Assam. It also adopted a resolution for the merger of Manipur. When there is agitation in these two areas, namely, Tripura and Manipur, for a democratic set-up it is very necessary from the point of view of homogeneity of that area and also security, that they should be merged in Assam, as recommended by the States Reorganisation Commission, (Interruptions). If it could not be done now, owing to practical considerations, it should be done in the near future. If it is to be done in the near future, why should it not be done now? When our Government are taking so much pains to merge Telangana and Andhra, and other parts in other States, and they are making so much of effort to effect reorganisation in other areas, I do not know why this little part should not be merged right now in Assam, so that the Central Government would not be put to the trouble of running the help to this part every day? Whether there are floods, or whether there is scarcity every time, the Central Government have to incur expenses as at present, and transport the necessary commodities by air to Agartala. Why should this continue for long? When there is an agitation in these places for democratic set-up, when we recognise also the right of every individual to have a democratic set-up, why should not these little parts be merged with Assam now itself, so that Government could have the necessary security measures, and keeping in view the contiguity and homogeneity of these areas, the development of the whole area may be taken up together? The problems are there in the plains as also in the hills. There are security troubles everywhere. We have got Pakistan also on the border. The border trouble is there in Tripura, in Assam and other areas too. The other day, my hon. friend Shri L.

Jogeswar Singh talked of infiltration in those areas, particularly, in the Naga Hills area. There, there is a no-man's-land on the Burma border. We do not know whether any help is coming from that area of no-man's-land. I am glad that the Prime Minister is here and I would like to tell him that we should develop a port at Rangoon and have a corridor-line bordering Tripura, Assam and Manipur, so that security measures can be taken in an effective and smooth way. That way, I believe, our difficulties in regard to transport, communication, trade, development of industries and so on, will all be solved. I would appeal to Government to take a little more care in regard to this area.

I have moved an amendment also in this regard. When the Central Government are taking so much pains for the development of the whole of India with a view to its integration, security and unity, I would beseech them to take a little more care of that area, and adopt a solution on the lines I am suggesting.

Shri L. Jogeswar Singh (Inner Manipur): On a point of information. I would like to tell my hon. friend that before he asks for the merger of these areas in Assam, Assam must first control the Naga Hills troubles. When Assam is not in a position to manage the Naga Hills, how is it that my hon. friend says, that it will be able to discharge its responsibility in Tripura and Manipur? When the Naga Hills area has not been controlled, how is my hon. friend so much interested in Manipur and Tripura being taken over by Assam?

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

4-08 P.M.

Shri S. C. Deb: If all these States are taken together, then there will be no trouble.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:] Mr. Speaker, Sir, a week ago today, I returned to Delhi after visiting many

countries and great cities in the West, and meeting many leading personalities there. I tried to understand the great movements that were taking place there, the thoughts in the minds of people there and the changes that had taken place. Even more so, I tried to understand what reflection there was of India in the minds of the people that I met in Europe.

I was interested in that naturally, because even as I watched something of the stuff of history being made in Europe, I wanted to know how far the history we might be making here was reflected in the minds of people in Europe. I found they were greatly interested, indeed sometimes more than interested, in what was happening in India, because they felt that something very significant was happening here something that would not only change India, but would affect other countries and other continents. And I thought then of the work that we do here in India, the great problems that face us, and the tremendous responsibility of this Parliament of India. This Parliament of India indeed has this responsibility of making the history of India.

That was one thought that struck me. Another thought that struck me as I travelled from country to country was of how the old frontiers had gradually meant less and less. Within an hour or two, I travelled from the capital of a great country to the capital of another great country. There were problems, certainly many problems and many conflicts, but this idea of national frontiers became less and less important somehow in the modern scheme of things.

I mention this because here we are considering with considerable heat and passion not the frontiers of nations but the borders inside the nation between two States or provinces. If the frontiers of nation become relatively less important than they were, and if in the course of a few years, they may almost be ignored for many matters, how much less important are these problems of State

boundaries which we are considering? I do not wish to minimise their importance, but I do wish this House to consider this question in proper perspective. We are apt to lose that perspective in the heat of debate or otherwise. I know that this question which we are considering, and this Bill and its provisions, have moved people strongly, deeply and that even now there is a great deal of feeling about them. I do not suppose that the most ideal solutions, whatever they might have been, could possibly have been pleasing to everybody.

So far as I am concerned—indeed, I might say, so far as Government here is concerned—it is of no great significance to us what part of India goes into this State boundary or that. Yes, certainly we must consider what is more desirable from various points of view. But in the ultimate analysis, it does not make much difference where one little part is from the Government point of view. From the individual's point of view or the State's point of view, it has certain importance; I do not deny that.

Therefore, the Government of India approached this question, if I may use word, more or less objectively and without any particular desire to impose this decision or that. We have been told that we did not go through the proper procedure of consultation and decision etc. But I think any person who knows what has happened in the last six seven or eight months in this country, will also know that the amount of consultation and discussion about this matter that we have had is without parallel. In fact, many people say—and perhaps, rightly—that we overdid this: it would have been much simpler if we had not tried to consult hundreds of thousands of persons in this process and thereby perhaps added to the confusion. However, it is a fact that this question has roused people. But I wish this House to realise this, and first of all look at this picture in proper perspective, lest we forget that perspective and get lost in the passions of the moment. Secondly, to realise that

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

however important these questions of borders might be, they are, after all, administrative divisions inside the country. Thirdly, whatever we may decide today, surely nobody prevents us afterwards, subsequently, from making any variation.

I realise that nobody wants to decide things and change them every-day. That is a different matter. But nothing is final in the sense that it cannot be changed in the future.

Now, our difficulty has been that we have tried too much perhaps to balance respective viewpoints, to try to find a common way, to find as large a measure of agreement as possible. And naturally, in doing so, we have often succeeded in displeasing many people. Yet I would beg of you to remember that in this very very complicated business which affected the whole of India, by far the greater part of India has accepted, broadly speaking, the proposals that are made. True, very important questions remain; among them perhaps the one that has been talked about most is the question of Bombay and Maharashtra.

Now, I have felt—I say so with respect—that perhaps the approach to these questions has been too much marred by strong language and by direct or indirect reproaches, and, if I may use the word, by running down this group or that group in this community or that, not only in regard to Bombay, but in regard to other places too—whether it is Bengal, Bihar or other places. I would beg this House to consider whether it helps in the slightest the consideration of these problems by running down any province, any community, in any part of the country, by considering one part more capable, more courageous, more independent or more nationalistic—whatever it may be. We are all here as Members chosen by some constituency or other in India. Naturally, we are interested in that constituency. But I submit that we are here as something else also. I am not here merely as Member for the

eastern part of Allahabad district. I consider myself the Member for India here, and I do submit that every Member of Parliament is a Member for India. We are not members of some local municipality or district to consider the particular interests of that area only and forget the rest of India. We have to consider every question, I hope to the best of our ability, in relation to the whole country. I am not Prime Minister of Allahabad district. I am Prime Minister of India by grace of this House, and I have to think or try to think in terms of India. I may make a mistake. Of course, I make mistakes; all of us make mistakes. But I do submit that when we begin to challenge each other's *bona fides*, then any discussion and any consideration of any problem on merits becomes a little difficult.

Let us consider these problems from this larger point of view, realising that even if some decision which we dislike is made it does not make a terrible lot of difference, realising that if the mistake is made, it is a mistake in a narrow sphere and it can be corrected later, because the greatest possible mistakes and the greatest possible error in this is having a wrong mind and a wrong approach to this problem and creating an atmosphere of conflict which is so vital to the development of any big thing in India. That is the basic approach.

Some hon. Members may well say, 'It is all very well; your intentions may be very good, but where have you landed us with your good intentions?' It is perfectly true that we have landed ourselves in a bit of mess. I admit it and I admit my responsibility for it because, naturally, as Prime Minister and otherwise also, I am at least partly responsible for it. I do not wish to run away from it. It sometimes happens that in trying to avoid one difficulty one lands in another. But there it is.

I do not wish to go into the past history of all these 8 months' debate and consideration; but we have arrived at a certain stage now and we have to look at the picture as it is. Many things could have been done, large bilingual States and many other things might have been done; they might be done later too. I do not rule that out. But, what exactly can we do at the present moment so as to promote and preserve and help to bring about this larger atmosphere of co-operative endeavour? In a decision which we take—the decision may please somebody or displease somebody; it may be a right or wrong decision—the main thing to consider is what is the final result of it in terms of goodwill or ill-will. That is the main thing.

On several occasions, in regard to this very matter of Bombay and Maharashtra, we varied previous decisions. Each time we varied it—I am talking about the earlier stages—we landed in a fresh difficulty. We did it at the suggestion of somebody, some respected colleague of ours and then, they themselves wanted something else. Ultimately we landed ourselves in this difficulty that any attempt to change it probably resulted in a worse situation than the first one.

Hon. Member, Shri Deshmukh said, he preferred a City State formula to the present state of affairs. So did we and that was our first decision. And, the hon. Member will remember that on one occasion, he told us not only on his behalf but responsibility and authoritatively on behalf of others too that we should adopt the City State formula. We adopted it although we had come to some other conclusion because we were anxious and eager to please. But not 48 hours had passed when we were told. No; go back upon that; we won't approve that. We want back upon it and so we shifted about in our anxiety to arrive at some decision which carried the largest measure of agreement and consent.

The hon. Member referred to what he called two crucial decisions which were taken without consultation. I am in a difficulty about this matter because I am really, totally and absolutely unable to follow him. I do not know where he gets his facts from. I consulted my papers, my Cabinet records and everything. There are two decisions—I leave out for the moment the statement that I made in Bombay. The first decision was taken, I am say, absolutely and repeatedly with the consultation of everybody and my colleagues in the whole Cabinet. I have no doubt about it. Finally, I say—leave out the intermediate stages—this Bill itself was placed before the Cabinet. The Bill, after all, contains it and it was the Cabinet that adopted it before it came to this House. That is the usual procedure. I do not understand how anyone can say without forgetting all these that this decision was adopted without consultation. There was more consultation than on any other subject that I have had since I have been Prime Minister.

The other matter is a small matter; what mistakes I might have made or anything said about me. [Shri Deshmukh was kind enough—and good enough to say that he did not refer to me when he said that there was a certain animus. I thank him for that statement, but it is a small matter after all as to what I am and what I may be. But, it is a much bigger matter as to what our method of Government is, what the procedure we follow in our Cabinet and the Government of India and in this Parliament and elsewhere. It is no small thing. Are we following wrong procedures; are we overriding everybody and just imposing some individual will, mine or a small committee's will over this Parliament, over the Government, over the country?

That is a vital matter. It is more vital than, I say, this whole States Reorganisation Bill. If we go wrong, how are we to function? It is charge

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

the hon. Member has made; it is a very serious charge. It is not easy to reply to it and to justify my own conduct. But I do submit that he has done little justice to his colleagues in the Cabinet and even less justice to himself when he made that charge. He has functioned in this Cabinet for 6 years or more and he has been a valued and respected member and colleague of ours. Now, he makes this charge against his colleagues after 6 years of functioning, together, a charge however much I may be guilty of or deserve, and I do submit it is a very very unfair charge on all my responsible colleagues in the Cabinet.]

However, there was this question of the statement that I made at Bombay. Now, what is the crucial decision and the statement that I made in Bombay? Repeatedly I had said at Amritsar Congress and at various other places that statement had been made repeatedly—that Bombay will be given an opportunity to decide by some democratic process what it should do and where it should go to. For my part, I would be exceedingly happy if Bombay went to Maharashtra. I have absolutely no reason against it and I shall be completely and absolutely frank in this House that I think there are many valid arguments, good arguments for Bombay going to Maharashtra. But I also say that other valid arguments are also to be considered on the other side. In this difficulty we thought, many of us thought, that the best way was to allow Bombay to decide. It may have been done even now. But, as I pointed out, the conditions have been such that so much passion has been aroused that it was not yet the right time to decide that. Let things cool down. I have repeatedly said, "Let normality prevail and then let it be decided by them". I do not naturally mean that you will have a plebiscite or referendum and all that; but, if there is a good atmosphere, I have no doubt that it would be far simpler to settle this matter without any such cumbersome proce-

sure. I was hoping for that and I still hope for that. In Bombay at the meeting of the All-India Congress Committee, I was not to my thinking making any great decision or announcement on a very big thing. I was merely stating what I had stated repeatedly—my view—and I am something; after all, I am the Prime Minister of India. And a Prime Minister is a Minister and he can lay down the policy of the Government—it may be repealed or it may be anything. I know something about democratic procedure; I know something about party procedure; I know something as to what the Prime Minister's duties are, and in the Constitution we have and in the Constitution that Britain has, the Prime Minister is a linchpin of Government. To say that the Prime Minister cannot make a statement is a monstrous statement itself. I entirely fail to understand where the hon. Member has got his acquaintance of democracy and what under the present Constitution of India and England the Prime Minister is and what he can do and what he cannot do. I am something more than the Prime Minister: we are something more; we are the children of the Indian Revolution. And although we may be toned down here and although we may forget much that we did before, we still have something of the revolutionary fire in us.

I venture to say that many of us know a little more about the Indian people, about those poor people, about those peasants than some other who talk about peasants. We have spent a good deal of our lives with those peasants and poor people, and it does not besave any person to talk of money-bags, in the sense of referring to our party or to our Government.

I made that statement in Bombay, a simple statement, if I may say so, to give an assurance that this was not a final thing; a statement which said, "Let peace be restored first and then this matter may be decided calmly". I do not mind which way it is decided. I am perfectly prepared to plead the

cause of Maharashtra with others. 'Animus' is a big word. I have no disinclination to Maharashtra, but 'animus' is a big word. I do attach much importance to this question being solved in a calm manner so as not to leave any head-ache behind.]

I do not entirely agree with all that Shri Patil said; I agree with much but I do not agree with something that he said. But I say that the main thing is that if you do something with Bombay this way or that way and as a result give head-ache to that party, the Maharashtra, it will do little good to Maharashtra to get that head-ache. By all means, let it get it in a friendly way, in a co-operative way, and it will be good for Maharashtra, it will be good for Bombay, and good for the country. That was the trouble I had. In the way to do these things.

I do venture to submit not in this matter only but in almost every matter in an individual's life or in a national life, that the older I grow, the more I feel that what is more important is the manner things are done than the things themselves. Means are more important than ends. More and more I feel that. All our trouble in this business has been not that the ends were not good but the means employed somehow tarnished the ends, made difficulties and actually came in the way of achievement of those ends. That has been the difficulty. I am not blaming anybody. If I am to blame, I am quite prepared to blame myself. It is not a question of blaming anybody, but I believe it is a fact that if you employ the wrong methods and gain something, that end is perverted. Other considerations come in, passions come into play. Because of this difficulty I wanted this question to be considered in a calmer atmosphere. The more I thought, the more I felt it was good to postpone this particular decision for some time. I say five years, but I am not making any rigid limit. That, oddly enough—what is called the crucial decision—was, apart from being a repetition of what I said, an indication that our

minds are not closed on this, an indication that this is not a finality that is coming in, but that the matter is left open for the future and whenever opportunity arises, it can be done. It was, to my humble thinking, a hand spread out to Maharashtra instead of against them, and, if I may say so,—I do not know if it is quite proper for me to say so—the day before I made that statement in the All India Congress Committee, I had the privilege of meeting quite a number of leading gentlemen from Maharashtra—I do not say they all represented Maharashtra, but some did—and we talked about these matters. I told them my difficulties and said "This Bill is there, what can we do about it?". I said that we can see that this matter is not closed, but is opened after a period. Then they said, "Can you not make your statement in the All India Congress Committee?" I said "Certainly" and I made that statement.

[It is not conveying any firm decision of Government as such or that the Cabinet and the Government have decided it. I made a statement. I know that when a Prime Minister makes a statement, it is an important thing, it is not a casual thing. That statement itself, if you examine it, was "the door being left open" and that there is no finality about it, it can be varied, it could have been varied slightly here or there. If you accept what the Bill contains, because it refers to my talk in Bombay about the Bill, which was, of course, Government's decision, etc. In order to lessen the shock of the Bill to those who do not like it, I found a way by which this can be varied or changed a little. It is really to lessen the shock of the Bill that I did so rather than to come in the way of Maharashtra.

Some people talked about a big bilingual State, and for my part, obviously I welcome it. I do not mind if Bombay is a City State. I do not mind if any chunk of territory were to go from one side or the other. Maybe I do not have a sense of provincialism in me. I can consider

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

economic reasons, geographical reasons. Geography is important, of course. Of course, geography of little patches become less important in this age of vast travel etc. But the one thing that is really important, I feel, is this. Stress has been laid on this in the Report of the Commission—how linguistic minorities are to be treated—because it just does not matter you put your boundaries, between this and that, but they are bound to be overlapping. You can put people speaking in one language in a closed house, in a closed province. But there are bilingual areas, maybe trilingual areas, whatever the percentage may be. How are you to treat them?

The House will remember that in the Commission's Report, there is a special reference in the concluding chapter to certain measures, certain protections, certain precautions, certain assurances, certain statutory provisions so as to give them protection—protection to the linguistic minorities. Now I am anxious that this should be done, and done in the form of words. At any rate this charge has some truth and I do believe that a language is not given protection or a group representing a certain language is not given protection when it happens to be in a minority or almost equal, whatever it is. That difficulty and that complaint must be removed altogether from India and removed in a way not merely by some pious protestations but by some active and precise instructions to that effect. One cannot get rid of all the evils of this world, but anyhow one should go as far as possible to prevent this happening. If this can be done, then the linguistic complaint goes or ought to go from every part of India. If I may say so, this fact, I am told, is in the Constitution, but nonetheless I do not think everybody realises it.

I do think that all the fourteen languages mentioned in our Constitution are our national languages—not Hindi only, but all the fourteen languages. Hindi, not because of any

linguistic superiority, but because it is spread over a larger area and for various reasons and facility and the rest, we have said, should be an all-India language; it should become an all-India language gradually and after a certain period for official purposes. But all are national languages. We want to encourage them. And, I am convinced that the encouragement of one language in India leads to the encouragement of others. The outlook that we can encourage one language by crushing other is completely wrong from any point of view—literary, or linguistic point of view. In this matter, for instance, I feel that any kind of application, letter or petition of any kind can be presented to courts: it can be done in any of the fourteen languages of India and no court will reject it. It may be, of course, that the court may be unable to deal with it if it is totally unaware of it because no court can keep fourteen translators. That does not matter. It is a matter of convenience. But, a court in Delhi has to accept an application put in Malayalam or Tamil or Telugu or Kannada. Let them get it translated. Maybe, it will delay matters. But it is none of your business to say that you cannot get it. It is one of our national languages.

If that is so about every language in India, it may be so especially in regard to the actual languages represented in a certain area. There should be no difficulty. Certainly those languages should be given that official position in that area, in applications and others. After all Government issues notices and others so that they may be understood. That notices is not merely to encourage or discourage a language. It should be issued in the language of that area, regardless. I say, of whether it is sixty or forty per cent.—whatever the percentage,—provided of course there are sufficient number of people to be approached in that way.

I just mentioned about the frontier. We are, as the House knows, facing

tremendous technological changes. We have got this marriage of science and technology and industry and that is producing enormous changes in the world. If you think of those changes, the problem that we face—such problems as in this particular Bill—becomes quite extra-ordinarily insignificant. Of course they have importance. I do not mean to deny it. I would beg of you to consider it in this particular context and consider the way the country is changing we are changing, what our future is going to be. I am intensely interested in the future of India; so are the Members of this House. We work for it. We may pause but India will continue. We have laid the foundation of that future today. [About our future, one thing is quite certain. It is not going to be a repetition of the past. The world is changing too rapidly and it is of the utmost importance that, in building that future, we should develop this all-India outlook. The provincial outlook is not going to pay either the province much less India. We cannot have it. I may come from U.P., my ancestors might have come from Kashmir, but, I consider myself an Indian I feel that I have inherited every great deed and great tradition of India from Cape Comorin to the Himalayas. Sometimes, there are comparisons in this House that the people of this province are brave, that the others are not so brave and that the others are businessmen and these people are saudagars and so on. All this thinking which we find is unfortunately the reflex of the caste system—a bane and curse to this country which should be dealt with as such. We are too much immersed in these things. Which province is there in India, which State is there in India, which has not got a proud tradition of its own? Go to the south—the Tamils; there is a great language and there are great traditions—military and the rest. Go to Andhra—famous Andhra empires. Go to the Malayalees, go to the Kannadigas—the Vijayanagar empire. Whether you go north or south or east or west, each area, each

part of India has got great traditions, great stories of the past, best culture—even military glory they have in store.

I inherit all that legacy. Do you think that I can confine myself to the story of Allahabad, although it is an ancient city, because I was born at Allahabad! I claim to have a right to the glory of Andhra, or Tamil Nad or Maharashtra or Gujarat or any part.

Maharashtra—everybody knows the vital part it has played in India's history, military way, scholarly way, literary way, in learning and in so many ways and lastly in the struggle for freedom. The Maharashtrians or Gujaratis or the Tamilians do not require protection. They are big enough. But the people who do require protection are our border people.

My hon. friend, Shri Jaipal Singh, suddenly gets excited when the word 'tribal' is mentioned. (Interruptions.)

Shri Jaipal Singh: I do not get excited.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: He may not get excited but I do get excited. Because, I think that we forget our responsibility, the trust that is reposed upon us by these people who do require every help and protection—not in the sense of imposing ourselves upon them but in the sense of always stretching out our hand of friendship and fellowship, to let them lead their own lives.

[We have got a little trouble in the Naga land, Naga Hills. I have said before—I say here—that I admire the Nagas. I like the Nagas. I think they are among the finest citizens of India. I want to win them over. I do not want to fight them. I do not wish to interfere with them. I think that they are much more capable of managing their own affairs than I can. So that, I consider myself—and I hope every Member of this House will consider himself—to possess the legacy of the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

great tradition of India from thousands of years, from the Himalayas down to the Cape Comorin, east or west.

We talk of geography. Geography is important and will remain important though it fades away in this air age. But geography has made India of the past, with Himalayas and the two seas surrounding. Whatever internal divisions and dissensions and conflicts we had in India in the past few thousands of years, the concept of India has remained. The concept of India, Bharat or Hindustan—call it what you like—has remained and has kept us mentally together. It mattered not so much in the old days and that is why politically we were apart. But it does matter today, in the age we live, when we must not only be integrated in that matter—that is not good enough—but we must emotionally and intellectually be integrated. The painful thing that has happened in the last few months is to display not to ourselves but to the world how we are not so integrated in our minds and hearts. We have to get over that.

Even accepting the mistakes, even accepting or realising that somebody else has committed the mistake, even accepting that the Government of India has committed the mistake, it will take time. It may be true. You can of course change the Government of India. You can change the decision—whatever it is—but keep, above all, the major thing in mind viz, we have to face the situation as it is today and how we can preserve this big thing, that is India uninjured in any manner. If we are making any mistake today let us calmly and quietly deal with it sometime later.

As for Bombay, I understand, I concede, the logic, the fairly strong logic. The logical aspect on behalf of Maharashtra, I do not deny. There are logical arguments on the other side too. Maybe, one is more powerful than the other. But, I look at it in the context of the present moment,

after we have arrived through a devious and tortuous way, at a certain position. How are we to deal with it? Are we to go on quarrelling and quarrelling about that or allow matters to settle down and deal with it in a proper way? According to our Constitution, it is always open to this House to deal with a matter whenever it chooses and, apart from that, we purposely say that we are not limiting this, we are not making it absolutely final; the thing will be open and in the meanwhile let us keep as many bonds as possible to prevent this kind of thing happening.

One thing I do not know yet. The hon. Member, Shri C. D. Deshmukh, called my attention to a couplet, an Urdu couplet. I think it was from a Pakistan poet.

Shri S. S. More: Has poetry any barriers?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Poetry has no barriers; ought to have none—certainly—but I cannot quite understand what he was referring to when he talked about:

बूँस सेते हैं खून, लूट सेते हैं बेवाओं का घर

I really do not understand what this has got to do—the widows being deprived of their houses—with the States Reorganisation Bill. Does he suspect that this is going to happen in some parts of India—Maharashtra, Bombay, Gujarat or anywhere? I just do not quite follow, nor do I follow what this argument had to do with the socialist pattern of society. It seems to me that many of these difficulties and many of these confusions are due to certain fixed wrong assumptions. When you get a wrong assumption in your mind then all things flow from it which have no bearing on the subject. What has socialist pattern of society got to do with this? It is said that this Bombay decision is meant to placate some

people in Bombay. Well, I cannot look into the hearts of the rich or other people, but I can tell you—and honestly—that it never struck me that this decision has anything to do with that with which other people aim that to be. And I do not see how their riches are going to be protected by this decision or otherwise, to put it in the other way, how their riches are going to be spoiled if Bombay goes to Maharashtra. I do not quite understand. I think they are capable of looking after themselves even if they are in Maharashtra and equally otherwise. It does not make the slightest difference to them. It may be, of course, that Government's policy is such as affects them; that is a different matter; but whether they are in Maharashtra, Gujarat or Bombay, it makes no difference to the position. So I submit that these questions should be considered apart from these extraneous matters.

Now, I am very reluctant to indulge well, in quoting poetry as my hon. friend did; but since he said so much about this may I also quote—it is a fairly well-known couplet:

हम चाह भी करते हैं तो हो जाते हैं बदनाम,  
वह कल भी करते हैं तो चर्चा नहीं होता ।

श्री वाङ्मोह (पूना-मध्य) : यही तो बम्बई में हुआ है। जरा एन्क्वायरी (जांच) तो कीजिए कि बम्बई में क्या हुआ है। अगर कुछ एन्क्वायरी करेंगे, तो पता सवेगा कि अमृतसर में जो ओडायर ने किया था, वह उसके मुकाबले में कुछ नहीं था, जो कि बम्बई में हुआ है।

Shri Jaipal Singh: Sir, there might be a very serious misunderstanding if I were not to ask the Leader of the House for a little bit of clarification about something in which some of us are vitally interested. He said something—I welcome the assurance; how strong that assurance is yet to be seen when the Bill progresses—in

regard to safeguards to linguistic minorities. He specifically mentioned 14 languages as being the national languages. Are they the national languages; that is to say, are the linguistic safeguards to be restricted only to these 14 languages, or will they be applicable to languages outside these 14 languages? That is really a very important issue.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I hope the hon. Member does not want me to be a little precise about it, but if he is referring to.....

Shri Jaipal Singh: Tribal languages

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: ..... tribal languages, I can tell him that our present policy is to encourage them in every way, both educationally and linguistically, in notifications etc.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have spoken on this subject on two occasions in this House and on both those occasions I have made my position clear. Unfortunately it is not the position that any party, whether the Congress or the party to which I belong, the Communist Party or the Jan Sangh, has taken. From the very beginning I said that in a complicated question like this the report of the Committee should be accepted. If it had been accepted, we would not have heard from the Prime Minister today that wherever we touch this scheme we prove to be wrong, we create more problems than we seek to solve. I also said that this question was being given the present shape because we were not true to our people, that it was our own creation, the creation of the leaders of the people, the educated classes and the politicians. Today I heard Shri Deshmukh saying the same thing. Strangely enough Shri Patil also said the same thing. I suppose when Shri Deshmukh said it he was thinking of politicians in Gujarat and when Shri Patil talked of it he was thinking in terms of politicians in Maharashtra. I do not suppose they were thinking of themselves, that they have also equally contributed to this confusion.