

[SHRI LOBO PRABHU]

the very university to which he was referring to, Osmania University, had failed in its experiment and given up teaching in Urdu medium? Another point of clarification is, he has been very easily assuming that Shri Masani has agreed with him about the introduction of regional languages in the universities. I wish he would see the script. The point he made was, and I want the Minister to answer it, that there should be no term fixed. The third question is, if the Minister is willing to accept the independence and integrity of the universities, will he affirm in this House that the universities will take the decision and not the Government. I want a reply to all these questions.

MR. SPEAKER : I will now take up the amendment.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : Sir, this is not fair.

MR. SPEAKER : He has answered all the questions.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : He has not answered all the questions. Sir, you must respect the rights of the opposition parties.

MR. SPEAKER : The Minister will only repeat what he has already said.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : I have asked three specific questions and I hope and expect that he will answer them. Let him say "Yes" or "No". Sir, I would like you to have some consideration for the views of the opposition.

MR. SPEAKER : He has answered those questions.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : He has not answered. These are specific questions.

MR. SPEAKER : After all, it is left to the Minister. He feels that he has clarified all those points.

Now, I will take up the amendment of Shri Yashpal Singh. Though he is not present here, I have still to put it to the vote of the House, because it has been moved. So, I now put the

amendment of Shri Yashpal Singh to the vote of the House.

*The amendment was put and negated.*

MR. SPEAKER : Now I will put the main motion to the vote of the House.

The question is :

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Education Commission 1964-66, laid on the Table of the House on the 29th August, 1966."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. SPEAKER : Now we will take up the second motion. There is an amendment moved by Shri Lobo Prabhu. I will put that amendment to the vote of the House.

*The amendment was put and negated.*

MR. SPEAKER : Now I will put the main motion to the vote of the House.

The question is :

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Committee of Members of Parliament on Education (1967) —National Policy on Education, laid on the Table of the House on the 25th July, 1967."

*The motion was adopted.*

17-55 hrs.

#### \*MAHAJAN COMMISSION REPORT

MR. SPEAKER : Now, the House would take up the half-an-hour discussion but before beginning it may I point out the procedure? Every day I am getting into some difficulty because a number of Members want to put a question or make a speech. The Rules are very clear. Those who would like to put a question should give notice before 11 O'clock and if there are more than five Members who have given such notice and who want to participate in the discussion, lots will be drawn and the five names selected; otherwise the half-an-hour debate would become a one-hour or two-hour debate.

\*Half-an-Hour Discussion.

A number of Members have sent chits now. There are already five names with me which have been sent to me by the office. If I allow all of them who have sent chits here, it will not be a half-an-hour debate but it will be a one-hour or two-hour debate. Therefore I would say, "Please do not put the Chair in an embarrassing position." Everyone of the hon. Members should get the privilege but we should also follow the Rules instead of embarrassing the Speaker after coming here.

Some friends are also leaving chits in my office room. When I am not there they leave these chits and go away and it is difficult for me to make a note of all these. With due respect to all the hon. Members, may I request all the Members to follow the Rules in future, if not today at least from tomorrow, so that the Chair is not put in a very very difficult position.

SHRI J. MOHAMED IMAM (Chitradurga) : Sir, I gave it long ago.

MR. SPEAKER : But I cannot help it in the lots some names do not get in.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU (Udipi) : He is interested in the subject.

MR. SPEAKER : But how can I help it? Those interested alone will give their names but when there are 20 or 25 names, all of them are put in the ballot and some of them may not get through the ballot. It is not in my hands to ignore somebody and put in somebody else's name. I know, Shri Imam came to me even yesterday and I have noted it. I requested him to give his name to the office and he has given it to the office.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur) : You are very sympathetic today.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur) : Mr. Speaker, it is a pity that a subject which should have been allotted a full day is to be discussed within half an hour. You have been good enough to explain your difficulties. This is a matter

which was awaited with bated breath by the whole country, this report of the Mahajan Commission, and we had thought that since the matter concerned not one State but three States and in a larger context the whole country the House would be provided an adequate opportunity by the Government taking the initiative in providing this opportunity. Unfortunately, the Government has tried to suppress a discussion of this subject in this House by refusing to place the report on the Table of the House and it is because of the refusal and the strange, inexplicable attitude of the Government of India that we had to take resort to this hardly satisfactory method of raising an important issue through a half-an-hour discussion.

I would here like to draw your attention to what a condition we are reduced to. The Chief Minister of Maharashtra when confronted by his Legislature told them that it is for Parliament to discuss and decide the issue, but his colleague and political mentor, the Home Minister of India, refused even to give us an opportunity by withholding the report. I must say, it is very significant. May be, the Government thought that perhaps it was better to avoid a discussion in the open so that there could be some counsel and we could reach an agreed solution. But I do not find any evidence of any effort being initiated by the Government to bring the leaders of the Opposition together so that an agreed solution could be found.

A dispute like the one which we have in mind is an unfortunate one. It should never have arisen. Why did it arise? I do not think there is anything wrong with the people of the three States concerned. They are as good as any nation can boast citizens to have. That is true of the people of Kerala, of Mysore and of Maharashtra. This kind of dispute arose because of lack of courageous, imaginative leadership. One often gets an impression, though it may sound a little harsh, that the Government of India has often shown a tendency which drives one to draw the inference that it may have some kind

[SHRI NATH PAI]

of interest in having disputes like that pending, so that it can arbitrate and sit in judgement if the disputes are prolonged. It sounds hard but the way this unhappy dispute between Mysore, Kerala and Maharashtra has been kept pending so long drives one to draw this conclusion. There is circumstantial evidence which corroborates this suspicion. The choice of the commission and the absence of the terms of reference is corroborative evidence that the Government is perhaps interested in prolonging the issue rather than finding an immediate solution in solving this issue.

Why do I say it? I have all the respect one should show to an ex-Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of India. And whatever my disappointment, as is the disappointment for all of us, with the findings of the Commission, this will not detract from showing the respect due to the ex-Chief Justice of India.

18 Hrs.

Having said that, I must say that the choice was eminently wrong. The Commission was required to delimit the boundaries between the linguistic States of India. Now, the hon. gentleman who was chosen for this job was known to be opposed to the very conception, Mr. Speaker, of linguistic redistribution. Is it fair to the issue? Is it fair to the people concerned? Is it fair to the individual chosen? Is it not corroborative of the evidence that the Government perhaps did not want a solution?

Secondly, the total absence of any terms of reference to the Commission saw to it that the Commission would not be able to do its job. The Government of India, after all the tribulations, trials and sufferings of the people in the affected areas in all three States, very unwillingly agreed to appoint a Commission. The Government of India could have done this long back, but it took more than all these years since 1956 to persuade it to do what is the simplest course of action, *i.e.*, to resolve

speedily the disputes which vitiate relations between States.

Mr. Speaker, we are passing through a very critical stage of the nation and the Government of India owes it to the people of this country that nothing that vitiates relations between the people of India is allowed to remain pending. These are pestering wounds which need to be healed expeditiously. What is the Government of India doing? We are seeing dangerous tendencies in the country, we are hearing an alarming kind of murmurings in the country, and I do not think that the Government of India is seriously concerned. I think, this generation of Indians can do one thing, if not anything else, and that is, to preserve the unity of this country. Anything that endangers that unity, anything that comes in the way of strengthening that unity, anything that jeopardises that unity, needs to be attend to immediately and it is in this broader perspective that I want to make my submission and I hope that the others also will bring, while talking about this subject, this wider national interest, whatever may be our own feelings on account of our happening, accidentally, to be born in this State or that State. Let it be remembered by all of us that the unity is being put on a test and we should not, however deeply we may be feeling, do anything which may put a further strain on the delicate fabric of the unity of this country.

I would, therefore, like to ask the Government of India this: Was it fair to the Commission, knowing the background of the unhappy, unfortunate dispute, not to give it any kind of terms of reference and leave it to the Commission to decide all such problems knowing how complicated and delicate the issue was? Mr. Speaker, you are a very dependable witness about the harm such a dispute can do to the relations between the people. You also know, Sir, how the issue can be resolved. You are also a witness—and it is known to many—to how such a dispute was resolved; there was the unhappy dispute between Tamilnad and Andhra Pradesh. Luckily for us, and good for the coun-

try, the issue was eventually resolved by a simple thing; there was no magic wand; the remedy was, the principle adumbrated, was linguistic homogeneity, village contiguity and relative majority. This is something which appeals to logic, this is something which is fair, this is something which has eradicated the problem, this is something which brought these two quarrelling States together and the bitterness which was left behind was eradicated.

Now the Mahajan Commission was not given any terms of reference. These two facts, *i.e.*, the absence of any terms of reference and the choice of the Commission, sustained a suspicion that the Government of India was not seriously interested in resolving issues which divide the people of India. Having said this, may I now make my submission?

I am sorry, it is a still-born report and nobody should try to revive it by claiming that it has been written by the ex-Chief Justice of India. In the first place, this was not an award. The terms of reference make it very clear that it is a recommendation. I am not speaking here for this or for that; I am going to make a plea and all should endorse it—when they hear dispassionately what I have to say, I think, they will be prepared to endorse. Let us try to end these disputes which divide one State from another.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA (Bangalore) : That was tried many times.

SHRI NATH PAI : If this is the spirit, let us calmly and coolly proceed with the argument.

I want to make this submission, Sir. In the first place, let us remember that this is not an award.

AN HON. MEMBER : Who says?

SHRI NATH PAI : I say it and the Commission says. (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER : It is not an award.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA : Virtually it is an award.

SHRI NATH PAI : Mr. Speaker, I will read out from the Commission's finding. The Commission says, the Government of India resolution appointing the Commission says that the Commission shall make its recommendations, not give an award. Then the Commission in its report again says : 'My recommendations on the matters entrusted to me'. The Commission says 'These are my recommendations'. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw Mr. Lobo Prabhu's attention to this thing that the Supreme Court in a matter which was raised and which was agitated before the Court on this issue, has said that 'The Commission is to inquire and make a report and embody therein its recommendation. The Commission is not entitled to make an award'.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to come to the issue.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Nath Pai, this is only an half-an-hour debate.

SHRI NATH PAI : Sir, the right of the man who gives the notice...

MR. SPEAKER : It is only 10 minutes.

SHRI NATH PAI : It is 15 minutes.

MR. SPEAKER : Please conclude now.

SHRI NATH PAI : Sir, I have just begun.

MR. SPEAKER : You must conclude now.

SHRI NATH PAI : Sir, the right of the hon. Member who initiates the debate is to adumbrate the issue and since I am giving you the proper perspective, I need your collaboration and help in this.

MR. SPEAKER : Yes, Yes.

SHRI NATH PAI : Mr. Speaker, I would like, in the first place, to point out that it was a still-born report. Not because I am dissatisfied with it. That can be a subjective statement. Why is it so? Because, (a) it is only a

[SHRI NATH PAI]

recommendation, (b) The Commission, I am sorry to say, Sir, has ignored all principles of natural justice, has ignored all the facts, has ignored all the experts, has ignored all the evidence given by experts saying—I quote the Commission—“What do these experts count for?” It is an extraordinary thing. But the Commission at one page of its report says that it has not found out any formula. I am going to make a plea that the discovery of a formula is not so difficult as if it is like discovery of the United States by Columbus. It is a simple thing; provided we are determined, we can find out a solution.

Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I was asked by friends like Mr. Lobo Prabhu : how can you disregard the findings of the Commission. The Commission by its inconsistency and refusal to adhere to any consistent principle has destroyed the report itself. One does not have to read it. I will tell you. Now I would like to read to you just only one thing. Why do I reject it? Not because it is against Maharashtra. That is not the material factor. How and when can a Commission's report be accepted? Only when a Commission will act as a Commission, when a Commission will show consistency, when a Commission will show relentless adherence to some principles. Now I would like to read only one thing. I was not going into the merits of the case to-day because mine will be a general debate.

MR. SPEAKER : Now you should conclude.

SHRI NATH PAI : Mr. Speaker, you will have to bear with me a little. The Commission says that 62% majority...

AN HON. MEMBER : How can be quote the report, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER : Anybody can quote if he has a copy of the report and if it has been already laid on the Table of the House. Even secret CBI reports have been laid on the Table by Members.

SHRI NATH PAI : I just want to make a small point in this connection. Mr. Speaker, I was saying that it is really without any consistency, lack of principle, disregard for facts, the Commission—I would like the hon. House to make its own mind—says that 62% is a slight and unstable majority. I accept it. (*Interruptions*). Another point is : the same Commission says that 41% is an overwhelming majority. 63% is slight but 41% is a convincing majority! Sir, the Commission then points out the responsibility of this House. What is the responsibility? It will ultimately be for the Parliament to decide whether it will re-demarcate the borders between the States. The Commission says that it is unable to resolve it. I will quote what it says. “The ultimate decision of making adjustment between the two States rests with the Parliament and it is not bound to decide this matter in accordance with the agreements of the States if it finds that it is not in the well-being of the population concerned.” You seem to have been rather very much in a hurry to proceed with the debate, but I would like to make a plea here that we have for the last twelve years seen that dispute. A report can be shelved, but the dispute is not shelved; the dispute remains with us and the dispute cannot be put under the carpet; the dispute has got to be resolved. We cannot allow such disputes to go on vitiating and embittering the relations between the people.

I would make a concrete proposal. I find that the Opposition parties can agree on principles, the principles which are well known and which were first adumbrated, as you would recall, Mr. Speaker, by Mahatma Gandhi in 1922, namely village, contiguity, relative majority and language as the basis.

I do not know why this report has not been placed on the Table. I do not know why Government did not provide the House with a sufficient opportunity so that the House may, irrespective of parties and States, dispassionately try to find a solution to this problem. Even now, my plea to Government and to the Prime Minister is this.

[SHRI NATH PAI]

I have already written to the Prime Minister and I have pleaded with her personally and I have the impression that she is agreeable. Will Government as a whole, therefore, make up their mind in trying to acknowledge that this is a festering wound which needs to be healed and that this dispute should not be allowed to continue like this, and that it is too risky a game to play with the lives and sentiments of our people and in the light of that, will the Prime Minister take the initiative or will the Government as a whole take the initiative in calling a round table conference of the party leaders of the national parties so that we can sit together and evolve certain agreeable principles and formulate a basis on which we can proceed? If Government are honest in preserving the unity of our country and in seeing that the wishes of our people will ultimately prevail and thus we can continue our basic heritage of unity, then let them make an effort at calling such a conference. I feel convinced that the Opposition will submit to Government unanimous agreeable formula and it will be up to Government to take that initiative. They should not go on pointing to Mysore and Maharashtra. The whole responsibility of Government is now very clear. If the Central Government feel that fissiparous tendencies have got to be checked then it is time that they showed courage. I, therefore, hope that the Government of India will no longer sit pretty on this issue but courageously come forth and accept my suggestion.

MR. SPEAKER : I find that even now Members are sending me chits. This is only a half-an-hour discussion. But it looks as if it would become a two-hour discussion. I am not able to understand how we can conduct the proceedings, if Members go on sending chits even now. For instance, Shri Tulsidas Jadhav has sent a chit just now and some others also are going on sending chits to me. After all there is some rule in regard to this matter. I should not be put in a very embarrassing position every time when I am sit-

ting in the Chair. I shall call only those whose names have been sent to me by the office after drawing lots. Let not hon. Members misunderstand me. I cannot help it. If they go on sending chits it is of no use. It is not proper because we do not have much time I think we have to follow some rules in this regard and there are some rules in this regard and we should follow those rules.

Now, Shri George Fernanades. He should only put a question and not make a speech.

श्री जार्ज फरेनन्डीज (बम्बई-दक्षिण) :

अध्यक्ष महोदय, वह तो जो आप ने कहा ठीक है लेकिन परिस्थिति को रख कर ही मैं अपना सवाल पूछने की इजाजत चाहूंगा। 1966 के मई महीने में जब बम्बई में अखिल भारतीय कांग्रेस कमेटी का अधिवेशन हो रहा था उस वक्त इस प्रश्न को एक नया मोड़ देने का काम हुआ था। प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी की ओर से एक आश्वासन उस वक्त देने में आया था कि एक कमिशन नियुक्त किया जायगा और जनमत को आधार रख कर उस कमिशन का फैसला दिया जायगा। अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस वक्त मैसूर सूबे में मराठी आशिक लोगों में से 7 लोग इस प्रश्न को लेकर वहां चुन कर गये हैं कि हमें महाराष्ट्र का ही हिस्सा कर के रहना है, मैसूर विधान सभा में नहीं रहना है तो यह जनमत है। इसलिए मेरा प्रश्न है कि क्या प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह आश्वासन उस वक्त कुछ लोगों को दिया था और अगर दिया हो तो जब कमिशन की नियुक्ति हुई तो उन के सामने यह प्रश्न क्यों नहीं रखने में आया? चूंकि आज यह रपट थी, तीन सूबों के बीच का यह झगड़ा है, केरल, मैसूर और महाराष्ट्र, उन में से दो सूबे के लोगों को बिलकुल ही नामंजूर है तो सरकार इस बारे में क्या रुख अपनाने जा रही है?

चूंकि प्रश्न तो फिर भी हमारे सामने रहेगा इसलिए उस को हल करने के लिए सरकार क्या मार्ग स्वीकार करेगी?

**SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) :** Government will decide nothing.

**MR. SPEAKER :** Why does Shri Krishnamoorthi want to get involved in this? He could yield to a Member from Mysore.

**SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY (Cuddalore) :** When both parties interested are fighting, there won't be an end at all.

**SHRI NATH PAI :** I did not speak for a State; I spoke for the nation.

**MR. SPEAKER :** They too will speak only for the nation—I am sure of it.

**SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY :** When the Commission was appointed, the Mysore people had some misgivings about it. But on the understanding, on the promise that the report of the Commission would be accepted and implemented, they accepted it. The Commission has given a categorical award. Whether it is in favour of Maharashtra or Mysore, it is not fair to go into the merits. My suggestion to Government is this : There is a report, an award by the Commission. Before any decision is taken, keeping the status quo, will Government entrust the Election Commission with conducting an opinion poll in the disputed areas as has been done in the case of Goa, to ascertain their preference for joining Maharashtra or Mysore? This is the only way to solve this dispute.

**SHRI A. K. GOPALAN (Kasergod) :** I want to ask the Home Minister whether on the question of demarcation of boundaries, the main principles which have been accepted were language, contiguity and village as the unit. If so, why is it that as far as Kasergode and the areas claimed by Maharashtra are concerned, these principles have not been observed by the Commission in its report?

When the question of reorganisation of provinces on a linguistic basis was taken up by this House, I as a Member moved an amendment to the effect that

where there are disputes of this character, a boundary commission should be appointed to go into the question with these principles as the guideline so that those disputes may be solved and reduced. Unfortunately, it was rejected.

As far as Kasergode is concerned, the Commission has said that 58 per cent of the people are Malayalam-speaking, but that the Malayalam they speak is entirely from the Malayalam spoken in Trivandrum. When this is the recommendation, that the Malayalam in one part of Kerala is different from that in another, what is the difficulty in Government telling the Commission.....

**SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR (Peera-made) :** Shri Mahajan does not know Malayalam.

**SHRI A. K. GOPALAN :** What is the difficulty in Government telling the Commission: 'we mean no disrespect to you. But you have abandoned all the principles of linguistic basis'?

**MR. SPEAKER :** Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta.

**SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR :** How is Delhi interested in this?

**MR. SPEAKER :** What am I to do? Lots have been taken and these names have come.

**श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : (दिल्ली सदर) :**  
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी पार्टी का इस मामले में नेशनलिस्ट एप्रोच है। बेलगांव महाराष्ट्र में रहे या मैसूर में रहे जब तक वह भारत में है हमारी पार्टी को उस बात से कोई चिंता नहीं है। लेकिन इसके टर्म्स आफ रैफ़रेंस के अन्दर जो महाजन कमिशन के बनाये थे उस में आप ने कोई गार्डिंग लाइंस नहीं दी कि कौन सी यूनिट आया गांव की यूनिट बनेगी या तहसील की बनेगी या थाने की बनेगी अभी कुछ नहीं बताया गया कि आया जो फंसला होगा रपट जो दी जायगी वह भाषा के आधार पर दी जाएगी या ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव कन्वीनियंस के हिसाब से दी जाएगी या कुछ सोशल एकोनामिक

[श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त]

प्राबलम के ऊपर दी जाएगी ? नतीजा यह हुआ कि महाराष्ट्र गवर्नमेंट ने उसे रिजैक्ट कर दिया और कुछ पोलिटिकल पार्टीज एजीटेशन भी कर रही हैं। इसी तरह से और भी दूसरे झगड़े हैं, जैसे पानी के हैं या बिजली के हैं या बाउंडरीज के हैं। कई जगह तो आपने कमिशन बनायें उनकी रिपोर्ट को माना नहीं। जैसे हरियाणा और पंजाब का बनाया लेकिन उसकी रिपोर्ट को आपने माना नहीं। यह जो कंट्री का डिस्ट्रिक्टेशन हो रहा है, चारों तरफ एजीटेशन हो रहे हैं, इन को ले कर मैं मंत्री महोदय से एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या कभी इन झगड़ों के बारे में फाइनलेटी होगी या नहीं और अगर होगी तो किस आधार पर होगी ? क्या आप निर्णय करेंगे कि सारे जितने झगड़े हैं ये पंच फैसले के आधार पर तय कर दिये जायें ताकि आगे एजीटेशन का स्कोप न रहे ? इन सब चीजों को खत्म करने के लिए आप क्या रास्ता सुझाते हैं ?

SHRI J. MOHAMAD IMAM (Chitradurga) : Mysore never wanted this dispute to be reopened, and they were against the appointment of any commission. It was on the insistence and the persistence and some of the subversive activities of my Maharashtra friends that this commission was appointed, and when the commission was appointed, they healed it, they welcomed it, they never said anything against it, not did they say anything about the terms of reference, because the only terms of reference in this case was to resolve the dispute between the two States.

Further, it is an award, firstly because there was an understanding and an agreement between the Chief Minister of Mysore and the Chief Minister of Maharashtra, that whatever may be the recommendation, it must be accepted by both the States. If I am correct, the Home Minister also has categorically assured us at that time that in order to put an end to this dispute, whatever recommendation is made by the commis-

sion will be accepted by the Government.

I think this report has created some stir and consternation in the mind of my hon. friend Shri Nath Pai who seems to have lost all sense of natural justice and equity, because he has gone on to accuse Justice Mahajan, who is neither connected with Maharashtra nor Mysore, he lives 2,000 miles away from Mysore.

SHRI NATH PAI : And 10,000 miles from reality.

SHRI J. MOHAMED IMAM : He has lost all sense of natural justice and equity and he accuses Justice Mahajan because he wants to get out the tangle into which he himself has got.

What is an award ? Just as the recommendations of the Fazal Ali Commission, appointed by the President of India, were accepted, it is the bounden duty of this Government that this Commission's report must be treated as an award, and that award must be accepted.

I regret very much that the Government has delayed so much. In fact, so many speculations have been raised. Though I have got every confidence in the justice of the Home Minister, I agree with Mr. Nath Pai that he ought not to have allowed such a long time to elapse. He should have taken such an important matter into consideration at once.

Though Mysore also stands to lose, it does not gain all its points, still in the interests of the country, in the interests of the unity of the country, it is much better that all such border disputes are put an end to, and unless we are disciplined and unless we accept the Commission's report, there will be trouble.

Is it because the report is not to their liking—first of all, they expected it would be to their liking—that they want to run away ?

MR. SPEAKER : Question

**SHRI J. MOHAMED IMAM :** So, this hesitation or indecision in such matters is always fatal to the interests of the country. So, may I know whether the Chief Minister of both the States did not come to an agreement and an understanding that they would accept implicitly the recommendations of the Mahajan Commission?

**MR. SPEAKER :** The hon. Minister.

**श्री देवराव पाटिल (यवतमाल) :** मैं नियमों के अनुसार काम करता हूँ। मैंने सब से पहले नोटिस दिया था। किसी का नहीं आया था, मेरा आया था। मुझे एक प्रश्न पूछने की आप इजाजत दें।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैं नियम पढ़ कर आप को बताता हूँ।

**श्री देवराव पाटिल :** मेरा नोटिस पहले आया था।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैं रूल पढ़ रहा हूँ।

**श्री तुलसीदास आषव (बारामती) :** महाराष्ट्र के एक आदमी को तो प्रश्न पूछने आप दें।

**MR. SPEAKER :** Order, order. I will tell the hon. Members what the rules are. Suppose 20 Members give notice in the office, they put lots and then, out of these 20, they pick up five names. This is what the office has done. Suppose, there are 120 names in the office what happens? (*Interruption*). I am not interested one way or the other. Please hear me.

**SHRI TULSHIDAS JADHAV :** One Member from Maharashtra may be allowed. One Member from Mysore has already asked a question.

**MR. SPEAKER :** I cannot help it. If I make one exception, how can I refuse the opportunity to another? It is just a half-hour debate. I have stated it already. I request the Minister to reply.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** *rose*—

**MR. SPEAKER :** Please sit down. I will adjourn the House if hon. Members continue to rise and speak. If you do not want to hear the hon. Minister, I will have to adjourn the House.

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA :** One question only.

**MR. SPEAKER :** How can I allow one question to one Member and not allow the same to others? I want to know the hon. Member's mind. How can I give to one and not to the others?

**SHRI J. MOHAMED IMAM :** *rose*—

**MR. SPEAKER :** I have called the Home Minister. (*Interruption*) If you do not want to hear, I will adjourn the House.

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA :** Kindly adjourn the House and let it be taken up tomorrow.

**MR. SPEAKER :** No. It should be finished today.

**THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) :** Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is no doubt that this dispute between the States was rather a long-standing dispute. (*Interruption*) And, therefore, naturally, only with a view to finding a solution to this problem that the Commission was appointed, as an aid to Government to come to a final decision. It would be wrong to say that there is no intention of the Government of India to settle this dispute. The idea is to find a solution.

As we all know, these border disputes are apt to create emotions anger, and feelings, and therefore, I entirely agree with Shri Nath Pai that we have to take a national attitude in this matter. It is only a national attitude that can help us to find out a solution to this problem. Even in this case, I want to make an appeal to all concerned that under no circumstances can we depart from our national attitude to find a solution to this problem, whatever happens, because the people of Mysore, the people of Kerala and the people of Maharashtra are ultimately the people of India. Whatever happens. (*Interruption*) we

[SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN]

must not say or do anything that will weaken the bonds of unity between these people. That is the final criterion which we must accept.

The point was raised as to why this report was not laid on the Table of the House. We were keen to have this whole question first of all examined properly. It is no use rushing into things. We are thinking, not in the formal sense as Shri Nath Pai has said, —about calling a Round Table Conference—but the Government proposes to call the leaders of political parties in Parliament and try to find out if we can evolve some sort of national consensus also in this matter.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : When the decision of the Commission has been given—when the award has been given—why should there be a second thought to it? Is it because he is coming from Maharashtra? (Interruption)

SHRI J. H. PATEL (Simoga) : Where was the common sense before

appointing the Commission? (Interruption)

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Parliament will have to take a decision in this matter. Parliament alone is the master of this problem. Government will certainly consider this question on merits and decide this matter. Ultimately these questions will have to be very carefully considered from the national point of view. After that, Government will apply its mind and certainly Government will have to come to certain conclusions. But Parliament ultimately is the master of the decision. Therefore, I would make an appeal to hon. members not to allow their emotions to be roused, but try to look at the problem objectively. (Interruptions).

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

18.31 Hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, December 7, 1967/Agrahayana 16, 1889 (Saka).*