

MOTION RE. REPORT ON THE  
WORKING OF THE PREVENTIVE  
DETENTION ACT.—contd.

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion moved by Dr. Katju yesterday:

"That the report on the working of the Preventive Detention Act, 1950, during the period 30th September, 1952 to 30th September, 1953, be taken into consideration."

In this respect, I have to inform hon. Member Acharya Kripalani, who was on his legs yesterday and had not finished his speech, that he has taken 41 minutes till now. I have no desire place a strict timelimit, but in view of the fact that a large number of people from various parties are anxious to speak, I think it is necessary to have some limitation in mind, and I trust the hon. Member will shorten his remarks and bring them to a close as early as possible.

**Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur *cum* Purnea):** Sir, about the time, I would only submit that many times I was interrupted in the course of my speech. I will try to take as little time of the House as possible.

Yesterday the hon. Home Minister talked of the Calcutta tramways agitation, the Lucknow students' strike, and of the Andhra troubles. In all these matters, the authorities were approached, but they refused to meet or have any talk with those who were considered the leaders of these agitations. But when violence ensued, these very leaders were called, and matters were settled; in every case the popular demands were conceded. I submit. Sir, this is putting a premium on violence. A democratic party should always be prepared to meet leaders of the people, to whatever party they may belong, and allow them to discuss things with them (the authorities) and, if possible, to come

to an amicable settlement, and that quickly.

I know, Sir, that the Home Minister is a kindly soul....

श्री कृष्ण एम्बानी (नामनिर्देशित—आल-  
भारतीय) : इतनी तारीक़ क्यों करते हैं ?

**Acharya Kripalani:**...because I know it as a matter of fact that whenever individual cases of detenus are referred to him, he is very liberal. He always tries to see that they are released, unless of course some State Government insists. But with all his liberality, I am sorry to say that when he lays down general propositions, he goes off the tangent. We have learnt something of scientific jurisprudence. We cannot unlearn those ideas now. We have learnt that it is far better that a few criminals escape rather than that one innocent individual should lose his freedom without trial through 'due process of law'. Sir, the Home Minister thinks it is much better that a few innocent persons lose their liberty than that one criminal escape. This, I submit, Sir, is putting scientific jurisprudence on its head.

**The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju):** I do not want to interrupt....

**Acharya Kripalani:** It may be very good....

**Dr. Katju:** I do not want to intervene, but that is a complete travesty of my views.

**Acharya Kripalani:** He will have a chance to answer. I said that it may be healthy for certain individuals to stand on their heads, but to put fundamental principles in politics, which are as good as principles in morals, on their head, is very dangerous.

**Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior):** It is Sheershasan. Isn't it?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Acharya Kripalani:** We have learnt that *habeas corpus*, while it provides security to the innocent, at the same time provides security to the guilty. But we also know that without this security to the guilty, there will be no security to the innocent. The Home Minister, therefore, insults our intelligence, when as a lawyer, he tells us that the requirements of a fair trial, that a detenu or any other criminal or would-be criminal is entitled to, are satisfied. And also, Sir, we are very sorry that he should make any insinuations against the highest tribunals in the land.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** Hear, hear.

**Acharya Kripalani:** This is the one thing, respect for the judiciary, that we have learnt from the British, and it is a very good thing. And in England, very great respect is shown to the highest judiciary, and it is so in America. There the executive would not talk of the judiciary in terms in which some of the Members on the Treasury Benches indulge often here.

Sir, yesterday a young man from the Congress interrupted me and asked me rather an irrelevant question. He asked me why did I leave the Congress. I was annoyed at the interruption and, I am sorry for it. But what I told him was absolutely correct. I said that Congress had been my home for decades; I knew no other home and I have been in it for the last 43 years, having joined it in 1908. One may leave his family... (*Interruptions*)—Sucheta Devi is quite safe, unless she leaves me which is more likely. I was saying, one may leave his family because one feels that the family traditions are not being kept. One may feel that the traditions that the father of the family had kept before the family were not being observed. That does not mean that the man who leaves the family is against the family. When he leaves it, he has always an affection for it.

**Shri Heda (Nizamabad):** Often he comes back.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Acharya Kripalani:** I know that wherever I go, I am invited by my former colleagues, now in high offices. I readily accept these invitations.

**Shri Gadgil (Poona Central):** Hear, hear.

**Acharya Kripalani:** A few days back, I was passing through Madras and the President of the Tamil Nad Congress Committee, who is an old friend came to receive me at the station, not caring whether I was in the Congress or not. If I oppose today the extension of this Preventive Detention Act, it is because I love the Congress and it is because I want that its reputation as a democratic party pledged to freedom, pledged to justice, not only here in India, but supporting these causes outside India, may be kept intact.

Sir, may I make a sporting offer to the Home Minister and to the Treasury Benches? Let them release the very few detenus that are yet there—after all, he will soon release them. Let the Government take the Opposition parties into confidence. (*Interruption.*)

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Acharya Kripalani:** Let them put us on our honour. And, I say—and I hope I am also speaking for the Communists—that we will try our best to see, so far as the members of our party are concerned, that they neither participate in, nor encourage, violence as long as democratic forms and procedures are observed by the Treasury Benches. I say, Sir, that we are passing through rather critical times and it is essential that we be united. I say we are anxious for this unity. But all that can be done if the ruling party is careful of its own conduct.

**Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh West):** Hear, hear.

**Acharya Kripalani:** The hon. Member thinks he is helping the cause that

[Acharya Kripalani]

I advocate. I am very sorry at the interruption.

I was saying that all this can be done if the ruling party is careful of its own conduct and is tolerant of criticism and is prepared on all occasions to sit and talk with the leaders of the Opposition to devise ways and means for minimising the differences and working for the good and the progress of this ancient land. Only so can we build the India of our dreams. Let the Treasury Benches give a thought to my proposal and let them act upon it and I assure them that the country will be at once electrified.

Shri Sadhan Chandra Gupta (Calcutta South-East): Sir, on behalf of the Communist party,—and I believe in this view I am reflecting not only the views of my party but the views of the entire opposition and the views also, if not the views at least the consciences of most of the Members on the other side,—we wish to record our emphatic opposition to the further continuance of the Preventive Detention Act. Now Sir, we oppose the continuance of this Act on the ground of principles as well as on the ground of abuses to which this Act has been put; on the ground of principles no less than on the ground of abuses, and on the ground of abuses no less than on the ground of principles.

Now, Sir, before I come to the principles and before I come to the abuses, may I deal in brief with a few of the arguments advanced for continuing this Act in operation? Sir, it has been stated in the report that has been circulated that we should not do away with this Act because there are supposed to be certain constitutional responsibilities which should not be lightly interfered with. Secondly, because the State Governments have all, without exception, asked for the continuance. Thirdly, because the Act is supposed to be fairly abuse-proof, and lastly, because the hon. Home Minister has by personal examination found out that the continuance is entirely justified, that the request of the

State Governments is not unreasonable.

Sir, as regards the second and third points, namely, the requests of the State Governments and the Act being abuse-proof, I shall discuss when I come to the administration of the Act itself. But, let us examine the two other points first. What are the constitutional responsibilities which will be interfered with by discontinuing the Preventive Detention Act? Is there anything in the Constitution which requires the enacting or the continuance of the Preventive Detention Act? Sir, we do not accept the proposition that the Constitution requires the Preventive Detention Act. But, even if we take it for granted, the Centre would not interfere with any constitutional responsibility by discontinuing it because the States have ample power to provide themselves with their own Acts. So, the constitutional responsibility argument is an absolute fallacy.

Now, what about the Home Minister's personal examination of the matter? He has not placed anything before us as to why and how he has satisfied himself, on a personal examination, that the Preventive Detention Act is justified. He has not said anything in his report. He has said something in his speech, which I shall deal with when I come to the administration of the Act itself. But, apart from that, apart from allegations of violence, apart from allegations of crimes, he has not given any other material, concrete material on the basis of which he has found that the request of the State Governments is justified. Sir, the two other points, as I said, I shall deal with later on,—the request of the State Governments and how far the Act is abuse-proof. But, I can just show now that the request of the State Governments is to perpetuate a reign of terror in the States, to suppress every kind of progressive movement, every kind of movement against exploitation and to use the Preventive Detention Act for that purpose.

Sir, I shall come to the principles upon which we object to the continuance of the Act. As regards the principles, I was very pained to find that the Home Minister thought it proper to scoff at them, to scoff at what he called copy-book *maxims*. I think what he meant was the maxim that no person should be detained without trial, that no person should be imprisoned without being heard. Sir, that principle we choose to follow and, if it is a copy-book maxim, we choose to copy it from the book of his own leader, the Prime Minister; not of course, from the book of the Mr. Hyde in him, who has come into existence on account of the necessities of imperialist exploitation and native exploitation; but from the copy-book of the Dr. Jekyll in him, who has committed suicide at the altar of these very exploiting powers on the 15th August, 1947. So, we wish to copy it from the copy-book of that Dr. Jekyll, who had solemnly declared that a Government which could not govern without such Acts had no right to exist. We naturally agree with him, with him as he was. Now, we take our stand on it and for very good reasons.

2 P.M.

After all, Sir, you know that every civilised society is revolted at the idea of detention without trial, that a person should be placed in prison without being heard in his defence. He might be innocent and there may not be anything against him, but he would not be heard, and without being heard, he would be put in detention; he would be kept in jail for days, weeks, months or even years. That is what we definitely object to and that is what we definitely stand against. When he has this contempt for the so-called copy-book maxim, we can easily understand his fear of the state of the law in other countries. He said that it is no use quoting the instances of America, Holland or Brazil or whatever it is. He wishes to distinguish the position in our country by the fact that our Constitution provides for a Preventive Detention Act. May I remind him, Sir, that there is nothing in the Con-

stitution of other countries to debar preventive detention? The only question is, not whether the Constitution allows it, but whether the conscience of society allows it. The other countries respect the conscience of society; in our country they do not respect the conscience of society; they do not respect the conscience of civilised society. That is the fault with us; the fault is not really with the Constitution; it is the same Constitution as in any other capitalist democracy. The fault is with our Governments who wish to tyrannise over the people of the country. He has also tried to minimise the effect of the operation of the Preventive Detention Act. He said only 117 persons out of 36 crores were in detention on the 30th September this year. Now, the question is not whether the number was 117 or 1,017 or 10,017. You know, Sir, while we were fighting the British, I think there was no day on which there were more than 50,000 or 60,000 in jail on a single day. 60,000 out of 40 crores is a very small number and it is nothing at all, but did we go by mere numbers or did we take into account the principle behind the oppression? Why should all these people be put in prison—because they were fighting for freedom? Here too we are not concerned about whether the number is 117; what we are concerned about is what are they being kept in the jail for and why are they being kept in jail without being heard. That is the stand we take and we maintain that stand in spite of all that the Home Minister has to say.

The arguments of the Home Minister in defending the course followed by the State Governments, I shall deal with presently, but subject to that, we are now on the principles and the principles are that not a single person should be put into detention except for the gravest emergency. What that grave emergency can be? It is accepted by every civilised society that the only grave emergency that can justify detention without trial is a paramount threat to the security or defence of the country—

[Shri Sadhan Chandra Gupta]

threat so grave that by giving a detenu a hearing, vital information might go to the enemy and thereby an instant danger to security may come. That is why preventive detention has been accepted only in war-time and we do not know any country where preventive detention has taken place in peace-time, because in peace, such an emergency is inconceivable and even in war-time, the power has been very sparingly used. Let us take the instance of Britain. During the last war, there were a very few persons in detention there without trial, although we know that in Britain Hitler had an extensive spy ring, which all along was subverting the security of Britain. Yet, only in extreme cases where there could be no hearing given without giving vital information to the enemy, was detention resorted to. And what does the Home Minister say? Why is detention necessary? Because there are hunger strikes somewhere, because there are labour troubles at other places, because there are student troubles elsewhere. Now, what is all this? Can't you deal with these troubles? Suppose they are very numerous. Can't we deal with those troubles under the ordinary law? If we cannot, if they are permitted under the ordinary law, we oppose their being prevented under the Preventive Detention Act.

Let us now come to the argument that the Act is abuse-proof. What is the hon. Home Minister's argument about it? Quite simple, namely, that there is really no abuse, because the Governments have the power to release persons *suo motu*—that is in the report. Secondly, because the Advisory Board is there and it is supposed to give a better relief than a trial court. Thirdly, because the High Courts and the Supreme Court are there to release the detenu. What is the power of *suo motu* release which has been made so much of? Can we receive any consolation from the fact that a Government, which has put us in detention, will sometime

release us *suo motu*? In the report, he has pointed out that so many were released *suo motu*. The reason for such a large number of releases is presumably that they were put in detention without any grouse, that they were put in detention *mala fide*, and when they thought that the things that the Government did not like would no longer trouble them, they were released, or when they found that the people's pressure could not be resisted, as in Bengal where they had to give in, they released the detenus. That is how *suo motu* release takes place. What about the Advisory Board? I know there are three Judges on the Advisory Board. Is it a sufficient protection? Materials would be placed before the Judges—reports by certain police agents, I believe—but there is no right to cross-examine these police agents. How can we prove the falsity of the reports without having the right to cross-examine the police agents? There is no such right. Now, Sir, even assuming that the Advisory Board was a much better court than an ordinary law court, what is the protection after all? For 70 days, not for one or two days but for 70 days, Government should keep us in detention without any Advisory Board at all. 70 days is bad enough. Why should we agree to remain in jail without getting any hearing at all?

Now, Sir, about the High Courts and Supreme Court. Unfortunately, the Home Minister could not conceal the chagrin at the releases granted by the High Courts and the Supreme Court. I should think it is very improper even to suggest anything against the High Courts and the Supreme Court here in releasing detenus. Sir, we as practising lawyers know it full well,—I think although the hon. Home Minister was an eminent lawyer in his time, as regards these Acts, as regards the constitutional remedies in respect of the Preventive Detention Act, I can claim to have more experience than he has,—I can say from my experience that it is extremely difficult to get a release from the High Court or the

Supreme Court. The High Court or the Supreme Court may be perfectly aware that the grounds may not be correct, but unless they can be convinced that the grounds were dishonestly given, were given *mala fide*, it is impossible to release the detenus. Now, Sir, that is a thing which is impossible. How can we prove what is working in the minds of the Government? Well, every politician knows why detenus are being held, but when it comes to being proved by legal evidence, we cannot do it for the simple reason that the law of evidence requires that hearsay evidence is no proof, opinion is no proof: but only your personal knowledge. And how can we have a personal knowledge, for instance, that the Home Minister of Bengal has detained a certain person because he had a conversation with the agent of the tramway company? Now, Sir, that is the difficulty in getting release even though every one knows that the detention order, from top to bottom, is illegal.

Now, Sir, it has been stated in the report,—a misleading statement—that High Courts and Supreme Court release detenus when grounds are insufficient or unjustified. Nothing of the kind. The High Courts and the Supreme Court are precluded from considering the sufficiency of the grounds—whether the grounds are enough to put one in detention, whether the grounds justify preventive detention. What the High Courts and the Supreme Court can look into is whether the grounds are such as are covered by the Preventive Detention Act, whether the grounds are not too vague to enable the detenu to make representation. Obviously, the hon. Home Minister would not like even that protection. Obviously, what he would like is that the grounds may be such that the detenu may not be allowed to make any representation at all, and yet the High Courts and the Supreme Court must uphold it. Obviously, the hon. Home Minister would like that the grounds may be absolutely irrelevant to the Preventive Detention Act, and yet the High

Courts and the Supreme Court must uphold the detention, because the Government has chosen to detain the detenu.

Now, Sir, that was about the argument that machinery has been provided in the Preventive Detention Act. What about the actual administration of the Act? The hon. Home Minister has waxed eloquent on the moderation with which the State Governments have applied this Act. Sir, I do not know where he got this idea. I do not know what materials he has studied in order to arrive at this conclusion that the State Governments have been moderate, that the State Governments have been reasonable. I shall in a moment tell you about our experience in different States. But before that, from the report itself, you will find, Sir, that there is no question of moderation. The report of course puts the ground so as to justify the detention. The statements in the report contain many serious and grave charges, doubtless with a view to showing up before this House how eminently necessary this law is. But what do we find even from a perusal of this report? Now, Sir, if you look at statement No. 3 attached to this report, we find in the grounds column, that one of the grounds given for detention is anti-sales-tax agitation: that is to say, people who would agitate against sales tax are liable to be detained. One other ground given in the case of U.P. is, inciting labour trouble. Mind you, Sir, it is not inciting violence but inciting labour trouble. A strike is a labour trouble; a tool down strike would be a labour trouble: 'satyagraha' in order to get some trade union rights would be a labour trouble; and for that we are supposed to be detained. Another ground given in respect of U.P. is, *kisan* agitation. Now, Sir, that gives an inkling into the exact way in which this Act is administered. Every State Government is not a fool like the U.P. or the Saurashtra Government. They know how to shield themselves. The Saurashtra or the U.P. Government have, in a moment of forgetfulness or

[Shri Sadhan Chandra Gupta]

in an unguarded moment, given out some of the real motives—anti-sales-tax agitation, labour trouble, kisan agitation. Now, Sir, if these are the rights in our country that we cannot agitate like this, we cannot agitate for the peasantry, we cannot agitate against an unfair sales tax without being detained, then, Sir, Heaven help us.

Now, Sir, that is not all. From an examination of the report we find that there have been flagrant abuses. People have been put into detention without any justification at all. Sir, we think that even if one or two cases in the whole of India have occurred where detention has taken place without any justification, where a man has been kept in prison without trial, without any justification whatever, it is sufficient to condemn this Act. But what do we find? It is not one or two cases. 374 cases have occurred during the last year where there has been no justification for detention.

Sir, if we look at the statement which gives the releases by Advisory Boards, High Courts and the Supreme Court, what do we find? We find that in the past year 224 detenus have been released by Advisory Boards. That is to say, 224 people were locked up, in whose cases the Advisory Board found that there was no sufficient material to lock them up. Sixty-four persons were released by the High Courts and 86 persons were released by the Supreme Court, because there were no materials to justify their detention. Now, Sir, can we really look with equanimity at this flagrant abuse of the Act, whereby hundreds of our citizens are likely to have their liberties deprived, only because it suits the Government, it suits the different State Governments and it suits the interests which they serve to put persons in detention?

I now come to the allegations of violent activities, indulging in violence, preaching violence, goondaism, dacoity

and all the serious charges, all the frightening charges that have been thrown at us to justify this Preventive Detention Act. Now, Sir, it is quite clear that if this had been the real motive for enacting the Preventive Detention Act, the Preventive Detention Act would not have been necessary at all. Sir, if I indulge in violence, if I assault someone, or kill someone, or hurt someone, or commit an offence, I can certainly be proceeded against under the Indian Penal Code. There are the sections which the hon. the Home Minister is well aware of—147, 323, 325, 302, 304 and all the rest of it, which give ample powers to meet different forms of violence. If I preach violence I can be proceeded against under the abetment sections of the Indian Penal Code. If I harbour dacoits, I can be proceeded against under Section 110 of the Criminal Procedure Code. If I carry on communal agitation, threatening the breach of the peace, I can be proceeded against, I can be prevented under Section 107 of the Criminal Procedure Code. Now, therefore, all those pretexts—pretexts I call them—are really meant to cover up, to screen, to smoke-screen, the real object behind the Preventive Detention Act, the object of checking every progressive movement, the object of preventing, of suppressing every movement for the betterment of our lives, every movement against poverty, hunger, misery and squalor.

Now, Sir, let us look at a few examples. I have already told the House about the anti-sales-tax movement in Saurashtra. And what was that movement? Some sales tax was imposed which was considered to be unfair, not only by Communists, but by Communists, Praja Socialists and even by Congressmen. In fact, all sections of the Saurashtra people combined against it. So terrific was the pressure that the Government had to yield: they had to postpone the levy of the sales tax, and yet for that movement people were detained. Not only Communists, Sir, not only Socialists Sir, even Congress people were detained.

Now, what happened in the tramway fare enhancement resistance movement? We find from the report that there are so many persons being detained in connection with the tramfare enhancement resistance movement. Now, Sir, the Tramway Company decided to enrich its pockets, to rob the poorest class of tram passengers, the second class passengers, by increasing their fare by one pice. Every right-thinking man objected. The tramway company is a foreign company. It had made huge profits and it had no right to rob our poor people of lakhs of rupees. Deputations were taken to the Government. They said it was quite right, they were justified in increasing the fares. A movement was launched, an entirely innocuous movement, a non-violent movement: the aim of the movement was that unless the tramway company agrees to withdraw the enhanced fare no passenger would go by tram. Everyone would either walk or go by bus. Millions of Calcutta's officegoers walked or went by bus. And that was too much for the Government. Everyone who preached this boycott of the tramway company was clamped in jail. First some case was started against them, and then when they found that the case could not stand, they were put under preventive detention.

Let us take the example of Jyoti Bose, the Leader of the Opposition in the Bengal Assembly. He was propagating boycotting tramways in a certain Calcutta street. He was taken over to a police station. The police officer who took him was writing down that he was charged with assaulting. When the police officer was asked by him: "What is that? Why do you say I am charged with assaulting?" The police officer replied: "Don't you realise that if I write that you were preaching for boycotting tram-cars, then there would be no case against you. That is what I have to do." Well, I cannot blame him. These were the instructions given to him by Government. What could he do, poor man? Now that is what is

happening. Even that charge did not hold good and he was placed under preventive detention.

Now, Sir, the same thing has happened as regards food movement. The movement was for the reduction of price of rice, for good quality rice and under mass pressure Government agreed to reduce the price to seven annas from nine annas. They had raised the price to nine annas. Repeated deputations were taken to them. They did not agree to reduce it and when a lakh of peasants and Calcutta citizens demonstrated they reduced the price by two annas. In spite of that people who organised the movement were put under preventive detention.

The same thing, Sir, as regards trade union rights in Burnpur, where members of the Indian National Trade Union Congress, Congressmen all of them, were put in detention, because the trade union led by one section of the Indian National Trade Union Congress did not suit the employers of the Indian Iron and Steel Company at Burnpur. This kind of thing has happened not only in West Bengal. I have quoted the example of Saurashtra. In Bombay the followers of the Akhand Karnatak Rajya Nirman Parishad have been detained for advocating a united Karnatak State. There are places, for instance in Travancore-Cochin, where they do not even want to utilise the Preventive Detention Act. They think implication in false cases is better, and thousands have been implicated in false cases. But many States think that the Preventive Detention Act may be a better substitute and so they resort to it.

Now, Sir, I can say from the experience of our State that the persons who have been detained had not been concerned in any violence. If violence has occurred, it has occurred not because of any activities of the detenus. It has occurred on account of the activities of the police. The tramway movement was entirely peaceful. There was no violence at all till the police in order to suppress the



[Shri Sadhan Chandra Gupta]

movement, began to enter into houses, to lathi charge people inside the houses, to commit vandalism and molest women inside houses. There is a limit to tolerance, and that is how some violence occurred. The leaders of the movement have always asked the populace to be peaceful in spite of all provocations. It is only the police, by lathicharging and shooting down innocent persons, that provoked violence. And there was very little of it; it was nothing compared to the police violence. Why this talk of violence, why this bogey of violence? The State Governments do not believe it. The reason is simple, They want to trample down our movement against British exploitation and against capitalist exploitation. They want to trample down our movement against enhancement of tram-fares which has been held to be unjustified by a Commission appointed by the Government. They want to check our movement against bonus. They want to check our movement against bad food, bad quality of rice and high price of food.

We as Communists are proud to have borne the brunt of the abuse of this Act, but other political parties have not escaped. They have got their share also. In West Bengal, Communists, Socialists, Praja Socialists and others have equally borne it, and even Congressmen have been detained.

Sir, in conclusion I appeal to all sections of the House to realise the pernicious character of this Act. It puts our country to shame before the conscience of civilized society. It has become a perpetual menace to every honest and right-thinking individual—to Communists and Socialists, to Forward Bloc or R.S.P., even to Congress people—whose motive is to stand by the millions of our oppressed people against a handful of persons who oppress them. It is a menace to our workers, peasants and middle classes. Whoever want to strive to get rid of the present life of hunger, misery and squalor is menaced by this pernicious Act. Therefore I would appeal to

every section of the House to voice their opposition against this pernicious Act.

#### STATEMENT RE. APPOINTMENT OF A COMMISSION FOR THE RE-ORGANISATION OF STATES

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Mr. Speaker, I am not intervening in this debate, but by your leave and the leave of the House I should like to make a statement totally unrelated to the subject under debate.

The Government of India have been giving careful consideration to the problem of the States which are constituent units of the Indian Union. These States, as they exist today, are largely the result of historical processes and the spread and consolidation of the British power in India. On the attainment of Independence, India was partitioned and the independent State of Pakistan was created. A process of merger and integration took place in regard to what were then called the "Indian States". This integration of the old Indian States, which was brought about within a very short period, was an event of historic significance. The integration, however, was naturally based to a large extent on the old patterns which existed before Independence.

The pattern of our States in the Union is thus the result of historical accident and circumstances. The mere existence for a hundred years or more developed, political, administrative and cultural associations within and between them.

The greater development of political consciousness among the people and the growing importance of the great regional languages led gradually to demands for the formation of certain States on a linguistic basis. Each such separate problem was, however, closely inter-related with other problems, and any formation of a new State necessarily affected a number of other States. It thus became increasingly difficult to consider such problem in isolation.