

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following message received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:—

I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on Tuesday, the 31st July, 1956, passed the enclosed motion concurring in the recommendation of the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to provide for the transfer of certain territories from Bihar to West Bengal and for matters connected therewith. The names of the members nominated by the Rajya Sabha to serve on the said Joint Committee are set out in the motion.

MOTION

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to provide for the transfer of certain territories from Bihar to West Bengal and for matters connected therewith, and resolves that the following members of the Rajya Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee:

1. Shri K. P. Madhavan Nair
2. Kakasaheb Kalelkar
3. Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji
4. Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt
5. Prof. Humayun Kabir
6. Shah Mohammad Umair
7. Syed Mazhar Imam
8. Shri R. P. N. Sinha
9. Prof. R. D. Sinha Dinkar
10. Shri P. N. Sapru
11. Shri Abdur Rezzak Khan
12. Shri Satyapriya Banerjee
13. Shri Kishen Chand
14. Kunwarani Vijaya Raje

15. Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha

16. Shri Govind Ballabh Pant."

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

FIFTY-SEVENTH REPORT

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): Sir, I beg to present the Fifty-seventh Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

MINUTES (1955-56) VOL. 5, Nos. 2 & 3

श्री ब० गो० महता (गोहिलवाड़) :
श्रीमन्, मैं एस्टीमेट्स समिति (१९५५-५६)
की कार्यवाही का सारांश, कंड १, अंक २ तथा
३, पेश करता हूँ ।

STATES REORGANISATION BILL—
contd.

Mr. Speaker: A list of selected amendments to clauses 2 to 15 of the States Reorganisation Bill has been circulated to Members last night. These amendments have been indicated by Members to be moved subject to their being otherwise admissible. Their numbers are as follows:—

Clause No.	No. of Amendment
2	270, 41, 42, 269, 210, 61, 211, 183, 212, 184, 63, 271, 185, 186, 213, 187, 214, 146, 383, 215.
3	452, 372, 373, 216, 420, 421, 165, 66, 132, 217.
4	261, 188, 189, 190, 191 192, 166, 193.
5	375, 274, 133, 218.

Clause No.	No. of Amendment
7	12, 167 (same as 12), 219 (same as 12 & 167), 70, 220, 148, 43, 134, 353 (same as 134), 135, 354 (same as 135), 321, 322, 44, 71, 136, 355 (same as 136), 137, 356, 357, 376, 138, 139, 140.
8	462, 45, 323, 46, 389, 47, 48, 141, 149, 194, 390, 391, 422, 423.
8A (New).	118.
9	263, 222, 49, 150, 358, 50, 1, 13 (same as 1), 324 (same as 1 & 13), 394, 395, 278, 325, 326, 3, 291, 292, 168, 327, 151, 396, 378, 379, 226, 397.
10	265, 279, 4, 444, 445, 280.
11	281, 169, 293, 398, 282, 333.
12	283, 399, 284, 400, 285.
13	266, 401.
14	352, 296, 85, 297, 465, 299, 300, 170, 336, 171, 153, 5, 24 (same as 5), 302, 303.
14A (New)	351.
15A (New).	143, 144, 154, 364 (same as 154), 155, 365 (same as 155), 424, 429.

Clause 2.— (Definitions)

Shri N. R. Muniswamy (Wandiwash): I beg to move:

Page 1, line 7—

for "the 1st day of October, 1956" substitute:

"a day to be notified hereafter by a special resolution passed by a three-fourth majority of the members present and voting in each House of Parliament."

Shri S. S. Merg (Sholapur): I beg to move:

(i) Page 1, line 7—

for "1st day of October, 1956" substitute:

"28th day of January, 1957."

(ii) Page 1, line 7—

for "the 1st day of October, 1956" substitute:

"a day to be notified by the President after the Boundary Commission to be appointed under the provisions of the Act has decided the Boundary disputes."

Shri R. D. Misra (Bulandshahr Dist.): I beg to move:

Page 1, line 7—

for "the 1st day of October, 1956" substitute:

a day as the Central Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, appoint."

Shri Gadilingana Gowd (Kurnool): I beg to move:

Page 1, line 13—

Omit "Mysore".

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi (Yadgir): I beg to move:

Page 1, line 13 and wherever it occurs in the Bill—

for "Mysore" substitute "Karnataka".

Shri Gadilingana Gowd: I beg to move:

Page 1, line 15—

for "existing State of Travancore-Cochin, the new State of Kerala" substitute:

"existing States of Travancore-Cochin and Mysore, the new State of Kerala and Karnataka respectively".

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram-Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

Page 1, line 15—

add at the end:

"and in relation to the existing State of Madras, the new State Tamilad."

Shri Gadilingana Gowd: I beg to move—

Page 1, lines 20 and 21—

for "and in relation to the new State of Kerala, the existing State of Travancore-Cochin" substitute:

"and in relation to the new States of Kerala and Karnataka the existing State of Travancore-Cochin and Mysore."

Shri Veeraswamy: I beg to move:

Page 1, line 21—

add at the end:

"and in relation to the new State Tamilnad, the existing State of Madras."

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): I beg to move:

Page 2—

omit lines 5 to 8.

Shri R. D. Misra: I beg to move:

Page 2—

for lines 5 to 8. substitute:

"(h) 'law' means any law, ordinance, order, byelaw, rule, regulation or other instrument having the force of law in the whole or in any part of the territory of India, passed or made by any Legislature, authority or person having power to make such a law, ordinance, order, byelaw, rule, regulation or instrument."

Shri Veeraswamy: I beg to move:

(i) Page 2, line 23—

omit "Madras".

(ii) Page 2, line 25—

after "Madhya Bharat" insert "Madras".

Shri Gadilingana Gowd: I beg to move:

Page 2, line 25—

after "Travancore-Cochin" insert "and Mysore".

Shri Veeraswamy: I beg to move:

Page 2, line 26—

after "Madhya Pradesh" insert "Tamilnad".

Shri Gadilingana Gowd: I beg to move:

Page 2, line 27—

after "Kerala" insert "and Karnataka".

Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): I beg to move:

Page 2—

after line 31, add:

"Provided that in the case of the State of Travancore-Cochin, the persons who immediately before the dissolution of the Legislative Assembly were members of that Assembly shall be deemed to be sitting members."

Shri Nesamony (Nagercoil): I beg to move:

Page 3, lines 7 and 8—

for "the 1st day of July, 1956" substitute:

"the 2nd day of May, 1956".

Shri Balasubramaniam (Madurai): I beg to move:

Page 3, line 8—

for "July" substitute "March".

Clause 3.—(Transfer of territory from Hyderabad to Andhra etc.)

Shri R. S. Diwan (Osmanabad): I beg to move:

(i) Page 3, line 20—

for "and Jukkal circles" substitute "circle".

(ii) Page 3, line 25—

add at the end:

"Uttnoor taluk, Bela circle of Adilabad taluk, Ada and Wakdi circles of Asafabad taluk."

Shri Gadilingana Gowd: I beg to move:

Page 3,—

after line 25, add—

“(h) Kolar District of Mysore”.

Shri M. R. Krishna (Karimnagar—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

Page 3,—

after line 25, add:

“(h) Bijapur, Dantevade, Konta and Anantgarh taluks of Bastar district of Madhya Pradesh;”

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): I beg to move:

Page 3,—

after line 25, add:

“(h) Sironcha taluk of Chanda district;

(i) Revenue circle of Chandra Bandi of Raichur taluka in Raichur district;

(j) Mudhole revenue circle of Sedan taluka, Gurumitkal revenue circle of Yadgi taluka and Miryan revenue circle of Cincholi taluka in Gulberga district;”

Shri K. G. Deshmukh (Amravati West): I beg to move:

(i) Page 3, line 28—

for “State of Andhra Pradesh” substitute “State of Andhra”.

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): I beg to move:

Page 3—

after line 32, add:

“(3) As from the appointed day there shall be added to the State of Andhra Pradesh the territories comprised in revenue firkas of Bellary including Bellary Municipal area, Rupanagudi and Moka in the Bellary Taluk of the present Bellary District in Mysore. The said territories;

(a) shall cease to form part of the existing District of Bellary of the State of Mysore, and

(b) shall be included in and become part of Anantapur District in the State of Andhra Pradesh.”

Shri Shankargauda Patil (Belgaum South): I beg to move:

Page 3—

after line 32, add:

“(3) As from the appointed day, the Madakasira taluk of Anantapur district, shall cease to be part of Andhra State and the said territory of Madakasira taluk will form part of Tumkur district in the new State of Mysore.”

Shri Raghavachari: I beg to move:

Page 3—

after line 32, add:

“(3) As from the appointed day there shall be added to the State of Andhra Pradesh the territories comprised in the Sirugappa taluk, the Bellary taluk, the Hospet taluk and the area of the Mallapuram sub-taluk in which the Dam and head works of the Tungabhadra Project are situated in the present Bellary district in Mysore State. The said territories;

(a) shall cease to form part of the existing district of Bellary in the State of Mysore; and

(b) shall become part of the Bellary district in the State of Andhra Pradesh.”

Clause 4.— (Transfer of territory from Travancore-Cochin to Madras)

Shri N. R. Muniswamy: I beg to move:

Pages 3 and 4—

for clause 4, substitute:

“(4). (1) As from the appointed day, there shall be added to the State of Madras the following territories, namely:—

[Shri N. R. Muniswamy]

(a) the territories comprised in the Agastheeswaram, Thovala, Kalkulam and Vilavancode taluks of Trivandrum district, and

(b) the territories comprised in the Peermede and Devikulam taluks of Kottayam district; and

(c) the Shencottah taluk (including Puliyara Hile Pakuthy) of Quilon district; and thereupon the said territories shall cease to form part of the existing State of Travancore-Cochin.

2(a) The territories specified in clause (a) of sub-section (1) shall form a separate district to be known as Nagarcoil district in the State of Madras;

(b) the territories specified in clause (b) of sub-section (1) shall be included in and become part of Mathurai district in the State of Madras, and

(c) the Shencottah taluk (including Puliyara Hile Pakuthy) of Quilon district specified in clause (c) of sub-section (1) shall be included in, and become part of Tirunelveli district in the State of Madras."

Shri Veeraswamy: I beg to move:

Page 3—

for lines 33 to 37, substitute:

"4. As from the appointed day, there shall be formed a new Part A State to be known as "Tamil Nad" comprising the existing State of Madras excluding Malabar and South Kanara districts and including Agastheewaram, Thovala, Kalkulam and Vilavancode taluks of Trivandrum district, Devikulam and Peermede taluk of Kottayam district and Shencottah taluks of Quilon district."

Shri Nesamony: I beg to move:

(i) Page 3, line 36—

after "Shencottah taluk" insert:

"as it was before the first day of July, 1956".

(ii) Page 3, line 36—

after "Quilon district" insert:

"and Devikulam and Peermede taluks of Kottayam district".

(iii) Page 4—

for lines 1 and 2, substitute:

"(b) the taluks of Agastheeswaram, Thovala, Kalkulam and Vilavancode shall be constituted into a district and Shencottah taluk shall form part of Tirunelveli district."

Shri Veeraswamy: I beg to move:

Page 4—

for lines 1 and 2, substitute:

"(b) shall be included in, and form part of a new district to be known as Kanyakumari district in the State of Madras."

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: I beg to move:

Page 4—

after line 2, add—

"and thereupon this State shall be known as the State of Tamilnad."

Shri Nesamony: I beg to move:

Page 4—

after line 2, add:

"(c) the taluks of Devikulam and Peermede shall form part of Madurai district."

Clause 5.—(Formation of Kerala State)

Shri K. P. Gounder (Erode): I beg to move:

Page 4—

for clause 5, substitute:

"5. (1) As from the appointed day, there shall be added to the State of

Travancore-Cochin the territories comprised in—

(i) Malabar District, excluding the islands of Laccadive and Minicoy, and

(ii) Kasargod taluk of South Canara district; and thereupon the said territories

(a) shall cease to form part of the State of Madras;

(b) shall form a separate district to be known as Malabar District;

and the State of Travancore-Cochin shall be known as the State of Kerala."

Shri R. D. Misra: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 4—

omit "Part. A".

Shri Shankargauda Patil: I beg to move:

Page 4—

omit line 12.

Shri I. Eacharan (Ponnani—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

Page 4—

after line 12, add:

"(iii) Gudalur taluk of the Nilagiris district;"

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): I beg to move:

Page 4, line 25,—

for "Mysore" substitute "Karnataka".

Clause 7.—(Formation of a new Mysore State)

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: My amendment No. 167 is the same as amendment No. 12 moved by Shri K. K. Basu.

Shri Gadilingana Gowd: My amendment No. 219 is the same as the amendment No. 12 moved by Shri K. K. Basu.

Shri Raghavachari: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 27—

add at the end:

"excluding the territories transferred to the State of Andhra Pradesh by sub-section (3) of section 3."

Shri Gadilingana Gowd: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 27—

add at the end:

"except Kolar district".

Shrimati Maydeo (Poona South): I beg to move:

Page 4—

for lines 28 and 29, substitute:

"(b) Belgaum district except Chandgad, Khanapur, Belgaum, Chikodi (Nipani Bhag), Hukeri and Athni taluks; and Bijapur district; and Dharwar district; and Kanara district except Karwar, Supa and Haliyal taluks, in the existing State of Bombay;"

Shri S. S. More: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 28—

for "taluka" substitute:

"and Khanapur taluks and predominantly Marathi speaking area of Belgaum taluka to be determined by a Boundary Commission and the Nipani Bhag of Chikodi taluka or alternatively the predominantly Marathi speaking area of Chikodi taluka to be determined by a Boundary Commission".

Shri V. P. Pawar (South Satara): I beg to move:

Page 4, line 28—

after "Chandgad taluka" insert:

"predominantly Marathi speaking contiguous areas of 180 villages from Khanapur taluka, 83 villages from Belgaum taluka including Belgaum city, 44 villages from Chikodi taluka including Nipani, 22 villages from Hukeri taluka and 10 villages from Athani taluka".

Shri H. G. Vaishnar (Ambad): My amendment No. 358 is the same as the amendment No. 134 moved by Shri V. P. Pawar:

Shri V. P. Pawar: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 28—

after "Chandgad taluka" insert:

"and predominantly Marathi speaking contiguous areas of the districts of Belgaum and Kanara to be determined by the Boundary Commission".

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: My amendment No. 354 is the same as the amendment No. 135 moved by Shri V. P. Pawar.

Shri Altekar (North Satara): I beg to move:

(i) Page 4, line 28—

after "taluka" insert:

"and Khanapur taluka and predominantly Marathi speaking area of Belgaum taluka to be determined by a Boundary Commission and the Nipani Bhag of Chikodi taluka, or alternatively the predominantly Marathi speaking area of Chikodi taluka to be determined by a Boundary Commission, and the predominantly Marathi speaking villages contiguous to Maharashtra State in Athni and Hukeri talukas to be determined by a Boundary Commission."

(ii) Page 4—

for line 29, substitute:

"and Dharwar districts and Kanara district except Karwar and Halyal talukas and Supa Peta, in the existing State of Bombay".

Shri S. S. More: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 29—

for "Dharwar and Kanara Districts" substitute:

"and Dharwar districts and Kanara district except Karwar and Halyal talukas and Supa Peta;"

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 29—

for "Kanara" substitute "Karwar".

Shri V. P. Pawar: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 29—

after "Kanara districts" insert:

"except the whole of Karwar taluka, Hallyal taluka and Supa Mahal."

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: My amendment No. 355 is the same as the amendment No. 136 moved by Shri V. P. Pawar.

Shri Shankargauda Patil: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 29—

after "Kanara districts," insert:

"Akalkot taluk, South Sholapur taluk and Sholapur city in Sholapur district, Jath taluk of South Satara district and Gadhinglaj and Shirol taluks of Kolhapur district,"

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: I beg to move:

(i) Page 4, line 30—

after "Tandur taluks" insert:

"and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Alnad taluka".

(ii) Page 4, line 32—

after "Udgir taluks" insert:

"and predominantly Marathi speaking contiguous revenue circles of Hulsur and Bhalki in Bhalki taluka, Torna and Aurad in Santpur (Aurad) taluka and Ladwanti circle in Humnabad taluka."

Shri R. S. Diwan: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 32—

after "Udgir taluks" insert:

"Bhalki and Hulsur circles of Bhalki taluk, Aurad and Torna

circles of Santpur (Aurad) taluk and Ladwanti circle of Humnabad taluk."

Shri Shankargauda Patil: I beg to move:

(i) Page 4, line 35—

omit "except Kasaragod taluk".

(ii) Page 4, line 36—

after "Coimbatore district" insert:

"Talvadi firka of Gopichettipalayam taluk in Coimbatore district, Nilgiri district and Hosur taluk of Salem district".

(iii) Page 5, lines 2 to 4—

for "and the said Kollegal taluk shall be included in, and become part of, Mysore district, in the new State of Mysore." substitute:

"and the said Kollegal taluk and Talavadi firka shall be included in and become part of Mysore district and the said taluks of Akalkot, South Sholapur, Jath, Gadhinglaj, Shirol and the territory of Sholapur city shall form a district called Sholapur district in the new State of Mysore."

Clause 8.—(Bombay)

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): I beg to move:

Pages 5 and 6—

for clauses 8 to 10, substitute:

"6. As from the appointed day, there shall be formed a new Part A State to be known as the State of Bombay comprising the following territories, namely:—

(a) the existing State of Bombay excluding—

(i) Belgaum district except Chandgad taluka and Bijapur, Dharwar and Kanara districts, and

(ii) Abu Road taluka in the Banaskantha district;

(b) Ahmadpur, Nilanga and Udgir taluks of Bidar district, Nanded district except Bichkonda and Jukkal circles of Deglur taluk and Mudhol Bhiansa and Kuber circles of Mudhol taluk, and Islapur circle of Boath taluk, Kinwat taluk and Rajura taluk of Adilabad district, in the existing State of Hyderabad;

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

(d) the territories of the existing State of Saurashtra; and

(e) the territories of the existing State of Kutch;

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

Shri S. S. More: I beg to move:

Page 5, line 5—

for "As" substitute "Two years" and;

Shri Altekar: I beg to move:

Page 5—

(1) line 5,—

for "As" substitute "For two years"

(ii) line 15,—

add at the end:

"After the said period of two years the said territories shall automatically merge in the State of Maharashtra."

Shri S. S. More: I beg to move:

Page 5, line 5—

for "Part C" substitute "Part A".

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: I beg to move:

Page 5—

omit lines 9 to 13.

Shri S. S. More: I beg to move:

(i) Page 5,—

for lines 9 to 13, substitute:

“(b) Thana, Kolaba and Ratnagiri districts”.

(ii) Page 5—

after line 15 add:

“(2) After the termination of the period of two years, as provided above, the State of Bombay shall automatically merge with and form part of the State of Maharashtra.”

Shri V. P. Pawar: I beg to move:

Page 5—

after line 15, add:

“Provided that the State of Bombay shall automatically be integrated with and merged in the neighbouring State of Maharashtra within a period of five years, unless the Parliament may resolve otherwise about the future of Bombay.”

Shri Raghunath Sahai (Etah Distt.—North-East cum Budaun Distt.—East): I beg to move:

Page 5—

after line 15, add:

“Provided that after a lapse of five years from the date of inauguration of the State of Bombay as contemplated above, this decision may be reviewed.”

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay City—North): I beg to move:

Page 5—

after line 15, add:

“Provided that the Government of India shall, within a period not exceeding five years, review the question of continuance or otherwise of the State of Bombay as a Part C State and place the matter before Parliament.”

Shri Telkikar (Nanded): I beg to move:

Page 5—

after line 15, add:

“Provided that the so formed Part C State of Bombay shall automatically be integrated with and merged in the State of Maharashtra within a period of two years from the appointed day.”

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: I beg to move:

Page 5—

after line 15, add:

“Provided that the said Part C State of Bombay shall automatically be integrated with and merged in the neighbouring State of Maharashtra within a period of two years.”

Shri Dabhi (Kaira North): I beg to move:

(i) Page 5—

after line 15, add:

“Provided that the Government may, after ascertaining the will of the people of the State of Bombay through a plebiscite taken after a period of five years from the appointed day, review the question of the State of Bombay and place the same before Parliament.”

(ii) Page 5—

after line 15, add:

“Provided that the Government of Bombay may, after ascertaining the will of the people of the State of Bombay through a democratic method after a period of five years from the appointed day, review the question of the State of Bombay and place the same before Parliament.”

New Clause 8A

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I beg to move:

Page 5—

after line 15, add:

"8A. As from the appointed day, the offices of the new State of Maharashtra shall be located in the city of Bombay."

Clause 9.— (Formation of Maharashtra State)

Shri R. D. Misra: I beg to move:

Page 5, line 17—

omit "Part A".

Shri Gadilingana Gowd: I beg to move:

Page 5—

after line 18, insert:

"(a) Greater Bombay,

(b) Borivali taluka of Thana district, except the villages of Bhayandar, Dongri, Ghod Bunder, Kashi, Mire, Rai Murdhe and Uttan, and

(c) the villages of **Mulund and Nahur in Thana taluka of Thana district, and thereupon the said territories shall cease to form part of the existing State of Bombay.* **"

Shri S. S. More: I beg to move:

Page 5—

for lines 19 to 35, substitute:

"(a) Greater Bombay, Thana, West Khandesh, East Khandesh, Nasik, Danga, Ahmednagar, Sholapur, South Satara, North Satara, Kolhapur, Ratnagiri, Kolaba, and Poona Districts; Chandgad Taluka and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Khanapur, Belgaum, Chikodi, Athani, Raibag and Mukeri Talukas of Belgaum District; Supa, Karwar, Halyal Talukas and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Yellapur and Ankola Talukas of Kanara District, in the existing State of Bombay;

(b) Osmanabad, Bhir, Aurangabad, Parbhani, and Nanded Districts and Ahmedpur Nillanga and Udgir Talukas and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Bhalki, Santapur, Aurad and Humnabad Talukas of Bidar district; contiguous Marathi Adilabad, Asifabad and Shirpur Talukas of Adilabad District and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Aland Taluka of Gulbarga District in the existing State of Hyderabad; and

(c) Budana, Akola, Amravati, Yeotmal, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara and Chanda District and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of—

(1) Warasuni, Balaghat and Baihar Talukas of Balaghat District;

(2) Sawnsar Taluka of Chhindwada District;

(3) Bhainsdehi and Multai Talukas of Betul District; and

(4) Burhanpur Taluka of Nimar District;

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

(1A) The various contiguous Marathi speaking areas mentioned in sub-section 1 of this section shall be included in and become part of those adjoining Districts as may be determined by the Boundary Commission, in the State of Maharashtra."

Shri V. P. Pawar: I beg to move:

Page 5—

for lines 19 to 35, substitute:

"(a) Greater Bombay, Thana, West Khandesh, East Khandesh, Nasik, Dangs, Ahmednagar, Sholapur, South Satara, North Satara, Kolhapur, Ratnagiri, Kolaba and Poona districts; Chandgad taluka and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Khanapur,

[Shri V. P. Pawar]

Belgaum, Chikodi, Athani, Raibag and Hukeri talukas of Belgaum district; Supa, Karwar, Halyal talukas and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Yellapur and Ankola talukas of Kanara district, in the existing State of Bombay;

(b) Osmanabad, Bhir, Aurangabad, Parbhani, and Nanded districts and Ahmedpur Nillanga and Udgir talukas and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Bhalki, Santapur, Aurad and Humnabad talukas of Bidar district; contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Aland taluka of Gulbarga district in the existing State of Hyderabad; and

(c) Buldana, Akola, Amravati, Yeotmal, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara and Chanda districts and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of—

(i) Warasuni, Balaghat and Baihar talukas of Balaghat district;

(ii) Sawnsar taluka of Chhindwada district;

(iii) Bhainsdehi and Multai talukas of Betul district; and

(iv) Burhanpur taluka of Nimar district;

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

(1A) The various contiguous Marathi speaking areas mentioned in sub-section (1) of this section shall be included in and become part of those adjoining districts in the State of Maharashtra as may be determined by the Boundary Commission."

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: I beg to move:

Page 5—

for lines 19 to 35, substitute:

"(a) Greater Bombay, Thana, Nasik, Danga, East Khandesh, West Khandesh, Ahmednagar, Sholapur, North Satara, South Satara, Kolhapur, Kolaba, Ratnagiri and Poona districts, Chandgad taluka and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Belgaum (including Belgaum city), Khanapur, Chikodi, Athni, Raibag and Mukeri talukas of Belgaum district; Supa, Karwar and Halyal talukas and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Yellapur and Ankola talukas of Kanara district in the existing State of Bombay;

(b) Osmanabad, Bhir, Aurangabad, Parbhani and Nanded districts, Ahmedpur, Nilanga and Udgir talukas, and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Bhalki, Santapur (Aurad), and Humnabad talukas of Bidar district, Adilabad, Asifabad and Shripur taluka of Adilabad district and Aland taluka of Gulbarga district in the existing State of Hyderabad; and

(c) Bhandara, Nagpur, Chanda, Wardha, Amravati, Yeotmal, Akola and Buldhana districts; and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of—

(i) Saugar taluka of Chhindwada district;

(ii) Bhainsdehi and Multai talukas of Betul district;

(iii) Warasuni, Balaghat and Baihar talukas of Balaghat district;

(iv) Bastar; and

(v) Burhanpur taluka of Nimar district in the existing State of Madhya Pradesh;

and thereupon the aforementioned territories shall cease to form part of the existing States of Bombay, Hyderabad and Madhya Pradesh respectively and will be included in adjoining districts of the State of Maharashtra."

Shri S. S. Mare: I beg to move:

Page 5—

for lines 19 to 23, substitute:

“(a) Greater Bombay, Thana district, West Khandesh, Nasik, Dangs, Ahmednagar, Sholapur, South Satara, North Satara, Kolhapur, Ratnagiri, Kolaba and Poona districts and Chandgad, Khanapur and Belgaum taluks of Belgaum district, in the existing State of Bombay;”

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): I beg to move:

Page 5—

(i) line 19, before “Thana” insert: “Greater Bombay and”; and

(ii) lines 19 and 20, omit:

“except the portions specified in clauses (b) and (c) of section 8.”

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): My amendment No. 13 is the same as amendment No. 1 moved by Dr. Rama Rao.

Shri Altekar: I beg to move:

Page 5, lines 19 and 20—

for “Thana district except the portions specified in clause (b) and (c) of section 8” substitute:

“Greater Bombay and Thana district.”

Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar): I beg to move:

(i) Page 5, line 19—

before “Thana”, insert “Greater Bombay.”

(ii) Page 5, lines 19 and 20—

omit “except the portions specified in clauses (b) and (c) of section 8”.

Shri N. R. Muniswamy: I beg to move:

Page 5, line 21—

omit “Dangs”.

Shri Altekar: I beg to move:

(i) Page 5, line 23—

after “district” insert:

“and Khanapur taluka, and predominantly Marathi speaking area of Belgaum taluka to be determined by a Boundary Commission, and Nipani Bhag of Chikodi taluka, or alternatively the predominantly Marathi speaking area of Chikodi taluka to be determined by a Boundary Commission, and the predominantly Marathi speaking villages contiguous to Maharashtra State in Athni and Hukeri talukas to be determined by a Boundary Commission.”

(ii) after “district” insert “and Karwar and Halyal talukas and Supa Peta of North Kanara district.”

Shrimati Jayashri (Bombay-Suburban): I beg to move:

Page 5, line 24—

omit “The villages Mulund and Nahur in Thana taluka”.

Shri R. C. Sharma (Morena-Bhind): I beg to move:

(i) Page 5, line 30—

for “Amravati” substitute “Amravati excluding Melghat tehsil”.

(ii) Page 5, line 31—

for “Bhandara” substitute “Bhandara excluding Gondia tehsil”.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: I beg to move:

Page 5, line 31—

after “districts” insert:

“Burhanpur taluk of Nimar district; Bhainsdehi and Multai taluks in Betul district and Saunsar taluk of Chhindwara district”.

Shri Altekar: I beg to move:

Page 5, line 31—

after "districts" insert:

"Waraseoni, Balaghat and Baihar tahasil of Balaghat district; Saunsar tahasil of Chhindwara district; Bhainsdehi, Betul and Multai tahasils of Betul district, and Berhanpur tahasil of Nimar district".

Shrimati Maydeo: I beg to move:

Page 5,—

after line 32, add:

"(d) Khanapur, Belgaum, Chikodi (Nipani Bhag), Hukeri and Athni taluks in Belgaum district, in the existing State of Bombay;

(e) Karwar, Supa and Halyal taluks in Kanara district in the existing State of Bombay; and

(f) (i) Greater Bombay;

(ii) Borivali taluka of Thana district, except the villages of Bhayandar, Dongri, Ghod Bunder, Kashi Mire, Rai Murdhe, and Uttan; and

(iii) The villages of Mulund and Nahur in Thana taluka of Thana district in the existing State of Bombay;"

Shri Nand Lal Sharma: I beg to move:

Page 5, line 34—

omit "Bombay".

Shri Telkikar: I beg to move:

(i) Page 5, lines 37 and 38—

after "Udgir taluks" insert:

"Bhalki and Hulsur circles of Bhalki Taluk, Aurad and Torana circles of Santpur (Aurad) taluk and Ladwanti circle of Humnabad taluk."

(ii) Page 5, line 40—

after "taluk" insert:

"Uttoor taluk, Bela circle of Adilabad taluk, Ada and Wakadi circle of Asafabad taluk of Adilabad district".

Shri Gadlingama Gowd: I beg to move:

Page 5—

after line 41, add:

"(3) Bombay shall be capital of State of Maharashtra".

Shri S. R. Telkikar: I beg to move:

Page 5—

after line 41, add:

"(3) The city of Bombay will continue to be the capital of both the States of Maharashtra and Bombay until the state of Bombay is finally merged in the State of Maharashtra".

Clause 10.—(Formation of Gujarat State)

Shri R. D. Misra: I beg to move:

Page 6, line 2—

omit "Part A".

Shri N. R. Muniswamy: I beg to move:

Page 6, line 6—

after "Broach" insert "Dangs".

Shrimati Jayashri: I beg to move:

(i) Page 6, line 6—

after "Surat" insert:

"Dang and Umargaon"

(ii) Page 6, line 6—

after Surat insert:

"and Dangs"

(iii) Page 6, line 6—

after "districts" insert:

"Umargaon taluka of Thana district and Navapur taluka of West Khandesh district".

Shri N. R. Muniswamy: I beg to move:

Page 6—

omit lines 12 to 14.

Clause 11.—(Formation of a new Madhya Pradesh State)

Shri R. D. Misra: I beg to move:

Page 6, line 16—

omit "Part A".

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: I beg to move:

Page 6, line 16—

for "Madhya Pradesh" substitute "Mahakoshal".

Shri R. C. Sharma: I beg to move:

Page 6, line 19—

for "districts" substitute "areas".

Shri Nand Lal Sharma: I beg to move:

Page 6—

(i) omit lines 21 to 24;

(ii) omit line 26

(iii) line 28,—

omit "Madhya Bharat, Rajasthan".

(iv) line 29,—

omit "and Vindhya Pradesh".

(v) omit lines 30 and 31.

Shri N. R. Muniswamy: I beg to move:

Page 6, line 22—

for "Sunel tappa of Bhanpura Tehsil of" substitute "the".

Shri S. C. Singhal (Aligarh Dist.): I beg to move:

Page 6,—

(i) omit line 26

(ii) line 29,—

omit "and Vindhya Pradesh".

Clause 12.—(Formation of a new Rajasthan State)

Shri R. D. Misra: I beg to move:

Page 6, line 33—

omit "Part A".

Shri Nand Lal Sharma: I beg to move:

Page 6, line 35 and 36,—

omit "except Sironj sub-division of Kotah".

Shri N. R. Muniswamy: I beg to move:

Page 7, line 4—

for "Sunel tappa of Bhanpura Tehsil of" substitute "the".

Shri Nand Lal Sharma: I beg to move:

Page 7, line 7—

omit "Rajasthan".

Shri N. R. Muniswamy: I beg to move:

Page 7—

omit lines 9 to 13.

Clause 13.—(Formation of a new Punjab State)

Shri R. D. Misra: I beg to move:

Page 7, lines 14 and 15,—

omit "Part A".

Shri Nand Lal Sharma: I beg to move:

Page 7—

(i) after line 19, add:

"(c) the territories of the existing State of Himachal Pradesh."

(ii) line 22—

after "Union" insert:

"Himachal Pradesh".

Clause 14.—(Amendment of the First Schedule to the Constitution)

Shri R. D. Misra: I beg to move:

Pages 7 to 9—

for clause 14, substitute:

'14. Amendment of the First Schedule to the Constitution:—

As from the appointed day, for the First Schedule to the Constitution the following Schedule shall be substituted, namely:—

[Shri R. D. Misra]

FIRST SCHEDULE

[Articles 1 and 4]

Name	Territories
I. STATES	
1. Andhra Pradesh	<p>The territories which were comprised in Srikakulam, Visakhapatnam, East Godavari, West Godavari, Krishna, Guntur, Nellore, Kurnool, Anantpur, Cuddapah and Chittoor districts and in the Alur, Adoni and Rayadurg taluks of Bellary district which formed part of Andhra State under section 3 of the Andhra State Act, 1953; and</p> <p>(a) the districts of Hyderabad, Medak, Nizamabad, Karimnagar, Warangal, Khanamam, Nalgonda and Mahbubnagar;</p> <p>(b) Alampur and Gadwari taluks of Raichur district; Kodangal taluk of Gulbarga district;</p> <p>(c) Tandur taluk of Gulbarga district;</p> <p>(d) Zahirabad taluk (excluding Nirna circle), Nyalkal circle of Bidar Taluk and Narayankhed taluk of Bidar district;</p> <p>(e) Bichkonda and Jukkul circles of Deghur taluk of Nanded district;</p> <p>(f) Mudhol, Bhiansa and Kuber circles of Mudhol taluk of Nanded district; and</p> <p>(g) Adilabad district except Islapur circle of Booth taluk, Kinwat taluk and Rajura taluk of the Hyderabad State added to the State of Andhra under section 3 of the State Reorganisation Act, 1956.</p>
<p>NOTE—Alur and Adoni taluks, were included in and become part of Kurnool district, Rayadurg taluk of Anantpur district and the territories specified in (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) above were included in and became part of Mahbubnagar, Hyderabad, Medak, Nizamabad and Adilabad districts respectively, on the State of Andhra Pradesh.</p>	
2. Assam	<p>The territories which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were comprised in the Province of Assam, the Khasi States and the Assam Tribal Areas but excluding the territories specified in the Schedule to the Assam (Alteration of Boundaries) Act, 1951.</p>
3. Bihar	<p>The territories which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were either comprised in the Province of Bihar or were being administered as if they formed part of that Province.</p>
4. Gujerat	<p>The territories which were comprised in Banaskantha district except Abu Road taluka, and Amreli, Mehsana, Sabarkantha, Ahmedabad, Kaira, Panch Mahals, Baroda, Broach and Surat districts of the State of Bombay, the territories of the State of Saurashtra; and the territories of the State of Kutch formed part of Gujerat State under section 10 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956.</p>
5. Kerala	<p>(a) The territories of the State of Travancore-Cochin which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were comprised in the corresponding Indian State (excluding Agastheeswaram, Thovala, Kalkulam and Vilavancode taluks of Trivandrum district and the Shencottah taluk of Quilon district transferred to the State of Madras by section 4 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956);</p> <p>(b) the territories comprised in Malabar district (excluding the islands of Laccadive and Minicoy); and</p> <p>(c) Kasargod taluk of South Kanara district formed part of Kerala State, under section 5 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956.</p>
<p>NOTE—The territories specified in (b) and (c) above shall form a separate district in the State of Kerala.</p>	

Name	Territories
6. Madhya Pradesh	<p>(a) The territories of the State of Madhya Pradesh which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were comprised in the corresponding Province or were being administered as if they formed part of that Province but excluding Buldana, Akola, Amravati, Yeotmal, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara and Chanda districts;</p> <p>(b) the territories of the States of Madhya Bharat which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were comprised in the corresponding Indian State excluding Sumel tappa of Bhanpura Tahasil of Mandasaur district;</p> <p>(c) the territories which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution was comprised in the Chief Commissioner Province of Pantha Piploda;</p> <p>(d) Sironj sub-division of Kotah district of the State of Rajasthan;</p> <p>(e) territories of the State of Bhopal which were immediately before the commencement of this Constitution being administered as if they were a Chief Commissioner's Province of the same name;</p> <p>(f) the territories of the State of Vindhya Pradesh which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were comprised in the corresponding Indian State; formed part of the State of Madhya Pradesh under section 11 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956.</p>
NOTE—Sironj sub-division specified in sub-clause (d) was included in and became part of Bhilsa district in the new State of Madhya Pradesh.	
7. Madras	<p>(1) The territories which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were either comprised in the Province of Madras or were being administered as if they formed part of that Province, but excluding;</p> <p>(a) Srikakulam, Visakapatnam, East Godavari, West Godavari Krishna, Guntur, Nellore, Kurnool, Anantpur, Cuddapah and Chittoor districts and Bellary district (transferred to Andhra State and the State of Mysore under sections 3 and 4 of the Andhra State Act, 1953);</p> <p>(b) Malabar district except Laccadive and Minicoy Islands transferred to the State of Kerala under section 5 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956;</p> <p>(c) Laccadive and Minicoy Island of Malabar district and Amindivi Island of South Kanara district which formed a Union territory under section 6 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956; and</p> <p>(d) South Kanara district except Kasargod taluks and Amindivi Island, and Kollegal taluk of Coimbatore district transferred to the State of Mysore under section 7 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956.</p> <p>(2) The territories of Agastheeswaram, Thovala, Kalkulam and Vilavancode taluks of Trivandrum district and Shencottah taluks of Quilon district of the Travancore-Cochin State, formed part of the State of Madras under section 4 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956.</p>
8. Maharashtra	<p>(1) The territories of Thana district (excluding Borivali taluk except the villages of Bhayandar, Dongri, Ghod Bunder, Kashi, Mire, Rai Murdhe and Uttan; and the Villages Mulund and Nahur in Thana taluk), West Khandesh, East Khandesh, Nasik, Dangs, Ahmednagar, Sholapur, South Satara, North Satara, Kolhapur, Ratnagiri, Kolaba and Poona districts and Chandgad taluk of Belgaum district of the State of Bombay;</p>

Name	Territories
9. Mysore	<p>(2) Ahmadpur, Nilanga and Udgir taluks of Bidar district, Nanded district except Bich Konda and Jukkal circles of Deghur taluka and Mudhol, Biansa and Kuber circles of Mudhol taluk and Islampur circle of Boath taluk, Kinwat taluka and Rajura taluka of Adilabad district of Hyderabad State; and</p> <p>(3) Buldana, Akola, Amravati, Yeotmal, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara and Chada districts in the State of Madhya Pradesh formed part of the new State of Maharashtra under section 9 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956.</p> <p>(1) The territories of the State of Mysore which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were comprised in the corresponding Indian State;</p> <p>(2) Belgaum district except Chandgad taluk and Byapur, Dharwar and Kanara districts of the State of Bombay;</p> <p>(3) Gulbarga district except Kodangal and Thandu taluka, Raichur district except Alampur and Gadwazi taluks, and Bidar district except Ahmadpur, Nilanga and Udgir taluks and Zahirabad taluk except Nirna circle, Nyakal circle of Bidar taluka and Narayankhed taluk of Bidar district of the State of Hyderabad; and</p> <p>(4) South Kanara district except Kasargod taluka and Amindivi Islands and Kollegal taluka of Coimbatore district of the State of Madras; formed part of the State of Mysore under section 7 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956.</p>
10. Orissa	<p>The territories which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were either comprised in the Province of Orissa or were being administered as if they formed part of the Province.</p>
11. Punjab	<p>(1) The territories which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were either comprised in the Province of Punjab or were being administered as if they formed part of that Province; and</p> <p>(2) the territories which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were comprised in the Patiala and East Punjab States Union; formed the State of Punjab under section 13 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956.</p>
12. Rajasthan;	<p>(1) The territories which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were either comprised in the State of Rajasthan or were administered as if they formed part of that State, except Sironi sub-division of Kotah district;</p> <p>(2) the territories which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were comprised in the Chief Commissioner's Province of Ajmer-Merwara;</p> <p>(3) Abu Road taluka of Banaskantha district of the State of Bombay and</p> <p>(4) Sunel tappa of Bhanpura tahsil of Mandssaur district of the State of Madhya Pradesh; formed the State of Rajasthan under section 12 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956.</p>
	<p>NOTE—The territories referred in sub-section (2) formed a separate district of Ajmer, and the territories referred in sub-sections (3) and (4) were included in and became part of Sirohi and Jhalawar district respectively.</p>
13. Uttar Pradesh	<p>The territories which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were either comprised in the Province known as the United Provinces or were being administered as if they formed part of that Province.</p>

Name	Territories
14. West Bengal	The territories which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were either comprised in the Province of West Bengal or were being administered as if they formed part of that Province and the territory of Chandernagore as defined in clause (c) of section (2) of the Chandernagore (Merger) Act, 1954.
15. Jammu and Kashmir	The territory which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution was comprised in the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir.
II THE UNION TERRITORIES	
1. Bombay	The territories of— (a) Greater Bombay; (b) Borivali taluka of Thana district except the villages of Bhayandar, Dongri, Ghod Bunder, Kashi, Mire, Rai Murdhe and Utan; and (c) the villages of Mulund and Nahur in Thana taluka of Thana district of the Bombay State formed a Union territory under section 8 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956.
2. Delhi	The territory which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution was comprised in the Chief Commissioner's province of Delhi.
3. Himachal Pradesh	The territories which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were being administered as if they were Chief Commissioner's Provinces under the names of Himachal Pradesh and Bilaspur.
4. Manipur	The territory which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution was being administered as if it were a Chief Commissioner's Province under the name of Manipur.
5. Tripura	The territory which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution was being administered as if it were a Chief Commissioner's Province under the name of Tripura.
6. The Andaman and Nicobar Islands.	The territory which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution was comprised in the Chief Commissioner's Province of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands.
7. The Laccadive, Minicoy & Amindivi Islands	The territories of Laccadive and Minicoy Islands in the Malabar district and the Amindivi Islands in the South Kanara district of the State of Madras formed a Union territory under section 6 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956".

Shri R. D. Mishra: I beg to move:

Page 7—

for lines 23 to 25, substitute:

"14. Amendment of article 1 and of the First Schedule to the Constitution:—(1) In article of the Constitution—

(a) for clause (2) the following shall be substituted, namely:—

'(2) The States and the territories thereof shall be as

specified in the First Schedule."

(b) As from the appointed day, in the First Schedule to the Constitution, for Part A, Part B, Part C and Part D, the following parts shall be substituted namely:—

Shri Raghavachari: I beg to move: Page 7, lines 30 and 31,—

for "sub-section (1)" substitute:

"sub-sections (1) and (3)".

Shri N. R. Maniswamy: I beg to move:

(i) Page 7, line 32—

add at the end:

“and the territory of the commune of Yanam”

(ii) (a) Page 8—

(1) for lines 7 to 9, substitute:

“4. Bombay the territories specified in section 8 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956.”

(2) omit lines 31 to 33; and

(b) Page 9—

omit lines 24 and 25

(iii) Page 8, line 12—

add at the end:

“and the territory of the commune of Mahe”

(iv) Page 8, line 30—

add at the end:

“and the territory now comprised in the erstwhile French settlements of Karaikal and Pondicherry”.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: I beg to move:

Page 8, line 37,—

for “Orissa” substitute “Utkal”.

Shri S. C. Singhal: I beg to move:

Page 9, line 7—

add at the end:

“and the territories comprised in the State of Vindhya Pradesh”.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: I beg to move:

Page 9, line 8—

for “West Bengal” substitute “Wanga Desh”.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi: I beg to move:

Page 9, line 21—

add at the end:

“and that part of Kashmir known as “Azad” Kashmir which is under the illegal occupation of Pakistan”.

Dr. Rama Rao: I beg to move:

Page 9,—

omit lines 24 and 25.

Shri K. K. Basu: My amendment No. 24 is the same as amendment No. 5 moved by Dr. Rama Rao.

Shri N. R. Maniswamy: I beg to move:

Page 9—

Omit lines 30 to 34.

Shri R. D. Misra I beg to move:

Page 9—

(i) after line 44, insert:

“PART D”

(ii) line 45,—

for “6” substitute “1”.

(iii) after line 46, add:

“2. The Andaman and Nicobar Islands.—The territory which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution was comprised in the Chief Commissioner's Province of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands.”

New Clause 14A

Shri R. D. Misra: I beg to move:

Page 9—

after line 46, add:

“14A. Consequential, supplemental and incidental amendments of the provisions of the Constitution—In order to give effect to the provisions of this Part of the Act the supplemental, incidental and consequential and minor

amendments directed in the following schedule shall be made in the Constitution:—

"THE SCHEDULE

Article 1.—(a) for clause (2) substitute the following "(2) The States and territories thereof shall be as specified in the First Schedule";

(b) in clause (3) for sub-clause (b) substitute the following:—

"(b) the Union territories specified in the First Schedule"

Article 3.—In the proviso, omit "specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule".

Article 31A.—In Sub-Clause (a) of clause (2), for "Travancore-Cochin" substitute "Kerala".

Article 58.—In the Explanation, omit "or Rajpramukh or Uprajpramukh".

Article 66.—In the Explanation, omit "or Rajpramukh or Uprajpramukh".

Article 72.—In clause (3), omit "or Rajpramukh".

Article 73.—In the proviso to clause (1), omit "specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule".

Article 80.—(a) in sub-clause (b), of clause (1), after the word "States", the words and "of the Union territories" shall be added.

(b) in clause (2), after the words "of the States", the words "and of the Union territories" shall be inserted.

(c) in clause (4), the words and letters "specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule shall be omitted; and

(d) in clause (5) for the words and letters "States specified in Part C of the First Schedule" the words "Union territories" shall be substituted.

Article 101.—In clause (2), omit "specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule", and for "such a State" substitute "a State".

Article 112.—In sub-clause (d) (iii) of clause (3), for "a Province corresponding to a State specified in Part A of the First Schedule", substitute "a Governor's Province of the Dominion of India".

Article 151.—In clause (2), omit "or Rajpramukh".

Part VI.—In the heading, omit "IN PART A OF THE FIRST SCHEDULE".

Article 152.—for "means a State specified in Part A of the First Schedule" substitute "does not include the State of Jammu and Kashmir".

Article 168.—In clause (1) in sub-clause (a) the word "Bombay" shall be omitted and after the word "Madras" the word "Mysore" shall be inserted.

Omit "Part VII".

Part VIII.—for the heading "The States in Part C of the First Schedule" the heading "the Union Territories" shall be substituted.

Article 241.—(a) In clause (1), for "State specified in Part C of the First Schedule", substitute "Union territory", and for "such State", substitute "such territory".

Omit "article 242".

Omit "Part IX".

Article 244.—Omit "specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule".

Article 246.—In clauses (2) and (3), omit "specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule" and in clause (4), for "in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule" substitute "in a State".

Article 254.—In clause (2), omit "specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule".

[Shri R. D. Misra.]

Article 255.—Omit “specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule”.

Omit “article 259”.

Article 267.—In clause (2), omit “or Rajpramukh”.

Article 268.—In clause (1), for “State specified in Part C of the First Schedule” substitute “Union territory”.

Article 269.—In clause (2), for “State specified in Part C of the First Schedule” substitute “Union territories”.

Article 270.—In clauses (2) and (3), for “States specified in Part C of the First Schedule” substitute “Union territories”.

Omit “article 278”.

Article 280.—In clause (3), omit “sub-clause (c), and reletter” sub-clause (d) as sub-clause (c)”.

Article 283.—In clause (2), omit “or Rajpramukh”.

Article 291.—Omit “(1)” and “clause (2)”.

Article 299.—In clause (1), omit “or the Rajpramukh”, and in clause (2), omit “nor the Rajpramukh”.

Omit “article 306”.

Article 308.—for “means a State specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule”, substitute “does not include the State of Jammu and Kashmir”.

Article 309.—Omit “or Rajpramukh”.

Article 310.—In clause (1), omit “or, as the case may be, the Rajpramukh”, and in clause (2), omit “or Rajpramukh”, and “or the Rajpramukh”.

Article 311.—In clause (2), omit “or Rajpramukh”.

Article 315.—In clause (4), omit “or Rajpramukh”.

Article 316.—In clauses (1) and (2), omit “or Rajpramukh”.

Article 317.—In clause (2), omit “or Rajpramukh”.

Article 318.—Omit “or Rajpramukh”.

Article 320.—In clause (3), omit “or Rajpramukh” and “or Rajpramukh, as the case may be” and in clause (5) omit “or Rajpramukh”.

Article 323.—In clause (2), omit “or Rajpramukh” and “or Rajpramukh, as the case may be”.

Article 324.—In clause (6), omit “or Rajpramukh”.

Article 332.—In clause (1), omit “specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule”.

Article 337.—Omit “specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule”.

Article 339.—In clause (1), omit “specified in Part A and Part B of the First Schedule” and in clause (2), for “any such State” substitute “a State”.

Article 341.—In clause (1), after “any State” insert “or Union territory”, omit “specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule”, omit “or Rajpramukh” and after “that State” insert “or Union territory, as the case may be”.

Article 342.—In clause (1), after “any State” insert “or Union territory”, omit “specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule” omit “or Rajpramukh” and after “that State” insert “or Union territory, as the case may be”.

Article 348.—Omit “or Rajpramukh”.

Article 356.—In clause (1), omit “or Rajpramukh” and “or Rajpramukh as the case may be”.

Article 361.—In clauses (2), (3), and (4) “or Rajpramukh” and in clause (4), omit “or the Rajpramukh”.

Article 366.—Omit “clause (21)”, and for “clause (30)” substitute—

“(3) ‘Union territory’ means any Union territory specified in the First Schedule and includes any other territory comprised within the territory of India but not specified in that Schedule”.

Article 367.—In clause (2), omit “specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule” and “or Rajpramukh”.

Article 368.—Omit “specified in Parts A and B of the First Schedule”.

Second Schedule.—(a) In the heading of Part A and paragraph 1, omit “specified in Part A of the First Schedule”;

(b) in paragraph 2, omit “so specified”.

(c) in paragraph 3, for “such States” substitute “the States”;

(d) Omit “Part B”;

(e) in the head of Part C, omit “of a State in Part A of the First Schedule” and for “any such State” substitute “a State”; and

(f) in paragraph 8, omit “of a State specified in Part A of the First Schedule” and for “such State” substitute “a State”.

Fifth Schedule.—(a) In paragraph 1, omit “means a State specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule but”;

(b) in paragraph 3, omit “or Rajpramukh”;

(c) in paragraph 4, in sub-paragraph (2), omit “or Rajpramukh, as the case may be” and in sub-paragraph (3), omit “or Rajpramukh”.

(d) in paragraph 5, in sub-paragraphs (1) and (2), omit “or Rajpramukh, as the case may be”, in sub-paragraph (3), omit “or Rajpramukh” and in sub-paragraph (5), omit “or the Rajpramukh”.

Sixth Schedule.—In paragraph 18, in sub-paragraph (2), for “Part IX”, substitute “Part VIII”, and for “territory specified in Part D of the First Schedule” substitute “Union territory”.

Seventh Schedule.—In List I,—in entry 32, omit “specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule”.

New Clause 15 A

Shri R. N. S. Deo (Kalahandi-Balangir): I beg to move:

(i) Page 10—

after line 4, insert:

“BOUNDARY COMMISSION

15A. The Government of India shall, before the 1st day of January, 1957 appoint one or more Boundary Commission or Commissions, consisting of Judges of the Supreme Court or High Courts, to go into the existing border disputes of different States, and such disputes of different States, and such Commission or Commissions shall after due investigation, give awards on the disputes in accordance with the following principles:—

(i) wishes of the people of the disputed area or areas concerned;

(ii) their historical, economic, linguistic and cultural affinities; and

(iii) considerations of administrative convenience;

and thereupon, the Government of India shall take necessary steps to implement such awards.”

(ii) Page 10—

after line 4, insert:

“BOUNDARY COMMISSION

15A. The Government of India shall, before the end of 1956, appoint Judges of the Supreme Court or High Courts, to go into the claims of Orissa

[Shri R. N. S. Deo]

for the inclusion of the border areas of—

(a) Singhbhum Sadar Sub-division and Seraikella sub-division of Singhbhum district of Bihar; and

(b) the 'Sankara Tract' of Raigarh district of Madhya Pradesh, and the Saraipali, Basna, Manipur and Deobhog thanas of Raipur district of Madhya Pradesh, and the Jagdalpur and Kondagaon tehsils of Bastar district of Madhya Pradesh;

in the State of Orissa. The Boundary Commission shall after investigating the claims, give awards in accordance with the following principles:—

(i) the wishes of the people of the respective areas;

(ii) their historical, economic, linguistic and cultural affinities; and

(iii) considerations of administrative convenience;

and thereupon the Government of India shall take necessary steps to implement such award or awards.”.

Shri V. P. Pawar. I beg to move:

Page 10—

after line 4, insert:

“15A. Notwithstanding anything contained in this Part, the disputes regarding the inclusion of any areas or the borders of the States, shall be determined by the Boundary Commission to be appointed for the purpose, by the President and the findings of the Commission shall be final.”

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: My amendment No. 364 is the same as amendment No. 154 moved by Shri V. P. Pawar.

Shri V. P. Pawar: I beg to move.

Page 10—

after line 4, insert:

“15A. (1) For fixing the boundaries of the States, the Union

Government shall appoint a Boundary Commission.

(2) The Boundary Commission shall fix the boundaries by treating a contiguous revenue village as a unit.”

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: My amendment No. 365 is the same as amendment No. 155 moved by Shri V. P. Pawar.

Shri Telkikar: I beg to move:

Page 10—

after line 4, add:

“Part IIA

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

15A. *Boundary Commission*.—The Government of India shall appoint a Boundary Commission before the 1st day of January, 1956 consisting of five Judges of the Supreme Court of India or High Courts of States to settle or decide the border disputes between two or more States according to the following principles:—

(i) contiguity of the disputed area to any of the proposed States;

(ii) linguistic, historical, cultural and economic affinities;

(iii) wishes of the people of the disputed area;

(iv) administrative convenience;

(v) interests of tribes;

(vi) a revenue village as a unit, if necessary;

(vii) minimising discontent among people as far as possible.

Provided that nothing in the foregoing provisions of this section shall be deemed to affect the power of a State Government to alter after the appointed day the name, extent and boundaries of any district or division in the State.”

Dr. Rama Rao: I beg to move:

Page 10—

after line 4, insert:

"15A. (1) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this Part, one or more Boundary Commissions shall be appointed by the Central Government to go into various disputes about boundaries and their inclusions and exclusions from the various States.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker: These amendments are now before the House.

Dr. Rama Rao who was on his legs when the House adjourned yesterday may continue his speech.

Dr. Rama Rao: Yesterday I was speaking on our joint amendment asking for a Boundary Commission to settle various boundary disputes. I also explained how the hon. Home Minister's proposal that Members must settle them here is not practicable. It is not realistic; I am not opposed to it; it is not possible to abide by the intransigence of any group. Here we want a judicial decision. The Government of India should not leave any party to these disputes at the

sweet mercies of any other party. I gave an instance of the Sironcha taluk in the Chanda district of Madhya Pradesh which is predominantly Telugu-speaking and which is accepted. The Hyderabad Assembly has passed a resolution to that effect; and I request the hon. Home Minister to call for a meeting of the M.P. members and the Andhra members. As far as Andhra is concerned, a couple of members would be good enough just as my friend Ella Reddi or any other Telenana member. Let us see its results. Here is a case of an overwhelming majority of Telugu-speaking people. Just 6 or 10 per cent. are Marathi-speaking and yet we are unable to accept the inclusion of it in the Andhra State. Therefore, there is no use leaving things unsettled. We must evolve a practical and realistic method. And, I do not see anything more practical than having a Boundary Commission or Commissions with judicial officers. For instance, we can have several such Commissions appointed, 10 or 12 and things can be settled completely before this Bill is passed in the Rajya Sabha.

For instance, this morning we read in the papers that Dr. Rajlakshman has declined to arbitrate between the parties in certain disputes. It is quite right that we should not drag the Vice President into these disputes. It is for a judge to go into these matters. Therefore, I once again appeal to the Home Minister to consider the question of establishing Boundary Commissions to settle these disputes. The Home Minister should not be dragged in all these petty wrangles; he should not be worried with statements, petitions and *satyagraha*. Let him take the proper method, not only for one instance but for all the disputed areas and let him establish Boundary Commissions. I do not know why Government is dead against these Boundary Commissions. The Home Minister counts upon the Zonal Councils for settling these disputes. Surely, they will not solve the problem. Lastly, I appeal to the Home Minister not to

[Dr. Rama Rao]

leave these disputes unsettled but to establish Boundary Commissions following the proper procedure for the settlement of these disputes.

I come next to the highest blunder that the Government has committed in this Bill, the question of the non-inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra. I won't repeat all that has been said. Many explanations have been given by Government, by the Home Minister and by the Prime Minister and we have yet to receive a single explanation, logical and correct, as to why Bombay is excluded from Maharashtra. There are many reasons but they are all invalid and untenable. My reading of the debate has been that the vast majority of this House are in favour of including Bombay in Maharashtra here and now. I am not speaking of the voting which may be different. Secondly, that Government has practically conceded the point that Bombay is part of Maharashtra. Thirdly, the Prime Minister's statement, I understood, as saying that no plebiscite or referendum will be necessary. Fourthly, he has also....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is not going to add anything to those arguments. We have devoted 75 per cent. of the time to Bombay as if other things did not count.

Dr. Rama Rao: Unfortunately, the Chair will have the misfortune to hear all those points. I am only summing up.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): The sting is in the tail.

Dr. Rama Rao: Things have changed even during these few days. For instance, the Prime Minister is now stating that no plebiscite or referendum is necessary. He also said that a period of five years is not necessary and that it may be a shorter period. Then why should we have this trouble? Many Ministers have spoken; many hon. Members have spoken about the wounds. Who has received these

wounds? Just remember that the persons who have received wounds—both mental and physical—are the Maharashtrians.

Mr. Speaker: I said that wounds should not be referred to. Somebody referred to it when I was not here and whoever presided, possibly overlooked that.

Dr. Rama Rao: I am not referring to that; I only give the remedy, the proper remedy and no quack remedy. Quack remedy is not useful. It will keep the wound open so that there will be further infection and complication. I give the magic remedy. That is, announce today that Bombay will be part of Maharashtra and then see the reaction of the whole of Maharashtra and also of the whole country. With the exception of a few vested interests, even the Gujeratis are not opposed to it. I know the communist party of Gujerat has passed a resolution demanding that Bombay must be part of Maharashtra. Therefore, with the exception of a few handful of persons all want Bombay to be included in Maharashtra, here and now. Why avoid this and keep the wound open for further infection and complications?

If Government think that the Maharashtra people will take this insult or injury lying down, they are mistaken. They will agitate. I want them to agitate non-violently and peacefully but to agitate persistently till they get it. I am not giving them the advice of my friend, Shri Murthy and ask them to wait. We Andhras never waited. As long as we waited, we were made fools of. There is a saying in our language, 'Even a mother does not give unless you ask for'. We must ask for it. We must ask in a way that even the deaf ear will hear it. So, the Maharashtra people will not give up the agitation; they will be going on with it and if Government wants to stop all this, the only remedy, the sensible remedy is to include Bombay in Maharashtra. Therefore, I hope

Government will consider this even at this late hour, at this eleventh hour, and give the Congress Party freedom of vote. It is not as if it is a question of the Government and the Opposition. It is a common point and, therefore, Government must give the freedom of vote to the Congress Members so that they can vote for Bombay being included in Maharashtra.

12 P.M.

Shri B. D. Misra: Yesterday I passed on my chit indicating my amendments Nos. 275, 276 and 277, but I do not find them in the list which has been circulated now.

Mr. Speaker: Has he passed on the chit?

Shri R. D. Misra: I gave it yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: Anyhow, let him send a further chit and notice will be taken of it. Evidently his slip has slipped out.

Shri B. Shiva Rao (South Kanara—South): My amendments are No. 116 to clause 5 on the formation of the Kerala State, and No. 117 to clause 7 on the formation of the new Mysore State.

The first amendment is on page 4 and reads as follows:

For line 12, substitute:

“(ii) the portion of Kasaragod taluk of South Kanara district situated to the south of the Chandragiri river and its northern tributary the Payaswani river;”

The second amendment is also on the same page and reads as follows:

“In line 35, for “South Kanara district except Kasaragod taluk” substitute “South Kanara district except the portion of Kasaragod taluk situated to the south of the Chandragiri river and its northern tributary the Payaswani river.”

The scope of these two amendments is the same. They seek to limit the area in Kasaragod taluk which, in the Bill, is proposed for transfer in its entirety to Kerala, only to the region south of the Chandragiri and Payaswani rivers. The meaning of these amendments is that we in South Kanara district are prepared to give away two-thirds of Kasaragod taluk to Kerala with our goodwill, because in this area, the Malayalam-speaking population is between 90 and 95 per cent. But we feel very strongly on the point—and we in my district are practically unanimous—that Kerala has no right from any point of view to that part of Kasaragod taluk north of these two rivers. The Malayalam-speaking population in this region, I understand from official sources, is 51.4 per cent., but many of them, like the fishermen and the weavers who speak a sort of Malayalam, are with us in our demand for the retention of that area in South Kanara. One section of the Moplahs—and I emphasise that phrase—no doubt supports the provisions as they stand, but this view of theirs is not based on any consideration of language. They want to link up with and consolidate the position of the Muslim League in Malabar entirely for political ends.

This border dispute has often been described as one between Karnataka and Kerala, but my district above these two rivers, which are mentioned in the amendments, belongs, properly speaking, neither to the Kannadigas nor to the Malayalees. It is the ancient Tuluva Kingdom with a people about a million in number, proud of their past, proud of their culture, and speaking a distinct language of their own, Tulu, which, in fact, is the main language of my district. I, therefore, appeal in all earnestness to this House not to break up the region of these people and transfer one part to Karnataka and the other to Kerala.

On a former occasion, when the S.R.C. Report was being debated in December, I gave all the relevant facts

[Shri B. Shiva Rao]

in support of our present demand. But today I take my stand primarily on one factor, because it seems to me that that factor should weigh more with us in this House than any other consideration in the reorganisation of States. That factor is: what do the people themselves in that area want? About that there is overwhelming evidence without any challenge. Thirty-four out of the thirty-six Panchayat Boards in this part of Kasaragod taluk have adopted resolutions in favour of remaining in South Kanara, and only one Panchayat Board, by a bare majority of one, has expressed its preference for transfer to Kerala. All the elected members of the State Legislature and of Parliament from the region north of these two rivers—and we are fourteen—are unanimous in the demand that this area should be retained in South Kanara. Not only the elected members, but also the P.S.P. candidates, who were our main opponents in the last general elections, are entirely with us in this demand. And the District Board of South Kanara has by a very large majority also supported our demand. Therefore, I ask, with all this evidence in our favour, is it wise and proper for the House to disregard the practically unanimous wishes of the people and compel them to live in another State?

We often claim to be a parliamentary democracy, and we say that we are the largest democracy in the world. And so we are in numbers. But let us ask ourselves whether our techniques and our methods are consistent in this matter with a proper concept of democracy. These enormous electorates of ours, eighteen crores or possibly more, create this sovereign Parliament and can change its personnel every five years; they can make and unmake governments. We are proud of the fact that our Prime Minister is a statesman of world stature; but constitutionally, he is Prime Minister only because some 360 of us—I do not know the precise strength of the Congress Party

at present—gladly elected him our leader after the last general elections. And we, who occupy the benches behind the Treasury Benches, in our turn, were elected by our respective constituents. We came into this House five years ago on a very definite election programme. The reorganisation of States was not an item in that programme. Our electorates will have the right to ask next February, or whenever the elections are held—fortunately I will not have to answer that question because I am not seeking re-election—whether they, who can create and uncreate a sovereign Parliament, cannot exercise even the right to decide for themselves whether the area in which they and their ancestors have lived happily for centuries should belong to one State or whether they are to be forced against their will into another State. I say that we are grossly exceeding our brief in this vital matter. Constitutionally, what we are doing in maintaining these provisions in the Bill in their present form is highly improper, and politically it is most unwise. I, therefore, appeal to the Home Minister and to the Government to go back to their original decision which was in favour of the amendments that stand in my name.

Shri Basappa (Tumkur): Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for the opportunity you have given me. I have not taken part in this debate so far.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): After moving the amendments concerning a particular State, some Members from the other States concerned may also be allowed to speak.

Mr. Speaker: Let others also think about these amendments.

Shri Basappa: This is a very important Bill and even a back-bencher like me wants to take part. (An Hon. Member: You are a middle-bencher). This Bill has created such great passions not only inside this country but

also in different parts of the world. The different countries are also looking at us to see whether we are doing the right thing with regard to this reorganisation. So, we have to look at this Bill from that angle, namely, as to what its reactions will be in different parts of the country and also outside.

In this matter, I have to congratulate the Government for taking a bold decision and implementing it. Acharya Kripalani and other great men in this House have been saying that this should be postponed till the passions cool down. I am not one with them because we have gone too far. It is not today's occurrence. To say so is like pulling them back and it is injurious to the country. So, we must all give support for the Government to see that this Bill is passed and implemented in its proper perspective. However, I welcome this and there is no question of postponing or adjourning this issue.

The question has been asked several times in this House whether it is the proper time to take up linguistic redistribution. It has been clearly stated that we are reorganising the States not only on linguistic consideration but that cultural and other aspects are also taken into consideration. If that is so, I do not know why these people are afraid of these linguistic States. Is it a crime? The mere fact that we are translating into action what we have been saying so far seems to them to be bad. To call them that they are linguistic States based on language alone is something which I cannot understand. It may look like a linguistic State; they are linguistic States. But at the same time, other factors have been taken into consideration. Is it a fault if they turned out to be linguistic States. How does it lie in the mouth of those people to say that they are more patriotic and that those who have been asking for these linguistic States are to be condemned in this House. After all,

these linguistic States have a great part to play in this country. In the past, development of the different parts of the country has not taken place in proper lines. Therefore, this idea has come into being.

Having said these few words generally, I wish to say a few words about the Karnataka State. It is an inevitable conclusion that after the formation of the Andhra State, the next stage was Karnataka State. I am glad that it will come into existence shortly. It is going to be a good State. We have been complimented as very fortunate in having that. I am very much flattered. Karnataka State is going to develop vast parts of the area and will turn its attention for the development of the whole of India. Karnataka has its own achievements and if I begin to narrate it will take a long time.

Mr. Speaker: Nobody is opposed to it.

Mr. Basappa: Having said that, I now tell the House that the next question is this. What is there to ask for after having got Karnataka? For the last 150 years, the Kannada State was dis-membered and it was distributed in five States and they did not get their due share. The Dhar Commission has stated that the southern districts of Bombay have been neglected. They have pleaded the cause very well. There were five or six small bits in different States and they were not looked after properly. There was encroachment on every side. It is not as if Kannada people going and occupying those areas. It was encroachment by the Maharashtrians or the Telugus or the Tamils.

Take for instance Sholapur. The mother tongue of the people there is Kannada. It is a pitiable sight to see how they are not able to read or write Kannada. They speak it but they read and write in Marathi; the administrative work is carried on in

[Shri Basappa]

that language. So, there should be border adjustments. If there are certain areas belonging to them, let them take those areas but if there are Karnataka areas let them come to Karnataka. We are of course Indians first and Kannada or Tamil or Telugu people next. But, when we are organising the States, let us do it properly and in a scientific manner, to the extent it is possible. I think that we have been proceeding on the right lines and let us go a little further and see that the process is completed. Let it not be left to the future people to say that we have not done this work properly.

On the eve of this reorganisation, I know there is a small ministerial crisis in Mysore. But the moment this new State is formed, I am certain that it will set right all these things and it will become a very good State in India.

I have a word to say about the names of new States. You yourself, Sir, I am told by Dr. Lanka Sundaram, worked for the name of Andhra State; I do not know if it is correct.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: On a point of personal explanation, Sir, I did not say that you worked for the name of Andhra State. In one situation, you would have been called a Hyderabadi and that disaster was averted. That is what I said.

Shri Basappa: I am sorry if I have misunderstood him. The idea remains. The new States are called Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and so on. Then, why not call this State Karnataka State. I do not want to quarrel on this issue. But, when we are doing things, let us do it properly. Otherwise, there will be bitterness left. We have accepted the name here as our great leaders advised us to do so for the time being. Let it not be mistaken that justice has not been done to them. The S.R.C. has called it by the name of Karnataka. Because some leaders from Mysore felt the other way, that name Mysore has been retained. But, there must be

some opportunity to see whether people like it or not, so that the proper names may be given to the States. I do not say that what we have done is wrong. We have to take all the people along with us. From that angle the name of Mysore is retained. If you think that we shall have certain good names which will remain for ever, which will indicate all the parts that are added to a State, then why not we have this name? That is the only point that I want to emphasise and I leave it at that. I do not want to press that matter very much.

With regard to certain areas, our friend Shri B. Shiva Rao has already stated about Kasargod taluk and I am not competent to say much on that. But, from what I see, it is better to have the whole taluk in Karnataka as he has stated. If, for any reason, that is not possible then at least Chandragiri River should be included. 34 out of 36 Panchayats have already declared in favour of that proposal. Out of the 169 schools that are there about 149 are Kannada schools. So there is a clear case made out from the administrative point of view and geographical point of view that it should be with Karnataka.

There is another case about Madakasira taluk. It has already been argued and most of the Members who spoke are agreed to a very great extent on its inclusion in Karnataka. The S.R.C. has completely argued the case for Karnataka. The High-power Committee that was instituted almost decided in favour of Madakasira taluk going to Karnataka. I do not know what happened subsequently to change that decision. Now it has been left there. 64 per cent. of the people there, as estimated by the S.R.C. itself, speak Kannada. And, what is distance from Hyderabad to Madakasira? It is 400 miles and odd. From all these points I say that Madakasira taluk should be put in Karnataka.

Then there is the Thalavadi firka in Coimbatore district. Why should we talk of small firkas going here and there? But here is a case of geographic contiguity. It is a plateau of 3,000 feet above sea level. The next adjacent firka is 3,000 feet below in a plain in Gopichetty Palaya taluk in Coimbatore District. There is no communication between the two. I myself explained this to the Prime Minister one day and he was able to appreciate that point of view also. 90 per cent. of the people there speak Kannada. There is also geographical contiguity and for all practical purposes it is now under the police, criminal and civil jurisdiction of Kollegal. Kollegal is now given to Mysore and, therefore, in the natural fitness of things this area also should go to Mysore State.

About Hosur in Selem District I do not say much because there are three distinct languages spoken there. Telugu forms the majority, next comes Kannada and last comes Tamil. So the Tamilians have no place there. But we cannot give it to Andhra because it is far away from the capital of Andhra and the desire of the people is the most important thing. In my opinion, wherever there is a question of difference, the ultimate thing to decide the issue is the desire of the people. And if you find that the wishes of the people is for going to Bangalore, which is only 25 miles from there and not 400 miles as Hyderabad, I think it is a fit case to be considered so that it should go to Mysore.

There are other areas also. There is the Bellary question. My friend Shri Raghavachari asked me to hold my soul in patience when I referred to the bye-election in Bellary. I thought, that bye-election which was fought between Andhra and Kannada candidates, had set at rest this question. Even a Congress candidate was not put up in order to avoid these Members saying that the whole Congress organi-

sation was behind him. I thought that bye-election had set the issue at rest. Again he raised the question. It was once decided. Two awards—the Wanchoo Award and the Mishra Award—were there and the Government took a decision on them. That was reversed by the S.R.C. For what reason, I ask. They have not given any good reasons for changing that decision. They had not realised the mistake. The Government had come to a decision that it should go to Mysore and a bye-election had proved the result. Now my friend asked me to hold my soul. I wish he would rather put an end to this rather than sticking on to that dead question at this stage.

Sir, I do not want to take much time. The question of Bombay has roused passions and feelings of Members very much. Our Home Minister and the Prime Minister have set at naught all those things. Whatever doubts and suspicions we had in our minds have already vanished. The Government has been correct in doing what has been done. At the same time, our great financier, Shri C. D. Deshmukh,—it is only the other day that we were exalting him as a great jewel of this Ministry and today we cannot say that he has gone out with any bad blood. He only gave expression to certain feelings. But at this time we want his sound experience especially when we are launching our Second Five Year Plan. We want his advice and guidance. Therefore, this House, this magnificent hall, as our Pantji has called it,—it has become magnificent not because of architectural beauty but because it is concerned with the well-being of the 38 crores of people in the country—should work for unity. Let us be worthy of this House in which we sit and do things in a manner beneficial to the people of India so that all may feel happy.

Mr. Speaker: Shri A. M. Thomas. Now I shall call Members from all the South Indian States.

Shri Mohiuddin (Hyderabad City): Hyderabad is a South Indian State.

Mr. Speaker: Hyderabad, Tamil Nad, Karnatak, Malabar and so on.

An Hon. Member: What about Maharashtra?

Mr. Speaker: Maharashtra has been called and called. I would suggest this. Whenever any hon. Member gets up he may say what all he wants to say all round his State.

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur): Sir, you were kind enough to say that hon. Members who have not taken part in the general discussion will be given a chance.

Mr. Speaker: I will call only those who have not taken part. In those States also there are people who have not taken part.

Shri M. D. Joshi (Ratnagiri South): Does that mean that Maharashtra will not be called or will it be called during the course of the day?

Mr. Speaker: I am not able to fix any particular time. As soon as this is finished, possibly I will call Punjab.

Shri R. S. Diwan: Some Members have got their problems inter-mingled with Andhra also. Should they speak on them?

Mr. Speaker: Certainly, they should speak all round.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi: Sir, we have moved our amendments.

Shri A. M. Thomas: As suggested by you, Sir I will devote my time to questions affecting Kerala versus Madras and Kerala versus Karnatak.

Mr. Speaker: If there is anything versus others also, you may speak.

Shri A. M. Thomas: When we are on clauses 2 to 16, the question of territorial adjustments affecting my State crops up and that is why I want to speak.

Sir, I would first address myself to amendments 116 and 117 moved by my very respected colleague Shri B. Shiva Rao. These amendments, although taken by themselves have no material bearing on the States Reorganisation, have been given an undue importance by several members of this hon. House. I should congratulate my friend Shri Shiva Rao for having obtained the sympathy of several Members. One honourable Member of this House had occasion to remark yesterday, with regard to territorial adjustments that Kasargod taluk stands on a special footing. I just want to disabuse the Members, who entertain such a notion, with facts and figures. Shri Shiva Rao has rightly conceded that, if Kasargod taluk is taken as a whole, it is a predominantly Malayalee area. I will just give the figures based on the 1951 census statistics.

Shri B. Shiva Rao: I said the area south of river Chandragiri is predominantly Malayalee. I did not say about the whole of the taluk.

Shri A. M. Thomas: If you take Kasargod taluk as a whole, the Malayalee population comes to 73 per cent, Tulu population 14 per cent, Kannada population—my friend wants these territories to be tagged on to Karnatak—is only 5 per cent, Marathi population 4 per cent, Konkini 3 per cent, and other languages one per cent.

My friend just referred to the area north of the Chandragiri-Payaswani river and he was addressing his arguments with special reference to that. What exactly is the picture of that area and also with regard to South of Chandragiri-Payaswani river based on the statistics published by the Madras Government based on the census of 1951? I have calculated the population figures. The total population north of the Chandragiri-Payaswani river is 185,000 out of which the Malayalees number 101,000 forming 55 per cent of the population; 50,000 Tulus forming 27 per cent of the population; and Kannadigas—again I emphasise—17,000

forming 9 per cent of the population. The total population of Kannadigas is only 17,000, out of the entire population of 185,000. The balance 17,000 form another 9 per cent. My friend Shri B. Shiva Rao said that the Tulu-speaking population is about 27 per cent. He placed some emphasis on it. We all know that Tulu language is more akin to Malayalam rather than to Kannada.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: What do the people say?

Shri A. M. Thomas: The figures that were given by Shri Gurupadaswamy when he spoke during the general discussion show that the Kannada population is 65 per cent north of the Chandragiri river. I am glad that my friend Shri Shiva Rao who knows more of the area does not support my friend Shri Gurupadaswamy. When some Members speak about the particular river it will appear that the Chandragiri-Payaswani river is an impenetrable barrier or a sort of a cease-fire line. Several Members asked me, "Why do you want the portion north of the Chandragiri river?" They asked me that question without knowing anything. This Chandragiri-Payaswani river boundary has been given some undue importance. If you take the area north of the Chandragiri river, you will find that majority population there is Malayalee. The Kannadigas form only nine per cent and my friend Shri Shiva Rao wants this area to be tacked on to Karnataka.

My friend Shri Shiva Rao just mentioned that the majority of the people there do want merger with Karnataka. But based on the information that I have got, I am not in a position to support Shri Shiva Rao. I am rather unwilling to bring communal considerations into this debate. Shri Shiva Rao himself was pleased to say that a section of the Moplahs alone do want a merger with Kerala and nobody else. The Muslim population who, my friend says, want union with their compatriots in Kerala, comes to 25 per cent north of the Chandragiri river, let

along those to the south of the river. I am afraid my friend has wrongly assessed public opinion in that area in a particular way. My friend has been saying that most of the schools there are Kannada. The educational institutions in South Kanara, in the local sphere, are under the South Kanara District Board, and so, in the matter of education, the District Board will have considerable say in the matter. The District Board in establishing or patronising the schools, has not, however, been able to inform Kannada Schools south of the Chandragiri river where the Malayalee population, according to Mr. Shiva Rao, comes to 90 per cent. But they were able to suppress in a way the legitimate feelings of the Malayalees north of the Chandragiri river who, even according to Shri Shiva Rao, form the majority population. Does it mean that those people have to remain in Karnataka?

If you take the matter of schools, I might point out this. With regard to Gudalur, for example, almost all schools have got Malayalam as their medium of instruction. The documents are all written in Malayalam. The court language is Malayalam. Even then, it has not been given to Kerala due to several other considerations. If we take a predominantly Tamil-speaking taluk in South Travancore which has been taken from Kerala and given over to Madras, we will find that the bilingual schools are more in number there rather than the unilingual schools. There are considerable numbers of Malayalam schools there. So, the arguments of my friend Shri Shiva Rao cannot stand. As has been pointed out by Shri Basappa, though Kannada-speaking people were in a majority in a particular area, the people were not given education in their mother tongue. Such developments have taken place. That only supports my argument. In this particular case the Malayalees were not given a fair deal in this area.

With regard to the percentage of literacy among the Malayalees, if the entire country is taken into account, the

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

Malayalees have been the foremost in literacy. But the least literacy among Malayalees is found north of the Chandragiri river. What does it indicate? Their aspirations were not being met.

Apart from these considerations, what is the justification for sub-dividing a taluk, and giving a portion to a unilingual area from another where in the majority speak the same language of the state from where they are sought to be taken away. May I respectfully ask Shri Shiva Rao whether in the scheme of reorganisation, in any area or in any State, this standard which has been laid down by Shri Shiva Rao, has been adopted? Shri Shiva Rao mentioned about the river. We have not come across, in any place, a river which has been adopted as the boundary.

Shri B. Shiva Rao: Has not any taluk been sub-divided in respect of the other parts of the country?

Shri A. M. Thomas: It has been sub-divided, but only in cases where the predominant population forms the non-linguistic portion of the particular taluk concerned. But here, in this particular case, the Malayalee population forms the majority. What is the justification in this particular case?

My friend was speaking about natural boundaries, mentioning the Payaswani river. He referred to this during the general discussion on a previous occasion. In this instance, I shall refer to the position in the four South Travancore taluks and especially the Vilavancode taluk. Right in the middle of this taluk runs the Kuzhithua river. Some arguments were advanced that this river could be taken as the boundary of the portion north of the Vilavancode taluk, and it should be retained in Travancore-Cochin State. But that argument has not been accepted. One argument was that even when the Tamil taluks demanded merger with Madras; they hoisted their flag south of the Kuzhi-

thua river. But I submit that all these arguments are of no avail, as far as we are concerned.

My friend Shri Shiva Rao has referred to the opinion expressed by the various panchayats. You must understand that when the elections to the panchayats took place linguistic formation of the States was never the issue. But I may point out that in at least three elections to Presidentship of Panchayats, this issue was definitely made one of the grounds on which decision was sought at the elections. The Malayalees have won those elections. When this issue was clearly put before the people, they won. I may refer to the speech of one member in the Madras Assembly. His name is M. Narayan Nambiar. He has referred to the fact that with regard to the recent election of three panchayat Presidents, this issue was prominently there, and the Malayalees have won. The fact that the panchayats have expressed their wishes in a particular way is of no consequence.

My humble submission is that there is absolutely no necessity for departing from the provisions contained in this Bill. Before I close, I just want to make one or two observations, because I may not get a chance to speak on these clauses when the other amendments are moved. I am referring to Kerala and Madras. I do not think this House will seriously consider the questions regarding Devikulam and Peermedi which have been the subject-matter earlier and which have been discussed at length. I had a full say in the matter when the report of the States Reorganisation Commission was discussed, and I need not repeat those arguments now. But there is the fact that the Gudalur taluk should go to Kerala. There is also an amendment regarding this. On all considerations, I would think that Gudalur ought to have come to Kerala. But I do not know whether I should reconcile myself to the pro-

visions in the Bill as they stand, especially having been a Member of the Joint Committee to whose report I have not appended a dissenting note. Although we have got only a mutilated Kerala, we have adopted ourselves to it for the sake of good relationship between the neighbouring States. I am glad to say that the Madras Government has also reconciled itself to the decision with regard to Devikulam and Peermedi; and is taking necessary steps in co-operation with the Travancore-Cochin Government to implement the provisions of the Bill as they stand. I do not think there is any use of raking up these old issues.

I just want to say one word with regard to the name of the State of Madras. While the hon. Home Minister Pandit G. B. Pant was speaking, an interruption was made, I think, by Shri Boovaraghassamy that the name of the Madras State should be changed into Tamil Nad. I am sorry to say that this is carrying the linguistic fanaticism too far. We all know that, though Madras is going to be more or less a unilingual State, there is much in favour of retaining the name of Madras. There is tradition and history behind it. I respectfully ask, by removing that name from the map of India, what does it profit the Tamilians. It is hardly fair to the other linguistic groups that have also contributed to build up the city and that have contributed to the growth of the State. The opinion of the Madras legislature is to the effect that the name should not be changed. There is a lot of goodwill in that name, the value of which cannot be measured in rupees, annas and pies. I ask the hon. Members who want to change the name, why should you squander the treasure in the good name that you have got?

An Hon. Member: What about Travancore-Cochin?

Shri A. M. Thomas: With regard to Travancore-Cochin, from the very start we have been agitating for a Kerala State. Even now, you will find

in the newspapers, the Travancore-Cochin Assembly is described as the Kerala Assembly. We were wanting a Kerala State from the beginning.

Shri Matthen (Thiruvellak): Certainly not.

Shri A. M. Thomas: My hon. friend may not agree; he will never agree.

Shri V. P. Nayar: What is the name of the P.C.C.?

Shri A. M. Thomas: Might be Tamil Nad because it was on a linguistic basis, so that if it was called Madras P.C.C. Malabar would have come in. I do not know why my hon. friend Shri V. P. Nayar should be very particular about the change of the name of the Madras State into Tamil Nad. I am sure that a majority of the Members of this House irrespective of the party considerations, would not like to drop the name Madras from the map of India. There is another thing that I forgot to mention. Even with regard to the people coming from the south, whether Tamilians or others, from our dress, from our language—even though I speak Malayalam—I am asked, are you a Madrassi.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: The South Indians object to that very strongly.

Shri A. M. Thomas: They may object. What I want to emphasise is that Malayalees have contributed their quota to the building up of the Madras city and the Madras State. Even if you are reorganising the States on linguistic considerations, I feel that the name of Madras should be retained. As I said, even a Malayalee is called a Madrassi though his language is Malayalam. Whenever we go to big cities like Bombay, Calcutta or Delhi, from our dress, etc., the people in the north ask, "Are you a Madrassi"? There is something in that name. I feel that that name should be retained.

With these words, I support the provisions of this Bill.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: (Kolsba)- I did not at first wish to intervene

[Shri C. D. Deshmukh]

in this debate, having had my opportunity. But, I feel that I ought to correct a few statements which were made by the Home Minister yesterday which, in my opinion, are wrong.

He said that there was full consultation at all stages, that there were 14 meetings and nine months deliberation and so on. Now, these matters have no great bearing on the Cabinet Ministers' responsibility. The specific point I made was that between the 10th or 11th when the Cabinet decided that there should be a separate city State of Bombay and on the 16th when the Prime Minister made his announcement that Bombay should be Centrally administered, there was no cabinet meeting which took a decision to alter the previous decision and also there was no power given to any Committee of the Cabinet to arrive at such a decision. Therefore, whether after the announcement it was reported to the Cabinet or not is immaterial with regard to this point. There is also the other point that the Prime Minister, without consulting his colleagues, should not have made that announcement of June 3rd. Not because I am not prepared to trust the Prime Minister's leadership. If he were alone, if the decisions had been left to him, even now I say, let him decide everything. But, we are working the apparatus of western democracy. I think the responsibility for securing that that apparatus is used properly rests on Parliament. The Prime Minister is not like the President of the U.S.A. who can hear the Secretaries and come to a decision by himself. Therefore, to say that there was full consultation including consultation with his Cabinet colleagues and then decision was taken by the Prime Minister or one or two colleagues in addition, really is not a sound defence. As I said, had it been a matter of the Prime Minister alone, I should not have bothered.

But, this kind of thing is likely to be infective. This kind of thing, to my knowledge, happens in many other States. I think in the cause of democracy, it is a very bad trend because other people who are in charge there naturally are not as big men as the Prime Minister. It is in the nature of things bound to be so. Therefore, this authority or competence to exercise authority by the Cabinet as a whole is being diluted at all levels. That is why I attach great importance to this point.

Then, the Home Minister said that I resigned—I have the speech before me; I am not quoting from memory—after the three-States formula was agreed to, I suppose in the Cabinet meeting of 10th January. That can't be. He says—

“Shri Deshmukh also did not like it so much so that he tendered his resignation after the publication of that proposal.”

There was no publication of that proposal. The proposal that was published was that Bombay should be Centrally administered, if I have followed what he said. He said that I had been associated with the Subcommittee. Here again, I think he is not knowingly perhaps, causing a wrong impression. I did attend some of the meetings of this Committee. That was in connection with boundary disputes all over, Belgaum city, Adilabad, and so on. I attended no meetings of the Committee which discussed Bombay. The only relevance of this matter is that at one time I did think that the general formula recommended by the S.R.C. about the 70 per cent. was right and that is why I advisedly said in my speech that on mature consideration. I think that it inflicts an avoidable measure of hardship on large numbers of people and that it is our duty to minimise it and that is why I have supported this proposal that there should be a boundary commission which will do

it in accordance with proper orderly procedure. If these questions are going to arise, it is no answer to say that zonal councils will be able to deal with them, because the dispute will be there. The only difference is that the zonal councils, being what they are, will not be able to deal with this question in a proper way, in accordance with the proper procedure, whereas a boundary commission will have far greater authority.

1 P.M.

Well, then, reverting to the chronology, I am in a difficulty now. I have correspondence with the Prime Minister which I wish to place on the Table. My own letter of resignation, I think, is not secret, and I do not think that I require the permission of the Prime Minister to place it on the Table of the House. It is not marked personal or secret or anything. Anyway, it is my resignation. So, I would like to place it on the Table in proof of what I am saying that I resigned on the 22nd January after the Prime Minister's announcement on the 16th that Bombay was to be Centrally administered.

Now, the question will arise why I waited these six days. I did not know what kind of talk the Maharashtra leaders had had with either the Home Minister or the Prime Minister between the 11th and 16th. They did not report to me. They did not see me afterwards. They saw me before they went to the Home Minister, but not afterwards. Therefore, I thought, well, it may be that they had accepted Centrally administered Bombay. It was not for me, then, being a financial expert, shall we say and not a proper politician, to raise any difficulties. But, when the Executive Committee of the Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee denied that they had agreed and protested and went to the length of saying that they should resign, then I made up

my mind that whatever they had done, it was not acceptable to their colleagues on the Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee, far less was it acceptable to the people of Maharashtra, and I formed the view that was as their supposed leaders had failed them in getting what they wanted or in securing their best interests. Therefore, I thought it was only right that plenipotentiaries who had failed in their job should resign their job and make way for better people. I cannot see anything wicked or wrong in this.

The next question is why I did not press my resignation. That will be clear from the Prime Minister's reply, but I cannot place it on the Table of the House. I made a general reference to it, and that was that it held out hopes of bigger bilingual States, Dakshina Pradesh and so on, and since as you know I have never wavered in my support of the bigger bilingual Bombay as the best solution, I thought I had better wait. In any case, as violence had broken out I also thought it was the duty of everyone not to do anything that would exacerbate the people further. Therefore I held my hands. Then, there were Members of Parliament who came to me. I did not mention any names, but I do not think they have so turned against me that they would mind my mentioning their names. It is a fact that it was Shri Feroze Gandhi and Shri Dev Kant Borooah who came to me and said: "This matter will now be in the hands of Parliament. Why are you in a hurry?" This was January you must remember and the session of Parliament was to come in February. Also, I was in a responsible position. I had prepared the budget. I had to deliver it. I had to secure the passing of the taxation measures. Then there were various other pieces of legislation which were very important. The Plan had to be finalised. In my humble way I thought it was my duty to stand by the country and not to press the re-

[Shri C. D. Deshmukh]

signation. I do not see there was anything wrong in it. I claim that in those three or four months I worked harder than I worked in the previous five years. I am hoping—I have some faint hope—that some Members at any rate will acknowledge that something valuable had been done for the country as a result of my holding back the resignation. But my resignation was never withdrawn. As I said, I refrained from passing it because of these considerations.

There is only one more letter I would place on the Table, but that can be only with the Prime Minister's permission, but I have to read out of it. It is marked "personal", not "secret" or "private", and it says—this is when I offered to resign again towards the end of April when I found that things were no better—

"Your resignation will obviously not be helpful even, I think, from the point of view of helping in a solution which you so much desire. The Bill is going to be referred to the Select Committee. The final stage will arrive when it comes back from the Committee. I would like you at least to wait till then."

And that is what I did. I waited till then. But, in the beginning of June I found that the Prime Minister had made a statement which, to my mind, spiked the guns of the Joint Committee. In other words, in the way pointed out by Shri Kripalaniji, naturally the Members of the majority party who were in the Joint Committee found that because the Prime Minister had now more or less made a pronouncement, it was not right for them to go any further. Now, as I pointed out, had it been something which would help the cause as I understand it, what I stand for, then I would not have

pressed the resignation, but it is my honest view that it places Maharashtra in a worse condition than if they had had a City State. The hon. Home Minister said it passes his comprehension. Well, I cannot help that, but I consider that five years is a longer period than one year or two years or three years. That is a simple matter of arithmetic. Also, when it is a Centrally administered area, whether to pass an Act or not to pass an Act to terminate it is entirely at the will of Parliament, but they have added a rider by way of an executive pronouncement that Parliament will not be moved to take that step unless the wishes of the people of Bombay are ascertained, not by regular voting but the sense. I do not know how one assesses the sense. There again I thought that that was worse than if Parliament had entirely been seized of the matter. The trouble with this finding out of the sense of the people is that nobody knows how it has been ascertained. Today, can anyone put his hand on his heart and say that the people of Bombay City want Bombay City to be separate from Maharashtra? What proof is there? The only evidence is that about 45 per cent. minus one want that Bombay City should go to Maharashtra. Now, there are five or seven per cent. Konkani-speaking people who, I know, will be taking the same view as Maharashtrians. Then there are, as an hon. Member said, about five lakhs of Tamil clerks. I see no reason why the Tamil clerks should object to Bombay City going to Maharashtra. They are going to ply their living or whatever it is, irrespective of it. They are not allowed to use Tamil there as an official language for the region. They have to learn Gujarati or Kanarese or Marathi for that purpose. So, it makes no difference to them whether they or their children learn Marathi or Gujarati. We have not gone to that length. We are prepared to give any kind of safeguards to minorities. If Bombay should have Gujaratis and

Marathi, let them have the freedom of choice. Gujarati is a very important language for the business of Bombay and I would like to make it compulsory for every child in Bombay City to know Gujarati because he then understands business and therefore instead of having only valour or more valour, he will have a little more discretion. Now, therefore, I say that there is no one here who can prove today that Bombay City wishes to remain separate. If that is so, why give an option?

So, according to my view, what the Prime Minister stated did make the matter very much worse, and that statement was made without any reference to any person, to my knowledge, in the Cabinet—at least it was not a Cabinet meeting or Cabinet committee meeting—and poor me who was known then to have offered his resignation, who was asked to hold his soul in patience till the Joint Committee sat and pronounced, was not even consulted, or asked: "Is this likely to meet your wishes? Do you think that would help you?" I am not worth very much. I have always held that no man is indispensable. I have always acted on the maxim that every man, every officer in a high job, should deliberately try to make himself dispensable and build up his office so that he is not missed afterwards, and I am quite certain I will not be missed: I have been written off already.

So, that is my reason why I attach very great importance to this, and whether this correspondence goes on record or not depends on your discretion. I am not anxious to put the Prime Minister's letter on the Table of the House if you are going to believe me that this is the extract from that letter. But if you are going to say I am quoting from some fabricated letter, then I must put it forward because his signature is there. So, will you kindly give your ruling as to what I should do?

Mr. Speaker: I think the House is satisfied with the hon. Member's oral statement.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Later on, I dare say the Prime Minister will permit me to publish this correspondence.

Only one short point. I asked for ten minutes. I think I have taken eleven minutes. The hon. Home Minister said that I agreed to the States Reorganisation Bill as every member and therefore there is a kind of estoppel against me. I cannot see how an estoppel can act against me, when my resignation is pending from the 22nd of January, when on the 24th of April, the Prime Minister says, 'Please wait and see what the Parliament does', when Members of Parliament come to me and say, 'Please wait and see; maybe, we shall be able to do something to bridge the gulf'. I do not remember now the date on which the States Reorganisation Bill was introduced. I have not yet had time to make that research. But I think it was sometime towards the end of April. I think it was about that time.

When the States Reorganisation Bill was introduced, I said to the Prime Minister that 'Since you are not now going to make a change, will you please allow me to speak against the Bill and to vote against it, and if for that purpose you think that I should not be a Cabinet Minister, then I am entirely agreeable that I should not be a Cabinet Minister'. That letter is on April 26th, to which this other letter is the reply. That is my own letter. It is only marked 'confidential'. But it is no longer confidential. Therefore, I am going to put a copy of that on the Table too. It shows that no estoppel can operate against me. I have always been.....

Mr. Speaker: That is not the main issue or the very relevant issue here, though, no doubt, I allowed an opportunity for the hon. Member.....

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I shall finish now.

Mr. Speaker: It is not a question so much of time as of the relevancy of that particular paper to be put on the Table.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: These statements made by the Home Minister would make me out to be an incorrect person. Now, I have no other opportunity of correcting them. And I have documentary proof that it is he who is wrong, and not I. How do I manage that? Would the Speaker tell me?

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): Even under the general provision of offering a personal explanation or clarification, he is entitled to do that.

Mr. Speaker: Then and there, he may have asked. As soon as these statements had been made, he might have asked immediately for an opportunity to give a personal explanation. I do not want to stand on any formality. But, is it necessary to put a particular paper or his resignation letter here on the Table?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I do not mind. It is in the rules of the House that if a Member reads from a letter, he should put it on the Table. I am not very familiar with rules.

Shri S. S. More: Is it not necessary that other Members also should know all the relevant facts before they come to some conclusions? From that point of view, all these documents will be of great importance.

Mr. Speaker: Are we deciding this issue on the grounds of resignation or otherwise of Shri C. D. Deshmukh?

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Then, I shall abide by your advice. I shall not place any paper on the Table of the House. I have done.

Shri T. Subrahmanyam (Bellary): The decade 1947-57 is likely to be the most eventful decade in our history. I think it will go down as a decade of revolution. Our country became free

in 1947, and then hundreds of princely States covering 360,000 square miles and with a population of about 60 million people were integrated. The next step that we are taking now is to reduce the number of these Part A, Part B and Part C States. The main Part A States will now be 15; and there will, of course, be the State of Jammu and Kashmir, and there will also be the Centrally administered States, namely the six Part C States.

I described this as a revolutionary decade. Revolution does not mean merely blood-letting, or looting or arson or burning. It means a basic social, political or economic change. Since we have really brought about these fundamental changes, this is going to be described, I am sure, as a momentous, eventful and revolutionary decade.

Some matters must be treated as finally closed. We cannot go on endlessly treating a matter as closed and then trying to reopen it. In this context, I feel that Bellary is one such matter. I would not have referred to this, but for the fact that some Members of the Opposition tried to reopen this issue through amendments No. 66 and No. 217.

They say in those amendments that three firkas of Bellary taluk and Bellary town should go to Andhra. Again, in amendment No. 217, they say that three talukas of Bellary district, namely Bellary, Hospet, Siruguppa and that portion of Mallapuram sub-taluka where the Tungabhadra project and the dam are situated, should be transferred to Andhra, according to the recommendations of the Reorganisation Commission.

The Government of India have taken a final decision regarding these matters. After the very careful and full consideration that they gave to this matter, they stated in the explanatory note on the draft States Reorganisation Bill and the proposals for amendment to the Constitution, after

the decisions of 16th January, as follows:

"Three decisions did not cover the Commission's recommendations relating to the proposed Punjab State, and the formation of a residuary Hyderabad State or in the alternative of a larger Telugu-speaking State and the transfer of certain areas of the present Bellary district of Mysore to the State of Andhra. The Government of India have since considered the outstanding issues very carefully in consultation with the State Governments and the parties and interests concerned, and the decisions which have been taken as a result of such consideration are based largely on agreement."

1-15 P.M.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Then, they say at page 2, para 7,

"As regards the proposed transfer of certain areas of Bellary district from the existing State of Mysore to Andhra, the Commission has recommended the review of the previous decision mainly to ensure the smooth and efficient execution and working of the Tungabhadra project. The Government of India recognise the vital interests of the people of Rayalaseema in this subject. However, they feel that the territorial adjustments proposed by the Commission are not necessary to secure the object in view. The high level canal scheme, to which the Andhra Government rightly attach great importance, has already been examined in some detail by the Government of India, and the project as proposed by that Government has been broadly found to be in order. It is the intention of the Government of India to take all necessary steps to ensure the satisfactory and speedy execution of this scheme. The purpose which the Commission

had in view in making its recommendation will, therefore, be achieved, without making any territorial changes, or reopening the question of the future of Bellary, which has already been settled after detailed enquiries."

I do not want to go on this occasion into the various enquiries made before, right from the time of Mr. N. C. Kelkar up to the time of the Dar Commission, the JVP Report, the Partition Committee's Report, and the reports of Justice Wa: 1100 and Justice Misra, and finally the decision of the Government of India in 1953.

The States Reorganisation Commission's recommendation which has been referred to, was based mainly on the Tungabhadra project. It is interesting to mention here that a conference was held in Bangalore on the 18th of June, between the representatives of the Andhra Government and the representatives of the Mysore Government. By a good and lucky coincidence, I happened to be there at that time, when talks took place. Shri N. Sanjeeva Reddi, Deputy Chief Minister of Andhra and Shri Kadidal Manjappa, Minister of P.W.D. and Revenue, and Dr. R. Nagana Gowd, Minister for Industries, Mysore, were present in that conference, and the talks proceeded in a very cordial and friendly atmosphere. An agreement was reached there to the effect that 35 per cent. of the waters of the high level canal should go to Mysore and 65 per cent. to Andhra. The agreement gave full satisfaction to both the sides, and it was made in a friendly and cordial atmosphere.

My hon. friend Shri Raghavachari and one or two other Members referred to the question of the bye-election. Hon. Members may have read from the papers that recently in Bellary taluk, a bye-election took place. The bye-election was caused by the resignation of the then sitting member of the Mysore Assembly from Bellary taluk, who has been supporting the Andhra cause. He gave his resignation as a sort of challenge, and it was accepted

[Shri T. Subrahmanyam]

as a challenge by the leaders of the Andhra State. The Deputy Chief Minister of Andhra and the other leaders of Andhra said, "This is virtually a plebiscite. We shall abide by what the result would be. If we get defeated, we shall not reopen this question. This question will be treated as closed. But if we succeed, it is virtually going to be a plebiscite." The Kannadigas did not take it as a plebiscite. They took it merely as a bye-election. Whatever it may be, in the bye-election, the candidate that supported the Andhra cause was defeated by a clear majority. Then, the Deputy Chief Minister of Andhra, Shri Sanjeeva Reddi said, "I accept the defeat; I shall accept the matter as closed. We are not going to refer to this subject again". But some friends have fallen into the habit of reopening matters over and over again. Shri Raghavachari was trying to analyse the result of the polling by saying that in three firkas the Andhra candidate got a majority. I do not know where he got his figures from. Probably, his other colleague, Shri Ramachandra Reddi, appears to be better informed. He stated that it was only in one firka that the Andhra candidate got a majority. In all the others, the Kannada candidate got a majority.

It is also a matter of significance that in the Joint Committee no attempt was made to reopen this issue. I consider that it was not a mere accident. I have reason to believe—the President of the Andhra Pradesh Congress was there; there were also other Andhra Members—that they must have felt that after this agreement with regard to sharing of the Tungabhadra under the high level and the result of this bye-election, no purpose would be served by reopening this subject. Therefore, no amendment was moved there.

I shall now appeal to the Andhra friends to treat this matter as closed and help in creating a healthy and

co-operative and constructive atmosphere in that district.

I must say a word with regard to border problems. Border problems are to be found between the borders of all the States throughout India. Therefore, I shall not refer to all the border problems. There is always room for give and take with regard to these border disputes. For instance, between Mysore and Andhra, there is a claim for some portion of Rajulabanda, for Andhra. There is a claim for part of Alur, Adoni and Rayadrag on behalf of Mysore. There is also a claim for an adjustment near Madak-sira. These matters, I hope, will be adjusted amicably if not now, in the future.

Now, I must say a word with regard to Bombay and Punjab. Since we are all citizens of India and should not take a mere parochial view of the situation, I feel bound to refer to these matters. I also raise my humble and small voice in appealing for a cordial and constructive climate being created in Bombay and in Punjab. The House will be interested to learn that Shri Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak is the only Lokmanya of India. He visited Bellary a few months before his deportation to Mandalay. He came for an inaugural function. Then he said that Maharashtra derived much inspiration from the traditions and history and greatness of the Vijayanagar Empire. He said that the history of the Vijayanagar Empire was inspiring to the founders of Maharashtra. They took the same traditions and ideals. He referred to the fact that Shivaji was assisted in founding the Maharatta Empire by Samarth Guru Ramdas, the saint of Maharashtra, and the founders of the Vijayanagar Empire, Hukka and Bukka, were helped by sage Vidyaranya. Therefore, the greatness of the Vijayanagar Kings has a special significance in modern times also. Those people bent all their energies and resources for constructing irrigation projects, for opening tanks, completing canals

and building big temples. Besides this, they showed a remarkable spirit of toleration with regard to religious and linguistic matters. I want to lay special emphasis on this fact. One of the titles by which the Vijayanagar rulers were described was:

Chatus Samaya Samuddharta.

'Samaya' means religious path. They protected and encouraged all the religious faiths, Shaivism, Vaishnavism, Jainism and Buddhism. Besides, they gave toleration and protection to Muslims and Christians. With regard to linguistic matters, they encouraged poets and writers in Sanskrit, in Kannada and in Telugu. Krishna-devaraya is described as a Karnatak ruler. He wrote a monumental work in Telugu and the theme of it was the life of a lady saint of Srirangam in Tamil Nad. That was the spirit which animated them. It is a fine example of religious and linguistic toleration and encouragement. It is even today very helpful and is to be copied by us.

In Maharashtra, Shivaji was a very brilliant and shining example of toleration and the spirit of encouragement of all religions and languages. We have similar examples in all parts of India. Maharashtra has produced the only Lokmanya. Gujarat has produced the only Mahatma. Therefore, I appeal to all the friends of Gujarat and Maharashtra to take an active part in setting up a cordial, constructive and co-operative atmosphere and solve the problem of Bombay in which all sections of this House are interested.

With regard to Punjab...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It would be best if he concluded with the appeal. Appeal would be the most effective way of concluding. He has already taken ten minutes.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Let him make a more fervent appeal.

Shri J. Subrahmanyam: I am concluding with a reference to Punjab. With regard to Punjab, I feel it has a bright history. It has a great future also. We have examples of the lives of Guru Nanak and the great saints that followed him. They are all part of our precious heritage. Therefore, even in the case of the Punjab, I appeal to the people concerned to accept the regional formula in a good spirit and work it in a co-operative and constructive spirit.

सरदार झ० सि० लहंसल : जो तरमीम (संशोधन) हमारे माननीय सदस्यों ने यहां उपस्थित की है, उन के ऊपर मैं अपने विचार रखना चाहता हूं। तरमीम ४६ के भाग सी में १ से ४ तक के जो भाग हैं उनमें कहा गया है कि बालाघाट जिले के बारमुनी, बालाघाट और बड़हर तालुक, दूसरे छिदवाड़ा जिले का सांसर तालुक और बेतुल जिले के मंसदेही और भुलतई तालुके तथा नीमर जिले का बुरहानपुर तालुका, यह सब जो नया मध्य प्रदेश बनेगा उसमें से निकाल कर नये महाराष्ट्र में मिला दिये जायें। इसका कारण वे यह बताते हैं कि वहां के लोग मराठी बोलते हैं और मराठी तौर तरीकों पर वे चलते हैं। इसी तरह से आप को तरमीम सं० १४२, १५०, २२५, ३२७, ३५८ और ३६२ मिलेंगी जिन में यह बातें लिखी गई हैं।

इसके साथ साथ हमारे मित्र श्री रा० ना० सि० देव ने तरमीम नं० १४४ दी है जिसमें उन्होंने सुझाया है :

"(b) the 'Sankara Tract' of Raigarh district of Madhya Pradesh, and the Saraipali, Basna, Mainpur and Deobhog thanas of Raipur district of Madhya Pradesh, and the Jagdalpur and Kondagaon tehsils of Bastar district of Madhya Pradesh."

[सरदार व्ग० सि० सहगल]

इनको उड़ीसा की जो स्टेट है उनमें मिला दिया जाये। मैं आप से यह कहूंगा कि अगर आप स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन रिपोर्ट (राज्य पुनगठन प्रतिवेदन) को देखें तो आप को पता चलेगा कि किन कारणों से उन्होंने इन स्थानों को उड़ीसा में मिलाने की सिफारिश नहीं की। मैं आपके सामने उत्कल के बारे में कुछ कह देना बाजिब समझता हूँ। उत्कल के बारे में स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन रिपोर्ट (राज्य पुनगठन प्रतिवेदन) के सफा १३२ पर पैराग्राफ ४८३ में लिखा है :

"The Utkal Sammilani's claim to portions of the Bastar district is based, among other reasons, on an alleged affinity between Halbi and Parjhi on the one hand and Oriya on the other, which in our opinion has not by any means been adequately proved. Besides, our more general remarks in the immediately preceding paragraph are also applicable in respect of this demand."

इसके साथ साथ मैं आप से यह अर्ज करूंगा कि इसी आधार पर हमारे विदर्भ के भाइयों ने जो इन जिलों की मांग की है उस के बारे में रिपोर्ट के पैराग्राफ ४८४ में इस प्रकार से लिखा है :

"The claim which has been advanced on behalf of Maha Vidarbha to Bastar, it is interesting to note, is also based on the argument that Halbi is a dialect of Marathi. Eminent linguists like Grierson and Sten Konow have, however, differed on this point; and Vidarbha's claim cannot, therefore, be considered to be stronger than that of Andhra or Orissa which we have found it necessary to reject."

ये सब चीजें, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपको रिपोर्ट के चैप्टर ८, पेज १३२ पर मिलेंगी।

यहां पर आज आप हिस्टोरिकल फैक्ट्स (एतिहासिक तथ्य) की बातें करते हैं और

चाहते हैं कि इस आधार पर ही हमको कुछ इलाके मिल जायें। लेकिन जो कुछ हिस्टोरिकल फैक्ट्स के बारे में कमिशन (आयोग) ने कहा है वह मैं आपको पढ़ कर सुना देना चाहता हूँ। कमिशन ने अपनी रिपोर्ट के सफा ६५ पर पैरा २३१ में कहा है :—

"Overemphasis on the historical factor is likely to lead to the growth of a sense of rivalry, exclusiveness and narrowness in different regions. This revivalism; which is the basis of many claims to statehood, is not in itself an evil thing so long as it is kept within bounds and is related to the main currents of Indian history."

हिस्टोरिकल आधार पर ही किसी को कोई चीज दे देने के क्या नतीजे हो सकते हैं, इसके बारे में जो पैराग्राफ मैंने आपको पढ़ कर सुनाया है, वह कमिशन की रिपोर्ट में से है। इन सब चीजों को ध्यान में रख कर ही कमिशन ने इन मवालाज का तमफीया (निर्णय) किया है और जो भी आर्गुमेंट्स आप देने हैं उन सब को कमिशन ने एक तरफ रख दिया है। इस वास्ते मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो कमिशन की सिफारिशें हैं, उन पर ही न चला जाय और कोई डिपार्चर न हो। हमारे विदर्भ के भाइयों ने जो तर्कों में पेश की हैं उनके उग्रिये से उन्होंने यह चाहा है कि वारामुनी, बालाघाट तथा बड़हर तालुके बालाघाट डिस्ट्रिक्ट के तथा और कई दूसरे इलाके नए महाराष्ट्र प्रदेश में मिलाये जायें। मैं इसे ठीक नहीं मानता हूँ। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा आपसे यह कहना है कि इस सम्बन्ध में आप कमिशन की रिपोर्ट के सफा १२६ पर सफा ४७२ को पढ़िये। इसमें उसने क्लेम्ट और काउंटर क्लेम्ट का जिक्र किया है। कमिशन का कहना है :—

"The suggestions made to this Commission regarding the exact extent of this State have been.

various and conflicting. In particular, the following claims and counter-claims have been made..."

यह जो क्लेम इन लोगों की तरफ से धब किए जा रहे हैं, इन सब पर स्टेट्स रिफॉर्म-नाइजेशन कमिशन ने जब अपनी रिपोर्ट लिखी थी, उस वक्त पूरी तरह से विचार कर लिया था। इस कमिशन ने सारे देश का दौरा किया और इन इलाकों के बारे में इन लोगों ने अपनी राय भी इस कमिशन के सामने दी। कमिशन ने इन इलाकों पर इनके क्लेम को क्यों रिजेक्ट किया है, इसे हमें देखना है। एक बहुत मार्फ की चीज उसने कही है, जिस पर हमें ध्यान देना होगा। कमिशन ने कहा है:-

"(i) it has been argued on behalf of Maha Vidarbha that the boundaries of Mahakoshal should be so drawn as to exclude the following areas, namely, the Marathi-speaking portions of the Nimar, Betul, Chhindwara, Balaghat and Bastar districts."

उस वक्त कमिशन ने इनके क्लेम को मंजूर नहीं किया और यदि उन्होंने इसे मंजूर किया होना और वे इनके कहने से संतुष्ट हो गए होते, तो भवदय ही अपनी राय इनके हक में देते और इस चीज को इस रिपोर्ट में लिख सकते थे। अगर आप केवल जनसंख्या के आधार पर ही इन चीजों की मांग करते हैं और चाहते हैं कि एक कमिशन बैठे तो आप ऐसा कर सकते हैं मुझे इसमें कोई ऐतराज नहीं है। ऐसा करने से जो सचाई है, वह आपके सामने आ जाएगी।

मैं आपको यह भी बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब इस रिपोर्ट पर मध्य प्रदेश असेम्बली में विचार हो रहा था, जिस की कि प्रोमीडिन्स मेरे पास मौजूद हैं, उसमें एक रेजोल्यूशन इस बारे में रखा गया था जो कि इस प्रकार है :

This House, after considering the States Reorganisation Commission's Report, hereby resolves that

"A new State of Madhya Pradesh comprising 14 Hindi speaking Districts (Mahakoshal)...."

A new State of Maharashtra, comprising the Marathi-speaking areas of the Bombay State (excluding Greater Bombay), the Marathawada districts of Hyderabad and the Marathi-speaking areas of Madhya Pradesh be formed...."

इस चीज को जब विधान सभा के सामने रखा गया था तो उस वक्त इन इलाकों के जो चुने हुए लोग थे क्या उनकी जबानों पर ताले लग गए थे कि वे इन इलाकों के हक में नहीं बोल सके। वे अगर चाहते तो बोल सकते थे और अपनी तरफोंमें पेश कर सकते थे। उनका सबसे पहला यह कर्तव्य होना चाहिये था कि जो रेजोल्यूशन (संकल्प) मूव किया गया था मध्य प्रदेश की सरकार की तरफ से उसको वे न मानते और कहते हम इस तरह से चाहते हैं। लेकिन उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह चीज नहीं हुई। वहां पर जो रेजोल्यूशन पाम हुआ है वह इस प्रकार है :—

"This House approves of the provisions contained in the Draft States Reorganisation Bill and recommends its introduction in Parliament".

तो मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि यदि वहां के नुमाइंदे (प्रतिनिधि) इन इलाकों को बिदम में मिलाना चाहते थे तो उन्होंने क्यों इसके बारे में कोई तरफोंमें पेश नहीं कीं। उनको चाहिये था कि वे तरफोंमें पेश करते।

इसके साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे बहुत से उड़ीसा के भाई भी यह चाहते हैं कि उनको कुछ इलाके दे दिए जायें। इसके बारे में उन्होंने एक तरफोंम नम्बर १४४ दी है। आप उड़ीसा की असेम्बली की प्रोमीडिन्स (कार्यवाही) को देखिये, कहीं पर भी आपको इन चीजों का जिक्र नहीं मिलेगा। लेकिन यहां पर वे चाहते हैं कि इन इलाकों को उड़ीसा में मिला दिया जाए।

[सरदार ब० सि० महलज]

इसी तरह से बम्बई की लैजिस्लेचर की प्रोसी-
डिंस को धाप देखिये धापको उनमें भी कहीं
पर कोई चीज नहीं मिलेगी। अब यहां पर
इन तरमीमों का रखा जाना कि वाराणसी,
बालाघाट, सावनसर तालुका छिदवाड़ा डिस्ट्रि-
क्ट का, भैंसदेही तथा मुलताई ताल्लुके, बेतुल
डिस्ट्रिक्ट के इत्यादि, मध्य प्रदेश से निकाल
लिए जायें तथा किन्हीं दूसरे प्रान्त में मिला
दिए जायें, ठीक नहीं है। ऐसी कोई भी तरमीमें
उन प्रदेशों की श्रमसम्बन्धियों में पेश नहीं की
गई थी और इनका अब यहां पर पेश किया
जाना कोई अच्छी बात नहीं है और इनको पेश
कर वैमनस्य फैलाना ठीक नहीं है। मैं अब
से अर्ज करता हूँ कि काफी दिन तक हम लोग
साथ साथ रहे हैं और हमने एक साथ मिल कर
काम किया है और कंधे से कंधा मिला कर हम
आगे बढ़े हैं। इस चीज को देखते हुए भी अब
यहां पर किन्हीं तरह की गर्मी लाना उचित
नहीं है। इन चीजों से कोई फायदा नहीं होगा।
इस वास्ते मैं चाहता हूँ कि वे अपनी एम्डमेंट्स
को प्रेस न करें।

इन शब्दों के साथ जो तरमीमें यहां पर
पेश की गई हैं, उनका मैं विरोध करता हूँ।

Shri Gadlingana Gowd: Sir, after
hearing the speeches of several col-
leagues of mine, I was very much
anxiously waiting for the speech of
the hon. Home Minister. After I hear-
ed the speech of the Prime Minister I
thought the Government is going to
concede this just request of the Maha-
rashtrians by ordering the immediate
merger of Bombay with Maharashtra.
It is an utter disappointment to me
that the hon. Home Minister, though
he took a lot of time in replying to
the debate and devoted three-fourths
of his time to clarify the two points
raised by Shri C. D. Deshmukh, left
those two points unanswered in spite
of his clever and intelligent and well-
worded sentences.

The two points raised by him are
those relating to the creation of the

Andhra State and the position of
Bombay. The hon. Home Minister, if
I remember aright, said that the
principles and policy were laid down
in 1948 and the matter was not placed
before the Cabinet. Similarly, regard-
ing Bombay he said that the Bill was
placed before the Cabinet. Naturally,
one can understand that a Bill will
be drafted only after the decision has
been taken by somebody. So, that
means that at the time of taking the
decision, the Cabinet was not consult-
ed, and the two points which were
raised by Shri Deshmukh remain un-
answered. The hon. Minister's effort to
create the impression in the minds of
the people that every matter was being
conducted or decided in a democratic
manner is not successful. The people
are now aware that everything is
going on in a most undemocratic
manner though we are told that we
are being ruled under democratic
methods.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Mem-
ber may remember that he has only
a very limited time.

Shri Gadlingana Gowd: I am
aware of it and shall try to finish
within the time allotted to me.

I frankly submit that dictatorship is
going on in the name of democracy.

We have been agitating for the last
40 years or so for the formation of
these linguistic States. The Govern-
ment have now come before the House
with a Bill for the reorganisation of
States in linguistic basis. But I submit
that when States are being carved out
on a linguistic basis, I do not under-
stand why Punjab Suba and Hariana
Pranah should not be created. The
Government must stand on some
policy, which is definite and clear. If
they are going to carve out these
States on linguistic basis, let them do
so on that basis alone, either taking
village or taluk or district as the unit.
Let them not give some places to one
State on a linguistic basis. When they
do not want to give some places to

some States, they gave their second reason, administrative convenience, and in some cases, a third reason, the wishes of the people. I therefore, urge that one principle should be adopted in carving out the States, and on the basis of the linguistic principle, it may be either village or taluk or district as the unit.

Coming to Andhra, which is the State I represent, I thank the Government for bringing the two parts of Andhra together by creating Andhra Pradesh. Our State has some more claim on Kolar, Parlakimedi and Pavgada of Mysore State. I do not propose to stress my claims particularly, but I only wish to emphasise my claim on the basis of language. If there are any Kannada-speaking areas in Andhra State, I have absolutely no objection to their going away to Mysore.

The new State of Karnatak is going to be called the Greater Mysore. Karnatak has got its own culture for the last thousand years or so. I, therefore, submit that it should not be called Mysore, but it should be called Karnatak. In fact, some of my hon. friends from Mysore have also expressed their view in favour of this. Similarly, Madras should be called Tamil Nad. As you know, Dravida Kazhagam is the most important party in Madras State and its leader has expressed that the State should be called as Tamil Nad and not as Madras.

Coming to the question of protection of minorities, if only the Government would take some more trouble and see that these minorities are reduced as far as possible, taking contiguity into consideration, many problems will be solved. If the minorities are left in unilingual States, again new problems will be created, because they will have to be given education in their mother-tongue, and posts or appointments will have to be reserved for them in the services. Therefore, I submit that these minorities should be minimised as far as possible by applying a certain fixed policy. Of course, you cannot help pockets occurring in the middle of some States, for which some

safeguards are essential. I am glad that the Government is moving in the right direction so far as this problem is concerned.

Let me give you some statistics about this debate before I close. Till 4 P.M. yesterday, about 70 members of this Sabha took part in the debate on this Bill. According to my information, about 31 spoke in favour of Bombay being given to Maharashtra, and only 10 against Bombay going to Maharashtra. You say that Government is administering things on democratic methods. After hearing the 31 Members in favour of Bombay going to Maharashtra—out of 70, 31 were in favour, and 10 against—things are decided in this manner by Government. Still the Hon. Home Minister says that the Bombay should be centrally administered. I do not understand whether it is democracy or autocracy, and it is for you to kindly come to some conclusion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But both sides might not have been given equal opportunities to speak, but the blame might lie with the Chair.

Shri Gadilingana Gowd: Out of the 70 Members that spoke....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Still more can speak; that cannot be conclusive.

Shri Gadilingana Gowd: In that case if a free vote is given to Members, I am sure there will be a large majority in favour of Bombay going to Maharashtra. It is not too late even now, and Government may kindly think over the matter and see that things are amicably settled and that Bombay is given to Maharashtra.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I do not wish to entangle myself in any boundary question or any of the controversial issues which have been debated at sufficient length.

I propose an amendment which I want the hon. Home Minister to consider in all seriousness.

You will find that under the definition, as given in the Bill, of "sitting:

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

member", a whole area comprising of about 12½ million people will be denied the benefit of this definition—I mean the area which is now Travancore-Cochin and which will form a substantial part of the future Kerala State. We know that in Travancore-Cochin we are having what is called the President's rule. I am not going into the details of how we had it or the Government's case for having it. I want the Government now to consider what harm is there in allowing the members, who functioned as members of the Travancore-Cochin Assembly before it was dissolved by the President by the Proclamation, to function as members of the Assembly of Kerala State, which is to be constituted. At the time when we were discussing the President's Proclamation, the hon. Home Minister's argument was that if elections were held from October 1st, this year, we are likely to have new States and, therefore, another election will also have to be held. He does not apply the same argument to Andhra unfortunately. But I want the hon. Home Minister....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Unfortunately life can be knilled but cannot be restored.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: He is speaking about the Travancore-Cochin Assembly and revival of that Assembly, I think that the hon. Member's point may, be relevant when we take up for consideration clauses 30, 31, 32, etc., under the heading "The Legislative Assemblies" because those clauses deal with that question.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I am thankful to the hon. Member. Later on when we take up those provisions, and if the definitions which come earlier do not provide for this, then we will be forced to the necessity of coming back to the definitions and changing them.

This is the first place where we can introduce the amendment and on

its basis we can build up later amendments. Those clauses are not passed and amendments can still be given. But, that is not the point.

It was observed that one could only kill but not revive. You would have heard the Rama-Ravana struggle. People who had died have been resurrected by Sanjeevani. I am not going into that. The question is whether it is within the legislative competence of this House to have this amendment or not. There is nothing repugnant to the Constitution if we were to adopt this. It is very definitely provided. Under article 4 such amendments as the one that I have tabled are within the competence of this House. I may, with your permission, read article 4 of the Constitution:

"Any law referred to in article 2 or article 3 shall contain such provisions for the amendment of the First Schedule and the Fourth Schedule as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions of the law and may also contain....." mark the words, "...such supplemental, incidental and consequential provisions (including provisions as to representation in Parliament and in the Legislature or Legislatures of the State or States affected by such law) as Parliament may deem necessary."

So, I submit that it is very clearly specified that, if this House wants any law relating to representation of an area in an Assembly, it can be made the subject matter of legislation in this House. In view of the very clear provision in article 4, I do submit that it is within the competence of this House to pass this amendment. There is nothing repugnant to the Constitution, nor does it go against the sense of justice. We have enacted and given to ourselves this Constitution.

I put this very simple question. 372 million people will more or less have their aspirations satisfied on a given date which is very near. Something has happened in the State of Travancore-Cochin. I am not going into the details. The Home Minister gave us some details. But, I am sure that the Home Minister will also desire that the earlier the President's rule is done away with in that State, the better it is for that State. I am sure that he will give an assurance that the President's rule will not be extended in that State for one day, if possible. Have not the circumstances changed in that State? I ask them to consider. They made much of the figures that in the State Assembly there was no solid majority. But, take for instance, the State of Andhra. A part of the members of the future Andhra Pradesh Assembly would have been elected two years ago while the members from Hyderabad will face re-election. There are contradictions. In the case of Travancore-Cochin, why is it not possible for the Government to accept this amendment and say that those members who were functioning in the State Assembly before the President's rule may be deemed to be members for all purposes. After all this is only an interregnum and it cannot last for ever. There is bound to be general elections.

Shri Mohinddin: May I enquire whether the Proclamation made by the President dissolving an assembly can be revived legally?

Shri V. P. Nayar: I would very earnestly ask my friend to read the Constitution, especially article 356 under which the President has issued the Proclamation.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I admit that both have read it but interpret it differently.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I would like him to read it with a little more care. Under article 356 (1) the Proclamation has been issued. It is within the power of the President to revoke or

vary the Proclamation. He need not even come before the House. There is article 356 (2) which gives this power. In spite of the Proclamation for dissolution, there is nothing which fetters him to vary it. If the President by another Proclamation revokes the earlier Proclamation by which he has clamped down President's rule in Travancore-Cochin, it will restore the status quo. The question whether a dissolved assembly can be resurrected does not at all arise. The question is whether that dissolution can be treated to have effectively taken away the provision according to which the Parliament has supreme power to legislate and enact. I submit that this is not a very small matter. I would very much like the Home Minister or Shri Datar to consider why it could not be done.

We know how passions have run riot in this debate. There are one and a quarter million people for whom the States Reorganisation Bill, on the date it comes into effect, has no meaning at all. The Constitution has no meaning for them. We know and the people of Travancore-Cochin also know that the Constitution has this very good sentence:

"We, the People of India, having solemnly resolved to constitute India into a sovereign democratic Republic and to secure to all its citizens:

Justice, Social, economic and political;....."

Where is the political justice for the Travancore-Cochin people? Are we not entitled to be governed by our elected representatives till such time as the whole country faces a general election? What is the fault of people of that State? If a particular political party has not been able to have a solid majority, are the people to be penalised? It is all idle talk to say that it is not possible because there is a particular provision by which the President has dissolved. The President, left to himself, has no power to dissolve the Travancore-Cochin State Assembly. He has taken power from the Rajpramukh under article 356 (1).

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

and used against that Assembly, under the dictates, or, shall I say, the advice of the Central Home Ministry. Whatever it is, it is after all a technical matter and the aspirations of millions of people are involved. To them alone, among the 372 million people in India, the most fundamental right of being ruled by their own elected representatives is denied. I hope the hon. Member who interrupted me would consider whether it is not possible to have this state of affairs improved. I would request the hon. Minister to consider whether we are bound to stick to certain formalities which deprive them of the realisation of their aspirations when all the rest of India will be marching forward or whether it is possible to invoke the provisions by which we are competent to enact and prescribe any qualification. We are competent to have any arrangement made whereby for the time being, representation in the Assembly could be given. The position has changed. It is not as if it has been static ever since the Proclamation was clamped down. The Home Minister said: "Let us have the President's rule for some time. After all, on 1st of October you are having new States." We are not having it on 1st October. He said that we would have a healing balm and medicine and all that we have had. Now, the situation has changed. What doubt is there? In an Assembly of 118, there was no solid majority. Even Shri Datar will not contradict me that twelve out of the 118 are going to Madras. Why are you depriving them, why are you preventing them, these twelve members whose territories we give to Madras very willingly, from sitting in the Madras Assembly? Is it not unjust? Out of the remaining 106, we know the party position I do not want to go into that. We must understand that along with these 106 members, you will be getting thirty members from what is called the Malabar district of the Madras State. You know it is a question of very simple arithmetic. Out of these thirty, there are only four Congress members. If the

Government is not willing to accept the proposition, that is, the only reason for which it cannot accept. In a house of 136, there are only forty Congress members and it cannot, by any sort of coalition, run the administration. Even members here who do not represent Travancore-Cochin are getting telegrams. Why not we do it? Is it not possible to keep away certain technical matters and give to the people of Travancore-Cochin the most fundamental right to be ruled by the members whom they have elected?

2 P. M.

It may be argued that, once the House is dissolved, not even the President has power to revive it. I believe the President has power to revoke his Proclamation. But if it is construed that that will not restore the membership of those who have lost it by dissolution, I suggest that we must pass this amendment and other consequential amendments which may be required, so that when the new States are reorganised, when the people are beginning to reap the fruits of their struggle for freedom, the people about whose culture, about whose great culture the hon. Minister himself has great admiration, about whose high literacy he has nothing but praise, those people, the most literate people in the whole of India, should not be denied the opportunity to be ruled by their own representatives till such time that the country goes to the polls for the general elections.

Shri Achuthan (Cranganur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, yesterday you were kind enough to remark that those who did not get any chance to speak during the consideration stage of this measure can make use of this opportunity. My hon. friend Shri V. P. Nayar spoke on his amendment to give life to the members of the Travancore-Cochin dissolved Assembly.

Shri V. P. Nayar: The hon. Member does not want it?

Shri Achuthan: In fact you yourself remarked that to give life is an impossibility as far as human beings are concerned. When I saw this amendment, I in my humble way examined its legal and constitutional implications. I do not know how we can by an amendment of this nature to the States Reorganisation Bill revive that Assembly or give life to those Members who have already been "dismembered" of the Legislative Assembly by the President's Proclamation which has been ratified by this Parliament and under which the administration of that State has been carried on for the past few months. Moreover, under the provisions of this Bill when Malabar is going to be tacked on to Travancore-Cochin State the Members of that district in the Madras Assembly for no fault of theirs will lose their membership. Necessarily they have to suffer. What else can be done? There can be only one argument and that argument was raised when the President's Proclamation was discussed in detail here, not only with reference to the members of the Travancore-Cochin Assembly but also with reference to the members of the Madras Assembly. This matter is now being raised simply as a phantom which can be made use of in connection with the coming elections. Even if we give life to those members and the Malabar members also come in, it may not be possible for a Ministry to be formed till the general elections are over and a party with a majority comes into power.

My hon. friend was referring to the reaping of the harvest or emancipation by the people. I am not able to follow what exactly he meant. In fact, after independence we are doing many things to enable the people to reap the harvest of freedom. I would say that in my opinion the reorganisation of the States is a very minor thing; the major thing is economic reconstruction. For the purpose of placating the poor people there, Mr. V. P. Nayar may perhaps say that linguistic reorganisation is the be all and end all of our life. I disagree with him. For the last few days we have

seen the heat that was generated in this House.

Coming to my State of Kerala, let me take up the amendment of Mr. Shiva Rao. That matter has been argued by one of the colleagues from my State. Rao has moved an amendment which has no basis whatsoever, linguistic, geographical, or the size of the State, and cannot be agreed to. In the region which is north of Chandragiri river the Kannada population is less than 9 per cent, even conceding that they have got contiguity. How can he bring forward and sustain an amendment saying that that area should go to Karnatak? The area of the Karnatak State is more than 50,000 square miles. How can that State say that this taluk which legitimately should go to Kerala must be disconnected from that region and must go to Karnatak. That a man of his position who has got some international stature for himself and his family has brought forward such an amendment is curious.

Then I find that Shri Nesanony has sent some amendments, about which he spoke during the consideration stage of this Bill. He said that the Commission had observed that the Shencottah taluk should go to Madras. There also before the Bill was drafted representatives of both the States were consulted by the Governments and they said that that portion jutting on the west side must go to Kerala State. Then President's rule was proclaimed in Travancore-Cochin. Under President's rule no party has any say; everybody is the same in the eyes of the Adviser. So the revenue officials of the Travancore-Cochin and the representatives of the Madras examined the matter and after due consideration they agreed that some smaller portions should also go to the western side which will form a part of Kerala. The Joint Committee have stated the matter very clearly in para 13 of their report—

"The Committee have been informed that the Government of Travancore-Cochin have formally transferred the portion of the

[Shri Achuthan]

Shencottah taluk lying to the west of the watershed line to another taluk of the Quilon district as from the 1st July 1956, and it has been agreed between that Government and the Government of Madras that the territory to be transferred from Travancore-Cochin to Madras may now be described simply as Shencottah taluk."

No complaint can be made against it because the revenue officers of the Travancore-Cochin State and the representatives of the Madras Government had agreed that the area lying to the west of the watershed must go to Travancore-Cochin and the area to the east should go to Tirunelveli. So his amendment does not stand. Mr. Nesamony has brought another amendment about Devicolam. This matter was discussed and all arguments for and against made during the discussion at the consideration stage of this Bill. My point is that the time has come when we should not bother about these things.

I have one word to say about the linguistic minorities. There must be provision made in this Bill by which if at all there are some linguistic minorities they must feel safe that nothing wrong would happen to them, and their culture, their language, the education of their children will be safeguarded. Moreover, you have shown by your sagacity in Punjab how even though there may be distinction with regard to language and with regard to other matters, in the national interest all these matters should go to the background. The Akali Dal has shown that it is not an organisation meant only for the development of a community, but gradually it must make itself an organisation for the development of India that is ours. We consider you as one of the topmost leaders of that organisation, one of the few level-headed great grand leaders of this land. You should give that kind of advice to the Akali Dal.

Sir, with regard to Kerala we are not going to bargain for an inch more that is not within our province. You were also of the same view. With regard to other matters concerning the number of members of the Legislative Assembly and the House of the People, when the appropriate time comes that question can be discussed. On the whole, the Bill as it is, I think is acceptable. Practically all the provisions are acceptable to us. Even though there had been heat here with regard to Bombay and Punjab, the time has come when things should cool down and we must consider how this can be passed as early as possible so that at least by October or November the new States may come into being and we may face the general elections with a view to see that this country marches further and further, from greatness to greatness.

Shri Shankargauda Patil: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity, since I had no opportunity to open my mouth during all the stages of the discussion over this Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now he can open his heart as well.

Shri Shankargauda Patil: Sir, the Maharashtrian friends have moved some amendments in regard to Belgaum City, Khanapur, some villages in the Chikodi taluk, Nipani town and some three talukas of North Kanara. Their main demand for adding these areas to Maharashtra is on the basis of language. It will be noticed that nowhere in these parts are the Marathi-speaking people in an overwhelming majority. In Khanapur we have got only 53 per cent. Maharashtrians, in Belgaum Taluk 60 per cent. and in the city 50 per cent. while in Chikodi taluka and other talukas they are in a minority. Even these figures are not as correct as to be accepted. Out of the 78 enumerators of Belgaum, Bombay 72 were Maharashtrians and they worked with

a Marathi bias. A complaint was made and Mr. Bowman, who was the man in authority, had to run down to Belgaum. His decision on that is well-known as the Bowman Award. According to that these figures are not to be accepted as final.

Now, it may be noted that politically these parts have always been in the Belgaum district and never formed part of Maharashtra. These were, including the Belgaum City, formerly in Bellary district in the Madras Presidency. Afterwards when it was taken over from Madras Presidency and tagged on to Bombay Presidency; these parts formed part of Dharwar district. Lastly they came to Belgaum district with Belgaum as district headquarters. The Congress and other major political parties have also accepted Belgaum as headquarters of Belgaum district and that this comes within the Congress Province of Karnatak. The Karnatak Congress Session was held in Belgaum and nobody objected at that time. The Maharashtraian leaders like Shri N. C. Kelkar, Shri P. V. Kane and others have in a statement admitted Belgaum as part of Karnatak. I now think it worthwhile to place before this House one statement issued by the Maharashtraian leaders at the time when the Marathi Literary Conference was called in Belgaum. A resolution was brought forward by some persons and as it was objected to by some Kannadigars, the Maharashtra leaders had issued a statement which is as follow:

"Our purpose was only to concentrate attention upon, and to clinch the fact that the Belgaum District has been so long, and is at present a district in the Karnatak Province—a fact borne out both by the British Government treating the Belgaum District as an administrative unit and by the Congress including it, by the common consent of both Maharashtra and Karnatak people within the territorial

jurisdiction of the Karnatak Provincial Congress Committee. A clear statement of this position was necessary by reason of the misunderstandings and prejudices created on the eve of the Marathi Literary Conference being held at Belgaum and it was in our view perfectly relevant to the affairs of the said Conference, because the Conference must concern itself with the position and prospectus of the Marathi language as well as relation to other languages. We therefore regard it as unfortunate that the President took the view that clause (1) of our resolution was out of order."

The subsequent portion is not so much relevant and so I am not reading it. This statement was issued—by Shri N. C. Kalkar, P. V. Kane and the Belgaum Maharashtraian leaders and this statement bears the signature of those people. That makes the position clear and the claim now advanced by the Maharashtraians, as it can be seen, is of very recent origin.

Now, administratively Belgaum is the headquarters of the Belgaum district and the Karnatak region of the Bombay State. It has developed on that line. There are 94 district and divisional buildings worth about Rs. 2 crores. If Belgaum town is disintegrated, it will be reduced to a small town and there will be no other headquarter left for the district or the division.

Commercially also we have considered this aspect. Commercially it is connected with the remaining parts of Karnatak and is the transit centre of Karnatak trade. It gets its food supplies and other material from Karnatak area. It has no particular economic affiliations with Maharashtra so as to take it from Karnatak area and tag it on to Maharashtra

Educationally and culturally also Belgaum is the centre of Karnatak.

[Shri Shankargauda Patil.]

The educational institutions in the town, namely the Karnatak L.E. Society, the Karnatak Law Society, the Commerce College, and the Kannada Training Colleges are established to cater to the needs of Karnatak and have invested several lakhs.

Then there is the well-known geographical factor. Geographically also Belgaum town and the other parts now claimed by Maharashtra are closely knit with Karnatak area on three sides. It is only on one side that it touches Maharashtra. The most important point on which the S.R. Commission has given much stress is what is known as the development of the Malenad tract, Belgaum and other parts claimed by Maharashtra. They form part of the Malenad tract of Karnatak. It extends into the interior of Mysore and the Government have got a special scheme to develop this tract. It has been neglected so far and with a view to have proper development and progress of this area, Belgaum and other parts have been included and the Commission have rightly done so.

Now it may also be noted that the Kannada people and the other minorities of the Belgaum town who come to roughly 50 per cent. have pleaded before the Commission, before the Government and before Congress Sub-Committee that it should go with Karnatak and that Belgaum should form the headquarters of Belgaum district. They had given all the evidence required to show that this part should go to Karnatak. From all these points of view I hope the House will realise that these parts included in Karnatak and Belgaum district as recommended by the SRC, approved by the Government and later on approved by the Joint Committee, should not be disturbed by this hon. House.

Then coming to North Kanara district, only three talukas are claimed

by the Maharashtrians. They are Karwar, Supa and Halyal. Here also the House will see that except in Halyal, in the other two talukas the predominant language is Kanarese and next to that comes Konkani. It has been discovered with convenience by the Maharashtrians that this Konkani language is either a product of Marathi or is very akin to Marathi. Therefore, they say it should be considered as Marathi-speaking area and joined to Maharashtra. This demand was even made by the hon. Shri C. D. Deshmukh. I am not a scholar of languages and therefore, cannot meet his assertions on that level. But I am in a position to place before this House some material of significance which will enlighten the House on this point.

I shall now quote from page 329, Section II, Chapter X of Census of India, 1931—Volume VIII, Part I—Bombay Presidency, General Report. The extract reads thus:

“Konkani is properly the language spoken in Goa and in parts of the Western Littoral. It is considered by scholars to be derived, not from Marathi, but separately and earlier from another Prakrit. It varies with the kind of speaker; high-class Goanese speak it with Portuguese words, Kanara Mussalmans with Urdu and Arabic words, and Chitpawan Brahmans with Sanskrit words.”

Secondly, I shall quote the resolution passed in the 3rd Konkani Conference held at Cowasji Jehangir Hall, Bombay, in 1942. It reads as follows:

“This Conference resolves to request the Chief Census Authorities of India to declare that the Konkani language is an independent language and not a dialect of Marathi language. This was considered as an independent language

age in the Census held prior to 1941. It should also be considered as an independent language in the Census of 1941 also."

Thirdly, I shall quote from the memorandum submitted to the States Reorganisation Commission by the Konkani Institute of Arts and Science, Bombay. It says:

"The language of the Konkani is Konkani which is an independent form of Indo-Aryan speech evolved by the fusion of the Magadhan Prakrit with the particular form of Dravidian speech spoken in the Konkani during the Mauryan rule."

I submit that this material will enlighten the House on the point that Konkani need not, for the purpose of reorganisation, be considered as part of Marathi.

There is another angle from which we will have to approach this problem in the context of this reorganisation. In the light of the reorganisation of the States, there is an opportunity afforded to all the linguistic groups or the cultural groups to come within one State or at least to form an integrated unit under one administration. The whole of the Kanara district was formerly part of Bombay Presidency. The British Government divided it into North and South Kanara and South Kanara was added on to the Madras Presidency and North Kanara was retained in the Bombay Presidency. Before the British effected this change, the whole district formed one single unit. When we are now given an opportunity to readjust things, when there is a chance of rational distribution of those parts, why not allow the Konkani people to have one unit and one administration so as to form one integrated unit, so that they may have an opportunity to advance culturally and progress in every direction? Therefore, from that point of view also, it should form a separate unit, and there is no special

reason why two groups of people belonging to the same area, namely, Konkani, should be separated.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How long will the hon. Member go on?

Shri Shaakarganda Patil: I shall finish in two minutes.

So far as South Sholapur, Jath, Akkalkot etc., are concerned, they should become part of the Mysore State, but they have now been given to Maharashtra. There is also an amendment given by me to this effect. My only point with regard to these areas is that they have not been finally included in any district in Maharashtra. In 1948, when the native States merged with the adjoining provinces, as a stop-gap arrangement, the British authorities transferred certain areas, in order to create certain new districts, to Bombay. In those taluks, the Kannada-speaking people are in a majority, and those people have a strong desire to go with Karnataka. From the statement made by some Congress and other leaders of Maharashtra, it seems, at least apparently, that they are not very keen to retain those parts. The demand of the people there is that these areas should go to Karnataka. The leaders seem to feel that they may go to Karnataka but that in exchange they should get some other areas from Karnataka. Whether we are willing to accede to it or not, whether it is a good principle to be adopted or not, is a different thing. But from what they have said, it seems very clear that they feel that it is not necessary to retain these areas in Maharashtra. They are not very keen about it. So, when the people want to go to Karnataka, it is my submission that those parts should be taken away from Maharashtra and be included in Karnataka.

सरदार रा० बा० सि० तिवारी (रिवा) :
घापने मुझे जो बोलने का अवसर दिया है उसके लिए मैं आपको कन्ववाद देता हूँ।

[सरदार रा० भा० सिंह त्रिपौरा]

मैं कोई नई चीज नहीं कहना चाहता और जो कुछ मैं पहले कह चुका हूँ, उसी को दोहराऊँगा। मेरे दो फिस्म के एमडमेंट (संशोधन) हैं। मेरी पहली तरमीम तो यह है कि मेरे प्रान्त को भलग ही रहने दिया जाए। मेरा प्रान्त जिस को कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश के नाम से पुकारा जाता है, एक बहुत ही पिछड़ा हुआ है और अब इसको मध्य प्रदेश में मिलाया जा रहा है जो कि खुद भी एक पिछड़ा हुआ प्रदेश है। वह इतना बड़ा प्रदेश बन जाएगा कि अगर आप उसको एक अरब रुपया सालाना ५० बरस तक भी यहां से दें, तो भी उसका डिवेलपमेंट (विकास) नहीं हो सकेगा। ऐसी हालत में उसके साथ विन्ध्य प्रदेश को मिलाने की बात सोचना और फिर इसके डिवेलपमेंट की बात सोचना एक भूल है। इसके अलावा जिस तरह से नए मध्य प्रदेश के आर्गनाइजेशन की डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन (वितरण) हो रही है, उससे साफ़ जाहिर है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश के साथ स्टेप मदरली ट्रीटमेंट (सौतेली मां का सा व्यवहार) अभी से होना शुरू हो गया है और उसको डिसेम्बरमेंट विभाजित करने की कोशिश की जा रही है। ऐसी हालत में विन्ध्य प्रदेश को प्रस्तावित मध्य प्रदेश में कोई इंसाफ़ पाने की उम्मीद नहीं हो सकती। यही कारण है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश के लोग प्रस्तावित मध्य प्रदेश में मिलना नहीं चाहते। विन्ध्य प्रदेश में जितनी भी पोलिटिकल पार्टियाँ (राजनैतिक दल) हैं, जैसे कांग्रेस है, सोशलिस्ट पार्टी (समाजवादी दल) है, राम राज्य परिषद् है, जन संघ इत्यादि हैं, उन सब ने एक मत होकर यह राय बाहिर की है, कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश को इसी तरह से कायम रहने दिया जाए। जब आप छोटे-छोटे प्रदेश बना रहे हैं जैसे कि केरला है, हिमाचल प्रदेश है, तो आप विन्ध्य प्रदेश को एक भलग इकाई के रूप में क्यों नहीं रख सकते। जब आप यह कहते हैं कि हिमाचल प्रदेश के लोग पंजाब के साथ नहीं मिलना चाहते, इस लिए हिमाचल को भलग रखा जा रहा है, तो फिर आप विन्ध्य प्रदेश के साथ भी वही

समूह क्यों नहीं करते और उसको भी एक भलग इकाई के रूप में बने क्यों नहीं रहने देते, जबकि वहां के लोगों की भी वही इच्छा है।

दूसरी तरमीम मेरी यह है कि अगर उसको भलग नहीं रखा जा सकता तो उसको उत्तर प्रदेश में मिला दिया जाए। उत्तर प्रदेश में रेहन बांध, माताटीला बांध बन रहे हैं और उनसे फायदा अभी से पहुंचना शुरू हो गया है यदि हम को भी उत्तर प्रदेश में मिला दिया गया तो हम भी इन बांधों से लाभ उठा सकेंगे। इसके अलावा उत्तर प्रदेश एक ऐसा प्रदेश है जिसमें कि सनिच पदार्थ नहीं हैं और चूंकि विन्ध्य प्रदेश में काफी सनिच पदार्थ हैं, इस वास्ते वह अपनी तरफ से ही हमारे इलाके का डिवेलपमेंट शुरू करेगा। ऐसी हालत में हम लोग यह चाहते हैं कि मध्य प्रदेश में हम मिलाने के बजाये उत्तर प्रदेश में ही हम को मिला दिया जाय। सिलैक्ट कमेटी (प्रवर समिति) में केप्टेन भावदेश प्रताप सिंह जी ने जो कि राज्य सभा के एक मੈम्बर हैं, इस भाषण की एक यह तरमीम पेश की थी, जिस को कि भाउट आफ आर्डर (नियम विरुद्ध) करार दे दिया गया था। यह बात जरूरी नहीं है कि सिलैक्ट कमेटी में यदि एक चीज को भाउट आफ आर्डर करार दे दिया जाता है तो उस चीज को मानने के लिए यह हाउस बाध्य है। यहां पर इस तरह की तरमीम पेश की जा सकती है और अगर आप समझते हैं कि यहां भी यह भाउट आफ आर्डर होगी तो मैं होम मिनिस्टर साहब से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि जिस तरह उन्होंने यहां पर बिहार और बंगाल के बारे में एक बिच पेश किया था उसी तरह का एक नया बिच विन्ध्य प्रदेश के बारे में भी पेश करें। इस तरह से भी हम को उत्तर प्रदेश के साथ मिलाया जा सकता है।

श्री अटकर (बुलढाना-झकोला रजिस्ट्रेशन-अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय,

घापने जो मौका मुझे अपने विचार प्रवृत्त करने का दिया है, उसके लिए मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

मैं कुछ शब्द महाराष्ट्र के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र में मिलाने का सवाल जब से यह रिपोर्ट प्रकाशित हुई है, चर्चा का विषय बना रहा है लेकिन उसका कोई संतोषजनक हल नहीं ढूँढा जा सका है। मेरा खयाल है कि इस सवाल को पेश हुए करीब करीब नौ महीने हो गए हैं। जिस तरह से इसका फैसला होना चाहिये या उस तरह से नहीं हुआ है। आज महाराष्ट्र में कोने कोने से यह धावाब उठ रही है कि बम्बई महाराष्ट्र को न देकर घापने धन्याय किया है। घाप किसी भी देहात में चले जायें, घापको यही सुनने को मिलेगा कि महाराष्ट्र के साथ धन्याय हुआ है। घापने यह भी देखा होगा कि महाराष्ट्र के पुरुषों, स्त्रियों और बच्चों ने यहां भी महाराष्ट्र और बम्बई के सम्बन्ध में अपनी मांगें रखीं और जो कुछ कहना था, वह कहा।

हमारे नेता, प्राइम मिनिस्टर महोदय, (प्रधान मंत्री) ने यह तो माना है कि बम्बई महाराष्ट्र का भाग है, लेकिन कहा है कि वह पांच साल के बाद महाराष्ट्र को दिया जायेगा। मराठी में कहते हैं : हिशोब कबूल तफ़्सील ना कबूल अर्थात् हिसाब तो ठीक है, बराबर है, लेकिन डोटेल्य (ब्यूरा) ठीक नहीं है और मंजूर नहीं है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि जब बम्बई महाराष्ट्र का है, इस तथ्य को सब स्वीकार करते हैं, तो फिर उस को महाराष्ट्र को देने में क्या रुकावट है और क्या हर्ज है।

इसके अतिरिक्त मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि महाराष्ट्र के कई टुकड़े कर दिए गए हैं। उस के कुछ गांव घेटर बम्बई में हैं। कुछ पोशन (भाग) तेलंगाना को दिया गया है और कुछ भाग मध्य प्रदेश को दे दिया गया है। उसको कई प्रदेशों में बांट दिया गया है। नए मध्य प्रदेश को बहुत इलाका मिला गया है—उसको सबसे ज्यादा इलाका मिला गया है।

हमारे सहलग साहब ने कहा कि महाराष्ट्र वाले कुछ क्षेत्रों को अपने में मिलाने के लिए अमेंडमेंट (संशोधन) लाए हैं और उन्होंने उसका विरोध किया। लेकिन उन्होंने अपने पक्ष में कोई फ़िगर (आंकड़े) पेश नहीं कीं। मैं इस सदन के सामने कुछ फ़िगर रखना चाहता हूँ।

बरहानपुर में मराठी बोलने वालों की तादाद ७१,२७४ है और हिन्दी बोलने वालों की तादाद २८,२५७ है। सोनसर ५ मराठी बोलने वालों की तादाद ८७,३३२ है और हिन्दी बोलने वालों की तादाद ३४,४१४ है। यह तादाद छिदवाड़ा तालुका की है।

श्री रायचन्ध भाई झाह (छिदवाड़ा) : कुल धावादी कितनी है ?

श्री अटकर : उस का यहां पर सवाल नहीं है। यहां पर साढ़े चार लाख मराठी बोलने वाले हैं। मेरा कहना केवल यही है कि जो मराठी भाषी भाग हैं, वे तो महाराष्ट्र को मिलने चाहिए। लेकिन ज्ञात होता है कि यहां पर इस सिद्धान्त पर कार्य किया जा रहा है कि

माझे ते माझे तुझे ते ही माझे च

अर्थात् जो मेरा है, वह तो मेरा है ही और जो तुम्हारा है, वह भी मेरा है।

उन्होंने बताया कि मध्य प्रदेश असेम्बली में यह बात क्यों नहीं रखी गई। मेरा कहना यह है कि जिस की लाठी होती है, उसी की मंस होती है।

बम्बई के बारे में हमारे नेता ने कहा है कि करीब करीब पांच वर्ष तक बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र में नहीं मिलया जा सकता है और कारण यह बताया है कि इतने समय में लोगों के दिल साफ़ हो जायेंगे। मेरा कहना यह है कि जहां दर्द हुआ है, वहां दवाई जल्दी से जल्दी दी जानी चाहिए। अगर न दी गई, तो उसके परिणाम अच्छे न होंगे—खराब होंगे। इस लिए मैं ने और श्री के० जी० देसमुख ने यह अमेंडमेंट रखी है कि

[श्री मटकर]

"The Central Government may, however, by notification in the Official Gazette, merge the above State of Bombay into the State of Maharashtra at any time but not later than two years from the appointed day and place this notification before the Lok Sabha at its next session."

मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि अगर गवर्नमेंट ने यह प्रपोज़िशन एक्सेप्ट करली, तो महाराष्ट्र के लोगों की बेचैनी और चिन्ता दूर हो जायगी।

अन्त में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक बाउंडरीज (सीमाओं) के बारे में निश्चय करने के लिए कोई बाउंडरी कमिशन (सीमा आयोग) नहीं बनेगा, तब तक मराठी बोलने वालों के साथ न्याय नहीं होगा। बाउंडरी का सला या तो बाउंडरी कमिशन द्वारा होना चाहिए और या थारबिडेशन (मध्यस्थता) के द्वारा होना चाहिए। अगर गवर्नमेंट मेरी प्रपोज़िशन को मंजूर कर लेगी, तो महाराष्ट्र के लोगों में प्रानन्द फैल जायगा।

Shri Telikar: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I have proposed some amendments relating to clauses 3, 7 and 9 that deal with the formation of Andhra, Mysore and Telengana. In these amendments I have suggested that some portions have to be excluded from one State and included in another State. Whether these portions belong to one State or the other has to be decided on the basis of population. I am not going to take the time of the House in giving those figures here. In short I may say that, on the basis of population, the revenue circles that I have suggested here should be included in Maharashtra. I am sure we cannot decide this question here and now; because, there will be other arguments. We are not going to decide on the basis of population here. Taking into consideration this aspect of the problem, I have suggested one amendment to clause 15 which demands a boundary commission. That boundary commission should decide the border issues

enunciating some principles. If a principle is not there, if you try to negotiate as was said yesterday by the hon. Home Minister, nobody would agree, and no negotiations would be successful. Therefore, we should enunciate some principles like those I have pointed out, namely, contiguity of the disputed area, linguistic, historical and cultural relations, economic affinities, wishes of the people, administrative convenience, interests of the tribes etc. We should try as much as possible to minimise the discontent of the people. If we can accommodate them in the areas which they want to join, there will be less of discontent. I have also suggested that a revenue village should be considered as the unit if necessary.

These are all minor questions of adjustment. There is one major hurdle, the problem of Bombay City. Before speaking on my amendments in this connection, I must say that we must decide the issue on its merits. Sir, it is no use attributing motives to anybody. After all it is a matter of inference and it is difficult to read the minds of others and find out what exactly they think. This is a solitary example of distinction, something different from the others. The reason given is that it is a cosmopolitan city, but in Hyderabad the Andhras are not more than 30 per cent. while the Mohammedans are 51 per cent., the rest comprising Marathas, Kannadigas etc. It has been given to Andhra. In Bombay the Maharashtrians form 43 per cent. and Gujaratis are only 14 per cent. They say it is for the sake of these Gujaratis, because of the possibility of discontent among this 14 per cent., that the city is to be centrally administered. This does not apply to Hyderabad. So, no special reasons can be given. So far as I know, there is no demand on the part of any other community in Bombay. Nobody has asked that the city should be centrally administered, but we find the Gujaratis insisting on Bombay being centrally administered. They have got their own State of Maha Gujarat. and

they are not going to get this city for their State. If at all, they are interested they are interested only in depriving Maharashtra of this great city which is the only port and source of commerce and industry.

It is said that Maharashtrians have lost their case because of the violent activities and other happenings in Bombay City itself, but I am at a loss to understand why there should be so much value attached to it. As a lawyer I know of cases where sometimes a lawyer provokes the magistrate or the judge and uses abusive language, as a result of which the case is decided against his client, but we praise only those judges or magistrates who decide the cases only on merit in spite of the provocation from the lawyer. Similarly, some thousands of people living in Bombay might have indulged in violent activities, but should the three crores of people in Maharashtra, who are waiting for a just decision, be punished for this? You may punish or find fault with those who are guilty, but not the others for no fault of theirs. That would be wrong. Let not our leaders think of their prestige or the steps they have to retrace. Let them decide on the merits of the case alone. By that their prestige and the prestige of the country will be enhanced not only in the eyes of the Maharashtrians, but the world as a whole.

At page 5 in line 24 there is a mistake. Instead of the present line, it should read:

“(b) Aurangabad, Parbhani, Bhir and Osmanabad districts.”

A correction has also been issued along with the Bill, but some Members might not have seen it. In view of the correction, I do not think I need press my amendment to this effect.

In Bhalki and Hulsur circles of Bhalki taluk, Aurad and Torna circles of Santpur (Aurad) taluk and Ladwanti circle of Humnabad taluk, the majority of the people are Marathi-speaking and these areas should be included in Maharashtra. Again, in Adilabad District there are some

areas: Uttoor taluk, Bels circle of Adilabad taluk, Ada and Wakadi circles of Asafabad taluk of Adilabad district—these are tribal areas and the people here speak Marathi language. It is their wish that they should join Marathwada. These areas may also be included.

And now.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: And now the hon. Member should conclude.

Shri Telkikar: All right, I have done.

Shri Raghbir Sahai: With your permission, I want to read out my amendment 149 to clause 8 which runs, thus:

Page 5, after line 15, add:

“Provided that after a lapse of five years from the date of inauguration of the State of Bombay as contemplated above, this decision may be reviewed.”

We have heard very passionate speeches on this subject in this august House during the last few days. My object in moving this amendment is not to give any advice to my friends from Maharashtra, because, I have no such pretensions to give any advice to anybody, but only in the discharge of a public duty I have thought it proper to move this amendment.

There is no secret about the feelings of the Maharashtrian people regarding this question, and I do not want to minimise the strength of those feelings. Even the Prime Minister and the hon. Home Minister have realised the gravity of the situation and they have conceded that the feelings of the Maharashtra people are very strong on this point. The only consideration that weighed with me in moving this amendment is this. I want to make this submission before this House that it is not only the strong feelings that should be the deciding factors or determining factors on such a complicated and intricate political question as this, but there are many other factors also to be taken into consideration.

[Shri Raghbir Sahai]

In this controversy, several hon. Members have quoted the examples of Calcutta and Madras, and just a little while ago, one hon. Member quoted the case of Hyderabad. With very great respect to all these hon. Members, I would submit that all these examples are beside the point, for, even in the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission, it has been said that so far as Calcutta and Madras are concerned, they bear no comparison to Bombay, because in both these cities, the majority community is about two-thirds. There is one other reason also. It is true that Calcutta is a metropolitan city, Madras is a metropolitan city and in the same way, Bombay also is a metropolitan city. But the cities of Calcutta and Madras, or Hyderabad for that matter, have not been the subject of enquiries by independent commissions and committees.

In the case of Bombay, we see that the Dar Commission, the JVP Committee, and even the States Reorganisation Commission have given definite findings on this question, namely that Bombay should not go to a unilingual State. I do not want to go into the various reasons. I know that the Maharashtrian friends do not agree to those reasons; it is quite open to them not to agree. But it is also clear that there are many people in this House and there are many people outside, who agree with them or are prepared to attach very great importance to the findings of these commissions and committees. After all, they were very able persons. Some of them are Members of this House and of the other House. Before them, all points of view were put forward, and after considering all of them, they have come to these conclusions. So, those conclusions cannot be brushed aside.

Shri R. S. Diwan: One of the members of these commissions, particularly of the JVP Committee, namely, our Prime Minister, said yesterday, 'What would happen if Bombay goes to Maharashtra? I do not understand'.

He himself has said that. Could the hon. Member explain that?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let the hon. Member go on in his own way.

Shri Raghbir Sahai: I am not going to put any interpretation on what the Home Minister or the Prime Minister has said. I am giving only my own point of view.

Everyone knows that after all these findings, and after the original Bill came before this House, there were exhibitions of violence in Bombay. It is really very sad that such exhibitions took place. The fact of the matter is that when violence took place there, not only the entire country but the entire world has taken notice of it. I do not want to allocate blame to this party or that party. But the fact remains that there were exhibitions of violence. If, after these exhibitions of violence, Government concede this claim asserted by friends from Maharashtra, that Bombay should go to Maharashtra, then will it not be said by all the people here and by the entire world that what could not be achieved by arguments has been achieved by a show of violence? That will be setting a very dangerous precedent. That is my strongest argument; simply because this impression should not be created either in the country or outside, the decision on this question should be postponed for some time. As everybody knows our international reputation has gone very high. And for what reasons has it gone high? It has gone high, not because of our military strength, not because of our industrial production, not because of our production of heavy machines, but because we are putting forward certain moral principles, we are making certain professions, and we are trying to act up to them. The entire world is enamoured of Panch Shila. Our Prime Minister goes about, talks to people and advises them that they should settle their disputes by mutual consultation. Coming nearer home, are we to decide important questions by violence? That will be

indeed tragic. If Panch Shila is a noble principle, it should be applied in our own home first. It is only on that consideration that I would tell my hon. friends here that this question should no more be agitated, but the advice of the Home Minister as well as the Prime Minister should be accepted.

My last argument would be that a period of five years is not a very big period, especially in the life of a nation or in the life of a country. It is a very small period. We took full thirty years to win Swaraj. It was for the first time, in the Lucknow Congress, if I remember aright, in 1916, that a resolution was passed by the Indian National Congress, pressing for self-government. It was in 1947 that our dream was realised. So, it took nearly thirty or thirty-one years. Can my friends from Maharashtra not wait for five years to obtain Bombay as a part of Maharashtra? They come from a State which has produced Lokmanya Tilak, of whom the entire country is proud. What does his life show? If we have learnt anything from his life, it is infinite patience, perseverance, tolerance and restraint.

Shri Sivamurthi Swami (Kushtagi): Fight for the right.

Shri Raghubir Sahai: Will it be proper for friends from Maharashtra to be precipitate in this matter or rash in this matter, guided by their emotions and passions? We know their feelings. We respect those feelings. We honour those feelings.

As one coming from Uttar Pradesh, I am supposed to be possessing a detached outlook. I am not a Gujarati, I am not a Maharashtrian, and therefore, I can speak with a certain amount of detachment. If my friends can appreciate that I can speak with some amount of detachment.

3 P.M.

Do not agitate on this question for five years. Try to win over the

minorities who are living in the city of Bombay. After five years, pass a unanimous resolution from every quarter that Bombay should go to Maharashtra. The entire country will be happy to see that Bombay becomes a part of Maharashtra.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The following further amendments to clauses 2 to 15 of the States Reorganisation Bill have been indicated by Members to be moved subject to their being otherwise admissible.

Clause No.	Name of Amendment
3	452.
5	116, 456.
6	275.
7	276, 457 (same as 12), 384 (same as 43), 385 (same as 134), 386 (same as 135), 387 (same as 44), 458, 117, 459, 460, 461.
8	388 (same as 45), 438, 277, 430 (same as 46), 431 (same as 47), 262, 439.
9	392, 393 (same as 50), 223, 432 (same as 395), 2, 224, 433, 225, 264, 434 (same as 378), 435 (same as 379).
13A (New).	295, 335, 360.
14	361, 362, 436.
15A (New).	402 (same as 154), 403 (same as 155), 228.

Clause 3.—(Transfer of territory from Hyderabad to Andhra etc.)

Shri Mohiuddin: I beg to move:

Page 3, line 15—

after "Gadwal taluks" insert:

"and revenue circles of Chandrabandi, Raichur and Yorgiri".

Clause 5.—(Formation of Kerala State.)

Shri B. Shiva Rao: I beg to move.

Page 4—

for line 12, substitute:

“(ii) the portion of Kasaragod taluk of South Kanara district situated to the south of the Chandargiri river and its northern tributary the Payaswani river;”

Shri Sivamurthi Swami: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 12—

after “Kasaragod taluk” insert:

“except the part north of Chandargiri River.”

Clause 6.—(Laccadive, Minicoy etc.)

Shri R. D. Misra: I beg to move:

Page 4, lines 18 and 19—

for “a new Part C State” substitute: “a Union Territory”

Clause 7.—(Formation of new Mysore State)

Shri R. D. Misra: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 25,—

omit “Part A”

Shri Sivamurthi Swami: My amendment No. 457 is the same as the amendment No. 12 moved by Shri K. K. Basu.

Shri Bhatkar: My amendments Nos. 384 to 387 are the same as Nos. 43, 134, 135 and 44 moved by Shri S. S. More and Shri V. P. Pawar.

Shri Sivamurthi Swami: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 29—

after “Kanara districts” insert:

“Sholapur city, South Sholapur taluka, Akkalkot taluka in Sholapur district and Jath taluka in South Satara district.”

Shri B. Shiva Rao: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 35—

for “South Kanara district except

Kasaragod taluk” substitute:

“South Kanara district except the portion of Kasaragod taluk situated to the South of the Chandargiri river and its northern tributary the Payaswani river.”

Shri Sivamurthi Swami: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 35—

after “Kasaragod taluk” insert:

“South of Chandargiri River”

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 36—

after “Amindivi Islands,” insert:

“Madakasira taluk of Anantapur district and Thalavadi firka”

Shri Sivamurthi Swami: I beg to move:

Page 4—

after line 38, add:

“(f) Madakasira taluk in Anantapur district and Adoni, Alur and Raydurga except Telugu majority firkas in Andhra State 1951 census;”

Clause 8.—(Bombay.)

Shri Bhatkar: My amendment No. 388 is the same as the amendment No. 45 moved by Shri S. S. More.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: I beg to move:

Page 5, line 5—

for “shall” substitute: “may”

Shri R. D. Misra: I beg to move:

Page 5, lines 5 and 6,—

for “a new Part C State” substitute: “a Union Territory”

Shri M. D. Joshi: My amendment Nos. 430 and 431 are the same as the amendments Nos. 46 and 47 moved by Shri S. S. More.

Shri Begawat (Ahmednagar South):
I beg to move:

Page 5—

after line 15, add:

"Provided that this new Part C State to be known as the State of Bombay shall cease to be a Part C State and merge in Maharashtra after a period of three years and that Bombay shall be the capital of Maharashtra then onwards."

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: I beg to move:

Page 5—

after line 15, add:

"(2) The Central Government may however, by notification in the Official Gazette, merge the above State of Bombay into the State of Maharashtra at any time but not later than two years from the appointed day and place this notification before the Lok Sabha at its next session."

Clause 2.—(Formation of Maharashtra State.)

Shri Bhatkar: I beg to move:

(i) page 5—

for lines 19 to 35, substitute:

"(a) Greater Bombay, Thana, West Khandesh, East Khandesh, Nasik, Dangs, Ahmednagar, Sholapur, South Satara, North Satara, Kolhapur, Ratnagiri, Kolaba, and Poona districts; Chandgad taluka and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Khanapur, Belgaum, Chikodi, Athani, Raibag and Mukeri taluks of Belgaum district; Supa, Karwar, Halyal taluks and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Yellapur and Ankola talukas of Kanara district, in the existing State of Bombay;

(b) Osmanabad, Baihar, Auran-
gabad, Parbhani, and Nanded dis-
tricts and Ahmedpur, Nillanga
and Udgir talukas and contiguous

Marathi speaking areas of Bhatki, Santapur, Aurad and Humnabad talukas of Bidar district; Adilabad, of Asifabad, and Shirpur, talukas of Adilabad district and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Aland taluka of Gulbgh district in the existing State of Hyderabad; and

(c) Buldana, Akola, Amravati, Yeotmal, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara and Chanda districts and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of—

(i) Waraseoni, Balaghat and Baihar talukas of Balaghat district;

(ii) Sawnsar Taluka of Chhindwada district;

(iii) Bhainsdehi and Multai talukas of Betul district;

(iv) Burhanapur taluka of Nimar district; and

(v) Former Indian State of Bastar in the existing state of Madhya Pradesh; and thereupon the said territories shall cease to form part of the existing states of Bombay, Hyderabad and Madhya Pradesh respectively.

(IA) The various contiguous Marathi speaking areas mentioned in sub-section 1 of this section shall be included in and become part of those adjoining districts in the state of Maharashtra as may be determined by the Boundary Commission.*

My amendment No. 393 is the same as the amendment No. 59 moved by Shri S. S. More.

Shri Waghmare (Parbhani): I beg to move:

Page 5—

for lines 19 to 23 substitute:

"(a) Greater Bombay, Thana, West Khandesh, East Khandesh, Nasik, Dang, Ahmednagar, Sholapur, South Satara, North Satara, Kolhapur, Ratnagiri, Kolaba and

[Shri Waghmare]

Poona Districts, Chandgad taluka and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Khanapur, Belgaon, Chikodi, Athani, Raibag and Kukeri talukas of Belgaon district, Supa, Karwar, Halyal talukas and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Yellapur and Ankola talukas of Kanara district in the existing State of Bombay."

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: My amendment No. 432 is the same as the amendment No. 395 moved by Shri Nand Lal Sharma.

Shrimati Jayashri: I beg to move:

Page 5—

(i) line 20, before "West Khandedh" insert "and Umergam Taluk";

(ii) line 20, after "West Khandedh" insert "except Navapur Taluk"; and

(iii) line 21, omit "Dangs".

Shri Waghmare: I beg to move:

Page 5—

for lines 24 to 29 substitute:

"(b) Osmanabad, Bhir, Aurangabad, Parbhani districts, Ahmadpur, Nilanga, and Udgir talukas and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Bhalaki, Santpur, Aurad and Humnabad talukas of Bidar district, Nanded district except Bichkonda and Jukkal circle of Deglur taluka and Mudhol Bhainsa and Kuber circle of Mudhol taluk and Islapur circle of Boath taluk, Kinwat taluk, Rajura taluk and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Adilabad, Asifabad and Sirpur talukas of Adilabad district and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Aland taluk of Gulbarga district in the existing State of Hyderabad."

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: I beg to move:

Page 5—

for lines 24 to 29, substitute:

"(b) the villages of Muland and Nahur in Thana taluka, Marathwada districts of Aurangabad, Bhir, Parbhani, Osmanabad and Nanded (except Bichkonda circle of Deglur taluk; Mudhol, Bhainsa and Kuber circles of Mudhol taluk) and Ahmadpur, Nilanga, Udgir talukas of Bidar district; Bhalki and Hukur circles of Bhalki taluk; Aurad and Torna circles of Santpur (Aurad) taluk and Ladvanti circle of Humnabad taluk of Bidar district and Islapur circle of Boath taluk, Kinwat, Rajpura and Utnoor talukas of Adilabad district, Bela circle of Adilabad taluk, Ada and Wakadi circles of Asifabad taluk of Adilabad district in the existing State of Hyderabad; and"

Shri Waghmare: I beg to move:

Page 5—

for lines 30 to 32 substitute:

"(c) Buldana, Akola, Amravati, Yeotmal, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara and Chanda Districts and contiguous Marathi speaking areas of Waraswani, Balaghat, and Baihar talukas of Balaghat district, Sawsar taluk of Chhindwada district, Bhandehi and Multai talukas of Betul district and Barhanpur taluk of Nimar district in the existing State of Madhya Pradesh.

Shri Bogawat: I beg to move:

Page 5—

after line 35, insert:

"(IA) All contiguous villages and towns having Marathi or Konkani as the mother tongue and having a population of 55 per cent. or more in these villages and towns now forming part of Hyderabad, Madhya Pradesh, Karnataka or Gujarat shall be merged in Maharashtra."

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: My amendments Nos. 434 and 435 are the same

as the amendments Nos. 378 and 379 moved by Shri Telkikar.

New Clause 13A

Shri U. R. Bogawat: I beg to move:

Page 7—

after line 22, insert:

"13A. A Boundary Commission shall be appointed by the Government to solve the boundary questions so far as the merger of contiguous villages or towns is concerned taking into consideration the languages of these villages and towns on the borders of the States about which there are disputes about their merger.

Shri S. C. Deb (Cachar-Lushai Hills): I beg to move:

(i) Page 7—

after line 22, insert:

"13A. As from the appointed day, their shall be fromed a Part A State to be known as the State of Assam comprising the following territories, namely:—

(a) the territories which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were comprised in the Province of Assam, the Khasi States and the Assam Tribal Areas, but excluding the territories specified in the Schedule to the Assam (Alteration of Boundaries) Act, 1951;

(b) the territory which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution was being administered as if it were a Chief Commissioner's Province under the name of Tripura; and

(c) the territory which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution was being administered as if it were a Chief Commissioner's Province under the name of Manipur."

(ii) Page 7—

after line 22, insert:

"13A. As from the appointed day, there shall be formed a Part A State to be known as the State of Assam, comprising the following territories namely:—

(a) the territories which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were comprised in the Province of Assam, the Khasi States and the Assam Tribal Area but excluding the territories specified in the Schedule to the Assam (Alteration of Boundaries) Act, 1951; and

(b) the territory which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution was being administered as if it were a Chief Commissioner's Province under the name of Tripura."

Clause 14.—(Amendment of the First Schedule to the Constitution)

Shri S. C. Deb: I beg to move:

(1) (i) Page 7, line 39—

add at the end:

"and also the territory comprised in the State of Tripura; and the territory comprised in the State of Manipur"; and

(ii) Page 9—

omit lines 35 to 44

(2) (i) Page 7, line 39—

add at the end:

"and also the territory comprised in the State of Tripura"; and

(ii) Page 9,—

omit lines 40 to 44.

Shri M. D. Joshi: I beg to move:

(i) Page 8—

after line 6, insert:

"3A. Bombay.....The territories specified in section 8 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956."

[Shri M. D. Joshi] ,

(ii) Page 9—

omit lines 24 and 25.

New clause 15A

Shri Bhatkar: My amendments Nos. 402 and 403 are the same as the amendments Nos. 154 and 155 moved by Shri V. P. Pawar.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): I beg to move:

Page 10—

after line 4, insert: .

"BOUNDARY COMMISSION

15A. The Government of India shall before the first day of January 1957 appoint one or more Boundary Commission or Commissions consisting of Judges of the Supreme Court or High Courts to go into the existing border disputes of different States, and such Commission or Commissions shall after due investigation, give awards on the disputes in accordance with the following principles;

(i) contiguous revenue village shall be treated as a unit of fixing boundaries;

(ii) wishes of the people of the disputed area or areas concerned;

(iii) their historical economic, linguistic and cultural affinities; and

(iv) consideration of administrative convenience; and thereupon, the Government of India shall take necessary steps to implement such awards".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These amendments are also before the House.

Dr. Jaisoorya (Medak): It seems to me that today's discussion is totally unrealistic for one reason. Who is the deciding authority as to what the boundaries are going to be? There are so many claims that are being put forward. Who is going to

listen to them? Who is going to decide them?

It is stated that the House has a right to decide. That is theoretical. Practically, we have been precluded from that by the statement of the Home Minister that it is the Zonal Councils that will decide. If that is so, let us stop our discussion here, and with all our *hissab kitabs* and go to the Zonal Councils when they are formed. If and when they are formed, let them decide. If the Zonal Council is not going to do it, we had suggested a Boundary Commission. But the Home Minister says that he is not willing for a Boundary Commission. He has put the whole onus on us without powers and privileges. Between ourselves—and we are very high class people, very learned people, very good people, as Members of Parliament, very nice people—we could come to good compromises. But we know what happens. They will say, 'Yes, but the State Governments are not agreeable'. This has happened to me. After all the 12 days of labour, suddenly some wretched, little party Under-Secretary of a provincial group says, 'No, it must be discussed at a higher levels'.

Let us decide today what the instrument is going to be. Is it going to be a Boundary Commission, if and when formed? Is it going to be the Zonal Council? Or is it going to be this House? After we are decided on this, let us come together and continue our discussion.

Finally, I want to say this. There is no doubt that up till now we have had minorities in every State as it is today. They were settled minorities. By a strange freak of geographical thinking, we have created, according to the SRC recommendations, all along the borders new minorities who are unsettled. We have said, let us have a Boundary Commission. They know their job. They have got fixed terms of reference. Let them settle this question. We will

carry on with our work. The Boundary Commission's decision will be final. People somehow have a faith in Boundary Commissions, that their decisions are absolutely impartial. Let us get on with our work. But that is not done. The other thing also is not done. The Zonal Councils are in a nebulous condition. It seems to me that we are working in a vacuum.

New conditions and new problems have arisen. We are facing those problems. It is a very funny thing to have large new enclaves which were there never before. Take, for instance, Madaksira. It should certainly go to Mysore by which it is surrounded on all sides. Then there are others. But these are minor items.

I have moved an amendment. I have put it only as a stick to beat the dog with. It is useless in our putting on claims and counter-claims when there is no forum entitled to practically settle these matters.

So I want to know from you what is to be done. Shall we continue our long, long list of claims and counter-claims or shall we decide today whether we shall have a sort of instrument to settle these matters? Otherwise, we will be simply talking in the air like in a share bazaar, where people make all sorts of noises. Nobody seems to know what is being said. Up till now, I do not know who is the deciding authority. I genuinely believe that the claims and counter-claims are very genuine. These are very big border problems created. The minorities are in a panic. We have a duty to see that not only our settled minorities are kept as they are, but we have also to absorb all the new minorities. It is a huge problem, almost as bad as the refugee problem.

Therefore, I am asking you, what is the instrument, what is the practical way we can tackle all these questions? Otherwise, it seems to me that the whole day has been wasted.

3 P.M.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): I feel the same difficulty as my hon. friend, Dr. Jaisoorya. As a humble Member of this House, I am anxious to understand what is going on. The hon. Prime Minister said that every Member represent the whole of India. Thus every member has full responsibility to determine equally all questions debated here. But when the debate is going on, I feel I am at sea in regard to boundary amendments.

When yesterday Shri Raghavachari was propounding some arguments about firkas in Bellary, I felt I knew something about it, because with respect to Bellary there were certain previous reports of Commissions. At the same time, I want to know the ins and outs and pros and cons of particular questions which are being agitated here by hon. Members. I want to give an intelligent vote. I want to support every good cause. But my difficulty is that I do not know how to appreciate the details. I am not supposed to be acquainted with all the geographical questions, the percentage questions etc. involved in the various amendments relating to the different parts of the country.

The Home Minister has said that he is not going to accept the amendment about a Boundary Commission. I can understand if the amendment relating to a Boundary Commission is put to the House. If it is carried, then I can understand that all these amendments can be brushed away. If it is not carried, then I think we should not waste any more of our time, because I understand that all other Members are feeling like me. They are not appreciating what is being said. They cannot look to the merits of the questions. They cannot understand the questions. I cannot know anything about what exactly is the situation and what is happening in a village or taluk in the south.

Therefore, my humble submission is that if this Boundary Commission

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

amendment is carried, let us stop the discussion so far as amendments relating to a particular village or taluk etc. are concerned. If it is not carried, let us not waste any time any further. Let us stop further discussion on these amendments so far as these clauses are concerned. Let us proceed further so that the rest of the time allotted may not be wasted. I am very anxious that the time of the House should not be wasted. We are very hard up for time. There are other amendments and other things to which we may not be able to devote sufficient amount of time.

Therefore, I feel that the time is not being properly utilised. I would beg of you to kindly decide this question either by yourself or in consultation with the Speaker, so that the time of the House may be utilised in the right manner. I agree with what Dr. Jaisooram has said, and I think every other Member of the House agrees with that. I would beg of you kindly see that we do not waste our time and we do not feel the frustration of sitting here and not being able to vote intelligently on all these amendments. I would make a formal motion in this respect if you order me to do so.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I feel that the difficulties are real. I will consult the Speaker and have the matter decided in the next few minutes. But let the debate go on. Let the debate proceed. I will consult the Speaker and see what can be done.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: The discussion on the clauses would have been more fruitful if every clause had been taken separately for discussion. I feel that you may consider this matter once again with the Speaker.

Clauses 2 to 15 are very important as they deal with the very question of reorganisation. Part I deals with the definitions and Part II with the

scheme of reorganisation. If hon. Members go carefully through the various implications of Part II, they will realise that the authors of the Bill.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Minister of Legal Affairs has heard the objections of the hon. Members and the difficulties that they experience, I will request him to consider this matter because I would like to know his reactions also.

The Minister of Legal Affairs (Shri Pataskar): I would like to have consultations with Shri Datar or the Home Minister, who are primarily concerned with it and are in charge of this Bill. Shri Datar has gone home and as soon as he comes, I will consult him.

Shri Matthew (Kottayam): I am not a lawyer nor am I a constitutional pandit. But, theoretically it may be that when one has sponsored an amendment he may be able to carry conviction to the Home Minister or to the whole House. It may be that the Government might consider the amendment and decide to accept it, though not at present. But the future always holds possibilities which we cannot rule out. Anybody may be able to carry conviction with the Home Minister or with the whole House and, therefore, to say that there is no use in discussing is not right.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: But where is the Home Minister?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let there be no discussion over this now.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: How will the conviction be carried to the Home Minister when neither he nor his Deputy is present here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He will be coming in a short time.

Shri Mathew: My submission is that when you place this before the hon. Speaker, you may also place this be-

fore him as also the view of the Home Minister when he gives his view.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This will also be taken into consideration.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: If the hon. Members go through the various clauses of this Bill, they will realise that no single principle or set of principles has been followed in respect of reorganisation. In some cases, language has been followed; in other cases it has been disregarded in some cases, geography has been paramount and in other cases it has been over-ruled; in some cases, administrative convenience has been considered and in other cases that has also been over-looked. So, you will see that no uniform policy has been followed by Government in respect of reorganisation. The result is confusion.

Many of the general problems connected with reorganisation have already been dealt with. I feel, however, that I should refer to one matter which has been engaging the attention of every hon. Member, and that is about controversial border questions. I am sorry that the Home Minister is not responsive to the constructive suggestions that have been made by various Members. Many Members have felt that the Boundary Commission is the proper machinery to deal with this problem. I have no disagreement with this suggestion but the hon. Minister seems to have turned down this request. The party to which I have the honour to belong has passed a resolution stating that in controversial areas a plebiscite might be adopted as the method of ascertaining the will of the people. If the result of the plebiscite shows that one State should get a particular area, then, that area should go to that State. I commend this suggestion to the Home Minister. If plebiscite is accepted as the proper thing for solving border controversies, there will be no heart-burning or bitterness in anybody; and therefore, I hope that this proposition, which is reasonable, will be accepted by the House.

If this is not accepted, I would again say that the Boundary Commission is the second best. I feel that if there is no proper and exclusive machinery to deal with the problem of boundary disputes, much injustice and bitterness would result and friction is bound to continue in some form or other. That is not conducive to the growth of harmony and good relation between people and people. So, there are two proposals before us. I commend both the proposals to Government and they may accept either, the proposal for a plebiscite or, in the alternative, a proposal for the Boundary Commission.

In the scheme of the Bill the matter is left to the Zonal Councils. I am afraid, the Zonal Council are not qualified to deal with this very important question, because in the Zonal Councils there will be Ministers of various States represented, and, when Ministers are represented, the question becomes more or less a political one. This matter of boundary disputes should be decided outside the political table. So, I say, that either ascertain the will of the people through plebiscite or appoint a Boundary Commission.

I said in the beginning that no uniform method has been adopted by Government in regard to reorganisation. I am one who feel that language should be the major consideration for rational distribution of States.

I feel that Punjab should be reorganised on the basis of language. Again, I feel that other areas, as far as possible and practicable, should be reorganised on the basis of language, subject to other minor considerations such as geography, history, administrative convenience and the like. So I feel that the present reorganisation is not a proper reorganisation because no definite or consistent policy is followed for all the States.

Having said this, I may now turn to a local problem which concerns me.

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

Some members have said that Karnatak people are the happiest because they have got their States without tears. I do not know how far that statement is true. But I feel that Karnatak State has got its disputes or troubles all round its borders. I do not know whether there is any single State in India today, which has got so many border problems. It is natural that it is so because Karnatak will be composed of five areas whereas in the other cases only two areas or one area will form a unit. The result is that all round the border of Karnatak State, we have several little difficulties, which ultimately make a big difficulty. For instance, reference was made by an hon. Member from that area that the question of Kasaragod should be reopened. The hon. Member, Shri Thomas, made out that the north of Chandragiri river in Kasaragod taluk is not predominantly populated by Kannada-speaking people. I think that is not true. He has taken the Tulu people as belonging also to the fold of Malayalees. Most of the Tulu people there want to go with Karnatak. He said that the decision of the various Panchayats is not a democratic decision because it was not made an election issue during the Panchayat elections. I may say that the reorganisation of States also was not made an election issue in the last general elections, but still we are dealing with that question. When all the local people concerned have expressed their opinion through their elected representatives, I think we ought to respect their opinion.

Then again, there is the question of Talawadi, firka. Nearly 95 per cent of the people there speak Kannada. There is no communication and no contact between that enclave and the rest of the Coimbatore district. There is no dispute regarding the complexion of that territory. Even the Tamilians admit that the majority of the people there speak Kannada, and their contacts are with Mysore. The people of this area have expressed their opinion in favour of merger

with Mysore. So this matter should be considered most favourably.

Lastly with one more suggestion I will finish, and that is about Madakasira. My friends have referred to this matter and I have also already referred to it. I beg of the hon. Minister to see this pocket of Madakasira taluk is joined with the prospective Karnataka State. There is no dispute about the complexion of this territory; it is entirely Kannada-speaking territory and it is surrounded only by Kannada-speaking areas. I feel that in the name of justice, this part of the territory should go to Mysore.

I trust that the hon. Minister will agree with my suggestions and include these areas in the new Karnatak State.

पंडित च० ना० मासवीर (राजस्थान) :

श्री डा० जयसूर्या और श्री मार्गव ने जो राजस्थान की भी, उसके सिलसिले में मैंने कुछ सोचा और मेरा ब्यास यह है कि क्लाब २ से क्लाब (खण्ड) १५ तक के बारे में ज्यादा झगड़ा बाउंडरीज के सिलसिले में ही है। इन क्लाबिज (खण्डों) के ऊपर जो धमंडमेंट्स (संशोधन) आई हैं, उन में बाउंडरी (सीमा) बगैरह पर ही ज्यादा जोर दिया गया है। मिसाल के तौर पर क्लाब ११ के ऊपर, जिस के द्वारा मध्य प्रदेश बनाया गया है, यह धमंडमेंट आई है कि मध्य प्रदेश में से बारासुनी, दालाघाट और बेहर ताल्लुके, सौसर, ताल्लुका, मैसदेही और मुलताई ताल्लुके और बरहानपुर ताल्लुका निकाल कर महाराष्ट्र में मिला दिया जाय। इधर राजस्थान की तरफ से यह मांग हुई है कि सिरोज का इलाका राजस्थान का है, इसलिए उस को वहां पर ही रखा जाये और मंदसौर डिस्ट्रिक्ट (जिला) को भी राजस्थान में मिला दिया जाय। विन्ध्य प्रदेश के एक मेम्बर साहब भी बोले थे और उन्होंने बही पुरानी बात कही थी कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश को जैसे का तैसा रखा जाय। सब धमंडमेंट्स इसी कित्य की है।

इस सिलसिले में मेरा ख्याल यह है कि हम लोग यहां बैठ कर इन इलाकों के बारे में विलकुल ठीक फैसला नहीं कर सकते हैं। यहां पर बम्बई की बहुत ज्यादा चर्चा हुई है, इस लिए ज्यादा लोगों ने वहां के मामले को समझ लिया है, लेकिन दूसरे इलाकों को तफ़्सीली बातों को समझने में ज्यादातर मेम्बर साहबान कांसिर (भसफल) रहे हैं इस को मद्दे-नजर रख कर यह प्रमेडमैंट पेश किया गया है कि एक बाउंडरी कमीशन (सीमा आयोग) मुकर्रर किया जाय। होम मिनिस्टर साहब की राय यह है कि बाउंडरी कमीशन की तजवीज़ को हम मंजूर नहीं कर सकते, क्योंकि इस बिल में सोनल कांसिल (प्रादेशिक परिषद्) को यह भक्तियार है कि वह बाद में इन बाउंडरी (सीमाओं) के मुताल्लिक फैसला कर ले। मेरा ख्याल यह है कि बाउंडरी कमीशन को मुकर्रर करने पर भी हम इस समस्या का हल जल्दी तो नहीं निकाल सकेंगे और जैसा कि मेरे एक दोस्त ने कहा था, सवाल बाउंडरी कमीशन या किसी और मशीनरी का नहीं है, सवाल उन डिस्प्यूट्स (विवादों) का है, जिनकी वजह से मौजूदा टैन्शन (खिचाव) बराबर जारी रहेगी। इसलिए अगर हम टैन्शन को खत्म करना चाहते हैं, तो हमें यह निश्चय करना पड़ेगा कि हम कोई ऐसी मशीनरी (तन्त्र) कायम रखें, जो इस समस्या पर तब तक विचार करती रहे, जब तक कि जरूरत रहे लेकिन इसका हल जल्द होना चाहिये। इसके अलावा हम को यह उसूल भी तय करना होगा कि हम जिले को यूनिट माने या शहर या देहात को और कितने परसेंट पापुलेशन को इस सिलसिले में सामने रखें। मेरा ख्याल यह है कि होम मिनिस्ट्री को खुद एक तजवीज़ लानी चाहिए या इस किस्म की प्रमेडमैंट मंजूर करनी चाहिये कि हम इस उसूल को मानते हैं कि जिन स्टेट्स को हमने बनाया है, उन के एरिया में अगर सत्तर परसेंट आबादी एक भाषा को बोलने वाली हो, तो एक शहर या देहात को यूनिट बना कर

—न कि ताल्लुके या डिस्ट्रिक्ट को—हम को

3 P.M.

तय करना चाहिए कि उस गांव या शहर को हम किसी पड़ोसी मित्र भाषा भाषी रियासत में मिला सकते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह प्रमेडमैंट स्वीकार किया जाये कि शहर या गांव ही इस किस्म का यूनिट हो। इस बात पर अब कोई बहस नहीं की जा सकती कि भाषावार प्रान्त बनें या न बनें, वे तो बन चुके और बन रहे हैं। सारा जोर उनकी तरफ दिया जा रहा है। यह कहा गया है कि जो भाषावार माइनारिटीज (अल्पसंख्यक) होंगी उनको ज्यादा से ज्यादा संरक्षण दिया जाये और उनको ज्यादा से ज्यादा मजबूत बनाया जाये। भसल हुकीकत यह है कि अंग्रेजी के डोमिनेशन (शासन) के खिलाफ यह भाषा का सवाल पैदा हुआ था और कोसिख यह भी कि अंग्रेजी को हटा कर हिन्दुस्तान के लिए एक अपनी भाषा बनायेंगे और साथ ही साथ हिन्दुस्तान के प्रान्तों का विभाजन भाषा के आधार पर करेंगे। इससे एक बड़ी ताकत पैदा हुई जिसका हमने इस्तेमाल किया। अब कोई वजह नहीं है कि हम डरे कि इसकी वजह से हिन्दुस्तान के लिए खतरा पैदा हो सकता है। सवाल केवल भाषा का ही नहीं है। लोग अपने आर्थिक हितों के कारण भी आपस में टकराते हैं। एक भाषा बोलने वाले भी मित्र आर्थिक स्वार्थ रखने के कारण आपस में टकरा जाते हैं। तो यह टकराव केवल भाषा के आधार पर ही नहीं होता, और कारणों से भी हो सकता है। लेकिन आज लोग अपनी भाषा में बोलना चाहते हैं, अपनी भाषा में अपना एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन (प्रशासन) करना चाहते हैं, विधान सभाओं में अपनी भाषाओं में बोलना चाहते हैं। आज हालत यह है कि कोई आदमी चाहे वह मराठी का या गुजराती का पंडित हो, पर यदि वह अंग्रेजी नहीं जानता तो उसे पढ़ा लिखा नहीं माना जाता। जिस वक़्त हमारे प्रान्त भाषा के आधार पर बन जायेंगे उस समय मराठी का पंडित, चाहे वह अंग्रेजी जानता हो या न जानता हो, वह विस्वास कर सकता है कि वह अपने राज्य में ऊंचे से ऊंचे पद पर पहुंच सकता है। सवाल केवल प्राइमरी (प्राथमिक) और

[पंडित च० ना० मालवीय]

संकिटरी एजुकेशन (माध्यमिक शिक्षा) का ही नहीं है। आज हर एक के लिए यह सवाल सबसे बड़ा है कि वह मुलाजिमतों में किस हद तक पहुंच सकता है, लेजिस्लेचर (विधान मंडल) में वह किस हद तक अपने विचारों को अच्छे तरीकों से प्रकट कर सकता है। अब ये सारी चीजें भाषा के आधार पर बन रही हैं तो आज चाहे कोई कितना भी उपदेश इसके विरुद्ध दे उसका कोई प्रभाव नहीं हो सकता।

हमको माइनारिटीज रखने का शौक नहीं है। यह सवाल हमारे देश में किसी तरह से पैदा हो गया। अगर हम इसको खत्म कर सकते हैं तो हमको इसे खत्म करना चाहिए। मेरा सुझाव है कि बजाय जिले के भाप शहर या देहात को आधार मानें—लेकिन जो भिन्न भाषा भाषी प्रान्तों के हमारे भाई हैं उनसे मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उनको यह समझना चाहिए कि आज हिन्दुस्तान में यह मुमकिन नहीं है कि किसी राज्य में केवल एक ही भाषा भाषी लोग हों। यह मैं मानता हूँ कि मध्यप्रदेश के उस हिस्से को जो कि अगर मराठी भाषी हं, तो पास के मराठी हिस्से से मिला दिया जाये। जो देहात और इलाके इस तरह से मिलाये जा सकते हैं उनको मिला देना चाहिए। लेकिन फिर भी कुछ अन्य भाषा भाषी हर राज्य में रहेंगे। अभी हमारे यहां भोपाल में कुछ गुजराती भाइयों ने एक बड़ा फ्लोर मिल (भाटे का मिल) खोला है और इस प्रकार उनके कुछ परिवार हमारे यहां रहेंगे। लेकिन जो इस प्रकार के लोग दूसरे राज्यों में रहते हैं उनको यह नहीं सोचना चाहिए कि हम माइनारिटीज के रूप में रह रहे हैं। उनके दिल में इस प्रकार का इनफीरियारिटी कम्प्लेक्स (हीनता ग्रंथी) नहीं रहना चाहिए कि हम माइनारिटी वाले हैं। लेकिन यह मांग बिल्कुल दुस्त है कि अगर किसी भाषा वाले अपने भाषा भाषी प्रान्त से अलग हैं और उसमें मिलाये जा सकते हैं तो उनको मिला देना चाहिए। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि

यह अमेंडमेंट स्वीकार किया जाये या होम मिनिस्टर साहब अपनी तरफ से ऐसा अमेंडमेंट लायें कि शहर या गांव को यूनिट मान कर उसको पास वाले उसी भाषा के इलाके में मिला दिया जाये। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसका फैसला जल्दी किया जाये। कहा जाता है कि जोनल काउंसिल्स (प्रादेशिक परिषदें) इसका फैसला कर लेगी। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर हम देश को जल्दी आगे बढ़ाना चाहते हैं तो हमको इसका फैसला अभी कर देना चाहिए। इसको आगे बढ़ाना ठीक नहीं होगा। अगर बाउंडरी कमीशन (सीमा आयोग) को यह काम दिया गया तो उसमें भी बहुत समय लभ जायेगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस बिल में ही ऐसा प्रावीजन कर दिया जाये कि आगामी चुनाव से पहले ही ये जोनल काउंसिल्स बन जायें और उनका सबसे पहला काम इस प्रश्न को हल करना हो। इनमें सब राज्यों के प्रतिनिधि होंगे। उनके पास फैंक्ट्स (तथ्य) और फिगर्स (आंकड़े) होंगे। उनको यह काम दिया जाये कि शहर और गांवों को यूनिट मानकर पास वाले उस भाषा के इलाकों में मिला दे। अगर हम ऐसा करेंगे तो हम बहुत से झगड़ों को खत्म कर देंगे। ऐसा न होने से स्वाभस्वाह का टेंशन (खिचाव) बढ़ रहा है। अगर यह प्रश्न हल हो जाये लोगों को आगे बढ़ने का मौका मिले।

दूसरी बात मुझे यह कहनी है कि मध्य प्रदेश के मिलसिले में बहुत से अमेंडमेंट हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : धानरेबल मेम्बर का वक्त तो एक ही बात में खत्म हो गया। अब वह दूसरी बात शुरू करने लगे हैं।

पंडित च० ना० मालवीय : मैं बोड़े में ही खत्म करता हूँ।

इन अमेंडमेंट्स के बारे में मुझे यह कहना है कि इनमें ऐसी कोई चीज नहीं है जिस पर कि स्टेट्स रिभागमेंटाइजेशन कमीशन (राज्य

पुनर्गठन आयोग) ने गौरव कर लिया हो। यह मांग की गयी है कि फिर से विन्ध्य प्रदेश को अलग रखा जाये, मध्य भारत को अलग रखा जाय या जो महाकौशल का दूसरा हिस्सा है वह अलग रहे। मैं इसका विरोध करता हूँ। इसमें बस्तर की भी मांग की गयी है लेकिन यह खुशी की बात है कि हमारे जितने भी महाराष्ट्रीय मित्र हैं उन्होंने बस्तर की मांग नहीं की है। केवल एक एन० बी० सरे साहब ने ही यह मांग की है। बिहार और उड़ीसा वालों ने भी इस तरह की कोई मांग नहीं की है और इस सिलसिले में स्टेट्स रिफार्गनाइजेशन कमीशन ने अपनी रिपोर्ट के पैरा ४८४ में अच्छी गेहानी डाली है। इसको देखते हुए मैं नहीं मानता कि बस्तर का इलाका मध्य प्रदेश से बाहर जाना चाहिए। मध्य प्रदेश और उत्तर प्रदेश में तो बाउंडरी के सवाल पर कोई झगड़ा पैदा ही नहीं होना चाहिए। जालौन, झांसी या हमीरपुरा चाहे इधर रहे या उधर रहे क्योंकि इन दोनों स्टेट्स का मिल कर एक जोन बन गया है। इसलिए कोई ज्यादा मुसीबत की बात नहीं है। इसके अलावा जो कुछ इलाकों की इधर या उधर से मांग की गयी है उसकी अब कोई जरूरत नहीं है। मैंने जो प्रमोडमैट सजेस्ट (सुझाव देना) किया है उसके आधार पर दूसरे प्रमोडमैट्स का विरोध करता हूँ और जो क्लोजेज हैं उनका अपने संशोधन सहित समर्थन करता हूँ।

Shri R. D. Misra: Sir, there is a point of order. I am in great difficulty because I have also given some amendments. My point of order is this. Rule 85 of the Rules of Procedure reads:

"A Bill, which is dependent wholly or partly upon another Bill pending before the House, may be introduced in the House in anticipation of the passing of the Bill on which it is dependent:

Provided that the second Bill shall be taken up for consideration and passing in the

House only after the first Bill has been passed by the Houses and assented to by the President."

If this Bill is passed by the House and the other Bill, the Constitution (Amendment) Bill, is not passed somehow by a special majority of the House, then what happens? What will be the position in that case? Can we enforce this Bill if the Bill is not passed by a special majority that is required? Therefore, this Bill depends on the passing of the Constitution (Ninth Amendment Bill Sir, if you will be kindly enough to see the statement of Objects and Reasons of the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill, 1956, which was originally introduced in this House, you will find that on page 18 it is written:

"In order to implement the scheme of States reorganisation, it is necessary to make numerous amendments in the Constitution with effect from the 1st October, 1956. This Bill seeks to make these amendments and also other amendments to certain provisions of the Constitution etc."

Then under "Clause 2" it is written:

"The reorganisation scheme involves not only the establishment of new States and alterations in the area and boundaries of the existing States, but also the abolition of the three categories of States (Part A, Part B and Part C States) and the classification of certain areas as Union territories. Article 1 has to be suitably amended for this purpose and the First Schedule completely revised."

Similarly, in the other Bill, which was about the reorganisation of States, originally introduced in this House, you will find in the Statement of Objects and Reasons....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why should we take the Bills as they were introduced? Now we have to refer to

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

the Bills as they have emerged from the Joint Committee.

Shri R. D. Misra: My main difficulty is this. These two Bills were referred to the Joint Committee and one Bill is dependent on the other.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Exactly. That is what I want to know. I want to know how one is dependent on the other.

Shri R. D. Misra: It is like this. If the Constitution Bill is somehow not passed by this House, can this States Reorganisation Bill be enforced in the country? If it can be enforced without the passing of that Bill, then it is dependent on that Bill. Therefore, that Bill should have been brought here and that should have been passed first by the special majority required. Afterwards we could have taken up this Bill, because this Bill requires only a simple majority while the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill requires two-third majority of the Members present and voting and a majority of the whole House. For this purpose I have given several amendments, but because the discussion is going on on minor things as to whether a portion should be given here or should be given there, my amendments have not been considered. I have given several amendments. If my amendments are out of order then they cannot be taken up.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendments are a different thing. They will be considered when the hon. Member gets an opportunity to move his amendments. Then we will consider their value or what their effect is. But, so far as dependence of one Bill on the other is concerned, he has made a general statement and not shown how we shall fail in enforcing this Bill without passing the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill. If he has anything concrete to say, he may do so.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Shri Sadath Ali Khan): Sir, this is just like asking, whether the hen comes out of the egg or the egg comes out

of the hen. This is an interminable discussion.

Shri R. D. Misra: In the report of this Committee, Sir, we have said that we are changing the First Schedule of the Constitution—clause 14. In the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill again we are amending the same Schedule. In the Schedule of the Constitution we are having Part A, Part B and Part C States. In the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill we are having territories. We are having two categories. In this Bill we are going to have four categories. Therefore, we are going to amend the Schedule twice in the same session. In one Bill we say that we shall have four categories and in the other Bill we say that we are going to have two classes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I follow the hon. Member now. Has he something else to say?

Shri R. D. Misra: There are several things, Sir. Under article 3 we are only entitled to increase and decrease the area. I do not find any relevant article which empowers this Parliament to finish the legislative assemblies of States. Unless we amend the article of the Constitution and empower this Parliament to do away with these legislative assemblies of States and create new legislative assemblies, how can we break up the existing legislative assemblies and create new ones in those States?

Similarly, the third thing is, we are creating High Courts and we are abolishing High Courts. There is no article in the Constitution which says that this Parliament has got any power under the Constitution to abolish any High Court established under the Part A and Part B States of the Constitution. So, there are provisions in this Bill and in the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill which depend on each other.

Therefore, first of all we have to see whether the Constitution has

been amended and thereafter we have to see that this Bill proceeds according to the Constitution. My question is only this. Can we proceed with this Bill in the present form without amending the Constitution first? If you think, Sir, that this can be enforced, then I have no objection.

Shri S. S. More: May I make one short submission, Sir? This point of order was raised by me in April last and then I quoted two previous decisions of the Chair, one of the two decisions regarding the Estate Duty Bill, was given on my point of order. When this Bill came before the House for reference to Select Committee. I rose to this very point of order citing rule No. 85, and the Speaker was pleased to uphold my point to some extent and gave a direction by way of a ruling that the particular schedule of the Constitution (Amendment) Bill should be incorporated in this Bill. If that is done, to some extent that difficulty will be obviated.

Then, in accordance with that ruling the Home Minister was pleased to table a motion by way of securing an instruction from this House that that Schedule may be incorporated in this Bill. If we look to clause 14 we find that an attempt is being made to fulfil or act according to the direction of the Speaker.

My feeling is, I was not satisfied with the ruling nor am I satisfied with what has been done by the Joint Committee and a point of order can be raised which will go deeper and will cover a wider canvas than has been taken up by my friend.

Sir, in this case we are vitally concerned with certain fundamental procedural matters. In this clause 14 you will find that in the Schedule which is going to be incorporated in the Constitution, in respect of every State there is a reference that the particular State shall be as defined in the States Reorganisation Act of 1956. Against the State of Andhra Pradesh there is reference to that.

In respect of every State, which is going to be modified by certain addition or certain deduction, there is reference to the States Reorganisation Act of 1956.

I am not now, at this stage, interested in making it a point of order, but I am only elucidating what I want to say. To me it appears that, to mention in a Bill the Bill itself as an Act is something strange and now, if the clause is passed, it would mean that our Constitution will have a Schedule in which a reference will be made to a subordinate piece of legislation, in a document of vital importance, of basic importance. Sir, I have cared to read the Constitutions of a good many countries and I have never found a reference in any Constitution to a subordinate piece of legislation which is supposed to derive sustenance and vitality from the original fountain-source, that is, the Constitution. This is a sort of putting the horse before the cart, and this is unknown to any legislature. So, my submission is that at this juncture, you may be pleased to postpone your ruling. Let us discuss these amendments and the clauses. At a later stage, we shall finally and in a more detailed way, go through the Constitutional procedure or the Constitutional difficulty. I am not interested in blocking the way of the passage of the Bill but I am interested more in the procedural correctness of this House. From that point of view, most of my friends and myself will be interested in bringing to the notice of the Chair so many important points. I therefore request you to postpone your ruling, and subject to our right of rising to that point of order in fuller details, the discussion may be carried on now. That is my point.

Shri R. D. Misra: I have got another important point.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Everything that comes after a thing would be more important than the one that has preceded. That is an admitted fact. Now, the hon. Member has had his

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

say and he can have a new point of order subsequently also, if he wants to raise one.

I was inclined to consider and decide the point of order that was raised by Shri R. D. Misra. But I have been advised by Shri S. S. More that, because he has certain other fundamental objections to make, my decision on this point of order may be deferred and that the debate might continue so that we might have a fuller discussion on the point of order raised, afterwards. I am inclined to accept that advice and I defer my decision for the present. Let the debate go on and we will consider the point of order subsequently and then decide on it.

Shri R. D. Misra: Now, I am raising another point of order. It is this. When this Bill was referred to the Joint Committee, the principle of the Bill was mentioned. This is what is said in the Statement of Objects and Reasons:

"The main features of the reorganisation proposed are the abolition of the existing constitutional distinction between Part A, Part B and Part C States, the establishment of two categories for the component units of the Union, to be called States and Union territories," etc.

These are the principles laid down in the Bill. This House decided that the Bill be referred to the Joint Committee.

Now, in the report of the Joint Committee, we find the following in para. 11:

"The Committee consider it advisable to bring the provisions of the Bill into conformity with the existing provisions of the Constitution. They have, therefore, maintained the distinction between Part A, Part B and Part C States so far as the present Bill is concerned".

So, I want to know how far the Joint Committee was within its rights to go beyond the principles of the Bill. The scheme or the principle of the original Bill was that the existing distinctions should be removed, namely, that the Rajpramukhs should be abolished, etc. This House gave the Joint Committee no instructions to amend these principles. We, in the original Bill, said that there will be only two categories of States, namely, Part A and Part B States which will classify the Union territories. Now, they have brought forward a Bill with new things. They are going to have Part A, B, C and D States. They are not abolishing these distinctions. So, this Bill which has emerged from the Joint Committee is a new Bill. If you like, I can quote several authorities from the British House of Commons. There, if any Bill comes out in a new form, generally the Minister withdraws the Bill, or another Bill is brought forward. I leave it to you to decide. You may consult May's *Parliamentary Practice*. I cannot find any precedent for this in this House. Otherwise, I would have quoted any ruling given in this House. You may decide the point as you like.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Ordinarily, a Bill does not have only one object and reason for its being introduced. There are many reasons. It was not the sole object of the Bill, namely, that it should bring in the alteration or modification regarding the present classification of States and it should obliterate the present classification. There were other things also that were placed in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. So, what the hon. Member mentioned was not the sole object.

Shri R. D. Misra: If you will kindly go through the Statement of Objects and Reasons, you will find that nothing has come out of it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think the hon. Member should hear me now.

Shri R. D. Misra: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That the existing classification of the States has to be removed was not the sole object of the Bill.

Dr. Rama Rao: Main object.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It was not even the main object. There were other more important objects of this Bill. If the classification has been adhered to, if that minor object of abolishing the classification has not been fulfilled, that does not make such a difference as to entitle the hon. Member to raise this point of order, and to suggest that the hon. Minister in charge should withdraw this Bill and that the Joint Committee had no powers or jurisdiction to modify the principle or do anything like that. I hold that it is perfectly in order if the classification is retained. What the Joint Committee have done is perfectly in order, and there is no force in the point of order raised by the hon. Member.

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: My learned friend could have raised that objection when he spoke yesterday for half an hour, when he quoted *Bhagavat Gita*, *Mahabharat*, etc.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us not have any quarrel about it. Let us proceed further.

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): Your ruling does not become a precedent for the future, I suppose. I am still at a loss to find out whether there is anything specifically mentioned in the Bill and whether that matter, major or minor, has been altered by the Joint Committee. What is your ruling? What is the precedent to be followed in the future?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have given my ruling on the facts that were given and that were involved in this case. When any future opportunity comes and when such an occasion occurs, the points, as they come, would be decided on merits.

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: Coming to the discussion of this Bill, I first completely agree with the objections just

now raised by Dr. Jaisoorya and Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, because the clauses under discussion are from 2 to 15.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It has been decided that it would be considered later. The hon. Member need not emphasise it again.

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: I shall first speak on my amendment Nos. 364 and 365 to clause 15A. By these amendments, I have prayed that there should be a boundary commission to fix the boundaries of the various States after the reorganisation is implemented, and that some principle should be laid down about the fixation of boundaries so that the boundary commission could act according to those principles. These border disputes between one State and the other should be amicably decided and there should not be unnecessary heat generated on this subject later on. But I do not see any reason why this simple demand is not conceded. We are told that there would be no boundary commission after the implementation of this Bill. When there is no boundary commission, is it the desire of the Government that there should be continuous disturbances and unrest between one State and the other for ever? Otherwise, how are the boundaries to be decided and settled? Regarding each and every State, there are disputes. There is not a single State which says that they have not got disputes.

4 P.M.

An Hon. Member: U.P.

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: They want some portions of Vindhya Pradesh. Of course, they have not said so expressly; but some Members have spoken of that. What I mean to say is, whatever amendments have been given to clauses 3 to 9 or 15, they are all regarding the boundaries. Is there any Member aware of all the details of the towns and villages and populations in these areas? Every Member speaks of the grievances of

[Shri H. G. Vaishnav]

the State from which he comes. He says that the population speaking a particular language is so much, contiguous area is so much, etc. We are unable to understand who is correct. In this way, there is nothing but confusion. It is impossible for all the Members to take the population of each State, each village, and the border villages into consideration and come to certain definite conclusions. Where is the harm in having a boundary commission? That is the simple remedy which will do away with all the headaches of the Government and the people. That is not conceded. I submit humbly this demand for the reconsideration of the Government and request that my amendment regarding a boundary commission should be accepted. These are amendments 364 and 365.

Coming to the particular region from which I come, namely, Hyderabad, the boundary disputes are so many because the whole State is being disintegrated. Specially coming to Marathwada, there are disputes between Marathwada and Andhra, Marathwada and Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra and Karnataka. In this way, from three sides, we see nothing but disputes. Unless there is a Boundary Commission, who is to decide this problem, I do not know. Advice is given to us that we Members may sit together and come to certain conclusions and if there is unanimous agreement, that would be given effect to. Again, the question will arise how this mutual agreement is to be arrived at. Because, persons or parties or particular groups which have gained by the S.R. Bill are not willing to part with any particular area on any ground. That is the experience gained when M. Pr., sit together. How are disputes to be finally decided when the party aggrieved makes his request and the party which has gained does not concede that request? This is not the way to settle boundary disputes which are of national importance.

I may take the instance of my particular district of Bidar. That district is tri-lingual. There are Telugu, Kanarese and Marathi-speaking people. Formerly, according to the report of the S.R.C., the whole of the district was to go to Andhra. But, the Telugu-speaking population was not more than 20 per cent. Later on, it was agreed that since Maharashtra State is being formed, the district may be divided into three portions and some parts given to Andhra, some to Karnataka and some to Maharashtra. Still, there are disputes. Three taluks have been given to Maharashtra, but there are disputes with regard to other taluks of Bhalki, Humnabad and Santpur. In two revenue circles, Bhalki and Hulsur in Bhalki taluk the majority of the population is Marathi-speaking. Even the Hyderabad Government is prepared to give these to Maharashtra. Because there is no provision in the S. R. Bill, nothing is done with regard to that area, which is tagged on to Mysore. So also the areas, Torna, and Aurad circles of Santpur taluk. In these two circles, the population of Marathi speaking people is more than 55 per cent. These circles have also gone to Mysore. The population of the contiguous area is Marathi-speaking. The same is the case with Lawdwanti circle of Humnabad taluk. I do not know how many of my friends understand this problem. I say more than 55 or 60 per cent. of the population in this area is Marathi-speaking. The area has gone to Mysore. To understand the problems correctly, there is no other way except to appoint a Boundary Commission. We may sit together. But, the Members do not agree. They say, the Marathi population may be there; but the decision is in our favour and so we are not prepared to consider.

So also is the case with Madhya Pradesh. I am given to understand that Waraseoni, Balaghat, Baihar, Sawnsar, Bhainsdhei and Multai

taluks which have an overwhelming Marathi population have been given to Madhya Pradesh. Six taluks is not a small area. The population here, as my friend says, is 4½ lakhs. I do not understand why this area has been given to Madhya Pradesh. Why should his headache be continued for ever? Is it not in the interests of all people, even of Madhya Pradesh, to settle the disputes? Even the people of Madhya Pradesh do not mind giving these areas to Maharashtra. Who is to decide? There is no Boundary Commission. My saying and somebody's saying does not help in any way. There is no go except to have a Boundary Commission, which will take a decision taking all things into consideration, language, contiguity, etc.

There is also a similar dispute between Andhra and Maharashtra. There is a large Marathi-speaking population in Adilabad district. The Hyderabad Government has no objection to separate these places because they have statistics with them. They are prepared to give these areas to Marathwada. Unfortunately, there is no provision in this Bill. They ask, how can they of their own accord give that area. My humble submission is though mutually we are prepared to do certain things, we cannot go on because there is no provision in this Bill. The Boundary Commission is essential.

As regards the other two points, I may say this. I do not want to say much on the big problem of Bombay. Already so many big persons have spoken on that. I shall also add my humble voice to what they have said. The trend of the speeches shows that after five years they are inclined to merge the area with Maharashtra, and they ask us to wait till that time. My humble submission is: what would have happened if Telengana had been kept separate from Andhra for five years according to the proposal of the States Reorganisation Commission? There it was stated by big people that if that had been done the situation would be

tense, there would be discontent and nothing but quarrel. To do away with that, they have recommended that Telengana should be merged with Andhra immediately. Are not those very principles applicable to Bombay? Will there not be tension in the city of Bombay? The five-year period is there and everybody will try to see that the decision goes in his favour, and so there will be various activities good and bad, and discontent and tension will prevail continuously for five years. For this single reason I think it is essential that the question of Bombay should be decided. In this connection I have moved amendments 389 and 391. I humbly request that a certain period may be fixed. Within a period of two years the problem should be decided clearly and without any dispute. Bombay should be merged with Maharashtra so that there may not be further tension.

There are also my amendments 357, 433, 364 and 365 regarding boundaries which I humbly submit should be accepted in view of the just demands made therein.

Shri E. S. Diwan: So, far, arguments for the inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra were advanced in the national interests. Today Shri Raghunir Sahai advanced one international argument. I am persuaded to remind myself of the Prime Minister's statement a few months ago that there is foreign money which is interested in the propaganda against India in our own nation. If I were to extend the very argument to the case of Bombay, I think I will not be very wrong and I am tempted to say that foreign money is interested in creating a Shanghai or a Singapore of Bombay. Taking this into consideration, Government should include Bombay in Maharashtra. If my statement is wrong, I will be glad, but if Government find some sense in that statement, they should examine it, investigate it and see that Bombay is included in Maharashtra.

The question is how you can stop Bombay becoming a Shanghai or a

[Shri R. S. Diwan.]

Singapore by its inclusion in Maharashtra. I would say it is just like a boil on the body. It can only be cured by means of the blood which is surrounding that boil. That way I say if Bombay is included in Maharashtra, there will be little possibility of its becoming a Shanghai or a Singapore. So many people have spoken and I do not wish to say anything more about Bombay.

In the present Bill, as my predecessor has said, some revenue circles have been left out from being included in Marathwada. Before I go into the details, let me repeat what I said yesterday, that unless you decide on some principles, some unit for the settlement of the border dispute, you cannot solve the problem. The States Reorganisation Commission decided that the district should be the unit, but they themselves made exceptions. Again, they said that 70 per cent. should be the population for the inclusion of a district or a taluk or an area from one State into another, but they have made exceptions in that respect also.

For example, in Bidar District, the total population is 11 lakhs out of which 5.5 lakhs is Marathi-speaking, that is about 50 per cent. Three lakhs are Kannadigas and one lakh Muslims who speak Urdu and one lakh Telugu-speaking people. In view of the majority, it should have gone to Marathwada, but it was tagged on to Telengana. There was no reason for that. In this way, the trouble was started by the Commission itself. As they did not fix up any principle or unit for settling the boundaries, I request that Government should have some unit, a revenue circle or a taluk or the village, and then we must prepare ourselves for a settlement.

As regards Bidar District, I would say that three taluks which are completely Marathi-speaking have been given to Maharashtra, but Bhalki and Hulsur circles of Bhalki taluk, Aurad and Torna circles of Santpur (Aurad) taluk and Ladwanti circle of Humnabad taluk which are predominantly

Marathi-speaking should be given to Maharashtra. In respect of Santpur taluk I may add that because of the Devnoor project which is going to come shortly, the people of Aurad and Torna circles will be detached from Bidar District in which they are kept now because the project will come in between and there will not be any direct communication between Bidar District headquarters and these circles. And as their geographical contiguity is with Osmanabad District, that is Maharashtra, and as they have a predominantly Marathi-speaking population, they should be joined to Maharashtra.

In Adilabad District Utnoor taluk has been added to Andhra. The Telugu-speaking population in the taluk is 4,259 and the Marathi-speaking population is 4,560, whereas the tribal people number 21,104. The tribal people are mostly Gonds who have infiltrated from the Gond area of Madhya Pradesh into Hyderabad, and they are influenced mainly by Marathi. Their names, their culture, their behaviour and ways of worship are all Maharashtrian. Their primary education is given today in Marathi. So, this taluk should also be added on to Maharashtra.

Then, Islapur circle of Boath taluk, and Ada and Wakadi circles of Asafabad taluk of Adilabad district can be added to Maharashtra because the majority of the people there speak Marathi. Similarly, Sirpur circle from Sirpur taluk should be added to Maharashtra.

Then again, as my predecessor has said, in respect of the border of the same area, I may add that Sawnsar, Burhanapur, Bhainsdehi, Waraseoni, Balaghat and Baihar taluks have a population of about five lakhs of Maharashtrians, and they should be given to Maharashtra instead of Madhya Pradesh as has been done today.

Shrimati Maydeo: I have given notice of some amendments to this

group of clauses. For instance, I have given an amendment to clause 7 which seeks to provide that the five taluks of Khanapur, Belgaum, Chikodi (Nipani Bhag), Hukuri and Athni in Belgaum district, and the three taluks of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal in the North Kanara district should be included in the Marathi-speaking areas.

Now, the States Reorganisation Commission have stated in their report, in respect of Karnataka, as follows:

".....the Kannadigas suffered most, with their area split up into four units in three of which they were at the tail end and reduced to the position of ineffective minorities...." the Kannadigas would prosper and be able to manage their affairs much better under their own government, if such a government were possible."

That shows that language was the main consideration before them. Everyone in this country, and even the States Reorganisation Commission, have felt that if people speaking the same language are brought together, they will progress better, and good government would be possible. But while bringing all the Kannadigas together, what they have done is to bring the people in these five taluks of Belgaum district and these three taluks of North Kanara district to the position of tail-end minorities. That is why their problem has become more difficult.

The members of the States Reorganisation Commission were aware that these people had repeatedly complained that injustice was being done to them, and so, their case should be reconsidered. But the Commission have stated that just as Bellary was given to Andhra, so should Belgaum go over to Karnataka. They have said in their report that now that Kolar having no Karnataka complexion, and Belgaum also having no Karnataka complexion have been given over to Karnataka, the Karnataka people should not complain if Bellary which has no Telugu comple-

xion is given over to Andhra? But what is the position in regard to Bellary? Earlier, the Commission had given it over to Andhra. Now, it is being taken back and added to Mysore. Why should not the case of Belgaum and Karwar also be considered on the same footing?

Some hon. Members have said that the population in these areas has no absolute majority of Marathi-speaking people, Marathi schools and so on. But if we see the records, what do we find? We find that in all these five taluks, the Marathi-speaking population is in a majority; it is 76.9 per cent. in Khanapur taluk, as compared to only 11.9 per cent. of Kannada-speaking people. In Belgaum taluk, it is 60 per cent. as compared to only 23 per cent. of Kannada-speaking people. In Chikodi (Nipani Bhag), it is 75 per cent. as compared to 17 per cent. of Kannadigas. Similarly, you will find in Karwar, Supa and Haliyal, the Marathi-speaking population is 71 per cent. as compared to 17.6 per cent. of Kannada-speaking people.

If we take into account the number of schools also, we find out of 19,000 pupils, about 13,000 are Marathi-school-going pupils, and only about 4,000 are Kannada-speaking students.

Similarly, in regard to control duties also, we find there is an important point to be noted. The Commission have mentioned that in Belgaum, there is trading in cotton and oilseeds. But if we analyse the income, we find that out of Rs. 12 to 15 lakhs of octroi income in Belgaum, only Rs. 150 are accounted for by the octroi in cotton, and about Rs. 14,000 are accounted for by the duty on oilseeds. These figures will go to show that Belgaum or that part of the Karnataka border, which is now given to them, does not have cotton and oilseeds as its main crops. Its main crop is paddy, and the Konkan area of Vengurla and Savangadi is supplied with paddy and rice when it is in shortage of that commodity.

One hon. Member had mentioned that in Bombay, there are about three

[Shrimati Maydeo]

lakhs of Karnataka people, and they have all unitedly voted that Bombay should remain out of Maharashtra. Now, why did they do so? There must evidently be some reason behind what they did. When all these five taluks in Belgaum district and three taluks in North Kanara district were given over to Karnataka, the Karnatakas very gladly joined hands with the other party and voted that Bombay should remain out of Maharashtra.

There is one other point also to be noted in this connection. The Joint Committee had requested that the parties should come to some terms amongst themselves, but it was the Kannadiga friends who were not ready for any sort of terms. Now, why should this be so?

Shri Bogawat: Decrease in their favour.

Shrimati Maydeo: They had got something, and they were happy with it, and they did not want to part with it.

Then, it was said by some hon. Members that the population there is mostly Kannada-speaking, and therefore there is no reason why Belgaum should not be where it is. But you will find from the report that hundreds of meetings were convened by the Marathi-speaking people in Belgaum district, and resolutions were passed by them saying that these tehsils should be joined to Maharashtra.

Again, if we take into account the result of the elections in the village of Galatga in Chikodi taluk, we shall find that in the gram panchayat elections, cent per cent. of the members who have been elected are Marathi-speaking; not a single Kannadiga member could get elected in this village. What does this show? If such injustice is done to the Marathi-speaking population, then it is impossible to carry on the administration there. This village may be called a Karnataka village, with Kannadigas, but all the gram panchayat members in that vil-

lage will be Marathi-speaking. How will they be able to administer that village? Will it be in the interests of the Karnatakas that this should be so? This shows clearly that if reasonable terms are not followed, the administration will be very difficult. I am sure such questions will be there in other States also.

The suggestion which is made is that there should be a boundary commission. But any commission that is appointed to go into this matter should be asked to take village as the unit, and contiguity as the main principle to be followed in arriving at their findings. I have to touch on another amendment of mine. It is to clause 9, that the areas mentioned in clause 8 should be added on to clause 9. In his speech yesterday in reply to the general discussion, the Home Minister has admitted that the Commission had recommended that Vidarbha should be a separate independent State for an indefinite period. He also admits in his speech that if Vidarbha had remained out, Maharashtra would have been somewhat truncated. This is our main complaint. The SRC admitted that reorganisation should be on language basis. Here they have brought all Kannada-speaking people together. What have they done with regard to Marathi-speaking people? Out of 3 crores and 50 lakhs of people, they have only formed a small State of Vidarbha consisting of 76 lakhs population. Then giving brotherly or fatherly advice, they were telling us: 'Look here. A completely Marathi State has been formed. Why should you grumble now? Out of a population of 3 crores and 50 lakhs, they have formed a State with a population of only 76 lakhs, and now we are told that we must be satisfied. They say: Here you have an opportunity to show good administration and all that. You are now 76 lakh people together'. But what was the result? It resulted in separatist tendencies. All the Vidarbha and Nagpur people were very friendly towards the Maharashtra people, but

when they got their separate administrative unit, they began to show separatist tendencies.

An Hon. Member: That is gone now.

Shrimati Maydeo: Similarly, these six lakhs of people were split up and sent to Karnatak. So I would like to say that all the Marathi-speaking people also should be brought together.

I do not understand why such a big town like Bombay, which is so important to Maharashtra—Bombay and Maharashtra are interdependent on each other; they will not be able to carry on without each other—should not be given to Maharashtra. When all this is clear, the High Command are closing their eyes to all injustices being done in Bombay State against Maharashtrians and turning a deaf ear to anything that is said by the Marathi-speaking people. Some hypnotic effect has come over their courage of conviction. I hope that this spell will clear off very soon and we will get justice.

The Home Minister also compared the position of Telangana with that of Bombay. But now Telangana is united with Andhra. Therefore, the same thing should be done in the case of Bombay vis-a-vis Maharashtra. I would only read one part of the Home Minister's speech yesterday.

"What I feel is that Bombay should be given over to Maharashtra, and then the other community which has fear...."

There is fear on both sides. If Bombay is left out of Maharashtra for the next five years, the Marathi-speaking people there will be reduced in number, there will be tension and mistrust, and so many other things. Similarly, the other community, which is 18 per cent in Bombay, the Gujarati community, are also afraid about how the administration will be carried on if Bombay is given over to Maharashtra. But the same paragraph can be applied to the other party also. The Home Minister said:

"Some doubts and fears were expressed that insidious methods may be adopted towards that end. I think it will be the duty of the Centre to see that no foul play is tolerated, and that nothing is allowed to be done in that way, that everyone has ample opportunity, necessary security and all the safeguards that are needed to enable one to have a full free and happy life in Bombay. So let there be no apprehensions."

I want to tell my Gujarati friends that this paragraph applies to them also very well. Why should not the High Command or our leaders request the Gujaratis to come to a compromise and allow Bombay its proper place in Maharashtra?

Shrimati Jayashri: I have moved my amendments Nos. 2 (to clause 9) and 444 and 445 to clause 10.

We are now dividing the various States on the basis of language. So it would be our duty to see that those districts and talukas which are on the borderlines of the various States do not suffer. We have to see that they are properly developed. That is the main reason why I have moved these amendments.

In the original Report, the recommendation was for a bilingual State so far as Bombay is concerned. Then we thought that no injustice would be done to those districts and taluks if they were kept as they were. But as we have changed our decision and as we are going to divide the Bombay State into three States, Maharashtra, Gujarat and Bombay, it would be necessary to take into consideration the case of these few taluks and districts. I refer in my amendments to the Dangs district, the Umergaon taluk in Thana and Navapur taluk in West Khandesh. Just now the hon. lady Member had emphasised her argument on the basis of language in respect of division of districts and taluks. I also strongly put my case on the same ground.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is good both the sisters agree.

Shri C. C. Shah (Gohilwad-Sorath): Let them settle it between themselves.

Shrimati Jayashri: I will take the case of Dangs. I feel that great injustice is done to the Bhil people. When I spoke on the S. R. Bill before, I had said that the people in this part are Bhils. They are backward classes, they are ignorant people. Their case is not properly brought before this House.

Sir, I will only read a few lines from the Bombay Assembly debates in which the then Chief Minister of Bombay, Shri Kher, had used these words:

"I do not wish to add salt to the wounds; nor do I want"

This was spoken by another member but he used the words of Shri Kher. A question was asked as to what is the mother-tongue of the Dangs and the reply given by Shri Kher, who was then the Chief Minister of the State, was 'Dangi'.

We have got a great authority on language, Sir George Grierson. In 1904, Sir George Grierson, an Indian Civil Servant, made a meticulous and scientific study of the languages and dialects and has left his impressions in the monumental 10 volumes of *The Linguistic Survey of India*. Sir George Grierson says that, 'due to long and close contacts with Gujaratis the Bhil dialects came to be influenced by it. Bhili is nearer to Gujarati and Rajasthani than to any other Indo-Aryan language. Bhils and other inhabitants speak mixed languages which are dialects of Gujarati.' This is given in the *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Vol. I. page 369.

Shri Dulekar (Jhansi Dist.—South): Do you want a Bhil colony in Gujerat?

Shrimati Jayashri: Everybody wants it; not only Gujeratis. You

have got your big U.P. and you have nothing to say.

The other argument is that at present the whole administration is done through the Surat district. Their business and trade is also connected with Surat district. Their village panchayats, a majority of them, 17 out of 29, have appealed that Dangs should be joined to Gujerat. Seven remained neutral and only 2 voted for Maharashtra. The desire of the people of Dangs is so strong to keep Dangs in Gujerat that even in the last general elections independent Gujerati candidates got about 80 per cent of the votes—the Scheduled Tribes of Dangs form about 84.3 per cent of the population—against a Congress candidate who was Marathi-speaking. That clearly proves that the Dangs people want Dangs to come to Gujerat. Out of 18,000 voters 14,000 have sent representations that it should be joined to Gujerat. My amendment also refers to two other talukas, one Umergam taluk in Thana district and another Navapur in West Khandesh district.

With regard to Umergam, I can say that even the M.P.C.C. delegation which was appointed to consider these cases have agreed that Umergam should be joined to Gujerat. In 1941, out of the total population, 52 per cent were Gujeratis. I am sorry to say that the census was not properly taken. Here again, if you will allow me, I would like to read another quotation from the Bombay Legislative Assembly Debates. Mr. Amul M. Desai, who was not a Congressman said this: If you will permit me, I would like to read from the Debates.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Within her time she may do it.

Shrimati Jayashri: He said that there is a great difference between the number of the population given in the 1931 census and the 1951 census. Those who were formerly put as Adivasis were entirely taken as Marathi-speaking. You can see that there are a larger number of Gujerati schools and a greater number of the

children also Gujarati-speaking. These are the reasons put forward by Navapur, Umergam and Dang. I also request, as other hon. Members have done, that a Boundary Commission should be appointed. I agree with them that there should be a Boundary Commission to go into all these matters so that no injustice is done to the people of these areas.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I wanted to say one thing. A point has been raised that the debate is not real. It was suggested that we might take vote on the point whether a Boundary Commission should be appointed or not. So far as I can see, there is no possibility of its being adopted, though there are real difficulties in the debate and we cannot arrive at the decisions that we want, one after the other. So far, I have not been able to see a better method and, as the Speaker announced this morning, we shall proceed like this unless we can find out a better method as to how we can decide. The Home Minister had announced that the Members concerned might sit together and if they arrive at a decision that would be very nice, though there is a very remote possibility of arriving at such a decision. I do realise that. I do not see, for the present there is any other method by which we can proceed and come to a decision. Therefore, I propose to proceed in the manner that we are doing for the present.

Shri Altekar: My hon. friend, Shri Raghbir Sahai, gave us a voluntary counsel that we should follow the advice of the late Lokamanya, that Maharashtrians should wait and be patient. We are, from our childhood, inspired by the teachings of the late Lokamanya and we know them better than my friend who has given this piece of advice. The late Lokamanya started a new progressive political school for counteracting such advice and for going ahead. He insisted that when you have got a right, you must ceaselessly strive for it. I would like to bring to the notice of my hon. friend that we are going according to that ad-

vice and that we are not in need of any sermon from him.

I would like to point out again that he is an advocate and, therefore he knows that justice delayed is justice defeated. Still he says: What will happen if you wait for five years more? I would like to urge that if we have got a just cause, if we have got a just claim to Bombay, we should have it now, but if we have got no claim, it may be rejected. "Because there is frustration, give Bombay to Maharashtra" is not my stand and I should like to bring this fact to the notice of my hon. friends. As a matter of fact, we have got good reasons why Bombay should be included in Maharashtra and therefore, we say that this request of Maharashtra should be conceded here and now.

I would like to bring to the notice of my hon. friend, Shri Dabhi, that just as Rameswaram, being an island, is part and parcel of Madras State, just as Chadd Bet being an island in Kutch belongs to Gujarat, Bombay, which is connected to the hinterland of Maharashtra, by land route equally, belongs to Maharashtra. Then he said: "what if water be flowing from Maharashtra into Bombay?" That argument does not stand at all. I would like to bring to his notice that—because he gave the instance of Delhi and its water—the Jamna flows by the side of Delhi. But there is no river flowing by the side of Bombay. The Tansa, Vaitarna and Tulsi supply water to Bombay and they are far far away and water is artificially brought from them to Bombay from far off places in Maharashtra. Natural water that is available to Bombay is only that of the Arabian Sea, but that is of no use to the people. We have no objection to water from Maharashtra going to Bombay.

Bombay lies on the lap of Maharashtra, and sucks its sustenance from Maharashtra. Therefore, it should go to Maharashtra. Let Bombay not deny the percentage of Maharashtra. ●

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member, in the present case, need not look to the Arabian Sea.

Shri Altekar: We have no objection to give water from Maharashtra. Therefore, I would say that the people of Maharashtra should not be denied their claim to Bombay.

My hon. friend, Shri Shah said that while we were reorganising the States on linguistic basis, geography should not come in. I would like to point out to him that if there are enclaves of some other language in a particular State, it would mean, according to him, that those enclaves should belong to the respective States although there is no connection and contiguity. When the language argument does not help them, they bring in geography, and when geography does not serve their purpose they resort to linguistic argument.

Shri Dhulekar: Let Ahmedabad go to Telangana.

Shri Altekar: My friend, Shri S. K. Patil stated that it was Shri N. C. Kelkar who decided that Bombay should be a separate Congress Province. I would like to point out to him that it was also Shri N. C. Kelkar who decided that the four Marathi districts of Nagpur should have a separate Pradesh Congress Committee, and the four Marathi districts of Berar should have another Pradesh Congress Committee. With all that, it does not mean that while we are reorganising States, we should, on that analogy, have a separate Marathi state of Berar and another separate state of Marathi-speaking people of Nagpur. As a matter of fact we have to consider size, population and various resources, when reorganising States. We should take all these points into consideration, and I have discussed these points in my minute of dissent. I do not wish to dilate upon them now.

Only one point with respect to Shri S. K. Patil's arguments I would like to answer and that is why the question of ascertaining the wishes of the people of Bombay does not arise on this occasion. I would like to point out that the question of the wishes of the people or plebiscite or vote is relevant only under two circumstances—one is when we are to form a separate independent State and another is when a particular area or town lies on the border of two States and it is to be assigned to one of those States. The S. R. C. has clearly stated that Bombay cannot be a separate State. It does not also lie on the border of two States.—No other State is within a distance of 85 miles from it. Obviously it should go to Maharashtra. I will not dwell on that point any further.

I shall now turn to the next question, that is, the question connected with border disputes. When States have been largely reorganised on linguistic basis, the question of border areas also has to be tackled in a similar manner. Otherwise, it may happen that a certain area in which a certain section of people speaking a particular language are in a majority will be turned into a minority by being put into another State. That should not happen. If a few districts of Karnatak had suffered in the previous State of Bombay, then a few portions of Maharashtra which now lie in Karnatak may also equally suffer. The only test that is to be applied is this. Under such circumstances we should make reorganisation in such a way that the irksomeness will not in any way be enhanced but be reduced to the minimum. From that point of view, we should take up this question of reorganisation and decide it in such a way that nowhere a majority of one language will be turned into a minority by being put into another State. Some of the tests laid down by the S.R.C. like administrative convenience, etc., should be subordinated to the question of the convenience of

the people, because people are not for administration but administration is for the people. Therefore, this question will have to be approached from this point of view.

It was suggested that the representatives of the different States sit together and come to an agreement. We on our part were discussing with our Karnatak friends, and altogether I believe I sat at 19 meetings and had long discussions. During the discussions I gathered very valuable information about geography, history, topography, etc. of Karnatak, but beyond that we could not progress. We felt that there was some difficulty, in the way of our Karnatak friends, and therefore we could not come to a compromise. I do not wish to assign blame to anyone. The point is that left to ourselves it is not possible in the delicate circumstances to come to any decision or compromise, and the only course, therefore, is that a Boundary Commission with suitable terms of reference should be appointed to decide this question. No other method will prove to be of any useful result.

When we have got that thing before us, the only question that I would like to dwell upon is that certain areas which we, as a matter of fact, deserve to get in Maharashtra should be included in Maharashtra. If I begin to dwell on the merits of the case of these various areas, possibly many of our friends will not be in a position to find interest in to follow and to appreciate them, but there are really several such grievances which will have to be looked into. From that point of view I would like to put the case before this House in a brief manner.

Let us take the question of the Kannara district—the three northern talukas of Karwar, Halyal and Supa Peta. They are one compact Marathi-speaking area. They speak Marathi or Konkani. Konkani is a

dialect of Marathi. Sir Vithal Chandavarkar had issued a memorandum, long long before there was a controversy over this question, that Konkani is a dialect of Marathi. He is a great scholar of Konkani language and was a Vice Chancellor of the Bombay University. He comes from Karwar. There are many other Konkani scholars who say the same thing.

Another point that I should like to bring to the notice of this House is the volume of "India 1956" published by the Government of India. At page 44, there is a linguistic map of India. There we find that Konkani is shown as a dialect of Marathi. Just as Brajbhasha and Kanoji are shown dialects of Paschim Hindi, and Oudhi and Wagheli of Purva Hindi and Bhojpuri and Mathili of Bihari, so Konkani is also shown as a dialect of Marathi and it is truly a dialect of Marathi. This is in *India 1956*, a Government of India publication. There is also a resolution of the Bombay Government to that effect and I have quoted it in my minute of dissent. I would like to point out that these three taluks do form a compact area. They are big areas of Marathi-speaking people and they should be put in Maharashtra.

5 P.M.

My hon. friend, Shri Patil from Karnataka said something about the history of these areas. During the British rule, they added on these areas according to the circumstances at that time. Thus Nipani division of Chikodi taluk was added on to this taluka as there was no adjacent Marathi-speaking area belonging to the British in 1848. It was added on at the time when the last Sir-lashkar, lieut. General of Peshwas died in 1848 issueless and there was no area in the hands of the British which was a Marathi-speaking one. The adjoining Marathi-speaking areas were held by the Maharaja of Kolhapur and Prince of Sangli. That

[Shri Atekar]

Britishers had no Marathi-speaking territory in their hands at that time was no fault of the Nepani people.

There are several other points which have been raised. So far as Nipani town is concerned, 67 per cent. of its population is Marathi-speaking and only sixteen per cent. is Kannada-speaking. Even in the case of Belgaum along with Shahapur, 53 per cent. are Marathi-speaking and 25 per cent. Kannada-speaking. Under such circumstances, it will be found that, if this area is taken together, it will form a highly compact area and the population of this area comes to 6,25,000. It will form a good district. To this can be added the southern taluks of Vengurla and Swantwadi of the Ratnagiri district which are far away from Ratnagiri. It will form a fine Konkan Belgaum district. It is in the fitness of things that these border areas should go to Maharashtra; it is only just.

My Karnataka friends said that was a jail in Hindalga near Belgaum. If there are some such difficulties, we shall build for them a jail in their own Karnataka portion. The good people of Maharashtra should not be dragged in the Mysore State for the convenience of the culprits in Karnataka.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should not give such promises at this moment.

Shri S. S. More: He is following the practice of the Government which gives promises but does not fulfil them.

Shri Atekar: I would, in this connection, like to point out what Justice Mishra said about the headquarters, in connection with Bellary. When we are reorganising States largely on linguistic basis,

things will have to be taken in these areas as they are and some difficulties regarding headquarters and etc. will be inevitable—People will have to take resultant advantage with disadvantages. That is what he said. The Andhras complained that their headquarters and Central Jail for the whole of Rayalaseema was in Bellary. There was the TB hospital and other Government buildings were also there. Therefore, they wanted Bellary to be retained in Andhra. But that was not accepted and it was not given to Andhra. There are only 22 per cent. Kannada-speaking people in Bellary and Karnatak got that town because they formed a single language majority group. When there are 53 per cent. Marathi-speaking people in Belgaum, should it not go to Maharashtra? Otherwise it will be sheer injustice. It is like using one argument in one case and another in other similar case. It is just like a pleader who argued two appeals before a court which were of exactly the same nature but being arrayed on different sides. In one case he argues and gets a decision in his favour; but in another he tries to argue on the same facts differently on the opposite side. I believe that no judge with a sense of justice and equity will allow such things.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Atekar: My hon. friends from Vidarbha and Marathwada have spoken in connection with certain Marathi parts of Madhya Pradesh. I would not like to dwell on them as I have no time now. My sister here spoke about Dang. Dang means forest in Jnaneshwari. And every one knows that the Dang District is a forest area. There is one thing which I would like to mention in this connection. The former Chief Minister of Bombay, Shri B. G. Kher and the Present Chief Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, both went to that area and held several meetings. One ad-

dressed in Marathi and the other in Gujarathi. They wanted to ascertain which language was understood. Shri Morarji, most honestly and impartially, stated that they understood Marathi and that it was a Marathi area and not a Gujarathi one. So, if my sister wants a boundary commission to settle such things, I am prepared. We are not objecting to any non-Marathi-speaking area going to its proper state. We want a just solution. We want the same principles to be applied everywhere. The idea of a boundary commission should be accepted to decide these questions satisfactorily and there would be no other suitable method to solve these disputes.

श्री बाघवारे : इस अवसर पर आपने बोलने के लिए मुझे जो समय दिया है, उसके लिए मैं आपकी धन्यवाद देता हूँ। जिस इलाके से मैं आता हूँ, उसकी कुछ हालत आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। मैं हैदराबाद के मराठीभाषी इलाके से आता हूँ, जिसके पांच जिले महाराष्ट्र में मिला दिए गए हैं। इसके अलावा बीदर जिले के तीन ताल्लुके भी महाराष्ट्र में मिला दिए गए हैं। फिर भी वहाँ के तीन ताल्लुकों के पांच रेवेन्यू सर्कल (राजस्व सर्कल) को महाराष्ट्र में शामिल नहीं किया गया है, हालाँकि वहाँ के अधिकतर लोग मराठीभाषी हैं। वे सर्कल हैं—भालकी ताल्लुके के भालकी, हुल्सूर सर्कल, हुमानाबाद ताल्लुके का लाडवन्ती सर्कल, सन्तपुर के औराद और तोरना सर्कल। ये सर्कल ऐसे हैं, जिन में मराठी बोलने वाले लोग ज्यादा रहते हैं बनिस्बत कर्नाटकी भाषा बोलने वालों के। लेकिन यह बिल ड्राफ्ट करते समय उन मराठी बोलने वालों का कोई ख्याल न करते हुए उन्हें कर्नाटक में मिला दिया गया। मैं इस सदन से अपील करूँगा कि ये इलाके महाराष्ट्र में मिला दिये जायें, वरना उन लोगों की कोई तरक्की न होगी। यहाँ पर चारों ओर से कहा जाता है कि स्टेट्स को इस तरीके से तक्सीम करना कि उनकी प्रगति हो और भाषा के विषय में सब को सुविधा हो। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता

कि यह सिद्धान्त सामने रखने पर भी उन इलाकों को उस प्रदेश के साथ क्यों नहीं मिलाया जाता, जिनकी मातृभाषा एक है। इस अवस्था में मैं तो यही कहूँगा कि मुझे राम नाम और और बगल में धुरी। प्रतिकूल (सिद्धांत) तो आप यहाँ पर बड़े बड़े दोहराते हैं, लेकिन उन पर प्रमल बिल्कुल नहीं करते।

यही अवस्था बेनगाम जिसे की है। मैं वहाँ के मन्त्र में कुछ आंकड़े आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। चंद्रगढ़ ताल्लुका तो महाराष्ट्र में मिला दिया गया है। सानपुर ताल्लुके में मराठी बोलने वाले लोग ७६.६ परसेंट, बेलगाम ताल्लुके में ५६.६ परसेंट और चिकोडी ताल्लुके में ७४.६ परसेंट हैं। इसी तरह मे हूकेरी ताल्लुके में ६६.६ और अथनी ताल्लुके में ६५.६ परसेंट हैं। फिर भी यह ताल्लुके कर्नाटक को दिये गये हैं हालाँकि कन्नड़ भाषा बोलने वाली जनता बहुत ही कम है। इसी तरह मे कागवार जिले के कारवार ताल्लुके में ७८.१, सूफा ताल्लुके में ८४.३ और हुलवाल ताल्लुके में ५६.२ परसेंट (प्रतिशत) मराठी बोलने वालों की जनसंख्या है। अगर दोनों जिलों को जुमला तौर पर देखा जाय तो ७१.३ परसेंट मराठी बोलने वालों की जनसंख्या होती है। यदि यातायात और व्यापारी व्यवसाय की दृष्टि से भी देखा जाय तो रत्नागिरी, दक्षिण सतारा और कोल्हापुर जिलों से यह इलाका मिला हुआ है। मैं नहीं समझता कि इतना होने पर भी इस इलाके को क्यों मैसूर में मिलाया जा रहा है। बेलगांव स्थानिक के चन्द सदस्यों को छोड़ कर सब कर्नाटकी सदस्य यह चाहते हैं कि यह मराठी बोलने वाला इलाका महाराष्ट्र में मिला दिया जाय ऐसा कल मेरे कर्नाटकी भ्राता भीमान् शिवभूति स्वामी ने कहा। इसके लिए मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ। अगर इसी तरह से दूसरे लोग अपना इलाका हमसे चाहें तो उनको देना चाहिये वैसे हमने माँदेड़ जिले का तेलंगु भाग दिया मैं यहाँ जूकूल सर्कल के लिये सिकायत करना चाहता हूँ।

[श्री बाबुभारे]

अब मैं धादिसाबाद के जिले पर आता हूँ। धादिसाबाद के दो ताल्लुके किन्नरट, राजुरा और एक ईस्लापुर सरकिल इतिफाक राब से दिये गये हैं। इनके अलावा और भी चार सर्किल हैं जिनमें मराठी बोलने वाले लोग बहुसंख्या में हैं, जैसे बेला सर्किल आधा बांकटी और सिरपुर सर्किल हैं, इसी तरह से उटनूर ताल्लुके में मराठी बोलने वालों की संख्या ४५१६ है और इसके अलावा ट्राइबल (गौड) लोग भी उस ताल्लुके में मौजूद हैं। होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने फरमाया था कि वे बाउंडरी कमिशन मुकर्रर करने से मजबूर हैं। मैं उनसे अपील करता हूँ कि जब तक वह बाउंडरी कमिशन मुकर्रर नहीं करेंगे उस वक्त तक ये झगड़े तै नहीं हो सकते। इन झगड़ों को हम धापस में बँठ कर तै नहीं कर सकते। ट्राइबल एरिया वाले हमारी तरफ महाराष्ट्र आना चाहते हैं। बाउंडरी कमिशन ही इन मामलों को तै कर सकता है।

इसी तरह से एक ताल्लुका गुलबर्गा जिले में है जिसका नाम अलंद है। उसमें भी मराठी बोलने वाले लोग हैं। अगर धाप इस मसले को डिमोक्रैटिक (लोकतन्त्रात्मक) उभूल पर तै करना चाहते हैं तो जो मराठी बोलने वाले इलाके हमसे तोड़ कर अलग कर दिये गये हैं उनको हमारे साथ मिला दीजिये। स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन बिल (राज्य पुनर्गठन विधेयक) में पहले मराठी बोलने वाले प्रदेश के दो हिस्से किये गये थे लेकिन अब विदर्भ और महाराष्ट्र को एक में मिला दिया गया है। इसके लिए मैं बन्यबाद देता हूँ। इसी तरह से मैं चाहता हूँ कि वह जो ऊपर बताये हुये मराठी बोलने वाले इलाके हैं उनको भी महाराष्ट्र में मिला दिया जाये, जैसे कि ग्रेटर बम्बई बनाने के बारे में गवर्नमेंट ने जो नीति अपनाई है। अगर यहाँ ऐसा नहीं हुआ जिससे महाराष्ट्र पर बहुत बड़ा अन्व्याय हुआ है। एक तरफ तो बम्बई को उससे अलग किया जा रहा है, जिसके बिना वह ऐसा रह जायेगा जैसे कि बिना सिर के बढ़ रह जाता है। दूसरी तरफ

यह बहुत से मराठी बोलने वाले इलाके उत्तम अलग कर दिये गये हैं। हैदराबाद में डेढ़ बी साल से हम लोग एक साथ रहते चले आ रहे थे। अब हैदराबाद का विभाजन दो महीने के बाद हो जायेगा और जो हमारे मुत्सिल जिले हैं वे हमसे विच्छेद जायेंगे। कहा जाता है कि कोई इलाका हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर तो नहीं जा रहा है। यह ठीक है लेकिन जो हमारे और हमारे पास वाले लोगों के रिस्ते बंधे अब अलग होने से टूट जायेंगे क्योंकि हम लोगों को अलग अलग राज्य के कानून मानने होंगे। जो दूसरी भाषा बोलने वाले लोग किसी प्रान्त में जाते हैं उनको उतनी सुविधायें नहीं मिल सकती जितनी कि अपने प्रान्त में। उनके बच्चे दूसरे प्रान्त की भाषा नहीं समझ पाते और उनको कठिनाई होती है। हमारे डिपुटी होम मिनिस्टर (गृहकार्य उपमंत्री) साहब बीदर जिले का दौरा कर चुके हैं। मैं उनसे अपील करूँगा कि हमारे जो इलाके बाहर कर दिये हैं उनको महाराष्ट्र में मिला दें तो बहुत अच्छा होगा।

अब मैं कुछ बम्बई के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। कहा जाता है कि जब बम्बई निवासियों के दिल के अकम भर जायेंगे तब हम उसके प्रश्न पर विचार करेंगे। सरकार की तरफ से कहा जाता है कि वह बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र में मिलाने को उत्सुक है। लेकिन सरकार इसके लिए पांच साल का समय चाहती है। मैं कहता हूँ कि पांच साल की क्या जरूरत है। अगर धाप महाराष्ट्र वालों को शान्त करना चाहते हैं तो धापको उनकी जायज मांग को मंजूर करना चाहिए। पंडितजी मानते हैं कि आबाधिकारी (भौगोलिक दृष्टि से) बम्बई महाराष्ट्र का है ऐसी हालत में धापको उसे महाराष्ट्र में मिलाने में कोई मुश्किल नहीं होनी चाहिए। इसके अलावा जो और मराठी बोलने वाले इलाके हैं उनको भी महाराष्ट्र में मिलाना चाहिए।

धाप कहते हैं कि महाराष्ट्र वालों ने बहुत झगड़े फिसादात किये हैं। मैं इसका

विरोध करता हूँ। हमने लोकतन्त्रमय तरीके से सत्वाग्रह करके अपनी मांग आपके सामने रखी है। हम आपको बतला देना चाहते हैं कि जब तक आप बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र में नहीं मिलाते हम लोग शान्त नहीं हो सकते और तरक्की भी नहीं कर सकते। इस समय जो महाराष्ट्र का इलाका है उसमें कोई कारखाने नहीं हैं और न उनके लिए सुविधा है। ज्यादातर इलाका खेती का है। उसके अलावा वहाँ पर और कोई व्यवसाय नहीं है। अगर प्राथिक दृष्टि से देखा जाये तो महाराष्ट्र एक बहुत गरीब राज्य होगा। महाराष्ट्र का धारादारोमदार बम्बई पर था और वही उससे अलग किया जा रहा है। अगर ऐसा किया गया तो हम महाराष्ट्रीय तरक्की नहीं कर सकेंगे। इसलिए मेरी हाउस से प्रार्थना है कि इस मसले पर वह ठंडे दिल से विचार करें और हमारी जायज मांग को पूरा करें।

अब मैं बाउंडरी कमीशन पर आता हूँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आनरेबल मेम्बर का समय खत्म हो गया, उनको अपना भाषण समाप्त करना चाहिए।

श्री बाबुलाल : मैं एक मिनट और लूंगा।

अगर आप बाउंडरी कमीशन मुकर्रर नहीं करेंगे तो यह झगड़े नहीं मिट सकेंगे। हम हैदराबाद के भाई डेढ़ सौ साल से एक साथ रहते आ रहे थे। हमने आपस में मिल कर जो कुछ तै किया जा सकता था कर लिया। दो तीन ताल्लुकों का झगड़ा और है। अगर आप बाउंडरी कमीशन मुकर्रर कर देंगे तो वह उन झगड़ों को तै कर देगा। कुछ मराठी बोलने वाले इलाके अभी हमसे बाहर है। इसलिए मैं हाउस से और होम मिनिस्टर साहब से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि बाउंडरी कमीशन मुकर्रर किया जाये ताकि सब झगड़ों को तै किया जा सके।

Shri S. S. More: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I have moved amendments

Nos. 41 to 56 to certain clauses. In view of the shortage of time, it will not be possible for me, to read those amendments, and so they may be taken as read.

I want to make one point clear. We have heard the speech of the Prime Minister; we have heard the speech of the Home Minister. We have seen that in both the speeches there was an attempt to appease the infuriated and anguished mind of Maharashtra. Particularly, when the Home Minister spoke, his words were sweeter than honey. But, mere sweet words, instead of sugar do not make the tea tasty and sweet. We want certain things to be conceded. We want Bombay as an inseparable part of Maharashtra.

5-21 p.m.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

That is our demand. Unless cogent arguments are advanced, convincing arguments are advanced, why Bombay is being separated from Maharashtra, the agitated mind of Maharashtra will not derive the necessary consolation. I am reminded of a Judge whom I met during my legal career. He used to write the main judgment and show it to both sides, both the plaintiff and the defendant. Whosoever gave something to him, he used to write the final order for that party. What used to happen? In the body of the judgment, the arguments used to be given for one party and the operative order or decree was for the other party. As he had received something from both and as he was out to please both, if the party, against whom the order was made, went to him, the Judge used to say, I have given all the reasons in your favour in the body of the judgment. If the other party asked, you have decreed, but what about the reasons, the Judge used to say, whatever was due to you, I have given and passed the final order in your favour. Thus he used to appease both the parties. In appeal the judgment used to be upset. Then, he used to say, what can I do

[Shri S. S. More.]

I have done my best for you, I am not responsible for what the higher authority has done. After hearing the speech of the hon. Home Minister, I found that he has given all reasons in favour of the claim of Maharashtra, but the order which has to be executed has been given in favour of those who are agitating to keep Bombay separated from Maharashtra. If you want to do justice, you must be fair to all sides and all sides must feel that you are acting according to just principles. Unfortunately, certain decisions have been given, though the reasons are sufficient to persuade them, to convince them about the mistakes that they have committed in coming to these decisions. But, a sense of prestige is standing in the way. If a sense of prestige stands in the way, poor people like Maharashtrians cannot help.

A five-year period has been mentioned as a necessary period. The Prime Minister in his Bombay declaration has stated,—I am quoting from the extract which has been circulated—

"I added, however, that subject to the Central administration of Bombay, it was our intention to make some suitable arrangements to associate representatives of Bombay with this administration."

What is the way of associating representatives of Bombay with the administration? The Bill is silent about it. How is this to be executed? Is the decision to be left to the executive Government or is the decision to be left to the Congress organisation? Because, it has been our experience that the leaders of the Executive Government functioning in their capacity as leaders of the Congress, consult nobody else, but their Congress lieutenants in the provinces. If that is the way of associating representatives, it means that only Congress representatives shall be consulted off and on and the administration shall be carried on according to their advice. It will be unfair to a large section

which is fortunately or unfortunately outside the Congress. We are legislating for the whole country. Everybody in the Bombay city must know who are to be recognised as representatives and the method of that selection. That is the salt of democracy. I have, therefore, tabled an amendment—I am referring to amendment No. 46 in which I have stated that the Bombay city, instead of being classified as Part C State, should be taken as a Part A State. Let it be an A class State. Let it have a legislative assembly. We can also amend the Constitution as we have been doing, and let us give Bombay City a legislature which shall be elected by the people according to a certain procedure laid down by us.

Mr. Speaker: It will be a City State.

Shri S. S. More: Not exactly that. I am prepared to go a little further. Let it remain under the supervisory control of the Centre because the present provision in the Bill takes Bombay to 1854.

Mr. Speaker: Leaving that alone, what is the legal position? That is what I wanted to know.

Shri S. S. More: According to the present Constitution if Bombay City is made an A State, it will have a full-fledged assembly. Then all the items in List 2 of the Seventh Schedule will be under its jurisdiction and to that extent.....

Mr. Speaker: It is only a city converted into a State. That is all.

Shri S. S. More: Yes. As far as the Constitution is concerned, Lists 1 and 3 give a large measure of power to the Centre and the only sphere which is exclusively reserved for the State Governments is under List 2. To that extent it is a sovereign State but even that sovereignty of a very progressive people we are taking away to appease somebody. My submission is that it is a retrograde step. The least that I can demand is to make Bombay a Part A State with an assembly elected by the adult

population of the area, and let all these matters remain with them.

Then, even if it is not found feasible for the present, I would urge amendment 48. Let Bombay City be under the Centre for a period of two years from the appointed day. My amendment says:

"After the termination of the period of two years, as provided above, the State of Bombay shall automatically merge with and form part of the State of Maharashtra."

Give them a period of two years. The Government, the high leaders of the Congress Party, should go about and move among the Maharashtrians and the Gujeratis and try to assuage the estranged feelings and remove the bitterness. In this period of two years they should create a healthy climate in the country so that Bombay can automatically go to Maharashtra without causing any discontent anywhere, without causing any bitterness anywhere, without giving any ground for untoward incidents as it has been unfortunately the case at present.

This is a very reasonable demand. Government spokesmen in the lobby and outside this House at different places have been telling us: "Well, five years' period is not the minimum. We shall do something about this within five years. It may mean six months, one year or two years. Provided feelings are restored to normalcy, to their peaceful character, we are prepared to concede the claim of Maharashtra and give Bombay to them." Why not incorporate that which you are promising everyone into a legislative garb and introduce it as a sub-section in this so that all minds which are agitated and which do not show any signs of reverting back to normalcy, may have some concrete hope so that they can say: "Let us stop all agitation now. We shall get Bombay within two years." I can assure my hon. friends here that every Maharashtrian who is responsible, who knows the importance of the unity of this country, who is pre-

pared to sacrifice all that is reasonable for securing the good and the happiness of this country, will go to every man whether in a hut or a palace and see that proper feelings are restored. Give them the period of two years, assure them that after a period of two years they shall have their due, that will go a long way to restore the feelings.

I want to refer also to Belgaum and other parts. I do not want to quote the data which have been quoted by my hon. friends. Shri H. G. Vaishnav, Shri R. S. Diwan, Shri Altekar, and Shrimati Maydeo have given us very useful data, which can convince anyone who is ready to be convinced, that a great injustice has been done to Maharashtra.

You know the story of Karnata....

Mr. Speaker: Is it necessary to elaborate this point in regard to the injustice?

Shri S. S. More: Yes. I hope you will permit me....

Mr. Speaker: I would appeal to hon. Members to come forward at this stage with their arguments and suggestions as to why they are moving their amendments.

Shri S. S. More: I have tabled amendment.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member has said that already. So far as general injustice is concerned, it has been repeatedly referred to by several hon. Members.

Shri S. S. More: I am not elaborating that point. But I have tabled my amendment, and I feel over this matter. I hope you will permit me to express my feelings. I do not want to add to the present volume of bitterness. But let me be allowed to express myself as freely as is possible under the rules of procedure.

Mr. Speaker: I thought the hon. Member had referred to all his amendments. Has he got any new amendment?

Shri S. S. More: I have spoken only to commend one or two of my amendments. I do know the fate of the amendments, but hope is eternal.

Mr. Speaker: I would not alter the fate of the amendments at all. Of course, it is left for the House to decide. So, far as I am concerned...

Shri S. S. More: I am trying to persuade the House to accept that amendment, at least as far as that part is concerned. I am sure you will allow me the utmost freedom to do so. The States Reorganisation Commission, while making their recommendations, were very generous, I would say, more generous than even Karna as painted in the *Mahabharata*. But Karna was generous at his own cost, while the States Reorganisation Commission tried to be generous at the cost of Maharashtra. Some big moneyed elements are entertaining apprehensions, and therefore, they said that there should be a separate Bombay State. Then, the Kannada people were laying some claim to Maharashtrian territory. Without going into the data, the Commission gifted away some inseparable part of Maharashtra, limb by limb, to the Kannadigas. A Kannadiga friend who was talking to me this afternoon said, 'Mr. More, do you know.....'

Mr. Speaker: I have to call other hon. Members also. I have no quarrel with the hon. Member going on. But the hon. Member had an opportunity to take part in the general discussion. Now, he has moved his amendments, and he has spoken for some time. I have allowed him freely to speak to the House what his amendments are intended to be for. The hon. Member may try to give some opportunities to the other Members also, who have not spoken so far in the general discussion. So far as Bombay is concerned, these are all general arguments, and they have been advanced already.

Shri S. S. More: I do abide by your pleasure....

Mr. Speaker: It is only for want of time that I am saying this. I have to regulate the debate here.

Shri S. S. More: I quite see that. We, Maharashtrians, unfortunately, are working under so many disabilities and handicaps. It really pains me. I shall abide by the time-limit. But I hope that you will permit me to say whatever I want to say to plead the cause of Maharashtra, and whatever points I want to urge for the consideration of the House.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid I have been misunderstood. What I wanted to say was that in the course of the general consideration, the question of the viability of the Maharashtra State, the advantages of including the Bombay city in that State, the arguments for and against it, the question of contiguity, historical and geographical considerations etc. have all been touched already. Now, we are concerned with the discussion of the amendments. Enough has been said already as to why Bombay city should be included in the Maharashtra State, and so on.

But I have got to call some more hon. Members. There are boundaries in other parts of the country also. I have got on my list today about 20 to 25 names. I do not know how many more names will be pouring in tomorrow. It is only in view of this, that I wanted the hon. Member to be brief. I have already allowed fifteen minutes to the hon. Member. I shall give him a little more time, if he has got any particular new point to urge; I have no objection to that.

Shri S. S. More: On occasions when we feel very emotionally and painfully on certain points, repetition has to be excused. Repetition is only for purposes of emphasis.

Mr. Speaker: I shall give the hon. Member five more minutes.

Shri S. S. More: This is a rare occasion. I always fall in line with you.

My submission is that some part of Maharashtra, such as Belgaum a territory which has more than 2800 square miles area, and which is inhabited by a population of more than five lakhs of Marathis has been given to the Kannadigas. They are my best friends, and let them have all the area: where Kannada is the prevailing language. I have been returned from Sholapur. There are certain parts where Kannada is the dominant language. We are open to exchange. But let that be a fair exchange. Now, Bellary has been given by the S.R.C. to Andhra, which has the proud privilege of returning you here. But by way of giving compensation to Karnatak they took away a slice of Maharashtra and gave it to Karnatak. Maharashtra is the sweet cake from which slices have to be distributed to crying children. So a slice has been taken away from Maharashtra to serve as compensation for Bellary, which was to part company with Mysore in favour of Andhra. Now, what has happened? Government have kept Bellary with Mysore, and the compensation which was to be given to Mysore for the loss of Bellary also remains with them.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. Member tabled an amendment

Shri S. S. More: Yes. I have no right to say that Bellary should be given to Andhra. As far as Maharashtra is concerned, I have tabled an amendment. As regards whether Bellary should be given to Andhra or not, I know there are more powerful voices and more competent voices to say that.

Mr. Speaker: I am only asking about Belgaum.

Shri S. S. More: I am not speaking without amendment. My submission is that we are there retaining the part which was to be given away, and also the compensation which was to be given for parting with that portion. My Kannada friends are very fortunate to that extent. I do envy their

good luck. They are having all the things in their own way, while we, Maharashtrians, are losing on all fronts. We lost to the north, we lost to the south, we are losing everywhere. If you will kindly take an overall picture of the whole Bill, you will find that Maharashtra is the greatest loser in this whole business of States reorganisation. Therefore, I say, let there be goodwill, let there be fellow-feeling and let all parties come together and come to an agreement. I do not mind if even Congress members alone sit together and decide the matter on principles of justice. But if that is not possible, I would urge, with your permission, that a Boundary Commission is the only remedy. An independent tribunal not to be influenced unduly by this party or that party which can go into the merits without any personal partisan spirit will be the best assurance of justice. What is needed in this country is a sense that this Government is out to do justice fairly and squarely to everybody irrespective of any other consideration. If such an assurance is there, it will help us to implement the Five Year Plan. It is the poor people who are going to co-operate for the implementation of the Community projects. But if they remain smarting under this grievance, that 'because I am poor, I have no strong voice in the Government, and I am likely to suffer', they will remain there sulking. In that state, the economic progress of this country, not of Maharashtra or Gujarat, but of the whole country, will come to an end. If there is a single weak link, if there is a single discontented section of the population in this country, then whatever we may do will not function smoothly.

The Home Minister was pleased to say yesterday that when an engine is off the rails something goes wrong with it. I believe that a discontented section of the people who have been martially trained to fight for their rights, if they go off the rails, not only will their own progress be stopped but the progress of those

[Shri S. S. More]

engines which are trying to run on the rails will also be stopped. That is what I have to say.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Banaras Dist.—Central)—rose.—

Mr. Speaker: What has Banaras got to do with this?

The Minister of Trade (Shri Karmarkar): It is the holy city.

An Hon. Member: Let it be Central-administered.

Shri A. M. Thomas: It is just to purify the atmosphere.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : जहां तक बम्बई का सम्बन्ध है, उसके बारे में यहां पर जो वाद-विवाद हुआ है उसमें महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात, दोनों के ही सदस्यों ने केवल यही सिद्ध करने की कोशिश की है, कि इसका सम्बन्ध उनके साथ ही है। मैं यह सिद्ध करने के लिए सड़ा हुआ हूँ कि बम्बई का सम्बन्ध केवल महाराष्ट्र या सौराष्ट्र में ही नहीं है, बल्कि सारे हिन्दुस्तान में है। बम्बई इनमें से किसी का भी नहीं है, बल्कि सारे हिन्दुस्तान का है। अगर आप मैकिड पाइप डियर प्लान (द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना) को देखें तो आपको पता चलेगा कि २० मिलियन टन कारगो (माल) हिन्दुस्तान में आता है जिसमें से कि ७० लाख टन कारगो सिर्फ बम्बई की हारबर पर उतरता है, अर्थात् जो इम्पोर्ट (आयात) या एक्सपोर्ट (निर्यात) कारगो की होती है, उसकी ३७ प्रतिशत सिर्फ बम्बई की हारबर पर ही उतार या चढ़ा कर होती है। इसके अलावा इस प्लान में ७६ करोड़ रुपया हारबर्स (पत्तनों) की इम्प्रूवमेंट (सुधार) के वास्ते रखा गया है जिसमें से कि २६ करोड़ रुपया सिर्फ बम्बई के वास्ते रखा गया है, अर्थात् ३५ प्रतिशत उस रकम का जो कि हारबर्स की इम्प्रूवमेंट के लिए रखा गया है, केवल बम्बई के वास्ते अलग रखा गया है।

Shri A. M. Thomas: We are not now on the division of assets and liabilities.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : ३५ प्रतिशत इम्पोर्ट जो होता है हिन्दुस्तान का वह बम्बई की हारबर से होता है और साथ ही साथ ४० प्रतिशत जो एक्सपोर्ट होता है वह भी बम्बई की ही हारबर से होता है। इन प्रकार यदि आप देखें तो आपको पता चलेगा कि बम्बई का सम्बन्ध सारे हिन्दुस्तान में है।

इसके अलावा इनकम-टैक्स (आयकर) को ही आप के मीनिंग में 'नकम-टैक्स' से जो आयदनी हिन्दुस्तान को हाती है, वह १३३ करोड़ रुपये होती है। इसमें से ४४ करोड़ रुपया केवल बम्बई में होती है, अर्थात् कुल आयदनी का ३० परसेंट केवल बम्बई में आता है। कस्टम्स (सीमा शुल्क) को यदि आप में तो आपको पता चलेगा कि १६४ करोड़ रुपया मालाना कस्टम्स में आयदनी होती है।

Mr. Speaker: The general rule is that the amendment should first be placed before the House so that the arguments may be followed by the House as a whole. Hon. Member may give a substance of the amendments so that we may follow. I am not able to follow how this is relevant to this discussion.

Shri Raghunath Singh: My amendment is that Bombay city should be made an A class State.

Mr. Speaker: In terms of the discussion we had so far, Bombay is a City State.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : मैं यह कह रहा था कि कस्टम्स से जितनी आयदनी होती है उसमें से ६६ करोड़ रुपया अर्थात् ४० परसेंट आयदनी केवल बम्बई की पोर्ट में ही हमें होती है। इनकम-टैक्स तथा कस्टम्स में जो कुल २६८ करोड़ रुपये आयदनी होती है, उसमें से ११० करोड़ रुपये सिर्फ बम्बई में आती है यानी तकरीबन ४० प्रतिशत केवल बम्बई से ही हमें आयदनी होती है।

Shri E. D. Misra: I want to ask one question. He has referred to the

Centre's income. Is all this income to be transferred to the A class State?

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : I will say that afterwards.

तो मैं यह कहा रहा था कि कुल ग्रामदनी का ४० प्रतिशत केवल बम्बई से सेंट्रल रेवेन्यूज (केन्द्रीय राजस्व) में आता है। इस वास्ते मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि बम्बई जो है, इसको एक "ए" क्लास स्टेट बनाया जाए और अगर इसको "ए" क्लास स्टेट नहीं बनाया जा सकता तो इसकी एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन (प्रशासन) की जिम्मेवारी केन्द्र के ऊपर हो। मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि काश्मीर, पंजाब, राजस्थान, मध्य प्रदेश और उत्तर प्रदेश ये जो पांच सूबे हैं, ये लैंड साव्ड (भूमि से घिरे हुए) सूबे हैं और इनके लिए एक ही पोटेंट है और वह है बम्बई पोटेंट।

इस वास्ते मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि बम्बई का सम्बन्ध सारे भारतवर्ष से है और बम्बई को केवल महाराष्ट्र में ही नहीं रहना चाहिये। यहां पर केवल महाराष्ट्रीय लोग ही नहीं रहते बल्कि दूसरे प्रदेशों के लोग भी रहते हैं। इसमें ६ लाख लोग यू० पी० के आकरे बस गए हैं। इस वास्ते भी या तो इसे सेंट्रल एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन (केन्द्रीय प्रशासन) में ही रखना चाहिये नहीं तो इसे "ए" क्लास का रूप देकर इसमें तीन जिले अर्थात् धाना, कोलाबा और रतनागिरि को मिला दिया जाना चाहिए।

हमारे देशमुख साहब ने अपने भाषण में मंत्रिमंडल पर कुछ आरोप किए हैं। उन्होंने कहा है कि मंत्रिमंडल की सलाह से बम्बई का फंसला नहीं किया गया है और उनसे इस बारे में सलाह नहीं ली गई है। उनका विचार था कि पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू को अपने धारण ही इसके भविष्य का डेक्लेरेशन (घोषणा) नहीं पर देना चाहिये था। मैं उनको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि सन् १९१४ में जब इंग्लैंड ने बार का डेक्लेरेशन किया था तो कोई फंसला मंत्रिमंडल ने नहीं किया था और वहां के प्राइम मिनिस्टर (प्रधान मंत्री) साहब ने इसका

डेक्लेरेशन कर दिया था। अगर आज्ञा थाफ कामन्स की ट्रेडिंस (परम्परा) को हम मानते हैं तथा इंग्लैंड में जो प्रेक्टिस (व्यवहार) प्रिबेस (प्रचलित) करती है उस पर चलेते हैं तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर के लिए यह आवश्यक नहीं था कि वह कैबिनेट से मन्त्रियता करते। जब ब्रिटेन के प्राइम-मिनिस्टर बिना कैबिनेट की मंजूरी के १९१४ में बार डिक्लेयर कर सकते थे तो अगर पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने कोई डेक्लेरेशन कर दिया तो इसमें कौनसी हत्या की बात थी। इस वास्ते मैं इसमें कोई धारणा की बात नहीं मानता हूँ।

Shri R. D. Mishra: Before anybody else begins, may I say this? You, Sir, had promised to give me some time to speak on my amendments.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member spoke yesterday.

Shri R. D. Mishra: I think I should be given time today or tomorrow so that I may speak on the amendments that I have tabled.

Shri M. D. Joshi: I want to know whether I shall get some time to speak tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: I am not speaking myself. I am giving the opportunity to all Members here on all sides. I have got a list of the amendments, notices of which have been sent actually and which have been indicated in the Bulletin. Those amendments will also be treated as having been moved. All hon. Members who may have tabled amendments may not have chances tomorrow or for that matter even if we sit for four or five days more. I am trying to call the attention of all hon. Members to the fact that whether they speak or do not speak on their amendments, their amendments have been treated as moved.

Shri R. D. Mishra: What about my amendments, Sir? I was putting that point of law before you yesterday which was misunderstood as point of love. If the Government accepts it and if the House accepts it, it will be all right. I have to urge some points in that connection because it is a legal matter.

Mr. Speaker: I shall try to give him time tomorrow....

Shrimati Eema Chakravarty: The hon. Member has taken so much time of the House that many Members who want to participate will be shut out.

Mr. Speaker: I will not shut out any body.

Shri Damodara Menon (Kozhikode): You, Sir, had said that chances will be given to Members who have not already participated in this debate....

Mr. Speaker: I am trying to, but I will leave it to the hon. Members themselves to tell me that they have not participated. It is not as if I have got all their names. I leave it to the good sense of the hon. Member, and if I call him perchance by mistake, not remembering that he has already spoken in this debate, I hope he will kindly sit down and give room for others. That is my general request.

Shri M. D. Jeshi: For the whole day today we have been waiting in order to get a chance to speak. As I have already explained, my district is going to suffer most by this reorganisation of States.

Mr. Speaker: Did he not speak in the general discussion?

Shri M. D. Jeshi: No, Sir.

Shri E. D. Misra: My difficulty is that my amendments relate to an important legal aspect and I have to explain it

Mr. Speaker: Yesterday, the hon. Member had an opportunity, and when I gave him a specific opportunity, he went on beating about the bush instead of referring to this point. What could I do now? At that time he might have referred to those amendments and also as to why those points of order ought to be taken as points of law and ought to have been considered by the House. One hon. Member cannot have the monopoly of the House.

Shri Neasey: I have moved amendments Nos. 282, 289, 290, 291 and 292. By the first amendment I want to substitute the words "2nd day of May 1956" in place of "the 1st day of July, 1956".

Mr. Speaker: What is the point?

Shri Neasey: It will be clear if I refer to the last portion of paragraph 13 of the report of the Joint Committee. It reads:

"The words and brackets '(excluding Puliara Hill pakuthy)' have accordingly been omitted from this clause and the date mentioned in sub-clause (r) of clause 2 has been changed to 1st July, 1956."

I submit that when the Bill was introduced in this House the words and brackets "(excluding Puliara Hill pakuthy)" were there. The reason why I want the change in the date is this. It is on that day the Rajya Sabha concurred with the resolution of this House to refer this Bill to a Joint Committee. On the day on which Rajya Sabha concurred with this House in the appointment of a Joint Committee to consider this Bill, Parliament because seized of this matter and it was improper on the part of any Government to have forestalled discussion in this House and decision in the Joint Committee by taking it out of the purview of this Parliament. When the matter came up for consideration before the Joint Committee, it was a *fait accompli* and that portion had already been taken out. That is why that date had been put in there. This House should ignore any act that has been done by the State Government or by the Madras Government or the Central Government in the matter of the rights of the people of Shencottah. I find that on the 26th of July, these areas have been constituted as a Pakuthy with Ariankavu as the headquarters. It is with a view to defeat the jurisdiction of this House that that subterfuge has been resorted to by the State Gov-

ernment, the Madras Government, or Central Government.

My second amendment, No. 189, is dependent upon the first amendment. I want to say there: "Shencottah taluk as it existed before the 1st of July 1956." Arbitrarily a decision has been taken that the boundary line between the Madras State and the Travancore-Cochin State should run along the watershed. There was the President's regime in Travancore-Cochin when this came up for consideration, now. Previously, all the fourteen members, who represented the Tamil areas in the dissolved State assembly, irrespective of party affiliations stood together and said that the whole Shencottah should go. In the words of the SRC, it formed physically and geographically, a part of the Tirunelveli district and so it must go to that district. It is rather unfortunate that the State Government which is now under the direct control of the President through his advisors, should take such a step in spite of the unanimous decision of the fourteen members and also the democratic wishes of the people of that area. I submit, Sir, that it was absolutely dictatorial on the part of any government to run over the heads of the Tamil Nad population in that area.

Then, the Travancore-Cochin Government has not got a single scheme in this area to develop it. On the other hand there had been recommendations at various stages to show that the Travancore-Cochin Government never cared to develop this area. It will be seen from the 3rd Volume of the Travancore-State Manual published in 1940—page 423—that:

"The only other tract of country in Travancore where artificial irrigation exists to any extent is the Shencottah Taluk, where the area irrigated is nearly 8500 acres, lying in patches interspersed with British territory. A scheme for the improvement of irrigation in Shencottah at an estimated cost of Rs. 3,39,890. was sanctioned in

1932, the cost for the preparation of the estimates being limited to five years' average revenue from the ayacut of the tanks proposed to be improved. For purposes of estimating and improving the whole area was divided into four basins, the following being taken as major basins and the streams running into them as minor basins: (1) Hanuman Nadi Basin, (2) Karuppa Nadi Basin, (3) Harihara Nadi Basin and (4) Kandar Basin."

So, I submit that this hill area, which is traversed by the four rivers that I have mentioned, constitutes four basins which irrigate 8500 acres of paddy land in Shencottah taluka. Now, that hilly portion where water is available has been taken away from Shencottah and added on to Kerala State. The Shencottah taluk has an area of 122.2 square miles. But according to the division that has now been made out of the Puliwara Pakuthi of 59.86 sq. miles and Shencottah Pakuthi: 48 sq. miles and Achamputhur Pakuthi .31 sq. miles and in all 60.65 sq. miles has been taken away from Shencottah, so that half of the whole area has been taken away where the economic life of the people was absolutely interdependent. Neither the River Boards Bill nor the Inter-State Water Disputes Bill is going to help us, because when once the region is put into another State no question of inter-State water disputes arises. Therefore, in all fairness this area ought to go to Shencottah and the decision of the State Government, or of any government on this matter, was absolutely based upon wrong information or it was rather ill-informed of the actual position. My amendment No. 189 has, therefore, to be accepted. I believe that the Central Government will reconsider the decision already taken and re-transfer this area to Shencottah taluk to form part of the Madras State.

I now come to my amendment No. 190 regarding inclusion of Devikulam and Peermede in the Madras State. Various reasons have been advanced

[Shri Nesamony]

by me at several stages of the discussion and I am not going to repeat them. But what I say is, whatever decision you take upon the boundaries between Tirunelveli in Madras State and Kerala, let that be the principle upon which Devikulam-Peermede question is also adjudged. They form part of one single State. You cannot apply one principle in one area and another principle in a different area. At least in one State let your principles be consistent; that is what I am pleading with the Central Government. In Devikulam and Peermede, 70 per cent of the total population is Tamilian. But the Commission said that those areas are necessary for the economic development of Kerala State. As regards Shenkottah, more than half of it has been taken away to Kerala State. Over 50 years ago, there had been schemes for rehabilitating the people of Shenkottah and developing the resources of Shenkottah. Still these schemes were not executed. But the remaining part of Shenkottah would not have the benefit of those schemes as most of this taluk has been given away for Kerala. I do not see any reason why Devikulam, Peermede and the whole of Shenkottah should not be given to Madras State.

6 P.M.

My next amendment is No. 191. It relates to the constitution of the four taluks mentioned in the amendment into a separate district. I should like to refer here to Ajmer, Coorg and other areas which have been constituted into separate districts in the reorganisation scheme. I understand that Ajmer has a population of 6,93,000. Coorg has a population of 2,29,000. The Nilgiris District of the Madras State has 3,11,000 as its population. But the population of these four taluks that have been transferred to Madras State is as much as 8,26,000. It is a compact area and is an administrative unit, and yet, the Joint Committee did not deem it wise to constitute these taluks into a separate district. In clause 15, there is a discretion given

to the State Governments to reconstitute their areas as they wish. But what I say is, while several other areas have been constituted into suitable districts, even though they have lesser population than that of these four taluks, these four taluks have not been constituted into a district and they have been added on to the Tirunelveli district of Madras State. Tirunelveli district has already a population of 27 lakhs and yet, these four taluks are sought to be added on to Tirunelveli. This is absolutely wrong.

Mr. Speaker: What is the population of these taluks?

Shri A. M. Thomas: 8,26,000.

Shri Nesamony: Yes.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Is it not now a judicial district?

Shri Nesamony: It is a judicial district. It has a district court with a district judge and two additional district judges and six munsiffs' courts. There is also a sub-divisional magistrate's court and there are two first-class magistrates besides three second-class magistrates. It is a police administrative unit as well as an executive division for public works. The whole set-up is there, to make it into a district.

Mr. Speaker: What is the average population of a district in Travancore-Cochin?

Shri Nesamony: It ranges from ten lakhs to 15 or 18 lakhs.

Shri A. M. Thomas: More than 20 lakhs. There are only four districts now in Travancore-Cochin, making a population of 92,81,000 in all.

Mr. Speaker: Is not Nagercoil a district?

Shri Nesamony: Nagercoil, along with the southernmost parts, constitutes half of Trivandrum district.

From the point of view of population, the four taluks in the southernmost part of the existing State of Travancore-Cochin should be constituted into a separate district of Madras. It is only fair that they should be constituted into a district.

I commend my amendments to the acceptance of the House.

6.04 P.M.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 2nd August, 1956.