

**Shri Balkrishna Sharma** (United Provinces: General): Mr. President, Sir, I rise to oppose the amendment which has been moved by Maulana Hasrat Mohani. When a minute before he was trying to act as a 'Khudai Fausdar', I was reminded of his very famous saying that he is either a Communist or a Communalist. (Some Honourable Members: "Both"). Now, he has become both a communist and a communalist and thereby he has tried to bridge the gulf between Karl Marx and Jesus Christ. The Maulana is a very great man. We have all looked upon him with reverence and respect all our life for his integrity of purpose and honesty, but I have always felt that he is one of those men who have always refused to work in a team. He is a man who is a solitary figure ploughing his lonely furrow. Even in the Muslim League which he joined after a great deal of confabulation, the Maulana, even though he was included in the High Command, remained a solitary figure. Now the amendment which he has moved is a very funny amendment, funny for the very simple reason that it really makes very little difference whether we consider the Union Constitution first or the provincial constitution first, because we have already got our objectives before us by a resolution of this House and anything that is not in consonance with that objective any member of the House is at perfect liberty to point out either in the model constitution for the provinces or in the Union Constitution, and therefore there is very little difference whether we consider the provincial constitution first or the Union Constitution first. The Maulana really raised a fundamental question as to whether we should have the provincial constitution in nature of merely giving provincial autonomy to provinces or a republican constitution. If the Maulana thinks that the House will fall in line with him, he can certainly bring forward amendments to the provincial constitution, deleting the words which he does not like, making the Governor the President, if he so likes, and giving all sorts and manner of powers that he wants to give to the provincial legislature. If his amendments are not accepted by this House, naturally it will not help him to bring in the Union Constitution for consideration first. Where is the difference, I fail to see. Let it be clearly understood that we have made up our minds not to follow any of the constitutions in a slavish way, neither the American Constitution, nor the British model, nor any other model. We are going to evolve a constitution according to our needs and we shall see to it that we do not fall a victim either to this or to that pattern.

The Maulana has talked blibly about the U.S.S.R. Perhaps the Maulana forgets the very great difference between the U.S.S.R. and this unfortunate land where the Maulana is trying to fly at my throat and I have been trying to fly at his throat. We have got to take into consideration the situation in which we are placed. I think that, if our country wants to evolve a constitution which is mid-way between federation and a unitary form of government, we must be at perfect liberty to do so. In a country like ours which is always inventing all sorts and manners of divisions--this fissiparous tendency is a historical tendency--I think we must be very careful that we do not give so much power to the provinces as would lead to further division of the country.

It does not make the slightest difference whether we consider the provincial constitution first or the Union Constitution first. If the Maulana thinks that the House will agree with him in making the Provincial Constitution a model republican constitution, he is at perfect liberty to place his views before the House, but if he tries to monkey with it, he will succeed in doing so.

Sir, I strongly oppose the amendment which has been placed before the House by the Maulana.