

12 NOON

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

1. STATEMENT ON ACTION TAKEN OR PROPOSED TO BE TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ON THE RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED BY THE I.L.O. CONFERENCE.

2. MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE NOTIFICATIONS

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR LABOUR (SHRI ABID ALI): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a Statement on action taken or proposed to be taken by the Government of India on the Recommendation adopted by the I.L.O. Conference at its 37th Session held in Geneva in June, 1954. [Placed in the Library. See No. S-448|55.]

THE MINISTER FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI A. P. JAIN): On behalf of my colleague Shri M. V. Krishnappa, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (6) of section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, a copy each of the following Notifications of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture:—

(i) Notification S.R.O. No. 3406, dated the 1st November, 1955.

(ii) Notification S.R.O. No. 3407, dated the 1st November, 1955.

[Placed in the Library. See No. S-451|55.]

THE STATES REORGANISATION COMMISSION'S REPORT, 1955—
continued

سرمدار بدھ سنگھ (جموں ایلڈ)

کشمیر): جناب چیئرمین صاحب - میں نے کل عرض کیا تھا کہ زبردستی کرنے کے بعد کشت و خون کرنے کے بعد قتل کرنے کے بعد لوٹ مار کرنے کے بعد اور ڈاکہ ڈالنے کے بعد پاکستان نے ہمارے ۲۷ ہزار مربع میل کے رقبہ کو اور دس لاکھ آدمیوں کو اپنے قبضہ میں کر رکھا

ہے - ہم نے یو - این - او میں کافی اپیلیں کیں اور کافی درخواستیں کیں - ہم نے کافی انتظار کیا لیکن آٹھ سال ہو چکے ہیں اور کچھ نہیں ہوا ہے - سر اوون ڈکسن نے جاسکو وہار کا جج مقرر کیا گیا تھا خود لکھا ہے اور اس نے بھی کشمیر میں حملہ آوروں کے گھس آنے اور اس ریاست میں پاکستانی افواج کی غارت گری کو بین الاقوامی قانون کی خلاف ورزی، تجاویز، مجرمانہ سرحد شکنی اور غاصبانہ مداخلت قرار دیا ہے - وہ قطعی فیصلہ کر چکا ہے

جب ہم نے گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کے ماتھے الحاق کیا تو ساری ریاست کا کیا اس لئے کیا کہ ہماری ریاست کے جو سام حدود تھے وہ اس پر قائم رہیں اور گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کا یہ فرض تھا کہ وہ ڈیفینس ہماری ایڈلی لائن پر کرتی - لہکن اب کئی سال سے سمجھوتہ کا سلسلہ جاری ہے خالی باتیں ہو رہی ہیں مگر کوئی فیصلہ نہیں ہوتا - کشمیر کے بارے میں کنونشن پاکستان میں ہو رہے ہیں اور کشت و خون کی جو جنگ کا نتیجہ ہے اور لڑائی جھگڑے کی دھمکیاں دی جا رہی ہیں - سیز فائر لائن پر جنگ کے سارے سامان، توپ و بندوق وغیرہ اور پاکستان کی فوجیں موجود ہیں - مگر اس طرح کے حالات میں سمجھوتے کی باتیں نہ معلوم کیسے ہو رہی ہیں - پاکستان تو کسی قسم کی شرائط کو نہیں مانتا ہم نے ایک دفعہ نہیں، دو دفعہ نہیں،

[سردار بدھ سنگھ]

متعدد بار سنہ ۱۹۴۷ سے لیکر آج تک برابر ریزولیشن پاس کئے - نیشنل کانفرنس نے جو کہ ایسی جماعت ہے جس میں کہ ۸۰ فیصدی مسلمانوں کی اکثریت ہے اور ملک کی نمائندہ جماعت ہے انہوں نے کئی دفعہ کہدیا کہ ہم ہندوستان کے ساتھ مل چکے ہیں۔ ہماری قانون ساز اسمبلی نے بھی جسکو کہ گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا نے اور پارلیمنٹ نے تسلیم کیا ہے یہ فیصلہ دیا ہے کہ ہمارا ہندوستان کے ساتھ مل کا فیصلہ اٹل ہے اور کوئی طاقت اسکو بدل نہیں سکتی۔ وہاں کی موجودہ گورنمنٹ اور نیشنل کانفرنس نے تمام دیریا میں ایک دفعہ نہیں دو دفعہ نہیں بلکہ بارہا کہا ہے کہ یہ فیصلہ اٹل ہے، قطعی ہے اور کسی دوسرے کو یہ حق نہیں ہے کہ ہماری قسمت کا فیصلہ کرے۔ ہم نے جو فیصلہ کر دیا ہے کہ ہمارا الحاق ہندوستان کے ساتھ مستقل اور پختہ ہو چکا ہے وہی قائم رہے گا۔ ہم نے یہ فیصلہ اس لئے کیا ہے کہ ہمارا آدرش، ہماری آئینیالیوجی، اور ہندوستان کی ایک ہیں، ملتی ہیں۔ جب ہم سنگھوں کے سامنے تھے قہد و بند میں تڑپ رہے تھے آزادی کی لڑائی لڑ رہے تھے اسوقت انگریزوں کی بادشاہت تھی تو اسوقت گاندھی جی، جواہر لال جی، آزاد صاحب اور سردار پٹیل نے کانگریس نے ہندوستان کی سرکار نے ہماری جان بچائی۔ اسوقت نہ جناح صاحب آئے

نہ مسلم کانفرنس آئی اور نہ دوسرے آدمی ہماری جان بچانے آئے۔ ہمارا آدرش بھی سوشلسٹ نظام کے اوپر مبنی ہے۔ ہمارا نصب العین نہا کشمیر ہے۔ ہم نے یہ عہد کیا تھا کہ ہم اپنے پیارے وطن کشمیر کو ایشیا کی برفانی چوٹیوں کی پیشانی پر چمکتا ہوا ہیرا بنائیں گے اور اس کے لئے حسب ذیل آئین تجویز کر رہے ہیں۔ اس پر اپنا حق قائم کرنا چاہتے ہیں اور ہم اپنے ملک سے تمام غربت کو، مصیبتوں کو، ظلم کو، زیادتی کو، جہالت اور مظلومیت کو دور کرنا چاہتے ہیں اور اس ملک کے ساتھ ہونا چاہتے ہیں جو کہ ہمارے نئے کشمیر کے اصول کو تسلیم کرے اور ہماری آزادی کو قائم رکھ سکے اور وہ ملک صرف ہندوستان ہے۔ جب ہم نے یہ فیصلہ کر دیا ہے تو پھر اب بار بار رائے شماری کے سوال کو کیوں اٹھایا جاتا ہے۔ آپ بڑے بڑے قانون دان جو یہاں بیٹھے ہیں، بڑے بڑے لائبر جو یہاں بیٹھے ہیں سب سمجھ سکتے ہیں کہ دنیا میں کوئی مثال نہیں، کوئی لاء کوئی عدالت ایسی نہیں ہے جو کہ یہ کہہ سکے کہ کسی جابر، قاتل، قاکہ، حملہ آور کا کوئی حق ہے کہ وہ اس علاقہ کو جو آپ یعنی ہندوستان کے سپرد کیا جاتا ہے جس پر آپ کنٹرول کرتے اور اس کی حفاظت کرنے کا حق رکھتے ہیں اس پر کوئی دوسرا مخالف ملک جابرانہ قبضہ کر سکے اور کہہ سکے کہ یہ ہمارا ملک ہے۔ وہاں آزاد کشمیر

کی فوجیں نہیں ہیں بلکہ پاکستان کی فوجیں ہیں اور ۲۷ ہزار مربع میل کے رقبہ میں وہ ہمارے ملک کے اندر گھسا ہوا ہے۔ تو اب بھی ہم میں کیوں یہ جرات نہیں ہوتی کہ اس کو نوٹس دیدیا جائے اور کہا جائے کہ آپ مہربانی کر کے تشریف لیجائیے اور ہمارا ملک ہمیں واپس کیجئے۔

ہم کو دو ہستیوں نے سہارا دیا جسکی وجہ سے ہم کھڑے ہو گئے ہیں اور ہم نے اُسرنو اس ملک کو زندہ کیا ہے ترقی کی سکیموں کو چالو کیا ہے۔ ہمارے معزز آئریبل بلڈت پلٹ صاحب یہاں ہیں وہ اسٹیٹ کے منسٹر بھی ہیں، وہ کشمیر گئے اور انہوں نے ایلی آنکھوں سے دیکھا، کانوں سے سنا اور تمام توازیخ کو پڑھا اور انہوں نے ہمارا قطعی فیصلہ کیا۔ ان کی ذاتی رائے کیا ہے؟ وہ تو ساری ریاست کی، ہندوستان کے بچے بچے کی اور کشمیر کے بچے بچے کی رائے ہے۔ کہ لوگ الحاق کے بارے میں فیصلہ دے چکے ہیں۔ جو فیصلہ ہو چکا ہے وہ اٹل ہے اور دستور ساز اسمبلی نے جو قطعی فیصلہ کیا ہے حکومت ہند اسکی قدر کئے بغیر نہیں دے سکتی یعنی اس کو کوئی نظر انداز نہیں کر سکتا ہے۔ عوام کی رائے کا جو فیصلہ ہونا تھا سو ہو چکا ہے تو پھر بار بار پلیبیسائٹ کے مسئلہ بلکہ ڈھونگ کو پیش کرنا

جبکہ حالات قطعاً بدل گئے ہیں بالکل نامناسب ہے۔ مخالف پراپیگنڈا سے اب تو پاکستان کی طرف سے دشمنی کی انتہا ہو چکی ہے اور ہر بات میں ہمیں وہ دشمن قرار دیتا ہے حالانکہ ہم اس کی طرف دوستی کا ہاتھ بڑھاتے ہیں۔ ابھی روسی لیڈر کشمیر نشریف لے گئے تھے اور وہاں کی حالت دیکھی۔ وہ زندہ قوم ہے وہ شاندار قوم ہے وہ انقلابی قوم ہے اور وہ جو وعدہ کرتی ہے اس کے پیچھے سر مٹتی ہے لیکن وعدہ کو پورا ضرور کرتی ہے۔ انہوں نے شروع سے آخر تک وہاں کی حالت کو دیکھا اسکو استغدی کیا اور کہا کہ کشمیریوں نے فیصلہ کر دیا ہے کہ کشمیر ہندوستان کا حصہ ہے۔ اس پر پاکستان چیخ اٹھا۔ جو ہمارے حق کی بات کرتا ہے، انصاف کی بات کرتا ہے اور حقیقت بیان کرتا ہے اس کے ویپر پاکستان برس پوتا ہے اور تمام دنیا میں شور مچاتا ہے۔ چونکہ میں ایلی جوانی کی عمر میں ۵ سال چین و روس کی حدود جہاں ملتی ہیں اس کو دیکھ چکا ہوں جبکہ میں سروس میں تھا۔ تب میں نے شمال مشرقی سرحدات کو دیکھا تھا۔ میں کوئی پیشینگوئی نہیں کرتا ہوں، حقیقت بیان کرتا ہوں۔ روس کے لیڈر یوں ہی گھماں لہریں آئے۔ کشمیر میں یوں ہی نہیں آئے اور انہوں نے جو کچھ کہا

[سردار بدھ سنگھ]

وہ یوں ہی غلطی سے نہیں کہہ دیا
پوری ذمہ داری اور حق سمجھ کر کہا ہے
کیونکہ وہ کبھی بھی کسی صورت میں
بھی ہندوستان کو یا پاکستان کو یا
امریکہ کو یا دنیا کے کسی ملک کو
اجازت نہیں دینگے کہ چار پانچ سو
میل لمبے سرحدی علاقے میں اسکو در و
گلگت میں امریکہ کے فوجی آتے بلیں
اور اس کے برخلاف استعمال کئے جائیں
وہ صرف یہی دیکھ رہا ہے کہ چونکہ
ہندوستان کا اس پر چبکہ یہ ریاست
کا حصہ ہے قبضہ رکھنے کا پورا حق ہے
گو ابھی قطعی فیصلہ نہیں ہوا اور
ہندوستان سے اسکی چونکہ دوستی ہے اور
یہ اسکی ایمانداری ہے اس لئے وہ چپ
بیٹھا ہے اور بہت احتیاط سے واچ کر
رہا ہے نہیں تو وہ چپ بیٹھنے والی
قوم نہیں ہے - جوں ہی اس کو معلوم
ہو کہ ہندوستان کے حق و قبضہ کو
چیلنج کرتے ہوئے پاکستان نے امریکہ
کو روس کے دروازے پر آتے بنا لینے کا
حق و اختیار دے دیا ہے توں ہی
بلڈشید خونریزی اور اذیت کا دور
شروع ہو جائیگا جس کا روسی لیڈروں
نے اشارہ کیا ہے اور پھر ہماری جان بھی
خطرے میں آجائیگی اور ہندوستان
کی آزادی اور شان میں بھی فرق
آجائیگا اور نہ معلوم اس وقت کیا
قیامت خیز واقعہ ہو جائے - اس لئے
میں کہتا ہوں کہ دیو نہ کیجئے انتظار
نہ کیجئے اور جتنی جلدی ممکن ہو
سکے اتنی جلدی پاکستان کو نوٹس

دیدیں کہ تم علاقہ خالی درو - کس
قانون سے کس لا سے وہاں تم قابض ہو
وہاں تم اس طرح قابض نہیں رہ
سکتے کسی قانون کسی لا میں یہ درج نہیں
ہے کہ کسی ملک پر جبراً قبضہ کیا
جائے اور تم نے اس پر جبراً قبضہ کر لیا
ہے اس لئے فوراً ہٹو - آپ مہربانی
کر کے یہاں سے فوراً چلے جائیں -

میں بڑے درد کے ساتھ بول رہا ہوں
اس لئے درد سے بول رہا ہوں کیونکہ
میں ایک رفیوجی ہوں اور چار لاکھ
رفیوجیوں کے نمائندہ کی حیثیت سے
بول رہا ہوں - وہ درد بہتک رہ
ہیں اور جتنی دیر ہو رہی ہے وہ
بیچارے دکھ مصیبت برداشت کر رہ
ہیں - آج تک ان کے لئے ایک بھی
گھر نہیں بنا ہے اور نہ معاوضہ ملا اور
نہ ملک کا حصہ واپس ملا - مگر آپ
بڑے اطمینان سے بیٹھے ہوئے ہیں اور
پاکستان کی طرف سے امید رکھتے ہیں
کہ ہمارا علاقہ خالی کرنے کا سمجھوتہ
کرینگا یہ ناممکن ہے - یہ ایک بڑی درد
ناک بات ہے کہ پاکستان کے اس عظیم
جہر اور غاصبانہ قبضہ کو برداشت کیا
جا رہا ہے - میں پھر عرض کرنا چاہتا
ہوں کہ جتنے پارلیمنٹ کے ممبر ہیں
ہندوستان کی جتنی جنتا ہے اور جو
گورنمنٹ کے اراکین اور ملک کے لیڈر
میں ان کی شان بڑی ہے طاقت بڑی
ہے اس لئے وہ مہربانی کر کے پاکستان
کو ہمارے علاقہ سے نکالنے کی کوشش

کریں تاکہ کسی طرح سے ہم وہاں
 اطمینان سے رہ سکیں وہ تب ہی ہو
 سکتا ہے کہ ہمارا ملائہ واپس لیا جائے
 ورنہ ہماری مصیبت و خطبہ دور نہ
 ہوگا اور آپ کی بھی بدنامی ہے اور
 گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کی شان و وقار
 میں بھی بڑا فرق آنے والا ہے اور عظیم
 خطرناک حالات پیدا ہونے والے ہیں
 اس لئے میری عرض ہے کہ جہاں
 باوندری کا تنازعہ ہے جھگڑا ہے پہلے
 اس کا فیصلہ کریں کیونکہ اسی جگہ
 پر آپ نے جنگ لڑی ہے اور اُنڈہ
 لڑنی ہے کیونکہ دشمن جنگ پر تلا
 ہوا ہے ہندوستان کا جو آسام سے لیکر
 تمام گلگت ایبٹ آباد اور پشاور تک
 سرحدات کا ۱۳ سو میل لمبا آپکا حصہ
 ہے اس میں آپکو حفاظت و کنٹرول
 کا انتظام قائم رکھنا ہے اور ۷ سو میل
 ہمارے علاقے کا جو سرحدی حصہ ہے
 اس کو بھی اپنے قبضہ میں رکھنا ہے
 میں عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ کشمیر
 سر ہے ہندوستان کا اور اگر سر قائم ہے
 تو ہندوستان قائم ہے اگر وہاں ہل والا
 جھلدا اور ہندوستان کا ترنگا جھلدا قائم
 رہیگا تو یہاں دہلی میں بھی قائم
 رہیگا اگر وہ نکل گیا تو یہ بھی نہیں
 رہیگا اس لئے ہندوستان کی شان؟
 عزت اور وقار اور ذمہ داری کا تقاضہ ہے
 کہ وہ پاکستان کو نوٹس دیدیں کہ
 آپ یہاں سے نکلے اور یہ علاقہ ہمیں
 واپس دیدو تاکہ ہمیں اطمینان کی
 سانس لینے کا موقع ملے -

†[سرदार बुद्ध सिंह (जम्मू एंड कश्मीर): जनाब
 चेंबरमैन साहिब, मैंने कल अर्ज किया था कि
 जबरदस्ती करने के बाद, कुत्तोखून करने के बाद,
 कत्ल करने के बाद, लूटमार करने के बाद और
 डाका डालने के बाद पाकिस्तान ने हमारे २९ हजार
 मुरब्बा मील के रकबा को और १० लाख आद-
 मियों को अपने कब्जे में कर रखा है। हमने ५०
 एन० ओ० में काफी अपीलें कीं और काफी
 दरखास्तें कीं, हमने काफी इन्तजार किया
 लेकिन ५ साल हो चुके हैं और कुछ नहीं हुआ है।
 सर ओवन डिकसन ने, जिसको वहां का जज
 मुकर्रर किया गया था, खुद लिखा है और इसने
 भी कश्मीर में हमलाआवरों के घुस आने और
 इस रियासत में पाकिस्तानी अफवाज की
 गारतगिरी बँनूलकवामी कानून के खिलाफ
 वर्जी तजावज मुजरमाना सरहद शिकनी और
 गाजबाना मदालखत करार दिया है। वह कतई
 फँसला कर चुका है।

हमने जब गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया के साथ
 इलाहाक किया तो सारी रियासत का किया इस-
 लिए किया कि हमारी रियासत के जो तमाम
 हद्द थें वह इन पर कायम रहें और गवर्नमेंट
 आफ इंडिया का यह फर्ज था कि वह डिफेंस
 हमारी अपनी लाइन पर करे लेकिन अब कई
 साल से समझौते का सिलसिला जारी है, खाली
 बातें हो रही हैं मगर कोई फँसला नहीं होता।
 कश्मीर के बारे में कन्वेंशन पाकिस्तान में हो
 रहे हैं और कुश्त व खून की जो जंग का नतीजा
 है और लड़ाई भगई की धमकियां दी जा रही
 हैं। सीनियर फायर लाइन पर जंग के सारे सामान
 ताँप व बन्दूक वगैरा और पाकिस्तान की फौज
 मौजूद हैं मगर इस तरह के हालात में समझौते
 की बातें न मालूम कैसे हो रही हैं। पाकिस्तान
 तो किसी किस्म की शरायत को नहीं मानता।
 हमने एक दफा नहीं, दो दफा नहीं, मुतहिद बार
 सन् ४९ से लेकर आज तक रंजाल्यशन पास
 किए। नेशनल कांफ्रेंस ने जो कि एंसी जमायत
 हैं जिसमें कि ५० फीसदी मुसलमानों की अक्स-
 रियत है और मुल्क की नुमाइन्दा जमायत हैं,
 इन्होंने कई दफा कह दिया कि हम हिन्दुस्तान

[सरदार बुद्ध सिंह]

कं साथ मिल चुके हैं। हमारी कानूनसाज असेम्बली ने भी, जिसको कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया ने और पार्लियामेंट ने तसलीम किया है, यह फ़ैसला किया है कि हमारा हिन्दुस्तान के साथ मिलने का फ़ैसला अटल है, और कोई ताकत इसको बदल नहीं सकती। वहाँ की मौजूदा गवर्नमेंट और नेशनल कांफ्रेंस ने तमाम दुनिया में एक दफा नहीं, दो दफा नहीं, बिल्क बारहा कहा है कि यह फ़ैसला अटल है, कतई है और किसी दूसरे को यह हक नहीं कि हमारी किस्मत का फ़ैसला करे। हमने जो फ़ैसला कर दिया है कि हमारा इलाहाक हिन्दुस्तान के साथ मुस्तकिल और पुस्ता हो चुका है वही कायम रहेगा। हमने यह फ़ैसला इसलिए किया है कि हमारा आदर्श, हमारी आइडियोलोजी और हिन्दुस्तान की एक है मिलती है जब हम संगीनों के सामने थे कंधे बन्द में तड़प रहे थे, आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ रहे थे, इस वक्त अंग्रेजों की बादशाहत थी। तो उस वक्त गांधीजी, जवाहरलाल, आजाद साहब और सरदार पटेल ने, कांग्रेस ने, हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने हमारी जान बचाई। उस वक्त न जिन्ना साहब आए, न मुस्लिम कांफ्रेंस आई और न दूसरे आदमी हमारी जानें बचाने आए। हमारा आदर्श भी सोशलिस्ट निजाम के ऊपर नहीं है। हमारा नसबुलएन ही नया कश्मीर है। हमने यह अहद किया था कि हम अपने प्यारे वतन कश्मीर को एशिया की बर्फानी चौटियाँ की पेशानी पर चमकता हुआ हिरा बनाएंगे और इसके लिए हसब ज़ैल आइन तजबीज कर रहे हैं : इस पर अपना हक कायम करना चाहते हैं और हम अपने मुल्क से तमाम गुरबत को, मुसीबतों को, जुल्म को, ज्यादती को, जहालत और मजलूमियत को दूर करना चाहते हैं और इस मुल्क के साथ होना चाहते हैं जो कि हमारे नए कश्मीर के उसूल को तस्लीम करे और हमारी आजादी को कायम रख सके और वह मुल्क सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान है। जब हमने फ़ैसला कर दिया है तो फिर अब बार बार रायशुमारी के सवाल को क्यों उठाया जाता है। आप बड़े बड़े कानूनदान जो यहाँ बैठे हैं, बड़े-बड़े लायक जो यहाँ बैठे हैं, सब समझ

सकते हैं कि दुनिया में कोई मिसाल नहीं, कोई अदालत ऐसी नहीं जो कि यह कह सके कि किसी जाबर, कातिल, डाकू, हमलाआवर का कोई हक है कि वह इस इलाका को जो आप यानी हिन्दुस्तान के सिपुर्द किया जाता है, जिस पर आप कंट्रोल करें और इसकी हिफाजत करने का हक रखते हैं इस पर कोई दूसरा मुखालिफ मुल्क जाबराना हमला कर सके और कह सके कि यह मेरा मुल्क है। वहाँ आजाद कश्मीर की फौजें नहीं बिल्क पाकिस्तान की फौजें हैं और २७ हजार मुरब्बा मील के रकबा में वह हमारे मुल्क के अन्दर घुसा हुआ है। तो अब भी हम में यह क्यों जुरायत नहीं होती कि इसको नोटिस दे दिया जाय और कहा जाए कि आप मेहरबानी कर के तशरीफ ले जाइए और हमारा मुल्क हमें वापस कर दीजिए।

हमको दो हिस्तियाँ ने सहारा दिया, जिसकी वजह से हम खड़े हो गए हैं और हमने अजसरनों इस मुल्क को जिन्दा किया है, तरक्की की स्कीमों को चालू किया है। हमारे मोअज्जिज आनरीबल पं० पंत साहब यहाँ हैं। वह एस्टेट के मिनिस्टर भी हैं, वह कश्मीर गये और इन्होंने अपनी आंखों से देखा, कानों से सुना और तमाम तारीख को पढ़ा और इन्होंने हमारा कतई फ़ैसला किया। इनकी जाती राय क्या है ? कि लोग इलाहाक के बारे में फ़ैसला दे चुके हैं, वह तो सारी रियासत की, हिन्दुस्तान के बच्चे बच्चे की और कश्मीर के बच्चे बच्चे की राय है, जो फ़ैसला हो चुका है वह अटल है और दस्तूरसाज असेम्बली ने जो कतई फ़ैसला किया है, हकूमत हिन्द इसकी कदर किये वगैरे नहीं रह सकती यानी इसको कोई नजरन्दाज नहीं कर सकता है। अक्वाम की राय का जो फ़ैसला होना था सो हो चुका है तो फिर बास्-बार प्लेबीसाइट के मसले बिल्क ढोंग को पेश करना जब कि हालात कतई बदल गये हैं बिल्कुल नामुनासिब है। मुखालिफ प्रोपेगंडा से अब तो पाकिस्तान की कई तरफ से दुश्मनी की इन्तहा हो चुकी है और हर बात में हमें वह दुश्मन करार देना

हैं। हालाँकि हम इसकी तरफ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाते हैं। अभी रूसी लीडर कश्मीर तशरीफ ले गये थे और वहाँ की हालत देखी। वह जिन्दा काँम हैं, वह शानदार काँम हैं, वह इन्कलाबी काँम हैं और वह जो वायदा करती हैं उसके पीछे मर मिटती हैं लेकिन वायदा को पूरा जरूर करती हैं। इन्होंने शुरू से आखिर तक वहाँ की हालत को देखा, इसको स्टडी किया और कहा कि कश्मीरियों ने फँसला कर दिया है कि कश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा है। इस पर पाकिस्तान चीख उठा। जो हमारे हक की बात करता है, इन्साफ की बात करता है और हकीकत बयान करता है, उसके ऊपर पाकिस्तान बरस पड़ता है और तमाम दुनिया में शोर मचाता है।

चूँकि मैं अपनी जवानी की उम्र में ५ साल चीन व रूस की हद्द जहाँ मिलती हैं इसको देख चुका हूँ जब कि मैं सर्विस में था। तब मैंने शुमाल मशरकी सरहदात को देखा था। मैं कोई पेशीनगोई नहीं करता हूँ, हकीकत बयान करता हूँ। रूस के लीडर यं ही यहाँ नहीं आये, कश्मीर में यं ही नहीं आये और इन्होंने जो कुछ कहा वह यं ही गलती से नहीं कह दिया, पूरी जिम्मेदारी और हक समझ कर कहा है। क्योंकि वह कभी भी, किसी सूरत में भी हिन्दुस्तान को या पाकिस्तान को या दुनिया के किसी मुल्क को इजाजत नहीं दूँगे कि चार-पांच सौ मील लम्बे सरहद्दी इलाके में इस्करदो व गिलगट में अमरीका के फौजी अड्डे बनें और इसके बरखिलाफ इस्तेमाल किये जायें। वह सिर्फ यही देख रहा है कि चूँकि हिन्दुस्तान का इस पर, जब कि यह रियासत का हिस्सा है, कब्जा रखने का पूरा हक है, गो अभी कतई फँसला नहीं हुआ और हिन्दुस्तान से इसकी चूँकि दोस्ती है और यह इसकी ईमानदारी है इसलिए वह चुप बैठा है और बहुत एतिहाद से वाच कर रहा है नहीं तो वह चुप बैठने वाली काँम नहीं। ज्योंही इस को मालूम हुआ कि हिन्दुस्तान के हक व कब्जा को चैलेंज करते हुए पाकिस्तान ने अमरीका को रूस के दरवाजे पर अड्डे बना लेने का हक व

अख्तियार दे दिया है, यह तो ब्लड शैंड, खूनरंजी और अजीयत का दौर शुरू हो जायगा, जिसका रूसी लीडरों ने इशारा किया है और फिर हमारी जान भी खतरों में आजायगी और वहाँ हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी और शान में भी फरक आ जायगा और न मालूम उस वक्त क्या क्यामतखैज बाकया हो जाय। इसीलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि दर न की जाय, इन्तजार न किया जाय और जितनी जल्दी मुमकिन हां सके उतनी जल्दी पाकिस्तान को नोटिस दे दें कि तुम इलाका खाली करो। किस कानून से, किस ला से, वहाँ तुम काबिज हो। वहाँ तुम इस तरह काबिज नहीं रह सकते। किसी कानून, किसी ला में यह दर्ज नहीं है, किसी मुल्क पर जबरन कब्जा किया जाय और तुमने इस पर जबरन कब्जा कर लिया है इसलिए फॉरन हटो। आप महरबानी करके वहाँ से फॉरन चले जायें।

मैं बड़े दर्द के साथ बोल रहा हूँ। इस लिए दर्द से बोल रहा हूँ क्योंकि मैं एक रिफ्यूजी हूँ और चार लाख रिफ्यूजीयों के नुमाइन्दा की हैसियत से बोल रहा हूँ। वह दर दर भटक रहे हैं और इतनी दर हो रही है वह बेचार दुःख-मुसीबत बर्दाश्त कर रहे हैं। आज तक इनके लिए एक भी घर नहीं बना है और न मुआवजा मिला, न मुल्क का हिस्सा वास मिला। मगर आप बड़े इत्मीनान से बैठे हुए हैं और पाकिस्तान की तरफ से उम्मीद रखते हैं कि वह हमारा इलाका खाली करने का समझौता करेगा, यह नामुमकिन है। यह एक बड़ी दर्दनाक बात है कि पाकिस्तान के अजीम जबर और गासिबाना कब्जा को बर्दाश्त किया जा रहा है। मैं फिर अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि जितने पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर हैं, हिन्दुस्तान की जितनी जनता है और गवर्नमेंट के अराक़ीन व मुल्क के लीडर हैं उनकी शान बड़ी है, ताकत बड़ी है, इसलिए वह महरबानी करके पाकिस्तान को हमारे इलाके से निकालने की कोशिश करें ताकि किसी तरह से हम वहाँ इत्मीनान से रह सकें। वह तब ही हो सकता है कि हमारा इलाका वापस लिया जाय। वरना हमारी मुसीबत व खतरा दूर न होगा और आपकी भी

[सरदार बृद्ध सिंह]

बदनामी हैं और गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया को शान व वकार में भी बड़ा फर्क आने वाला है और अब खतरनाक हालात पैदा होने वाले हैं। इसलिए मेरी अर्ज है कि जहां बाउंड्री का तनाजा है, भगड़ा है, पहले इसका फैसला करें क्योंकि इस जगह पर आपने जंग लड़ी है और आइन्दा लड़नी है और क्योंकि दुश्मन जंग पर तुला हुआ है, हिन्दुस्तान का जो आसाम से लेकर तमाम गिलगट, एबटाबाद और पेशावर तक सरहदाद का तरह सौ मील आपका हिस्सा है, इसमें आपको हिफाजत व कंट्रोल का इन्तजाम कायम रखना है और ७ सौ मील हमारे इलाका का जो सरहदी हिस्सा है, उसको भी अपन कब्जा में रखना है। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि कश्मीर 'सर' है हिन्दुस्तान का और अगर 'सर' कायम है, तो हिन्दुस्तान भी कायम है। अगर वहां हल वाला भंडा और हिन्दुस्तान का तिरंगा भंडा कायम रहेगा, तो यहां दहली में भी कायम रहेगा। अगर वह निकल गया तो यह भी नहीं रहेगा। इसलिए हिन्दुस्तान की शान, इज्जत और वकार और जिम्मेदारी का तनाजा है कि वह पाकिस्तान को नोटिस दें दें कि आप यहां से निकलो और यह इलाका हमें वापस दें दो, ताकि हमें इत्मीनान की सांस लेने का मौका मिले।]

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR (Bombay): Mr. Chairman, I am thankful to you for giving me an opportunity to express my thoughts on the Recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission. I appreciate the sentiments and views expressed by the Leader of the House yesterday with regard to the outlook that we should have on the S.R.C. I reciprocate those sentiments. If we differ in certain respects from the recommendations of the S.R.C. it should not be misunderstood. The problems which we have to face are difficult and I expect a sympathetic outlook towards us.

Sir, during the last seven years, our country has been progressing from destination to destination. Our

achievements were big. We solved many intricate problems. We have solved the food problem. We have solved the princely States problem. We have completed the First Five Year Plan. And fortunately our country has established its role as peace-maker in the international world. We are really proud of these achievements. The credit goes to our revered leader Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

In his greatness we are great and in our greatness he is also great. After tackling these problems, we have now to face a new situation. We have got independence. It was the most cherished-goal but, next to independence, an ordinary man living in towns and villages wants that the administration should be conducted in the language which he knows well. So, the linguistic problem is most important according to him. In the world, there were various forms of States; there were theocratic states, there were autocratic states, there were plutocratic states, there were aristocratic states and there were bureaucratic states. In a democratic State—I do not want to enter into that controversy as to whether power is devolved from above or whether it is evolved from below, whether the Federal unit should have all the powers or whether the units should also have certain powers—the units have got an important place and that should be recognised. During the British regime, it was a bureaucratic State and they never cared for the sentiments of the people. They wanted that India should be ruled effectively by division of India, if possible; therefore, they never yielded to our sentiments but a time has come when the cherished goals of the people must be respected. How can we do that? That is a question. Unfortunately for this country, the question of distribution of States has a very tragic history. In 1903 or 1904, Lord Curzon partitioned Bengal. Revolutionary tendencies came on the surface and ultimately the British Government had to yield before the popular will. That was not the end of the story. We

carved out several separate States. Sind was carved out, N.W.F. was carved out and then Orissa was carved out but that was not the end. These communal divisions in India ultimately led to the division of India itself. Fortunately, that chapter has ended. There is no foreign rule in this country and no one would say that there should be communal divisions which would keep one group fighting against another. We have discarded communal divisions, we have discarded caste and now we are asking for the creation of States on a linguistic basis. I may be excused if I say that even in the case of the division of India, popular will of a section ultimately prevailed. That was a sorry thing but after all we cannot annul history. So, we have now become independent and every one of us is desirous of making the Centre strong. How can that be done unless the units are well-knit and unless the units are self-developing? We, therefore, welcomed the formation of the Andhra State. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that the creation of Andhra was on a linguistic basis. I do not mean to say that our Government yielded to this on account of pressure from those people, physical or otherwise, but we accepted in all goodness the insistence of the demand for the formation of Andhra. We accepted that principle. I should like to state that language has a great influence on the minds of the people and should be recognised as such. In making this statement, I have got good authority with me. The Nehru Committee accepted that principle as long ago as 1928. It said, "It becomes most desirable for the Provinces to be regrouped on a linguistic basis". I have another authority with me in no less a person than Mahatma Gandhi. This is what Mahatma Gandhi said in a letter to Dr. Radhakrishnan:

"Sevagram

Dear Sir Radhakrishnan,

You know I have always aimed at a redistribution of Provinces on a linguistic basis. The cue was taken from the Andhra movement. I

should, therefore, be more than glad if Andhra could have its status as a Province recognised even now.

Yours sincerely,
M. K. Gandhi".

This was as long ago as 1938. I have got certain other articles in which Gandhiji has expressed himself clearly that there should be linguistic States in India. This is an article dated 19th April, 1942. Gandhiji says, "I believe that the linguistic basis is the correct basis for demarking Provinces". In the same article, he says, "the demand for amalgamation has to be made by Congressmen living in the respective areas. If it is unanimous, the Congress cannot resist it". In another article dated 30th November 1947, he says, "There can be no compromise with evil and since linguistic redistribution is desirable from almost every point of view, all delay in carrying out the project should be avoided." And, this is the last, in his speech of the 25th January 1948, that is six days prior to his death, Gandhiji said, "The Congress had already adopted that principle and had declared its intention to give effect to it constitutionally as soon as they came to power as such redistribution would be conducive to the cultural advancement of this country." So, if I say that in redistributing our States we should have the authority of politicians, of philosophers, of seers, of leaders, then I cannot be blamed. The leadership goes to Pandit Motilal Nehru and to Mahatma Gandhi.

SHRI KANHAIYALAL D. VAIDYA (Madhya Bharat): They are all dead.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: I know that, Mr. Vaidya.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are not giving any new information.

DR. P. C. MITRA (Bihar): Not dead. They are all living still.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Unfortunately, the sentiments or the thoughts expressed by Mahatma Gandhi are not wholly acceptable to present day leadership. My hon. friend, Mr. Dhage, yesterday asked, "How did this

[Shri T. R. Deogirikar.]
change come about?" You would find the first phase of the change even in the Report of the Dar Commission. Then came the J.V.P. Report and subsequently, the States Reorganisation Commission also says that the States are not to be redistributed on a linguistic basis.

Language is not the sole criterion for redistribution of States—that is what the S.R.C. has said. Mahatmaji was the Father of the Nation and we are his children. We abide by what he said. If somebody comes forward and says that the whole outlook is wrong, then of course I will say: Kindly excuse me. If it is my fault to demand Provinces or States on the basis of language, then kindly don't blame me. If you want to blame anybody blame Gandhiji. That is the stand which I have taken, and I ask you, Sir, how can a principle which was good when we were under foreign rule be bad when we have become independent? Principles do not change from time to time. They are one and indivisible. Gandhiji had accepted that principle and in all humility I say as a humble follower of Gandhiji: Kindly accept that principle. Let us accept that principle and try to avoid all ill-effects that will otherwise be produced by the redistribution of States. Let there be no linguistic fanaticism. I do not like linguistic fanaticism at all. But let us not say day in and day out that linguistic redistribution is bad and that we are creating them helplessly. That creates a very bad atmosphere. Unfortunately we were victims of that composite State and it is not our fault. We were victims from the British times, and if we are asking to give us redress, don't have any bad views about us. We are every now and then told: Look at the problem from the national point of view, from the point of view of unity and security. I admit that that is the uppermost thought, that ought to be the uppermost thought in everybody's mind, but if you go on saying every now and then that demanding linguistic States is something wrong, something sinister,

something sinful, then it creates an inferiority complex in our mind. So kindly avoid it. If you want to change the basis of the redistribution of Provinces or any other thing, then kindly say so so that we can mentally adjust ourselves to that view, but this helplessness and halfheartedness is not conducive to the growth of India. I should like to ask my leaders here: What is the binding force in a vast country like India? We have discarded religion; we have discarded caste, and rightly so. If we are discarding languages as well, I should like to ask how can man be bound to another man? What is common between us? Economic links are yet to be forged. Are we to wait till then to have redistribution of Provinces on those basis? But so long as economic links are not forged, we have no other alternative except the linguistic one. India, though free, is **not yet**, I must say, as united as we desire it to be. We fought bravely for our independence and we will fight bravely if the time comes. At the time of calamities the whole country becomes one and bravely fights the intruder, the aggressor, the evil-doer, but are you going to ask me that 'you' invite calamities for that purpose? That will be wrong. In spite of our economic progress and our Five Year Plans we have not developed that feeling of oneness, and hence enthusiasm has to be whipped up for carrying out our programmes. I leave the subject here and I request my leaders to think about it. We have become free; we are economically advancing, but we are not coming nearer to each other. Let us try this experiment of linguistic States, and if you find that it creates fissiparous tendencies, let us readjust our States in any other way, but for the time being at least, don't abuse us and accuse us for demanding linguistic States.

Sir, I welcome the appointment of the S.R.C. from that point of view. The Members of the Commission were good: they were laborious and talented, but I may say that they were not from the masses. They did not know the hearts of the people. No doubt

they were impartial, they were good, they were talented, but they did not know the mind of the people. I appreciate their services to the country and I am thankful to them. They had a difficult task before them. There were three inter-dependent problems, the problem of A, B, and C Class States, the problem of the native States merging in our union after the abolition of those Princely States and there was the third problem of creating new States on linguistic and other basis. This was a difficult job. It must be borne in mind that the Commission was not appointed for reorganising States on linguistic basis alone. It was a complicated problem and therefore the task was difficult. It is no wonder therefore that, after the publication of the report, there was great commotion and stir in the country, and I thank our Prime Minister for announcing that the decisions of the Commission were not final, that by discussions and negotiations the recommendations can be altered in such a manner as will be least unacceptable to the people, and that saved the situation to a great extent.

Now I should like to state one or two things that may not be palatable. Before the report was out, the recommendations were known to the people. That was a very bad thing. Secondly, if they had to make certain recommendations they ought to have taken certain people into confidence and thus could have avoided the situation which had arisen; the sweeping recommendations would not have come. We are not such bad people as not to know the difficulties of the Commission. We could have adjusted our differences and could have agreed to certain things which would have been acceptable to the country. But that did not happen. Fortunately the Working Committee has taken that task and I am thankful to the Working Committee for that.

I am now coming to the vexed question of Bombay City. Bombay city is a vexed question, as you know. Unfortunately it is so. I am really sorry

that it is taxing your brain; especially it is worrying Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Govind Ballabh Pant and other members of the High Command. I am extremely sorry for that, but I cannot help it. They are responsible people and they must solve it.

I will consider now what is the Bombay problem. Bombay Province, as you know, is a composite province. In former days Sind was there; Gujarat was there; Karnataka was there; Maharashtra was there and the Bombay city was there. But, after partition, Sind went out.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): Before partition.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Yes, in 1935 Sind went out and the remaining four component parts remained. It was our desire, a long cherished desire, that all Marathi-speaking people, who were scattered in three States, should be united.

Some of our people were in Madhya Pradesh, others were in Hyderabad State and the remaining were in Bombay State. So what is meant by Samyukta Maharashtra is not a very dangerous thing. We simply said, 'unite all the Marathi-speaking people together and solve that problem once for all'. That was our demand. Unfortunately, the Commission could not understand our sentiments. We were asking that brothers who were separated by various causes should be brought together. They could not enter into our hearts and therefore they could not understand our problem.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Because there was no Maharashtrian in the Commission.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: No, no. Do you think that Maharashtrians will not do injustice to us?

So that was the problem. Now, look at the psychology in which the Commission proceeded. They proceeded from this point of view that Bombay city was an important city and that

[Shri T. R. Deogirikar.]
it must be protected. That was the hypothesis.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): For whom?

DR. R. B. GOUR (Hyderabad):
From whom?

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: It should be protected because it is a city of importance and therefore their first consideration was to protect Bombay city.

DR. R. B. GOUR: From whom?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him go on.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: How can that city be protected? It cannot protect itself because it would have been a small State comprising of 30 lakhs of people and an area of 111 sq. miles. So Bombay city could not protect itself. It could not be given to Gujarat because there was no contiguity between Bombay and Gujarat. If I say a certain thing in a light vein, you will kindly excuse me. They committed a mistake. There was contiguity, if not by land, by sea or by air. But I am thankful to them for not bringing out such a formula that Bombay can be contiguous to Gujarat. They did not say that and I am thankful to them. This I am saying in a lighter vein and will excuse me. Bombay could not be given to Maharashtra because, Sir, representations were made to them and therefore they were afraid of Maharashtra. Sir, I say it is a natural division. If you look at the map of Bombay State, the map will speak about our demands. We need not say anything about it. The map will show what is the actual position—a hundred miles to the north, 200 miles to the South and a small pocket like Bombay in between. Fortunately, both the Commission and the Working Committee have accepted that geographically Bombay belongs to Maharashtra and I am thankful to them. Bombay could not remain separate; Bombay could not be joined to Gujarat but the Maharashtra's claim

to Bombay which was natural and legitimate was brushed aside. I will tell you how it came about finally. Therefore, out of helplessness, they came to the conclusion that Bombay should be a bilingual State. That is a dangerous doctrine. If they had proceeded on the basis that bilingual States should be created, then I would not have objected to their findings but if you come to a certain conclusion out of helplessness, why do you try to make virtue of necessity? I am not able to understand that. So our demand was not accepted by the Commission and they created a State comprising Bombay city, Gujarat, and Maharashtra; Saurashtra and Cuttack were also added and to balance it Marathwada was also added. So what has now come about is neither a bilingual State nor a unilingual State but a balanced State and they are asking us to accept this balanced State. No doubt there is a slight majority of Maharashtrians in that so-called bilingual State.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI (Bombay): A majority of 70 lakhs.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Now, I must tell you why we are not accepting that balanced State. The first reason is that we do not want a bilingual State of S.R.C.'s conception. Out of 16 States in India you have created 15 States on a linguistic basis while Bombay alone is made an exception.

AN HON. MEMBER: Punjab is there.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: You omit Punjab; I have no objection. You omit two or three more. But I must say that almost all States are formed on the basis of language but Bombay happens to be the one unfortunate State where linguism is not accepted. Why are we singled out? Are we such miserable creatures as not to get the benefit of linguistic States?

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad):
You are virile people.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Secondly, one portion of the Marathi-speaking

people has been cut out. Therefore it cannot be a bilingual State in the real sense of the term.

Then there is another problem. After the creation of these linguistic States, a new complex has grown in people's mind and what is that complex? I must always be alert to see that the Gujarati does not get a majority in a composite State, in the Congress party itself. I for one would not like clashes to take place between Gujaratis and Maharashtrians. I will try to avoid them as far as possible. Why are you forcing the Gujaratis and the Maharashtrians to fight each other in this way? I do not like such clashes any more in this country which will lead to disunity, insecurity and bitter results.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): It would mean co-existence.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Therefore even in a bilingual State there will always be a feeling of separate language groups. It will result in internal clashes and if we are to begin to build up a new State with this feeling of rivalry and feeling of dominance of one group over the other, then our administration, our economic progress, everything will suffer. Moreover, our relations with our Gujarati friends will not be one of cordiality but one of hostility. So the S.R.C. has sown the seeds of dissension whose germination we want to prevent. Therefore we have come to the conclusion that if we are to separate, let us separate here and now.

There is one other reason—and it is a most important reason—to which I shall draw your attention to. It is this. Various allegations are made in the representations submitted by non-Maharashtrians for not giving Bombay to Maharashtra and for not merging Vidarbha with Maharashtra. The Commission ought not to have mentioned those reasons. If they were convinced about those reasons

then they should have called us and asked us for our explanation. For your information, Sir, I will refer to some of them. On page 123 in para. 448, they say:

"There seem to be some *prima facie* justification for the suspicion that if Vidarbha joins Maharashtra, it cannot be certain that its resources will be spent within its own area on suitable development schemes and projects."

So a suspicion has been expressed about Maharashtrians that we will not spend the money for projects and schemes if Vidarbha joins Maharashtra. Sir, I do not like that remark. Then in para 450, they say:

"Communalism, it has been stated, may also be introduced into the political life of Vidarbha if it joins Maharashtra."

So, Maharashtrians are stamped as communalists and which Maharashtrian will tolerate it, I ask. I am not at all angry, I tell you. But with all humility I say that these remarks are not proper and they ought not to have been made. I say again and again that if the Commission wanted to make certain adjustments or certain reorganisation; where was the necessity for passing these remarks? They could have done so without entering into these, I should say, derogatory remarks. That could have been very well avoided.

Then, we come to Bombay. The allegations referred thereto are more harmful. On page 116, paragraph 418, it is stated:

"We are impressed by the cogency of these arguments, but we cannot lightly brush aside the fears of the other communities."

The fears of other communities with respect to Maharashtrians, other communities are afraid of us! Though our arguments for merger of Bombay with Maharashtra are cogent, still they are afraid. They

[Shri T. R. Deogirikar.]

are apprehensive. They have got fears with regard to Maharashtrians. That is the third thing which we do not tolerate. And then if you go a little further, on page 117, paragraph 421, it is stated:

"The likely psychological dissatisfaction of the Gujarati and other communities, in the event of Greater Bombay forming part of Maharashtra, may be very great, and it will be unwise to hope that the industrial and commercial life of the area will remain unaffected."

So, they are looking only to the psychological dissatisfaction of the Gujarati and other communities. Maharashtrians' psychology was never before them. Why we thought of rejecting the recommendations was due to these considerations of the S.R.C. So, these are the things which have hurt us most

And I am going to show still further who generated these fears, who have created suspicions in the mind of the S.R.C. Look to the Bombay Citizens' Committee's Report which was quoted yesterday by Mr. Dhage. Substantially the whole line of argument has been incorporated in the S.R.C. Report from the Bombay Citizens' Committee's memorandum. I would most humbly request Pandit Pantji to go through this report and find out where the mistake lies. In the beginning, Shri Purshotamdas Thakurdas, who is the Chairman of that Committee, says:

"The one common binding force that has drawn them together on the same platform is their desire to contribute towards the political solidarity and national unity of the country. (Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair). They have been unanimously of the view that unless the people are infused with the spirit of national consciousness and rise above considerations of regional or sectarian interests, it would not be possible to consolidate the forces of national unity, for

economic reconstruction, essential for the maintenance of our hard-won freedom."

What Shri Purshotamdas Thakurdas has said is perfectly all right.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH (Bombay): What is the page?

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: It is in the introduction. If a person like Shri Purshotamdas Thakurdas—with due reverence to him I say—comes and tells me, begins to teach lessons on national security to us who passed the whole of our life in jail for fighting our cause—if somebody comes and teaches us these lessons, then it becomes very hard for us to digest. But they have done it. And look at the list of persons. Mr. Dhage has read out the list, but I re-read it and I found that there are certain Members of Parliament who have signed it. I do not want to name them. They will come forward. But I could not understand why the name of our B.P.C.C. chief was not there. Mr. S. K. Patil. Is he not a citizen of Bombay and why should his name not be there? It is an astounding thing. I could not understand it. And if you go through the pages, you will find how this fear complex has been engendered. On page 26, Chandulal Bhajji just refer to it—it is stated:

"Besides, the trade, commerce and industry will be seriously dislocated as a result of inclusion of Bombay and its suburbs in a linguistic administration, involving a great deal of hardship and harassment to a major portion of the population of the City. The apprehensions stated above are not merely an expression of a fear complex."

So, according to it, these apprehensions are real; they are not born out of a fear complex:

"As a result of the agitation for linguistic States and the expression given to the same by sponsors of

the movement of United Maharashtra, several persons are reported to be making plans for moving to centres outside Bombay, if the City is to become a part of any unilingual State."

So, before Bombay becomes a part of a unilingual State, these industrialists have begun to shift from Bombay! Can any one of us believe it? This was the threat given by them, if you will permit me to use that word, and this weighed greatly on the minds of the S.R.C.

I do not want to read many more passages, but only one or two. They say:

"While we strongly plead for the continuance of the present composite State of Bombay, which is necessary in the larger interests of the country as a whole and the component units of the present State in particular, we submit that in event of splitting up the existing State as a result of the persistent demand on the part of any linguistic group, the City of Bombay along with its suburbs should be constituted into a separate unit and should not be made a part of unilingual State."

This is what they have stated.

At another place they have stated that the capital is theirs. It reads:

"It may be safely asserted that the vast bulk of the capital invested in the different industrial establishments has mainly come from the Parsis, Gujaratis, Bhatias, Marwaris and several other communities. The same is the case with our financial institutions, banking companies, insurance companies, and other trades and professions."

They have stated that everything will be shattered if Bombay becomes part of a unilingual State. May I ask you, gentlemen, whether it is showing trust towards us or distrust

towards us? And of all persons the Members of the Commission ought not to have been influenced by what has been stated in the memorandum submitted by the Bombay Citizens' Committee. Unfortunately it is so. They could have said that in India how can one part of the country be afraid of the other part? There are sufficient guarantees everywhere. The Central Government is powerful and why should you be afraid of Maharashtrians? But they have not done it, and they have incorporated certain things which are damaging to us. That is the reason why we do not want a State of the S.R.C.'s conception. I was thinking to myself if a foreigner reads these things attributed to us, what impression will he carry about Maharashtrians? Let alone the foreigners, if persons in other States read these statements, they will say that these Maharashtrians are communal, they are untrustworthy. Why should we not be afraid of them?

There are suspicions and many other things are attributed to us. Therefore, we do not want this State, if the S.R.C. wanted to form a State of the present conception, they could have taken shelter under good terminology, phraseology. They could have said, "India is in danger, in difficulties. We want to undertake various industrial programmes and why not live together?" That appeal would have been a fitting appeal and it would have touched our hearts. But instead of doing that, if you are going to condemn us and if you are going to ask us to come into the bilingual State, of course, no Indian, much less a Maharashtrian, will tolerate it. So, kindly excuse me if I may disagree with you and do not misunderstand me in the least. That I expect of you. Let me assure my Gujarati friends that they are not in this controversy. It is the Bombay merchants or capitalists. They have attributed certain things to us. I know Gujarati people and if a time comes, I will say from house-to-

[Shri T. R. Deogirikar.]

that the Gujaratis are the best people in India. They are social. They are generous and very hospitable. You will rarely find such people in any other part of the country. But unfortunately, they have a mental outlook which is different from ours. They are always thinking in terms of rupees, annas and pies. And we always think in terms of Shakespeare, Kalidasa and Bhavabhuti. So how can that combination be compatible? Even if we lived for two hundred years, we could not identify ourselves with them. Kindly excuse me.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ (Madhya Pradesh): Lakshmi and Saraswati live together.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: But they are "द्विर्ग भिन्नास्पद".

By nature, they are not compatible. Therefore, Saraswati and Lakshmi cannot live together.

The mental make-up of the Gujaratis and that of the Maharashtrians are quite different and therefore, though co-existence is possible, identification is not possible. Therefore, the S.R.C. Report is unacceptable to us and I am glad—I am thankful to the Working Committee for looking into the hearts of the Maharashtrians and keeping that Report aside. I am really thankful and grateful to them for understanding our sentiments and setting aside that Report.

Some of our leaders from Maharashtra had an interview with the Congress High Command. Their hearts were pierced by the S.R.C. I cannot forget the love and affection with which the High Command received us. We thought that we were approaching a kind mother, when we approached them. Have similes no place in politics? Certainly they have. Gandhiji once described the late hon. Gokhale as 'mother Ganges' and Tilak as 'Himalayas'. Permit me to say, Sir. When we went to the High Command, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru appeared to us like the Gan-

ges and Pantji like the Himalayas. All the rivers flow from the Himalayas. They were so kind towards us that I have no words to express it. So were Moulana Saheb and Shri Dhebar. They pointed out to us their difficulties. We appreciated their difficulties. In all sincerity I tell you that they were put in a difficult situation and we could understand their difficulties. On the second day, we told them that. We do not want the so-called bilingual State conceived by the S.R.C. Report. And if a bilingual State is at all to be formed why should our brothers from Vidarbha be kept aside? That was our natural demand. We said, "Let all Maharashtrians and Gujaratis come together and let us again try to forge the bond of love and affection for a certain number of years." We were prepared to do it in the light of the difficulties through which the High Command was passing.

AN. HON. MEMBER: No hostility afterwards?

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: No, no. Certainly not. You and I are friends. So, do not be afraid of clashes.

But the Gujaratis thought that the proposal was made by us to keep them permanently a minority and that this was made *mala fide*. I tell you that nothing is as hard as this from Gujarat. I never expected that they will question our *bona fides*. We went to the High Command with an open heart and with all humility, and said, "Let there be the bilingual State of our conception. Let all the Maharashtrians and all the Gujaratis be brought together." The G.P.C.C. and B.P.C.C. rejected it. I did not question the doubts and difficulties they had. They were justified in raising the objection to this proposal, because Chandu Bhai and myself are good friends, but we cannot say what our followers will be. Therefore, there was this danger that the Gujaratis would have been permanently in minority and so we did not pursue

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): They are disloyal followers.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Kapoor Bhai's followers also can be both loyal and disloyal.

Now, the Working Committee suggested a formula and that was the formula of three States. Really speaking, it is not a formula of three states. It is a formula for a separate Bombay City State. They came to this conclusion not in a spirit of disgust or helplessness, but they thought that if the S.R.C. proposal which was best according to them, was not acceptable, then the second best was the three-State formula. I may not agree with them, but I do not question their good motives. Some of my friends from Gujarat and Bombay have tried to discredit me—Deogirikar—personally, by saying that this proposal of three States has come from me and that I have originated it. If they are a little careful, they will see that the germs of this proposal are to be found in the Bombay Citizens' Memorandum. It has not come from the High Command or from Mr. Deogirikar. I emphatically deny the fatherhood of that formula. It is not mine—I say this not only once, but twice and thrice. I have nothing to do with it. But if anybody is responsible for it, it is the Bombay Citizens' Committee.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Or the Dar Commission.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Or Brahma. I am not committed to anything. Let me assure you. It is engineered by the Bombay Citizens' Committee, as I said. They are the authorities suggesting this formula in their memorandum. Just imagine for a moment what an ordinary small man like myself can do. The question was of bringing Vidarbha into Samyuktha Maharashtra and how can a poor Deogirikar say that he has got the capacity to bring Vidarbha into Maharashtra? That can be done

by the High Command alone, and none else. I have not got that capacity or status. That capacity and strength are with the High Command and they are trying for it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Nobody from Maharashtra is going to speak. I am the only spokesman. So kindly give me some more time. I may assure you that none from Maharashtra will speak.

The High Command alone can say that they will try to persuade the Vidarbha people to join Maharashtra and unless that is done, the three State formula cannot come for consideration. That is the case regarding this proposal of the three State formula. Let me make my position as the Chief of the Maharashtra Provincial Congress Committee clear. We have simply stated that it does not commend itself to us. We have not said that we have rejected it. We have not said anything. And we welcomed the attempts of the High Command in trying to bring Vidarbha into Samyuktha Maharashtra. These were our feelings and we expressed them in as clear terms as possible. Let there be no misunderstanding on that score. We 1 P.M. have made another proposal to the Congress High Command to kindly reconsider their proposal with regard to the creation of Bombay State. So, the three-State formula does not commend itself to us. We welcome the attempts that are being made by the High Command in bringing Vidarbha to us, but with regard to Bombay, with all humility, we are requesting the High Command to reconsider their decision.

Now, I come to the very vexed question of creation of Bombay city as a separate State. The reasons why Bombay city is to be created as a separate State are these. The Bombay Provincial Congress Committee

[Shri T. R. Deogirikar.]

does not want a separate City State because according to them, they think, the best solution is the S.R.C. formula. If the S.R.C. formula is not acceptable, if there is no alternative, then create Bombay City as a separate city State they say. They are not doing it willingly but out of helplessness. They are not accepting Bombay city State as a separate State willingly.

The Gujarat Provincial Congress Committee says that Bombay city should not be the capital of a unilingual State. They will have a separate State of their own. They have got industries. They have got the capital. Kandla is developing. Kakrapara is there. We say to our Gujarati friends, "you have got a good unit; you have got 75 textile mills in Ahmedabad. There may be 80 textile mills in Bombay. You have got a self-contained unit in Gujarat. Let us also have a self-contained unit in Maharashtra". They say "No." Gujaratis say they have a claim on Bombay because it was built up not only by Maharashtrians but by all communities together. I do not deny that. But they say that it cannot be the capital of a unilingual state. The interests of the capitalists are interwoven with Bombay. No doubt, the capital came from Bombay capitalists but may I say that we Maharashtrians are also responsible for our share?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Other communities also.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Yes, Maharashtrian is one community, Mr. Chandulal. This is not the only community in Bombay; other communities are also there.

Then, it is said that Bombay is a multilingual city. Why only Bombay? There are so many cities in India which are multilingual, but are you going to give separate city States because of that particular regard.

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA (Andhra): Only Madras.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: So many multilingual cities are growing today. These multilingual cities and cosmopolitan nature of cities are growing.

It is said Bombay has got cosmopolitan culture. I could not understand what is this "cosmopolitan culture."

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Let linguism disappear.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Let us wait for that. So, it is said that Bombay is a cosmopolitan city; it has got cosmopolitan culture.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Cosmopolitan outlook.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: All right, let it be 'outlook'. But we Indians are under the impression that the culture of India is one which is a mixture of Aryan culture, Islamic culture, Buddhist culture, Christian culture and so on. It is *Sanskriti Sangam*. That is exactly what is meant by "cosmopolitan". There you do not find anything particular in cosmopolitan for which Bombay city need be kept as a separate city State. So, I do not agree with this view.

DR. R. B. GOUR: What about the culture of stock exchange?

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: It is certainly not "agriculture". These reasonings are not at all convincing. As I said, geographically Bombay forms a part of Maharashtra. 80 miles to its north and 100-200 miles to its south and on the east there is Maharashtra area. Bombay is surrounded on all sides by Maharashtrian area. There are 49 per cent. or 48 per cent. or 44 per cent. of Maharashtrians in Bombay. Chandubhai will at once get up and say it is 43.6 per

cent. I may assure him that Maharashtrians are the biggest majority in Bombay city. You cannot deny that. As Mr. Dhage said yesterday, if you are going to give a separate status to the city of Bombay because the percentage of Maharashtrians is not in overwhelming majority, then why do you keep Bangalore in Karnataka where there are only 23 per cent. of Kannadigas.

SHRI RAGAVENDRARAO (Hyderabad): Hyderabad.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: My friend says Hyderabad has got 49 per cent. of Urdu speaking people. That does not appeal to me. I say, even if Bombay had less percentage than 43, 46 or 49, anyway, it is greater than Gujaratis percentage. Therefore Bombay ought to have been given to Maharashtrians. That is our argument.

Now, I will give you some reasons why Bombay city should not be created into a separate city State. First of all I would like my friends to answer my question as to what is the problem of Bombay? Nobody has cared to understand as yet what the problem of Bombay city is. I will simply ask you to look at the Union List and the Concurrent List and you will understand that in the city of Bombay the State legislature has no power except the power of legislature and police. The industry, the transport, the finance, insurance, banking, commerce, everything is in the hands of the Centre. Over and above that there is the powerful Bombay Corporation. What remains in the hands of the State Government is only legislative and police powers. Out of these two powers we are prepared to hand over the police power to the Corporation. So ultimately what remains in the hands of the State legislature is only the legislative power.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Nothing more?

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: That will be not troublesome to you. But

certainly, Mr. Chandulal, you do not know the safeguards given in the Constitution.

Secondly if you want to create a city State, certain elementary things are required. A state must have cohesive element. People must be loyal to the State. They should be prepared for sacrifice for the maintenance of their State. Are any of these factors to be found in Bombay city? Yesterday some one asked me about the principles which have been disregarded by the S.R.C. Bombay is the typical example where no principle is applicable for forming it into a city State. So, the cohesive element is not there.

The conception of a city State has been discarded by all modern political thinkers as the wants of the cities have grown. Unless they have got hinterland, city States cannot be formed. The S.R.C. Report said that Bombay city state should not be formed. The J.V.P. report and the Dar Commission report said that if at all Bombay was to be divided into three, four or more parts, Bombay city should form a separate unit. But, fortunately, for us the S.R.C. has recommended that Bombay city should not be formed into a separate unit, and they were right and wise in saying so. They have not accepted the recommendations of the Bombay Citizens' Committee. They have categorically stated that it will be a retrograde step if you form Bombay into a separate unit.

The fact that Bombay is a port should not be forgotten. It has danger both from inside and outside. Unless the State has got vast area to protect it, it will not be in the interest of that particular area to get the status of a State. That is the third argument. I have just now said that there are so many eminent capitalists in Bombay who have said that Bombay should be kept as a separate City State in the alternative. But I have here the names of a number of persons who have said that Bombay

[Shri T. R. Deogirikar.] should not be formed into a separate unit at all. And their opinions count very much in the Indian politics. They are eminent economists and industrialists also (1) Shri John Matthai, (2) Shri V. N. Chandawarkar, (3) Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao, (4) Shri V. L. Mehta, (5) Dr. D. R. Gadgil, and (6) Shri A. D. Gorwala, Sir, the hon. Mr. Pant is not here at the moment, but I am sure that Mr. Pataskar will carry my humble message to him. In all humility I ask: Will you just ask Shri C. D. Deshmukh about his views over this matter? And if all these economists say with one voice that there is danger in creating a separate Bombay City State, then it will be advisable for the Central Government to think about it. So these disinterested parties' views count very much and they must be given proper attention to by our leaders, by our Cabinet Ministers.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): Kindly let us know as to how many non-Maharashtrians wish for the merger of Bombay into Maharashtra?

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Sindhis are among the non-Maharashtrians.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: You are mistaken. I am a Sindhi.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Dr. Choithram Gidwani has said this thing many a time, and he is going to make a speech that Sindhis are not against the merger. I can correct my view, if you tell me something.....

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: I am sorry to say that Dr. Choithram in this matter does not represent the Sindhis' opinion.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Then, I am subject to correction. I will then say that all Sindhis are against the merger. Are you satisfied Mr. Malkani?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Deogirikar, it is time.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: I shall finish within ten minutes. Sir, we will be uprooting the life of several thousand employees both in the Government and outside. I believe, one lakh of people will be affected, if you create a separate Bombay City State. Bombay has no hinterland, and industrial development is impossible. By creating such a State, you will no doubt be justifying the arguments given in the S.R.C. Report about Maharashtrians. But I request you not to accept those reasonings and those arguments. Do not create Bombay as a separate State. What will be the fate of the Congress? I cannot imagine that. But I can tell you that if Bombay City State is formed, there is danger to Congress both in Maharashtra and in Bombay. Have you seen the results of the Corporation today? What has happened there? Mr. Patil was absolutely sure that he would be able to carry the S.R.C. Report through the Corporation. And today, you know that the voting is 50 against 46. That is what is going to happen in Bombay. So for God's sake, avoid it. I tell you all this in the interest of the Congress itself and not in the interest of Maharashtra.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: But if you tell this to the Communist friends, they will be opposed to you.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Let them be opposed.

Then, Sir, I tell you one more thing. Do you know how many non-Maharashtrians, Gujaratis and others are today living in Maharashtra? Almost all the business is in the hands of the Gujarati friends for the last hundred years, and they have not made any complaint against us. We are living as good brothers.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: How many Maharashtrians are there in Gujarat?

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: In Ahmedabad, there are 30,000 labourers. We Maharashtrians are only labourers and clerks, and nothing more than that. If you think that there is any substance in the fears and suspicions of the capitalists, you are welcome to safeguard their interests in any way you like. Our Constitution has made ample provision in this matter. For example, there are articles 301, 302, 303 and 304 which protect such interests. And article 307 has devised some machinery for that purpose. You can ask the capitalists if these provisions are not sufficient. If they don't find these provisions sufficient, give them whatever safeguards they demand. We have absolutely no objection to that. But they must say so in the interest of the country. Then I can understand it. They are also our countrymen. I am not prepared to misunderstand that position. They are as much Indians as you are or I am, or any other person for that matter. So, if they have any fears and suspicions, root them out by giving them as many safeguards as they want, provided you accept the position that Bombay, geographically and administratively, forms part of Maharashtra. Sir, from whatever little information I possess, I can say that if this merger comes about, there will be no trouble and no opposition of any kind. I am absolutely certain that a formula, agreeable to all, can be evolved if we sit together.

Then, Sir, I should like to make a few observations with regard to the border areas. Just as there is discontent in the various States, similarly there is discontent prevailing in the border areas. For many years, these areas had the same grievance as the States had, and there were constant clashes going on between them. The time has come when these problems should be resolved. Sir, between Maharashtra and Karnataka there are certain taluks—seven, I think—where the area-wise readjust-

ment is necessary. North Karwar has three taluks which have been wrongly merged into Karnataka. The language spoken there is Konkani. It is a dialect of Marathi. They have no script or literature of their own. Devanagari and Marathi are their scripts. They have no literature of their own. The people of Supa, Haliyal and Karwar want a merger with Marathi areas. In Belgaum District, the Belgaum taluk, the Chikodi taluk, the Nipani area, and the whole of Khanapur, deserve a merger with the Marathi-speaking areas. It has been said that these taluks cannot be split up. But I am asking one question, and that is this: if you are going to split up the States, then why can't you split up the taluks and do away with their grievances once and for all? That is my request to you with regard to that.

Then, Sir, in the end, I should like to state a few things. Certain unwanted considerations have crept in, in the linguistic controversies. It has been argued that every question should be looked at from the point of view of the country's unity and security, and from the national point of view. I entirely agree with that view. But will you not also agree with me that we who fought for the independence of the country and suffered so much have also fought for justice? Then give us that justice. On behalf of Maharashtrians. I can assure you that we will sacrifice everything for the nation, for the unity and security of the country. I want to make it very clear here, Sir, that we will remain loyal to the Congress and to the High Command. Please, do not doubt it. We were born and brought up in the Congress. Do not ask us to lead a life of humiliation in the Congress with our mental dissatisfaction and with our distressed hearts we will not be able to give you strength.

I am therefore again requesting the Government to give us justice. To my friends in Gujarat and Bombay I appeal to give up all distrust about us. Entertain no fears; they are all

[Shri T. R. Deogirikar.]

imaginary. Have no suspicions; they will ruin us. Let us be friends in the service of the country. Do not come in the way of justice. Be generous as you ever are. To my leaders I implore not to put us in an embarrassing position. I know that their task is difficult and that their responsibilities are great. They will have to solve our problems. We may have erred but might have erred in a right cause. Kindly excuse us if we have said anything inadvertently and hurt you. We have faith that truth will ultimately triumph. 'From darkness lead us to light and from death to immortality.' Conquer us with overpowering love and give us justice. That is my demand.

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is a very unique report which we are discussing today. It is unique in many ways. If you look at the reactions, you will see that never before a blue book published by the Government had caused such serious riots in Belgaum and in Bombay and elsewhere in India. Never before a report was published the injustice of whose recommendations infuriated the people to such an extent that they preferred citizenship in prisons to citizenship outside. Never before a report was published which was burnt in public meetings at least in two States in India.

AN HON. MEMBER: What are they?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: None the less, the Commission have made many worth-while recommendations which certainly merit our appreciation. Their recommendations for the formation of linguistic States like Kerala and Karnataka, the abolition of the Rajpramukhs, the provision of safeguards for linguistic minorities in Chapter IV of the report and lastly their equalisation of Part A. and Part B. States are certainly welcome recommendations which are worthy of acceptance. At the same time. there are certain

recommendations in this report which, I consider, are politically wrong, morally indefensible and rationally untenable. Sir, if you look at the recommendations for the creation of a separate Telangana which carries the germs of warfare between the Telugus of Andhra and the Telugus of Telangana for five years in the name of the unity of India, if you look at the recommendations for creating bilingual Bombay which has driven a wedge between the Maharashtrians and the Gujaratis, if you look at the summary rejection of Orissa's claims for border readjustments, then, I am sure you will agree with me that the Commission leaves much to be desired.

Sir, we have been asked to consider this report with respect. I yield to none in that desire. This is a report which has been drafted by three very eminent persons who are held in great esteem by all of us. But to hold a person in high esteem is completely different from respectful appreciation of his views. I may love you, Sir, but you should not expect me to love your dog too. Holding a man in esteem is completely different from holding his views in esteem. As you know, respect is reserved; respect is not commanded. I also tried to view this report with the utmost respect but I will take the House into confidence and confess that all my attempts have resulted in utter futility. I do not hold it in any respect, nor does it command the respect of 15 million Oriyas. It is not merely a sentimental expression because the S.R.C. has ignored our claims, not that, but for very objective reasons which I will place before you. This report does not command the respect of 15 million Oriyas. In the first place, if you turn to page 24 of this report, you will find that the hon. Members of the Commission set out before themselves the task of giving satisfaction to a substantial majority of the Indian people. That, we consider most unfortunate. This attitude of satisfying the majority at the cost

of the minority is something very repugnant to the political concept that is obtaining today.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar):

बहुजन हिताय, बहुजन सुखाय ।

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I am coming to that. Why should the hon. Members of this Commission equate the majority with the nation? Here, they are sowing the seeds of dissension. If you want to give life to the unity of India, that mythical concept, if you want to infuse vitality into it, if you are going to make it something real, something abiding, then such mischievous doctrines of giving satisfaction to a substantial majority at the cost of the minority should be eschewed.

In the second place, why I do not hold this report in any respect, why Orissa does not hold this report in any respect, is because this report is alleged to have been altered at the eleventh hour. I invite the attention of the House to a statement which was made by no less a person than the Revenue Minister of Bombay, Shri B. S. Hirey, on the 21st October. He issued a statement that a prominent member of this Commission read out to him the chapter of the Commission relating to Samyukta Maharashtra conceding their demand, but he alleged that this report was altered at the eleventh hour. Now, on October the 26th, the Secretary of this defunct S.R.C. issued a statement contradicting those facts.

SHRI T. BODRA (Bihar): Is it all relevant to the discussion here? We are concerned with only what is actually contained in the report.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: In the first place, if my hon. friend is ignorant, I cannot help it. If my hon. friend is ignorant, I cannot undertake his education on the floor of the House. He should go to the Library and make a reference to what has appeared in cold print. Sir, this is a very dangerous precedent. May I know when the S.R.C. ceased to exist? It ceased to function when it had submitted

its report to the Government, and that was on the 30th September 1955. May I know what was the legal, what was the official, status of the S. R. C. on the 26th October? If a contradiction was to be issued, if any rejoinder was to be issued, then in the fitness of things it should have been issued by the hon. Members of the Commission individually and not by the Secretary of this defunct body. Therefore, to cut the matter short, here remains this contention unchallenged, and, therefore, Orissa believes that this report had been altered at the eleventh hour, even though according to a very prominent Member of the Commission who told me himself that in the beginning when they considered the question of Seraikella and Kharsawan, they were agreed to settle it in favour of Orissa.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ: I want to know from my hon. friend whether the Commission is not competent to change its own report before submission to the Government and before it was signed?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: It is true, but the Commission should have said that 'we erred in the beginning but we have now corrected ourselves', but the Commission does not say anything like that, but the Secretary of this defunct body issues a statement contradicting certain allegations.

In the third place, why we do not hold this report in any respect is because of the dissociation of the Chairman, Mr. Fazl Ali. I was very happy when the hon. the mover of the motion was paying a glowing tribute to Mr. Fazl Ali. I too had occasion to know him.

I had occasion to know him as the Governor of Orissa. I was much impressed with his judicial sobriety and his judicial demeanour. Therefore it pains me that having been the Governor of Orissa, knowing fully that this Commission was going to adjudicate upon the rival claims between

[Shri S. Mahanty.]

Bengal and Bihar and between Bihar and Orissa, knowing fully well that he was called upon to decide these questions, at the last moment he dissociated himself from the discussions of these very burning questions on the ground of his long association with Bihar. I respect that sentiment but may I ask why this principle was not followed when it came to the question of U.P. ? It is a matter of common knowledge that Justice Fazl Ali hails from U.P. and blood is thicker than water. So if he was so scrupulous not to associate himself with Bihar-Orissa questions, why he associated himself with it when it came to U.P. We know this that the hon. Home Minister Govind Ballabh Pant, while he was Chief Minister of U.P., once said that U.P. is the land of Ganga and Jamna, U.P. is the land of Rama and Krishna. Also it is the land of Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Therefore when it came to U.P. the gentleman associates himself even though he hails from that State, even though it is a matter of common knowledge that blood is thicker than water but when it comes to the question of Bihar and Orissa or Bihar and Bengal, the gentleman gives a note to justify his dissociation. I am not at all disrespectful when I say, therefore, that the Chairman—Mr. Fazl Ali fulfilled all his roles very judiciously except as the Chairman of the S. R. C. That makes a very big difference. For us it is not final, nor are we going to take it as final nor do we believe that a group of persons, however high, however mighty they may be, will put a final seal on the destiny of millions of people. However, the people have fought against any such decisions in the past and I am sure, given the blessings of our Prime Minister and of you, we will fight many more battles. Now let me come to Orissa.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Why require blessings for fighting?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Fighting for a good cause. Our independence was the child of a struggle.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Our struggle.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Now I come to Orissa. It is worth while here to indicate very shortly the background of Orissa's claims. Orissa was carved out of the ex-province of Bihar and Orissa in the year 1936. A Committee—the O'Donnell Committee which was appointed in the year 1931 to demarcate the territories, left out many essential Oriya tracts like South West Midnapur in Bengal on communal grounds—on the ground that the transfer of 10 lakhs Hindus from Bengal to Orissa will increase the Muslim majority in Bengal which was not liked by Congress politicians. Number two was, they left out Singhbhum because they cited three reasons.

1. Lack of geographical continuity;
2. the indefinite attitude of public opinion towards the question, and
3. lack of communication.

Then they also left out many Oriya tracts in Madhya Pradesh like Deobhog and Phuljhar, and in the erstwhile State of Madras which was recommended by the Philip Duff Committee of 1921. In the year 1948, on the 1st January all the Oriya speaking States of the Eastern States Agency including Seraikella and Kharsawan but excluding Mayurbhanj were merged with Orissa. It is better for the information of my friend Mr. B. K. P. Sinha that I should read out the Preamble of those merger agreements which was approved by the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. The Preamble of the Seraikella Agreement reads as follows:

"Whereas in the immediate interest of the State and its people the Raja of Seraikella is desirous

that the administration of the State should be integrated as early as possible with that of the Province of Orissa in such manner as the Dominion of India may think fit."

The Preamble of Kharsawan agreement was more specific and it states:

"Whereas by reason of its geographical situation, the smallness of its size and its resources and the oneness of its economic and cultural life with that of the province of Orissa, it is apparent that the complete merger of the State of Kharsawan in the province of Orissa is the only way of securing the peace, progress and prosperity of its people."

Here was an agreement which the Government of India lawfully entered with the rulers of those States knowing fully well of the fact that this merger was in the best interests of the people. If my friend says that a lawful agreement which was entered by the Government of India is to be treated as a scrap of paper, well, I have no quarrel with him. So after Seraikella and Kharsawan and many other Oriya speaking States were transferred to Orissa, a movement was started in those merged areas for the creation of a Union on the pattern of PEPSU, Himachal, Rajasthan and Vindhya Pradesh. Unfortunately Seraikella became the hub and the centre of that movement and the Government of Orissa, for reasons which I am not going to discuss now, banned it and they declared that movement as illegal. Thereafter the issues were confused. The resentment against this kind of undemocratic procedure was confused and was misrepresented by the leaders of Bihar and by the press of Bihar like Searchlight and Indian Nation as dissatisfaction against the merger with Orissa. Then there were my friends who have been clamouring for Jharkhand and they staged a demonstration in Kharsawan on the 1st August 1948 with bows, arrows and all kinds of lethal weapons. Their number ran into thousands and my friend was

yesterday asking how many times the Government of Orissa shot at them. The reply is, as many times as these Adivasis—these innocent Adivasis—being incited by their sophisticated leaders, who are living far away from them, tried to create lawless situation, the Government of Orissa had to face them. Sir, it is an amazing story, what they did. In the year 1950, human sacrifices were offered by my friends in Mayurbhanj and these are.....

SHRI S. M. HEMROM (Orissa) : Who was responsible for these.....

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I am coming to it. My friend has returned on Congress ticket. He should better ask his conscience, he should ask his political integrity, he should better ask the leader in his home State.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: If they are all backward and uncivilized people, let them remain with us.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I am not going to yield to you. So these sophisticated, these urbanised tribal leaders who have got nothing in common with the tribal population, who never share the trials and tribulations and miseries.....

(Interruptions.)

I am not yielding to you. You will have your chance. Here is my friend and his party offered human sacrifice in Bamanghati sub-division. It is a story recorded in.....

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR) in the Chair.]

SHRI S. M. HEMROM: There was an enquiry.....

SHRI S. MAHANTY: which has been recorded in human blood and my friend's denial is not going to wipe it.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI S. M. HEMROM: Who was responsible for these?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I am coming to that.

SHRI T. BODRA: On a point of information. If my friend can tell the number of the Adivasis killed by the Orissa firing.....

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I am telling you, as many times my friend wanted to offer human sacrifice and wanted to create a situation where there will be no decency, no law and no order.

SHRI T. BODRA: Who burnt the S.R.C. report?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I burnt like Mr. Karmarkar who was burning British products in the Satyagraha days.....

(Interruptions.)

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE (SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR): May I suggest that they might be permitted to go out and settle the matter?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: My time is limited and I am not going to enter into barren controversies. The facts are there, the history is there which no amount of bluff can change.

In this context on the 1st January 1948, when these tribal leaders, inspired by foreign Christian Missionaries wanted to create a lawless situation in Kharsawan, they had to be faced and faced effectively. Thereafter the situation was confused and at that time Mayurbhanj was not merged with Orissa. There was no geographical contiguity. Therefore the Government of India had to transfer these two States temporarily to the district of Singhbhum. A temporary arrangement was sought to be made permanent even after Seraikella and Kharsawan no longer continued as isolated territories after merger of Mayurbhanj. So this is the background. Orissa was claiming Singhbhum Sadar Sub-division and the Seraikella Sub-division, and also a few areas from Madhya Pradesh and the Madhya Pradesh Government were also amenable to their transfer to Orissa. But if you look into the S. R. C. Report, you will find that

without going through all these facts, without taking into considerations any of these circumstances, they have summarily rejected these claims to Seraikella and Kharsawan, just because after the transfer of a portion of Manbhum district to West Bengal, Dhalbhum in Bihar would be an isolated territory and it would have no geographical contiguity. As I have submitted in the very beginning, the whole underlying idea in this Report is the appeasing of the stronger units at the cost of the weaker ones, and the appeasing of the substantial majority at the cost of the minority. And so in keeping with that principle, they have said that because Dhalbhum will become an isolated territory, Seraikella and Kharsawan should not be transferred to Orissa. Sir, we have all read of Rip Van Winkle in fiction and Rip Van Winkle lives in our imagination, but I have yet to see three such Rip Van Winkles in 1955 who are still living in the year 1931. Of course, the O'Donnell Committee rejected Orissa's claim to Singhbhum on three grounds. The first reason was want of geographical contiguity between Orissa and Singhbhum. But in the year 1955, I may inform my hon. friend Mr. Sinha there is clear geographical contiguity. It would seem hon. Members did not even care to look at the map. In the year 1931 Orissa had no communication with Singhbhum, but today Orissa has at least six road communications with Singhbhum, whereas Bihar has only one road communication, and that through Chaibassa over the Tabo hills which is mostly impassable. The other reason was that public opinion in 1931 was somewhat vague, and the issue was not properly placed before the public. But in the year 1955, as many as seven out of the twelve Members to the Legislature from Singhbhum Sadar, in their representation to the Commission and in the evidence that they led before the Commission have expressed themselves unequivocally in favour of these areas going to Orissa.

SHRI S. M. HEMROM: To which constituency does one of those seven belong?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I refuse to yield. What this wonderful gentleman is blabbering I do not know. At least if he wants to say something, he must speak out distinctly and clearly.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): Please sit down. If the hon. Member yields, you can interrupt him, but if he does not yield, don't disturb him.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Does he contest this fact that out of those twelve M.L.As, as many as 7 M.L.As. were in favour of this area going to Orissa? They submitted a representation to the Commission. Does he contest that? If not, he should accept what I said.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): You have only ten more minutes, Mr. Mahanty, and so do not be excited by the interruptions.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: No, Sir. And you must protect me from these interruptions, for I am not yielding.

(Interruptions.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): Please do not interrupt.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: You will kindly give me these two or three minutes also, Sir, that have thus been lost due to these interruptions.

So, they do not contest this fact that out of the twelve M.L.As seven of them, in the memorandum that they submitted to the Commission and also in the evidence that they led before the Commission were in favour of Orissa. And my hon. friends do not contest that.

And now comes the question of language. Let me make it perfectly clear that my claim to Singhbhum Sadar is not based on language alone.

SYED MAZHAR IMAM (Bihar): Why?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Ask the Commission why they have made their recommendation regarding Bidar, why with a Telugu population of 18 per cent. It should go to Telangana? Or Ask the Commission why Kolar with an overwhelming Telugu population should go with Karnatak and not with Andhra? My hon. friend had better ask them and they will give the reply. Therefore, consistent with the principle that has been adopted by the S.R.C. in all these cases, our claim to Singhbhum district is not based on language alone. I do not want to keep any fact secret from the House. What is the linguistic landscape of Singhbhum Sadar which we claim. The Hos predominate with about 50 per cent. and the Oriyas constitute about 18.7 per cent. in Singhbhum Sadar. Now I ask my hon. friend if he cares, to look at the bilingual figures of the Census reports, he will find that the Hos have the maximum linguistic affinity with Oriya. They have more affinity with that language than with Hindi. Secondly,—and this is a very important fact which I would request the House to take into consideration—the Hos are found nowhere else in the Indian Union except in the Singhbhum District, and also in the neighbouring districts in Orissa. The whole population of the Hos is about 4.83 lakhs roughly speaking. In the whole Chotanagpur Division minus Singhbhum, the number of the Hos is only about 4,000. In Cuttack which is in the interior of the coastal districts of Orissa their population is about 5,000 or more.

SHRI T. BODRA: Therefore the whole of Orissa is Jharkhand.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I am perfectly in agreement with my hon. friend there. But what is the meaning of this term "Jharkhand"? It is interesting to learn what this slogan used by my hon. friends from Bihar means. Jhar means jungle and Khand means State. And so, my hon. friends, in the year 1955, when there is this Industries Fair which we had the opportunity to see, in the year 1955 when the

[Shri S. Mahanty.]

Damodar Valley is coming up, when the Hirakud project is coming up, these friends want a State of jungles. And who will be the citizens of that State? The citizens will be the tribals, rustics for whom my hon. friends.....

SHRI T. BODRA: Sir, speaking of them as rustics is an insinuation at me.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: No, I am a rustic, just as the tribals.

SHRI D. P. KARMAKAR: Congratulations.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: The tribals and the peasants, they are rustics; but my hon. friend is not, he looks more like one of the streamlined heroes in a Hollywood film. What similarity has he got with the Hos? With their tears and tribulations, he has nothing in common.

SHRI T. BODRA: I am a Ho myself.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: If they want to have a Jharkhand as a heaven for foreign missionaries, let them have it. If the Government concedes such a Jharkhand, I may be willing to part with such areas where there is a concentration of tribals. But since the Jharkhand concept has been rejected by the Excluded and Partially Excluded Areas Committee of the Constituent Assembly which worked under the chairmanship of the late Thakkar Bappa, since that conception has been rejected by the S.R.C. also, since the Jharkhand concept is not going to materialise at all, the limited issue before us is whether Singhbhum Sadar should remain with Bihar or go to Orissa.

Now, what are the tests that we should apply? Number one is language and linguistic affinity. If that test is applied Bihar's claim is untenable. As the hon. Home Minister has also conceded elsewhere, Bihar could have no claim on Singhbhum District linguistically. Number two is economical affinities of the Hos. Even my hon.

friend will admit that the Hos have been migrating towards Orissa during the last decades in search of land, in search of rehabilitation and in search of their livelihood. They are all being provided in Orissa, but not in Bihar.

SHRI T. BODRA: Stones do not give bread.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: It is most ungrateful on the part of my friend to say that. I will invite his attention to what has been observed in the Census Report of 1951. It is said that the pressure of population in Bihar is so high that they have no land in Singhbhum; they do not get any land in the Chotanagpur plateau and, therefore, they have been migrating continuously during the past decades to the neighbouring districts of Orissa where they are getting land, where they are being rehabilitated. If the economic test is applied, Bihar's claim is out of court.

Thirdly, if the public opinion test is applied, then also the M.L.As. of Singhbhum in their representation to the Commission and also to the Government, have expressed themselves in favour of transfer to Orissa. Therefore, I still believe that it is not as if Orissa is supplicating for a few hundreds of square miles. The claim of Orissa is not based on an expansionist motive. People are asking for Vishal Andhra, for Samyukta Maharashtra and so on but we are not asking for a greater Orissa or anything like that. We are only asking for a unification of the Oriya speaking areas under one administration. We are not asking for the moon; we are not going to stand in the way of expansion of Bihar or Bengal or of any other State. We wish the best of luck but they must also concede that here is a unit which has suffered most during the British days and which was thought fit to be left as a backwater of India, that in the interests of the unification of the Oriya speaking people in one State, some steps should be taken and that the demands put forward in that

connection should be conceded. This is, after all, a small demand and they should not have made this kind of a fetish over it.

Coming to the question of Seraikella and Kharsawan, I have already referred to the agreement which the Government of India entered into with the Rajahs of those States. Therefore, legally also this is the position. The Oriyas constitute the single major language group there. It would be found that the candidate belonging to my party defeated the official Bihar Congress nominee in the last general election; he not only defeated him but also made the Congress nominee lose his deposit. My friend of the Jharkhand Party also contested but got only 7,000 votes as against my party candidate who got about 15,000 votes. That was in a way a plebiscite. That election was fought on the specific issue of the transfer of Seraikella and Kharsawan to Orissa.

SHRI T. BODRA: Wrong.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: My hon. friend says it is wrong. Well, he cannot change facts.

SHRI T. BODRA: I will prove it.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: You may prove it when you get your chance. Even according to the distorted translation of the election manifesto which was read out in the Bihar Assembly, there has been a frank confession. Even the States Reorganisation Commission was fully convinced that the majority of the voters—not in one single booth but in the constituency as a whole—were in favour of merger with Orissa. This was the issue that was placed before the three eminent persons of the States Reorganisation Commission. Without taking those facts into consideration, they have summarily rejected our claim. They have rejected our claims on Seraikella and Kharsawan because if Manbhum is transferred to Bengal, if Seraikella and Kharsawan are transferred to Orissa, then Dhalbhum in Bihar will be reduced to an isolated territory. It

is not a fact. They have not even made a mention about Orissa having preferred a claim to Singhbhum Sadar. That only indicates with what prejudice and with what closed mind, they had approached this subject.

Before I conclude, I will only say that we do not want to endanger the interests of Bihar or of Bengal or of any other State. When we speak of the unity of India, let it be very clearly understood that the unity of the nation or nations should not be equated with powerful units like Bihar or U.P.

SHRI T. BODRA: I want one minute Sir I want to know whether my hon. friend, Mr. Mahanty, can speak any of the Tribal languages, languages of the people for whom he is milk and honey?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: It is fantastic to say that if the border between Bihar and Orissa is rationalised the unity of India will be in danger. I do realise that the expansionist tendencies which have flowed through history since the days of Asoka may be endangered but that will not endanger any clear principle, to speak the least, the unity and security of India.

With these words, Sir, I appeal to the Government of India, I appeal to the Parliament of India, to remember the fact that it is not Orissa supplanting but that justice itself is on trial. The Government of India is on trial; their statesmanship is on trial; the entire Parliament is on trial. Fifteen million Oriyas will watch with interest the reply that is forthcoming.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I speak in this debate with a great deal of hesitation and sorrow. I have heard my hon. friend, Mr. Deogirikar, very very carefully and I shall try to meet some of the arguments advanced by him. I would like to say here that even before the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission was out, much was said about regrouping States on a linguistic basis. After the Report was released,

[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.]

this was discussed much. While expressing their opinions, champions of linguism have expressed themselves in a way in which they should not have done. Their expressions have created misgivings in the minds of people who are affected by this kind of militant approach to this problem.

I do not want to discuss the problems of all the States with which I am not familiar. I am familiar only with two States, Uttar Pradesh and Bombay. On this occasion, therefore, I want to restrict my remarks to those two States only. Luckily U.P., which is a bulwark of stability for the whole of India, is not touched by the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission. Somebody here said that it was a giant; some other people called it an elephant. One can find similes with regard to anything and everything but I shall content myself by saying that whether it is a giant or an elephant, U.P. adds to the strength and stability of the whole of India.

I shall now come to the State of Bombay. While I speak I do so in pain and sorrow. The protagonists of linguistic States have made Bombay city a prize territory over which the leaders of Samyukta Maharashtra have shown a great deal of passion.

Even a mildest man like 2 P.M. Shri Deogirikar here has shown some passion. If I have to refer to these leaders in this regard I do so with distress because most of them are friends and they were comrades in the struggle for freedom. In their passion to annex Bombay to Maharashtra, what they have said and done wounds me and people like me very deeply. I am a Bombayite myself. I have a number of Maharashtrian friends and I believe they claim us as their friends. I have spent the best part of my life in Bombay and yet I and people like me, who were born north of Daman have been characterised as Jews, as aliens to be fought and to be driven out.

SHRI A. ABDUL RAZAK (Travancore-Cochin): Very unkind remarks.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI:

They are very unkind no doubt. Shri Deogirikar has asked why people are afraid of Maharashtrians. I will give you presently the reason, Sir. A few weeks ago a number of Bombayites including women who happened to speak my language were spat upon in the streets of Bombay. Gandhi caps of many of the Gujaratis were snatched, their clothes were torn and the national flag on their shops and other places also was dishonoured. Stones were thrown at a public meeting at Shri Morarji Desai and Shri S. K. Patil. This has not only hurt us, Gujaratis deeply, but it has also hurt the non-Maharashtrians and the saner elements among Maharashtrians. They do not want such things to happen.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Do you propose all Maharashtrians to leave Bombay? Will you be glad?

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: I do not want anyone to leave. We all should live in Bombay, those who are living in Bombay now should live there.

Then, Sir, it was said by Shri Deogirikar that the leaders do not know the masses. If these are the masses to be known, then I am quite sure that the leaders have come to know them very well.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): He did not say that the 'leaders' do not know.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: I have taken down his words on paper.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): He said so about the members of the S.R.C.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: If so probably their fears are also justified if this is going to be the state of affairs.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): Say that.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Probably many Members here know that, after the S.R.C. Report was out, threats were given as a result of which valuable properties had to be insured against the risk of riot and crores of rupees were spent for insurance.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): In Bombay?

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Yes, in the city of Bombay. These things which the Maharashtrians have spoken and some of them have done have hurt us very deeply. That is why people are afraid. Even a few days ago it was predicted in Parliament that the issue will be decided in the streets of Bombay.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: That has been contradicted.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: It is not contradicted. He said that the people will decide the issue. I do not say that he said he would do so, but in the name of the people he said so. It is in his speech; you can read that.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: An incorrect statement.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: It is given in today's papers, in the 'Hindustan Times'; I have read it.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: It is doing injustice to Mr. Gadgil to refer to it in that way. In the same portion you can read it that he said that it should be avoided. That is what he exactly said.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: I will read out the statement. "The issue will be taken away from the hands of the leaders and parties, and people will decide it in the streets of Bombay." That is what he said.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Also read the last portion.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: What I am saying is that it is pre-

dicted that it will be so done. I am not saying whether he wants to do it or not. I say it is predicted that this will happen. There is nothing wrong. Still it is here. After saying that, Sir,.....

DR. R. B. GOUR: What was done to Maharashtrians in Baroda?

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Then, Sir, what happened on the 18th and 21st November seems to have been approved.....

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख (हंदराबाद) :
बड़ौदा में जो गुजरातियों ने यह मूवमेंट
चलाया कि दक्षिण वाले दक्षिण को जाओ,
तो क्या महाराष्ट्रियों ने बड़ौदा को वहां से,
गुजरात से, निकाल देना चाहा ?

श्रीमती लीलावती मुंशी : यों तो पूना
में भी चला है और महाराष्ट्र में भी चला
है ।

That is not the issue. We are talking about Bombay.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: If that is so, from every province the other people will have to go.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: I am not asking anyone to go from Bombay. I am saying that Bombay belongs to Bombayites. That is my plea.

What happened on the 18th and 21st November.....

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Did those people who created trouble come from outside Bombay? Is that your case?

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: People who were inside. I am coming to that. Please listen. Why are you so very impatient. Even on the 18th and 21st I have received letters from Maharashtrian friends and even here in the Parliament it seems to have been approved and glorified. Well, it was done in a city where Gujaratis

[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.]
and Maharashtrians lived happily
together for over a century.

Now let me turn to the S.R.C. Report. It is the report of those whose integrity and impartiality is unquestioned. The report is a balanced document deserving our admiration. They have rightly emphasised the unity of the country and produced a solution which, according to them, is in the best interests of the country. Suddenly they are all treated as unfair men. A responsible member of the Bombay Cabinet has gone so far as to say that they first wrote chapters in their favour and changed them later, thus imputing dishonest motives to the Members of the Commission. That was amply refuted there and the Members of the Commission are quite capable of defending themselves against such slander.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Mr. Hiray has contradicted that statement.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: I have not seen that at all. Anyway I need not say anything more on the subject, but may I ask those hon. Members who impute motives whether they consider all the three Commissions which have gone into this question of Bombay at different times unfair and partial? During the last seven years three Commissions were appointed one after the other and we could not have found a better set of people to go into this question than the members of these Commissions. But what did they say? They said that so far as the city of Bombay is concerned, they are all unanimous that Bombay should not be made a part of any unilingual State. The J.V.P. report says "that in case linguistic States are formed out of the present Bombay Province, the area of the greater Bombay will have to be constituted as a separate unit." Sir, I would have liked to quote the relevant portions of all the Commissions' reports, but the time at my disposal is very short, but I take it that all the Members are

familiar with the conclusions arrived at. Are we to assume, Sir, that Members of these three Commissions including Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, Pandit Hridaynath Kunzru, Sardar Panikkar, Shri Fazl Ali and the members of the Dar Commission were all unfair and partial? Is it by such technique that they want to gain the city of Bombay in a free and democratic country? Sir, the S.R.C. has advocated a bilingual State for Bombay comprising of Gujarat and Maharashtra. Although the Gujaratis were in a minority—a minority of 70 lakhs; it is not one, two or three lakhs and people here do not seem to know that—it was accepted by the Gujarat and the Bombay Provincial Congress Committees in the common interest of the nation as a whole. The Maharashtrians were given a majority over the Gujaratis by about 70 lakhs in the proposed bilingual State of the S.R.C. variety.

Looking to their attitude, past as present, it would have been very difficult for the Gujaratis to progress in any direction. I should like here to hon. Members to read some of the figures given by the hon. Shri C. Shah in the other House as to how much money is spent for irrigation in Maharashtra and what little portion has been given to Gujarat and so on and so forth. In the past, Gujaratis have suffered many handicaps and I know them. A rupee could not be spent in Gujarat unless four rupees were spent in Maharashtra. In spite of all this, it was accepted because the leaders of Gujarat have learnt discipline under Gandhiji and Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. The Gujaratis were prepared to stay in the bilingual State in the interest of unity of the nation. In the face of most provocative abuses and slanders for well-nigh seven years, they remained steadfast, never saying a bitter word against anyone.

Of course, Bombay is the bone of contention. It is built by the labour of all communities which the Maha-

rashtrians now want to possess. Just now Mr. Deogirikar said that they feel humiliated to stay in the bilingual State.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: No; you have misunderstood him. He has.....

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Let him contradict. Why do you want to interrupt?

They say that Bombay, historically and geographically, is a part of the Maharashtra region but this claim is not supported by facts. Historically and geographically, Bombay was never a part of Maharashtra.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO (Hyderabad): The S.R.C. said that.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: You take only one portion which suits you.

From the beginning of the Christian era, it was never a part of Maharashtra. North Konkan including the Island of Bombay which was then called the Seven Palm Island formed part of the Western coastal belt, called Aparanta, and later Lata, which was included in Gujarat.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: And then in Karnataka.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: This region was geographically distinct from Dakshinapatha, as the region of Maharashtra was then called.

Here, Sir, I should have liked to give a few historical facts compiled from the books of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, Prof. Kane, Member of this august House, and Grierson, Gazetteer of Bombay and the Rise of Bombay by Edwards, but again my handicap is the time. If any hon. Member wants to know about these facts, I am prepared to give him a note on the subject.

It was only in 1865, after the Railways were built across the hills and mills were erected that the Maharashtrans began to come to Bombay.

DR. R. B. GOUR: What about Thana District?

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: My hon. friend will kindly read history.

Even in the beginning of the 20th century, their number was very negligible; only 17,000 in the city of Bombay. In a brochure on textile industry written sometime in 1934, I think by one of the Maharashtrans, it is stated that the workers were drawn from the districts not only of Ratnagiri, Satara, but Surat, Broach, U.P., Hyderabad and parts of South India. Sir, Bombay city has been built by the joint efforts of all and its communications link with Maharashtra is in no way more intimate than with Gujarat and the economy of Gujarat depends to a large extent upon the city of Bombay. So, Bombay was never a part of Maharashtra either geographically or historically. Even today, it has been linked by three bridges to the hinterland and its connection with Maharashtra is through a corridor mostly consisting of a mixed population. So the claim of Maharashtra on this count is untenable.

Sir, Shri Deogirikar quoted certain figures. I should here like to mention that according to the S.R.C. report there would be 220 lakhs Maharashtrans as against 150 lakhs of Gujaratis in the proposed bilingual State. That is, they will have a majority of 70 lakhs. But this large majority does not satisfy the champions of Samyukta Maharashtra. First they swore by the linguistic principle and wanted to form Samyukta Maharashtra with the city of Bombay and wanted to keep Gujarat out of Bombay. But when they found that they could not have Bombay in this way, they said—it may not be official but it was reported in the papers—that they were prepared to sacrifice their sacred principle of linguism by which they swore so much and said that if Saurashtra was excluded, that is, if the Maharashtrans became 220 lakhs and the Gujaratis were reduced to 110 lakhs, they would be prepared to remain in

[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.]
the bilingual State. They had a second proposal and that was that Vidarbha should be added. That means they would become 3 crores and the Gujaratis would be 1½ crores. So the principle of linguism is sacred if the Bombay city could be appropriated to Maharashtra and Gujarat thrown out. The principle of bilingual State is also equally welcome to them provided the Maharashtrians are 70 per cent. and the Gujaratis are reduced to less than 30 per cent. That is the arithmetic which nobody mentioned here. And they would see to it that after five years, tired and frustrated the Gujaratis walk out.

I am sorry to refer to these controversies but hon. Members of this House do not seem to know all the facts. They are not familiar with them; probably they have not gone into the details of this issue. That is why I have taken the trouble of giving these facts.

In pushing their demand, the Maharashtrian leaders did not mind uniting with people with whom they have nothing in common. What is common between Shri Shanker Rao Deo, Shri N. V. Gadgil, Dr. Naravane and Shri Hiray on the one hand and Shri Dange, Shri S. M. Joshi, Shri Lalji Pendse and others on the other hand? It is a strange combination, which has only one thing in common and that is, opposition to the Gujaratis. The language that the leaders of the Samyukta Maharashtra have used has no non-violence in it. While addressing meetings, first they incite the people and then they say that people should not loot or commit arson because they happen to be non-violent, but they say that in such a way that people do the very same thing and we have seen the result. One leader is reported to have reminded everyone about the Marathas and Aurangzeb and how Surat was looted by the Marathas. They say that the Gujaratis are grocers while the Maharashtrians are prepared to have *akharas* in the streets of Maha-

rashtra. It was reported that a staunch Gandhian like Shri Shanker-rao Deo threatened to go on fast unto death. I do not know how far it is correct. I have taken only the newspaper reports because I have got the cuttings of them. Then I have read in a paper that he said that he would go in trenches to fight for Samyukta Maharashtra.....

SHRI D. NARAYAN (Bombay): Where did you read all this?

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: It comes every day in the papers.

SHRI D. NARAYAN: Will you please show them, put them on the Table of the House? I question that. I would like to see them.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Yes, Sir, certainly I will. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): You cannot interrupt.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: If the statement is not true in fact, one cannot frame an argument on that.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Now, Sir.....(*Interruption*).

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: She is basing her arguments on information (*Interruption*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): If she has referred to a document, I would have asked her to place it on the Table of the House.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Let her produce the newspaper.....

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: I do not say that he said it. I said I read it in the newspapers.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): She is at perfect liberty to do that.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Nobody can vouchsafe for it. After all these things are reported day after

day and I am going to refer to them. If they are wrong my friends will say so.

Then, Dr. D. R. Gadgil stated in unequivocal terms that when Bombay is included in Samyukta Maharashtra, Marathi would be the State language and under the specious plea of decentralization, he says that the industries would be diverted from the City of Bombay to Maharashtra—very peaceful intentions indeed! It is openly stated in Bombay that when Bombay is acquired for Maharashtra, the Marathi-speaking people would be able to capture the commercial power. Threats are being held out that if Bombay City were excluded from Maharashtra, it would strike at the very root of the peaceful formation and functioning of the Federal Union.

Again, it is stated that conflicts will arise—conflicts which may give rise to most serious problems, both for Bombay City and Maharashtra. Shri. . . . again I will refer to the Member without the name, is reported to have said that if Bombay is made the Capital of Maharashtra, we shall see the rich as a class are wiped out. You can imagine who has said that. There is not much difference between the language of one leader and the other. Is it any wonder.

SHRI A. ABDUL RAZAK: Let us now hear something about the speeches delivered by Shri Morarji Desai also.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: You quote them, I do not mind it. I have not quoted, you can quote them.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): Please address the Chair.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: And so, Sir, I am just saying why we are afraid. The question was posed as to why we are afraid? Why other people are afraid? That is the only thing that I want to establish by this. And what is the position today? Out of the total population, there are about 4:5 lakhs labourers, 56:5 per cent. are

non-Marathi-speaking people and Marathi-speaking are only 43 per cent. in the City of Bombay. Of the City's population, quite a large section.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): You have to wind up, Mrs Munshi. It is time.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: But, Sir, they have taken so much of my time. I am sorry. You have given everyone more time than was allotted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): I have not done it. We have to stick to the schedule of time.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Mr. Deogirikar was allotted 45 minutes and he spoke one hour and twenty minutes. Sir, if you will bear with me, I shall finish as soon as possible. Of the city's population, quite a large section of it as would appear from the huge meetings which have taken place in Bombay, do not want to join Maharashtra—and my Sindhi friend here says that they do not want to join Samyukta Maharashtra—and until this claim to Bombay City was made a few years ago, no one thought that Bombay City was a part of Maharashtra; and in 1921, when the Congress also had a new constitution, they had a separate Bombay Committee. And if I mistake not even the Communist and Socialist Parties have recognized Bombay as a separate unit and they have separate committees—I speak subject to correction.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Bombay Communists are under the Maharashtra Committee.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: But I said subject to correction about those two Parties.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: So far as Sindhi friends are concerned, they will be bound by the High Command's decision, whatever it may be

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Now, we are told that Marathi-speaking people are willing to give guaran-

[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.]
 tees. After what has happened in Bombay recently, could anyone believe that their guarantee has any sanctity about it? Are they quite sure that even after five years, the next set of leaders will respect their guarantee? Even today, they say that they wanted masses to remain non-violent. Did the masses listen to them? What is the sanctity of such a guarantee, I ask, and what authority have a few leaders of Maharashtra to give a guarantee on behalf of the people, who do not listen to them? Even now it was conceded that some other people will come and they may not listen to us. One plausible argument is that the Bombay City draws its supply of water and electricity from Maharashtra. What then? Are not Bombay and Maharashtra part of the same country? (Some hon. Members: Bombay and Maharashtra?). I mean Bombay city and Maharashtra. Is not electricity and water being supplied to Pakistan from India? Is not the Bhakra Nangal power going to be supplied to Rajasthan? Does not the Rihand Dam Project depend partly on Vindhya Pradesh? It would be catastrophic to the country as a whole if regions claim sovereignty in matters of natural resources which even nations have not ventured to claim.

In such a case, one may ask what about Ganga? Is it to belong to U.P., is it to belong to Bihar, or is it to belong to Bengal?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: It belongs to the whole of India.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: That is exactly my point. The Constitution has provision enough and I am sure the country as a whole has power enough to prevent any such regional exclusiveness.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): Now, you have to wind up.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Please give me five minutes more. Let me finish my point. The contention

that the Bombay City is too small a unit—I do not want to take that point as the time is short. The present Bombay population is 28·39 lakhs. I must explain it fully. Economically Bombay is the nerve centre of India. Its port, naval and air bases can be compared to the finest in the world. And I can assure you, given ten years of time, to build up its own destiny, Bombay will be 60 lakhs strong, one of the greatest cities in the world.

If you compare the resolutions passed by the Maharashtra, Gujarat and Bombay Provincial Congress Committees, you will find the difference of language and approach to the problem.

Gujarat and Bombay accepted the bilingual State suggested by S.R.C., but Maharashtra did not. Even today, Maharashtra leaders are not accepting and yet people are asking Gujaratis and Bombayites to accept the bilingual State. People forget that such union can only come about with goodwill on both sides. It cannot be forced upon people.

Now, it was stated—again I have to refer to my friend—that it is humiliating to remain in a bilingual State. At the moment, most of the leaders at the Centre and in the States are Gandhian leaders who are steeped in the Gandhian traditions. If such people are guilty of using such language, what will happen when the present generation is gone and the new generation comes to rule? It was said: “we can be good neighbours, but we cannot stay together.” This was stated in the other House and it cannot be contradicted. Personally, I wish them well. If we have to separate, is it not better to separate like two good brothers and thereafter live in peace instead of living together and quarrelling at the slightest provocation? Marathas are a martial race no doubt but I hope their valour is for fighting the enemies of the nation and not for fighting their own brothers. Like the big brothers that they are, we would like them to have big hearts and generosity over

the smaller unit, instead of having a linguistic battle here. Just see the other points also. Even for them, the disgraceful happening at Bombay is a lesson. For a century and a half, Bombay has been built up as a great City in the whole of India. Its hinterland is not one, but many. There are lakhs of Southerners, Uttar Bharatiyas, etc. They have all contributed to its progress.

AN HON. MEMBER. They all contributed to the Maharashtra.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: They did not. How can you prove that? Bombay belongs to no region. It belongs to the whole of the country. It has a cosmopolitan atmosphere. That is why I respectfully say that this difficult problem should now be solved by giving a separate Bombay City State as suggested by the Working Committee.

Sir, mention was made of culture. I should like to say, "let us rescue culture from controversy." So far Gujarati and Marathi cultures were considered interwoven. They were part of the larger Indian culture. If now the Maharashtrians want to develop it on a line of their own, I have no quarrel with them. Even in a separate Bombay State, we will all be part of the great India and we will all be Bombayites. Let me say in the Home Minister's words: "There should be maximum opportunity for everyone to develop—majority and minority all." Let us have integrated approach and let us guard against parochialism. Gandhiji was also quoted here yesterday. "All languages are languages of India and the languages should not be allowed to become a limiting factor."

I would, therefore, urge upon those who have the right to decide this matter not to hesitate in implementing the suggestion given by the Working Committee. Let us settle this matter, so that we all may live in peace.

Sir, I would also urge upon Parliament to solve this problem once and for all and to make the city of Bombay

constitutionally national, as it is already national in composition and spirit.

DR. R. B. GOUR: In view of the minorities' strength in Ahmedabad would you also say that it should be a separate State?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): Well, I do not know whether the Maharashtrian friends will be generous to you but the Chair has been.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR (Travancore-Cochin): Sir, I have become a little bit nervous due to fear which Mrs. Munshi's speech has instilled in me that the Gujarati friends will claim Ernakulam, a portion of which was built after the Gujaratis had migrated there as a commercial class, as well as the suburban towns, where the Gujaratis are a dominating commercial people against whom we have no grudge. But now this fear has been caused in my mind by Mrs. Munshi's speech that they will claim that Ernakulam as an ancient city had connection with Gujaratis and it was only after that that the vast hinterland between the far off Gujarat and Ernakulam had come into being and, therefore, Ernakulam was theirs. That is the sort of fear in which I am. So I am re-thinking as to what to speak about this S.R.C. Report.

There is a sort of gloomy feeling all over the country. But as for my part and also for the part of my country, Kerala, we have a sort of satisfaction because we have been given according to the recommendations Aikya Kerala for which we have been struggling for a long time. Also, Tamil Nad has been given a Tamil speaking State. Karnataka is going to have its own State. Because of all such things, we have got a sort of satisfaction. More particularly, we are happy over the recommendation for the elimination or eradication of the institution of the so-called Rajpramukhs and Uparajapramukhs from the face of this land but we are quite unhappy because certain anomalies were created by the

[Shri N. C. Sekhar.]

illogical logic of the Commission which created bilingual States like Bombay with Maharashtra and Gujarat put together and also a Punjab State. Then there is the problem of the Delhi State etc. These are the questions which create anxiety.

Secondly, there was no recommendation for the appointment of a Boundary Commission to determine the boundaries of the reorganised States. We are afraid there are disputes, claims and counter claims from almost all parts of the country. These are questions to be settled.

In regard to the question of linguistic State, this is considered undesirable as it will produce fissiparous tendencies, creating disunity and insecurity in India. Sir, as many hon. Members stated here and in the other House and as has also been stated in the Report itself, this linguism has taken its birth in the course of our bitter struggle against the British Imperialism. It has a history of 35 years. When the Congress adopted the principle of linguistic provinces, we saw that people from almost all the linguistic provinces—even though not in existence then—rallied in the national struggle against the British Imperialism. We have now become free and we are also having freedom to develop our own language and culture as well as the social and economic environment which was absent during the administration of the British. It is in that eagerness and in that feeling that the people from all parts of the country have rallied themselves into the freedom struggle. It has been said by the Congress leaders very often to the people that their claims would not be renounced or denied. Even in 1946 or so, the Congress in one of its resolutions has stated that, if it came to power, it would implement its resolution in regard to the reformation of India on the basis of language. Let me emphasise the fact that no people from any part of the linguistic regions—as some people desire to call them—had ever demanded that the reorgan-

sation should be on the basis of separatism. We never demanded that we should be separate from the Central Government. We never even asked for self-determination which is a different principle in politics, because we feel that we are a nation with multi-lingual and multi-cultural characteristics. That is a historical fact recognized even by the S.R.C.

SHRI A. ABDUL RAZAK: What about the Kerala Socialist Party?

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR: I am coming to Kerala. Now, one of the hon. Members has asked whether to ask for a separate province would not be encouraging fissiparous tendencies. That tendency has been fought down with all the vigour that the people have got—I assure you, it is the Kerala people, in spite of the Socialist Party and the P.S.P. It is we, the bulk of the democratic movement in Kerala, who fought for the separation and merger of the Tamil taluks of the Travancore-Cochin State with their neighbouring Tamil area. Shri Abdul Razak must realise that. Similarly, we shall fight all fissiparous tendencies that will create disunity and disruption in our national life.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

But the object of creating a union and a united nation is to enable the people to have the opportunity—equal opportunity—equality to develop their culture, language and social life, as stated in our Constitution. What sort of union the British created? The Dar Commission and the S.R.C. say that the Britishers in spite of their creation of provinces on an artificial basis have created a sort of unity. That unity, that tendency is still amongst us.

AN HON. MEMBER: Unity in bondage!

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR: Unity in bondage, unity to disunite. That is the sort of unity which we are having. People have been kept oppressed and suppressed. That is why the people from all parts of India, from Maha-

rastra, from Gujarat—when I say Gujarat I do not mean the big capitalists who are fighting for the Bombay city, but the Gujarat peasants, workers and middle class intelligentsia,—want linguistic States. Mrs. Munshi in the course of her speech said that in the Gujarat area even the irrigation facilities are absent. The so-called “Gujaratis” are interested in not creating the irrigation facilities for the poor peasants. Their object is to spread all over India to exploit the peasants, the owners of the land. That is not the sort of unity that we want. Gujarati people themselves demand that they must have a separate Gujarat State.

Coming to Bombay, Prof. Malkani said that in Bombay there are other people too who are not Maharashtrians or Gujaratis. Of course, I know there are about 3 lakhs of Malayalis and an equal number of Tamil-speaking people and also Telugus. I can vouch that these people stand united behind Maharashtra demand for the merger of Bombay city with greater Maharashtra. These are very clear ideas; they have expressed them not through microphones but expressed in public meetings in which thousands and thousands gathered to express themselves on this issue.

When we recognise this linguistic principle as the basic principle to reorganise the States, certainly, there cannot be any quarrel between States. But here our present Government is not in a mood to accept this principle. On the eve of his falling a victim to the bullet of a criminal, Gandhiji issued a statement regarding the reorganisation of provinces. I have heard certain Members misquoting Gandhiji to suit their purpose, but I will give you the relevant portion which appeared in the Harijan two days after his assassination. He said:

“The Congress Working Committee had been discussing the question of reconstitution of provinces on a linguistic basis. The Congress had already adopted that principle and had declared its intention to give effect to it consti-

tutionally as soon as they came to power, as such redistribution would be conducive to the cultural advancement of the country. But such redistribution should not militate against the organic unity of India. Autonomy did not and should not mean disruption, or that hereafter provinces could go the way they chose, independent of one another and of the Centre. If each province began to look upon itself as a separate, sovereign unit, India's independence would lose its meaning and with it would vanish the freedom of the various units as well.

The character of India's independence as conceived by the Congress was based on village autonomy. But all the villages were to derive vitality from the Centre, as the latter in its turn derived all power and authority from the former. It would be fatal if it led to narrow provincialism, mutual bickerings and rivalries—between Tamil and Andhra for instance, Bombay and Karnataka and so on. The redistribution of provinces on a linguistic basis was necessary if provincial languages were to grow to their full height. Hindustani was to be the *lingua franca*—Rashtra Bhasha—of India, but it could not take the place of the provincial tongues. It could not be medium of instruction in the provinces—much less English. Its function was to make them realise their organic relationship with India. The world outside did not know them as Gujaratis, Maharashtrians, Tamilians, etc. but only as Indians. We must, therefore, resolutely discourage all fissiparous tendencies and feel and behave as Indians. Subject to this paramount consideration, a linguistic redistribution of provinces should give an impetus to education and trade.”

(Harijan February 1, 1948, as quoted in the A.I.C.C. Economic Review, 15 October, 1955.)

By this statement Gandhiji meant two things: (1) the reorganisation of

[Shri N. C. Sekhar.]

States should be on linguistic basis and (ii) where Hindi is not peoples' mother-tongue, the regional language should be allowed to be the medium of instruction.

Redistribution of provinces on the basis of "linguism" has not been conceived by the Commission appointed by the Government. Who were the people on this Commission? As Mr. Deogirikar said, "They are very good people". There is one Judge of the Supreme Court, There is one statesman in the person of Mr. Panikkar and then a public servant in the person of our hon. friend, Dr. Kunzru. But the point is that politically and socially they are not the brain of the common man who feels that he must have some part in the democratic set up of the Government. That is why in our part of the country the peasants and workers and the intelligentsia who do not know English are very happy that now they will be able to lend their mite in the development of their national life. That is their feeling. So also is the feeling of the Common man in Gujarat and Maharashtra. But here that feeling is not taken into consideration or respected by the responsible Commission which was appointed for that purpose. That is the training of the British imperialism. If I may say so, it is that 'divide and rule' policy which is still being retained. That is why I say we emphasize that the majority of the Indian people—those who are not interested in exploiting other people—are behind the demand of Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay city merged into Maharashtra, Gujarat as a separate State and also Punjab.

With regard to Punjab, people feel that Punjabi speaking State as demanded by the Punjab people should be allowed to be formed. Here my friends have pointed out the fear—expressed in the Commission's report as well as in the opinion expressed here—that the Punjabi martial race will dominate all over north India or Maharahshtrians, the warrior class, will domi-

nate all over India. That will not happen. The history has now been changed. Now, we have democratic movements everywhere. In the present set up of the international world everything has become different. The common people have started playing a dominant part in moulding the history of our nation. Therefore there is nothing to fear. Nobody can dominate other people. That is not going to happen hereafter. (*Time Bell*). I am allotted 20 minutes, Sir, and I have taken only 15 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. Two minutes more. You began at 2-33.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR: The Government, Sir, must take courage in their both hands to reorganise the States on the basis of language. That should be the basic principle, and not any other principle. All these things must be settled in a proper way. And in order to decide the boundary question, the Government should appoint a Boundary Commission which can go into the whole question of boundaries and settle the matter once for all on the basis of village as a basic unit to determine the boundary. That is the only way in which this trouble with regard to boundaries can be put an end to.

Then, Sir, I was talking about Punjab, but I had to deviate....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Time is up.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR: Yes, Sir. Then, with regard to Manipur and Tripura, they are only small States, and the people there are mostly the tribal people. But now there is a movement there to form a democratic set up in which they can develop themselves as the people in other parts of India are doing. There is no justification for merging Tripura with Assam, where the people are not of the same type as the people in Tripura.

With these few words, Sir, I appeal to the Government not to get influenced by certain influential people, but to implement the recommendations, so far as the South is concerned, with certain

suitable changes. We are prepared to rally the people behind the Central Government, and we shall allow no fissiparous tendencies to exist. So, Sir, we are for a democratic set up, and not for a divide-and-rule policy. Thank you.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: Sir, I hope it is now widely recognised that the problem of reorganisation is a very urgent and a very pressing problem which cannot be shelved. It is fortunate that the Commission was appointed and it has submitted its recommendations. At present, there is a rising tide of provincial consciousness, sometimes healthy, sometimes unhealthy, but the consciousness is there, which makes it necessary to reorganise our States. When Andhra was separated, it had an explosive effect, a kind of a chain effect. When Andhra was separated, the question of separating Karnataka, separating other States, immediately arose. It was inevitable. And also because of the first Plan and because of the second Plan, reorganisation becomes important. Personally I feel that it is good that the problem should be solved here and now. The leaders that we have got now are well-known and famous leaders. We are not likely to have them for all time. And it is good if this decision is made when Panditji is with us, Pantji is with us, Maulana Azad is with us, and Rajendra Babu is with us, because we do know that whatever may happen to India, they will be able to find out a solution for our greatest problems. They have faced many more difficult problems, and this problem too they will be able to solve well. And it is good that they are with us; it is good that they are there to solve one of the most complicated and most important problems of India. Therefore, Sir, I believe that this question of reorganisation cannot be put back, cannot be shelved, even when Rajaji says so. It has got to be faced. Sir, I also believe that the time has come for making decisions, final decisions, and as quickly and as firmly as possible.

I am glad to say that the Commission consisted of very able members, very impartial members, and members who have put in national solidarity and unity as the first requisite of reorganisation, and they never lost sight of this when they made any recommendations. We here do lose sight of it here and there, but they never lost sight of this. And I do believe that the recommendations made by the Commission are, on the whole, very good with one recommendation which I consider bad, and that is the recommendation about the creation of a small and minor State of Vidarbha. Sir, I am very glad that as soon as the Report was out and placed on the Table, the Government and the Working Committee of the Congress took quick steps, firm steps, for consulting all sorts of people, consulting Legislatures, consulting Chief Ministers, consulting P.C.Cs. and consulting all Parties, and making some decisions immediately final and some decisions semi-final; and I do believe that most of the decisions by the Working Committee will be finalised within the next few days. I congratulate them heartily for all that, because it is necessary that these decisions should be final, and these decisions should be firm, and these decisions should be implemented quickly. Otherwise what will happen? As I see it, everyone in our House is generally, sober and restrained. But even here I do find that on this matter we let ourselves go in a way that personally I do not like. I would therefore say that if even our House loses itself now and then, it is just a warning that we should take our decisions as quickly as possible. But may I say that even the Working Committee of the Congress has, to my mind, giving a decision—about Bombay—with which I am unable to agree?

Sir, why do I say that the Commission made a big mistake in the creation of Vidarbha? There was some internal tension in Madhya Pradesh. There is a tension within a family; there is a tension within a joint family; there is a tension here and there. In fact, life itself is tension; no tension,

[Prof. N. R. Malkani.]

no life but death. But was the tension so great in Madhya Pradesh to justify the separation of Vidarbha—to create four districts, then add four more to it and make it eight—in breach of all the principles which have been asserted and stated by the Commission on every page, for example, geographical, historical, cultural, financial, and administrative? And I hardly find any reason among these five or six reasons why Vidarbha should have been separated and a small State created. It was bound to lead to great difficulties, and it has led to a chain of difficulties. They say somewhere that “the claim of Vidarbha can no longer be ignored”.

3 P.M.

I do not know what would have happened if it had been “ignored”, just like I don't know what would happen if you ignore the claims of Sikhistan or a separate State in Punjab. I don't say that anybody's claims should be ignored, but immediately Vidarbha is mentioned, it produces a chain of effects that we are not able to control. The moment Vidarbha is created, Maharashtra claims it and we cannot deny it. By no logic can you deny Vidarbha to Maharashtra. Maharashtra has brotherly love for Marathwada and fatherly or grand-fatherly affection for Vidarbha and you cannot say ‘No’ to it. You may say that Vidarbha never wanted it, that Vidarbha never wanted to be separated to be merged into Maharashtra; but Maharashtra claims it, and personally I think you cannot say ‘No’ to it. You have got to say, ‘Take it’. And then the cry for Samyukta Maharashtra becomes stronger.

What is the next result? Madhya Pradesh plus Bhopal, plus Vindhya Pradesh, plus Madhya Bharat becomes one State. Look at the map and see how absurd it is administratively, geographically. From end to end, it is 800 to 900 miles long. Never were these areas together; they had no historical ties, no permanent common interests. It will be a big headache to

you the battle of capitals, if not now but some other time in the future—Jabalpur versus Bhopal versus Indore versus Rewa versus Gwalior, with Gwalior at one end and Jabalpur at the far end. The whole thing was a surprise to me, pleasantly unpleasant surprise or unpleasantly pleasant surprise. It would have been a pleasant surprise if only Bhopal, Vindhya Pradesh and Madhya Bharat had been thrown together. That would have been a highly desirable thing. I know that nobody in Madhya Bharat was for it. The Pradesh Congress Committee of Madhya Bharat was against it. The Maha Sabha was against it. Some papers were against it. Yet we are today in for a Madhya Pradesh from Jabalpur right up to Gwalior. I do not like this State. I may tolerate Uttar Pradesh but I cannot tolerate this Madhya Pradesh. It is much too big, too ill-shaped and too ill-assorted.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Why this partiality?

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: I am not Partial. It is much too big, much too sprawling. All this was brought upon us because of the creation of Vidarbha. If there had been no Vidarbha, the present Madhya Pradesh would have continued, and it would have been another Bombay, a very important and progressive bilingual State, which Bombay would not have been had it not been a bilingual State.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Which nobody wanted.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: I am not quite sure. I have lived among Gujaratis for seven years there. I have been educated in Ferguson College among Maharashtrian friends. I know that both these groups, who are differently constituted and are different in temperament, have lived well with one another for several generations, making a great success of their State. This was another result of Vidarbha, that it made the demand for Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay in it

very strong now. Let me dispose of the Bombay question here. I am personally very much against the creation of Bombay city as a separate State. I personally feel that the High Command of the Congress has accepted it as a necessary evil, not as a necessary good. I have not yet come across any one who is for it, but everybody says that he cannot help it, and in a state of helplessness agrees to carve it up. If really the Maharashtrians love Bombay, then I would tell the Maharashtrians to talk in a different way. You know the story of a child which was claimed by two mothers, and the Qazi called the executioner to divide it in two parts and said, to both "You take one half and let the other take the other half". Then the real mother cried, 'No don't cut it up. Give the child to the other woman. Let it be hers' If we are going to separate Bombay, then I say it is up to the Maharashtrians to say, 'Please don't cut it out. It is doing violence. Give it to Gujaratis, give it to anybody else but do not cut it.' This is the way to prove your real claim to Bombay, not by issuing veiled threats, not by showing bad temper inside the Legislature, not by riots in the streets of Bombay and so forth. At least from the Maharashtrians I expected some discretion, some statesmanship, some diplomacy, some shrewdness, for which they are known. You don't expect any shrewdness or diplomacy from the Sikhs in the Punjab, Master Tara Singh is not much of a diplomat or statesman. He is just Master Tara Singh. But for the Maharashtrians to behave like this savours of the Punjab.

I would again say. 'Don't cut up Bombay.' You have got half a dozen reasons for not doing it; why half a dozen, I have got a dozen reasons why you should not cut it up and make it a separate State. If you do that, its commerce will dwindle. Its importance will dwindle. Bombay city is not like Delhi. You can cut up Delhi and present it to anybody, you can put it anywhere you like. Delhi is only an official city. You can

cut it up and put it anywhere you like in the South, West or East, but you can never do that with Calcutta. You cannot do it with Madras and you cannot do it with Bombay most of all. I would much rather say, 'Go Back to the bilingual State'. There should not be any serious objection to this. This will be the best solution possible. For Bombay does not belong to the Maharashtrians only but belongs to all of us. It belongs to the Sindhis, to the Bengalis and to everyone of us. You can certainly go back to Gujarati friends. I don't think that so much love has been lost that you cannot approach them. Gujaratis are on the whole behaving much better. Let us have rather huge State including Vidarbha and Kutch, from Bhuj right up to the northern point, but don't cut up Bombay. Bombay is a port of India. In fact it is more like London and belongs to the British if any. It remains British and European in character. If you want to transfer it to anybody, transfer it to the British, because it is they who created it and built it up. I would therefore tell the Maharashtrians and the Gujaratis to live together again as before. It is not very difficult. I am half Gujarati and I will tell my Gujarati friends, "Don't think of majorities and minorities. You are businessmen. You are very clever people. You are very shrewded businessmen. You do not think generally of minorities and majorities. You rule Calcutta but you are a minority there. You rule Madras, even though you are a minority there. Go with the Maharashtrians and make your State a great success;" and I am certain they will make a great success of it.

At the same time I would say to my Maharashtrian friends: Stop making a fierce love to Bombay which frightens me. Don't make a fierce love, don't be greedy, don't be dizzy with greed as I would tell my Gujarati friends, "Don't be giddy with fears." You are both giddy. Looking at friends on the opposition side, they get a few fears and a few creeps. You please don't give them the

[Prof. N. R. Malkani.]
 creeps. See that their fears are allayed and that there is no dizziness. Looking at the 12 storeys of buildings and the big factories of Bombay, their mouth waters—the Maharashtrian's mouth waters. He sees that he has no rupees in his pockets and the other man has cheque books but money cannot be got by pocketing Bombay. Business instincts, business training and business habits don't come like that, but have to be cultivated. You know politics is the art of achieving the possible and the practicable but it should also be the art of achieving the practicable which is desirable. You are achieving the possible perhaps but which is not desirable. I would even go so far as to give a challenge to my friends by saying, let the Gujaratis go out of this House and let the Maharashtrians also follow them. Let the rest of us decide for you the fate of Bombay. But would you abide by it? As a matter of fact I will say that it should be the convention of this House that on this heated question of Bombay the Gujaratis should have only one representative and the Maharashtrians one representative and let the rest of them both keep quiet so that we the rest may listen. Otherwise we really don't listen to you. People who are partisan, I don't listen to. I, like others, am deluged with literature which I don't want to read. I am deluged with articles which I don't want. I want to hear non-Maharashtrians and non-Gujaratis on this matter. When the Punjab question comes. I don't want to hear a Sikh or a Punjabi at all. I want to hear a non-Punjabi because even if he talks nonsense, he will be non-partisan. So I again entreat both of you who are my friends to get together. Most of my Sindhis are in Bombay State and they are afraid one way or the other. We are full of fears—we are afraid of Maharashtrians and of Gujaratis by turns. We don't know what to do. So we simply say—let us keep quiet. Whatever the High Command says we will bow to it. I may just give an advice to my Maharashtrian friends here

I have rarely heard you say that 'whatever the High Command says, we bow to it.' You don't say so. That creates fears within my own mind and your bona fides are questionable. You don't say "Whatever Panditji says, we will agree to it blind-fold." I would also say: You are all gentlemen and good sport, you better stop talking of the people, of public opinion, of the streets of Bombay etc. You say, "Didn't you see what happened on the 17th November? It might come again." That kind of talk, that tone and manner do not become the Maharashtrians. It might have become them, it may have suited them say years ago, two hundred years ago but today, this kind of language is quite out of place and out of order now. Here we are to sit together—and co-operate as friends and decide things for the good of India and Maharashtra and Gujarat. Thank you.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Empty pockets and bulging pockets cannot co-operate.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: You want to cut pockets.....

DR. P. V. KANE (Nominated): Sir, I must make it clear in the very beginning that I don't speak as belonging to any particular part.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: Thank you, so much the better.

DR. P. V. KANE: And I must also say that I am only a nominated Member. I join with the others to some extent in praising the three gentlemen that took this onerous and rather thankless task of making a report on the subjects entrusted to them but I don't give any unqualified praise for that. I am going to show in the short time at my disposal that their report suffers from several drawbacks and the first and the most important drawback is that they do not lay down any fundamental broad principles which should govern their final decision. That was the matter entrusted to them. If we look at the Resolution

which is set out in the beginning in the Introduction, the Government have laid down the following task. I read the last sentence of that Resolution which they quote:

"The Government expect that the Commission would, in the first instance, not go into the details, but make recommendations in regard to the broad principles which should govern the solution of this problem and, if they so choose, the broad lines on which particular States should be reorganized, and submit interim reports for the consideration of Government."

They were entrusted with three different tasks—broad principles. Secondly, they were to show how reorganisation will be made and were called upon to make interim reports if they thought proper. I regard that really they were bound to submit but they have said, "We were not bound to accept it." You look at the comma—after 'reorganized' it stops and 'submit interim.....' that shows that Government wanted interim report so that they can say 'On the evidence so far advanced, this is the trend'. If there is any contrary trend, people should come forward.....

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Madhya Pradesh): There is one phrase 'if they so choose'.

DR. P. V. KANE: That goes with the broad lines. My point is, they must submit. That was my idea. That is what was laid down on them by the Resolution. Now they go on into history and they show that for many years—for 40 years the Congress had passed resolutions about the reorganisation of States on the linguistic principles. Then they have shown that upto 1945-46 when the manifesto for election was put forward by Congress, they insisted on linguistic provinces. They show that. But when the Congress came into power in 1946-47, the attitude of some of the leaders changed and then we have the J. V. P. report and many other reports—The Dar Commission report

etc. There the position was shifted. They said not only that. Look at the Dar Commission report which is summarised. They said, 'You must look into the history, geography etc.' So many things they put down. Then other reports followed and now we have a jumble of principles. What was wanted was, what is the fundamental or first principle. They lay down national security and nobody denies that. Those who are great protagonists of the language basis don't say that security or unity of India should in any way be endangered. They all take it for granted. Therefore that principle should not be trotted out. The principle was linguistic province. They should have said that linguistic test is the most predominant test and if we are to judge of a man's idea from the handiwork that he has produced, these people have produced 14 unilingual States. If we have to judge from it, you must say that the most predominant consideration is language otherwise they should not have made two States taking 2 languages, Andhra and Madras. They were reorganising. They could have therefore suggested that a composite State is the best thing for the unity and security of India. Therefore we shall divide India only into 7 States—there are 14 languages and so 2 languages for each State. If it is the principle then as far as possible anywhere not more than two languages may come but there must be a composite State always—if that is a *sine qua non* of unity and security.

My submission is that this is only trotted out for separating certain people or for joining them. But throughout the Report, the whole object of the Commission has been to create unilingual States. Look at the 14 languages and you find every language has got one State.

AN. HON. MEMBER: More than one State, some times.

DR. P. V. KANE: Yes, in some cases the same language has more than one State.

[Dr. P. V. Kane.]

There is then the colossus, the giant State of U. P. with more than 63 million people. As against that you create a small dwarf with 7 millions and then you ask the two to co-operate. How can the giant and the dwarf do that? You know how in the story, the giant got all the benefits and the dwarf got all the wounds. But that is how they have recommended, simply because they got frightened about Maharashtra and they have created this small dwarf of a State with 7 millions.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: U.P. is not a giant, it is a lamb.

DR. P. V. KANE: All right, all right. If not a giant, have it as a lion. Then it becomes a combination of the lion and the lamb. Well, there is this other colossus or lion or whatever you call it, which extends from below Agra in the north right down to Andhra in the south—about 800 miles or so, called Mahakoshal or whatever the name be.

AN HON. MEMBER: A thousand miles.

DR. P. V. KANE: About a thousand miles, a big chunk.

(Interruptions)

I would request my hon. friends not to interrupt me. I am an old man and time is short, and so many people are yet to speak. What I am pointing out is that these two colossuses—I will not call them giants, but colossuses—the Uttar Pradesh and Mahakoshal or Madhya Pradesh, or whatever you call it, have been created. Another colossus is Rajasthan, I mean in area it is. Look at the map and you will find that half of India is taken up by these three States. Therefore, my submission is that the Commission did not apply its mind to these things properly. They should have avowed the fundamental principle. Ultimately the principle is the same, but they have tried to whittle it down and that is what I do not like at all. Either you

do not accept the principle at all or you accept it properly. They actually say that language is a very important principle. Look at the summary of their findings and at what ultimately emerged. On page 25 you will find what they say. I will read only a few lines, since there is very little time. This is what they say:

"The principles that emerge may be enumerated as follows:

- (i) preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India;"

No one complains about that. Bombay was at one time quadrilingual, with Marathi, Gujarati, Kannada and Sindhi. Gradually it became trilingual and now it is shedding its wings with Karnataka going and now it is bilingual. Why not have it unilingual? In those days the State stretched from Shikarpur in the north to Dharwar in the south, it did not come in the way of unity and security. Well, the next thing that emerges is:

- "(ii) linguistic and cultural homogeneity;

- (iii) financial, economic and administrative considerations; and

- (iv) successful working of the national plan."

These are the principles which they say, emerge from the Reports. And looking a little further you find at page 29 something else. After all linguistic provinces are merely a means to an end. They are not the end. But sometimes the means are so important that unless you emphasise the means, you cannot get the end that you want. Ultimately on page 45, while summarising the conclusions, they say in paragraph 162:

"We now summarise our final views on the role of language as a factor bearing on the reorganisation of States. After a full consideration of the problem in all its aspects, we

have come to the conclusion that it is neither possible nor desirable to reorganise States on the basis of the single test of either language or culture, but that a balanced approach to the whole problem is necessary in the interests of our national unity."

All the same, there are about fourteen linguistic States, and that it seems, does not come in the way of unity and security. But if you create one Maharashtra with Bombay, then the world will fall, the sky will fall down. That is the attitude of their minds, I might say with great respect. One was the Chief Justice in the Supreme Court Another is Dr. Kunzru who has been in public life for more than 50 years and the third gentleman is a very versatile genius. They are great men. But even great men commit mistakes. We know there is the Supreme Court to correct the mistakes of the High Court. And if there were a super-Supreme Court, Supreme Judges will be corrected. In our Parliament, we can criticise everybody, provided it is honest criticism, however high his position may be. Parliament is the supreme authority and therefore I am exercising that power to criticise, even if the people are of high position and they are entitled to great respect. I say this respect is there, but respect does not mean submission. Respect means also criticism, for that is a way to show respect. You can say, "You are a great man, but here you appear to have committed a mistake." That is my duty as a Member of this august House and I am performing that duty.

So, they applied that single test to fourteen States, but they are afraid to apply it to two cases—Maharashtra and Punjab. With the problem in the Punjab, I am not very familiar. There it seems, the battle is not one of language, but one of scripts. I am told that the people there can understand both Hindi and Punjabi. I do not know, but I am told that it is not a question of languages as in the case of Kanarese and Marathi or between Hindi and Kanarese or Tamil and some other language. It is a fight on

a different plane. So out of a multi-lingual State you create a bilingual State.

Next they say that they have taken the district as the basis. Is that so? As a matter of fact, I have seen half a dozen instances where tehsils and talukas have been taken away from one State and placed in another. Those who are interested enough can look them up. For instance there is Kollegal Taluk of Coimbatore district which has to go to Kerala. So also Kasaragod Taluk which is in South Kanara. And then there is the case of Kolar where the Telugus form some 54 per cent. and the Kannadigas only about 21 per cent. and yet Kolar is to be kept with Mysore. And there is another example. Even Loharu sub-tehsil of the Hissar district is to be transferred to Rajasthan. Another glaring example is Chas—a revenue *thana*—and Chas has been separated from its old bindings and kept elsewhere. So I say they have not applied the language principle as they should have. Then comes viability. And they also say that each case they have decided on its merits. That is what they say on page 66. But that gives great latitude to anything that one can do.

This is what they say on page 66, paragraph 235, last sentence. "We have accordingly examined each case on its own merits and in its own context....". They should have examined each case on the priority of principles. They did not do that. It is merely "...on its own merits and on its own context and arrived at conclusions after taking into consideration the totality of circumstances and on an overall assessment of the solution proposed". There is no word said about the dominant principle or the predominant principle. That word is not there. This is a kind of approach which one should not at all like.

We come now to another aspect. The question is of giant States or of lesser States. About this, this is what they say and yet they have made,

[Dr. P. V. Kane.]

as I said, two big States or three big States and one small dwarf State. Paragraph 220 says:

"In a matter like this, it would be unwise to be dogmatic or to rule out exceptions. When it is suggested that the weight of argument is in favour of large rather than small States, the objective is that every State should have adequate resources to assume the responsibility devolving on a full-fledged constituent unit of the Union. This, however, does not mean that units should be so unwieldy as to be without any intrinsic life....

Everywhere they quibble as it were, put in a proposition and then try to balance it.

"..... of their own or to defeat the very purpose for which larger units are suggested, i.e., administrative efficiency and co-ordination of economic development and welfare activity."

They talk of an unwieldy State. U.P. is one such with nearly 63 million people and Vidarbha another with 7 million people. Look at America: At least in the Senate, New York which has about 1,20,00,000 people has only two votes. Nevada which has only ten lakhs of people also has two votes. All the 48 States have two votes each and in all 96 people are elected. It is only in the House of Representatives.....

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): What are the powers of the Senate?

DR. P. V. KANE: The Senate is far more powerful than the House of Representatives. If you look at American history you will find Senator this, Senator that and so on. These are the most powerful people, not the House of Representatives. You read properly American political history.

SHRI LAVJI LAKHAMSHI (Kutch): Why don't you suggest that our Rajya Sabha should be like this Senate?

DR. P. V. KANE: I do not want to go into all that. I am glad that at least one out of the three members of the Commission is in favour of what I am saying. He has said that this is a big State. Sardar Panikkar has given a dissenting note saying that U.P. should be divided. I am not alone in that. That is all that I am saying.

I now come to the State of Bombay. The hon. Minister in charge of this motion ridiculed—I do not want to say invective—this idea. It should not be that I have got only fifteen minutes and so I must put forward only points relating to my State. If you had given me two hours, I should have covered the whole of the Report. That was not allowed and, therefore, everybody said something which was uppermost in his mind. The hon. Minister should not have referred to that; he should have said that everyone's views are correct so far as these things are concerned. There is another point that I want to touch upon. He said that there was no surprise. The Prime Minister is reported to have said that he was surprised but he never said what it was that surprised him. Now, we have a bhashya, a commentary, for it. It is said that if he was surprised, he may have been agreeably surprised. I may say, Sir, that I was disagreeably surprised at the Report.

Then we come to the Bombay State. Here again a personal explanation is necessary. Some gentlemen from Bombay who are now there on that Committee which my hon. friend, Mr. Deogirikar referred to, instead of counting their profits as directors' commission and so forth, began to delve into ancient history when this question arose. I do not know whether they themselves wrote anything or read anything. They have so much of money; they must have employed a poor man like me who is interested in ancient history. They

might have paid him Rs. 200 and asked him to find this out. That man being low paid got hold of an article contributed by me some forty years ago, in 1916 or 1917. The paper is headed "Ancient Geography of Maharashtra". From that, they have taken out a quotation saying Dr. Kane is in favour of saying Konkan, of which Bombay is now part, is not Maharashtra at all. I strongly repudiate this. There I was not concerned with the Bombay of the present day. I was concerned with the most ancient times a time about which there is no record up to 1,200 A.D. I made that clear in the beginning and I said that although Konkan was separate from Maharashtra, the language was Marathi. In Maharashtra itself people were fighting in those days and there were several kingdoms.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH (Madhya Bharat): What about Konkani?

DR. P. V. KANE: I have to tell those people, those people who have become learned of ancient antiquities, that my paper was on the ancient geography. At that time Bombay was not even heard of. It was never heard of at that time and I must make that clear. Those days, Bombay was a small fishermen's village. In 1663 it came to the British Crown as part of the dowry of Princess Braganza to Charles II. It was so poor that Charles II gave that village at an annual rental of £10 to the East India Company which rent also was not paid. This rent was never paid by the Company. It was such a small place; its history is less than 300 years old. If anybody has made that great and prosperous, the first credit must go to the Englishmen. They worked and laboured. There were no Gujratis working there then. Then came the Parsis. Now we have the big houses of Wadias, Tatas, Sir Jamshedji, Petit and so on. They came there. The Wadias were very famous for their navigational skill. They were so famous that the Britishers thought it necessary to put curbs.

Of course now they talk of free trade and all that but to prevent Indian ships going to London, they put up a duty of 100 per cent. on goods carried by Indian ships. These Parsis are big people and they are great geniuses. They are most adaptable. Whenever they were under Hindu Kings, they said, "We shall behave like you". When the Britishers came, the necktie and collar came. They are very good people. There are Parsis who were on this Bombay Citizens' Committee but I do not think that the Parsis, as a Samaj, have said anything in this dispute about Bombay or about Maharashtra. They say, "Whoever is the ruler we shall be all right". In the whole world they are not even two lakhs.

DR. M. D. D. GILDER (Bombay): One lakh and odd.

DR. P. V. KANE: In Bombay they number some thousands. They are quite prepared and ready. So, the small energetic community of Parsis came. The Marathas did not come because they had then the whole of India, right from Delhi to Tanjore. They had the run of this whole land. They did not want Bombay at all at that time and, therefore, they did not come. When the British arms succeeded came the Marathas. Before the Marathas came the Gujratis. Now, I am afraid they will also go and probably the Marwaris will come. After all, Lakshmi is *chanchal*; you must remember that. Of course, the Parsis are there but they have not that importance that they enjoyed some hundred years ago. Now the Gujratis are there and they will also leave that and most probably the Marwaris will come in. Later on, we do not know who will come.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time, Dr. Kane.

DR. P. V. KANE: I want five to ten minutes to develop that point.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore): Let us hear him, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please finish in five minutes.

DR. P. V. KANE: Now, take the question of commerce and trade. I may tell you frankly as a lawyer that there was no Workmen's Compensation Act some 30 years back. In the mills, there was no provision of any such benefits. My colleagues in the schools used to work in the mills, Marathi and other boys. If a leg was cut off, not a pie was ever paid.

It is only during the last thirty years you have got the Workmen's Compensation Act. So what I am saying is that nobody should boast. These Gujaratis did not bring money from Gujarat. They created money here and they have spent it here. They have spent the money in setting up mills. But they are not the only things that contributed to the growth of the Bombay city. There was the intellectual life, the life of art and so forth. Others have contributed by blood, toil and tears. All have contributed. There were the Wadias, the Petits, and there were men like Sir Jamshedji Jeejeebhoy, Sir Dadabhoy Naoroji and Sir Feroze Shah Mehta. The Gujaratis were not prominent there a hundred years ago. During this period art, literature and science developed and with that they are also there. They have got many things. Let them have it. Nobody denies it. But do not insist that you have created Bombay. It has been created by the British, by the Parsees, the Gujaratis and by everybody. There are so many communities and everyone has given, according to his ability, whatever he can to the Bombay City. So that particular claim they have made I cannot allow to go unchallenged.

Let me proceed to another point. The important paragraphs are those from 411. I am only dealing with Bombay State and to some extent with Vidarbha. I can only read some sentences. I cannot read all. The second sentence of paragraph 411 says, "At

the same time we cannot ignore the fact that important sections of public opinion in the Marathi-speaking districts of Madhya Pradesh"—this is the thin end of the wedge—"do not subscribe to the ideal of Samyukta Maharashtra". I have shown some inconsistencies. This is another thing, viz. vagueness. "Important sections of public opinion", who are those? I do not know whom they examined. I am told in the report that they examined 900 people, went to 104 places, and examined 2,000 important memoranda. All that they have done. Here I do not want the names to be given; they should have given at least the number of people examined. I do not think the evidence is going to be printed. The University Commission published volumes of evidence. Here there is no volume of evidence. They should have at least said, "We have examined a 100 people on this point. Out of that so many, say 80 or 50 or whatever that number be, were of this view." Not a word. It is vague. It simply says, "important sections of public opinion do not subscribe to the ideal of Samyukta Maharashtra". May be your point of view, my point of view or their point of view or somebody else's point of view. So this is too vague. So here I leave this paragraph.

I now come to paragraph 416 which is another important paragraph. This is the first portion, "During the course of our enquiry, a vast majority of persons who appeared before us and did not belong to either of the two contending language groups".....that is, they were neither Maharattas nor Gujaratis. I suppose; that is what is in their mind. I think—"expressed themselves strongly in favour of placing the Bombay city under a separate administration in the event of the disintegration of the State". They must say how many appeared. Maybe two. I challenge it. "Vast majority" means what? How many? Supposing they visited 100 places and on an average examined 90 people in one place, they should say out

of these 90 how many were examined, how many belonged to the Mahratti-speaking community, how many to the Gujarati-speaking community and how many for and how many against. This term "a vast majority of persons" creates a false impression. They may say "several people" or "a large number of people". I object to these words being used unless we are given the means to verify whether this is the correct state of things. Then the same paragraph says in continuation, "We also noticed serious misgivings in the minds of large sections of the inhabitants of Bombay as well as persons outside about the future of the city, if it formed part of a unilingual State". Here again occur the words "misgivings in the minds of large sections". Later on the words used are "fears and suspicions". I wonder at these. At the head of this Commission there is a highest judicial officer. I have known that in law mere suspicion is not sufficient to convict a man. Supposing there is suspicion, supposing I know and the judges know in their minds that X has committed a murder, still, unless there is legal evidence, he must be given the benefit of doubt. It is not for me to tell the Chairman of this Commission. But there are two other gentlemen who probably are not lawyers. My idea is that this is all wrong, to proceed on the basis of mere apprehension and fear. This examination was all in camera most probably. Nobody else was present except these three, and these several persons' statements were never put to the people who were to be condemned *ex parte*. It is the general principle of law that nothing can be done against any man unless he is given an opportunity of being heard. Was there opportunity given to the Maharashtrians to show that all these apprehensions were wrong? I do not think. Let them say. Now let me proceed to another paragraph (418).

Here they say, "We are impressed by the cogency of these arguments,

but we cannot lightly brush aside the fears of the other communities." Who are the other communities? According to their own figures 43 or 44 per cent. are Maharashtrians. Only 17 per cent are Gujaratis. That comes to about 61 per cent. The balance belonged to the other communities. How many did they examine? Whom did they examine and what did they say? All this has been brushed aside as not worth the trouble to go into.

SHRI T. BODRA: If everyone does not stick to the time-table where is our chance to come for speaking?

SHRI BARKATULLAH KHAN (Rajasthan): It is the inherent power of the Chair to allow any one to speak as much as the Chair permits.

DR. P. V. KANE: The Commission says, "The position of the city, therefore, is different from that of Madras and Calcutta." I do not see how. Madras, Calcutta and Bombay were all small villages 300 years ago. There was the Fort St. George in Madras and Fort William in Calcutta built by the British. Only Calcutta had a large number of Bengalis and Bombay a large number of Maharashtrians. The majority in Bombay were Maharashtrians as Bengalis were in Calcutta. But Bengalis had nothing by way of commerce or trade, if I am not mistaken and most of the trade was in the hands of English and Marwari and Gujarati hands. My submission would be that all the three cities are on the same level.

In the same paragraph in the end you find, "the views and apprehensions of the minor language groups." I do not want them to mention names, but let them say how many people were examined.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: These minor language groups are given in the census report.

DR. P. V. KANE: I want to know the persons examined by this Commission. They say, "the views and apprehensions of the minor language groups". How did they come to know?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: The number is given in the initial Introduction.

DR. P. V. KANE: This is the language used. Why Bombay (*Time bell rings.*) alone should be treated differently? My submission is all this more or less shows the views or the mind of the person who wrote this report.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kane! Now you should close.

DR. P. V. KANE: I now come to Vidarbha and I shall say one or two sentences. The pages I refer to are 122 to 125.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I suggest that you need not read the paragraphs but just give your observations.

DR. P. V. KANE: I have already said that they say that Vidarbha has different land and tenancy laws, this and that and therefore they are unwilling to join Maharashtra. This factor does not appeal to them when they go to Malabar which has a different tenancy law and all that, different from Travancore-Cochin. Therefore I say they are not logical. This is one charge that I make. Another thing they say about Vidarbha is that it is a very good State and all that. I want to challenge that the Commission is not quite correct there.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Which paragraph please?

DR. P. V. KANE: I refer to paragraph 456. They say, "Vidarbha will be one of the most important cotton-growing areas in the country." I do not know whether they are aware of the fact that the indigo industry collapsed because synthetic indigo was manufactured in America and other places. Americans are now finding

out whether synthetic cotton can be manufactured and if they succeed all this importance attached to cotton-growing Vidarbha will go.

Just one sentence and I shall finish. The Maharashtrians feel that they have been subjected, without any reason, undeservedly, to a sort of stigma, as it were, in this Report, and that will rankle in our hearts till we die or even after perhaps if that is possible. The point is why should there be all this suspicion about Maharashtrians not in one place but in several places in the report. We do not want Bombay city to go. It is for the Government to see the justice of the case. We are loyal citizens of the Indian Union. We shall obey the laws, but do not take away our right to grumble or to complain or to criticise. This has always rankled in our hearts and will rankle.

SHRI M. M. SUR (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, at the outset I must say that I agree in general with the principle enunciated by the States Reorganisation Commission although I do not agree with much of its findings. There are many matters which I should like to criticise but the time at my disposal is short and therefore I shall concentrate only on one problem, that is, of Bengal.

Sir, the Commission has not taken all the facts into consideration, particularly the injustice that was done to Bengal for over half a century during British rule, for no fault of her own except the fault of her spirit or nationalism, spirit of sacrifice and her capacity for bearing infinite pain. Having conquered the whole of India, the British rulers were after a cultural conquest. They were thrusting upon us European culture, European way of thinking and their conception of human values but the soul of Bengal revolted against this. There arose social reformers like Ram Mohan Roy, Keshab Chandra Sen, Iswar-chandra Vidyasagar, and last but not the least Bankim Chandra Chatterjee

who composed the famous song *Bande Mataram*. This was too much for the English Rulers; they saw the danger signal and the policy of persecution started. They divided Bengal into several portions—Bihar, Orissa, Assam and Bengal. They neglected the education of the Bengali boys and girls. Whatever education they could get was from private enterprise which started private colleges and even now 90 per cent. of the Graduates that the Calcutta University is turning out are coming out from these private colleges. Then there was this political movement and it came up in rotation almost every 10 or 12 years and Bengal was foremost in all these movements. There were repressive laws to curb the spirit of the Bengalis but notwithstanding all these facts, there arose also during this last half a century *Shri Arabindu of Pondicherry* fame and *Rabindranath Tagore*. The Britishers not only neglected their education but they also did not give any chance to the Bengalis for employment in the industries which they started, in the jute mills or in other industrial undertakings. They sowed the seeds of provincialism starting from Bengal in all the provinces and that is the reason why we are suffering now. There are now a large number of educated unemployed, both boys and girls and these educated unemployed are a source of danger to any province, particularly to a frontier province like Bengal. It must be said to the credit of the present Government that they have been able to keep the students in check but who knows, there may be an upheaval any time and that will endanger not only the safety of this small province but also the security of the whole of India. In order to give employment to all these young men and also to the very large number of refugees who are coming and who cannot be settled in any other province because the climate and the environment do not suit them and who have to be settled in this province, we have to develop our agriculture and our industry. In order to develop our

agriculture we need water and water is unfortunately in the catchment area just outside the borders of Bengal. Therefore the West Bengal Government has asked for certain areas so that Bengal can build her own dams and hydro-electric projects without much interference. It is true that we have this River Boards Bill and the Inter-State Water Disputes Bill and there can be arbitration and all that, but it takes a long time. In order that things can be done speedily they have asked for a little of *Manbhum*, a little of *Santhal Parganas* and *Dhalbhum* so that Bengal may develop her agriculture and her industry and also tackle the question of the educated unemployed. The demand of West Bengal, considering the problems that she has, is modest and if we take the Hindi-speaking areas of Uttar Pradesh and the newly suggested Madhya Pradesh and if lines of demarcation between them are re-adjusted, not only the demand of West Bengal can be met but the demand of Orissa can also be met without difficulty. We have here a very vast population who have been under repressive laws and whose spirit has been broken, but the talent is there. If it is properly utilised, given proper opportunities, we can expect there will again rise men like *Keshab Chandra Sen*, *Tagore* and *Swami Vivekananda* for the benefit not only of Bengal but for the whole of India. The people of Bengal are not business people, but there are men of talents among them and if proper scope for development is given to them that would benefit the whole of India and that will add to the glory of the country for which we can all be proud.

4 P.M.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN (Madras):
Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am indeed sorry that we are in this plight today, brother against brother. I am more concerned with the unity of India than with any linguistic provinces. After thousands of years the country has become united once again

[Dr. P. Subbarayan.]

under the leadership of our Prime Minister and I hope this will be kept in mind all the time. And I feel the division into linguistic areas is going to cut right against this unity because it will really result in everyone for his language and none for his country. Therefore, I hope, in considering this Report, we will not get lost in this linguistic tangle. As has been pointed out, linguism seems to have played a great part in the Report that has been submitted, except in one case, that is the new province of Bombay which they have suggested. The whole principle that has been in the minds of the framers of this Report has been language. We have new provinces like Karnataka. Fortunately they still call Madras as Madras and I hope we will keep to the name of Madras and not turn ourselves into Tamil Nad. Andhra, of course, really brought about all this trouble. I say it with all due apologies to my Andhra brethren.....

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA: Because of Andhra you are getting the other linguistic provinces.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: I did not hear the gentleman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is because of Andhra you are getting other linguistic provinces—he says.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: That is why I say you are the guilty party. That is what I am contending. It is because of you all this trouble has come. That is what I intended to say and I reiterate it....

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: You did not retain them

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: It is not a question of our retaining them. Mr. Dasappa is very wrong. We wanted nobody to leave us, we wanted them to remain with us. It is otherwise it is they who left us. Even today we are merely the residuary legatees, if I may use such a word. After Andhra and Kerala go out, we

remain as Madras and not as Tamil Nad. Even today, the Commission has called us as Madras and not Tamil Nad. I feel that it would have been better if the map had been redrawn as my friend Mr. Rajah suggested. It would have been the best thing for the whole of India if we could have had five big States with the Centre as the co-ordinating agency. But I am afraid Mr. Rajah and I are too late in this.....

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Nothing is late in the life of a nation.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: If the people realise that as time goes on, and the unity of India really gets strengthened, this is a solution which might come at the end. But taking things as they stand, I feel that injustice has been done to the new State of Madras in what has been suggested by the Commission. And that is, with regard to Devikulam and Peermade—they say that the result of the last election in the Travancore-Cochin State proves that the Tamils are united in wanting to go back to Madras, but at the same time they talk of economic considerations—that it would result in the economic instability of Travancore-Cochin if Peermade and Devikulam are handed over to Madras. Well, all that I say is that you cannot have two principles working at the same time. You either work on the linguistic principle or on the economic principle. You cannot apply one when it suits your convenience and refer to the other because it does not suit your convenience. I still feel that it will be good if Travancore-Cochin and Madras could remain together. But perhaps it is too late. If that is not to be the case, I plead that there is a case for Devikulam and Peermade being part of Madras. They talk of engineering difficulties and irrigational facilities. May I remind my Travancore-Cochin brethren that it was they who were against the utilisation of the Periyar water, though they were not able to use it themselves for irrigation? And

the then Madras State which was composed of Andhra as well had to pay a price for the Periyar dam. And what is more the same thing happened once again. When we wanted to generate electricity in the Periyar dam built by ourselves, built at the expense of the Madras State, there again, the Travancore-Cochin Government claimed that more royalty ought to be paid because what was conceded was not the production of electricity but merely irrigation facilities. That is how we behave when we get divided into linguistic areas. That is why I claim that the claim of Madras for Peermede and Devikulam is really on a very sound basis. Even today our irrigational facilities have been exhausted and we have very few sources to tap. The Cauveri has been fully exploited and whatever source of irrigation we can find must come from the Western Ghats. And if that is so, the importance of Devikulam and Peermede for Madras becomes apparent, if one would only open his eyes and see it. There are other new schemes of irrigation. The waters that flow from the Western Ghats flow back into the sea. If only they could be dammed, they could be utilised in our area, for irrigating some of our dry districts like Coimbatore and Ramanathapuram. And, therefore, it is necessary that Peermede and Devikulam should be in the Madras State in order that these places may be properly exploited for irrigational purposes. It is really a policy of dog in the manger, because the Travancore-Cochin State of the future will not be able to utilise these waters because they have not got the land which they can irrigate with the amount of water that could be banded. And, therefore, from every point of view, either from the population or the decision of the electorate, or from economic considerations, I say with all the emphasis that I can command that Peermede and Devikulam really ought to belong to the new Madras State. (*An hon. Member:* to the old Madras State.) The old one is gone, when you reor-

ganise the States, there is no old Madras State. Therefore, I do say this that with the new division as suggested by the S.R.C., most of the forest areas which we have developed ourselves would go out. For instance, the forests on the Malabar side of the Anamalais will go into the Kerala State. Kollegal—rightly I admit, I do not claim it—has gone into Karnataka. But we have lost our forest wealth by Kollegal going into Karnataka. (*Interruption.*) Mr. Dasappa, if he listens to me, will know what I am saying. Well, if you consider the forest wealth of the old Madras State and what it is now, indeed you will find that what will be left over to the new Madras State will be very little in the matter of utilisation of forests.

SHRI SHRIYANS PRASAD JAIN (*Bombay*): Socialistic pattern of society.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: My friend, Shri Shriyans Prasad Jain talks of socialistic pattern of society. I would like to remind him that socialism does not mean robbing Peter to pay Paul and if he is really willing to do that, he may easily agree to share his wealth.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: It is funny that both Dr. Subbarayan and Mr. Jain talk of socialism.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: My dear Dasappa, I have already been abolished. I hope you realise that.

But leaving that apart, considering the resources that will be necessary for a State to exist, I think that there is a case that some forest areas should at least remain with us. I really mean by this that there is a claim for Gudalur from Kerala. Having taken everything, wanting Peermede and Devikulam and wanting back the five Tamil taluks which even the Commission could not think of recommending for them, they still demand Gudalur as well. Gudalur is very important from our point of

[Dr. P. Subbarayan.]

view also, because our power station is in that area. The Pykara Dam and perhaps, the new Kunda scheme also will involve Gudalur. Therefore let them be generous. They want us to be generous in regard to Peermade and Devikulam. Let them be generous in regard to Gudalur. I said that I am willing that they should remain with us but if they want to go, I do not prevent their going. But I want my economic situation properly guaranteed and safeguarded so that I may exist by myself I may develop by myself; so that I do not lose anything in the process of this linguistic tangle and linguistic babel—if I may use such word—because that is what is resulting from this. I made an appeal and I make it even now to my Karnataka brothers and that is this. It will be indeed very good if there could be a big Southern State. If Kerala, Karnataka and Tamil Nad could come together, then we shall have really an influence in the future on the Indian Union.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Why have you left the Andhra State?

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: If the Andhras want to come, then let them come. They have just separated. If you come in, Mr. Dasappa, I think that the Andhras may easily follow suit when they see how we live together. You are not with us. Therefore, I am demanding that of you. I am asking you, "Better come along with us." That I am demanding of you in the interests of the Indian Union.

Lots of people talk about the Uttar Pradesh being separated. I am not concerned with it. We want to separate ourselves. Why should we want some other State to be separated because we are separating into various States? On the other hand, we can have a big State to counter-balance the great influence of Uttar Pradesh. What is wrong in it? There is nothing wrong in that.

All this is because of the original intention of the Congress that the States should be formed on a linguistic basis. But let us divide as brothers. Let us think first of the unity of India. Therefore, I would now like to refer to some of the recommendations which have been made in their Report with regard to the Services. I am really rather enamoured of them. They should not only have the Indian Administrative Service and the Indian Police Service, but they also need an Indian Service of Engineers. I hope most of the States will accept this suggestion. The Engineering Service of India will be able to get the best talent they can. Afterwards, it will be an Indian Service of Engineers and not merely a provincial service. The same I would say in regard to both the Medical and Public Health Services which have also been recommended. It seems to me that we have forgotten these important suggestions in our fight and conflict in regard to language. These are some of the recommendations which, I hope, our leaders in the Centre will carry out, because I feel that it will be a better thing if, apart from the two Services, i.e., Administrative and Police, other Services also, like the Indian Medical and Health Services and Indian Service of Engineers and even a new Indian Educational Service are constituted for the preservation of the unity of India.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Forest?

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: Everything, because you are afraid of competition from others. I feel that that will really lead, in spite of the linguistic division, to the unity of India, when the Services would think of India as a whole and not of a particular linguistic area from which one may come. Therefore, I would very much like to commend this part of the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission. I hope that the leaders who are dealing with this will not forget that economic considerations should not be the only criterion; the

language plus the economic considerations should be the thing by which they could come to a final decision.

SHRI T. BODRA: Sir, I thank you very much for the opportunity given to me to express my views on the S.R.C. Report and place before the House the opinions of the peoples of the hills, the Adivasis, tribal people and some of the non-Adivasis living in Jharkhand.

On the 19th of December, I had tabled an amendment to the motion of the hon. Home Minister, but the Chairman was pleased to cancel it while discussing this Report. My amendment was as follows:

".....and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government should immediately take steps for the formation of 'Jharkhand State' constituting the following areas:

(1) the five districts of Chota Nagpur division, viz., Ranchi, Hazaribagh, Palamau, Manbhum, Singhbhum and Santhal Parganas now in Bihar State;

(2) the districts of Mayurbhanj, Keonjhar and Sundargarh now in Orissa State;

(3) the districts of Surguja, Raigarh and Korea-changbhakar now in Madhya Pradesh; and

(4) the adjacent hill tracts round about Chota Nagpur and the aforesaid Chota Nagpur States."

Now, Sir, we have heard about Maharashtra, about Bengal, about Orissa and I am the only Member who is here to tell you something about the Gonds, Santhals, Mundas and other people. Now, I would remind the House that the Chota Nagpur division consists of five districts and then the Santhal Parganas which is the homeland of the Santhals and they are in a majority there, and that there was an agitation in regard to a

separate State according to the historic records. That information may even now be found in the Record Room. After Independence was attained by India, these Chota Nagpur States were transferred either to the administration of Orissa or Madhya Pradesh or Bihar.

Now, Sir, this is the position. According to the Census of 1951, there have been a population of 1,63,67,177. The area is 63,859 square miles. I have given you now a rough idea of what this Jharkhand State is and we claim this area not only from Bihar, but also from Bengal, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh. On what grounds? Not on the linguistic basis. On the 14th, I was listening to the debate in the Lok Sabha and the hon. Home Minister, Pandit Pant was good enough to say that, although there are only fourteen languages which are recognized, that does not mean that about two to three crores of people whose languages do not come under these fourteen have not got the right to live or that they should necessarily have a stunted growth. The Gonds, Mundas, Santhals etc. who number about two to three crores have also got the right in this democratic India to grow according to their own individuality, although they have not got a language which comes under these fourteen languages. But what do we find today? Bengal is claiming parts of Jharkhand area, Bihar is claiming some parts of Jharkhand area, Orissa is also claiming parts of Jharkhand area and Madhya Pradesh is also claiming parts of our area. I am dead carcass and these four people have been saying "this area must come to me, this area must come to me and that area must come to me". I put a question to the House? Are the people of this area dead? I have just given you the population of this area as 1,63,67,177. They are not dead; they are still alive. Unless a plebiscite is taken, unless the wishes of the people are judged, you cannot put off their just claims by saying that this belongs to Bihar, this belongs to Orissa, this belongs to

[Shri T. Bodra.]

Madhya Pradesh or this belongs to Bengal. Simply because the tribals and the Adivasis have been exploited for centuries together, because they are inarticulate today, the advanced brethren of India should come forth under the cloak and garb of administrative convenience and say that this is mine, this is mine and this is mine. This is fantastic.

I am very sorry that this attitude has been taken. The members of the Commission visited this Jharkhand area. Lakhs and lakhs of people staged demonstrations, from Kishanganj to Dumka, from Dumka to Jamtara, from Jamtara to Chittaranjan, from Chittaranjan to Dhanbad, Dhanbad to Purulia, Purulia to Ranchi, Jamshedpur, Seraikella and everywhere in a stretch of hundreds of miles lakhs and lakhs of Adivasis staged demonstration. Mr. Panikkar and Dr. Kunzru heard the cry of "Jharkhand Alag Prant", "Jharkhand Alag Prant". They have also remarked "this cry of Jharkhand Alag Prant will go down till they breathe their last". I am very sorry, today in this S.R.C. Report I find that their findings are entirely different. According to the Commission "this demand does not represent the majority view, even in South Bihar. While outside the opinion is against separation, this separation will affect the entire economy of the existing State and upset the balance between agriculture and industry". The demand, therefore, has not been conceded and a special development board for South Bihar has been recommended to avoid any complaint of neglect from this area.

Your honour will find that in these six districts—five districts of Chota Nagpur division and one district of Santhal Parganas—there are 87 constituencies. Out of these 87 constituencies, in 52 constituencies we stood for the separation from Bihar. The Jharkhand party fought the election on the clear manifesto that we do not agree with the colonial policy of Bihar.

The Lok Sevak Sangh in Manbhum captured 8 seats on the clear manifesto of separation from Bihar. The Chota Nagpur and Santhal Parganas Janta Party also fought the election on the same basis. They won 8 seats. Then there were independents. So out of 87 constituencies, we captured 52 seats. The Members of the Commission ought to have realised that this is the majority and not the minority view. Jharkhand Party contested the elections in the districts of Ranchi, Singhbhum and Santhal Parganas. Jharkhand is not a party of multi-millionaires, of capitalists. We have no gigantic press like the Patrika and Indian Nation. We have no great man like Tagore and this and that. We are the Party whose people have been exploited and suppressed by their advanced brothers of India. It never occurred to the Commission that Jharkhand is not demanded only for six districts of South Bihar. They are oblivious of the fact that there are three districts in Orissa and three districts in Madhya Pradesh which the Jharkhand Party has claimed for amalgamation to the aforesaid six districts now in South Bihar.

In Orissa and Madhya Pradesh the Jharkhand Party members joined the congress after a compromise because of the firings opened on them. Sunder Mohan and Ghasi Ram were elected to the Orissa Assembly but they did not find a place of honour for themselves.

AN HON. MEMBER: They were made Ministers.

SHRI T. BODRA: Yes, the Orissa Government made Sona Ram Manjhi insane. He was put in the Ranchi Mental Asylum. After he was discharged from the Asylum the Orissa Government again made him insane.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS (Orissa): Mr. Manjhi is the elected representative of Adivasis along with his friends.

SHRI T. BODRA: I am coming to that. Let the hon. Member have

patience. I will tell you what you have done.

Out of these 87 seats we captured 52. That is the majority view.

There is another remark by the Commission that "the entire economy of the State will be upset". I give you the comparative figures to show that only six districts of Chota Nagpur and Santhal Parganas—I am not talking of other districts claimed by Jharkhand—gives the necessary requirements:

State	Area (Sq. miles)	Population (Million)	Revenue (Rs. Crores)
Assam	55,000	9	11.39
Orissa	60,000	14	11.95
Chota Nagpur (6 districts)	64,000	16	23.60

So, the very recommendation of the S. R. Commission that we do not represent the majority of the view, or that the entire economy of the Bihar State will be upset when this part is separated, is entirely wrong.

May I submit, Sir, that Jharkhand area is the richest in minerals in India. It has the largest concentration of India's ancient Adivasis. This is an area in which one-fourth of the total tribal population of the whole of India is concentrated. It is particularly lucky inasmuch as the mineral deposits are concerned. This area has got iron, coal, mica, manganese, copper, chromite, lime-stone, bauxite, asbestos, kaolin, kyanite, chalk, gold, tin-stones, graphites, glass, sand and even uranium is located in Singhpura district. On the eve of India's rapid industrialisation we have got so much natural resources, as a result of which big industrial towns are developing. Bokharo Thermal Plant is situated in Jharkhand, Rourkela Steel plant is situated in Jharkhand, Indian Copper Corporation is situated in Jharkhand and so many industries are developing in Jharkhand. For these there are claims and counter-claims by Bihar, Bengal, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh. The result is that the whole progress of industrialisation of the whole of India is retarded.

Because of their appeasing policy the Government of India will give

something to Bengal, something to Bihar, something to Madhya Pradesh and something to Orissa. I submit, Sir, that we must look to the interests of mother India in which every one of us should be interested. If you do not give Jharkhand to the Adivasis, do not give it. But I must say that Adivasis have been treated like *pariahs* and they have not been cared for for centuries together. They have been dying of starvation. I do not mind whether you give us Jharkhand or not. But let everyone here know that the treatment that has been meted out to Adivasis is far from satisfactory. We have got to strengthen all the units if we look to the interests of the mother India. I appeal to all the Members in this House to bear in mind the fact that we have got to industrialise the whole of our country rapidly so that we may not have to depend on America, Russia and England for our requirements.

Sir, I have seen that some hon. Members stated that Adivasis have become Christians, and therefore their movement is nothing but a movement of the Christians. But if they had paid any attention to what the hon. Home Minister said on last Sunday, they would not have said so. Sir, the hon. Home Minister said, "Christianity is a religion of India. Just as Hinduism and Islam are the religions of India, similarly Christianity is also a religion of India." Therefore, Sir, there is no harm if the tribals have become Christians, if the Nagas and the Khasis have become Christians, or if the people of Himachal Pradesh have become Christians. You must realise that it is you people who have been neglecting them, and who have always been casting a sort of capricious eye on their wealth. And I say that the Nagas and Khasis have never been looked after well. I am surprised at the wisdom of two Members of the Commission who say that Himachal Pradesh must be merged into Punjab. But thanks to the Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Fazl Ali, has given a minute of dissent. And I hope that

[Shri T. Bodra.]

the Government will accept his note of dissent.

Sir, I submit that today we are partitioning India, and let us not forget that this partition of India can never be annulled and cancelled for some centuries together.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): It is not partitioning the country.

SHRI T. BODRA: I say it is partitioning the country. You search your hearts and find it out. Sir, let it not be said by the children of ours, who grow up after 25 years, that the Members of Parliament had not given a right decision. So, Sir, I submit that Jharkhand is the richest area in minerals in the whole of the world, and yet its inhabitants are so poor and so down-trodden. Why is that so? Because there is the largest concentration of India's Adivasis, the first citizens of India, comprising one-fourth of the total tribal population of India, which is uncared for. The total area is composed of 12 districts; and in the capital of Ranchi, they have a revenue of Rs. 22 crores. Sir, we demand Jharkhand on the grounds of administrative convenience, economic development, geographical situation, ethnological and political grounds, and on the grounds of peace and justice. We do not get justice in the court and we do not get peace anywhere. Sir, our friend was flowing with love and honey, and he has all of a sudden become a friend of the tribal people. I ask my friend, Mr. Mahanty, to go through the Civil List of the Orissa Government and let my Bengali friends go through the Civil List of the Bengal Government, and find out therefrom how many Santhals have become gazetted officers.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Let him give me the candidates.

SHRI T. BODRA: If the candidates are not coming forth, it is your fault. Sir, we find that the

tribals are practically half-naked and not properly clothed. They have got nothing on their bodies excepting some rags. And yet my friends here are showing their love for the tribals.

Now, Sir, the non-Regulation period was from 1833 to 1854. There was no ruler whatsoever. And from 1854 to 1935 it was a non-Regulation Province. Then, Sir, these Adivasis and the tribal people revolted against the British Imperialism. And it was Santhal Hul then. From 1880 to 1900 it was Laraka Ho Rebellion and Sardari Larai. Then there was the Birsa Munda Rebellion. That was from 1900 to 1903. I am sorry that nobody has spoken about Birsa Munda. Everybody in every corner of India had accepted the subjugation of the British people. But Birsa Munda rebelled against the British Imperialism till 1903, when he was captured and he was poisoned to death. He was also a great national, and he had to fight against the British bayonets, and we are very proud of that.

Then, Sir, what happened after India became independent? People sacrificed their hearths and homes. I want to know if there is anybody here who is going to deny that fact. They had to leave their lands, and it is very unfortunate that those lands have not yet been restored to them. What has now happened, Sir, is that the so-called plain people have become British people and are working against our interests. There was a firing at several places in the year 1947, and in the subsequent years. There was a firing in Kharsawan on the 1st January, 1948, when the people of Kharsawan said, "We are part and parcel of Chota Nagpur and we will live along with the people of Chota Nagpur." It is a matter of shame that over 1,200 people were killed, including women and children. There were bullets and sten-guns were freely used there. Let Mr. Mahanty and Mr. Dwivedy deny that. (*Interruption.*) You should be ashamed of that. That blunder was done during the regime of Mr. Mahtab.....

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: May I request you to rule these things out, because it is stated.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bodra, all that is not relevant.

SHRI T. BODRA: Sir, they fired at several places, including Kharsawan, Mayurbhanj and so on and so forth. And then it is a fact that all these firings were declared illegal. Can anybody deny that?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All that is not relevant to the discussion.

SHRI T. BODRA: Then, Sir, with regard to the question of compensation, Bengal says, "Oh, I must be compensated." So, Bihar should be compensated, Orissa will claim something else, and Bihar will say उड़ीसा तो हमारा था वह कहां चला गया, and Bengal will say कि हमको कम्पेनसेशन दीजिये। So the question of compensation either to Bengal or to Bihar or to Madras is absurd.

So, this question of compensation does not come. I will come to the other items.

As a result of the partition, West Bengal was left with 40 per cent. of the area and 36 per cent. of the population. As a result of the D.V.C. and Mayurakhi project, the economic capacity and potentialities of West Bengal have been increased and West Bengal can now support a much larger population. Ninety-nine per cent. of electrical energy and the tea-growing tracts of Bengal have enriched West Bengal. They have the city of Calcutta, the emporium of North East India and a great financial and commercial centre. Undivided Bengal had a revenue of Rs. 44 crores with a population of 60·8 millions. West Bengal has a revenue of Rs. 31 crores with a population of 21·8 millions, i.e., two-thirds of the revenue but one-third of the population of undivided Bengal. The *per capita* revenue available to West Bengal has doubled as a result of partition. What more do they want? If they want Manbhum, with

the D.V.C., where shall be the Santhals, it is not Bihar which will be sacrificing. It will be we, the tribals, who will be sacrificing. Nine thousand acres in 35 villages have been submerged. In Purulia also, 13,000 acres in 40 villages have been submerged. The Santhals have claimed compensation for this, land for land, but up till now nothing has happened. We, the Adivasis, are making Bihar and Bengal richer, but there is nothing for us. The question for them is always 'Give, give' but they never believe in give and take. Similarly in the Rourkela steel plant area also, many thousands of persons have been displaced from their hearths and homes. The scheduled castes and others have made sacrifices for this, but they are only being exploited.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Mr. Jagjivan Ram is there to safeguard them.

THE MINISTER FOR COMMUNICATION (SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM): I am not an Adivasi.

(Time bell rings.)

SHRI T. BODRA: Sir, so many Members exceeded their time, but they were allowed to continue. I am the only one of my party to advocate their lost cause.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You object to other Members exceeding their time and so you should not break the rules.

SHRI T. BODRA: They are trying to take away Dhanbad also. The Members of the Commission have given Purulia to Bengal. Dhanbad is only a sub-district, having a Sub-Treasury, the A.S.P. or the D.S.P. for police administration and an additional District Collector. Now, the members of this Commission are wrong in this also. Most of the roads pass through Purulia. From Dhanbad to Ranchi it is *via* Purulia; from Muri to Dhanbad *via* Purulia. The Commission members have also recommended that a portion of the Kishanganj sub-division should also be transferred to Bengal on the same principle, i.e., the portion

[Shri T. Bodra.]

east of Mahananda. I do not understand on what principles the members of the Commission have recommended this. We have recently got from the Planning Commission sanctioned for a project on the Kasai and Ajay rivers, which is going to cost about Rs. 3 crores. Bengal will say, 'I won't give you water, if you don't take our men.' If these portions are taken away by Bengal, it will be absurdity.

So far as my friends from Orissa is concerned, they also want Seraikella and Kharsawan, even though their population is only about 18 to 20 per cent. The Hos are 68 per cent. I am a Ho.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: He has interrupted me often. Let me ask him a question. May I know if it is not a fact that the candidate of the Ganatantra Parishad defeated his party candidate and his party candidate had to forfeit his security?

SHRI T. BODRA: If the ruler of Hyderabad happens to be a Muslim, it does not mean that the Hyderabad people are all Muslims.

Oriyas will say, 'काँऊ, जान्ने छोन्ती', Bengalis will say, 'কোথায় জাচ্ছেন', I will say, 'কোথা তেম চলা ঘন'. This language affinity does not mean anything. The Commission has rightly said that Seraikella and Kharsawan should not be given to Orissa.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI T. BODRA: I will just give some page numbers. I will request hon. Members to read page 13 of the Orissa Assembly proceedings, pages 44—46 of the Bihar Assembly proceedings, and 103 of the Orissa Assembly proceedings. On page 22 of the West Bengal Assembly proceedings, it is clearly accepted that there are only 6½ lakhs of Santhals in West Bengal, while the Santhals in the areas now claimed by them are 15 lakhs. Should those 6½ lakhs come to us or should these 15 lakhs go there?

Now, in the Bihar Vidhan Sabha, you will find the speech of Ghaniram Santhal on page 22; on page 25 and 26 the speech of Haripada Singh, and on pages 64—67 the speech of Sidue Hemron, and on page 70 the speech of Sirish Chandra Banerjee. All these speeches will show that it is Jharkhand that they are claiming.

Then, Sir, in the end, having carefully considered the Report of the S.R.C., the Working Committee of the Jharkhand Party condemns the recommendations particularly in regard to West Bengal, Orissa, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. In the national interest, the Jharkhand party has always stood for the consolidation of the Jharkhand area and it reiterates its firm and irrevocable resolve to continue and intensify the struggle to achieve constitutionally its objective, namely, a separate administrative unit of the Jharkhand area with Hindi as the State language. It calls upon all Jharkhandis to resist any attempt at the disintegration of the Jharkhand area and to make every sacrifice to attain their real political and administrative integration.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Hyderabad): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have heard with great attention the speeches since yesterday. I have read with great respect the speeches that were delivered in the other House. I have read with keen interest the comments and criticisms that have come regarding the S.R.C. report since the beginning of October and I am convinced of two facts—one, that the great emphasis on the unity and security of India was perfectly justified and the other fact is that the S.R.C.'s recommendations, in view of all considerations, are the best that we could have had in the present circumstances. These are the two conclusions to which I have come. I am in support of these conclusions and I would submit before this House my own view based on facts and figures.....

DR. R. B. GOUR: Of India of 1945.....

(Interruptions.)

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): You have had enough of interruptions since yesterday.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let there be no interruptions.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Regarding the unity and security question, my learned friends on the side opposite including both the parties and some on this side have raised a protest saying, "Where was the question and where was the necessity to think of security and unity. It is an insult to us that such a proposition has been put forward." It has also been suggested and with great vehemence that this Commission not only did go wrong but the Congress has gone back or has repudiated its policy of linguistic States if I may so call it, which was recognized in 1920 at the Plenary Session of the Congress at Nagpur. They have gone further and said that this introduction of administrative convenience, financial viability and security and unity are things which ought to be discarded and simply a Commissioner or a Settlement Officer should be appointed to draw a line, find out the language and then divide the whole of India on that basis. When the matter was first referred to the Dar Commission, my hon. friend Mr. Dhage was to this extent correct that there were certain psychological factors on account of the partition of India etc. But I do not agree with him when he says that because in the Dar Commission there were three persons, although capable, although honest but they belonged to North India and that is why they could not appreciate and they could not give a proper judgment.....

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: They suffered from fear psychosis.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: If that was the only basis, in addition to that

basis you have given another basis also. Now I would say that after the advent of independence, certainly the emphasis was changed—and perfectly correctly—from linguistic States or provinces to other factors—political and economic—and I agree to a certain extent what my hon. friend says, about the Dar Commission but I would submit that after the Dar Commission, when this report was submitted in the Jaipur Congress, the Congress appointed a Committee of persons of whom we are all proud—Pandit Jawaharlal, Sardar Patel and Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya—and this fact has not been clearly noticed. Now you will see that these people did not belong only to North of India and I would like to just read one or two passages from this J.V.P. Committee report, as it is called. It is given on page 16 of this Report also:

"(a) When the Congress had given the seal of its approval to the general principle of linguistic provinces it was not faced with the practical application of the principle and hence it had not considered all the implications and consequences that arose from this practical application;

(b) The primary consideration must be the security, unity and economic prosperity of India and every separatist and disruptive tendency should be rigorously discouraged;

(c) Language was not only a binding force but also a separating one; and

(d) The old Congress policy of having linguistic provinces could only be applied after careful thought had been given to each separate case and without creating serious administrative dislocation or mutual conflicts which would jeopardise the political and economic stability of the country."

If the S.R.C. has given consideration to these factors, could anybody today

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.]

say that they have chalked out their own path? This path is supported by these three eminent sons of this great country. Not only this. In the Hyderabad Congress in 1953 and in the Kalyani Congress in the year 1954 the same principle was reiterated and I very much remember when in the A.I.C.C. Session the Mysore Chief Minister brought a Resolution which was, to a certain extent, to weaken this position, it was absolutely thrown out. Now after that the position was going further and in 1953 on 2nd October when Panditji was speaking in Madras—the Hindustan Times and Standard gave that—he said:

“I do not want at this stage to refashion the States and establish a Commission”

but when the demand and the urge was submitted on the part of the persons who thought very much of the linguistic problems, he, as a democrat, had to yield and just two days after—as today is 20th, on the 22nd of December 1953, he made the announcement in the Parliament appointing the S.R.C.

5 P.M.

This is the background of the shift in the policy. Do my learned friends want that the emphasis that the Congress or rather the country gave to greater power being with the provinces, should be there even now? Do they want that even today we should lay greater emphasis on the powers of the States? If there is a shift, it is a well-considered shift. It is a shift which has resulted after looking into the problems with great care and scrutiny. That was the position so far as this language policy is concerned.

Now I may just give you the reasons why it is necessary to give so much importance to the question of unity. Just glance through the history of our country and see how many times we had a united and

strong central Government in India. The tendencies generally were fissiparous and centrifugal, with rivalries between petty States and so on. Really speaking, there were few periods, say, during the reigns of Asoka the Great or Akbar the Great, when the country could be said to have some strong central government.

SHRI R. C. GUPTA (Uttar Pradesh):
Or ancient India.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: May be in ancient India. And then we come to the period of the English in this land. Then, of course, due to the influence of university education and to the establishing of means of communications, there was a unity created in the intelligentsia. In these circumstances and under these conditions now we have to look at the problem. The unity which is at present created has been created by the Congress and naturally our thoughts go back to those martyrs and in particular, Sir, to the year 1920 when under the dynamic personality of the Father of the Nation, the struggle for freedom was started, and most of us have had the privilege and honour of taking part in it, as students, as teachers, as lawyers and so on. My submission is, in view of these facts, was it not right on the part of the Commission to have given greater consideration to unity and security? It is not because of any distrust of the South or the North as has been pointed out here or of my dear Maharashtrian brothers or anybody else. There is no question of any distrust. It should not be taken in that light. It is a phenomenon. It is a problem, it is a question which you have to solve. In view of that, I submit that the recommendations of the S.R.C. will have to be looked into with this background, with these factors in mind.

There is another factor which deserves our consideration. We have to see what will happen after twenty years. Do not see what is today or what will be tomorrow. But we have

to imagine and see about the future, for we have got a great responsibility. We are certainly confronted with a challenge and that challenge is this sentimental approach. This problem in itself is not a big problem. But this sentimental approach and the emphasis on language have made this problem a big one. So I would request all hon. Members to consider this problem with farsightedness and to have a long range policy.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. P. SUBBARAYAN) in the Chair.]

There is another factor which we have to bear in mind. Are we here to advocate the cause which each represents? Or are we here in the position of judges, in the position of persons to decide and determine these affairs and who will be responsible to the coming generations? I would respectfully point out that whenever we make a suggestion, it should be a workable suggestion. Sir, we have had great saints. We have had great professors and we have had great philosophers and great scientists.

DR. R. B. GOUR: And barristers also.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I thank my hon. friend very much for the remark. But though we have produced these great persons, one thing we have lacked and that is the co-operative working spirit, the spirit to work together. That has been our deficiency. We have not developed that part of it.

Now, coming to the present problem, I say that while it is true that the last word rests with Parliament, yet we should remember that we have appointed three most eminent people in India—and I am glad none in this House has suggested anything against their impartiality, against their ability and against their character. In fact, one of the leaders—Acharya Kripalani—in a statement has asked the people to blindly follow the S.R.C. Report. Similarly, I

have got papers and quotations to show that practically the whole country has welcomed the Report. The Commission had great difficulties. They, of course, had to decide. Now we see how on questions of border disputes so much heat is generated, say between Bihar and Orissa. We have seen the differences between Bengal and Bihar. And you, Sir, very correctly while emphasising unity in your speech, have also said that there is some grievance in Madras against Kerala. So starting from Himachal Pradesh down to Kerala, there are differences and there are difficult problems. But taking all these into consideration, the Commission have come to certain decisions. They have come to certain conclusions and they are in the Report. So I would say, let us honour this Report. This is not for good, for if there is any difficulty it could be corrected in future. And some of the points raised by my learned friend Shri Deogirikar and others deserve serious consideration and nobody would put them aside lightly—those difficulties will be dealt with. But I would beg of all my friends who do not agree, to think of India. Think of Bharat. Sir, you very correctly asked this question: If everybody thinks of his own territory, who is going to think of India?"

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Was the Commission in the position of an arbitrator?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I submit we should give it that position, in view of the great task that was entrusted to them. They gave the task nearly two years—21 months to be exact—and they have examined 9,000 witnesses. They have gone through 2,000 memoranda and a lakh and odd other documents.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Then why did the Congress Working Committee modify it?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. P. SUBBARAYAN): Order, order.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I will give an answer to my hon. friend. What I submit is that the best minds have been applied to this problem and the Commission had given it its best thoughts, and I would certainly request even the Congress Working Committee to follow up this Report and to endorse the Report, because....

SHRI R. B. GOUR: Because it is in your interest.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Well, my hon. friend is thinking of his own interests, while I am thinking of the interests of India. That is the whole difference.

Now, with this background, I would like to say something about other factors.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. P. SUBBARAYAN): There are only two minutes more.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: No, Sir. I am coming now to the question of Telangana. This much was only by way of giving the background to justify S.R.C.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. P. SUBBARAYAN): It is not my fault if you come to it only now. You have only two more minutes.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: But everybody has had half an hour here.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. P. SUBBARAYAN): I am only following what has been put down here. You have only one or two minutes more.

DR. R. B. GOUR: You wind up, otherwise the security of India is in danger.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Coming to the point, so far as the homeland theory, viz., one language one State, is concerned, I would point out that this Commission has strongly condemned it unequivocally and I would just read out a few sentences.

PROF. G. RANGA: If you read, you will not have time to say anything.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I will not read it. I would refer to pages 42 and 44. I had wanted to read about half a dozen sentences but due to the limited time at my disposal I will only read one sentence. It is in paragraph 157. "The idea that all people who speak the same language and constitute a majority, whether in a village or a taluk, should be attached to their homeland will do immense harm to our national growth and must, therefore, be rejected unequivocally. The allegation, "one language one State" is absolutely repudiated.

DR. R. B. GOUR: They should be attached to other languages?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am coming to this. So far as Telangana is concerned, the S.R.C. has given an opinion after considering all the factors. They said: Andhra and Telangana have common interests. They hope that these interests will tend to bring them closer to each other. If, however, our hopes for the development of the environment and conditions congenial to the unification of the two areas do not materialise and if public sentiment in Telangana crystallises itself against the unification of the two States, Telangana will have to continue as a separate unit.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Separate Telangana is no separatist tendency?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I hope, Sir, that you will allow me some concession for the time taken away by these interruptions. So far as the question of public sentiment is concerned, it has been challenged by my hon. friends on the other side and by my hon. friend, Mr. Gurumurthy, on the other side. I accept the challenge, Sir, and would request anybody from this House or the other House or any one so appointed to go

there and satisfy himself whether it is or it is not a fact that 95 per cent of the people are for a separate Telangana and then only vote for it. Otherwise not.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI BASAVAPUNNAIAH (Andhra): I accept that challenge.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. P. SUBBARAYAN): One minute more and no more.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: My submission is the challenge that I have thrown stands good. My friends wanted to address a public meeting and, in spite of the previous record of service and the popularity, they could not do so.

AN HON. MEMBER: Because of your goondaism.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Certainly not—the public tempo. So far as that criterion is concerned, I will leave it to the House. My friend, Dr. Raj Bahadur Gour also said that some Educational Director told him that educational facilities will not be there, that hospitals will not be run and also threw out a challenge saying that if anybody wants to convince he would be convinced. I am here and now prepared to accept that challenge and to convince you provided you are reasonable. As there is not much time, I am unable to give facts and figures about economic viability and all other factors to justify Telangana.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. P. SUBBARAYAN): I gave you three minutes and the time is now over. Please resume your seat.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Yes, Sir, I am concluding my remarks, by saying that in the interests of Bharat, I appeal to all, especially to my Bombay and Punjab friends and also to my Andhra friends to respect the S.R.C. Report and be respected by the whole of India.

DR. M. D. D. GILDER: When we were in our teens, in schools and colleges, we used to dream as to how we should run the world's business. When the hon. Minister for Legal Affairs and I were in Opposition in the Bombay Council, we also dreamt dreams of how the business should be conducted and how the administration should be run. So, the Congress also in its teens, if one may say so, long before it dreamt of coming into power, passed some resolutions. One of them was that the Viceroy should get not more than Rs. 500. The brunt of that fell on the first Congress Ministers; the Ministers could not get more than Rs. 500. Similarly, Sir, the Congress passed a resolution about linguistic provinces at a time when it did not think it would come into power; but there was something behind the scenes in that Resolution. At that time Gandhiji was taking the Congress from the intelligentsia to the masses and in order to take the Congress to the masses, linguistic provinces or linguistic divisions were necessary. It has been said that Gandhiji was for linguistic division. Yes, in those days, but Gandhiji is gone now and I do not know what he would have done now. Since the Congress came into power, it had been saying that not only linguistic considerations but also considerations of security, financial and administrative arrangements and economic viability should also be the considerations. You will see in the Resolution appointing this Committee that these things are definitely stated. If my linguistic friends wanted to quarrel, that was the time for them to quarrel.

Nobody has anything to say about the personnel of the Commission. Everybody praises them for their integrity, for their acumen and for their sincerity of purpose but when the Commission has not taken the view that one takes up, faults are found with the Commission. It is said that it did not submit an interim

[Dr. M. D. D. Gilder.] report. We see the conflagration that has been lighted after the Report was released and I think the Commission was wise in not submitting an interim report and thus extending the time of the conflagration. It is said that the Commission did not go throughout the country. I do not know which part of the country they did not go to. It has been said that the Commission did not take people into their confidence. If you appoint a Commission then naturally you must leave it to the Commission to decide things. It has been said, if fourteen linguistic States could have been formed why not one or two more which have been left out? If even in spite of the other considerations like security of the State, financial and administrative arrangements, if States could be formed on linguistic basis, they have done so. If the considerations mentioned above did not stand in the way, they formed the linguistic States. These considerations did not stand in the way of the fourteen States but they stand in the way of these others. Therefore it is that they have proposed the other arrangement. Our Leader who has inherited from Gandhiji the habit of thinking aloud, in one of his speeches said that he was surprised at the report. Naturally, Sir, I was surprised too but I was very pleasantly surprised. It was a pity that he omitted the adjective because that has been misrepresented in some quarters. That was asked even of the hon Home Minister.

Before I come to give my remarks on the other proposals, let me talk about the Chapter on minority rights. The Commission has gone into the question of the protection of minorities in different countries and has found that our Constitution gives sufficient protection to the minorities excepting in the case of primary education, where they recommend the enacting of Constitutional provisions. They say that if there is sufficient number of students, primary education should be given in the

language of those students. They also say that the Central Government should take over the power of direction. There had been a case in the Supreme Court in which this question was raised.

The next question is about the recruitment to the services. That is certainly an administrative matter. Even in Bombay State, before the Constitution came into force, domicile was one of the considerations and for this there were about 30 questions to be answered by the poor man who had applied for any post. He had to reply to them before a Magistrate who in turn had to certify that he was satisfied that the man had a Bombay domicile. After the passing of the Constitution, especially article 16, directives were issued but there are many States which have not followed those directives.

Therefore, Sir, I think it ought to be put on a legal basis. The Commission has said that the Public Service Commission should be appointed by the President. I do not know whether that would make any difference because, after all, human nature is human nature, and whether the man is appointed by the President or by the Governor would not make much of a difference.

SHRI GULSHER AHMED (Vindhya Pradesh): Need not be of the same State.

DR. M. D. D. GILDER: That I agree but after all human nature is human nature, and if there is a candidate from that State, the State to which a member of the Public Service Commission belongs, it would be said that he favoured a member from his State. It may be right; it may be wrong.

Then, Sir, supervisory authority is proposed to be given to the Governor to see whether these minorities are safeguarded. But, Sir, has the Governor got that power to call for the papers? Has the Governor got any sanction?

PROF. G. RANGA: That is the difficulty.

DR. M. D. D. GILDER: Can he interview the Secretaries as the Governors in the British days used to do? There are only two clauses about discretionary power to be given to the Governors, but how far he would exercise that discretionary power should be made specific. I quite agree that the Governor may be the protector of the minorities, but how that can be done is a thing that requires consideration.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras): The Commission has suggested amendment of the Constitution to that effect.

DR. M. D. D. GILDER: Then I come to the question of the services. I quite agree that the administrative and security services, for reasons of safety and security, should be under the Centre. But when we come to the technical services there are the difficulties that I found as a Minister in administering these technical services. The usual formula "existing and accruing rights of the services" would again come. If you remember, in the old days, the Indian Medical Service people claimed naturally to hold the top administrative posts both on the side of medicine and on the side of public health and the Minister had nothing to say. The Central Government sent the Surgeon-General who may or may not carry out his (Minister's) policy. Besides, Sir, say for instance a professor of anatomy is taken from the Services. Where will they get the demonstrators and the readers? Ordinarily as in other services, the demonstrators become lecturers, readers, assistant professors and so on. But, as has happened in the days of the Indian Medical Service, you may have a reader or an assistant professor of long experience and on top of him a freshly passed student is put in, and it is said, "This is only a leave vacancy". So I am not agreeable

to the technical services being centralised.

Now, Sir, coming to the "game of grab" that has been played here all the day, I feel sorry. I congratulate my hon. friend, who spoke for Maharashtrians, for the high tone of his speech, but I am afraid, on a good many points I do not agree with him. I also appreciate the speech of Professor Kane, who spoke so highly of the Parsees. But, Sir, when he referred to paragraphs 411 and 416 where the Commission says that a good many people were of the contrary view, he challenged the veracity of the statement of the Commission. Would that be proper? Then he said that the Commission talked of 'suspicion'. Of course he has a legal mind and he says "Leave aside the 99 guilty persons but don't convict an innocent person." But, Sir, we are not talking of technical justice. We are talking of feasibility, possibility and so on, and if a good many people come and say that they have got suspicions, surely the Commission has got to take notice of it.

For instance I will read out to you one piece, what an economist of Maharashtra says "The future of Bombay is in the long run bound up almost exclusively with Maharashtra. This will reduce the industrial importance of Bombay for those parts and also stop the flow of industrial labour from distant regions. Bombay's all-India importance for certain specialised activities may remain; but it will exist chiefly as the port and economic centre of Maharashtra, which is the role indicated by its geographical location." He says further on, "He would impose a ban on the establishment of new, or expansion of old industrial undertakings within a distance by road or rail of, say, 50 miles of the Fort area." Fifty miles take us to the foot of the Shiadari mountains. That means that these industries can be established only on the top of the mountains.

Well, Sir, if these are some of the pronouncements of Maharashtrian

[Dr. M. D. D. Gilder.]
economists, is it not possible that non-Maharashtrians would have some suspicions and fears of what may happen to them?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: What book is that?

DR. M. D. D. GILDER: He is Professor D. R. Gadgil.

PROF. G. RANGA: Of the Gokhale institute.

DR. M. D. D. GILDER: I must say from my knowledge of the Bombay city, where the bones of several generations of my ancestors lie, that there were a good many people in Bombay City who were indifferent as to where they would go, but, after the publication of the report and after what they saw what has happened in Bombay and gone on in this House and the other, many of them have changed their opinion and have taken a definite point of view now. Take for instance the Maharashtra alternative. They wanted Vidarbha to be joined so that the Maharashtrians would be 66 per cent. Then they wanted a companionate marriage. They said Gujarat can go away in five years if it likes so that Bombay city (the dowry) will remain exclusively with Maharashtrians. We do not know of companionate marriages yet in this country. They are not legalised anyway. But that was what was proposed. I personally would have much liked that the Report of the S. R. C. had been put into execution in toto and we would have honoured them. We would have taken their verdict as the verdict of God. But since now my Maharashtrian friends have fallen out and they have stated that they cannot conceive of Samyukta Maharashtra without Bombay City as its capital, I am sorry to say that we cannot be partners and we have got to be neighbours. Sir, the situation is very delicate. I would still suggest to my Maharashtrian friends and my Gujarati friends and to the people from Bom-

bay City that they sit without the diehards on either side and come to some solution. We would much rather prefer that with the feeling that we would be sorry to part company. What would be the state of Bombay City will have to be decided, whether it would be a separate State or a centrally administered State or an annexe of the Central Government. That will have to be considered too. With regard to our Five Year Plans which were made when the States were together, with the separation of Bombay City as a separate State I am perfectly sure that they will be considerably delayed, but I hope that we shall be able to put them into execution even then.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Vice-Chairman, I feel that we are discussing a very delicate subject indeed and while paying compliment to the members who served on the Commission who were among the best in our country who could be found to do the job—people with wide experience and with mature judgment—who have spent two years in meeting people, getting evidence and submitting their report, still the report has failed to satisfy, as was expected, a number of people. Sir, I am one of those persons who would not have liked even to see the appointment of this Commission. But what happened in Andhra? After Andhra province was conceded, everyone was suddenly very eager to see that the once-made promise—the promise made by the Congress—of division of the country on a linguistic basis was carried out. As has been rightly pointed out by the hon. Member from Hyderabad, Mr. Akbar Ali Khan, those people seemed to have forgotten what ultimately would happen, when the report was submitted and when the actual division of the country had to take place. They forgot that our unity has not gone deep down after the British had left. They forgot that the common bond of language which brought all the provinces together

under the British, which had not been brought about even in the earlier days of ancient India of Asoka, may be due to want of communications and other things, would not last long if the question of dividing the country on a linguistic basis became a fact. We have seen how even over the question of making Hindi compulsory in the South passions have been roused. We know how in many States the question of giving a few more jobs to people who are not called *mulkis* has been raised, we also know how in the Centre charges are levelled against Ministers that immediately after a Minister from a certain State takes up office his office becomes filled with people of that State. There may not be any truth in these things, but that is our temperament. I for one would have liked that we had more time to make the country feel that it had achieved something great through independence by a successive series of Five Year Plans being carried out, by the standard of living in the country being raised by education of the people, by having an education policy on uniform lines. I wish this question had not been raised at all. As has been rightly pointed out, again by the hon. Member from Hyderabad, the conditions when this promise was made were different. We were then under the British and every programme that had an appeal to the masses had to be taken up for the sake of bringing unity among the people. Now, after independence those conditions no longer hold good and as such the Congress could not be held to that promise. That would have been the best thing to do but perhaps as was pointed out by Prof. Malkani.... (Interruptions.) Sir, the time is restricted and I would not like to be disturbed, and I hope you would kindly concede that.

As I was saying, perhaps those who had to take a decision over this important issue thought that this issue must come today or tomorrow. And while the leaders who are respected,

who have given of their best to the country and who are loved by the country, are there, whatever differences that may arise could be ironed out and perhaps this is the best time. So after the Commission has been appointed and submitted its Report, I feel that it is our duty to take the Report as it is, leaving the minor changes to the Government. Of course, the Opposition was expected to bring amendments, but beyond that people on this side, I feel, should not have recommended, in spite of opportunities being given in the name of democracy to the various legislatures to put forward their suggestions, any major changes. Because that creates doubts in the mind of the common people. It is said in the Bhagwat Gita:

“न बुद्धि भेदं जनयेत् आज्ञानां कर्मसंगिनाम् ।
जोषयेत् सर्वं कर्माणि युक्तः समाचरन् ॥”

People in Legislatures are the *vidwans*. After all, howsoever perfect the report may be, there is bound to be some difference of opinion and it is not possible to please all, but to point a finger at the Report and say that this should have been done or this should not have been done is not in the over-all interest of the country. I feel that we here, now having been given an opportunity of discussing this Report, have a great responsibility even at this stage. We have to take the greatest common factor and we should not emphasize these little differences over what has been conceded or what has not been conceded.

Another thing is that I feel that we are here in the position of lawyers or counsels for a case where the case has to be put up but not judged because it is a commonly accepted principle that no judge who has any stake in any decision can be considered a qualified judge. So in deciding a question that affects our particular province, we should not speak in a role as if we decide what is right or what should be right, but we should speak only as a

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] person who has to put up a brief saying that this is the case and we should willingly—and when I say willingly it should be really willingly—be prepared to accept the decision whatever that may be. Only if we speak in this tone in both the Houses the country will take the report with utmost calmness. For that reason I feel that though there are certain questions relating to Madhya Pradesh, I should not, as far as I am concerned, refer to them as demands but refer to them as a case just for consideration because even if this House were to give a decision this is not the time to give a decision. The expression of views in this House would be taken into consideration by those in power, by the party in power. It would have been better if whatever the Commission has decided were considered final just as you do not go beyond the Supreme Court, but here the case is slightly different because Parliament is considered to be the over-all authority and by Parliament is meant the Government in power and it is that which should give the final decision but it is the duty of all Members of the party in power to make the task of those in power so easy that it does not cause any division. As I have come from Madhya Pradesh, I would just make one point with regard to the capital. Of course, Madhya Pradesh can have no grievance because so many provinces are joined on to it and it has become bigger beyond perhaps management but I suppose it will not be so. Still it has become very huge but this is not the time to go into that because I for one am prepared to follow the rule of discipline and accept whatever has been stated in the report of the Commission. They have stated that Jabalpur, being centrally situated, would be suitable as capital and this seems to be a suitable recommendation. Sir, I would not go into the question of Bombay. So many people have already spoken on that and I again may be called an interested person because I once belonged to Bombay

Presidency and as such I would not touch on that question but that question certainly deserves consideration from the various points of view already expressed. One more thing is about Karnataka. A little bit of injustice, they say, has been done, may be due to oversight, because that is what people mean when they object to people from the north dealing with southern parts. It is not always possible to take into consideration such vast evidence before them, all factors of language, dialects and region and so on, and as a result the tehsil of Belgaum which really should have— if we accept this principle of linguistic division—gone into Maharashtra has by mistake gone into Karnataka. And that will create difficulties with regard to the university teaching and other teaching. This deserves looking into

I must here refer to Uttar Pradesh and there I think as a number of people from U.P. are present I am perhaps treading on other people's pet corns.....

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Spare us for Heaven's sake.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I must say that I fully endorse the minute of dissent of Mr. Panikkar. As Pandit Kunzru happens to be from U.P. he himself would like that the opinion of his other colleagues should be given more weight and this being put before the Government. The point is this, as Mr. Panikkar himself has stated, that a number of people from U.P. themselves—as is the wont of the people in every State to say—have stated that the east is being in a way looked after at the cost of the western part of the State. I feel there has been evidence led on that. In order to make people in the South feel that unwieldy States are not put there and in order also to make people feel that the wishes of some of the people from the western side are considered—perhaps if Government is thinking in terms of readjustment—then the western part of U.P. could be joined on with some other districts, say

from north, Gwalior on that side and another State formed.....

SHRI SHRIYANS PRASAD JAIN.
Do you welcome Madhya Pradesh, an unwieldy State?

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Well, personally I don't for reasons already stated. As I am saying, even here, as far as U.P. is concerned, if Madhya Pradesh has to be kept as recommended by S.R.C., U.P. has to be kept. But as far as Madhya Pradesh is concerned, I do think it has become like an octopus, rather too big a State. But still I do not know on what evidence the Commission came to the conclusion—and I have not before me all the evidence—and, therefore, it is not easy to say anything on the point.

Sir, I would like to say a word about Delhi. I would like to endorse the S.R.C.'s recommendation. In spite of the agitation staged more prominently here than in any other part of the country,—which reaches people in power more easily—in spite of the agitation that the State should be kept separate as it is, I hope that the Government will not yield on that point and will not make unnecessarily small States a cumbersome charge on the taxpayer with the paraphernalia of Ministers, different departments, etc., etc.

Finally, I would like to endorse the point raised by you yourself, Sir, about the Services, and that has been pointed out by the Commission. I am not satisfied with more Services being made all-India Services. That will not be enough guarantee for the unity and security of the country. I for one have always held that only in bilingual States lies the security of India. This is not the time for me to go into the history of all these past 1,100 years or 1,200 years. I need not remind the House of our weaknesses, how we at the slightest provocation, as I have already referred to, become provincial minded, how we become proud of our own provincial culture, language, literature, etc. I do not want to refer further to show

how these are inherent dangers to the security and unity of the country. The whole world is watching us as to how we would be tempted in our present passions raised for the division of the country, which would weaken our strength, so that some amongst them might get perhaps a chance to benefit by it.

So, what I would like to see is and Government to consider is, as was suggested by many people outside, though not in the House,—I am not the first to suggest that here—that if the country is to be divided, maybe for the sake of economy, maybe for the sake of administrative convenience, because of common languages, there ought to be a unitary Government. And if that is not there—even now we have been fighting for our share in the economy of the country because of the prosperous business of a certain State, because of the share in income tax and as we are even now fighting for the possession of Bombay and trying to say, who is responsible for this prosperity—a time would come when perhaps the strong hands that are today would not be there to control, when our fusion has weakened on account of the tie of language, which always binds people, having disappeared. I am one of those people who feel that in spite of Hindi being made the national language, it is the English language which has bound us together and which people in the South think is easier for them to learn, as they are already used to it. And also because of the very difficult legal terminology in Hindi and case law, etc. of High Courts and the Supreme Court being in English language, the English language will have to remain. If that tie of a common language is weakened then unless there is a unitary Government at the Centre, through this vicious circle of having appointed a Commission, having to adopt its Report, having to go through the consequences, perhaps we are paving the way for insecurity of the State.

With these few words I feel that the Report should be accepted as it

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]
is, to make the task of the Government easy and give a lead to the people in the country so that people do not feel that only by doing what they did in Andhra, by forcing the hands of the Government, or by staging what they did in Bombay the other day, last month on the 22nd November, they can force the hands of Government into doing anything that they liked it to do. That would be the very negation of Government and administration and ushering in of chaos.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU:
Mr. Vice-Chairman, after having seen what has happened in the country after the S.R.C. Report, I feel that there should be no States formed on the linguistic basis. But when matters have reached this stage, when almost all the States in India have considered the S.R.C. Report and have come to some decision or other and since Parliament has wasted so much of its precious time in discussing this Report. I do not know whether I will be justified in saying that this should be shelved for some more time, to enable the people who speak different languages, who belong to various States, to sit and think about this in a calm and dispassionate way and come to an amicable settlement as to which area should belong to whom. I for one coming from the South having recently witnessed the separation of Andhra from Madras State feel that there should be no States formed on the linguistic basis. I agree with the learned speech, which you, Sir, made a little while before and also the opinion of Mr. Rajah that as far as the South is concerned, just to counter-balance the mighty U. P. we should have a Southern State formed with Madras, Karnataka and Kerala and if Andhra is willing, Andhra also. That is, the region south of Hyderabad State is to be formed into a State and called the Southern State. Why I say that is this. It may be said that we speak four different languages—Tamil, Malayalam, Kanada and Telugu. But for a person like me

who knows both Tamil and Telugu well—I feel—there is not much difference between these four Southern languages. A man who can read Tamil can easily read Malayalam; and he can understand it also to a certain extent. Persons who read Telugu can easily read Kanarese—I can read Kanarese of course, without knowing much what it means. But so far as the characters are concerned, they are the same. A person knowing Telugu can easily read Kanarese, but with some difficulty. In my opinion, there is not much difference between all these four languages. I, for one, will feel that it will not be difficult to have common characters for these languages to enable all these four States to come together and form a Southern State with a common language, if possible.

I am now coming to the S.R.C. Report; lest I may not have time at the end to offer my opinion, I am coming to my own State. I shall deal with the injustice that has been done so far as Madras is concerned. Dealing in brief with Bombay as to whether it should remain in Maharashtra or whether there should be a bilingual State as has been suggested by the Commission or whether Bombay should be a City State, I, for one, feel that, when it is accepted as a broad principle by the Commission that language should be the basis for the formation of States and when we find that Marathi is the largest spoken language of Bombay, why should not Bombay belong to the Maharashtrians? I feel that the Himachal Pradesh should remain as a separate State by itself. If there is time, I shall give out my reasons. I feel that Bellary should remain as it remained with Andhra and the Kolar Gold Fields should either go to Andhra or if it is not possible, it should go to Madras and definitely not to Mysore.

Coming to Madras State which is my own, I was rather amused, when the S.R.C. Report was published, to find that only five taluks from the Travancore-Cochin State have been

allotted to Madras and not all the nine taluks for which there had been an agitation.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about those who migrated?

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: I will come to that late and I shall deal with it.

If they had stated in the Report that from the point of view of financial viability, the two disputed taluks of Devikulam and Peermede are essential for Travancore-Cochin, whatever be the other factors, I, for one, will feel that the Commission has dealt with this properly. But, with great respect to the members of the Commission, I would say that I do not agree with the various arguments advanced by the Commission. The arguments were just like those of a lawyer who argues before the Judge, just to buttress his point of view.

It has been stated in the Report in para 295—and it is only about four or five lines—as follows: “The Devikulam and Peermede Taluks stand on a somewhat different footing. These are hilly areas which, for various economic and other reasons are of great importance to the State of Travancore-Cochin.” That is the point. The percentage of Tamil-speaking people in the Devikulam Taluk is 72 per cent. and yet it does not go to Madras. The population of Peermede taluk is 44 per cent. “It has, however, been stated before us that this fairly large Tamil population of these two taluks is accounted for, in part, by a floating corps of labourers employed by plantations in this area. Recent figures for the Peermede and Devikulam taluks show that the Tamil migrant population constitutes 30 per cent. and 46 per cent. leaving behind 14 per cent. and about 26 per cent. as the non-floating Tamil-speaking population in the two taluks respectively.” With great respect to the Commission, I do

not know from what statistics they got these figures and I do not also know on what basis they arrived at this conclusion regarding this floating population.

Sir, I tried to go through the Census Reports for the years 1931, 1941 and 1951. For 1931, the Devikulam population was 51,730; for 1941 53,394 and for 1951, 62,130. The Malayalee population was 3,894 for 1931, 8,282 for 1941 and 16,050 for 1951. So, in the year 1951, the Tamil-speaking population in Devikulam was 62,130 and the Malayalam-speaking population constituted only 16,050. And yet, Devikulam is included only in Travancore-Cochin now.

Coming to Peermede, it is here that this question of floating population comes. The Tamil population in 1931 was 24,776 and the Malayalee population was 19,284; for 1941 the Tamil and Malayalam speaking population was 31,911 and 31,748 respectively. In the 1951 Census, we find that the Malayalees have made a jump over the Tamil population—the Tamil-speaking population being 42,570 and the Malayalam-speaking persons being 50,440.

I read out these figures for the purpose of showing to the House as to who are the migrants and which is the floating population. The Tamilians in Peermede in 1931 were 24,776 and Malayalees 19,284 and in 1951, they were 42,570 and 50,440 respectively. What does this show?

AN HON. MEMBER: Do any of them have families in Tamil Nad?

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: I will come to it.

In 1931, the Malayalees were less than the Tamilians and in 1951 they are more. They have gone up by about 8,000. So, this increase is due to the floating population from Travancore-Cochin—the Malayalee-speaking persons from Travancore-Cochin migrating to this area and

[Shri P. S. Rajagopal Naidu.] predominating the Tamil population. So, the floating population is not of Tamils, but it is the Malayalees.

On the basis of the 1951 Census figures which indicated that only 26 per cent. of the Tamilian population in Devikulam and 14 per cent. in Peermede represent persons who had been born within the Travancore-Cochin State, the Commission assumed, in my opinion, that the rest of the Tamilian population there was part of the floating population of persons who had come to these two taluks for working in the estates there. Persons born in Travancore-Cochin State, if they happened to be Tamilians, were taken to be the permanent inhabitants by the Commission and those born outside Travancore-Cochin State have been taken as outsiders who could have come only recently for the purpose of being employed as labourers. After all, even a person born in one State may migrate to another State and can settle there.

On this basis, the question should have been considered. But, on the other hand, they took into account only the Tamilian population represented by persons who had been born within the Travancore-Cochin State and drew the conclusion that the rest of the Tamilian population was floating population who had gone there for doing labour. Forget all these things and take an average of the Tamil speaking population and the Malayalam speaking population of these two taluks. These two taluks taken as a unit it comes to 57 per cent. Tamil speaking and 43 per cent. Malayalam speaking. Even on that basis, these two taluks should come to Madras State.

Sir, one more point about Peermede and Devikulam. The S.R.C. has dealt with Kollegal taluk in Coimbatore district. The Kannadiga population there is 77 per cent. and the Commission has suggested their merger with Karnataka. Why not the same one principle is applied in the case of

Devikulam where the Tamil speaking population is 72 per cent? The Commission has not adopted one common principle in the matter of distribution of taluks. Of course, it has been stated that district should be taken as a unit.

SHRI A. ABDUL RAZAK: Even in the case of Kasargode this principle has not been applied.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: I have not studied much about Kasargode. When my friend gets a chance he will be able to speak about it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. P. SUBBARAYAN): One more minute and you must finish today.

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंढरपुरी (पेप्सू):
मे यह प्रपोज करना चाहता हूँ कि हाउस
का समय आधे घंटे के लिये और
बढ़ा दिया जाये क्योंकि जो दो, तीन आदमी
और बोलने वाले हैं वे भी बोल लें।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. P. SUBBARAYAN): I have considered your request, but we should also think of the staff who work here. They have been here from 11 to 6. Therefore, I am not willing to accept that proposition.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: Sir, if it is the desire of the House, I will finish in two minutes. Vishal Andhra, I feel, is a burning question. I for one feel that there should be a separate Telangana State. I for one also feel that it should be left to the Telugu speaking population of Telangana to merge with the present Andhra or not. It should not be forced upon the Telugu speaking population of Telangana whether they should remain with Andhra or not.

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA: How are you interested in Andhra?

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: My friend asks me how I am interested in Andhra. Am I not interested about other States as a citizen of India? The Nizam had ceded some of the Telugu-speaking area contiguous to Hyderabad to the British. The language is the same; the culture is the same. Of course, the two mighty rivers Godavari and Krishna also flow through Telangana and Andhra area, but as I stated before, it should not be forced upon the people of Telangana; it should be left to them. They should come to a conclusion by referendum or by any other means

whether they should remain with Andhra State or not.

I do not want to take up any more time since the House is waiting for me. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. P. SUBBARAYAN): The House will now adjourn to meet again tomorrow at 11 A.M.

The House then adjourned at five minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 21st December 1955.