

- (ii) Statement No. III—Tenth Session, 1955. [See Appendix XI, Annexure No. 93.]
- (iii) Statement No. VI—Ninth Session, 1955. [See Appendix XI, Annexure No. 94.]
- (iv) Statement No. VIII—Eighth Session, 1954. [See Appendix XI, Annexure No. 95.]
- (v) Statement No. XIX—Sixth Session, 1954. [See Appendix XI, Annexure No. 96.]
- (vi) Statement No. XXII—Fifth Session, 1953. [See Appendix XI, Annexure No. 97.]
- (vii) Supplementary Statement No. XX—Fourth Session, 1953. [See Appendix XI, Annexure No. 98.]
- (viii) Supplementary Statement No. XXVI—Third Session, 1953. [See Appendix XI, Annexure No. 99.]

THE STATES REORGANISATION
COMMISSION'S REPORT, 1955—
continued

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will now continue the discussion on the S.R.C. Report. There is a very large number of speakers. If necessary, the House will have to sit till 7 O'clock, just as the other House is doing. Hon. Members will please restrict speeches to their time.

Mr. Pydah Venkata Narayana.

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA (Andhra): Sir, I was told that.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You want to speak later. All right. Diwan Chaman Lall.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me this early opportunity of intervening in this debate and my first duty is to add my small voice to that of the Leader of the House in paying my tribute to the three men who have presented this report and who have performed their duty in an objective manner, keeping their patriotism alive and their nationalism alive in making the recommendations that they have made. They have been imbued with a sense of high patriotic duty and indeed both this House, and I am quite sure, the nation are grateful to them for what they have done. It is not necessary, Mr. Deputy Chairman, to agree with every word that is to be found in the report made by these three great statesmen, but you will agree that it is necessary that we should pay the greatest attention to what they have done in view of the fact that they have probed into this matter with the greatest care and deliberation. I believe something like a lakh and a half or more documents were placed before them and I believe that 2,000 memoranda were considered by them apart from the various interviews that they gave. Now a document of this nature naturally assumes a very great authority and it would be wrong to disturb the recommendations of this Commission lightheartedly. Indeed, unless there are overriding considerations, it would be wrong to disturb the tenor of the report as it has been presented by these three men. They have followed the commonsense procedure of dealing with the local territorial difficulties on a national basis. Sir, I am quite well aware that there are many people about, after the publication of this report, who instead of following this commonsense method of seeking a solution for a difficulty are going about the country trying to seek difficulties for the solutions propounded by these gentlemen. They have taken upon themselves the profession of seeking and creating difficulties. They are undeterred by the magnitude of

the task. I, therefore, would beg of you to permit me not to range over the entire area of the sub-continent which is the subject-matter of this report but to confine myself to certain principles and to certain particular issues because if I do not do that I shall probably be speaking, Mr. Deputy Chairman, if you will permit it, all the rest of the day.

Sir, one cannot view this subject of the reorganisation of the States standing at one spot or standing in one corner and trying to look at the problem from that particular corner. We have got to take an overall view of the picture, the overall view of a united India, united and powerful as much in the presence of her friends as in the face of her enemies, if there are any. Therefore, whatever sustains and supports the unity of India, whatever creates a little more power for this great country of ours has to be supported and accepted and whatever in the name of sectionalism seeks to divide and weaken our country has to be rejected. That is the basic principle on which we must proceed in considering the recommendations of our friends. The touchstone, I submit, in considering this matter can be only the happiness, the security, the well-being and the good of our country and nothing else.

Last year, sensing this great danger that was facing my particular province, the Punjab, I proceeded to find some sort of a solution, a way out of this difficulty, and after careful consideration we came to the conclusion that we must place before our people a certain objective, namely, the objective of a greater Punjab in order that we may educate the people and wean them away from this communal spirit that happened to be rising in the midst of our people. We who have been nearly ruined and destroyed by the partition were naturally anxious that there should be no further partition and ruination of our people. That was a basic fact. When hon. Members consider this

matter they must remember that the freedom that they have achieved and the right that they have obtained of sitting in this chamber to deal with the affairs of their country is the right which they have achieved at the sacrifice and sufferings of two provinces, Bengal and the Punjab. It is the sufferings of millions of people in these provinces that have enabled them to sit in peace and quiet here as great men dealing with great problems of their great country. Therefore, we were determined that never again will we face any further partition of our country. Five million people coming away from West Pakistan, having lost everything and spreading themselves over eastern Punjab, Delhi and various other provinces, these were the symbols of the fact that we were not prepared to put up with tyranny and oppression and with communalism which seeks to divide our people, but that we were willing to live in peace in a united and powerful India. Therefore it was, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that I personally accepted the Chairmanship of what is known as the Maha Punjab Front. The object was to educate people and in a democracy education is the true path of enlightenment. Many people did not understand this but under the guise of protecting minorities, unfortunately, communal cries were raised and communal cries led to other counter-cries with the result that we in the Punjab almost became unworthy of the greatness and the glory that was ours in the past. I in that situation had counselled patience. On the 10th of April last year, at the opening session, the conference was attended by thousands of people. I said to them that we must be patient and await the decisions of the Commission of which my hon. friend sitting on my right was a very important and valuable member. After all, I said to them they are three of the ablest statesmen we have got and, therefore whatever they suggest we must not merely look at with great attention, but do our level best to accept it

[Diwan Chaman Lall.]

and the verdict that they give. Every one of us, nevertheless, was united in this demand for a larger area of the Punjab which would give us room for development and expansion. In fact, one of the important members of the Cabine^t of the Punjab, Sardar Partap Singh Kairon, said, I took down the words, "We are for greater Punjab in which PEPSU and Himachal should be merged, where people may lead prosperous and comfortable lives." Now, what is it that we mean by a larger Punjab, a prosperous Punjab? Let us have a look at the picture. In the Punjab that we visualised, PEPSU, Himachal and whatever was left of eastern Punjab, forming one particular area, the area would be less than 40,000 square miles. The population of this area would be 13 million people. Remember we in the Punjab were more than double that number. We had vast territories in which we could expand ourselves, but after the Partition we were narrowed down into this particular area. PEPSU was separated as a separate province. Himachal was separated as a separate province. And here are all these millions of people, so many millions who had come away from Pakistan, cooped up in the narrow area of Punjab, unable to expand. So, what we suggested was that in this larger context of Punjab which would include Himachal as well as PEPSU, we would have room to expand, room to spread out, as we were able to spread out in undivided Punjab. You will realise that in the Punjab which was divided, without PEPSU and Himachal, the population was nearly 400 to the square mile, if I am not mistaken, but in Himachal the population is only about a hundred to the square mile. The population of Himachal is about one million and one hundred thousand in an area of eleven thousand square miles. The population of PEPSU is 3½ million in an area of about 10,000 square miles. Now, here is an area in which we could expand, that is the area of Himachal. And hence we suggested

that this population, one united population of our people, who speak practically the same language—I shall come to that matter a little later—should not be confined in the narrow strip of the territory which was divided. Indeed, Punjabis should be able to expand in these three areas of Himachal, PEPSU and Punjab combined. There were some of us who even suggested that Delhi should be made part and parcel of this area. Now, Delhi, as you know, has really become a Punjabi city, the majority of the people who live here today are Punjabis. But that is no reason why we should press a demand of this nature, because there are other considerations, except the consideration of language, which should operate in this context.

Now, Sir, in this position in which we find thirteen million people in an area of about 40,000 square miles—37,378 square miles to be exact—you will notice that if Himachal is left out, then there is no further room for expansion. As I have said, if this population is to expand—as it does expand and is rapidly expanding—you do not want the Punjabis to go roaming round all over the world. In fact, we have become actually after the Partition wanderers seeking protection and shelter against the blasts of communalism which almost nearly destroyed us. But we are a resourceful people. The Punjabis are a people who are able to make their way in the midst of adverse circumstances. Let me pay my tribute to them—and incidentally—while I am paying my tribute to them I am paying a tribute to myself—the Punjabi is not easily suppressed. You will recall that invasion after invasion of our country took place. The Greek came; the Mongol came; the Tartar came; the Turk came; but the Punjabi remained keeping his culture and religion intact throughout these centuries until this last holocaust which drove us from our homes. Now, we who have become wanderers from the land where the bones and the ashes of our

ancestors lie, also seek a home and it is the duty of this country. The leaders of this country, to see that the home is worthy of the race which has stood up for the freedom of this country, and suffered as my people have suffered

Now, Sir, we have had enough of partition. That is one basic fact. Never again are the people of the Punjab going to accept any formula, any decision which seeks to divide them once again, after having suffered what they have suffered. And in this context, people under the false and fatal cries of attempting to protect minorities are really covering themselves up with the cloak of the minority but hiding the dagger of communalism under that cloak. We have to be wise and careful and clear, having accepted a secular State, that never again will communalism seek to raise its head either in our province or in any other province.

Now, Sir, people who do not know the history of the culture of my province talk rather vaguely and disconnectedly about protecting the culture of the various areas of this territory which I have designated as the one Punjab. They do not realise that the culture of the Punjab is a culture which owes its significance and its strength to the inter-mingling of various strains of culture of various kinds. How many hon. Members here know that the Gandhara school of art and sculpture was the creation of my province? It saw its birth in the Punjab. It was a mixture of the Greek and Indian. How many know that the great folk art of Basoli—which is dead now unfortunately—came from the hills and the mountains which we say are part and parcel of the Punjab. The great Kangra school of painting, the glory of India, is part and parcel of the heritage of Punjab. The Greek has come, the Tartar has come, the Mongol has come and there has been this great inter-mingling of culture

which has been the strength of our people. If you try to isolate one area from the other on the basis that it has a different type of culture territorially, you will be frustrating the march of progress of the Punjabi race. You will be frustrating them, you will be destroying the advance and the progress of their culture which owes its strength to this inter-mingling. Therefore, when people talk about different culture of Himachal as one of the reasons for a separate Himachal, they do not realise that the culture of the Punjab is a mixed culture and that it owes its strength to this inter-mixture. And we will die and be extinguished if that inter-mingling is stopped and if this fresh blood is not constantly coming in to support it and sustain it.

Now, Sir, the Punjabi language itself is an index of what I am saying. People do not realise that the base for Punjabi is Sanskrit, the basic factor in Punjabi is Sanskrit. Therefore, it is akin to Hindi. Apart from that there is the Greek strain. Apart from the Greek strain there is also the Turkish strain. It is an extraordinary thing that when the Mongols came and conquered, a large number settled down in the north-west Punjab and they have left the mark of their tongue upon our speech. You will permit me, Mr. Deputy Chairman, to enlighten the House with one or two words which are rather extraordinary. For instance, the turnip is known throughout India. It is known as *Salgam*. But in our language it is described by a peculiar name *Gongolu*. It was a Greek word for turnip—*Gongulos*. I do not know whether Alexander the Great brought the turnip from Greece and gave it to the Punjab. Then again, in my part of the world—the Punjab from which I come—it is an extraordinary thing again—a spoon is not known as *Chamcha* as it is known in the rest of India. It is called *Kashuk*. The word *kashuk* is a pure Turkish word. It is the

[Diwan Chaman Lall.]

Mongols who settled down there who left it behind. Today, a peasant in my part of the world will say to another, 'Oh, *Khal*, please stop.' Again, it is a pure Turkish expression. The Arabic characters of the Turkish language were, by a stroke of the pen of Ataturk destroyed and replaced by the Roman characters. The sound 'Hay' has gone out of the language and 'Khe' becomes 'Hay.' So also, it is not 'Khal', but it is 'Hal'. But they are exactly the same words. These point to the fact that Punjabi is a very important and fine language, with resources that go deep down into history. The history of many a country is inter-mingled with the history of Punjab, thereby giving that richness of the language, which is the Punjabi language. Such is the culture of our country, which has been enriched by the cultures of various other people.

May I, therefore, say at once that when people are demanding Punjabi as the language of the State, they have every justification for demanding it. When people talk about Hariyana being a land in which Punjabi is not spoken, they do not really know what they are talking about. It becomes a pure political stunt to use that particular little area to divide us. We know that Hindi is now our national language. When we know that if there is an area in which a form of Hindi is being spoken, it cannot be separated merely on the ground that it speaks a form of Hindi which is going to be the national language of every one.

They do not also know that amongst the Sikhs, the great Gurus wrote Sanskritised Hindi. They did not write the Punjabi as we know it. I shall come to that in a minute. But let me say at once that all the controversies about language or about script are infructuous. They have no value whatsoever. But in all these controversies, I would beg my hon. friends here, and I beg of you, **Sir, not to confuse the great Sikh**

community or to identify it with the communalists whose past is one of intrigue and threat and threat and intrigue. The Sikh community is a great community. It is a community which has left its mark upon the culture and the life and the religion of our people. Just now, I said a word about the Sikh Gurus. When a Sikh communalist talks about the Punjabi language as distinct from the Hindi language, he is talking with his tongue in his cheek. The great Granth Saheb is written in a language which is Sanskritised Hindi which only a Punjabi knowing person will never be able to understand, but only a person with some knowledge of Sanskrit or Hindi will be able to understand. Not only that, Guru Govind Singh's Bani was also written in Sanskritised Hindi. Today, every Sikh offers his prayer and reads his scriptures in that particular language and not in the Punjabi language. It is, therefore, nonsense to try and create an antithesis between the two languages. Both languages are fine and we welcome those who will give preference to both these languages in our province. But I, as a Punjabi, am prepared to say this much that everything that we can do will be done for the protection of the Punjabi language and its future development. The question of script is an unnecessary controversy. Any one who wishes to have the Punjabi language in the Gurmukhi script ought to be allowed to do so and I would press my people to try and accept the Gurmukhi script if that will be the only thing that will avoid any controversy on this point.

But the communalists are not content with these things. What they want today is to try and do what the Muslim League did in the olden days which led to the partition of India. I do not think that I am disclosing a secret when I say that there is correspondence in existence which reveals that some of these men tried to bargain with the Muslim League on this basis that they were ready to accept the entire division of the

country, not on the basis on which the Punjab has now been divided, but they were prepared to give up the rest of the Punjab up to the Ghaggar boundary, provided they could get a little satisfaction in the matter of weightage or percentage in services and in ministeris. That is on record. That is the record of the communalists that they were prepared to stab India—to the extent of another 200 miles into the heart of our country and make a present of it to the communalists provided they were satisfied with a little percentage here or a little percentage there.

That was the first demand. The second demand was an independent Sikh State. When that was not conceded or even allowed, came the third demand for an autonomous Sikh State. The first was the giving away to Pakistan the territory right up to Ghaggar; the second was an independent Sikh State and the third was an autonomous Sikh State. When this was not also conceded, we are now faced with the Punjabi Suba. My hon. friend, Mr. Dhage is not here at the moment.....

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad): I am here.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Oh! You are here! He talked about the Punjabi Suba. But I am quite certain that he did not mean what the communalists meant.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have three minutes more.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I am grateful to you. I shall try and wind up as quickly as possible. This is an important matter and I seek your indulgence.

Now, Sir, let me make three offers, standing as I do for the unity and prosperity of my country. Here is a great leader of the Sikhs, Master Tara Singh, who was a great leader of the Congress. Unfortunately, he has been keeping very bad company

recently and I am afraid that this great leader is being misled by little men who surround him—selfish men who are living in the dead past, nursing their personal interests, thinking that weightage and minister-ships are a substitute for the general prosperity and happiness of the people of our country. Look at the proposition from this point of view. A lot of things have been said about employment, percentage in services etc. Does any one know that .004 per thousand is the figure of employment in the services and are we going to break each other's heads and create bitterness between one community and another for the sake of the employment of 400 per thousand of the population? Why not cast our eyes a little wider and come to an understanding in regard not to this percentage of employment, but employment for all, happiness and prosperity for all irrespective of any community or any religion or any caste or any creed? In fact, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Hindus and the Sikhs of the Punjab are like the two arms of the body. They are the two nostrils of the same nose through which Punjab breathes and lives and any person who seeks to divide them is not a friend of either of them, but an enemy of the people and an enemy of the nation. I ask them to shed their fear. What is necessary is to shed their fear. Guru Nanak was once going through the forest and got held up by his disciples. The disciples said, 'Guruji, it is getting dark and we are very afraid.' He asked them "What are you afraid of?" "We are carrying a lot of bullion and a lot of jewels". And the Guruji said wisely, "Throw away the bullion and the jewels and you will not be afraid any longer." I ask my friends, the communalists to throw away this desire to dominate, throw away this desire for percentages and jobs and this and that. They will no longer be afraid because it will be the duty of every one to see that they are fully protected. Of course, it lies upon the majority to see to it that they are fully protected; it is their duty to

[Diwan Chaman Lall.]

create that necessary confidence amongst the minority. We are brothers. We have got to live like brothers. To create that necessary confidence to shed hate and fear Gandhiji did teach us that you can conquer hate with love. That is the basic, fundamental principle which is the tradition of India which has come down to us from the centuries. That is what we must learn—to conquer hate with love, to conquer fear with bravery and courage, to live like brothers one of another.

Now, Sir, let me make three offers. I want these three offers to be considered by my friends very carefully. Master Tara Singh was a great leader of the Congress Party. I ask him now to come back to the Congress. There is no reason why he and his followers should not come back into the Congress fold and exert their influence inside the Congress in order to achieve that brotherhood and unity and that strength for his country which we all desire.

I propose, secondly, to the Congress High Command that the very wise words of my hon. friend and his colleagues with regard to the decision about the Punjab should be accepted *in toto*. They have not accepted the Maha Punjab conception; they have rejected it. Well and good. If it is rejected it is rejected on wise grounds. I am prepared to accept that, but at the same time I ask the Congress High Command and this Government to accept the decision arrived at by these three great men in regard to the Punjab and not to weaken the proposition placed before them.

I suggest again, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that every safeguard that we can provide under the Constitution, either under Art. 39 or Art. 40 or the other Articles of the Constitution for the protection of the culture and the language of the people of my province should be provided constitutionally, and if necessary, by convention making the Governor of the

province as the guardian of the minorities in regard to this matter. It is the duty of the majority community to do so.

Pedlars of political panaceas and charlatans of communal chicanery and brokers of border changes and boundary alignments have been busy these days parcelling out these North Western territories seeking to divide the peoples of Punjab. They forget that we are one people. No reader of the Gurū Granth Sahib will follow it unless he is familiar with the basic Sanskrit language. The Guru said once:

(Karhu hukam apna sabh dusht
ghaun,

Turk Hind ka sakal jhagra mitau:)

That is what we want. Put an end to this *jhagra*, two brothers, living in harmony, following the precept of the Guru.

If my pleadings are in vain, may I make this appeal that in the matter of language and cultural interests, the security and the unity of India, which are all matters to be considered equally along with the language of the province, this issue may be decided by the Prime Minister of India, by his own solitary arbitrament. I assure you the Punjab would abide by his verdict in this matter.

(Time bell rings.)

One thing is absolutely certain. The old order is dying and a new order is arising. A new revolution is taking place not only in our country but throughout the world. If this great revolution succeeds, the millennium that our sages and seers have dreamt of will be the heritage of every man in this country, nay of the whole world. And in this new and glorious spirit we must look to the dawn, the new dawn that is breaking over humanity, and remember, that we as the inheritors of a great tradition have embarked upon a great adventure hand in hand, no matter who we are

because we are Indians first and Indians last, Indians who are citizens not merely of one province or of another, but citizens of India—and I go beyond that—citizens of a free and peaceful world.

SHRI K. MADHAVA MENON (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I welcome the States Reorganisation Commission Report. I feel that if in reorganisation there is so much of danger that some friends talk here, then it is better to end this controversy once and for all and let there be an amity by a proper reorganisation of States. This has to be done at some stage or the other, hence the earlier it is done the better, otherwise bitterness only will increase.

Sir, when Pakistan was carved from India Mahatma Gandhi was almost about to give his life on the question of the division of India, but at last, because of this consideration, he agreed to the division of India, and India was divided much as every one of us deplored in those days. But I feel that it has been a blessing in disguise. But for the partition there would have been so much obstacle in the way of working that we would not have been able to achieve what we have had.

Dr. Subbarayan said yesterday that the mischief was done by Andhra, but I do not feel so. I was also in the Madras Cabinet for some years. I think the partition of Madras has only done good both to Andhra and to Madras. The bitterness that was there before is no longer there and both the States are now free from obstruction, from bitterness. They are able to work so well that both the States are progressing. So there is nothing to feel sorry for if we could have a proper partition or proper reorganisation of States.

The general principles—about a dozen—adopted by the S.R.C. are good. They are: cost of change, unity and security of India, language and culture, financial stability, smaller and larger

States, wishes of the people, geographical factors, administrative considerations and so on. It is all these considerations and not in particular the linguistic consideration alone that has led to these recommendations. I wish they had stuck to it in all matters. When it comes to the question of Telengana it comes to the question of the wishes of the people. In another case the language or geographical factors are taken into consideration and all the other 11 considerations are practically given up. When it comes to the question of Vidarbha, it is a balanced approach, when it comes to the question of Bombay, it is a different criterion. Sir, I do not want to tread on the corns of other hon. Members. I do not want to speak with regard to any other State. I shall confine myself to my State, that is the proposed Kerala State. Sir, I welcome the recommendations of the Commission to have a separate Kerala State. But I wish that they had not given us a mutilated Kerala State, and I wish that the general principles adumbrated had been stuck to. Sir, Kerala is the smallest State recommended by them. Dr. Subbarayan pleaded that Kerala people should be more generous. Sir, I also appeal for generosity, sympathy and a little understanding, and for nothing more. According to the States Reorganisation Commission's Report, the population of that State is about 14 millions and the area is 14,980 sq. miles. Out of these 14,980 sq. miles, half of this area consists of forests, and of the remaining half, one-third consists of backwaters and rivers. And if you then consider the density of population, it will be about 3,000 to 4,000 people per sq. mile in that area. So, we are struggling for existence, and we are struggling for space. Therefore, Sir, I seek the sympathy, I seek the understanding, I seek the generosity of the Government, and more particularly of the residuary Madras State. I do not want to grab any land. I do not want to grab any area. But I plead for generosity on the part of the residuary Madras State and on the part of the Karnataka State.

[Shri K. Madhava Menon.]

(*Interruption.*) If you take the entire area into account, that is a different question. But I said that half of it consists of forests and of the remaining half, one-third consists of backwaters and rivers. And therefore we have to calculate the density of population according to that area. Sir, ours is the smallest State. And then West Bengal comes next with an area of 34,590 sq. miles. And the largest unit is Madhya Pradesh with 1,71,200 sq. miles. Madhya Pradesh is twelve times as big as Kerala. The density of population of the Kerala State is self-evident from the Table given in paragraph 754 of the Committee's Report.

Sir, in dealing with the proposals for the adjustment of boundaries, I again earnestly appeal that the Government should bear in mind this background of the density of population and our struggle for existence, with reference to Kerala. When these considerations are taken into account, I see absolutely no justification on the part of the S.R.C. for excluding Gudalur taluk of the Nilgiris District from Malabar and the five taluks of Travancore-Cochin from the proposed Kerala State. Sir, for this argument I shall give my reasons.

Gudalur is one of the three taluks of the Nilgiris District. The Nilgiris District was formed in 1877 as a health resort. Ootacamund is supposed to be the queen of hill stations. And for the formation of the new District, two taluks of the adjoining Coimbatore District, which was very big, were taken, and one taluk was taken from Malabar, and that is Gudalur. So, Gudalur taluk, as said formed part of Malabar till 1877. It is contiguous to Malabar and lies on the western slope of the Ghats. The physical features and vegetation and climate of Gudalur taluk are the same as of Malabar and distinct from the Nilgiris District. These are the quotations from the Nilgiris District's

Gazetteer. The majority of the people of this taluk are Malayalees. Even according to the Census figures of 1951, the Malayalee population is 48 per cent., the Tamil population is 21 per cent., and the remaining population is divided into half a dozen other small aboriginal tribes. You will also find, Sir, that the customs and manners of these people are same as those of the people of Malabar. The court language there is Malayalam, and the schools have got Malayalam as the medium of instruction. Of the six Panchayat Members, five Panchayat Members are Malayalees, and of the Members of the Nilgiris District Board two are Malayalees.

Apart from this, Sir, I will now point out what the Madras Government themselves say about Gudalur. When the question of reorganisation was not at all anywhere in the air, the Madras Government themselves said something in the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Madras Act (XII of 1931). There is an Act called the Malabar Compensation for Tenants Improvements Act. This Act was passed and this Act was extended to Gudalur in 1931. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons, this is what the Madras Government have said:

"The Malabar Compensation for Tenants Improvements Act of 1899 (Madras Act I of 1900) was passed with a view to secure to the tenants of Jenmis in the Malabar District on ejection from their holdings compensation for improvements made by them or their predecessors. The area known as the Gudalur taluk of Nilgiris District formerly belonged to the Malabar District and the conditions of tenure in that area are similar to those of Malabar. Representations have been made from time to time that the Malabar Compensation for Tenants Improvements Act should be made applicable to the Gudalur taluk of the

Nilgiris District on the ground that the tenants of the Jenmis of that taluk require the protection of the Act just as the tenants of the Jenmis of Malabar. It is accordingly proposed to extend the provisions of the Act to the Gudalur taluk of Nilgiris District."

This is what the Madras Government themselves say. The entire taluk belongs to the two landholders in Malabar and there are 13 roads leading from Gudalur to Malabar, while there is only one road leading from Gudalur to the Nilgiris. That is the position, Sir. The Malabar Tenancy Act is also applicable to Gudalur. When the questions of reorganisation were not in the air, the Madras Government said that the legislation intended for the Malabar District of the Madras State should be made applicable to Gudalur also. That is a fact of great significance. Gudalur, in fact, has been treated all along as belonging naturally to Malabar. Sir, I do not want to say anything more. It is rather unfortunate that in spite of the various memoranda and representations submitted to the S.R.C. regarding Gudalur taluk, no mention of it has been made in the Report at all. I feel, Sir, that is an omission which they have committed, and the Government should rectify that omission. Sir, regarding the four taluks of Travancore, viz., Thovala, Agastheeswaram, Kalkulam, Vilavancode, these are only four of the eight taluks of Trivandrum District of Travancore-Cochin State. The S.R.C. has adopted the district as the basic unit for making territorial readjustments because of this fact that the districts have developed an organic and administrative unity and an economic life of their own. The Commission says:

"We have departed from this rule only when, for ensuring geographical contiguity or for some other important administrative or economic considerations, detachment of

part of a District has become imperative."

The report of the Commission does not make any reference to any ground which has made the detachment of these four taluks from Trivandrum District imperative. Its geographical position is this: The West Ghats are almost an unbroken mountain chain. The Western Ghats are more or less like Kalidasa's description of it:

स्थितः पृथिव्यां इव मानदण्डः ।

The Western Ghats lie from one end of Malabar to the other. West of the Western Ghats is all Kerala.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras): In those taluks west of the Ghats, do they speak Malayalam or Tamil?

SHRI K. MADHAVA MENON: The misfortune is that they speak Tamil also. The only ground for separating these taluks from Kerala is that these people speak Tamil also. Everyone of them knows Malayalam also. They can read and write it.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): Some speak Kannada also.

SHRI S. C. KARAYALKAR (Travancore-Cochin): Are not those taluks contiguous to Tinnevely District?

SHRI K. MADHAVA MENON: The Western Ghats come in between. I would appeal to the Members to look at the map. These Western Ghats are a natural boundary separating the whole of T. C. State and Malabar from the rest of India. Kerala has always been considered to be that part of Indian territory which lies west of the Ghats.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Three minutes more.

SHRI K. MADHAVA MENON: I would like to have at least five minutes more.

MR. DEFUTY CHAIRMAN: If every Member goes on exceeding his time limit, it will be very difficult

SHRI K. MADHAVA MENON: If it is a question of historical reason, even the headquarters of the Maharajas of Travancore till about two centuries back had been in Padmanabhapuram in Kalkulam Taluk which is now proposed to be given to Madras State. It is true that the people of this area speak Tamil, but it is wrong to conclude from it that it is part of Tamil Nad. It is really a bilingual area. Everyone of them understands the Malayalam language as well and there is a good percentage of people in these taluks who speak only Malayalam. It is also true that during the last two general elections, the majority of the Members who have returned to the T. C. Assembly from these taluks were returned on the Travancore Tamil Nad Congress ticket. Passions played a big part in these general elections, and the result of these elections alone should not be a consideration in deciding the fate of these taluks. Sir, I do not want to say anything more on this.

Then I come to the question of Shenkotta taluk. I agree that that portion of Shenkotta taluk which lies to the east of the Western Ghats should go to Madras, that the portions which form an enclave in the Tinnevely District should go to them, but the other portions of the taluk should form part of the Kerala State.

Dr Subbarayan referred to Devikulam and Peerameede. The SRC has recommended that these should go to Malabar. As it has been stated in the report itself, there is Tamil population there, but it is a floating population. The entire labour there comes from Madura, Ramnad and Tinnevely, and they are all living in the lines—they have no homesteads of their own—built by the estates.

(Shri A Abdul Razak interrupted)

SHRI K. MADHAVA MENON: I do not agree with him. The Commission itself has given reasons.

We have heard certain rumours that Kasaragod taluk should go to Karnataka. It has been given by the Commission to Kerala. The SRC has given reasons why Kasaragod Taluk should go to Kerala. Seventy-eight per cent of the population there speak Malayalam.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Even to the north of Chandragiri River?

SHRI K. MADHAVA MENON: I am coming to the Chandragiri River also. The Commission itself says that, if you take the census figures, you will find that 78 per cent of the people of the Taluk as a whole speak Malayalam and they follow Malayalee customs and manners, and so they say that there is no necessity for bifurcating the taluk at all. My friend asks about the Chandragiri River. I wish he had asked about the Piousvini River, the source of Chandragiri River. If you take the Chandragiri River, then, 51.74 per cent of the population north of Chandragiri River speak Malayalam. It is only 9 per cent who speak Kannada. Twenty-six per cent speak Tulu, and 12.95 per cent speak other languages. If you want the actual population, Malayalam people are 1,11,237; Kannada people 18,419; Tulu 52,398; and others 25,464. So, even if you talk of the population north of the Chandragiri River, this taluk can only go to Malabar.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Is this according to the 1951 census?

SHRI K. MADHAVA MENON: I am speaking of the 1951 census. From the point of view of geographical contiguity and every other consideration, Kasaragod should only form part of Kerala.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS (Orissa): Sir, I thank you very much for having given me this opportunity to speak on the SRC Report. The SRC report

and its consideration necessarily take us back to the revered memory of that great Indian, the late lamented Sardar Patel, and our great leader, Pandit Nehru, to whose untiring efforts we owe the unity of India, the ideal of all Indians for generations. It is only fair that we pay our homage to that great leader, popularly known as the Iron Man of India and also to our great leader, Pandit Nehru, who is today a popular figure not only in our country but also in all the countries of the world.

Having said this, we have to congratulate the Home Minister, Pantji, for having the mantle of Sardar Patel on whom fell the duty of consolidating India and now it remains for this noble soul, with the help and co-operation of the Sub-Committee, to redraw the map of India, which is certainly a big task. In this task let me
 1 P.M. appeal to the hon. Members of this House as also the electorate and the vast majority of the people in this country, that they should co-operate with the Government and falsify the anticipations of anti-Indian elements who are mostly out of India and are longing to see that India breaks on this score. Let it be our endeavour to see that the Government of India successfully redraw the map of India to the satisfaction of all and with the concurrence and good wishes of the people of this country.

Having said this, let me come to the Commission. Generally people in this country associate youth with revolutionary work or revolutionary thinking. I must congratulate my friends, the talented members of the S.R.C. that they have brought in, even at the fag end of their life and service to the country, revolutionary changes in the working of nationalism and democracy in India. The great recommendations that they have made regarding the abolition of the office of Rajpramukhs and the creation of one-class State are certainly unique in themselves. The breaking up of Hyderabad is equally an important event. Equally so is the amalgamation of Mysore with

Samyukta Karnataka as also Travancore-Cochin with Aikya Kerala. These are important achievements and feathers in the cap of the Commission. With these, if there are criticisms, I think the Commission will have to take it in good spirit.

Sir, I equally thank my hon. friends for having stressed the security of India. To me, as an Indian, as a man from Orissa, security first, India first and security of India for ever—that is my slogan and that is our slogan. So far as the recommendations regarding security of India are concerned, you have our fullest co-operation. Security necessarily means first, the frontiers of India. I agree with my hon. friend Chamanlalji when he spoke of the great sufferings of the people of Punjab and Bengal. We have all our sympathies with them and for them. Sir, my hon. friend has spoken about Mahapunjab. There are others who speak about a Punjabi Suba. As brothers, as comrades in arms, I appeal to all Hindus, Sikhs, Christians and all the people of Punjab to solve their differences, to sit together, sit with a determination to solve and see that those are solved. Unless and until we do it, I think it is unfair to call ourselves democratic or unfair to speak of nationalism, if we cannot get these things settled. Recrimination takes us nowhere. Hard words cut no ice.

Having come to Bengal, I think hon. Members feel that Bengal should have our sympathy and support. Think of Bengal. It is a State that borders Pakistan. You call upon the Government of Bengal to co-operate and help you in the matter of security of India and you want the Government of Bengal to take care of law and order and also to support you and help you in matters of infiltration of undesirable elements or illicit trade that is going on between the borders. If these have to be checked and attended to, any State—what to speak of Bengal—should have the area necessary for its control. I do not feel therefore that there should be any criticism of the recommendations of the Commission.

[Shri Biswanath Das] regarding Kishengunj. One of my hon. friends has spoken in the name of minorities. May I appeal to him to see the statement issued by important Muslim elements of Bengal who have disclaimed such unnecessary apprehensions? Under these circumstances, I feel that the recommendations of the Commission deserve consideration.

Then I come to Assam. That again is a border area. I think I must frankly confess that I am not at all for the continuance of these C class States. They should go and go bag and baggage. They are a strain on the national finance and they are an unnecessary appendage to the administrative set up. Why should you have C class States even on the border area of Assam? Look at the picture. The Adibasi elements that are not under the control of Assam administration—you get trouble but you have absolutely no trouble in the area which is under the administration of Assam. That clearly proves, as the Simon Commission once recommended that C class States—then minor administrations—should not be under the Government of India but should merge in the neighbouring States. In that view of the question, I recommend and I appeal to the hon. Members as also to the Government of India to wipe off the C class States and not allow them to come as territories except those that are absolutely necessary for the purpose of strategical reasons or from the point of view of State necessities.....

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): But you would be prepared to exclude the North East Frontier Agencies.....

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: There again I would plead that matters of over-all control may be left with the Government of India but the administrative set up should be that of the State because the State Government has got the agency and has officials who have experience of such administrations. That is my feelings and that is my experience.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Those tribals are not represented in the Assam Assembly.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Give them. Having stated so much, I come to criticism of the S.R.C. The Chairman has appealed to us to make helpful suggestions. I agree with him in full. In criticising the S.R.C. let us not talk in terms of contradictions. One of our friends Dr. Lanka Sundaram wants to wipe off U.P. Why? Because he wants that there should be a balance between the South and the North. I don't know how wiping off U.P. brings in the balance. But whatever it is, it is not left to my hon. friend in the same breath to claim Vishalandhra having himself chosen to wipe off a big province in the name of balancing.

SHRI N D M PRASADARAO (Andhra): What has Dr. Lanka Sundaram got to do with that? That is the suggestion of Sardar K. M. Panikkar.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Let my hon. friend look into the speeches and then he will know. And so, I say these are the contradictions. Now, where are these eleven lakhs of Andhras he speaks of living in Orissa? Where are these eleven lakhs? Look at the Census Report. It will be seen that only 3 lakhs and 42 thousands of Andhras live in Orissa. They come to 2.3 per cent., nothing more. And they are all distributed in all the thirteen districts, the main portion being in Ganjam and Koraput. And in Ganjam and Koraput, what is their strength? Look at the same Census Report. I would invite the attention of my hon. friend to the Census Report published in 1954.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): What is their percentage in the town where you beat up the Andhras and burnt their houses?

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Yes, yes, when he knows the facts, my hon. friend will be wiser. I know he is angry and I also know the reasons for the same. But he will be wiser if

he looks into the Census Report. There again, it will be seen that the Oriyas are in a majority. He can read it.

SHRI N. D. M. PRASADARAO: I dispute that statement, Sir.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Let him dispute it, let him repudiate it, let him do anything, but.....

SHRI N. D. M. PRASADARAO: But the.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Let him go on, Mr. Prasadarao.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Here are the figures from the Census Report and they cannot be wiped off.

SHRI N. D. M. PRASADARAO: But, Sir I am quoting the same Census figures.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, yes. You can do it in your speech. Let him go on.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: According to these Census figures they form one-seventh of the population in Ganjam district and one-sixteenth of the population in Koraput district. And yet my hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram lays claim to Koraput and Ganjam. And in the whole State they form only 2·3 per cent. of the population. These are the census figures, they are not my figures.

Then there is another gentleman—Mr. Theodore Bodra—representing Bihar, and he claims Jharkhand. And Jharkhand is to consist of what? It will have some districts from Bihar, some from Orissa and also some from Madhya Pradesh. Sir, Mr. Jaipal Singh also speaks now in the same manner and in the same strain. I want to know why Mr. Jaipal Singh who calls himself a great supporter of Jharkhand, did not make any, such demand and move this question in the Constituent Assembly which was the forum for such an agitation and for

such claims? Sir, I would again appeal to him to state why this same claim was not put forth before the Constituent Assembly when the Dhar Commission's Report was discussed in that assembly? He was quiet all these years, and suddenly he woke up. And he woke up because of Bihar. You look into all the publications in the press and you will see that the so-called Jharkhand Party and our Bihar friends have joined hands. Sir, "Jharkhand" is a conception of the Britishers and of the British missions. These friends had been trained for a different purpose and now their slogans have been changed. I thank the Government of Madhya Pradesh for having appointed a commission to look into the non-Indian activities of these foreign missions. Now these people have changed their tone and slogan and the slogan now is "We want Jharkhand and we should remain in Bihar." I say, all right. We bless them. For this advocacy I bless my friends always.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: It is their stand that.....

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: I will show my hon. friend what their stand is...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can explain everything later on Mr. Sinha.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: You can see it in the press and also from their writings. No one wants a division of the Adibasi areas as the spoils of war. No one wants that. I am not in favour of it. But if today we claim Sadar Sub-division and Seraikella Sub-division of Singhbhum district, it is not as spoils of war. Nor are we claiming areas which are not connected. Sir, if we claim this, it is because of linguistic, social, economic and cultural homogeneity of the areas. Also it is supported by geographical associations and historical traditions.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Historical?

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Yes, I can explain it to my hon. friend, not

[Shri Biswanath Das]
only here but if he would come along. I can explain it to him outside, I will try to show it to him, prove and convince him, both from historical records and also from the census reports. Sir, where is Hindi in Singhbhum district? Let me refer my hon. friend to the Census Report so that he may be wiser. The Hindi speakers in Singhbhum the total number of those who speak Hindi in Singhbhum district, according to the Census of 1951 is 2 lakhs 12 thousand and odd, or you may put it as 2,13,000 roughly. You see it on page 41 of Bihar Census Report. And the increase in the ratio of persons speaking Hindi, that is to say, increase over the 1931 figures, is of course, much greater than in the case of any other language. This is due mainly to the growth of Jamshedpur which is predominantly Hindi speaking. Out of the total population of 14,81,000 in Singhbhum District, 1,95,000 were found to be immigrants according to the 1951 census and 1,80,000 persons had come from Hindi-speaking areas. That means floating population. Are you going to decide the fate of a sub-division or a district on the wishes of a floating population which has absolutely no interest in the district?

SYED MAZHAR IMAM (Bihar):
What is the population of Oriyas?

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: I am coming to that brother. Do not be anxious, do not be impatient. Having eliminated the floating population of 1,80,000 how much is left? There are 32,000 Hindi speakers confined either to the city of Jamshedpur or to the towns of Musabani or Chakradharpur. So where is Hindi-speaking population in Singhbhum Sadar and Seraikella Sub-divisions? You find them here with Oriyas associated as brother to brother, house-owner to house-owner in the villages of Singhbhum district in these two sub-divisions or with Bengali speaking people in Dhalbhum sub-division. If we put up this claim, it is because of the economic inter-

dependence of the people in these areas. If we make this claim, it is because of the social intercourse of the people, the Oriyas and the Adibasis. They are equally "Bhassis" that is to say, brother agriculturists in the field. If the Oriya is a physician, the Adibasi is the patient. If the Oriya is a *purohit* the Adibasi is his *Jajaman*. This is not my view. Look at the O'Donnell Committee's Report which has refused Singhbhum to Orissa. Even this Committee had to admit that it is the Oriyas that have social relations and economic relations with the people, but not the Biharis. Let me refer to page 10 of Vol. I of the Report wherein it is said that after the detailed census of 1931, on the basis of language, the Oriyas numbered 89,631 in the Sadar Sub-division alone. Bihari-cum-Bengali constituted 6,997; this means that the Oriya population was five times more than the combined population of Hindi and Bengali speaking people. The Bengali speaking people now desire to come to Orissa; they do not want to be with Bihar. Where there is your claim, I ask? It should not have been so, if the Commission had taken into consideration all this. I had written a letter to Dr. Kunzru intimating him as to how our claims were not considered by the Commission. If they had considered and come to a decision, we would not have minded. That they have not done. You are talking about the security of India. If people in a State feel—and honestly feel—that because they have no pull in the Centre they do not get justice, is it fair to India? It is not fair to India and it is not going to help your security if that is the feeling in the minds of people.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: That is the feeling in Kishanganj also.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Shri Bodra said that he was speaking as a Ho. It will interest you to know, Sir, that Ho community is to be found either in Singhbhum District or in the neighbouring districts of Orissa and nowhere in Bihar. I can give you the

number from the Census Report You will please see that in India the total Ho population is 5,99,000 Out of this number, four lakhs and odd people live in Singhbhum, about 1,88,000 in Orissa and four or five thousand Hos are distributed all over Bihar My friend said that he was speaking on behalf of the Hos as if he was a Ho.

SHRI R P N SINHA (Bihar) Not all over Bihar but only in Chota Nagpur

SHRI BISWANATH DAS I know, only in Chota Nagpur, while in Singhbhum and in the neighbouring districts of Orissa you have got all the Ho population What right has my friend from Bihar and the leaders from Bihar to thrust on us a sermon, "Be calm and quiet Give dispassionate thinking"

Having stated so much, I would now appeal to the hon^{ble} Members of this House Why should these friends abuse—and abuse whom, the representatives of the Hos and others, the Scheduled Caste and general representatives of Singhbhum District as also the representatives of the Hos and Santhals in the Orissa Assembly? Have they not the right to demand that they should be allowed to join and live happily with their own people? What right have you to abuse them? Let me appeal to Mr Theodore and Mr Jaipal Singh and say that such things should not and will not pay them in the long run He was showering abuse on Mr Sonram Soren, the Adibasi Minister of Orissa. Mr Sonram Soren came at the head of the pool, not only himself but with his colleagues, with a thumping majority defeating all the rivals Now, that being so, what right have you, who have come through the back door, who have come to Parliament from a pocket borough of 200 or 300 votes, to go on abusing people who have been directly representing the electorate, and no less, the adibasis, and for whom they are entitled to speak? I would resent such things and would again appeal to them not to go the way they have been

What has pained us more is the fact that the Commission has not given its thoughts to this important question. When I make this allegation, I must have some grounds to prove it I wrote a letter to Dr Kunzru I communicated the contents of the letter to the Members of the Commission including its worthy Chairman and also to the Members of the Sub-committee of the Working Committee In that letter I had quoted chapter and verse the reasons why our claims on Madhya Pradesh, on the Sadar subdivision and on Serakella have not been considered by the Commission at all Speaking about our claim on Madhya Pradesh, I had said

"I invite your attention to paragraphs 735 and 745 of the SRC Report, wherein mention has been made of elaborate enquiries undertaken regarding Orissa by the O'Donnell Committee in 1934 and an overwhelming public support was found regarding the retention of those areas in Madhya Pradesh and that Hindi is the predominate language In this connection I beg to point out that if the Commission had merely opened their eyes and looked into the contents of the O'Donnell Committee Report, specially those of Volume I pages 18 and 19, they would have seen that these statements are incorrect They (decision against Orissa's claim) are not due to the so-called overwhelming public support for Madhya Pradesh, people or Government nor due to opposition by majority of Hindi speakers, but on the basis of statements by a Deputy Commissioner of Raipur regarding Bindra Nawagarh, and also merely on the basis of the statement of a Settlement Officer regarding Padampur, Chandrapur and Malkhurda While inclusion of Phulihar and Mahasmudra was decided on the ground that the people have no public opinion and that the zamindar of Phulihar opposed it"

This cannot be said to be a decision of the Committee (Time bell rings)

[Shri Biswanath Das]

I am sorry, Sir, I am the only one speaking for Orissa.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two more have already spoken.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Kindly give me two more minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should close at 1.30. If every Member goes on taking extra time, the others will suffer.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: We regret that so far as the decisions relating to Bengal, Bihar and Orissa are concerned, the recommendations of the Commission are not really the recommendations of the Commission. Why? Because Mr. Fazl Ali, at the end of the Report has said that he has refrained from taking any part in investigating and deciding the territorial dispute regarding Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. His was a balanced judicial mind and this important decision is being deprived of the same. I do not intend making any allegations but I have to state that Sardar Panikkar was an Adviser to the Eastern States which constitute now practically half of Orissa. I feel, Sir, that probably something was working in his mind lest he should be misunderstood by others. Else, we have absolutely no complaint against the Commission. Our complaint relates to these stated incidents, and the fact that the Chairman of the Commission, who is a very important person, who has a judicious and balanced approach to questions has abstained. We feel that this boundary question should be referred to a tribunal. Have a tribunal consisting of either the retired Chief Justice of the Federal Court of India, Mr. Varadachari, or the retired Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of India, Mr. Patanjali Sastri or the retired Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of India, Mr. Mahajan. We have no objection. We want that judicious and balanced mind should be brought into this important question and decisions

should be given, and we are prepared to abide by the decision. We want a decision.

(Time bell rings.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, Mr. Biswanath Das, you have to close.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Please give me only two or three minutes more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. You have already exceeded the limit by five minutes.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: I am sorry, Sir. I want only two or three minutes more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Have one or two minutes.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Sir, let me refer to the proceedings of the Bihar Legislative Assembly of the 25th November, wherein the M.L.As. representing the Ho community have moved amendments to the main Resolution, for the amalgamation of these two sub-divisions with Orissa. 11 or 12 votes were cast in favour of this. Because these people voted either for Bengal or for Orissa you say that they were purchased. What about Jharkhandis? What were your credentials a year back and what are your credentials now? You are certainly different from what you were before. Therefore in these circumstances I appeal to the hon. Members not to give any importance to the so-called wailings of my friend, Shri Theodore Bodra.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Prasadarao.

SHRI N. D. M. PRASADARAO: Mr. Deputy Chairman, before discussing this question of States reorganisation let me first of all pay my homage to those martyrs who agitated and who laid down their lives in the cause of reorganisation of States on linguistic basis beginning from the time of

Bengal partition down to the martyrdom of Potti Sriramulu, and also to the martyrs of Bombay who died on November 18 and 21.

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

Sir, this is a very important question and the Home Minister has rightly advised us to be very calm, cool and dispassionate while we discuss this report, because so many questions are involved. Border disputes are there; some States are being wiped out and some States are being totally altered. Therefore it is quite right that he has advised us to be cool and dispassionate.

Sir, several Members have paid tribute to the labours of the Commission. I also join them in paying tribute for all the work that they have done. Sir, I have one remark to make about the Commission's work. Some time ago, speaking, I think, on the University Grants Commission Bill, Dr. Kunzru said that the Commission had never been interfered with, that the Government had never instructed them to do this or that, and they were in no way influenced by the Government. May be quite correct, Sir, But I would like to say this that even though when they started doing their work or during the course of their work Government had never interfered, their hands were tied down from the very beginning as they were asked to do their work within the four corners of the terms of reference that were placed before that Commission. Those terms of reference have led them to make some major recommendations, which I consider major blunders. Sir, what are the terms of reference? Of course I need not read them. So many Members have already referred to them. They refer not only to language but to certain other considerations also. They said about national unity, national security economic viability and so many other things. Quite right, Sir, nobody objects to it. If the reorganisation of States on a particular basis will

endanger national unity or national security, certainly it should not be done. But why are they clubbed together? When we are discussing the question of States reorganisation on linguistic principles, why is this question of national unity and national security brought in? At no other time during the last 30 or 40 years did any person think that if the States are reorganised on a linguistic basis either national unity would be endangered or national security would be threatened? No thought had come so long; it has come only after 1947, after the transfer of power and the ruling class has got the power in their hands to recarve the States, to reorganise the States.

Let us see what is this national unity. What is the outcome of the recommendations of the S.R.C.? They have recommended 13 States to be reorganised on a linguistic basis, Sir, out of 16 States, when 13 States are to be reorganised on a linguistic basis does it threaten national unity? Does it threaten national security? Therefore, unnecessarily, instead of simply saying "You reorganise the States on a rational basis or on the basis of the principle which was recognised and which has been influencing the policies of the major political parties in the country, namely, the principle of language", instead of simply saying to them that "you reorganise them on this principle" they have clubbed in all these things, and that is why, Sir, so many things have come in. Too much insistence on this national unity without any context has led to several mistakes, major blunders, in the recommendations of the Commission. That is why, Sir, it has been recommended that the Osmania University should be placed under the Central Government and the medium of instruction in this university should be Hindi. This way, it is a sort of artificial unity that they are thinking of. Sir, this national unity can be achieved only with the willing co-operation of all the people, of all the linguistic groups living in our country. But what is this? If supposing through these artificial

[Shri N D M. Prasadarao]
measures somebody wanted national unity to be built up, will it be built? If very large sections of the people even in this House fear that arbitrarily Hindi is being imposed on them in the name of national unity, they are justified, as such fear has been engendered by some of the utterances made by responsible leaders. I refer to the latest utterance, the latest statement made by no less a person than the Chairman of the Hindi Commission, Shri B G Kher Sir, while speaking in Hyderabad on December 17, he said something to the effect that if the regional languages grow as they like, then there is the danger to Hindi growing as the national language of India. Why should these two be counterpoised? Suppose I want my Telugu to be developed or some friend from Kerala wants Malayalam to be developed, how does it affect, how does it come in the way of Hindi being developed as a national language? There is no controversy at all; there is no enmity among these languages. Therefore when such things are being imposed in the name of national unity, naturally there will be dissensions and there will be suspicion. Therefore this question of national unity should not have been brought in the consideration of the question of reorganising the States. This thing has been proved by 13 States being recommended on the basis of language

Similar is the question of national security. Does national security depend upon whether a State is created on a linguistic basis, or whether it is a bilingual State or not or whether it is big or small? National defence is the concern of all the people living in our country. Even if there is a big State, say, with 3, 5 or 6 crores of population, can that State alone defend the whole country from aggression? Therefore this question also should not have been brought in. They say regionalism, provincialism, linguism, and all these isms will develop and national security and national defence would be affected. But today I ask,

how is the army organised? We find there is the Rajputana Regiment, the Mahratta Regiment; similarly we have got Madras Regiment also. Even though they are recruited on that basis, even though they are named on that basis, do they threaten the security? Are they less patriotic? National defence and national security depend upon the consciousness of the people, upon the patriotism of the people. When Kashmir was threatened, the whole nation rallied together and went to defend Kashmir. Therefore this question of national security should not have been brought at all in the context of States reorganisation.

Sir, another thing has also been brought in—economic viability—whether a State would be able to balance its budget, whether it would be able to meet all the expenditure that it has to incur in the State. If that is to be taken as the criterion, I would ask the Government whether any single State is economically viable as it exists today, including the U.P. which was referred to by one hon. friend as a giant? Sir, I have taken some figures from the report of the Taxation Enquiry Commission relating to the State revenues and expenditure on the revenue side. All the Part A States, we find, are not economically viable in that sense. These are the figures for 1953-54, the last year for which the Taxation Commission has given figures:

State	Total revenue (In crores)	Expenditure on revenue side (In crores)
Assam	13.74	14.93
Bihar	32.78	35.36
Bombay	68.15	72.06
Madhya Pradesh	23.11	25.21
Madras	64.90	74.65
Punjab	18.51	19.57
Orissa	12.05	14.67
U. P.	66.27	78.54
West Bengal	37.72	50.57

Sir, these revenues include not only the ordinary taxes but even the grants-in-aid from the Union Government. You will find from these figures

that no single State is balancing its budget unless it raises loans or the Centre gives more aid. That is how the States are getting on. Therefore when considering this question of States reorganisation, this question also should not have been brought in. It has been unnecessarily brought in. That is why the Commission has been misled on several issues and that is why they have committed some blunders. Sir, when I say that the Commission's recommendations are not acceptable to many people in the country, I speak the fact.

The hon. Minister for Home Affairs, speaking while introducing the motion, said that almost all the people in the country welcomed it and that only some insignificant minorities have not accepted it. Sir, I would respectfully tell him that this insignificant minority includes the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress itself, for they have already modified certain recommendations made by the States Reorganisation Commission. What has become of the recommendation about Telangana? They said that right now they favoured the formation of Visalandhra. Then, have they accepted Part IV dealing with Services and other things? They have not; they have postponed decision on it. And what about Punjab? Consultations are still going on; they are calling the Punjab leaders and talking to them. The very fact that even the Congress Working Committee has modified certain recommendations of the S.R.C. shows that the recommendations are not quite satisfactory to a very large percentage of the people of the country.

Now, I come to some of the recommendations made by the Commission. My friend, Mr. Akbar Ali Khan, is not here today. He said that 95 per cent. of the people in Telangana did not want a merger with Andhra; did not want Visalandhra. Sir, I am sorry that he has completely exaggerated the picture. Sir, it is not 95; I would have accepted if he had said 0.95. That is the correct picture if he goes and

sees in the villages. Let him see the papers published in Visalandhra and he can see how many meetings, attended by thousands and thousands of people, are being held in Telangana in favour of Visalandhra. I have got here the papers just received. Take any paper and you will find reports of number of meetings being held in Telangana. This is one paper received yesterday and this says that in Suryapet, Janagaon taluks and Peddapalli several meetings were held attended by thousands of people. In Suryapet Taluk 10,000 people attended one meeting. In Peddapalli 1500 delegates attended a conference. In Sultanabad Taluk many meetings were held; in Huzurnagar a week has been observed supporting Visalandhra from 15th to 21st. In Mankote Taluk 4,500 people have attended meetings in three or four places. Sir, there are several such reports and it will take much time if I were to read out all of them. Let him go to these villages and just see that reactions of the people; let him not just see only the reactions of some interested persons in Hyderabad city. Let him go to the villages and he will see that the entire people, barring a few interested persons, are demanding Visalandhra. He said that public meetings could not be held in favour of Visalandhra and he has challenged my friend Raj Bahadur Gour. If he wants to challenge, there are 89 lakhs and twelve thousand and odd Telugu people in Telangana who can accept that challenge. Who are disturbing the meetings? If some meetings are not being held, who is responsible for that? Not only the meetings addressed by Raj Bahadur Gour but even the meetings held and addressed by the Chief Minister of Hyderabad State are being disturbed but who are disturbing them?

DR. R. B. GOUR (Hyderabad): I have addressed dozens of meetings; not a single meeting of mine was disturbed by anybody.

SHRI N. D. M. PRASADARAO: So, Sir, he challenges that meetings would

[Shri N. D. M. Prasadarao]
not be held. Of course, there are some persons who will try always to disturb meetings held in support of a democratic cause. My friend, the Nawab of Chhattari, is not here. He would have told how in Hyderabad when any popular cause has been championed the *goondas* used to disturb and the Nawab of Chhattari was himself a victim to that. When he wanted to come to Delhi by plane from Hyderabad for talks on the question of merger of Hyderabad with Indian Union, what fate had met him he would have told. That is how the meetings are being organisedly disturbed by interested persons. So, it is not a case of holding a meeting or disturbing a meeting. It is the cause of the people. So, go and see in these villages and you will find.

Sir, yesterday and day before yesterday we have heard the arguments for and against Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay. I do not wish to deal at length in the short time at my disposal.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): Only four minutes more.

SHRI N. D. M. PRASADARAO: I would respectfully say, that the Commission has not been factual and truthful when dealing with the case of Bombay. They have said that the Gujaratis are very patriotic and self-sacrificing and willing to live in a bilingual State, but it is very unfortunate to find that this patriotism and self-sacrificing spirit has evaporated today. Today when some Maharashtra leaders offer the same demand of a bilingual State with all the Maharashtra people coming together, then this self-sacrificing nature and this patriotism evaporates. The Gujaratis will not live in such a bilingual State. When I refer to Gujarati people I do not mean the workers and peasants of Gujarat. It is the leaders, it is the monied monopolists of Gujarat that I mean. Similarly, they are willing to live in Bombay in peace if it is only a bilingual State without Vidarbha.

They are patriotic. If supposing Vidarbha also is thrown in or supposing Gujarat is separated and Samyukta Maharashtra is separated with Bombay, then also they could not live. What is this patriotism? Why should these compliments be given to these persons? Therefore, when these questions are discussed and decided, I have to say that the Commission has not fairly dealt with the whole question.

I come to the question of Punjab. Here also another major blunder has been done by the Commission in respect of Punjab. Just now, the hon. Diwan Chaman Lal has said that the slogan of a Punjabi Suba, the demand for a separate Punjabi-speaking State, is a communal one. But, Sir, that very communalism has been expressed right here itself, in this House, when he demanded that they want to expand. The Commission itself has said that if the States reorganisation means linguism or separatism or expansionism or 'exclusivism', it should be rejected. But right here and now he has expressed expansionism, at whose expense, at whose cost? Are the people of those provinces and those regions which he wants to include in the Maha Punjab, willing to that? Recently, the Legislative Assemblies of Punjab, Pepsu and Himachal Pradesh, which have to come together in a single province, as recommended by the S.R.C., have discussed this problem. They have expressed their opinions and what is the result? Sir, in Pepsu, out of 44 persons who spoke 41 persons have supported the formation of Punjab, not the Maha Punjab recommended by the S.R.C., but a Punjabi Suba and only one or two have stood for Maha Punjab. Similarly, in Himachal Pradesh also, they have taken a vote—not only discussed—and there they have rejected this. They want that Himachal Pradesh should be separate. And the voting was 34 for the retention of Himachal Pradesh as a separate province and only 4 for the recommendation of the S.R.C. Similarly, in Punjab also, about 64 persons have spoken on the S.R.C. Report, of whom

52 persons both Hindus and Sikhs—he was telling that this slogan of Punjabi Suba is a Sikh slogan, a communal slogan—of all the parties, whether they are Communists, Congress or others, wanted a Punjabi Suba and Hariana Pranth, not the Maha Punjab as recommended by the S.R.C.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): It is time.

SHRI N. D. M. PRASADARAO: Just two or three minutes more, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): No, please wind up.

SHRI N. D. M. PRASADARAO: Only 11 stood for Maha Punjab. Therefore, it is no use denouncing that the demand for a Punjabi Suba is a communal slogan. Just as other people are demanding, the Punjab people are also demanding. And when you have accepted Punjabi as a national language—as one of the fourteen national languages—when you have accepted them as a linguistic group, they are also demanding a Punjabi Suba. Therefore, it is not a communal slogan. Just in order to deny the Punjabis the right of forming their own State you are giving them a bad name, just as the saying goes; 'give the dog a bad name and kill it'. Similarly, you are giving it a very bad name.

Sir, I will deal with only one more point before I finish. In many of their recommendations the S.R.C. have tried and applied the principle of balancing. This balancing formula is a very dangerous formula. Take the case of Punjab or any other State. Take the case of Maharashtra. They wanted to balance two forces. They have brought in Marathwada to Maharashtra and in order to counter-balance this they have brought in Kutch and Saurashtra. Similarly, they have included a Karnataka area, Bellary taluk etc. in Andhra; and in order to counter-balance and to com-

pensate for that, they have kept the mainly Telugu-speaking area, Kolar, in Karnataka. Sir, they speak of percentages, forty per cent., fifty per cent., sixty per cent. of Sikhs in the Punjab. These balances and counter-balances, these compensations, etc. are not a proper formula. The only proper formula, the only rational and correct formula would have been the formation of States on the basis of language. Even now the time is not over.

2 P.M.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore): Will you on that score allow Bellary to be in the Karnataka State?

SHRI N.D.M. PRASADARAO: Oh yes. Our Party has made it quite clear that the three taluks have arbitrarily been merged in Andhra and that they should have gone to Karnataka. If there are any villages on the border with Telugu majority, they should go to Andhra.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): That is all.

SHRI N. D. M. PRASADARAO: Therefore, this is the correct principle and I hope that the Government will accept it and when the States are reorganised, they would be reformed on that basis.

سید مظہر اسلم (بہار) : سر-

یہ ایس - آر - سی رپورٹ جو ہملوگوں کے سامنے ہاؤس میں لائی گئی ہے اس کے متعلق میں کچھ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں - قبل اس کے کہ میں کچھ کہوں میں ابتدا یہ فرض سمجھتا ہوں کہ کمیشن کے ممبروں کو مبارکباد دوں کہ انہوں نے جو کوشش کی ہے اور اس رپورٹ کو تیار کرنے میں جو محنت کی ہے وہ بہت ہی قابل مبارکباد ہے -

[سید مظہر امام]

اس میں کوئی شک ہے کہ اپنے صوبے کے متعلق مجھے رپورٹ سے اتفاق نہیں ہے۔ وقت کم ہے اس لئے میری رپورٹ پر بولنا نہیں چاہتا مگر بہار کے متعلق میں ہاوس کے سامنے چند باتیں عرض کر دینا ضروری سمجھتا ہوں۔ اس لئے کہ بہار کے دو علاقے اس رپورٹ کے ذریعے بنگال کو دئے گئے ہیں۔ نمبر ۱ - کشن گنج کا علاقہ، نمبر ۲ مان بھوم کے کچھ پارٹس۔ یہ علاقے بنگال کو دئے گئے ہیں۔ میں سب سے پہلے یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ کسی حصہ کو ایک صوبہ سے دوسرے صوبے میں ملا دینے سے مجھے کوئی عذر نہیں ہوتا۔ اس لئے کہ ہندوستان ایک ہے اور کسی پروانس کا کوئی پارٹ کسی پروانس میں رہے یہ ایسی چیز نہیں ہے جس پر اعتراض کیا جائے۔ مگر سوال یہ ہے کہ جب پروانسز کا دستوری بیوشن لینگویسٹک بیسس پر کیا جا رہا ہے۔ کلچرل بیسس پر کیا جا رہا ہے تو دوسرے پروانس کو بھی اصولاً یہ سوچنے کا حق حاصل ہے کہ اس پروانس کے لوگوں کا کلچر بھی وہی ہے یا نہیں جو ان کا خود کا ہے۔ بنگال کا قیامت ایک نو لینگویسٹک بیسس پر ہے اور دوسرے اس بیسس پر ہے کہ وہ رفیوجیز کو بسانے کے لئے علاقہ چاہتے ہیں

میں اس ہاوس کے سامنے یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جہانتک رفیوجیز کے بسانے کا سوال ہے تو صرف بنگال ہی کا حق نہیں ہے کہ ان کے لئے وہ علاقہ کی قیامت کیے۔ رفیوجیز ہندوستان میں آئے ہیں اور وہ ہندوستان کی محبت کے بھوکے ہیں۔ ہر شخص ان کے ساتھ ہمدردی کرنے کے لئے تیار ہے اور جس حصہ میں زمین موجود ہے وہاں ان کو بسانے کے لئے انتظام ہونا چاہیئے۔ یہ گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کی ذیوتی ہے اور اس میں کسی شخص کو کوئی عذر نہیں ہے۔ میں آپ سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ بہار گورنمنٹ نے ہمیشہ اس بات کی کوشش کی ہے کہ ہم اپنے یہاں رفیوجیز کو بسانیں اور ان کو جگہ دیں۔ مگر ہمارے بنگال کے دوست یہ نہیں چاہتے۔ وہ یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ ان کو علاقہ دیا جائے جس میں رفیوجیز بسائے جاسکیں۔ اب سوال یہ بھی پیدا ہوتا ہے کہ بہار کا جو علاقہ بنگال کو دیا گیا ہے وہ رفیوجیز کے بسانے کے لائق ہے یا نہیں۔ اگر وہ علاقہ رفیوجیز کے بسانے کے لائق نہیں ہے تو پھر وہ اسکو لیکر کیا کریں گے۔ جہاں تک زبان کا سوال ہے آپ دیکھئے کہ کشن گنج میں کیا پوزیشن ہے۔ ہمارے بنگالی دوست بہت آسانی سے اس ہاوس میں اور اس ہاوس میں بھی بول

وہ ہیں کہ ہم اس علاقہ کو الگ کر کے
بیسس پر چاہتے ہیں۔ میں اپنے
دوستوں سے پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں کہ
وہ مہذبانی کر کے بتائیں کہ کس
گنچ میں بنکالی بولنے والے لوگوں کا کد
پوسٹلٹیج - ہال کسٹمکٹ میں
بنکالی بولنے والے ص ۳ پوسٹ
میں اور دو یہ حار لاکہ پاپولیشن
کا ایریا ان 'و' دیا گیا ہے اس کے
اندر ان کی پاپولیشن اور 'زی' کم
ہے۔ پہلے میں یہ نہیں کہنا چاہتا۔
کہ وہاں کے لوگ بنکال میں ملنا
چاہتے ہیں یا نہیں۔ میں پہلے
صرف اس رپورٹ کے اس حصہ کو
پڑھ کر سٹائٹنگ جمر سے یہ معلوم
ہو سکے کہ خود کمیشن نے کیا فیصلہ
کیا ہے اور کیا اس نے سمجھا ہے۔
وہ پیراگراف ۶۵۳ ہے جو/سطح ہے۔

"While making this recommenda-
tion we have to take note of the
fact that the eastern portion of the
Kishanganj sub-division is predomi-
nantly inhabited by Muslims who
would view with concern the trans-
fer of this area to West Bengal on
the ground that their linguistic and
cultural rights might suffer and that
the possible resettlement of displace-
d persons from East Bengal might
dislocate their life. These fears are
not without justification. It would,
therefore, be necessary for the West
Bengal Government to take effective
steps such as the recognition of the
special position of Urdu in this area
for educational and official purposes.
The density of population in this
area is such that there is little scope
for any resettlement of displaced
persons. The West Bengal Govern-
ment would, therefore, do well to

make a clear announcement to the
effect that no such resettlement
would be undertaken. This would
go a long way in our opinion in dis-
pelling doubts and fears."

جناب والا - میں یہ عرض کرنا
چاہتا ہوں کہ اس نوٹ کے بعد
ہاؤس کے سامنے یہ مسئلہ صاف ہو
جانا ہے کہ وہاں کی زبان بنگلہ نہیں
ہے۔ حیدرآباد اور کسٹن گنچ دو
ہی ایسی جگہیں ہیں جہاں کے
لئے کمیشن نے اپنی رپورٹ میں
یہ ریکمنڈ کیا ہے کہ اردو کا اسپیشل
انتظام کیا جائے۔ اس سے تمام ہاؤس
کے سامنے یہ مسئلہ صاف ہو جاتا
ہے کہ وہاں بنگلہ زبان نہیں ہے۔
اس نے علاوہ چٹائی گوری اور
درجنگ کو ملانے کے لئے آپ کو
واستہ چاہیئے۔ میں آپ سے یہ
پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں کہ گورنمنٹ آف
انڈیا کی سڑک اور ویلوے سے اگر آپ
کو بہار سے ہو کر جانا پڑتا ہے تو
کیا اس کے لئے آپ کو کوریڈر
چاہیئے۔ کیا یہی نیشنلزم ہے۔ اگر
ہم نہ دیں تو ہم سے کہا جاتا ہے
کہ آپ نیشنلزم کے خلاف بات کرتے
ہیں۔ مگر آپ یہ علاقہ اس وجہ
سے مانگتے ہیں کہ ہم اس علاقہ
سے جاتے ہیں تو ہم اپنی نظروں
سے دیکھیں کہ یہ علاقہ ہمارا ہے
بہار کا نہیں ہے۔ جب ملک ایک
ہے تو ایسا سوال پیدا ہی کہاں
ہوتا ہے کہ علاقہ ہمارا کی طرف

[سید مظہر امام]

سے ہمیشہ یہ کہا گیا کہ اس سوک کو جس طرح سے چاہئے استعمال کیجئے - ہمارے چیف منسٹر شری سر کرشن سنہا نے بنگال گورنمنٹ کو اس ۲۶ میل لمبی سوک کے لئے زمین دی جو نیشنل ہائی وے بنالی گئی ہے جسکا نمبر ۳۴ ہے کہ وہ حسب مرضی اسکو استعمال کر سکتے ہیں مگر اس پر بھی ان کو اتفاق نہیں ہوا ہے - اس سلسلے میں ہمارے چیف منسٹر صاحب نے بہار اسمبلی میں جو آفر کیا ہے اسکو میں ہاؤس کے سامنے پڑھ کر سنا دینا چاہتا ہوں تاکہ رائے کا جو مسئلہ ہے وہ حل ہو جائے -

"The provisions are embodied in Part XIII of the Constitution, and I would refer particularly to articles 301, 302, 304 and 307. I would also refer to item 23 of the Union List under the Seventh Schedule to the Constitution, and the power which the Parliament have by virtue of this item to enact legislation regarding National-Highways. We contend, Sir, that in view of these constitutional provisions, West Bengal can make as full and free a use of the two National-Highways in question now, as they would if the area were transferred to West Bengal. I would go a step further, and declare that, even apart from the constitutional provisions, and any law that Parliament might enact in future, we are prepared to agree to any arrangement regarding the use of these Highways and other allied matters, that the Union Government may desire."

یہ کلہر ڈکلیوریشن ہمارے چیف منسٹر صاحب نے اپنے ہاؤس میں کر دیا ہے - آپ اس نیشنل ہائی وے کو بھی لے لیجئے لیکن پھر بھی وہ اس کے لئے تیار نہیں ہیں -

اب سوال یہ ہے کہ وہاں پر بنگال میں ملنے کے لئے ریشز آف پیوویل نہیں ہیں - اس وقت تک ۱۵ سو سے دو ہزار تک آدمی جیل جا چکے ہیں اور ابھی سٹیٹو گارڈ جاری ہے - ابھی کچھ دن پہلے وہاں ڈاکٹر معصود صاحب کی صدارت میں پولیٹیکل کانفرنس ہوئی تھی جس میں چار لاکھ انسان جمع ہوئے تھے - اس کے علاوہ وہاں ایک مسلم کانفرنس بھی ہوئی تھی جسکو میں نے پریسائیڈ کیا تھا -

ان لوگوں کی بڑی آواز ہے کہ ہم بنگال میں نہیں جائینگے - بنگال کے لوگ یہ کہتے ہیں کہ ہم بہار کا ایریا اس لئے چاہتے ہیں کہ -

"(iv) need for ensuring protection of Bengali culture and heritage amongst the Bengali-speaking people in Bihar."

اس لئے اس ایریا کو آپ چاہتے ہیں کہ اس کو پریٹیکٹ کریں - میں اپنے دوستوں سے انصاف کرنے کے لئے درخواست کروں گا اور دریافت کرنا چاہوں گا کہ جب آپ کو اپنی لینگویج اور کچھ بیماری ہے تو دوسرے کو کیوں نہ بیماری ہوگی - میں حضور کے سامنے یہ رکھنا چاہتا ہوں

کہ اگر ان چار لاکھ لوگوں کو وہاں بھیج دیا جانا ہے تو پھر ان کے بچوں کو تین تین زبانیں پڑھنی ہوں گی۔ اردو پڑھنی ہے اور ہندی بھاشا پڑھنی ہے کیونکہ وہ نیشنل لیگجویج ہے اور اس کے علاوہ ان کو بنگالی بھی پڑھنی ہوگی۔ تو میں پوچھتا چاہتا ہوں کہ کیا تین تین زبانوں کا پڑھنا کوئی آسان کام ہے۔ وہ لوگ جب تک بنگالی لیگجویج نہیں جائیں گے تب تک وہاں کی سروس میں ان کو حصہ نہیں مل پائے گا اور وہاں کی سہیتزن شپ رائٹ کو کیسے صحیح طریقے سے انجوائے کر سکیں گے۔ اس کے معنی یہ ہیں کہ ان کی حیثیت لنگسٹک میٹارٹی کی ہوگی۔ ہمارے دوست نے ابھی کہا ہے کہ وہاں کے مسلمانوں نے کہہ دیا ہے کہ صاحب کیسی بات کا انہیں ڈر اور خوف نہیں ہونا چاہیئے۔ سوال یہاں اور خوف کا نہیں ہے بلکہ سوال یہاں پرنسپل کا ہے۔ انہوں نے مرشد آباد کا نام ہاؤس میں لیا لیکن میں کہتا چاہتا ہوں کہ مرشد آباد کا مسلمان بنگالی چانتا ہے اور بہار کا مسلمان ہندی اور اردو چانتا ہے۔ بہار کے مسلمان کی لیگجویج ہندی اور اردو ہے۔ تو انہیں بنگالی بھی پڑھنی ہوگی اور اس طرح سے وہ ایک میٹارٹی میں ہو کر رہ جائیں گے۔ ہماری آواز وہاں کی اسمبلی میں ایک میٹارٹی کی آواز ہوگی۔ یہ سوال نہیں ہے کہ وہاں

مسلمان کتنے ہیں اور کیسے ہیں۔ اس سے مجھے کوئی مطلب نہیں ہے۔ جو سب سے بڑا سوال ہمارے سامنے ہے وہ تو لیگجویج کا ہے کہ انہیں بین من زبانیں پڑھنی ہوں گی۔

ایس۔ آر۔ سی رپورٹ میں جو ایسورنس دیا گیا ہے اس کو میں نے آپ کے سامنے پڑھا۔ اب میں آپے ہائی کمانڈ ڈاکٹر بی۔ سی۔ رائے کے ایسورنس کو آپ کے سامنے رکھتا چاہتا ہوں۔ ان کو میں صرف چیف منسٹر آف بنگال ہی نہیں سمجھتا ہوں بلکہ ان کو میں ایڈا ہائی کمانڈ بھی سمجھتا ہوں کیونکہ میں ایک کانگریس میں ہوں۔ اس لئے ان کو چیف منسٹر آف بنگال کے ساتھ ہی ساتھ ایڈا ہائی کمانڈ بھی ماننا ہوں۔ میں یہ عرض کروں گا کہ ہائی کمانڈ ہونے کی حیثیت سے ان کو خود غور کرنا چاہیئے کہ آیا یہ بہار کی ذیمانڈ صحیح ہے یا نہیں۔ وہ اپنے اسٹیٹمنٹ میں فرماتے ہیں:--

"No. 7.—With regard to the question of settling refugees in the area to be transferred from Purnea district, the West Bengal Government are prepared to give an undertaking that no refugees will be settled there unless it be by mutual agreement with the local people."

اس کے صاف معنی یہ ہیں کہ ان کے جاکر پوچھیں گے، تو کیا ریفرنڈم لیکر پوچھیں گے، کیسے پوچھیں گے۔ یعنی معنی یہ ہیں کہ جب آپ کے اندر وہ آجائیں گے تو آپ جو

[سید مظہر امام]

چاہیں گے کریں گے - ایس - آر - سی نے کہا ہے کہ پاپولیشن وہاں زیادہ ہے اور جگہ نہیں ہے پھر بھی بلکال گورنمنٹ یہ دہتی ہے کہ ہم ان کو وہاں مسائیں گے - یہ کنڈیشنل تھا اور انہوں نے اس کنڈیشن کو فلفل نہیں کیا اس لئے بھی یہ ایک لیگل پوائنٹ ہے کہ یہ علاقہ ان کو نہیں مل سکتا ہے -

श्री बा० कि० प्र० सिंह : हिटलर ने भी सभी इलाकों को म्यूचुअल एग्रीमेंट से जर्मनी में मिलाया था ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): Another two minutes.

SYED MAZHAR IMAM: Another five minutes and I will finish

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): I am sorry. There are other speakers. We must co-operate.

سید مظہر امام : دوسری چیز

مجھے مان بھوم کے بارے میں عرض کرنی ہے - مان بھوم کے بارے میں انہوں نے جس رائے کو دیا ہے اس کے اندر لینگویج کے گورنمنٹ کو انہوں نے نہیں مانا ہے - ایس - آر - سی - کی رپورٹ میں مان بھوم کے بارے میں لینگویج کے گورنمنٹ کو نہیں مانا گیا - یہ کہا گیا ہے کہ کسانوں پر وہ پروجیکٹ بنا رہے ہیں - میرا خود ساڑھے پانچ کروڑ کا پروویژن فائو ایر پلان میں ہے اور ہم کسانوں پر پروجیکٹ بنائیں گے - اس کے علاوہ وہاں قیما

نالہ ہے - جس کا پانی ہم جمشید پور کو سچلائی کرتے ہیں - اور یہ بھی ہے کہ وہاں سوورن دیکھا رپورٹ ہے جس کے اندر ہم ریزروائر بنا رہے ہیں تاکہ ہم جمشید پور کو ایکسٹرا پانی سچلائی کر سکیں - نو وہ ایڈیا بھی چلا جاتا ہے - اس کا کیا نتیجہ ہوگا - اس کے علاوہ وہاں ان کی ۵۲ پرسنٹ پاپولیشن ہے اور جو دھار کمیٹی نے رپورٹ دی ہے اس میں کہا ہے کہ اگر کسی جگہ ۷۰ پرسنٹ سے کم پاپولیشن ہے تو وہ کبھی بھی نہیں ٹرانسفر کی جا سکتی ہے - اس بنا پر بھی یہ علاقہ ٹرانسفر نہیں ہونا چاہیئے -

دوسری چیز میں یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہمارے دوست کہتے ہیں کہ کشن کالج کا علاقہ اس لئے ہمیں دیدو تاکہ ہم نارتھ بلکال میں جائیں - میں ان سے یہ پوچھتا ہوں کہ ہم دھلیا سے رانچی کیسے جائیں گے - بلکال کے ذریعہ ہی تو ہو کر جانا ہوگا - بلکال کے ہی ریل و روڈ سے ہو کر جانا ہوگا - ان کو یہ ایڈیا دے دیتے ہیں - اسی طرح اگر جمشید پور جائیں گے تو اسی ایڈیا سے پاس کرنا پڑیگا جو کہ بلکال کو دیا جا رہا ہے - تو آپ مجھکو تو بلکال سے ہو کر جانے کو کہتے ہیں لیکن خود نہیں جانا چاہتے - ہم استرازا اگر جاتے ہیں تو بلکال سے

ہو کر جاتے ہیں لیکن ہم نے کیا کبھی کوئی قیامت کیا - اگر کیچمنٹ ایریا کا سوال اٹھایا جاتا ہے تو اولاً اگر کیچمنٹ ہوتا تو ان کا کل جودہ سو ایکواٹر میل ہوتا لیکن اب ان کو تین ہزار اسکوائر میل دیدیا گیا ہے - اگر بہار کیچمنٹ ایریا دیماند کرنے لگے تو وہ یو - پی اور سی - پی سے بہت سا ایریا قیامت کر سکتا ہے - کیونکہ گڈک اور سون دیور میں ہمارے پروجیکٹس موجود ہیں اگر ہم یو - پی سے اور سی - پی سے یہ قیامت کرنے لگیں کہ وہ ایریا ہم کو دیدیا جائے تو کیا یہ مناسب ہوگا - بہار میں قی - بی - سی بنا ہے جس میں کہ ہماری لاکھوں ایکڑ زمین اندر واٹر چلی گئی ہے اور ۲۷ ہزار آدمیوں کو وہاں اپنی زمین چھوڑ دینی پڑی ہے اور مکان چھوڑ دینا پڑا ہے - اس سے کس کو واٹر ملنا ہے - بنگال کو ملتا ہے - بنگال کے لئے ہم نے یہ کیا لیکن ہم نے کسی طرح کا سوال نہیں اٹھایا - کل کو یہ کہا جا سکتا ہے کہ چونکہ ہم اس سے پانی لینے ہیں اس لئے قی - بی - سی - ایریا کو بھی ہمیں دیدو - تو میں گورنمنٹ سے اور اس ہاؤس سے عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ یہ اصول کوئی اصول نہیں ہے - اس اصول پر ہائی کمانڈ کو کوئی فیصلہ نہیں کرنا چاہیئے بلکہ یہ فیصلہ کرنا چاہیئے کہ ہمارا جو ایریا وہاں پر ہے وہ ہمارے پاس

رہے اور ہم وہاں رہیں - میں یہ ضرور عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اگر کسی علاقے کے لوگ یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ ہم وہاں جائیں تو بہار والوں کو اس میں ہرگز عذر نہیں ہے ورنہ آف دی پیوپل لے لی جائیں اور اگر ویشیز آف دی پیوپل یہ ہیں کہ ہم وہاں جائیں تو ہمیں کوئی اعتراض نہیں ہے - اگر دھنباڈ کے علاقہ کے لوگ یعنی پورنیا کے علاقہ کے لوگ اور کشن گڈج کے علاقہ کے لوگ وہاں جانا چاہتے ہیں اور چاہیے ہیں کہ ان کا علاقہ بنگال کو دیدیا جائے تو ہمیں کوئی اعتراض نہیں ہے - ہم تو صرف یہی چاہتے ہیں کہ ویشیز آف دی پیوپل کے خلاف یہ نہیں ہونا چاہیئے - ویشیز آف دی پیوپل کے بارے میں چیف منسٹر آف بنگال نے بھی کہا ہے اور اس اصول کو ایکسیپٹ کر لیا ہے وہ اپنے اسٹیٹمنٹ میں کہتے ہیں -

“That the district of Goalpara as mentioned above should be transferred to West Bengal, if the people in that area are willing to be so transferred.”

اس کے معنی یہ ہیں کہ گولپارہ کے لئے وہ اس پرنسپل کو ایکسیپٹ کرتے ہیں کہ اگر ویشیز آف دی پیوپل ہے تو وہ آئیں - جب آپ اس کے لئے اس اصول کو مانتے ہیں تو کیوں نہیں اس اصول کو دوسرے ایریاز کے لئے بھی مانتے - اگر ویشیز آف دی پیوپل ہیں - تب تو اسکو

[سید مظہر امام]

ٹرانسفر کر دیا جائے اور اگر لوگ نہیں جانا چاہتے ہیں تو پھر ان کو کہیں ٹرانسفر کیا جائے۔ آج بھی آپ دیکھ لیجئے کہ ویشیز آف دی پیوپل کیا ہیں۔ پورنیا میں قریب قریب پندرہ سو آدمی جیل جا چکے ہیں اور جا رہے ہیں۔ اس طرح سے یہ صاف معلوم ہو رہا ہے کہ وہاں لوگوں میں اس کے لئے ان ولنگنڈس ہے۔ میں عرض کروں گا کہ صرف اس بلڈ پر کہ کسی علاقہ میں ۵۲ پرسیلٹ لوگ ایک زبان کے ہیں اور ۴۹ پرسیلٹ لوگ دوسری زبان کے ہیں اس لئے اس علاقہ کو دیکھا جائے میرے خیال میں یہ مناسب نہیں ہے۔

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): You have already taken three minutes extra. Please wind up.

سید مظہر امام : میں یہ عرض

کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ پورنیا علاقہ میں ۵۲ پرسیلٹ لوگ بلگالی زبان کیوں بولتے ہیں۔ اگر وہ ۵۲ پرسیلٹ لوگ بلگالی ہوتے تو بھی مجھے کوئی عذر نہیں ہوتا اور نہ بہار کے لوگوں کو عذر ہوتا وہاں کے جو لوگ ہیں وہ بہاری ہیں ان کی شادی بیٹا بہار ہی میں ہوتے ہیں اور انکا کلچر بہاری ہے۔ چونکہ وہاں زیادہ تر بلگالی اسکولس دے رہے ہیں اس لئے مجبوراً ان کو بلگالی پڑھنی پڑی ہے ان کی بہت بڑی تعداد ایسی ہے

جو کہ ہرگز جانا نہیں چاہتی۔ جو ۵۲ پرسیلٹ کی پاپولیشن ہے وہ بھی بلگالی نہیں ہے۔ اس لئے میں گورنمنٹ سے اور اپنے بلگال کے بھائیوں سے اپیل کروں گا کہ وہ اس چیز پر غور کریں اور سوچیں اور ایسے علاقوں کو اپنے میں کبھی بھی نہ ملائیں جو کہ ان کے ساتھ ملنا نہیں چاہتے ہیں۔ یہ چیز ان کے لئے مناسب نہیں ہے۔ ان دی انٹریسٹ آف دی کلتوری یہی بہتر ہے کہ وہ اس ڈیمانڈ سے باز آئیں۔

آخر میں میں چیف منسٹر آف بلگال سے چٹکو کہ میں چیف منسٹر آف بلگال ہی نہیں سمجھتا ہوں بلکہ اپنا ہائی کمانڈ بھی سمجھتا ہوں اپیل کروں گا کہ وہ بہ حیثیت ہائی کمانڈ کے ہماری اس بات پر خود غور کریں۔

†[सचिव मजहर इमाम (बिहार): सर, यह एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट जो हम लोगों के सामने हाउस में लाई गई है इसके मुताल्लिक में कुछ अर्ज करना चाहता हूं। कबल इसके कि मैं कुछ कहूँ मैं अपना यह फर्ज समझता हूँ कि कमिशन के मम्बरों को मुबारिकबाद दूँ कि उन्होंने जो कोशिश की है और इस रिपोर्ट को तैयार करने में जो मेहनत की है वह बहुत ही काबिले मुबारिकबाद है। इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि अपने सूबा के मुताल्लिक मुझे रिपोर्ट से इत्फाक नहीं है, वक्त कम है इसीलिए मैं पूरी रिपोर्ट पर बोलना नहीं चाहता मगर बिहार के मुताल्लिक में हाउस के सामने चन्द बातें अर्ज कर देना जरूरी समझता हूँ, इसीलिए कि बिहार के दो इलाके इस रिपोर्ट के जरिये बंगाल का दिये

गये हैं: (१) किशनगंज का इलाका (२) मानभूम के कुछ पार्ट्स। यह इलाके बंगाल को दिये गये हैं। मैं सबसे पहले यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि किसी हिस्सा को एक सूबे से दूसरे सूबे में मिला देने से मुझे कोई उजर नहीं, इसीलिए कि हिन्दुस्तान एक है और किसी प्रॉविंस का कोई पार्ट किसी प्रॉविंस में रहे यह ऐसी चीज नहीं है कि जिस पर एतराज किया जाये मगर सवाल यह है कि जब प्रॉविसेज का डिस्ट्रीब्शन लिग्विस्टिक बेसिस पर किया जा रहा है, कल्चरल बेसिस पर किया जा रहा है, तो दूसरे प्रॉविंस को भी असलन यह सोचने का हक हासिल है कि इस प्रॉविंस के लोगों का कल्चर भी वही है या नहीं जो इन्तला खुद का है। बंगाल का डिमान्ड एक तो लिग्विस्टिक बेसिस पर है और दूसरे इस बेसिस पर है कि रिफ्यूजीयों को बसाने के लिए इलाका चाहते हैं। मैं इस हाउस के सामने यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि जहां तक रिफ्यूजीज के बसाने का सवाल है तो सिर्फ बंगाल ही का हक नहीं है कि इसके लिए वह इलाके की डिमान्ड करे, रिफ्यूजीज हिन्दुस्तान में आये हैं और वह हिन्दुस्तान की मुहब्बत के भूखे हैं। हर शख्स इनके साथ हमदर्दी करने के लिए तैयार है और हिन्दुस्तान के जिस हिस्सा में जमीन मौजूद है वहां इनको बसाने के लिए इन्तजाम होना चाहिए। यह गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की ड्यूटी है और इसमें किसी शख्स को कोई उजर नहीं है। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि बिहार गवर्नमेंट ने हमेशा इस बात की कोशिश की है कि हम अपने यहाँ रिफ्यूजीज को बसायें और उनको जगह दें। मगर हमारे बंगाल के दोस्त यह नहीं चाहते; वह यह चाहते हैं कि इनको इलाका दिया जाय जिसमें रिफ्यूजीज बसाये जा सकें। अब सवाल यह भी पैदा होता है कि बिहार का जो इलाका बंगाल को दिया गया है वह रिफ्यूजीज के बसाने के लायक है या नहीं। अगर वह इलाका रिफ्यूजीज के बसाने के लायक नहीं है तो फिर वह इसको लेकर क्या

करेंगे? जहां तक जवान का सवाल है आप दीखिए कि किशनगंज में क्या पोजीशन है। हमारे बंगाली दोस्त बहुत आसानी से इस हाउस में और उस हाउस में भी बोल रहे हैं कि हम इस इलाका को लिग्विस्टिक बेसिस पर चाहते हैं। मैं अपने दोस्तों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि वह मेहरबानी करके बतायें कि किशनगंज में बंगाली बोलने वालों का क्या परसेंटज है। होल डिस्ट्रिक्ट में बंगाली बोलने वाले सिर्फ २ परसेंट हैं और जो यह चार लाख पोपुलेशन का एरिया इनको दिया गया है इसके अन्दर इनकी पोपुलेशन और भी कम है। पहले मैं यह नहीं कहना चाहता कि वहां के लोग बंगाल में मिलना चाहते हैं या नहीं; मैं पहले सिर्फ इस रिपोर्ट के इस हिस्सा को पढ़कर सुनाऊंगा जिससे यह मालूम हो सके कि खुद कमीशन ने क्या फैसला किया है और क्या इसने समझा है। वह पैराग्राफ ६५३ है जो इस तरह है :

"While making this recommendation we have to take note of the fact that the eastern portion of the Kishanganj Sub-division is predominantly inhabited by Muslims who would view with concern the transfer of this area to West Bengal on the ground that their linguistic and cultural rights might suffer and that the possible resettlement of displaced persons from East Bengal might dislocate their life. These fears are not without justification. It would, therefore, be necessary for the West Bengal Government to take effective steps such as the recognition of the special position of Urdu in this area for educational and official purposes. The density of population in this area is such that there is little scope for any re-settlement of displaced persons. The West Bengal Government would, therefore, do well to make a clear announcement to the effect that no such re-settlement would be undertaken. This would go a long way in our opinion in dispelling doubts and fears."

[संयद मजहर इमाम]

जनावेवाला, मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि इस नोट के बाद हाउस के सामने यह मसला साफ हो जाता है कि वहाँ की जवान बगला नहीं हैं। हैदराबाद और किशनगंज दो ही ऐसी जगह हैं जहाँ के लिए कमीशन ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में यह रिकमेंड किया है कि उर्दू का स्पेशल इन्तजाम किया जाय। इससे तमाम हाउस के सामने यह मसला साफ हो जाता है कि वहाँ बंगला जवान नहीं हैं।

इसके अलावा जलपाइगुरी और दार्जिलिंग को मिलाने के लिए आपको रास्ता चाहिए। मैं आपसे यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इण्डिया की सड़क और रेलवे से अगर आपको बिहार से होकर जाना पड़ता है तो क्या इसके लिए आपको कोरीडर चाहिए? क्या यही नेशनलीज्म है? अगर हम न दें तो हमसे कहा जाता है कि आप नेशनलीज्म के खिलाफ बात करते हैं। मगर आप यह इलाका इस वजह से मांगते हैं कि हम इस इलाका से जाते हैं तो हम अपनी नजरों से देखें कि यह इलाका हमारा है, बिहार का नहीं है। जब मुल्क एक है तो ऐसा सवाल पैदा ही कहाँ होता है? इस के अलावा बिहार की तरफ से हमें यह कहा गया कि इस सड़क को जिस तरह से चाहिए इस्तेमाल कीजिए। हमारे चीफ मिनिस्टर श्री श्रीकृष्ण सिन्हा ने बंगाल गवर्नमेंट से इस २५ मील लम्बी सड़क के लिए जमीन दी जो नेशनल हाईवे बनाई गई है जिसका नम्बर ३४ है कि वह हस्बे मर्जी इसको इस्तेमाल कर सकते हैं। मगर इस पर भी उनको इत्तफाक नहीं हुआ है। इस सिलसिला में हमारे चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब ने बिहार असेम्बली में जो आफर किया है उसको मैं हाउस के सामने पढ़ कर सुना देना चाहता हूँ ताकि रास्ते का जो मसला है वह हल हो जाय :

"The provisions are embodied in Part XIII of the Constitution, and I would refer particularly to articles 301, 302, 304 and 307. I would also refer to item 23 of the Union List under the Seventh

Schedule to the Constitution, and the power which the Parliament have by virtue of this item to enact legislation regarding National Highways. We contend, Sir, that in view of these constitutional provisions, West Bengal can make as full and free a use of the two National-Highways in question now, as they would if the area were transferred to West Bengal. I would go a step further, and declare that even apart from the constitutional provisions, and any law that Parliament might enact in future, we are prepared to agree to any arrangement regarding the use of these Highways and other allied matters, that the Union Government may desire."

यह किलियर डिक्लेरेशन हमारे चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब ने अपन हाउस में कर दिया है। आप इस नेशनल हाईवे को भी ले लीजिए लेकिन फिर भी वह इसके लिए तैयार नहीं हैं।

अब सकल यह है कि वहाँ पर बंगाल में मिलने के लिए विशिष्ट आफ पीपल नहीं हैं। इस वक्त तक १५०० से २००० तक आदमी जेल जा चुके हैं और अभी सत्याग्रह जारी है। अभी कुछ दिन पहले वहाँ डा० महमूद साहब की सदरत में पोलिटिकल कान्फ्रेंस हुई थी जिसमें ४ लाख इन्सान जमा हुए थे। इसके अलावा वहाँ एक मुस्लिम कान्फ्रेंस भी हुई थी जिस को मैंने प्रिंसाइड किया था। इन लोगों की यही आवाज है कि बंगाल में नहीं जायेंगे। बंगाल के लोग यह कहते हैं कि हम बिहार का एरिया इसीलिए चाहते हैं कि :

(iv) need for ensuring protection of Bengali culture and heritage amongst the Bengali-speaking people in Bihar "

इसलिए इस एरिया को आप चाहते हैं कि इसको प्रोटेक्ट करें। मैं अपने दोस्तों से इन्साफ करने के लिए दूरखास्त करूंगा और दरयाफत करना चाहूंगा कि जब आपको अपनी

लॅंग्वेज और कल्चर प्यारी हैं तो दूसरों को क्यों न प्यारी होगी ?

मैं हुजूर के सामने यह रखना चाहता हूँ कि अगर इन चार लाख लोगों को वहाँ भेज दिया जाता है तो फिर इनके बच्चों को तीन तीन जबानें पढ़नी होंगी। उर्दू पढ़नी है और हिन्दी भाषा पढ़नी है क्योंकि वह नेशनल लॅंग्वेज है और इसके अलावा उनको बंगाली भी पढ़नी होगी। तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या तीन तीन जबानों का पढ़ना कोई आसान काम है ? वह लोग जब तक बंगाली लॅंग्वेज नहीं जानेंगे तब तक वहाँ की सर्विस में इनको हिस्सा नहीं मिल पायेगा और वहाँ की सिटीजनशिप के राइट को कैसे सही तरीके से एन्जाय कर सकेंगे। इसके मायने यह है कि इनकी हैसियत लिंग्विस्टिक मायनॉरिटी की होगी। हमारे दोस्त ने अभी कहा है कि वहाँ के मुसलमानों ने कह दिया है कि साहब किसी बात का इन्हें डर और खौफ नहीं होना चाहिए। सवाल यहाँ डर और खौफ का नहीं है बल्कि सवाल यहाँ प्रिंसिपल का है। इन्होंने मुर्शिदाबाद का नाम हाउस में लिया लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मुर्शिदाबाद का मुसलमान बंगाली जानता है और बिहार का मुसलमान हिन्दी और उर्दू जानता है। बिहार के मुसलमानों की लॅंग्वेज हिन्दी और उर्दू है तो इन्हें बंगाली भी पढ़नी होगी और इस तरह से वह एक मायनॉरिटी में होकर रह जायेंगे। हमारी आवाज वहाँ की असेम्बली में एक मायनॉरिटी की आवाज होगी। यह सवाल नहीं है कि वहाँ मुसलमान कितने हैं और कैसे हैं। इससे मुझे कोई मतलब नहीं है। जो सबसे बड़ा सवाल हमारे सामने है वह तो लॅंग्वेज का है कि इन्हें तीन तीन जबानें पढ़नी होंगी।

एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट में जो एशोरेंस दिया गया है उसको मैंने आपके सामने पढ़ा अब मैं अपने हाईकमांड डा० बी० सी० राय के एक्सेलेंस को आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। उनको मैं सिर्फ चीफ मिनिस्टर आफ बंगाल ही नहीं समझता हूँ बल्कि उनको मैं अपना हाईकमांड भी समझता हूँ क्योंकि मैं एक

कांग्रेस मैन हूँ। इसलिए उनको चीफ मिनिस्टर आफ बंगाल के साथ ही साथ अपना हाईकमांड भी मानता हूँ। मैं यह अर्ज करूंगा कि हाईकमांड होने की हैसियत से उनको खुद कराना चाहिए कि आया यह बिहार की डिमान्ड सही है या नहीं वह अपने स्टेटमेंट में फरमाते हैं :

"No. 7.—With regard to the question of settling refugees in the area to be transferred from Purnea district, the West Bengal Government are prepared to give an undertaking that no refugees will be settled there unless it be by mutual agreement with the local people."

इसके साफ माने यह है कि उनसे जाकर पूछेंगे। तो क्या रिफ्रैंडम लेकर पूछेंगे कैसे पूछेंगे यानी मानी यह है कि जब आपके अन्दर डर आ जायेंगे तो आप जो चाहेंगे करेंगे। उन्होंने खुद कहा है कि पोपुलेशन वहाँ ज्यादा है और जगह नहीं है फिर भी बंगाल गवर्नमेंट यह कहती है कि हम इनको वहाँ बसायेंगे। यह कन्डीशनल था और उन्होंने इस कन्डीशन को फुलफिल नहीं किया इसलिए भी यह एक लीगल प्वाइंट है कि इलाका उनको नहीं मिल सकता है।

श्री ब० कि० प्र० सिंह : हिटलर ने भी सभी इलाकों को म्यूचुअल एग्रीमेंट से जर्मनी में मिलाया था।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): Another two minutes.

SYED MAZHAR IMAM: Another five minutes and I will finish.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): I am sorry. There are other speakers. We must co-operate.

सैयद मजहर इमाम : दूसरी चीज मुझे मानभूम के बारे में अर्ज करनी है। मानभूम के बारे में उन्होंने जिस राय को दिया है उसके अन्दर लॅंग्वेज के क्वेश्चन को उन्होंने नहीं माना है। एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट में

[संयुक्त मजहर इमाम]

मानभूम के बारे में लैंग्वेज के क्वेश्चन को नहीं माना गया है। यह कहा गया है कि कसाई रीवर पर वे प्रोजेक्ट बना रहे हैं। मेरा खुद साई पांच करोड़ का प्रोजेक्शन "फाइव इयर प्लान" में है और हम कसाई रीवर पर प्रोजेक्ट बनायेंगे। इसके अलावा वहां डैमना नाला है जिसका पानी हम जमशेदपुर को सप्लाई करते हैं। और यह भी है कि वहां स्पर्श रेखा रीवर है जिसके अन्दर हम रिजर्वीयर बना रहे हैं ताकि हम जमशेदपुर को एक्सट्रा पानी सप्लाई कर सकें। तो वह एरिया भी चला जाता है। इसका क्या नतीजा होगा? इसके अलावा वहां इनकी ५२ परसेंट पोपुलेशन है और जो धार कमेटी ने रिपोर्ट दी है उसमें कहा है कि अगर किसी जगह ७० परसेंट से कम पोपुलेशन है तो वह कभी भी नहीं ट्रांसफर की जा सकती है। इस बिना पर भी यह इलाका ट्रांसफर नहीं होना चाहिए।

दूसरी चीज में यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि हमारे दोस्त कहते हैं कि क्रिशनगंज का इलाका इसलिए हमें दे दो ताकि हम नार्थ बंगाल में जायें। मैं इनसे यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि हम धनबाद से रांची कैसे जायेंगे। बंगाल के जरिए ही तो होकर जाना होगा। बंगाल के ही रेल व रोड से होकर जाना होगा, अगर इन को यह एरिया दे देंगे। इसी तरह अगर जमशेदपुर जायेंगे तो इसी एरिया से पास करना पड़ेगा जो कि बंगाल को दिया जा रहा है। तो आप मुझको तो बंगाल से होकर जाना को कहते हैं लेकिन खुद नहीं जाना चाहते। हम जामतारा अगर जाते हैं तो बंगाल से होकर जाते हैं लेकिन हमने क्या कभी कोई डिमान्ड किया? अगर कैचमेंट एरिया का सवाल उठाया जाता है तो अव्वलन अगर कैचमेंट होता तो उनका कुल १४०० स्क्वायर मील होता लेकिन अब उनको तीन हजार स्क्वायर मील दे दिया गया है। अगर बिहार कैचमेंट एरिया डिमान्ड करने लगे तो वह ५० पी० और सी० पी० से बहुत सा एरिया डिमान्ड कर सकता है

क्याँकि गंडक और सोन रीवर में हमारे प्रोजेक्ट्स मौजूद हैं अगर हम ५० पी० से और सी० पी० से यह डिमान्ड करने लगे कि वह एरिया हमको दे दिया जाय तो क्या यह मुनासिब होगा। बिहार में ६० बी० सी० बना है जिसमें कि हमारी लाखों एकड़ जमीन अन्डर वाटर चली गई है और २७ हजार आदिमियों को वहा अपनी जमीन छोड़ देनी पड़ी है और मकान छोड़ देने पड़े हैं। इससे किसको वाटर मिलता है? बंगाल को मिलता है। बंगाल के लिए हमने यह किया लेकिन हमने किसी तरह का सवाल नहीं उठाया। कल को यह कहा जा सकता है कि चूंकि हम इससे पानी लेते हैं इसीलिए ६० बी० सी० एरिया को भी हमें दे दो। तो गवर्नमेंट से और इस हाउस से अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि यह उसूल कोई उसूल नहीं है। इस उसूल पर हाईकमान्ड को कोई फँसला नहीं करना चाहिए। बल्कि यह फँसला करना चाहिए कि हमारा जो एरिया वहा पर है वह हमारे पास रहे और हम वहां रहें। मैं यह जरूर अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि अगर किसी इलाके के लोग यह चाहते हैं कि हम वहां जायें तो बिहार वालों को इसमें हररिगंज उज्ज नहीं है। विशेष आफ दी पीपिल ले ली जाय और अगर विशेष आफ दी पीपिल यह है कि हम वहां जायें तो हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है। अगर धनबाद के इलाका के लोग यानी पूर्णिया के इलाके के लोग और क्रिशनगंज के इलाके के लोग वहां जाना चाहते हैं और चाहते हैं कि उनका इलाका बंगाल को दे दिया जाय तो हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है। हम तो सिर्फ यही चाहते हैं कि विशेष आफ दी पीपिल के खिलाफ यह नहीं होना चाहिए। विशेष आफ दी पीपिल के बारे में चीफ मिनिस्टर आफ बंगाल ने भी कहा है और इस उसूल को एक्सेप्ट कर लिया है। वह अपने स्टेटमेंट में कहते हैं :

"That the district of Goalpara as mentioned above should be transferred to West Bengal, if the people in that area are willing to be so transferred."

इसके मायने यह है कि गोलपाड़ा के लिए अगर वह इस प्रिंसिपल को एक्सेप्ट करते हैं कि अगर विरोज आफ दी पीपल हैं तो वह आयें। जब आप इसके लिए इस उसूल को मानते हैं तो क्यों नहीं इस असूल को दूसरे एरियाज के लिए भी मानते? अगर विरोज आफ दी पीपल हैं तब तो इस को ट्रांसफर कर दिया जाय और अगर लोग नहीं जाना चाहते हैं तो फिर उनको क्यों ट्रांसफर किया जाय? आज भी आप देख लीजिए कि पिंशज आफ दी पीपल क्या हैं पूर्णिया में करीब करीब १५०० आदमी जेल जा चुके हैं और जा रहे हैं। इस तरह से यह साफ मालूम हो रहा है कि वहां लोगों में इसके लिए अनविर्गलगनेस है। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि सिर्फ इस बिना पर कि किसी इलाका में ५२ परसेंट लोग एक जवान के हैं और ४८ परसेंट लोग दूसरी जवान के हैं इसलिए इस इलाका को दे दिया जाय, मेरे स्थान में यह मुनासिब नहीं है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): You have already taken three minutes extra. Please wind up

सचिव मजहर इमाम : मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि पूर्णिया इलाका में ५२ परसेंट लोग बंगाली जवान क्यों बोलते हैं। अगर वह ५२ परसेंट लोग बंगाली होते तो भी मुझे कोई उजर नहीं होता और न बिहार के लोगों को उजर होता। वहां के जो लोग हैं वह बिहारी हैं उनकी शादी ब्याह बिहार में ही होते हैं और उनका कल्चर बिहारी है। चूंकि वहां ज्यादातर बंगाली स्कूल्स रहे हैं इसलिए मजबूरन उनको बंगाली पढनी पड़ी है। उनकी बहुत बड़ी लड़ाव ऐसी है जो कि हरगिज जाना नहीं चाहती। जो ५२ परसेंट की पोपुलेशन है वह भी बंगाली नहीं हैं इसलिए मैं गवर्नमेंट से और अपने बंगाल के भाइयों से अपील करूंगा कि वह इस चीज पर गौर करें और सोचें और ऐसे इलाकों को अपने में कभी भी न मिलायें जो कि उनके साथ मिलना नहीं चाहते हैं। यह चीज इनके लिए मुनासिब नहीं है।

‘इन दी इनटरस्ट आफ दी कन्ट्री’ यही बेहतर है कि वह इस डिमान्ड से बाज आयें।

आखिर में मैं चीफ मिनिस्टर आफ बंगाल से जिनको कि मैं चीफ मिनिस्टर आफ बंगाल ही नहीं समझता हूं बल्कि अपना हाईकमान्ड भी समझता हूं, अपील करूंगा कि वह बाहेंसियत हाईकमान्ड के हमारी इस बात पर खुद गौर करें।

SHRI LAVJI LAKHAMSHI (Kutch). Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am straightway coming to the proposals with regard to the State which affects my State. That is because of the time limit that you are trying to rigorously impose, not that I do not attach importance to the other provisions that are made in this Report, and particularly the proposals and the recommendations which are made in Part IV of the Report, but for want of time, I would not like to give my opinion on them. I would only say that those particular recommendations which are contained in Part IV should be accepted in toto in the interest of the nation.

Now, Sir, coming to the proposals made with regard to the Bombay State, we find that the Commission has proposed the new State of Bombay comprising the Marathi-speaking areas, Saurashtra and Kutch. In this composite State the Marathi-speaking people will number about 2 crores and 30 lakhs, and the Gujarati-speaking people will be about 1 crore and 60 lakhs. Apparently, Gujaratis are in minority. Sir, the three great statesmen, while making these recommendations, have expressed certain hopes, and their hopes are contained in their Report on page 121, paragraph 439, where they state as follows:

“Having regard to these recommendations and to the traditions of tolerance which have so far been characteristic of the existing Bombay State, the arrangements proposed by us, which bring together all the Gujarati-speaking people and

[Shri Lavji Lakhamshi]

also a great majority of the Marathi speaking people will, we hope, be worked in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and good will."

That was the hope on which they based this proposal whereby a minority of the people is proposed to be placed along with a majority of the people. By these proposals, Sir, the linguistic aspirations of my Marathi-speaking brethren are more than satisfied. They get one State, Vidarbha, with an absolute majority. That is a unilingual State. In the proposed State, they go in a majority of over 70 lakhs. But the linguistic aspirations of the Gujaratis have not been fulfilled. And yet Gujarat accepted it. Saurashtra, Kutch and other Gujarati speaking areas were sought to be added to the proposed new State. It is not that we had no linguistic aspirations of our own but with a certain amount of trepidation, we accepted it because the great statesmen expected from us the spirit of accommodation and tolerance. But, Sir, I regret to find that this spirit has been misinterpreted by various speakers, various leaders, who claim themselves to be the leaders of Marathi speaking areas. They think that in the matter of division of offices and the distribution of loaves and fishes, by some permutation and combination the Gujaratis, although in a minority, will be enjoying the fruits of majority. Certainly, Sir, the Gujarati speaking people did not expect that spirit. It stands to commonsense that it is not possible for any minority to exercise that sort of influence or that sort of power grabbing. As a matter of fact, Sir, it is claimed—and I concede it and accept it—that the Marathi-speaking people, that the Maharashtrians, have made great sacrifices for the liberation of this country, and they have rendered a great service in the cause of the country in the various spheres of life. I, on behalf of Gujarat, can also lay our claim, our humble claim. We have also done our best in that direction. But surely that is

not the criterion for dividing a territory. They cannot say "Oh, this area should be given to us simply because we have done a great service, or we have made some sacrifices." But despite their linguistic aspirations not having been conceded, the Gujaratis were going in a minority into the State with a certain amount of trepidation, hoping, of course, that there would be cordial relations. But unfortunately we were misinterpreted. If we have been misinterpreted, we do not mind it, it is perfectly all right. But to add insult to injury, my friend, the then MPCC chief says "A Gujarati thinks always in terms of rupees annas and pies, but we think in terms of Mega Dud and Kalidasa" as if the whole of Gujarat consists of those *bambas* who think in terms of rupees, annas and pies. (An hon. Member: What about Gandhiji?) I would not like to name that divine personality. He belonged not only to Gujarat, but to the whole world. I simply wish that the Chief of the MPCC had not made these remarks and hurt us in the way in which he did.

Then, Sir, certain other speeches have been made by my friend, Mr N V Gadgil, and by certain other friends that the capitalists will exploit the situation. That is why I say, Sir, that the spirit has not been properly understood. Unfortunately, Well, if that spirit is not understood, we on behalf of Gujaratis, or at least on behalf of Kutchis, would like to say that we would not like to go into partnership with those who are not going to understand the spirit with which that partnership is going to work or is expected to work. Mr Deo girikar has quoted Mahatma Gandhi, his letters, his speeches, his writings, in support of linguism. Well, Sir, linguism, in its proper perspective, is a very good thing. As a matter of fact, our three great statesmen have more or less accepted this idea of linguism, and as a result of that, they have recommended thirteen or fourteen States on linguistic considerations. In so far as the

Bombay State is concerned, they have made their recommendations subject to one condition that they shall have to work with mutual goodwill. If this goodwill is not forthcoming, then this State cannot work. And now, the visible manifestation of that goodwill is lacking, in so far as our brethren are concerned. Certainly, we abide by the recommendation made by the Commission. Sir, this is almost the unanimous view, and they say that this is after all the best recommendation or the best solution of this tangled problem. Yet it does not find favour with them. We have also gone in with a certain amount of trepidation. But, Sir, now when this thing is being interpreted in terms of the loaves and fishes of office, and when we are being discarded, certainly we cannot agree to this. Although it is the best solution to the problem, we cannot accept it with any amount of confidence in the State which has been proposed by the SRC. And if that is so the problem boils down to this: What should be done about this Bombay City? That is the problem which is posed. With regard to the solution of the problem relating to the city of Bombay, I would like to say that the material which has been gathered during the last so many months and years is voluminous.

We have all the material before us from which to judge this question of Bombay City. As a matter of fact, I think that both sides have presented their case one way or the other. My friend Mr Dhage, wants to discard the memorandum that was submitted on behalf of the Citizens Committee. I would only ask the hon. Members of this House to go through it and read it. It gives any amount of material for judging the question; you may judge it one way or the other, but the material is there, considerable amount of material for you to take your decisions on. My hon. friend, Mr Dhage's strange logic is "It comes from Mr H. R. D. Tata, Mr Purushotamdas Thakurdas and others and therefore it should be discarded". It is really a very strange logic. It should

be rejected not for what it contains but it should be rejected on the basis of the quarter from which it comes. It is a highly intolerant mind that would reject it simply because it comes from persons whom you call capitalists. Sir, what is capitalism? We have accepted it. It is a historical phase that we have got capitalism. It is a historical phase in this country that we had the Rajas, the rulers, but the spirit of this great country, the ancient culture of this country, the great leaders of this country, demanded that these rulers should give up their power, and they willingly gave up their power. It stands to the greatness of this country that such a thing has happened only in this country that Kings gave up their power willingly. Such a marvellous thing has happened. You have placed before yourselves the ideal of a socialistic pattern of society and tomorrow you will find that these very capitalists, in a co-operative spirit, in true national spirit will give up all that they have.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh) People are giving away their lands in Bhoomidan.

SHRI LAVJI LAKHAMSHI Quite right. My only submission, my only respectful submission, to the Members of this House is, 'Please do not abuse your fellow citizens'. If tomorrow you want that the same capitalists should surrender their entire wealth in the national interests, I am sure the Chandulals and Jains, in true national spirit will completely co-operate with you.

Sir, I said that you must try to go through the material that is placed before you. I admire also Prof. D. H. Gadgil, who has also placed material before the Commission for judging the case of Bombay one way or the other. A lot of material has been given. Then after considering this material these three great statesmen have come to the conclusion that Bombay City cannot form part of any bilingual area. Before this, this very

[Shri Lavji Lakhamshi.] question of the Bombay City came in for consideration by Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Patel and Pattabhi Sitaramayya. They also came to the conclusion that the City of Bombay cannot form part of any unilingual area; if unfortunately the question ever cropped up of dividing Gujarat and Maharashtra, then the City of Bombay should become a City State. A third impartial tribunal, the Dar Commission, also came to the same conclusion. I will prove it that from the material that is available, there will be no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that the City of Bombay cannot form part of any unilingual area. There is a lot of material one way or the other. I would submit only one point. They say, 'There is Calcutta, there is Madras, there are so many cities which can form City States, if you make a City State of Bombay'. I would submit only one thing, that this is industrially a highly advanced city; culturally, educationally and in politics also, it is a highly advanced city, with a great public life, with a population of 35 lakhs. These people ought to be considered. What is their desire? That is one thing. The next thing is whether it is really part of any unilingual area or any geographical area? It is said that geographically it is part of Maharashtra. I would only submit that the various maps given in the Memorandum of the Citizens Committee will show that geographically even it cannot form part of that area. Take the rainfall of Maharashtra and the rainfall of that area; take the vegetation that grows there. From no point whatsoever can it be claimed as a part of Maharashtra. Our Mahamahopadhyaya Kane said that he was thinking of the ancient geography of Maharashtra. Well, geography does not change with the passage of time

DR W S BARLINGAY (Madhya Pradesh): Is Konkan part of Maharashtra or not?

SHRI LAVJI LAKHAMSHI: Konkan is not part of Maharashtra. There is one criterion that a common man like

me would like to place before this hon. House. Take any person from any part of India and send him to Bombay. He will find that the little things that he does, the little ways that he has got, are to be found in Bombay also. There is an atmosphere about the Bombay City. If I were to wear my dhoti in a particular way, I find it in Bombay also. If I were to have a particular way of using *dantan*, I will find it in Bombay also. It is spread all over the city. In other words, this city is miniature India. Having regard to that and all these considerations, all the impartial tribunals after tribunals have come to this conclusion, except of course my Maharashtrian friends, that it should be made into a separate State if unfortunately we are forced to the conclusion that Gujarat and Maharashtra should be separated. It is true that now we cannot go back to the proposal that the Gujaratis and Maharashtrians should remain together. It will be wrong because we are suspect. It does not arouse our confidence either

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Who are the suspects, not the people but the leaders?

SHRI LAVJI LAKHAMSHI: The leaders of Maharashtra are suspect, because they are promising that, if we don't concede their demands, the matter will be settled in the streets of Bombay. These are the leaders of Maharashtra. I did not want to speak about that. I wanted to avoid all this passion. It is hardly becoming that women should be molested, it is hardly becoming that public property should be burnt, it is hardly becoming for these persons, for these leaders, to claim later that they bared their chests to firing. In this atmosphere you don't expect

DR W S BARLINGAY: Do you contend that Maharashtrian society consists of hooligans?

SHRI LAVJI LAKHAMSHI: In this atmosphere, in so far as Kutch's con-

cerned, we do not want to enter into these troubled waters. Thank you, Sir.

श्री एन० बी० दशमुख (हैदराबाद): मैं तत्करीब शुरू करने के साथ साथ एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट का अभिनन्दन करना चाहता हूँ। चूँकि मैं हैदराबाद से आया हूँ और कमीशन ने हैदराबाद का डिस्ट्रिक्टिगेशन (विभाजन) करने का कहा है, मैं उसका अभिनन्दन करना चाहता हूँ। हमारा हैदराबाद बर्दकिस्मती से तीन मुखत-लिफ जवानों के बोलने वाले लोगों का एक अनसर्गिक मजमुआ है जिसकी वजह से हम वहाँ पर किसी तरह की तरक्की नहीं कर सकते थे और हम बिल्कुल बैकवर्ड थे, बिल्कुल पीछे पड़े हुए थे। हैदराबाद का विभाजन करके कमीशन ने हमें तरक्की करने का मौका दिया है। दूसरी चीज जो कमीशन ने की है वह यह है कि हैदराबाद मीडिकल एजेंज की बुराइयों का एक सेंटर बना हुआ था, हैदराबाद की तरफ मीडिकल एजेंज के सेंटर के तौर पर सब जनता देखती थी, वह अब हमेशा के लिए खत्म हो जाएगा। कमीशन ने जो तीसरा अच्छा काम किया है वह यह है कि राजप्रमुख पद खत्म कर दिया है और वह निजामशाही जो बहुत जमाने से चली आ रही थी, उसका खात्मा किया है। चौथी चीज, जो इस कमीशन ने की है, वह यह है कि सू० एन० ओ० में पाकिस्तान की तरफ से जो हैदराबाद का सवाल बार बार रखा जाता था उस का हमेशा के लिए खात्मा कर दिया है। इस तरह से यह चीजें उन्होंने की हैं जिनके लिए हमारा यह कमीशन काबिले मुबारकबाद है। लेकिन इन तीनों इलाकों को अलग करने का जो सुझाव इस कमीशन ने पेश किया है, अफसोस है कि उसमें कमीशन ने किसी उराल को सामने नहीं रखा है। मैं मिसाल के तौर पर अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि हैदराबाद के मराठवाड़ी इलाके में दो पांच जिले उन्होंने अलग किए हैं, लेकिन दो और जिले ऐसे हैं, बीदर और अदिलाबाद, जिनमें मराठी बोलने वाले लोग काफी तादाद में मौजूद हैं। यह होने के बावजूद भी उन्होंने बीदर और अदिलाबाद को तिलंगाना में शामिल किया है। बीदर जिले को तिलंगाना में

शामिल करते वक़्त कमीशन ने यह कहा है कि हमारा यही उद्देश्य है कि हम जिले का विभाजन नहीं करेंगे। उन्होंने यह तसलीम किया है कि बीदर जिला बहुभाषी मराठीभाषी है और यह हालत होते हुए भी उन्होंने एक अजीब आर्ग्यूमेंट सामने रखा है और वह आर्ग्यूमेंट यह है कि बीदर जिले से एक रेल जाती है जो सीधे हैदराबाद को जाती है और बीदर जिले से एक नेशनल हाईवे जाती है। लेकिन कमीशन ने इस चीज को नजर अन्दाज किया है कि जो रेल हैदराबाद को जाती है वह रेल पूना और बम्बई तक पहुँचती है। एक तरफ से नेशनल हाईवे हैदराबाद को जाती है तो दूसरी तरफ से अहमद पुर, निलंगा और लातूर से होते हुए पूना को भी एक रास्ता जाता है और वह बहुत पक्की सड़क है, ऐसा मैं समझता हूँ। इस तरह से यह होने के बावजूद चूँकि तेलंगाने को उनको अलग रखना था, मेजरिटी मराठवाड़ी का जिला उसको बहाल किया गया। तहाँ की पापुलेशन के लिहाज से बीदर जिले की पापुलेशन ११ लाख है और उसमें से साढ़े चार लाख लोग मराठी बोलने वाले हैं, सवा तीन लाख कन्नड़ी बोलने वाले हैं, तकरीबन दो लाख लोग उर्दू बोलने वाले हैं और पाँच लाख तेलगू बोलने वाले हैं जिनको यह जिला दिया गया है। ये मराठी बोलने वाले लोग इन्टर मिनिगल्ड नहीं हैं बल्कि उनका अलग हिस्सा है। तो साढ़े चार लाख मराठी बोलने वाले हुए और उर्दू बोलने वाले जो तकरीबन दो लाख हैं, उनमें से एक लाख लोग इस इलाके में बिखरे हुए रहते हैं इस तरह से साढ़े पाँच लाख की ऐसी आबादी बीदर जिले की होती है, अगर बीदर जिले का विभाजन नहीं करना है तो वह मराठवाड़ी के साथ महाराष्ट्र में आना चाहिए था।

[Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

SHRI V. PRASADRAO: Everybody in Telangana is saying that those areas should go to Maharashtra.

श्री राघवेंद्र (हैदराबाद): बीदर शहर में कौन ज्यादा है?

श्री एन० बी० दशमुख : बीदर शहर में कन्नड़ लोग ज्यादा हैं, मैं मानता हूँ।

श्री राघवेन्द्र : पहले यह कर्नाटक में था।

श्री एन० बी० दशमुख : तेलगू बोलने वाले लोग भी चाहते हैं कि इसका विभाजन किया जाए, लेकिन इसके बावजूद भी एस० आर० सी० ने इसका विभाजन करने से इन्कार किया। इसी तरह से अदिलाबाद जिले में दो लाख लोग मराठी बोलने वाले हैं। बीदर जिला, अहमदपुर तालुका, निलंगा तालुका, उदयगिरि तालुका पूरे मराठी बोलने वाले हैं और थालुकी और सन्तपुर तालुके आधे मराठी और आधे कन्नड बोलने वाले हैं। अदिलाबाद में रजारा, किनवट और बाँध ये तालुके मराठी बोलने वाले हैं। यह होने के बावजूद भी इन तीनों तालुकों को इस उसूल के तहत कि जिला ताड़ना नहीं हैं, कमीशन ने तेलंगाना में रख दिया है। कमीशन ने एक जगह यह कहा कि हम जिले को नहीं ताड़ेंगे लेकिन दूसरी जगह ऐसी मिसालें मौजूद हैं। कमीशन ने चांदगढ़ तालुके को अलग किया है, कंसरगढ़ तालुके को अलग किया है। इसी तरह से राजस्थान में वनस-कन्था जिले का आबू रोड तालुका अलग किया गया है। न सिर्फ तालुकों का ही नहीं जगह उन्होंने डिवीजन किया है, बल्कि कई जगह विलिजेशन और दहातों को भी अलग किया गया है, मसलन उन्होंने आंध्र में से पत्तुर और चित्तूर में से मवाजियात तामिलनाडु को देने की सिफारिश की है। बिहार में से चास थाने को अलग कर के बाकी पूरूलिया सव-डिवीजन कमीशन ने बंगाल को देने की सिफारिश की है। इसी तरह से राजस्थान को हिसार के कुछ विलिजेशन देने का निर्णय दिया है। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि जहां पर न सिर्फ जिले बल्कि दहात भी अलग किए गए हैं वहां पर यही उसूल मराठवाड़ा की तक्सीम में भी लागू होना चाहिए था लेकिन मराठवाड़ा में ऐसा नहीं किया गया है। इसके साथ साथ विदर्भ को मध्य प्रदेश से अलग करते वक्त उसमें से वस्तर स्टेट का मराठी स्पीकिंग एरिया अलग होने के बावजूद उसको हिन्दी मध्य प्रदेश में मिला दिया गया है। इसी तरह से बेलगांव जिले के चांदगढ़ तालुका के सिवाय भी और बहुत इलाका, जैसा कि कल दवागिरिकर

जी ने जिक्र किया था, महाराष्ट्र में आना चाहिए था।

उसी के साथ साथ काराड को भी, यह बयान करते हुए कि वहां पर कोंकणी बोली जाती है, कर्नाटक को दिया गया है। मैं अर्ज करूंगा, जिस तरह से फि डगे साहब ने बताया है, कि कोंकणी कोई अलग जवान नहीं है। कोंकणी मराठी की ही एक डाइलेक्ट है। जहां कोंकणी बोली जाती है, जैसे रत्नागिरि, कोलाबा और थाना जिले, वहां के लिखे पढ़े लोग मराठी बोलते हैं और उन लोगों की लिपि मराठी है। महज इस वजह से कि मराठी की एक डाइलेक्ट को, अलग एक बाजू के लोग बोलते हैं, इस डाइलेक्ट को कोंकणी कहते हैं। वह कोई अलग जवान नहीं है, वह मराठी की एक डाइलेक्ट है। जिस तरह से हिन्दी की डाइलेक्ट मैथिली है, भोजपुरी है, ब्रजभाषा है या और दूसरी मुख्तलिफ डाइलेक्ट्स हैं और सब मिल कर पूरी हिन्दी भाषा है, उसी तरह से कोंकणी एक डाइलेक्ट है और कोई अलग भाषा नहीं है। इस तरह से काराड का उत्तरी हिस्सा भी महाराष्ट्र में आना चाहिए। यह हिस्सा नहीं दिया गया है।

इसके बाद मुझे यह बहना है कि मराठी भाषा के दो प्रान्त बनाए गए हैं। एक तरफ ७०, ७५ लाख लोकसंख्या का विदर्भ अलग किया है और दूसरी तरफ मराठवाड़ा के पांच अजला को गुजरातियों के साथ मिला कर, बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र के साथ मिला कर, एक बार्डिलिंगवल बम्बई स्टेट बनाया है। हमने यह सोचा था कि हम हैदराबाद से निकल कर संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र में आएंगे। हमारी यह मांग थी कि संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र, बम्बई की राजधानी के साथ जो मिलेगा उसमें मराठवाड़ा मिलाया जाय लेकिन कमीशन ने यह कह कर कि बम्बई स्टेट से ये मिलना चाहते हैं हमको बम्बई स्टेट में ला दिया है। इस वजह से इस उसूल को कि एक जवान का एक स्टेट होना चाहिए बाजू रखा गया है। कमीशन ने यह कहा कि हम होमलैंड की थ्योरी को मुतलक नहीं मानते हैं लेकिन मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र मांगने वाले लोगों ने कभी भी होमलैंड की थ्योरी को अपने पास तक जानें नहीं दिया

हैं। होमलैंड की ध्योरी में सावरैनीटी शामिल हैं लेकिन संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र ने हिन्दुस्तान की सावरैनीटी से अलग कोई सावरैनीटी नहीं मांगी है। ऐसी हालत में होमलैंड का कोई सवाल ही पैदा नहीं होता है। एस० आर० सी० ने विदर्भ को अलग रखने की दो, तीन वज्रहात बताई हैं। एक वज्र यह बतलाई है कि उनके सामने जो शहादत आई है उसमें बड़ी इन्फ्लु-एंसल शहादत ऐसी है जिसकी वजह से उन्होंने यह कहा कि संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र में मिलने के साथ कम्युनीलिज्म बढ़ जाएगी। चन्द कम्युनिटीज अपने को अलग करने के लिए कम्युनीलिज्म की बात करती हैं, वहां कम्युनीलिज्म हो सकता है लेकिन संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र में मिलाने के लिए कम्युनीलिज्म है, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है। मुझे एक पुरानी बात याद आ गई। हम हैदराबाद में निजाम के खिलाफ रीस्पॉन्सिबल गवर्नमेंट की मांग कर रहे थे और निजाम के सब अजीजदारों की ही वहां पर जागीरदारी थी, वहां पर सर्विसेज में उसी के अजीज सब भर हुए थे और वहां के सार ठाँव उसी के अजीजों के हाथ में थे तो जब वहां की जनता ने उसके खिलाफ रीस्पॉन्सिबल गवर्नमेंट की मांग की तब निजाम और उसकी हुकूमत ने स्टेट काँग्रेस के मूवमेंट को यह कह कर टालना चाहा कि इसमें कम्युनीलिज्म है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, वही चीज यहां पर भी मालूम होती है। जिन लोगों ने शहादत दी होगी उनमें मैं सम्भ्रता हूँ कि वियाणी जी और कन्नमवार जी होंगे जिनको कि एक अलग विदर्भ रखने से मिनिस्ट्री में जगह मिल जाती है, मुमकिन है कि महाराष्ट्र में आने के बाद उन्हें वह जगह न मिलती और उनका सीट बाकी न रहती क्योंकि वहां विदर्भ से जो मिनिस्टर्स हैं उनमें एक हैं माराही और दूसरे हैं कोमटी। ये दोनों महाराष्ट्रियन नहीं हैं। ऐसा होने के बावजूद भी वे मध्य प्रदश में मिनिस्टर्स हैं। उनको यह खोफ हो गया कि.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should not make any allegations against persons who are not here. Discuss the Report. We are not concerned with the persons.

श्री एन० बी० वंशमुख: रिपोर्ट में ही कम्युनीलिज्म का इशारा किया गया है और यह कहा गया है कि जो इन्फ्लुएंसल एविडेंस हमारे सामने आई है उसमें ऐसा कहा गया है। वह इन्फ्लुएंसल एविडेंस क्या है, यह हमारे सामने नहीं है जिसकी वजह से मजबूरन हमको इन चीजों की तरफ जाना पड़ता है। दूसरे उसमें यह कहा गया है कि चूंकि महाविदर्भ की मांग बहुत जमाने की है इस तास्ते महाविदर्भ दिया गया है लेकिन मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि महाविदर्भ की जो मांग थी वह हिन्दी स्पीकिंग एरिया के खिलाफ थी। हिन्दी स्पीकिंग एरिया के खिलाफ उन्होंने महाविदर्भ की मांग की थी, संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के खिलाफ वह मांग नहीं थी, उसके खिलाफ महाविदर्भ की कोई मांग नहीं थी। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि इस एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट में कई मसले ऐसे हैं जिनको लोग नहीं मानते हैं और जिससे लोग इंकार करते हैं। एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट की निम्नलिखित कर्ग असंबली की जो रिपोर्ट है उसको मैंने पढ़ा। कर्ग असंबली के सब सभासदों ने एस० आर० सी० के सामने यह एविडेंस दी थी कि उनको कर्नाटक में न मिलाया जाए; उनको मैसूर स्टेट में न मिलाया जाए इसके बावजूद भी चूंकि पूरे कर्नाटक के अन्दर कर्ग को अलग नहीं रखा जा सकता है इसलिए नेशनल इंटरस्ट के तहत कर्ग को मैसूर में विर्सिजित किया गया, मैसूर में मिला दिया गया। कई मसले ऐसे हैं जहां पर कि लोगों की ख्वाहिशत का कोई लिहाज नहीं किया गया है।

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: What is wrong with that?

श्री एन० बी० वंशमुख: राँग कुछ भी नहीं है। मैं तो कर्नाटक इलाका बनने के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ, लेकिन विदर्भ को महाराष्ट्र से अलग रखने की जो वज्रहात उन्होंने दी है उनके ऊपर बोल रहा हूँ। मैं कर्नाटक स्टेट बनने के "फार" में हूँ जो कि मैंने पहले ही कह दिया है।

इस तरह से मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि ये वज्रहात बतला कर विदर्भ को अलग रखना मुनासिब नहीं था, इसलिए एस० आर० सी० ने यह जो तरीका रखा है वह बिल्कुल गलत है। परसों

[श्री एन० बी० दशमुख]

हमारे होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने यह बतलाया कि एक लैंग्वेज के लोगों के एक जगह रहने से सेपरेटिस्ट मॉटीलटी बनती है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि इसमें कौन सी सेपरेटिस्ट मॉटीलटी होती है बल्कि मैं तो कहूंगा कि सेपरेटिस्ट मॉटीलटी अलग रहने की इच्छा से होती है। बंगाल के एक भाषा बोलने वाले प्रान्त होने के बावजूद भी उसका विभाजन हो गया। उसी तरह से पंजाब का भी विभाजन हो गया। उसमें ऐसा नहीं हुआ कि उधर, पाकिस्तान में, जो बंगाली गया वह बंगाली जवान नहीं बोलता था और इधर का बंगाली कोई दूसरी जवान बोलता था। एक बंगाली जवान बोलने वाला प्रान्त होने के बावजूद भी बंगाल का विभाजन हुआ। जब वहां सेपरेटिस्ट टैंडेंसी रही तभी उसका विभाजन हुआ। संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र मानने वालों ने कहीं भी सेपरेटिस्ट मॉटीलटी की बात नहीं कही है, कहीं भी उन्होंने यह नहीं बतलाया है कि हम हिन्दुस्तान के सिटिजन नहीं हैं बल्कि संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के सिटिजन हैं। लेकिन एस० आर० सी० ने यह बतलाते हुए भी कि एक भाषा सेपरेटिस्ट मॉटीलटी पैदा करने वाली होती है, १२ स्टेट एक भाषाभाषी बनाए हैं। मुझे यकीन है कि केरला अलग हो जाय, आन्ध्र अलग हो जाय, कर्नाटक अलग हो जाय या तामिलनाडु अलग हो जाय, लेकिन अलग होने के बावजूद भी वे कभी भी हिन्दुस्तान से बाहर जाने की स्वाहिश नहीं करेंगे। इसी तरह से संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र भी संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र बनने के बाद, हिन्दुस्तान से अलग हो जाने की कभी स्वाहिश नहीं करता है। लेकिन मैं यह समझता हूँ कि महाराष्ट्र को कांग्रेस की हाई कमांड और हिन्दुस्तान सरकार एक मुजरिम समझती है। मुझे एक साबिक बात कुछ याद आ गई। जब श्री सावरकर को इंग्लिस्तान से पकड़ कर हिन्दुस्तान लाया जा रहा था तो वे रास्ते में मार्सेलीज के पास समुंदर में कूद पड़े। कूद पड़ने के बाद अंग्रेज यह समझ कर कि ये मुजरिम भाग जाने वाला हैं एक इंग्लिश आफसर के हाथ में हथकड़ीयां पहना कर और सावरकर के हाथ

में हथकड़ीयां पहना कर दोनों को अपने साथ साथ लाए थे। महाराष्ट्र की निस्वत भी मैं यह समझता हूँ कि यहां की जो कांग्रेस हाई कमांड है और यहां की हिन्दुस्तान सरकार है उन दोनों के खयाल में और एस० आर० सी० के खयाल में भी शायद यह बात है कि यह भाग जाने वाला शख्स है इसलिए इसको गुजरात से बांध दिया जाय तो फिर यह पक्का और मजबूत रहेगा। इस तरह से ताज्जुब की बात यह है कि दीगर लिंग्विस्टिक स्टेट बनाए जाने के लिए सेपरेटिस्ट मॉटीलटी का कहीं भी जिक्र नहीं किया जाता, अलबत्ता जब महाराष्ट्र की मांग हांती है तो यह कहा जाता है कि तुमको गुजरात के साथ बांध दिया जाएगा। पर्याय के तौर पर महाराष्ट्र कांग्रेस कमेटी ने कहा कि महाराष्ट्र का पूरा इलाका फिर से एक जगह लाया जाय वहां गुजरात कमेटी ने कहा कि नहीं, नहीं, हम महाराष्ट्र के साथ नहीं रहेंगे अगर महाराष्ट्र पूरा एक जगह आ जाय। जिस तरह से कि एक मुजरिम जिसके साथ हथकड़ीयां लगी हुई हैं जब वह उन्हें छोड़कर भागना चाहता है तो फिर उसको कहीं बांध देने की कोशिश की जाती है इसी तरह से कांग्रेस वीकिंग कमेटी ने यह शर्त लगाई है कि अगर तुमको सारा महाराष्ट्र एक जगह लाना है तो बम्बई तुमको नहीं दी जायगी क्योंकि तुम सजायाफूता हो, तुम मुजरिम हो। यहां की कांग्रेस हाई कमांड का रिजोल्यूशन मुझे तो ऐसा ही मालूम होता है। गुजरात प्रोविंशल कांग्रेस कमेटी का रिजोल्यूशन तो बड़ा अजीब है। रहो तो हमारे साथ रहो, नहीं रहते तो फिर बम्बई अलग किया जाय। वे बम्बई नहीं मांगते क्योंकि बम्बई पर उनका क्लेम है नहीं। मगर वे यह कहते हैं कि अगर हमसे अलग होना है तो बम्बई को भी अलग किया जाय। बम्बई को अलग रखने की निस्वत भी एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट ने कहा है कि चन्द लोगों को खोफ है। खोफ किस किस का है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता।

कल मिसजेज लीलावती मुंशी ने कहा कि बम्बई में गुजराती लोगों को बोलने नहीं दिया, गुजरातियों के घर लूट, वहां उनकी कोई सभा

नहीं होने दी। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि यह एक दुर्गम निर्णय है और महज कहीं कोई फसाद होने की वजह से उस निर्णय पर ज़ज को असर नहीं डालना चाहिए। मैं यह कहूंगा कि आज की यह बात नहीं है। मैं बड़ौदा के बारे में आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ। हालाँकि वहाँ महाराष्ट्रियन लोग उस जमाने में गए थे जब हिन्दुस्तान में परकीयों का आक्रमण हुआ और परकीयों की तरफ से स्त्रियों की इज्जत पर और धर्म पर हमले और मुस्लिम किस्म की लूट खसूट हो रही थी, लेकिन इसके बावजूद भी वहाँ गुजरात कांग्रेस ने एक ऐसा भूवर्ग चलाया जिसका मतलब था दीक्षणीनो "दीक्षणा जाओ"। उस भूवर्ग के सिलीसले में वहाँ एक सुखसे नाम के मराठों को कल भी किया गया। यह होने के बावजूद भी मराठों कभी ऐसा नहीं कहेंगे कि चूँकि बड़ौदा में ऐसी चीज़ें होती हैं इसलिए बड़ौदा गुजरात में न रखा जाय। एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट ने इस चीज़ को तसलीम किया है कि बम्बई प्रदश महाराष्ट्र से घिरा हुआ है, बम्बई महाराष्ट्र का हिस्सा है, बम्बई की कांग्रेस महाराष्ट्र पर निर्भर है, लेकिन इसके बावजूद भी चूँकि लीलावती मंशी जी यह कहती हैं कि वहाँ दंगे फसाद करने वाले लोग हैं.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have only three minutes more.

श्री एन० बी० दशमुख : इस वास्ते उसको महाराष्ट्र से अलग किया जाय। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि यह ऐसी कोई वजह नहीं हो सकती कि महाराष्ट्र से बम्बई को अलग किया जाय। सरमायादारों को मुमकिन है यह वजह होगी कि बम्बई में महाराष्ट्रियनों के आने के साथ उनके सरमाये पर कोई असर पड़ेगा। लेकिन मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि बम्बई तो क्या, महाराष्ट्र का कोई भी एक बड़ा टाउन लिया जाय, कोई भी एक व्यापार लिया जाय, कोई भी एक कारखाना या इंडस्ट्री ली जाय वहाँ सिर्फ गुजराती और मारवाड़ी लोग हर जगह फैले हुए हैं। तो फिर सिर्फ बम्बई अलग रखने की वजह से उनके

व्यापार पर क्या असर होगा? कोई असर नहीं होगा। मराठवाड़े में मुझे मालूम है कि फूलचन्द गान्धी जी और गुजरातियों ने संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र की मांग की और कहा कि बम्बई महाराष्ट्र को मिलना चाहिए। जिस तरह महाराष्ट्र के दूसरे हिस्सों में रहने वाले दूसरे लोगों के धंधे पर किसी तरह से असर नहीं पड़ेगा वे लोग अपना धंधा ठीक तौर से चला सकते हैं उसी तरह से बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र में रख देने की वजह से भी कोई असर नहीं पड़ सकता।

एक और खौफ जो यहाँ जाहिर किया गया उसके सिलीसले में मैं कुछ अर्ज करूंगा। बम्बई की पापुलेशन निस्फ तकरीबन मराठी है। हमारे जो गुजराती और नान गुजराती सरमायादार वहाँ बसे हैं वे उस मराठी पापुलेशन को बम्बई से निकाल तो नहीं सकते हैं। इसी तरह से बम्बई में जो फसाद करने वाले हैं वे भी वहीं रहने वाले हैं उनको निकाल तो दिया नहीं जायगा। कोई भी वजह ऐसी नहीं है कि बम्बई को आजाद किया जाय। बम्बई को आजाद रखने से बंबई को क्या क्या नुकसानात होंगे इस एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट में भी उसका कुछ जिक्र है। इसके अलावा कल श्री दवांगीरकर ने भी बतलाया है कि वहाँ के सरकारी नौकर चले जाय, उसके ऊपर आश्रित सब लोग चले जाय और बम्बई से महाराष्ट्र की कैपिटल को उठा दिया जाय तो वहाँ की एक लाख पापुलेशन कम हो जाती है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, that will do. Please finish now.

श्री एन० बी० दशमुख : इस वजह से मैं पार्लियामेंट से अपील करूंगा कि अगर वह महाराष्ट्रियनों पर डिस्ट्रस्ट करती है तो उस डिस्ट्रस्ट को वह छोड़ दे, वह खौफ जो उनके दिमाग में है उसको छोड़ दे। कैपिटलिस्ट्स तो दुनिया के किसी भी इलाके में अपने कैपिटल जमा देते हैं और वहाँ के हालात के लिहाज से उनकी कैपिटल को कोई नुकसान नहीं पहुँचता। एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट में भी मराठा कम्युनिटी की बहुत प्रशंसा की गई है

[श्री एन० बी० दशमुख]

और कहा गया है कि उन्होंने नेशनल मूवमेंट में ये ये काम किये हैं, उन्होंने हिस्ट्री क्रियेट की हैं, इसलिए मैं नहीं समझता कि उन पर भरोसा रखने में क्यों इतना हर्ज है। इसके साथ साथ मैं दो तीन चीजों की तरफ तवज्जो दिलाना चाहता हूँ.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. Please sit down. Your time is over. I am calling Mr. Dasappa.

श्री एन० बी० दशमुख : मैं कभी वक्त नहीं लेता हूँ, सिर्फ एक चीज और कहना चाहता हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You leave it to your other friends.

श्री एन० बी० दशमुख : मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सिर्फ विशाल आंध्र बनना चाहिए, यह जो आजाद तेलंगाना का मूवमेंट है वह सही मूवमेंट नहीं है। इसके साथ साथ बेलारी का वह इलाका जो कर्नाटक को दिया गया है वह आन्ध्र को नहीं दिया जाना चाहिए।

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am grateful to you for having called upon me to participate in this historic debate. Let me at the outset, Sir, express my gratitude to the hon. the Home Minister for creating a very fine atmosphere for the whole debate. He struck a note which, I am sure, has found an echo in the hearts of every Member of this House and I am confident that has largely contributed to the debate that has been going on here in such a very dignified manner.

Sir, let me get into the subject at once and say that I join the rest of the hon. Members in expressing my great appreciation of the devoted and patriotic labours of the S.R.C. The fact that they have had to shoulder a very great burden and the fact that they have performed the task with such a tremendous amount of labour and with not a little amount of success, however, does not mean that every Member should agree with every recommendation. It is true

that they have taken an objective view of the whole situation in the land and they can claim to know more than any single individual as regards the whole of the country. but may I be pardoned if I were to say that so far as the particular areas are concerned, the hon. Members here can also lay claim to know the circumstances, the problems and the difficulties that beset us in the matter of reorganisation of that particular area. Sir, it looks to me on a general appreciation of the situation that those who stand to benefit by these proposals and those who have not been affected in the least and whose *status quo* has been maintained are unanimous in applauding the proposals but those who do not so feel, those who feel that some sort of injustice has been done to the particular area, which concerns them, they do feel honestly that the S.R.C. does not deserve unqualified support. This, Sir, is a **most natural feeling**, and I do not think either the Government or the learned Members of the S.R.C., should entertain the feeling that we are unnecessarily critical or that we are not doing sufficient justice to them.

Sir, this problem was no doubt beset with a considerable amount of difficulty and I would just quote one or two sentences from the J.V.P. Report which brings out this point very clearly. This is what they say: "Whatever the origin of these Provinces and however artificial they may have been, a century or so of political, administrative and to some extent economic unity in each of the existing provincial areas had produced a stability and a certain tradition and any change in this would naturally have an upsetting effect. It would have certain far-reaching consequences, political, economic, financial and administrative" and if linguistic divisions are made "immediately conflict will arise and passions will be aroused". And so they laid it aside, not for all time to come, and therefore I feel that one should not express any surprise if he sees a certain

amount of passion being exhibited here and there, but, by and large, it must be admitted that the vast changes proposed have evoked on the whole a very favourable response from the people.

One of the things, Sir, which has been considered by the S.R.C. and on which I find it difficult to agree is with regard to the size of the States. They have given a whole Chapter or a sub-chapter on this question of States, whether they should be small or big, and paragraph 212 deals with the question. I would like to read just one sentence in that paragraph: "A small State, it is claimed, may be able to administer its area intensively and to promote social welfare measures much more effectively than a large State." Now this question whether a State should be large or whether a State should be small has nothing whatsoever to do with the question of the fundamental unity, integrity or solidarity of the country. I for my part can never associate the question of the division of the Provinces with the idea of harming the stability or unity of the country. Sir, the Constitution of India has been such that there are much fewer powers left with the units than with the Centre and I do not want to elaborate that point. It is a point which is very well known, and therefore it does not matter how we divide or reorganise the States; it is not going to affect the stability and the strength of the country. If anything, having very large States and having something like a Prussian hegemony might harm the stability and the unity of the State, but certainly not the smaller States.

I would also like to refer to another point, namely this that at the time article 3 and Schedule III-A were under consideration in the Constituent Assembly, they envisaged not a reduction of the number of seats in the Council of States, but an increase in the number of seats. This is what they say when the question came up before the Constituent Assembly. When allot-

ting seats to the Rajya Sabha the arrangement was that one seat should be allotted to every million up to five millions, and thereafter one seat for every additional two millions. Thus the total worked out to be 205. Of course there were the twelve nominations by the President with the result that there were 217 seats. Why they did so is explained here. This is what Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari says: "I would like to say why this is necessary because we could have adopted a different scheme even though it may be in contravention of the recommendations of the Union Constitution Committee" on which of course Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and others were present.

"It may be, as honourable members of the House will understand, that there is a further splitting up of the units in Part I. If that will be the case, the number will naturally be increased because by every splitting up of the units, the commitments will increase by at least five". So having fixed the maximum at 250, they have only provided for 205 plus 12 seats so that if there were to be a further splitting up of provinces then there will be an increase proportionately. That is one of the things which I thought I should place before the House when pleading for smaller States.

The second point is this. After all, I come from Mysore and you know very well how it is functioning. When we are thinking of a Socialistic State, of a Welfare State, I feel the larger the number of States and smaller the States the better it is for us because every part of the State—outlying and far flung areas of the State—can have full attention by the Administration.

Sir, may I know how much time I have?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have to close at 3-30.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: That is, ten minutes more

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: To be exact, eight minutes.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Sir, I do not want to elaborate this point. I only say that you compare the progress made by the progressive States—both the smaller and the bigger States and you will find that in the smaller States like Travancore-Cochin or Mysore or Coorg, every part of the State, every village has received specific attention and has been looked after well. I am not casting any aspersion on the working of the bigger States. Sir, Bombay is acknowledged to be one of the most efficiently managed States and yet our Karnataka friends feel that they have not had their due share obviously because they were far-flung from the headquarters. That is one of the reasons why there is a very pronounced section in Mysore in favour of a small State—I do not say it is in a majority because both in the legislature and in the P.C.C. the vote has been in favour of United Karnataka. But what is required is goodwill which was referred to by the hon. Prime Minister in his speech this noon. He laid very great emphasis on goodwill and said that any State, whether big or small, this way or that way, must have the goodwill of all sections of its people. What I am saying is that this idea of a small State is one which has attracted the attention of people in Mysore and they feel that even if there are two States it will not go against the unilingual objective. Each State can work out its own salvation.

Further, I must say that the S.R.C. having laid down a proposition in favour of bigger States has also recommended the formation of a second Telugu and a second Maharashtra State in Telangana and Vidarbha. This fact has also created trouble in places like Mysore. They ask a very simple question. If you can have Telangana and Vidarbha why not here also? Sir, I will read out just a sentence from the report:

"The creation of Vishalandhra is an ideal to which numerous indivi-

duals and public bodies, both in Andhra and Telangana, have been passionately attached over a long period of time, and unless there are strong reasons to the contrary, this sentiment is entitled to consideration."

About Telangana they say:

"Telangana claims to be progressive and from an administrative point of view, unification, it is contended, is not likely to confer any benefits on this area. . . . Telangana feels that the claims of this area may not receive adequate consideration in Vishalandhra. . . and so on.

Likewise with regard to Vidarbha also identical sentiments have been expressed. Now, I say either you adopt one policy; either include Vidarbha in bigger Maharashtra and Telangana in Andhra, or you mete out the same treatment to the other area, that is, Karnataka also. If you are going to have two States there, have two States of Karnataka also. There is no reason why it should not be done. And I must say that in this matter it is not as if all patriotism is on one side and the others are unpatriotic. After all we belong to the same country and I ask, why should we think of larger States? Where was Mahatma Gandhi born? He was born in the small Indian State of Porbandhar and he liberated India. I can quote any number of instances like this. So it is not necessary that a State should be a very large unit. Having said that much, I wish to say that if it becomes absolutely necessary and inevitable that there should be a united Karnataka, then it must be ushered in in very favourable circumstances.

Now, I would just like to answer one or two points raised by my friend Dr. Subbarayan. He spoke of all-India Services. Already the States are compared with District Boards. They are shorn of all their powers. Why is it, in addition to the I.A.S. and I.P.S., you want all the other Services also

to be centralised? Why does he want an Indian Engineering Service, Indian Agricultural Service, Indian Electrical Engineering Service, Indian Mechanical Engineering Service why does he want all such services to be recruited by the Union Public Service Commission? It would have been far better and more honest on the part of my friend to have pleaded for the elimination of all the States and for having a unitary State. That is all that I wish to say on that.

Then I come to another point. They say that the criteria for having parts of other States into a new State are geographical contiguity, administrative convenience and the wishes of the people. I ask every hon. Member here if these tests are fulfilled in a particular case, would it not be fair and reasonable that that area should be merged with the State they want to join? Judged from this point of view, I wish to refer to a few places in this connection which should go into the Kannada State. Not that Mysore or Karnataka wants to grab even an inch of land. But if language, wishes of the people, geographical contiguity and administrative convenience all go to favour it, I ask who should be there to oppose it? Judged from that point of view Kasaragod—34 out of 36 Panchayats want this—should go to Karnataka. Likewise, Madakisira. It is virtually an enclave. It is like Munagala in Telangana. The S.R.C. has recommended that Munagala should go into Telangana.

Sir, I do not want to speak on Bellary because I see nobody here who is opposed to the retention of Bellary by Mysore. We know that the Andhras at no time laid any claim to Bellary. When the S.R.C. was investigating, the Mysore Government or the Mysore public were never informed of the fact that Bellary was being claimed by those friends but today we find.....

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I can quote the Chief Minister here but I have no time.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): The Andhra leaders themselves suggested that this should belong to Karnataka.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Sir, it is so obvious. And if you permit me, I would quote from a letter of Panditji. This is what the Prime Minister said to Gadalingappa on 5th August 1953:

"In reply to your telegram dated 5th August 1953 to the Prime Minister I am to say that there is no question of Government going back or changing the decision already reached in regard to Bellary Taluk. The Government came to this decision after full consideration and will abide by it. In any case Government do not change their decision because of fasts and other similar activities."

(Interruptions.)

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA (Andhra): Was this after the S.R.C. report or before that?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: If time is taken away by the interruptions of hon. Members, I cannot help it.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Please wind up.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: In any case, they say Government do not change their decision because of fasts and similar things. Likewise in Talwadi, that is a portion of the taluk of Coimbatore which had formed part of Kollegal originally and is now taken out of it. Ninety per cent. there are Kannadigas and they all wish to join Karnataka. Likewise also is the case with regard to Hosur. I do not want to take Hosur or Madakisira or Sholapur south or Akalakote. The point I say is if it satisfies all these things, why should anybody object? Therefore, I feel that these parts, which I have mentioned, should go to Karnataka.

[Shri H. C. Dasappa.]

And there is only one other thing which I wish to say.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. Please pass it on to Mr. Govinda Reddy and he will continue your speech.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I am glad the hon. Home Minister said with reference to Karnataka it may be enlarged Mysore. So, what I say is the name could well be retained as Mysore and that will at least go to partially mitigate whatever other feelings they may entertain.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, after the great advocacy of an extremely poor case by my hon. friend, Shri Biswanath Das, and the two Surendras in the Opposition, I start with a handicap and a temptation. The handicap of eloquence I cannot get over, but I propose to curb my temptation. I do not propose to reply to their arguments because our case in respect of Singhbhum, Seraikella and Kharsawan is so watertight that it needs no refutation. It is ours, it has been ours and the Commission has recommended that it will remain ours. The hon. Shri Biswanath Das started with encomiums to the Commission, but he ended by giving them some very hard knocks. This Report is a human document. Like all human documents it needs deep scrutiny. The responsibility of this House in a matter of this nature is rather grave. We sit here as representatives of the States and where the fate of the States is concerned, it is for us to write *finis*, to pronounce the final judgment. I hope hon. Members will bear this in mind and give considered thought to the recommendations of the Commission. The principles that the Commission has enunciated are, in my opinion, unexceptionable, but the application of those principles, in some cases, has been faulty and faltering. Kishanganj and Manbhum, the two areas of Biha. that are proposed to be trans-

ferred to Bengal are cases in point. Before dealing in detail with the cases of these areas, I would draw the attention of this House to a principle enunciated at page 56 of the Report:—

"No change should be made otherwise than for compelling reasons."

I will ask the hon. Members of this House to keep this principle in mind and then judge whether, in recommending the transfer of these areas, this principle has not been respected more in the breach than in the observance.

Coming to the case of Kishanganj first, Bengal based its claim on linguistic considerations. The Commission came to the conclusion that arguments based on linguistic considerations were far from conclusive. Is this statement correct? With very great respect, no. There are observations in the Report itself which prove conclusively that linguistic considerations far from being inconclusive are conclusive, and conclusive in our favour. Sir, the Commission observes that the language of that area is written in Kaithi script. They describe Kaithi script as allied to Hindi. With very great respect I must say that this script is not an independent script. The alphabet is the same as Devanagri, the characters are the same as Devanagri, the grammar is the same, the verb is the same, the gender is the same. This script derives its name from a particular caste, the caste of Kayasthas who have served as scribes for centuries in northern India. In the interests of expeditious writing they eliminated the lines over the letters and *Dirgha Matras*; there is the absence of *Dirgha Matras* and over-letter lines. These are the only two factors which distinguish Kaithi from Devanagri proper. Therefore, this observation of the Commission that this Kaithi script is allied to Hindi, with great respect to them, is not correct. Kaithi is nothing but a sort of Hindi shorthand. Kaithi is prevalent not only in that area. Kaithi is prevalent throughout Bihar and I am sure

throughout the eastern regions of U.P. Wherever we have Devanagri, for popular use you have the Kaithi script.

Sir, I come next to the question of the population. Let us take the language of the area from the criterion, from the standpoint of the population of that area. It is admitted that Muslims are far more than eighty per cent. of the population of that area. The Commission has recognised that they have a distinctive language. That language is Urdu. And in view of this recognition the Commission have recommended that Urdu should occupy a special position in the educational and official spheres in this area when it is transferred to Bengal. Sir, there is no distinction between Urdu and Hindi. I can assure you that as spoken in the rural areas they are one. This reality that Urdu and Hindi are the two currents of the same stream was recognised by the Father of the Nation who put a special emphasis on Hindustani which embraces in its popular aspect both Hindi and Urdu. Be that as it may. Whether Urdu and Hindi are same or similar, leave that question apart. This is clear and it has been admitted by the Commission that the language of near about ninety per cent. of the population of this territory is Urdu and Urdu is entirely distinct from Bengali. Urdu has nothing to do with Bengali and, therefore, on the basis of language the *status quo* should have been maintained. And this difference of language distinguishes the Muslims of this area from the Muslims of Bengal. The Muslims of Bengal are all Bengali-speaking; the Muslims of this area are Urdu-speaking. Would it be proper then to transfer this area and its population to a territory where a different race rules and where a different language is spoken? These Muslims, it is only for the last few hundred years that they had been at the borders. There is a history behind this. They are known as Abadis. Abadi is nothing but an abbreviated form of Shershahabadi. Sher Shah, when he became emperor of India, was faced

with depredations in his territory from the territories of the Sultans and Nawabs of Bengal. At the back of those depredations were mainly the Muslims of Bengal. It was to protect the territory of the Imperial Delhi or Bihar that physically thousands of people who were living then in Bihar and eastern U.P. were transported to those border areas—the border between Bengal and what was the then Bihar or the Indian Union—and there they were settled. These people are genuine Biharis or U. P. people. Their language has been distinct, their associations have been entirely with the people of Bihar. Rather for the last four hundred years they have served as the sentinels of Bihar against the depredations of Bengal. There has been a bitter fight between these people and the Muslims of Bengal for four hundred years. We do not want to deal with this question from the point of view of community, religion or caste. Here is a people who are distinct from the Bengali Muslims, who have been on terms of enmity with them for the last four hundred years. Is it then proper to throw them in the same hotchpotch as the Muslims of Bengal or the Bengali population?

The Commission has recognised the wishes of the people as an important element in the formation of a State. This principle was recognised by the Motilal Nehru Report, by the Dar Commission and by the J.V.P. Report, and this Commission has set its seal to it. This principle has been subject to only one qualification, i.e., that no conglomeration of people, if other considerations do not warrant, can have a separate State of their own, on their mere desire. The people of Kishanganj do not want a separate State. They simply want to remain part of a State of which they have been a part for centuries. They want to remain part of a State which satisfies all the criteria of statehood laid down by the Commission itself.

I can understand the qualification so far as the formation of a separate

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha.]

or independent State or province is concerned. But this qualification was developed for a particular purpose, for a particular class of case, for a particular category. Is it proper then to project this qualification, to a question of an entirely different kind. I submit that it is not proper.

The Commission has recognised that the wishes of the people are an important element to be considered in a democracy. What are the wishes and desires of the people or their fears and apprehensions are laid down in some detail in paragraph 653 of the Report of the Commission itself. It is clear that these people want to remain with Bihar. Then the strongest argument for this transfer has been that it will facilitate communication between the two parts. The resources of our Constitution are not limited in this respect. There are several articles in Part XIII of the Constitution and the power is given to the Union by item 23 of the Union List to make communication easy between various parts of the country including the two parts of the same State or two provinces. Why should not this Parliament of India take recourse to those powers and facilitate communication between the two parts of Bengal? That can easily be done.

It has been recognised by the Commission itself on pages 175—paragraph 646 and they say, "It may be possible, as the Bihar Government has contended, to mitigate these difficulties within the existing constitutional and administrative framework." They recognise that the Constitution provides adequate remedies for the difficulties from which Bengal suffers. Still, while they lay down that without any compelling reason no change shall be made, a change is made. It is for this House to judge whether this change is in consonance with the principles that they have themselves laid down.

I am conscious of the demands of national security as much as my hon.

friend from Orissa. That is a border region—on the border of two independent countries, India and Pakistan. Would it be proper to have on that region—on that border—a population which suffers from a sense of grievance and frustration? Their grievances may have projections in spheres which may, I apprehend, be subversive to the nation itself.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are working for Bihar.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Leave them. They were the sentinels of Sher Shah. Read the whole history.

Sir, I urge that the demands of national security require that this area should remain a part of Bihar and not be transferred to a province where these people will not feel at home because when people are frustrated, their mind works in peculiar ways and it may manifest itself in many ways which may be subversive of the national security.

Coming to Manbhum Sadar, linguistic considerations have weighed, to a great extent, with the Commission. They stress the fact that the Bengali-speaking population according to the 1951 census is 55 per cent. Bilingualism is inevitable in border regions. The percentage of people speaking different languages always vary in the border regions. In view of this fact, it was enunciated by the Dar Commission that only when the people speaking one language in an area form more than 70 per cent of the population in that area, then that area will go into that unit where that language is the main language. This principle was enunciated by the Dar Commission. And this Commission set its seal on that principle. According to them, the figure of Bengali-speaking population is 55 per cent. It falls short of the standard laid down by them by 15 per cent. Still, this area is proposed to be transferred to Bengal. How was this 55 per cent achieved? That is a very sad and sorrowful story of the suppression of

a backward and docile people by a people more advanced and virile. We were, along with Assamese and Oriyas, for a large number of years, ruled from Calcutta. Bengali people received the benefits of education before others could get it. The result was that all these areas were full of Bengali Officers, Bengali professional men, school masters, etc.

And they saw to it that the language of the people was suppressed in this area. Sir, I am simply quoting a small report written in 1915. At that time, there was no popular Government in Bihar, no association of the representatives of the people with government. It was an alien Government and the report could not be partial towards Hindi and prejudicial towards Bengali. Here is what Mr. Hignell, Deputy Commissioner of Manbhum, writes:

"The Hon'ble Revd. Dr. Campbell informs me that when he first came to the Sub-Division (I believe some 35 or 36 years ago) all pleaders and Mukhtears addressing the sub-divisional Courts, spoke in Urdu or Hindi. At the end of 1912, there was not a single Hindi-speaking Pleader or Mukhtear practising at Dhanbad.... All the educational officers from the Deputy Inspector of schools downwards, Sub-Inspectors and Inspecting Pandits were Bengalis. This is not surprising but it is significant that even in the Topochanchi thana, adjoining the Hazaribagh district, where the last census shows some 73 per cent. of the population to be Hindi-speaking there was not a single school, in which Hindi was taught or used as the medium of instruction.

"Bengali has been imported into this district by the swarms of Bengali pleaders, Mukhtears, Managers, Tahsildars and clerks, who have been installed here in the absence of the local educated class.....

"The truth is that the Bengali section of the population has monopolised the advantages of education

and the school teachers are all Bengalis who impose their alien language on the population."

There is testimony after testimony to show how this 55 per cent. has been achieved.

I will just take only a minute or two. Language and culture often go together and when there is some divorce between language and culture, the linguistic principle, to the extent of that divorce loses its force or validity. Is there that identity between the linguistic principle and cultural principle in this area? With great respect, I say, 'No'.

The castes who inhabit this area are mostly Biharis, namely Kurmis, Goals, Maithils, the castes which you do not find in Bengal. These castes form 70 per cent. of the population of this area

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all, Mr. Sinha.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I will take hardly two minutes more.

There are two schools of Hindu Law in India—the Dayabhaga and the Mitakshara. Mitakshara is followed throughout India. Dayabhaga is followed only in Bengal. The population of this area is governed by the Mitakshara school of Hindu law, not by the Dayabhaga school of Hindu law. This is a clear indication to show that they are not part and parcel of Bengali race or Bengali people. The customs and manners that they follow are the same as that in Bihar. Bengalis have distinctive surnames, for example, Chatterjee, Mookerjee, Ghosh, Bose and so on

In a population of 8 lakhs at one estimation the Bengalis are 25,000, and at the highest estimation they are 50,000. The genuine Bengalis, Bengalis really by race, constitute only 1/16th of the population.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No more. Kakasaheb Kalelkar.

KAKASAHEB KALELKAR (Nominated): Sir, considering all the viewpoints placed before the country, the safest thing would be to support the recommendations of the S.R.C. as they are. After the report is implemented, you could have some boundary Commissions here and there to effect small changes.

But this does not mean that I approve of the principles accepted by the S.R.C. report.

The various provinces of India were formed either by the Pathans, the Bahmani kings or the Moghuls and later by the English people. So the provinces established by these people were for administrative convenience only of the rulers.

I am for having very small States. When Mahatma Gandhi championed the cause of linguistic provinces, let us remember that he wanted linguistic provinces and not linguistic States. There is a world of difference between provinces and States. States have greater autonomy with a political consciousness of separate individuality whereas provinces are merely administrative units. What we really want is administrative units based on language. Therefore, I think, it is not a good plea that all people speaking one language should somehow be brought under one common State. People speaking one language can be divided into two, three or even more States. For once, I think, Dr. Ambedkar was right in saying "if we have small States in India, there will be more people trained to constructive leadership and administration, the backward people would have more chance of training themselves in administration". So I am for having nearly 40 or more States.

But, today, I am for accepting the report as it is. Considering the present situation, so far as Bombay is concerned, I am for the bilingual State as recommended by the S.R.C.

For a long time I was an advocate of having Bombay as a separate State, but then with what logic can we say that Bombay shall be the only State which shall be a city State. What about Madras, Calcutta, Kanpur and Ahmedabad? The question of hinterland for a city State is important. If you want to give a hinterland for Bombay, do you know what the natural hinterland to Bombay is? It is a multilingual strip of land in maritime western province of India where five languages are spoken—Gujerati, Marathi, Konkani, Kannada and Tulu i.e., from Broach to Manglore or Nileshwar. So that is the region which is the natural hinterland of Bombay. If you have a separate maritime province of India on the western coast, Bombay could be the capital of that strip known as Konkan area.

If you make Bombay a second capital of India that is a different story altogether. That could justifiably be done. Perhaps Bombay's contribution to the cause of Swaraj and the well-being of the whole country justifies its being elevated to the position of a second capital of India. If we do that, that would be quite all right.

I know, during the last few months passions have risen very high and my friends of Maharashtra are fond of saying that the idea of a bilingual state is dead and buried deep. I would say that their passions are of a very short period—few months or few years—and ought not to weigh with us. We are thinking of the permanent well-being of the people. Therefore, I would still plead for having bilingual Bombay State as suggested by the S.R.C. report.

The Maharashtrians and Gujaratis have learned to work together, during British rule also we worked together. In early days of British rule Maharashtrians organised practically the whole educational machinery of Gujarat and also of Sind. In Sind the word 'Godbole' is used for Arithmetic. A Maharashtrian, Godbole.

went to Sind and wrote a book on Arithmetic. Today a Sindhi student says, "I have got so many marks in Godbole". So, the Maharashtrians had gone to Sind and Gujarat for organising the education machinery there.

If you go back to the ancient history, you will find that Gujarati kings ruled over Maharashtra and Maharashtrians ruled over Gujarat. Our destinies are thrown together. Culturally and educationally, we are on the same level. I believe that no language in India has a separate culture. If you remove the various terminologies, the residue is the same throughout India. We should not accept the plea that each language or literature has a separate culture. The whole of India has got one culture. So far as the culture is concerned, we have assimilated from all fronts and we have got a common culture of India.

In spite of that, if we are not able to agree why not allow Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, who is a true well wisher of each and every Indian in the country, to give his award. During the days of partition we could entrust our destinies to the hands of a Britisher, Radcliffe, why not leave it now in the hands of the best amongst us. Therefore, I would plead with my Maharashtrian and Gujarati friends that they should in large numbers issue a statement that whatever our feelings, we leave everything in the hands of Jawaharlal Nehru, and whatever he decides, we shall accept it cheerfully and implement it loyally. I think that is the solution left with us.

So far as my knowledge of Assam is concerned, I think separation of N.E.F.A. completely would not be a right thing. Today the Assamese people and the N.E.F.A. people may not be able to see eye to eye with each other, but God has made them permanent neighbours and eternal neighbours should not be separate

from each other with a water tight administrative wall. Therefore, some sort of association of Assam with the administration of N.E.F.A. and vice versa is a necessity, otherwise we shall be creating problems of all types.

In the same way the question of Marathi and Kannada. I grant that the two languages are totally different, the former is said to be an Aryan language while the latter is considered to be Dravidian, but in our everyday life we find the inter-mingling of the two languages. I know from my childhood—I belong to that part—people speak Marathi and Kannada freely. Moreover they inter-marry. A friend of mine spoke to his Kannada wife in Marathi whenever they did not want others to understand what they said because in the house all others spoke and understood only Kannada. Take the case of Shri Gangadhar Rao Deshpande. He speaks both Marathi and Kannada but his grandmother did not understand a word of Marathi. I have myself in my House a Gujarati boy married to a Bengali girl from Cuttack. They live quite happily together. I do not think difference of language and culture in India should develop so much antipathy. We cannot build up a nation on the basis of antipathy. If we thus allow our capacity for hatred to grow, I do not think we shall succeed in the international field.

Mutual love, forbearance, large-heartedness and co-operation are our capital; if we lose it, we shall lose all position and strength in the international field. One Jawaharlal Nehru will not be able to save India or the world unless there is this capital of co-operation, of love, of sympathy, and of large-heartedness in abundance. I do not think we are going to succeed either at home or in the whole world, if we have not got such capital. I think, we should cry a halt to all these wranglings and grabbings, and we should have smaller States, and smaller States will

[Kakasaheb Kalelkar.]
have more people trained to administer, and the Centre will be comparatively stronger. What we need is a compact and full autonomy in small States, and a powerful Central Administration. I think, that would be the only correct solution. But if we are not in a mood to do it I think, the best thing under the circumstances is to accept the Report as it is, and wherever there are keen differences, we should leave them to be decided by Jawaharlal Nehru.

SHRI NARAYANDAS DAGA (Hyderabad): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the recommendations made by the S.R.C. Sir, we are having this discussion here for the last two or three days, and numerous friends have paid their compliments to the Members of the S.R.C., and I am only too glad to join them in paying my humble compliments to them.

Sir, the wisdom and impartiality of the members of the Commission is beyond any doubt. They were very competent persons, and if anybody thinks that even one of the Commission's decisions is not based on solid reasons, I think, he is gravely mistaken. If anybody thinks that they have not considered all the aspects of the question while giving their decisions he is gravely mistaken.

Sir, if you refer to the Report itself, you will find in paragraph 386, it has been stated as follows:

".....if, for the present, the Telangana area is constituted into a separate State, which may be known as the Hyderabad State, with provision for its unification with Andhra after the general elections likely to be held in or about 1961, if by a two-thirds majority the legislature of the residuary Hyderabad State expresses itself in favour of such unification."

Now, Sir, here the emphasis is placed on the two-thirds majority, and this itself shows that the Commission was quite confident that Telangana would

be a viable State and if the people want to join Visalandhra, then they should be allowed to do so, only with a large majority. This factor probably has not received the consideration of the hon. Members who have spoken on this subject.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO (Hyderabad): They have argued out a case for Visalandhra.

SHRI NARAYANDAS DAGA: They have argued out the whole case of Visalandhra only in respect of one point.

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order

SHRI NARAYANDAS DAGA: About the two river basins also, we have got to say something. Those rivers can be very well developed if both the Governments, of Telangana and of Andhra, constitute a Joint Board for the development of those rivers, and that Board should be presided over by an officer of the Central Government. And that Development Board will be able to work better than what either of the States independently will be able to do.

Now, Sir, I would like to deal with some of the points raised in connection with the viability of the State of Telangana. Some hon. Members have expressed very grave doubts. As far as the size of the new State of Telangana is concerned, the State will be much bigger in area than the present States of Punjab, West Bengal, Madhya Bharat, Mysore, Saurashtra and Travancore-Cochin. All the five States that I have just now mentioned are viable States.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: In area only.

SHRI NARAYANDAS DAGA: In other respects also. Anyway, I am coming to that point. So, Sir, this State will be bigger in area than the new States of West Bengal, Kerala

and Vidarbha, and only slightly smaller than the State of Madras. So far as the revenues of the State are concerned, they will be more than the revenues of the former States of Punjab, Assam, Orissa, Madhya Pradesh, Madhya Bharat and Rajasthan and if we calculate the revenue receipts on a *per capita* basis, they will be even higher than practically all the former Part A States like Bombay, U.P., Bihar, etc. etc.

Now, Sir, certain fears have been expressed that the finances of this State will not be able to meet the expenditure on education, etc. But I submit that these fears are unfounded and are based on no facts. We should not forget that this State will have a surplus of about Rs. 2 crores. Even if we take it for granted that this State may fall short of its finances, does anybody think that the sister State of Andhra will be able to subsidise it from their own resources? Even today, they have got a deficit, and they would not be able to finance our schemes at all. The burden will certainly fall on the State of Telangana. We are already spending more and more on education, health and other nation-building activities than even the Andhra State, and in course of time, I am sure we will be in a position to spend much more than that, when our industrial and other projects are ready.

Then, Sir, fears have also been expressed by certain quarters about the loss of excise revenue, if prohibition is to be introduced. This State will have an income of about Rs. 5 crores under this heading.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Are you not in favour of prohibition?

SHRI NARAYANDAS DAGA: It will be introduced, but we cannot have prohibition in one part only. If Vishalandhra is formed, it will have to be introduced immediately.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: That is what is happening actually.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must hear the other side of the picture also.

SHRI NARAYANDAS DAGA: Secondly, if Telangana is formed, it will be introduced only gradually and loss of revenue, if it is caused, will be made up by the steadily increasing revenue from Sales Tax. Our present income from Sales Tax is a little over Rs. 2 crores, and it works out at Rs. 1-12-0 *per capita*, whereas the other States have gradually been able to take their Sales Tax revenue to Rs. 6 *per capita*. There is a wide difference between Rs. 1-12-0 and Rs. 6. Within four or five years, Telangana also will be able to get Rs. 4 *per capita* from this source, totalling about Rs. 5 crores, and the land revenue will be going up as a result of minor and major irrigation works that are coming into existence. Our production in the collieries will increase. We are starting new industries, and our investments in certain industries will also be yielding results by that time and that will add to our surplus and not cause any deficit.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: And give them to the Birlas also.

SHRI NARAYANDAS DAGA: It is very unfortunate. I agree with you there.

It has also been said on the floor of this House that this demand for a separate Telangana is supported only by the big business, and that the masses have nothing to do with it. As the position stands there is hardly any vested interest of the type in the real sense in the State of Hyderabad with the exception of one who had landed there a year ago and taken possession of these industries. It has been said that the people are not for this, etc. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that about a month ago a strike was held in the City of Hyderabad. No major political party gave a call for this strike. Only business associations were in favour of a strike on

[Shri Narayandas Daga.]
the 25th because the Assembly was going to meet. Section 144 was imposed and the leaders tried to ask the people to remain peaceful, but the strike was so successful that not even a pan shop was opened, not even a restaurant was opened, or a grain shop. All shops remained closed. Have all of them taken a loan from the State Banks or from the Industrial Finance Corporation or from the I.T.F.? Did all of them form part of big business? If that was so, then well and good. If that was not so, then you have got to accept that the strike was successful and people wanted it. If anybody is going to benefit from merger with Andhra, then it will be the cities of Hyderabad and Secunderabad, because business will increase by that merger. There is no doubt that the businessmen in that particular area will be benefited. (Interruptions.) You have to accept that the strike was successful.

SHRI B. V. GURUMURTHY (Hyderabad): Hartals can be made successful by various means.

SHRI NARAYANDAS DAGA: This hartal was successful, and it goes to prove that the people of Hyderabad and Secunderabad are behind the demand.

I would like to say something about the contention of my hon. friend who referred to the wishes of the people and the Working Committee's resolution. I can tell you that that august body is not in the habit of using empty phrases for the sake of decorum.

(Time bell rings.)

I am speaking for the first time. You may consider my case and give me five minutes more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No special concession to anybody.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: He is making his maiden speech.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I know that you will plead for every Member.

SHRI NARAYANDAS DAGA: This august body is not in the habit of using empty phrases for the sake of decorum. The wishes of the people are certainly for the formation of a separate Telangana.

SHRI RAGHAVENDRARAO: The status quo?

SHRI NARAYANDAS DAGA: Not the status quo but for a separate Telangana. Every political party which commands the support of the people wants this. They are an 80 per cent. majority, so much so that my hon. friends who are talking of Vishalandhra are not able to hold any public meeting even.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Question.

SHRI NARAYANDAS DAGA: You have not been able to hold any public meetings. Only you say that public meetings have been held and then issue statements. The hon. the Home Minister knows that these meetings were reported to be held but were never held. I know, Sir, that the Hyderabad Assembly of course has expressed itself in favour of Vishalandhra, but this Assembly cannot be taken to be representative of the people so far as this matter is concerned. The elections were held under peculiar conditions and certain candidates were mistaken as heroes by the electorate, because they had just come out of the jails. The people who were innocent could not make out between those who went to jails before 1948 and those who went afterwards. If they want, I can give them this challenge. Let them have a test election of ten or twenty seats on the basis of Vishalandhra.

Another very important point, of all the Southern States, Hyderabad will be ideally placed for the introduction of Hindi. The ten per cent of the Muslim population of that State speak Urdu. Ten per cent. of the non-Telugus speak Urdu and understand it very well. Twenty-five per cent. Telugu-speaking people also understand Urdu and speak

Urdu. This comes to a total of 45 per cent.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): The whole of India is expected to understand it.

SHRI NARAYANDAS DAGA: And within three years we will be able to introduce Hindi in offices. With these few words, I support the creation of a separate Telangana and I appeal to my hon. friends to discuss it dispassionately and objectively in the light of facts.

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am glad that this Report has come up before Parliament for discussion. I had also given notice of certain amendments but the Chairman said that we could not move any amendment because no motion will be put, and that Members should express only their views.

I was elected to this House from the composite Madras State and because of the favour conferred by this and the other House on the Andhras, I now happen to represent the Andhra State. The Andhra State was the first linguistic State in India; not only that, the first non-official resolution moved on the floor of this House related to the formation of a separate Andhra linguistic State, and I had the honour of moving that resolution, though it was negatived. Because of the sacrifices of Potti Sriramulu and others, the demand had been conceded and we have been enjoying a separate Andhra State. Dr. Subbarayan said on the floor of the House yesterday that all this trouble was due to the coastal Andhras.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Does my hon. friend know that Orissa came into existence in 1935?

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA: I am coming to how they got it despite the Congress direction. how they helped the Simon Commission how we boycotted it and for

3. R.S.D.—7.

being patriotic how we were penalised, etc. I am coming to the Orissa question also at a later stage.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: More Oriyas went to jail than Andhras.

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA: Dr. Subbarayan said yesterday that all this trouble was due to the Andhras. But the fact is that the majority of Indians have been working for the reorganisation of India on the basis of language, culture and some other factors. It is the cherished ambition and desire of a great majority to have their own homeland, of course within the Indian Republic and Indian Union. Dr. Subbarayan has been feeling very much because he said yesterday that he was losing S. Kanara, he was losing Malabar and he lost Andhra and so on. He said that all this trouble was created by Andhras. He wanted to rule the entire composite Madras State, in which there was Andhra portion—it was something like a Madras Empire and Andhra was a colony.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Venkata Narayana, it is better that you confine yourself to the recommendations of the Commission. Don't go into past history. You would be losing time if you go into past history. Leave it there.

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA: I will be given 30 minutes. Except some of those people who were wanting to rule others, all others are very happy for this report and for the reorganisation of India on the linguistic basis. That is what I said.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: You must permit me to correct. This kind of history is a falsification. Madras has been ruled consecutively by Andhra Ministers.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The rule is, that no Member can stand up when another Member is speaking. I want you to observe it.

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARA-YANA: I know what Mr. Rajah said when Andhra was separated. This morning Mr. Madhava Menon, who was also a Minister at that time, said that Dr. Subbarayan was not correct. All others who cherished an ambition to have India reorganised on the basis of language must be grateful to Andhras. Instead of that, Dr. Subbarayan accuses us. I am sorry he is not here.

I was very grateful to the Home Minister Pandit Pant who made an elaborate statement when the motion was moved. The hon. Prime Minister also comes again from U.P. The recommendation of the Commission is that it should not be changed and it is recommended to be kept intact. So they don't understand all these problems—especially in the North there is not much of a language problem. If either by accident or by a design S.R.C. recommends for removing a portion of U.P. to be annexed to some other State, then only either the Prime Minister or the Home Minister could understand how difficult it would be for them to keep quiet. Now there is a movement. So many Members spoke that U.P. is too unweildy, especially in population and is exercising some undue influence on others. Why should not Pandit Pant agree to disintegration of U.P.? They don't understand. Neither the Prime Minister nor the Home Minister is entitled to advise us on this issue because there is no language problem there and U.P. was not affected at all by this S.R.C. though Mr. Panikkar in his minority report said that it is desirable that it should be divided but because the majority report suited them, they kept quiet. Others say that the protagonists of the linguistic States are not patriotic. I say they are as patriotic as the others are. We don't want a foreign State. We want a State within the four walls and boundaries and political jurisdiction of the Bharat Government and not a separate one. Otherwise why should there be a Federal Government?

Abolish all the provinces and Ministries, Cabinets and Legislatures. Have all districts only, let the Centre rule all the districts directly without having any States. Have a unitary system of Government. It is only because of administrative convenience that provinces were divided. The Congress, under whose guidance the national fight took place for achieving independence, was not satisfied with these political divisions of India because either the East India Company or the British Government, whenever they acquired certain portions, they were annexed either to this State or to that State. Not being satisfied with the working system, the then real National Congress was for re-organising provinces on the basis of language and they were promising that when they came to power, they would divide India politically also on that system but after they achieved independence, they forget all about it and this Congress has changed its character. All people came into it and it is a packed body and they forgot all about it. They were busy with administration. That is the reason why we Andhras had to revive the movement which was kept under suspension in the national interest then, and therefore we got it. So Andhra is the sole reason for this reorganisation which is the cherished desire of a great majority of the people. Of course some hon. Members like Dr. Subbarayan or Mr. Rajah may not like it and that is a different thing.

To start with, I now deal with Vishalandhra. Hyderabad has been disintegrated. There was not a single person against its disintegration. Everybody agreed. The natural corollary would be to annex the different areas to the neighbouring provinces.....

AN HON. MEMBER: Annex or merge.

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARA-YANA: Should be merged with the

neighbouring States and for this small and simple thing, I don't understand why there is so much of fight. The S.R.C. in its report had advanced all sorts of arguments or relevant arguments in favour of Vishalandhra but it said that one should wait till five years. What reason is given is impossible for anybody to understand. The entire statements were in favour of Vishalandhra. But the difficult portion is the judgment which is not in accordance with the arguments—it is a deferred measure, or deferred payment. They ought to have said that it must be an immediate thing along with other States when the whole of India is reorganised. Instead of saying that, they said one should wait. For that they have not given good reasons. They say—financial viability etc. What does our Constitution say? There must be total prohibition in the whole of India in all the States. Of course it must be completed within a course of period. In Andhra no doubt there is total prohibition. In some places there is prohibition, in some they are going to introduce. Because there is an excise duty, and prohibition is not introduced in Hyderabad, it might be a surplus State financially now but if not today or tomorrow, within a certain period it must be completely dry and then it will be a deficit State by about Rs 3 to 4 crores and so how could it be financially self-sufficient? What about the food problem? It is deficit in food. We are surplus in food. What about the rivers? If the two great rivers are under one political administration, instead of having only dams at delta areas, we can have dams at higher reaches and the entire basin and valley could be irrigated and more food can be produced and under two different managements, even if small things were held up, it will be difficult to improve the irrigation schemes. What about the people there? All the parties except the State Congress are all unanimously in favour of immediate merger and Vishalandhra but there is no Congress there in Telangana as such. There is a

Congress Party there. Even the Hyderabad Congress Party which is a Committee was never convened to consider this question at all. Some of the members of the so called Hyderabad Pradesh Congress Committee have met and they said something. They ought to have officially convened a meeting of the Hyderabad Congress Committee. They ought to have placed this proposition before them and ought to have taken their views. They failed to do that. What about the legislators? A great majority of the legislators are in favour of Vishalandhra. No doubt there was no Resolution passed by the Hyderabad Legislature and they also had a discussion just like the Parliament had and just like any other State Assembly and they also discussed the matter. A very great majority of them spoke in favour of immediate Vishalandhra. And so only a few legislators were against it. And no official meeting was ever convened to discuss this question, by the Hyderabad Congress Committee. So in this respect the question of that Congress Committee need not be taken into consideration at all. All other political parties were in favour of the immediate formation of Vishalandhra.

And what about the Ministers? Except two Ministers, all the others have made public statements supporting the immediate formation of Vishalandhra. And here was the Resolution passed by the Congress Working Committee advising the immediate formation of Vishalandhra. As against that advice which is a sort of a mandate or direction, the Hyderabad Congress had no business to pass such a Resolution and if there is discipline in that party, they ought to obey that advice of the Congress Working Committee. They had not even convened a meeting of the Hyderabad Pradesh Congress Committee. The other political parties have expressed their opinion, have passed resolutions in favour of the immediate formation of Vishalandhra. Therefore, when so many factors are

[Shri Pydah Venkata Narayana.] in favour of the formation of Vishalandhra immediately, along with the other linguistic States, there is no point in waiting for a period of five years. The Prime Minister today made a statement, also to the effect that Vishalandhra should be formed immediately. But a few interested people, including some big persons in order to safeguard their vested interests, are opposed to it, but they are a microscopic minority and so we need not take them into consideration. Therefore, I hope the House will discuss and view this matter objectively and advise the Government in whichever manner it likes, for the formation of Vishalandhra immediately.

Coming now to the question of Bellary, we find that in this district there are about ten talukas. Of these three talukas were given to Andhra and about six talukas were given to Mysore. Justice Misra was asked to submit a report and after that the decision on Bellary was taken. Now the S.R.C. have recommended that Siruguppa, Bellary and Hospet and a portion of the Mallapuram sub-taluk of the Bellary district should come back to Andhra. Sir, some hon. Member read out a letter to say that the Prime Minister had said that the Bellary question would never be reopened. But that was a letter written prior to the appointment of the S.R.C. or prior to the submission of the Report of the S.R.C. But that is actually a point in our favour, because in spite of this letter, knowing pretty well that there is such a letter from the Prime Minister that this question will not be reopened, having all these facts before them, the S.R.C. have recommended that these areas should go to Andhra.

AN HON. MEMBER: To whomsoever it may go.

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA: Whatever it may be, there was this letter, and when there is a

certain document in my favour I naturally would see to it that it is placed before the judge. So in spite of that letter, they have recommended that these parts should come to Andhra. They have equated Bellary with Kolar in several places. Kolar is recommended to be retained in Mysore undisturbed, though there is a clear 55 per cent of Telugus in that area. It is an admitted fact that Telugus are in a majority in Kolar, excluding the mine area. There are about 6 to 7 per cent, of Tamils and the rest are Kannadigas. The Andhras are no less than 55 per cent. In spite of that, it is said that Kolar will be retained with Mysore and they have given some reasons. Why should it be with Mysore? They have not given satisfactory reasons for this. They speak of Tungabhadra project and Mysore. But the chief spokesman of the Andhra Government, addressing the Rotarians at Cocanada recently said that even small decisions could not be implemented because of this joint administrative board, because joint decisions have to be taken by both the Governments. So let alone high level canals, even small improvements, small things and decisions, they say, could not be implemented. So the Andhra Government have been feeling a lot of difficulty in giving effect to several pieces of advice given by their engineers for improving the scheme and connected matters.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: May I bring it to the notice of the hon. Member that the Chairman of the Board has issued a statement that the allegation is false and that the work is proceeding smoothly and there is no trouble whatever?

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA: Their Chairman said so and the Andhra man said this only recently and I also attended that meeting and I heard all this myself. So they have been feeling great difficulty in respect of the improvements to the Tungabhadra scheme. There is a lot to be done and if this

joint control is to continue, it is felt that it will be almost impossible to complete the scheme in the near future, taking all these into consideration, they have recommended that these portions should go back to Andhra. I will just read out what they say in this respect. They say in para 331:

"After very serious consideration, we have decided to recommend the exclusion of a portion of the present Bellary district along the course of the Tungabhadra from Karnataka and its transfer to the Andhra State. We are aware that this is not in accord with the findings of an eminent judge like Shri Justice Misra and also with the decision taken by the Government of India in 1953 in respect of certain areas forming part of the present Bellary district. It is only after giving due weight to these important pronouncements and careful examination of the different proposals that we have come to the conclusion that the change proposed is desirable."

Further, in para 332 they say how this is linked up with the question of Kolar.

"The retention of Kolar district in the Karnataka State and the addition of the major part of Belgaum district to it will, in our opinion, be more advantageous to the new State than the continuance in it of the eastern portion of the Bellary district"

Further, in para 334, the Commission has said:

"There seems to be a great deal of force in the contention put forward on behalf of the Andhra Government that in view of the communication and other links of Bellary with the rest of Rayalaseema and the dependence of Bellary town on the existing Andhra State rather than Mysore in the matter of trade and commerce, these talukas

have a much closer relation with the Andhra State than with Mysore. Bellary was administered as a part of the composite State of Madras for more than one hundred and fifty years, during which it developed into a sort of unofficial capital for the entire Rayalaseema area."

On the question of Kolar they say:

"It may be noted that the three talukas in question cannot be regarded as unilingual.....".

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Everybody has read and re-read these things.

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA: Pardon?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I say, everybody has read these things and you need not necessarily read them out now.

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA: But unless I read this portion in this context.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us have your views.

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA: Unless I read this portion it is not possible to bring out the link. I do not know from what angle others have read it:

"It may be noted that the three talukas in question cannot be regarded as unilingual. Besides the Hospet and Bellary urban areas are fast assuming a mixed character. We have not attached any particular importance to the language factor in taking a decision on the future of the Kolar district where the Telugu-speaking people constitute about 54 per cent. of the population. Our assessment of the language factor in the area of Bellary proposed to be transferred to Andhra must be governed by similar considerations."

[Shri Pydah Venkata Narayana.]

I do not know how the Mysoreans now claim Kolar and, at the same time, Bellary.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: You had, until yesterday, not laid claim to any part in Mysore or in Bellary. Your own people have said that it should go to Karnataka.

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA: Just wait. Those people are referring to statements in their favour and I am doing the same thing. Now, let us see the latest. In spite of these statements—all these things were before the three Judges—the three Judges have come to this conclusion that it should be transferred to us. The three Judges had taken into account all these things; they had applied their minds and yet have come to the conclusion that they have come to, that is, transferring of these areas to Andhra. Because of the majority of the Kannadigas, they want Bellary; because they have now got it, they want Kolar also. The Telugus who are in a minority in Bellary and other places are being terribly victimised. The Municipal Council there is controlled by the Telugus; a resolution was passed urging its merger with Andhra. What does the Mysore Government say in reply? It gave notice of supersession to that Municipality. It threatened the Municipality with supersession. In the case of the other Municipalities in Mysore, the date was due to expire the next year but, instead of extending the date in the case of Bellary, they gave notice of supersession to that Municipality. When the time expired, they appointed a Special Officer. Is it the fault of that Municipality that it should have wanted to be merged with Andhra? Is it the way the minorities are to be treated? It is quite unsafe for the minorities to be there. My friends, the Mysoreans are very kind people, very good people—of course, my opinion about them has not changed much—but the poor Telugus are being victimised. That is the reason

why it is impossible for us to continue there.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are not there anyway.

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA: I mean 'my people'. My people are there.

(Time bell rings.)

How many minutes more, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Three minutes more.

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA: How many minutes have I taken?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have got three minutes more.

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA: I started only at.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You started at 3.15 or about a minute later.

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA: My friend was referring to Orissa and other things. I want to speak now about Koraput, Parlakimedi and the coastal belt south of the Munshali river. I shall also speak about how this State of Orissa was created. My friend was taking credit for all these. When the Simon Commission came, the National Congress directed all nationalistic minded people to boycott that Commission. The Andhras obeyed this but the Orissa gentlemen came out of the A.I.C.C. after fighting with the President, went to the Simon Commission and gave evidence thus co-operating with it. Thus they got the Province of Orissa.

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI PYDAH VENKATA NARAYANA: I was given only a few minutes and so I would not like to be disturbed.

Though the Central Government, in the beginning, were against the inclusion of Koraput and Parlakimedi and the coastal belt—in the White paper also these places were not mentioned, there was no mention in the Bill that was introduced in Parliament—ultimately because of the Rajah of Parlakimedi and Jeypore and these people—these loyalists—these places found their places in the Act as finally passed. The O'Donnell Committee and all the other committees did not accede to this. We were penalised for our patriotism, for our having obeyed the directive of the National Congress. Since we have the peoples' Government, since we have a democratic Government, it is for them not to penalise us but to set right these things. For about 300 years, Koraput was in Vizagapatam. These places have no means of communication other than through our territory. If they want to go to any other part of Orissa, they must pass through Andhra territory in some places fifty to hundred miles. There is no other means of communication. The train connection is there through Vizag. In Koraput, there is a majority of Andhras. So is the case in the coastal area and Padhampur.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do, Mr. Venkata Narayana. There are other speakers from Andhra tomorrow who will continue it. Alluri Satyanarayana Raju is going to speak tomorrow.

I have to inform hon. Members that if we have to finish the list today, we have to sit one more hour extra. I hope the House will sit till 7 P.M. and finish the list. Otherwise, other Members tomorrow will not have any time.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Hyderabad): It is very hard for the staff to continue after 6 P.M. They are working from 11 A.M.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Otherwise, many Members will have to go without speaking.

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL (PEPSU): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I must, to start with, congratulate the Members of the States Reorganisation Commission who have produced such a fine document.

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

There is no denying the fact that the problem of redrawing the map of India on a rational basis is not an easy job although, after hearing the various Members of this House, it seems that the problem is very easy according to each particular case because everybody thinks that whatever is in the best interests of a particular vested interest is perhaps the best solution. I must strongly submit that the problem, if it were so easy, did not call for the appointment of such a high powered commission. There is no denying this fact either that this Commission was set up with a view to meeting the demand for linguistic provinces. This demand, as we all know, originated a long time back and it was also accepted by the Congress. Due, however, to the change of times, this opinion has also grown that linguistic basis is not the sole criterion for the division of India. There are other considerations also. When the Commission was appointed, its terms of reference gave various factors which were to be taken into consideration by the Commission while making their recommendations. Every Member of this House has acknowledged that the Commission has done its job very well although it is not possible for any Commission to satisfy each and every element in such a vast country. Opinions will differ and they will continue to differ because there can be honest differences of opinion also and also because people refuse to see other men's viewpoints. The background in which we should view the recommendations of the Commission is that since the problem was so very ticklish and since it was not possible for the Commission to satisfy the aspirations of different parts of the country, whatever could

[Shri J N Kaushal]

be done under the circumstances has been done and I would beg of hon. Members not to rake up the old controversies but to view the recommendations of the Commission in that perspective. The two bold decisions of the Commission which have been hailed by every section are the abolition of Part B and Part C States so that henceforward all the States in India will have equal status, and also the abolition of the institution of Rajpramukhs. There were very strong sentiments in the country on both these subjects, and the Commission has given effect to those sentiments and has recommended that henceforward there will be only one type of States and there will be a few centrally administered territories. I think these are in fact very courageous recommendations and the Parliament would do well to implement those recommendations *in toto*.

Now the other point on which the Commission has bestowed great attention is the point where the Commission has provided various safeguards for satisfying the legitimate demands of various minorities and where the Commission has also proposed the setting up of various all-India services and has also drawn the attention of the Government to the fact that in public service commissions and in the appointment of Judges of the High Court a considerable number should be drawn from the other States so that there may be better administration and there may be a better sense of oneness in the country.

Now coming nearer home to my own province, the Commission has recommended the abolition of PEPSU. I am one of those who welcome that decision, although there is a very strong sentiment in PEPSU that during the last two years it was a very well administered province, it had seen a well-knit democratic Government and it had completed its Five Year Plan in two years' time whereas other provinces had taken five years to complete that plan. But, as soon

as reorganisation of States is taken up, PEPSU could not exist, because PEPSU was divided into five zones geographically not contiguous to each other. Therefore PEPSU could only exist if the Commission had not come into being, but once the Commission was appointed for redrawing the map of India on a rational basis, there was no justification for PEPSU to exist as a separate entity, and I would therefore take this decision in a practical sense and would welcome that we are going to be one with the Punjab and henceforth we will form a bigger State. The only point of sorrow is that things in Punjab for the moment are not also very good. We are afraid that so far as the communal situation was concerned, PEPSU was perhaps in a better position. We have seen that for the last one year there was a Hindu Chief Minister and although the Sikhs have always been saying that PEPSU was the homeland of Sikhs, they have never clamoured against that Chief Minister—only because he is a *pucca* Congressite. He does not believe in the communal theory in which other persons might believe. Therefore, as I submitted a little earlier, the communal situation in PEPSU was very good. There was very little distrust among the communities and the people were living in a peaceful atmosphere. But in Punjab, unfortunately, the atmosphere is surcharged with communalism, but I feel that this is a passing phase and this will, in course of time, die out. We cannot also lose sight of the fact that the recommendation which the Commission has made for the merger of Punjab, PEPSU and Himachal Pradesh has not been well received by all sections of the people living in these three regions. Although I feel that this was perhaps the only natural and ideal State which should have come into existence on the northern border of India, the prosperity of any State will depend only on the goodwill of the people who reside there on the co-operation which they extend to each other and the way in which they receive the recommendations of the

Commission. But, unfortunately, we have to confess that there is a lot of difference of opinion. So far as the Himachal people are concerned, they are practically with one voice of this view that they want to remain separate, because they have a fear in their mind that if they joined the greater Punjab their development will stop. This fear complex is working in the minds of all those States who are going to lose their existence. But so far as the Himachal people are concerned their fear is based on another circumstance also. They say that they are backward and if they go to a larger State their voice will be very feeble, and the Chairman of the Commission has also agreed with this view and has recommended that it may remain a separate entity. Although, as I said, I would have very much wished that this should also have formed part of Punjab, yet with a view to respect their feelings and in view of the fact that the Chairman of the Commission has also agreed with their sentiments, I don't mind if the decision is taken that Himachal Pradesh may remain separate.

So far as the further bifurcation of this province is concerned, I am very much opposed to it. So far as the Akali demand or the demand of other Sikhs who think in communal terms is concerned, I would at once say that I am one with them when they seek protection for the Punjabi language, because my submission to the House is that Punjabi is not the language of Sikhs alone. Punjabi is the language of all persons who reside in Punjab. It is rather unfortunate that the Sikhs should try to father that language. On the other hand I would say that it is the Hindus who have made the greatest contribution to the Punjabi literature. It is the Muslims who have also made a great contribution to the Punjabi literature. The most standard work in Punjabi is that of a Muslim, Waras Shah. Everybody draws inspiration, so far as literature is concerned, from that work, and it was not written by a

Sikh. Then we know the most modern writer and poet was Dhani Ram Chatrak who died very recently. He was the greatest living writer and poet. He was a Hindu, not a Sikh. Therefore this cry of the Sikhs that they are the only protagonists of Punjabi is highly mistaken. Punjabi is the language of all persons who reside in Punjab and I am one of those who very strongly submit that all efforts should be made to further the progress of Punjabi.

5 P.M.

So far as the Sachar formula on the Punjabi language is concerned, I would submit that there is one formula in PEPSU also and the PEPSU formula is working better than the Sachar formula. The only difference between the two is that in one place option is given to the parents that they can go and tell any school authorities that they want their child to take his education not in Punjabi but in Hindi or *vice versa*. No such option has been given by the PEPSU Government. The PEPSU Government has laid down that all those who reside in predominantly Punjabi-speaking areas must receive education in Punjabi till the fourth class and after that they must read Hindi as a compulsory subject and *vice versa*. I would say that there is no conflict between Punjabi and Hindi. Punjabi is our regional language and Hindi is our *rashtrabhasha*. Why should the Hindus residing in Punjab be afraid of reading Punjabi? It is very wrong for the Hindus to refuse to acknowledge Punjabi as their mother-tongue while they live in the Punjab. I am at one with Diwan Chaman Lall when he said that he would beg of the Hindu friends to read Punjabi in Gurmukhi script also if that would satisfy the Sikh friends, because reading Hindi in one script or the other would not make much difference. If the Sikhs think that the Punjabi language will survive only if it is read in Gurmukhi script, I would have no difficulty in that. My children read both Punjabi and Hindi with the same ease. Where is the difficulty in reading Punjabi

[Shri J. N. Kaushal.]
in Gurmukhi script? I would therefore submit that all safeguards should be provided for protecting Punjabi and for enriching Punjabi because it is the regional language and its due place has been recognised in the Constitution.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): It is time now.

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL: I will take five minutes more.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): I am sorry.

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL: I will try to be very brief.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): All right. You wind up in two minutes.

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL: Then I will submit a few points regarding PEPSU. The capital of the new province as has been recommended by the Commission is Chandigarh although the Commission has also stated that Patiala should be given its due place. With very great respect I have to say that I differ from the recommendation of the Commission in this matter because Chandigarh is not centrally situated. If you just look at the map, you will find that it is in one extremity while Patiala is the only central city which is fully developed. It was the capital of a premier State for centuries and it has all the concomitants of a capital. It has a medical college; it has Degree colleges; it has a very big hospital. Then there are a number of buildings which can house the various Government servants and offices. And I must say that during the last two or three years PEPSU has very much advanced industrially. The number of factories is going up. It is a city of gardens and anybody who has had a look at Patiala city would agree with me that Patiala is more centrally situated than Chandigarh. A lot of money has been spent on Chandigarh but I would submit that in spite of the best efforts

of Government, there is very little private venture; only a dozen private houses have come up. It will take 20 years, perhaps even fifty years, for Chandigarh to grow into a full-fledged city. Even then I am afraid it may not become a commercial city at all.

There is another submission that I wish to make. Since two new States are coming into existence, the Services should be integrated not on the basis of pay but on the basis of length of service; otherwise this will for all time to come be a point of dissatisfaction and the State cannot progress if the Services are discontented.

Another point that I want to make is this. During the interim period between October and the coming general elections, what will become of the two legislatures? I am told that the people are thinking that the number of legislators from PEPSU should be reduced from 60 to 35 and on an *ad hoc* basis 35 persons will be chosen. I would say that it will be entirely erroneous. When there is only an *ad hoc* arrangement, let all the members of both the Assemblies sit together and after six months there will be general elections. That will be in the interest of both the States.

Then so far as the Five Year Plan of PEPSU is concerned, I would submit that PEPSU has some surplus money and it should be allocated for being spent according to its own needs. So while drawing up the Bill, this should be borne in mind that this surplus money meant for its development should be kept intact on a district basis and it should not be allowed to be lost in the greater State.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: By 'surplus money' do you mean the money in the treasury of the Rajpramukh?

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): I would request Members to realise that it is not my time but it is Members' time. If one Member takes another minute, he is only taking another Member's time. I hope they will scrupulously stick to their

time; then only we will be able to finish by 7 O'clock.

SHRI A. ABDUL RAZAK: Sir, mine is the lone and feeble voice in this House representing the 15 lakhs of Tamils, now in Travancore-Cochin, and as such, I entreat this House as well as the Chair to accommodate me to the greatest extent possible. My friend Mr. Madhava Menon referred to some Tamil areas in Travancore-Cochin today. I am glad that he also referred to Devikulam, Peermede and other Tamil taluks at present included in the Travancore-Cochin State. I am glad, however, that he made a tempered speech. But the irony of it was that he prefaced his speech by saying that he was not prompted by a desire to grab territory but during the course of his speech he repudiated himself. I am sorry, Sir, that he has failed to grasp the gravity of the feelings of these 15 lakhs of Tamils now struggling in Travancore-Cochin. Sir, for the last 200 years or so these 15 lakhs of Tamils have been subjected to the worst forms of social tyranny, political oppression and economic exploitation. The Home Minister the other day wanted us that we should keep under check the gamut of emotions that come upon us these days. Therefore I do not wish to relate here the instances of social tyranny and political vandalism that the Travancore Tamils have suffered up to now. Yet, Sir, I would cite—rather I should cite—one instance for the information of this honourable House. I do not know whether Mrs. Bharati knows that not long ago until the late eighties of the 19th century, our women could not go out in the open except without covering their breasts. This measures the depth of social tyranny and political oppression that our people were subjected to for the last 200 years. Therefore, as a natural consequence, the urge to freedom and self-respect and the longing to be with their own people in the adjoining territories buttressed itself in the mind of our people even before the birth of the Indian National Congress. This feeling, this urge to

freedom, this urge to self-respect, expressed itself in many sporadic uprisings which were ruthlessly put down by the Malayali rulers. Sir, until 1948 when adult franchise with responsible Government was granted to the people, this feeling of the Tamils did not take any definite political shape. Only during the elections in February 1948, for the first time in the politics of the State, the Tamils could organise themselves under the banner of the Travancore Tamil Nad Congress. During the elections in February 1948, the Travancore Tamil Nad Congress placed this issue of the merger of the predominantly Tamil taluks with the adjoining Tamil districts in Madras before the people and set up fourteen candidates. As against these fourteen candidates, the so-called State Congress, an all-Malayali Congress, also set up fourteen candidates. The result was not one of them was returned to the Assembly and more than that half a dozen of them had to lose the security amounts furnished by them. Thus, even as early as 1948, the demand of the Travancore Tamils was well defined and affirmed by the people. The demand was that the predominantly Tamil taluks in Travancore-Cochin, nine taluks in number, should merge with the adjoining Madras State.

Then, Sir, in 1949, July 1, the integration of the two princely States of Cochin and Travancore took place. At that time, on the eve of this merger of these two princely States, it was interpreted by them, in the Malayali press and platforms, as a first step in the direction of forming the Aikya Kerala or the Kerala State. Then, the Travancore Tamil Nad Congress also rightly thought that there was an opportunity for the Travancore Tamils to avail of this integration and merge with the Madras State. Towards this end, the Travancore Tamil Nad Congress boycotted the Assembly and defied all the laws of the State. For five days from 13th April to 18th April, 1949, the decrees of the State did not actually run in the Tamil territories.

[Shri A Abdul Razak.]

Then, Sir, the timely appeal came from our late lamented leader, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel through Shri Kamaraj Nadar as his personal envoy and the appeal was carried to us that the integration of these two princely States was a political necessity, not related to the formation of the Aikya Kerala and that our demand would be sympathetically considered if and when the question of the redistribution of the States was taken in hand.

Then, Sir, after 1949 in all the elections that followed this demand of the Travancore Tamil Nad Congress was affirmed and reaffirmed by the people. Now, Sir, when the assurance given to us by the late Sardar Patel was on the point of being implemented, the announcement of this Commission took place. And this Commission dealt with this issue of reorganising the States on a rational basis and yet recommended that only five of the nine taluks are to be merged with Madras State, retaining the other four taluks in the Kerala State. And these four taluks that are recommended to be retained in Kerala State are: Neyyattinkara, Devikulam, Peermede and Chittur. In recommending the retention of these four taluks in the Kerala State, I should say with all respect to the Members of the Commission, they have violated—I will not say flouted—the very principles they have enunciated in the first few chapters of their Report. It is to this task of proving the injustice embodied in the recommendation for the inclusion of these four taluks in the future Kerala State that I address myself now. I will first take up Devikulam and Peermede. These two taluks constitute a mountain region which forms one compact geographic unit with the Kodaikanal hills beyond the Palni hills which are now included in the existing State of Madras. It should be borne in mind, in this context, that this region did not form part of Travancore territory until 75 years ago, when this region was annexed to the Travancore State on the

strength of a lease executed by the Raja of Punjar, a descendant of the Pandias, who signed his name as Minakshisundaram. Another fact that has to be borne in mind is that until 1935, this region was entirely cut off from the main body of Travancore. As such, trade channels and communications were developed and maintained for the last several hundred years through the many passes leading to the various villages in the Madura district of Madras State. Notably there are five such passes, namely, Bodynayakkanur pass, Thevaram pass; Kambam pass, Gudallur pass and Sivagiri pass. And luckily for the Tamils of Travancore-Cochin, this fact is acknowledged in the 1951 census prepared under the supervision of a Government officer of the Travancore-Cochin State. Therefore, due to proximity and through these passes, Tamils from the adjoining villages of the Madura district edged their way into this mountain region and settled themselves there as early as four hundred years ago. These Tamils are settled there chiefly in the Anchanad villages, namely, Marayoor, Keezhanthur, Vattavada, Kottakkombu, Nachivayal and Kanthaloor. Still later on the strength of specific sanads issued by the Naiks of Madura, Tamil people from the adjoining villages in Madura district went into this region and engaged themselves in cardamom cultivation. For two centuries and over due to the pioneering activities of these Tamils, the monopoly of cardamom cultivation was held by them and that position is still retained by them, as nearly 92,000 acres out of 96,000 acres under cardamom cultivation are owned by them.

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

If we consider the recommendations of the Commission bearing in mind these factors, they would appear very unjust and unconvincing.

Sir, in recommending the inclusion of these two taluks in the future Kerala State, the Commission has

advanced three arguments—(1) that the Tamil population is migrant and is a floating corps of labourers; (2) that this region is required for easing some of the burden on the heavily congested littoral areas of the State; and (3) that it is required for affording protection to the rice fields in the valley-bottoms, hydro-electricity, etc.

I will first take up the argument that the Tamil population is migrant and is a floating corps of labour. I might, at the very outset, say with due respect to the Members of the Commission, that it is a most fantastic and invidious distinction that they have made in regard to the Tamils in Devikulam and Peermede. Nowhere else have they made this distinction. I ask the hon. Members of this House to consider whether they have applied this distinction in the case of Malayalees in Kasargod or in the case of Kollegal taluk, or in the case of Dhanbad district in Bihar?

This argument is as unconvincing as it lacks substance. This argument cannot stand the slightest scrutiny. I would refer the hon. House to the statistical figures of our Census Reports. According to the 1931 Census Report, the Tamil population of these two taluks was 76,506, whereas the Malayalee population was 23,178. In 1941, the Tamil population was 85,305 and the Malayalee population was 40,030. In 1951, the Tamil population was 1,04,700 and the Malayalee population was 66,490. I would only entreat this House to compare the 1931 figures with those of 1951. Sir, it is very clear that, whereas the increase of the Tamil population during the course of these 20 years is not even 50 per cent. the increase of the Malayalee population for the corresponding period is 300 per cent. This is a biological impossibility. If you accept this view, does it not stand to reason that it is the bulk of this Malayalee population that is migrant there and that they alone constitute a floating corps of labour and not the Tamils, as they are there since the time of the Pandyas?

The second argument of the Commission hinges on the question of density. My hon. friend Mr. Madhava Menon also was indulging on this factor of density. The inflated figure given by Mr. Madhava Menon is a monstrous exaggeration. There is not so much congestion and at any rate it is not going to be so in the future Kerala State. The average density for the existing State of Travancore-Cochin is 1,015, whereas in the future Kerala State excluding Devikulam and Peermede, the density will be only 977.8 per square mile. This view was fully supported by the Chief Minister of the State of Travancore-Cochin when he recently came forward in the Assembly of that State asking for the exclusion of the Laccadives and the Amindives from the future Kerala State. If there would be so much of density in the future Kerala State as has been expressed by my hon. friend, Mr. Madhava Menon, how could a responsible man—an able person of the status of the present Chief Minister of Travancore-Cochin—come forward to say that they would not take the Laccadives and the Amindives within the jurisdiction of the future Kerala State? Even assuming that argument of a high rate of density, where is the space left for the settlement or supplanting of the Malayalees? Sir, the total area of these two taluks is 1,119 square miles and excluding the two pakuthis of Pallivasal and Peruvanthanam, the total area is only 1,035 square miles and this extent of 1,035 square miles is distributed in the following manner:—

Periyar lake and catchment area—
305 sq. miles.

The Kanan Devan Hills Produce Company concession area—215 sq. miles.

Other tea, gardens—97 sq. miles.
Cardamom plantation—215 sq. miles.
Anchanad villages—112 sq. miles.

What remains, therefore, is only an extent of 91 square miles which is covered with dense forests and grass lands, not at all suitable for habitation.

[Shri A. Abdul Razak.]

So, this being the real picture of Devikulam and Peermede, it will not be very difficult to detect the motive behind the so-called Colonisation Scheme. Under these circumstances, it could lead to only one inference and that is that the Malayalees will get into this region—particularly into the Anchanad villages—and occupy that area forcing or elbowing out the Tamils. I submit, Sir, that this is not a very honest motive; this is a foul intention. This motive force behind this colonisation scheme is very clear from the statement made in the Travancore-Cochin Assembly by an ex-Chief Minister of that State

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN): Three minutes more.

SHRI A. ABDUL RAZAK: I am entitled to half-an-hour. I have taken hardly 15 minutes.

I would, therefore, refer the hon. Members of this House to page 201 of the printed proceedings of Travancore-Cochin Assembly dated 21st to 24th November, which were distributed to us. The ex-Chief Minister says:

“.....Devicolam and Peermede certainly must be retained in the State, every inch of the land of these taluks.... the retention of Devicolam and Peermede in all their entirety in the Kerala State is essential and all important. Simply because Tamilians from beyond worked there in the past—Tamilians from Madurai—I may mention the fact that even that cannot be allowed to continue too long.”

Then on an after-thought, the stroke of wisdom came upon him and he corrected himself by saying:

“I do not say that all Tamilians working there should be sent out.”

Therefore, the motive is clear that the Government of Travancore-Cochin wants to supplant the Malayalese by driving away the Tamilians, the original inhabitants of the locality

(Time bell rings.)

SHRI A. ABDUL RAZAK: I will take only a few minutes more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN): You should try to wind up.

SHRI A. ABDUL RAZAK: Then, Sir, I come to the other argument of this area affording reasonable scope of settlement with the future development of this region. Even by this argument, the Tamils have a stronger case than the Malayalese, as I told you before, the average density for the future State of Kerala would be 977·8, per square mile whereas the density of population in the five southern taluks of Shencottah taken together is 1,280·7 per square mile. Therefore, even on this pretext the necessity for easing the density of population with the future development of this region is greater for the Tamils than for the Malayalese.

Then I come to the third argument of affording protection that is necessary for the hydro-electric project at Pallivasal and the rice fields in the valley-bottoms. Sir, the Travancore-Tamilnad Congress itself has very magnanimously—perhaps more liberally than the Commission themselves have done in excluding a small portion of the Mallapuram sub-taluk from Karnataka—excluded the Peruvanthanam pakuthy and Pallivasal pakuthy. From this, what remains therefore, for consideration is the protection that is necessary for the rice-fields in the valley-bottoms

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN): One more minute.

SHRI A. ABDUL RAZAK: I will finish in two minutes. The Members of the Commission have proceeded on an incorrect appreciation of the geography of this region. The mode of cultivation obtaining in the rice-fields is peculiar. It is known as *punja* cultivation which cannot be better expressed than in the words of Professor George Kurien, condensed and

adopted by O. H. K. Spate in his 'India and Pakistan'—general and Regional Geography; p. 629.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN): You should wind up.

SHRI A. ABDUL RAZAK: He says:—

"Along the backwaters (punja and cole areas) the problem is not to get water on the land but to get it off. These areas are divided into blocks of up to 50 (exceptionally 100) ac., bounded by double dykes enclosing a channel. From July to September-October the ground is submerged, sometimes to a depth of several feet; after the rain the water is lifted into the bounding channels by Persian wheels; latterly oil-driven and still more recently electric pumps powered from Pallivasal have been introduced. The land lies three or four feet below the water-level in the channels, and sluices regulate various inundations during the growing season. Should the bunds be burst the half-drowned crop may be reaped from boats by cutting off the heads."

Sir, I would emphasize only these two points: In the rice-fields along the valley-bottoms the problem is not to get water on the land but to get it off and "should the bunds be burst the half-drowned crop may be reaped from boats by cutting off the heads."

That means, the problem in the rice-fields in the valley is one of getting off the water from the land than to get it on the land. Therefore, it was only in the interest of these rice-fields that the Maharaja of Travancore agreed in 1886 to the proposal of the Secretary of State for India on behalf of Madras to construct the Periyar Lake which, you, Sir, were good enough to refer to yesterday.

For the development of this region and the utilisation of its waters, the Travancore-Cochin Government has absolutely no scheme, whatsoever. On

the other hand the Madras Government have included three schemes in the Second Five Year Plan which entirely depend upon the waters of this region. The Periyar Hydro-electric project the foundation of which was recently laid in the Gudalur village of Periakulam taluk of Madurai district, the Aladi Upper Periyar Project and the Pambiar Project have been included in the Second Five Year Plan.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN): Please sit down.

SHRI A. ABDUL RAZAK: I will finish.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN): No, no. Order, order. Please sit down. I am sorry. Mr. Dave.

SHRI S. P. DAVE (Bombay): Mr. Vice Chairman, in the beginning I think it my duty to pay a tribute to the Members of the Commission who have presented a Report which is very precise, comprehensive and analytical. It may be that some of us may differ with the conclusions they have arrived at, and it is quite possible that all the recommendations that they have made may not meet with the approval of all the Members here in the Parliament and outside. But, I think, they have done their job marvellously well with impartiality and a judicial sense for which we are grateful to them.

Coming next to the provinces with which I am connected, namely the States of Bombay and Gujarat, I have to offer a few observations. While doing so I must commend to this House the wise speech of one of my predecessors Kakasaheb Kalelkar. He has uttered something which was extraordinary in the sense that when feelings are high generally, on this controversial issue he has made a very sober contribution to the debate by pointing out that let us not try to separate; let us try to come together. Let us not try to talk in a negative language but let us make certain positive contributions for the unity of the country. I also request very humbly to the Members of this House

[Shri S P Dave]

to consider this question which is very delicate, in the spirit that India is one great Union whether we speak one language or another, whether it is Tamil, Telugu, Gujarati, Marathi, Urdu or Punjabi. We are sons of the same mother-country. We have fought shoulder to shoulder with the British Imperialism and attained Independence. We have been in the same prison house or we enjoyed the fruits of liberty all together.

Why do we forget that when we sing our National Anthem, we do not sing the praise of one province or another. We do not speak in the language of Jai Gujarat, Jai Saurashtra, Jai Maharashtra or Jai Bombay but we pay our homage to the mother-country by saying Jai Bharat, Jai Hind. Therefore, Sir, if we approach our picture in that sense, then difficulties could possibly be lessened.

Somebody else said here something about politicians. Politicians are inevitable in every country. But is it really they who clamour and who protest against the redrawing of the map of India on a certain basis, or is it that they have the backing of the people? I do not doubt the honesty of majority of them. They must be voicing the feelings of the people. But then, what is the way out? When two brothers in a family think that it is not possible for them to remain together and their individual development lies in trying to lead a separate life, nothing on earth can keep them together. But they can do that with grace, with sweetness, with goodwill, with mutual concord and without letting the world know that they had been quarrelling. Can we not do that in that manner? I think, we have sense enough to realise that. When we are today talking in terms of co-existence of mutual tolerance, of goodwill, of unity, in the nations of the world, can we not apply that theory to ourselves here? Have we not that wisdom? Therefore, let us not try to talk in a passionate language which may give rise to ugly pictures, which we witnessed in the city of Bombay some

time back, and about which people create apprehensions in our minds. This is not a matter to be fought for. It is a matter for conciliation, for discussion, and for negotiation. Sir, I am essentially a trade union worker, and may I offer the recipe to the House, the recipe which I use in my daily disputes? Even though it may be a very common recipe, I feel that it has a magical value. What is that recipe?

Whenever there are any differences between man and man—and there are bound to be some differences—the best way is not to use the cudgels, not resort to the law of jungle, not to assert that might is right, but let us adopt some effective methods to resolve those differences. Today, we live in a world which recognises the principle of right is might. सत्यमेव जयते is the slogan that we have adopted, and *satya* and justice cannot be separated. If that is so, let us try to mutually discuss, negotiate, conciliate, and come to a mutual understanding. But there are occasions when feelings are very high on both the sides, and people are determined—take it or leave it, and no ground to be given. What is going to happen then? There are instances of that nature even in the history of the world. We have a proverb in Gujarati which says that the causes of majority of disputes in this world are *jar*, *jameen* and *goroo*. *Jar* is money, *jameen* is land, and *goroo* is woman. An epic was written on the Helen of Troy, as we know it. I have seen cases going to the Privy Council about land being two inches short this side or that side, or cases where a neighbour has to put up a window inside or outside as a matter of right. People do not think of expenses, and their feelings are there. In such cases, the best way is to leave the settlement of the disputes to arbitration. Here, Sir, in our country we have set up one of the highest forums, namely, the Indian National Congress. Today, it is that Party which is a ruling Party in the country, and therefore whatever the views may be on the other

side, I think, the ruling Party, whatever decision it takes, will have to be acceptable to this House.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: But there are dissensions in the ruling Party itself.

SHRI S. P. DAVE: Of course. And you also will be here in good faith, and you can also extend your help and co-operation in trying to remove those tensions. Therefore, Sir, I view this problem from that angle.

Then, Sir, if we just try to study the history of this particular dispute, we will find that at one time the Gujarat Provincial Congress Committee passed a resolution accepting *in toto* the S.R.C. Report. Later on, however, when it learnt that some other elements in the composite State did not extend the same amount of response, then naturally it came to the conclusion, which is also the conclusion of the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress, as I understand it, namely, the creation of three States, Bombay, Maharashtra including certain territories and minus certain territories of the old Karnataka, and Gujarat.

Now, Sir, there is a heated controversy as to what should be done about Bombay, whether Bombay should go with Maharashtra, or it should stand separate. I think, I may not add a word more to what the S.R.C. has argued out in connection with Bombay. It has the support, I am told, of the decisions of the former Commissions which went into this question very minutely, namely, the Dar Commission, the J.V.P. Committee, etc. Sir, after all, to try to make out something which rationally cannot be proved merely results in greater and greater dissatisfaction and discontent among people who are deeply affected thereby. I may lay a claim to certain things, even though I may not be sure about my claim. And when judicially I am deprived of that claim, I go about saying "Oh, I am robbed, I am disappointed." Something here was said

about the historical and geographical connection of Maharashtra with Bombay. I am not a research scholar, and my opinion may not be final on the subject. But it appears, Sir, that even the Congress, during its history of the past two generations, has all along treated Bombay as separate from Maharashtra, because there was the Bombay Provincial Congress Committee, as also the Maharashtra Provincial Congress Committee. And the Maharashtrians made their demand that for the growth and development of the Maharashtrian culture, a separate university should be established. Similarly, such a demand came from Gujarat and Dharwar also. These facts merely show what was considered to be at that time the feeling of the people. And I am told that a veteran Maharashtrian like Shri N. C. Kelkar started a movement for separate Maharashtra Committee. These are, Sir, the facts. If we come to a reasonable understanding with goodwill, nothing better than that. Otherwise, the only solution which appears to me to be very feasible and practical in the present circumstances is to abide by, and cheerfully abide by, whatever is being decided for us by the Working Committee of the Congress.

Sir, I am fully aware of the fact that the wind blowing from that side of the country is not free from passion. I am told that there is to be a strike on the 28th of this month, but what that strike will result in, no one knows. Are we going to be moved by such demonstrations? Can history be written or re-written by such demonstrations? It takes two people to do mischief. If both of us come to a decision that there shall be no mischief, there is no third element now which is going to put mischief in our minds. Therefore, let the leaders who are here take this warning that mischief, trouble and turmoil cannot lead to peace or prosperity for any constituent units of the country. It is only by understanding, by mutual goodwill, by creating a feeling of mutual love for each other that we can make each

[Shri S P Dave]

either concede anything that we consider or do not consider to be our own. Sir, I wish and I hope that my voice will prevail upon those whose duty it is to advise the people on both sides. Let them reconsider. Nothing has been spoiled; nothing has been wasted; nothing has been done. There is enough time always for peace. Gandhiji told us, 'Explore to the last all avenues of a peaceful settlement before you decide to pick up a quarrel.' I would always remember that, but it is the common property of the country. Of course, it was meant for labour-capital disputes, but it can serve in all disputes, wherever we go. Therefore, I offer this advice which is not my own but which comes from the Father of the Nation. Try the way of negotiation, consultation and failing that arbitration. Behave towards each other in a brotherly manner and try to find out a solution which will be acceptable to both, but if it is not acceptable to both, the country has to go on, the administration cannot stop. Therefore, let those in power decide the matter and let us all dutifully and in a disciplined manner try to work it for some time to come, even though it may not be palatable to us or to some of us. I do not want to take more time of the house since I am told that time is rationed. Thank you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity. Once again, I implore the leaders of the composite State of Bombay, the City of Bombay, of Maharashtra and others to put their heads together and give a formula which will be acceptable to us, if not acceptable to all but at least let us remain in goodwill, cheer and accord.

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI (Travancore-Cochin). Mr. Vice-Chairman, wide and varied reactions we are seeing in the wake of the publication of the S.R.C. Report. These are not wholly unexpected or unnatural. On the whole, I feel that our people have received the report with remarkable restraint. Except in the City of Bombay and the Vidhan Sabha of Vindhya Pradesh there was not much

violence. This to a large extent is due to the moral influence exercised by the leaders of the nation, and we can generally be proud of our people for the way they have received the Report. Of course, the authors of the Report can be proud of themselves for the general welcome the Report has received.

Sir, it was no easy job to have waded through the large mass of conflicting views, marshalled facts and figures, assessed warring claims, gauged the deep feelings on both sides and then to weigh the pros and cons and give a verdict. When two people advance their claims to a piece of land, of course, the Judge cannot please both sides while giving his verdict. So also with the S.R.C. Report, there is a certain measure of dissatisfaction on all hands, but the general and substantial satisfaction is also there. Rajaji, the most astute politician and statesman of our times, wishes the Report to be shelved for some time and India to be ruled as a unitary State. He wants big States, really big multi-lingual States. Sir, he is one who can see through the mist that shrouds the future and guide us. Certainly his opinion must receive the most anxious consideration. But Gandhiji stood for the redistribution of States on the basis of language. His instinct was unerring and always he felt the pulse of the nation. This feeling for States on the basis of language was implanted in the hearts of the people almost half a century ago. With the formation of Andhra, the formation of linguistic States was inevitable. When one crystal appears in a saturated solution, the process of crystallisation follows rapidly. Andhra was the first linguistic crystal in free India. Linguistic States may be good or bad, but their redistribution cannot be delayed, however much we may desire it. Feelings and expectations have been roused in the hearts of the people and that cannot be easily curbed. We must now implement the Report swiftly and smoothly. Of course, obvious mistakes have to be rectified by mutual agreement and adjustments.

made. Whatever we may say, we cannot deny the fact that language is the one overriding consideration that has gone into the grouping of States. The only bilingual State proposed by the Commission seems to be going because of the insistence of Maharashtra that all the Marathi-speaking areas should come into one unit. I am not surprised if the Gujaratis are afraid to be in a bilingual State, where they would be reduced to a very small minority. The predominantly industrial city of Bombay remaining a separate State, unattached to any language group, will give greater scope of employment to the people from other States also. Then, there are another five years before the Maharashtrians, if they woo Bombay, i.e., woo the people who are non-Marathis including Gujaratis, they can have that Queen of Cities. Of course, sincere and sedulous courting will be responded to, but as at present any attempt by any section for a marriage by capture may only estrange that city eternally. I think that it is an excellent arrangement if it is provided that Bombay will go to the Maharashtrians after five years, if the voters so choose. Let Maharashtrians befriend the non-Maharashtrians and win their confidence and let others feel that they are safe in their hands.

6 P.M.

Now, coming to other States, you must either break up U.P. and the proposed Madhya Pradesh into sizable and manageable units or have big ones like Vishalandhra. Sir, coming from a compact and well administered State, I prefer States of manageable size, say about one crore of population and 25 to 30 thousand square miles of land. But that cannot be had.

About my own State, my feeling is that but for the stand of our friends from Madras that they want an exclusively Tamil State, perhaps a bilingual Southern State as Rajaji envisages would have been possible. Tamil and Malayalam almost imperceptibly merge into one another and there cannot be more affinity between

any other two languages. So a Tamil-Malayali State would have been possible without the least strain. Anyway that dream is not to be realized because the big brother Madras thinks the other way about it. Unless two language groups genuinely desire for a common State, it is no good and it is the predominant group that should show the inclination. Now, Sir, I accept the basic principle—basic conception of the Kerala State. But it should have been treated with a little more generosity and understanding. Kerala is the tiniest of the newly conceived States—a bare 14,980 sq. miles, i.e., 1/5th the size of Karnataka and less than 1/3rd the size of Madras. I don't dare to compare Kerala with U.P. or Madhya Pradesh for my State will look too insignificant and microscopic. But in population, we don't lag behind anybody. Kerala has 1.36 crores whereas the five times bigger Karnataka has only 1.39 crores and almost four times bigger Madras has 2 crores. That is our problem Sir—I mean the problem for all of us because the strength of a chain depends upon the weakest link in it. So much so, it is our common interest or rather the interest of the Nation to see that all the States, whatever be the meridian in which they lie, or whatever the languages spoken therein, are viable and progressive. So the Tamil Nad must not only give up their claim on Peermade and Devikulam but they should agree to the four southern taluks of Travancore, Gudalur and part of Shencottah, going to Kerala. So also the vast State of Karnataka should not nibble at the Kasargode taluk north of Chandragiri river.

Sir, when I say that the Tamil labour in Peermade and Devikulam are migratory, I don't mean any disrespect to them. Neither labour nor migration are disrespectful. But the fact remains, Sir, that the Tamil labour who give the majority to the Tamils in these two taluks, do look upon Periyakulam, Kambom, Bodinayakanur and other villages of Madras as their homes. If you take

[Shrimati K. Bharathi.]

estate labour in these areas, 80 per cent. of them are common voters in Devikulam and Peermade as well as in Madras. They even take passage money from estates to go home to Madras. So the fate of this area shall not be decided by those people who do not really feel like belonging to that place.

Then, Sir, the Tamil majority in this area is not so predominant as is being made out. They will be below 57 per cent. if the two taluks are taken together. So it should hence be treated as a bilingual area. An area to be treated as unilingual, should have at least 70 per cent of one language according to the Dar Commission and the S.R.C. has followed that principle.

SHRI A. ABDUL RAZAK: The Tamils are 70 per cent. in the two taluks excluding Peruvanthanam and Pallivasal pakuthies.

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI: You please look into the figures. Then these two taluks form about 13 per cent. of the entire area of the Travancore-Cochin State and the population is only 2 per cent. Should a majority of this 2 per cent. population be allowed to take away 13 per cent. of the area of the State? Then the area of Kerala will be reduced from 14,980 square miles to 13,871 square miles and still the population will remain almost the same, i.e., 1.36 crores will be 1.35 crores. Sir, these taluks are vital to Kerala in many ways. There we have the source of all main rivers. There we have the important hydro-electric schemes. That part gives us the bulk of the forest revenue. That is our main-stay in agricultural income-tax. That alone gives us the spare land to spread out our ever-increasing population within the State. These taluks are a part of the Kottayam District and there are neither geographical, administrative nor economic reasons warranting the taking away of these areas. If that

is detached, I think the tiny Kerala State will only wither away and die.

Then paragraph 294 of the S.R.C. Report says: "that Shencottah Taluk is partly an enclave in Tirunelveli district of Madras and the percentage of Tamil speaking people is about 93. Physically and geographically it belongs to the Tirunelveli district with which it should now merge". By the logic of the S.R.C. Report itself, the area which is an enclave should merge. If the whole taluk is merged in Madras, an enclave will be created in Kerala. Therefore, the portion of Shencottah, west of the Western Ghats must be retained in Kerala. Otherwise even administrative difficulties may crop up.

Then the four Southern taluks of Travancore, sought to be taken away, are part of Trivandrum District and have developed as an integral part of it. The Commission, I regret to say, have deviated from the principle laid down by them in para 291 of their report, viz., that a district would not be disrupted except for ensuring geographical contiguity or for some other administrative or economic considerations which make the detachment of a part of the district imperative.

Sir, geographically, these four taluks are contiguous to the rest of Kerala and are completely separated from Madras by the Western Ghats. There is only one main pass in the Western Ghats known as Aramboly through which alone communication is possible between this area and Madras. Administrative convenience requires this area to continue as a part of the Trivandrum district. The farthest point of this area from Trivandrum city will not exceed 54 miles. Economically these taluks have developed as an integral part of the Trivandrum district. Almost all the trade relations of the area are with Trivandrum. This area is far more developed than the rest of Travancore-Cochin State. They have the best irrigation communication and other

facilities. This is a bilingual area where everybody understands Malayalam. Detachment of this area from its present set-up will be detrimental to the interest of the people there. Sir, it may also be noted that during the last elections, when passions were roused to the highest level, while the Travancore Tamilnad Congress polled 1.5 lakhs, 1.2 lakhs were cast against them.

SHRI A. ABDUL RAZAK: How much did you score?

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI: That is not the question. I wish to say that 1.2 lakhs were cast against them.

Sir, in some States it is alleged that the areas where linguistic minorities live are neglected. But in the case of the southern taluks of Travancore-Cochin State which may be called Tamil taluks, the case is just the opposite. There, the governments of yore as well as new have conferred all their favours. All the old and most of the new irrigation works are there. It has the best and first concrete road. They had compulsory primary education ahead of other areas. For an area of 645 square miles and a population of 8.2 lakhs, there are 58,593 schools and 612 miles of roads. Instruction in Tamil is imparted not only in primary schools but at all levels, up to the university.

Moreover, the presence of Tamils concentrated in one area—often holding the political balance—will give strength and confidence and importance to the Tamils left diffused in the rest of the State. Even if these taluks are detached an equal number of Tamils will be left behind in the South.

Sir, it is ephemeral passion that makes some people think in terms of going away. That will be bad in the long run for those who go and for those who remain. But whatever happens, let there be no bitterness.

Then about the Gudalur taluk, we seek its inclusion in Kerala because....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. P. SUBBARAYAN): One more minute only.

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI: I will finish just now. We want it to be included in Kerala because it is contiguous with Kerala. My esteemed colleague, Shri Madhava Menon has already advanced the arguments on which this claim is based.

Whether we form the linguistic States or not, and whatever be their areas, let us not speak in the language of war. Once a decision is taken, let us abide by that decision. Every State is ours. That is how I regard them. I can go and settle down anywhere in India. Language belongs to him or her who masters it. It is very often tribalism that we find in the guise of linguism and not even real love of language. Otherwise, any one who speaks a language should be treated as being of that language. But strangely enough I know, Sir, Travancore Tamil Nad leaders who do not know Tamil at all, not only to read or write, but even to speak. Language is not in the blood.

SHRI A. ABDUL RAZAK: May I....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. P. SUBBARAYAN): No interruption, please.

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI: Language may be a tool and it may be a qualification in a particular area. But let us not make language a goddess and that too, a goddess of destruction. Sir, I think that we must teach our children three or four languages, marry them and settle them in different States. Let them roam about and feel like being Indians.

श्रीमती मायादेवी छत्री (पश्चिमी बंगाल):
उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस कमीशन में जो आदरणीय पुरुष थे उन्होंने सरर दश के कोने कोने में जा कर और तकलीफ उठा कर इस रिपोर्ट को तैयार किया है। परन्तु जब हम

[श्रीमती मायादवी छात्री]

इस रिपोर्ट के ऊपर बहस करते हैं तो हम लोग पूरी तरह से इस पर सहमत नहीं होते हैं और हम लोग इसका पूरी तरह से समर्थन भी नहीं कर सकते हैं।

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI CHANDRAVATI LAKHANPAL) in the Chair]

महोदया, कमीशन ने जो रिपोर्ट तैयार की है उसमें लिग्वेस्टिक बेसिस (आधार) के प्रिंसिपल को छोड़ दिया है। भारत की स्वाधीनता के बाद जो दर कमीशन (Dar Commission) बैठा था उसने भी कहा था कि केवल लिग्वेस्टिक बेसिस पर दश का बटवारा करना उचित नहीं होगा और दर (Dar Commission) के बाद जो जे० बी० पी० कमेटी बैठी थी उसने भी कहा था कि हमारे दश में बहुत से भाषाभाषी हैं, इसीलिये भाषा के आधार पर ही यदि हम दश का बटवारा करेंगे तो उससे हमारे दश में यूनिटी और एकता नहीं आ सकेगी। इस स्टेट रिऑर्गनाइजेशन कमीशन की पोलिसी भी यही दिखाई देती है कि लिग्वेस्टिक बेसिस पर दश का बटवारा न किया जाय और एकनामिक कंडीशंस (आर्थिक अवस्था) को देख करके और दम्युनिकेशंस बगैरह की जो तकलीफें हैं उनको भी देख कर के ऐसा किया जाय। इसी विचार को सामने रख कर दश का पुनर्गठन करने के लिये इस कमीशन ने अपनी रिपोर्ट इसी आधार पर तैयार करके यहां पर पेश की है।

महोदया, हम देखते हैं कि कमीशन दश के कोने कोने में गया, हर तरह के आदिमियों से मिला और हर तरह की माइनारिटी (अल्पसंख्यक) कम्युनिटीज के आदिमियों से भी मिला। फिर भी माइनारिटी कम्युनिटी का जहां सवाल आता है वहां पर उसके बारे में कोई खास ध्यान दे कर Commission ने अपनी रिपोर्ट तैयार नहीं की है। तब भी रिपोर्ट के पैरा ४ में माइनारिटीज के बारे में जो कुछ भी कहा गया है उसके ऊपर हम लोगों को पूरा महत्व देना

चाहिये, क्योंकि यह हमारा कर्तव्य है कि हम लोग माइनारिटीज की रक्षा हर तरह से करें। अगर किसी भी स्टेट में जाइये माइनारिटी कम्युनिटीज मिलेंगी और वे अपनी भाषा, कल्चर, (संस्कृति) और रीतिरिवाज में उस स्टेट की भाषा, कल्चर, (संस्कृति) और रीतिरिवाज से न मिलने पर भी उसी स्टेट में ही रही हैं। इसीलिये हालांकि कमीशन ने उन लोगों को कोई सन्तोष नहीं दिया है फिर भी स्टेट्स में रहने वाली माइनारिटी कम्युनिटी को सरकार की तरफ से पूरा पूरा सेफगार्ड मिलना चाहिये।

महोदया में वेस्ट (पश्चिमी) बंगाल से आती है इसीलिये मैं यहां पर वेस्ट (पश्चिमी) बंगाल के विषय में ही आपका विशेष ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहती हूं। १९४७ में बंगाल का विभाजन हुआ और आधा हिस्सा हिन्दुस्तान हो गया और आधा हिस्सा पाकिस्तान हो गया। जब एक अंग से दो अंग हो गये तब भी बंगाल के लोगों ने खुशी से हंसते-हंसते अपने प्रदेश को विभाजित कर दिया। किस लिये विभाजित कर दिया? दश के लिये। अपनी स्टेट को विभाजित कर के दश को संगठित रखने के लिये, दश को मजबूत बनाने के लिये उन लोगों ने इतना सैक्रीफाइस (त्याग) किया। यदि आप वेस्ट बंगाल के मैप को देखेंगे तो आप पायेंगे कि वह एक ट्रंकटेड बंगाल हो गया है, उसका शरीर है और सिर है, लेकिन उसका गला नहीं है। वेस्ट बंगाल का ऐसा चित्र आपके समाने रहते हुये भी आप लोग वेस्ट बंगाल के प्रति कोई भी सहानुभूति दिखलाना नहीं चाहते हैं। वेस्ट बंगाल एक फ्रॉन्टियर स्टेट है क्योंकि उसके सामने पाकिस्तान है तिब्बत है, भूटान है और नेपाल है। इतने देशों से घिरा हुआ वेस्ट बंगाल है। कमीशन ने भी अपनी रिपोर्ट में कहा है कि इंडिया की स्पेक्टोरिटी का बड़ा भार ख्याल रखना होगा और अगर कोई फ्रॉन्टियर स्टेट है तो उसको पूरी-पूरी मदद देनी होगी। परन्तु हम देखते हैं कि इस तरह का विचार सफलभूत होने वाला नहीं है क्योंकि संवैधानी के हिसाब से

वेस्ट बंगाल के ऊपर विचार नहीं किया जा रहा है। हम मानते हैं कि आज हमारा कोई दुश्मन नहीं है और सारं दश हमारे मित्र हैं परन्तु पोलिटिक्स (राजनीति) एक ऐसी चीज है जो ठि, चेंज हो सकती है। कौन जान सकता है कि कल हमारे दश के ऊपर क्या विपत्ति आ सकती है और हमारे दश की क्या अवस्था हो सकती है। इसलिये यदि हम अपने फ्रॉन्टियर स्टेट को कमजोर रखते हैं तो फिर हिन्दुस्तान कैसे मजबूत रह सकता है? यदि हमारा कम्युनि-केशन लिंक भी ठीक न हो, एक प्रॉविंस से दूसरे प्रॉविंस में जाने के लिये कोई लिंक (सम्बन्ध) न हो तो फिर ऐसा बार्डर प्रॉविंस कैसे मजबूत रहेगा और भविष्य में वह दश की रक्षा कैसे कर सकेगा?

महोदया, हम चाहते हैं कि वेस्ट बंगाल पर सरकार का पूरा-पूरा ध्यान जाना चाहिए। वेस्ट बंगाल में, जो कि इतना छोटा सा स्टेट है, यहां पर आप देखिए सारं रिफ्यूजी पाकिस्तान से आ-आ कर ३ मिलियन से भी ज्यादा, साढ़े ३ मिलियन तक की संख्या में भर गए हैं। न इन लोगों को कहीं सेटल होने के लिए जगह मिली है, न इनके खाने, पीने और रहने का अभी तक बंदोबस्त ही पूरा तोर स हुआ है। कोई भी आदमी सियालदा स्टेशन में था और वहीं इधर-उधर रास्ते में देख सकता है कि कौन सी जगह ऐसी नहीं है जहां रिफ्यूजीज नहीं हैं। जब से हमारा दश स्वाधीन हुआ तब से वेस्ट बंगाल को एक विपत्ति से दूसरी विपत्ति, दूसरी विपत्ति से तीसरी विपत्ति का सामना करना पड़ रहा है, लेकिन उसकी कोई समस्याएं भी घट नहीं रही हैं। इस पर भी जो इस स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन कमीशन ने उसकी ओर कोई सिम्पैथी नहीं दिखाई है, यह गजब की बात है।

महोदया, हम चाहते हैं कि मानभूम, दालभूम और राजमहल जो कि ईस्टर्न बिहार के पार्शन हैं, ये वेस्ट बंगाल को दे दिये जायें और इसके साथ-साथ चिशनगंज जो पूर्णिया का एक छोटा सा हिस्सा है उसे दे दिया जाय जिससे

कि नार्थ बंगाल और साउथ बंगाल को कनेक्ट करने के लिए हमको एक लिंक मिल जाय। यही हम चाहते हैं। लेकिन जब मैंने सुना कि हमारे एक बिहारी भाई ने इस मांग को जबर्दस्त तौर से क्रीटसाइज किया और अपोज किया तो मुझे दुःख हुआ। मैं समझती हूं, हम लोग जो संसद में हैं, हमें सारं दश को आगे रखकर ही बातें करनी चाहिए, सारं दश का इंटरस्ट एक ही समझ कर हमें बोलना चाहिए। फिर, यदि एक स्टेट का थोड़ा सा हिस्सा दूसरे हिस्से में उसकी भलाई के लिए, उसकी उन्नति के लिए चला भी गया तो उससे तो अपने पड़ोसी की भी उन्नति है, अपनी भी उन्नति है और सारं दश की उन्नति है। इसमें जबर्दस्त आब्जेक्शन करने का तो कोई कारण दिखाई नहीं देता है, और अगर हम लोग यहां ज्यादा से ज्यादा एजिटेशन करते हैं तो उसका परिणाम यह होता है कि जिन जगहों की हम चर्चा करते हैं वहां और भी ज्यादा एजिटेशन होता है।

हमारे बिहार के सदस्य, श्री सिंहा ने कहा है कि वहां पर ज्यादातर मुसलमान रहते हैं, इसलिए मुसलमानों के लिए बड़ा भय है कि वेस्ट बंगाल में मिल जाने से उनका वही ट्रीटमेंट मिले या न मिले जो कि उन्हें इस समय मिल रहा है और यही कारण है कि वहां के लोग वेस्ट बंगाल के साथ मिलना नहीं चाहते हैं। महोदया, मैं यह कहना चाहती हूं कि हमारे वेस्ट बंगाल में सिर्फ मुसलमान ही नहीं हैं बल्कि सारं दश के आदमी रहते हैं और रिफ्यूजीज हो करके हिन्दू ही नहीं आते, मुसलमान भी आते हैं। मुसलमान रिफ्यूजीज को भी बराबरी का हक मिल रहा है, उनकी भी हम समान तौर से सेवा और देखरेख कर रहे हैं और उनमें कोई फर्क नहीं रखा है। जो पार्शन हम लेना चाहते हैं उस पार्शन में जो भी आदमी रहते हों, किसी भी माइनोरिटी के लोग रहते हों, उनके लिए पूरा-पूरा संफगाई रखा जायगा। उनके लिए किसी प्रकार का भय नहीं है और न भय दिखलाने का कोई कारण ही हम देखते हैं।

[श्रीमती मायादेवी छत्री]

इस सम्बन्ध में महोदया, मैं यह कहती हूँ कि हमारा दश में जो विदर्शी लोग आते हैं उन सबसे हम भाईचारे के नाते दिखलाते हैं, सबसे भाई भाई कहते हैं, परन्तु अपने ही दश में छोटा सा हिस्सा इधर लेने में या उधर देने में, जिससे कि हमारा दश का ठीक ढंग से पुनर्गठन हो सके, हम आब्जक्शन करते हैं, तो यह हमारी कितनी छोटी मनोवृत्ति है ? बाहर से जो लोग यहां आते हैं वे हमसे क्या कहेंगे ? उनके सामने तो हम "हिन्दी चीनी भाई भाई" "रूसी हिन्दी भाई भाई" बोलते हैं, लेकिन अपने ही दश में अपने पड़ोसी को अपना छोटा सा हिस्सा देने के लिए, छोटा सा हिस्सा सैक्रिफाइस करने के लिए भी तैयार नहीं हैं, तो ऐसे नारों का कोई महत्व नहीं रहेगा ।

महोदया, मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि मुझसे पहले बिहार के जो मेम्बर बोले हैं उन्होंने कहा कि यह हिन्दी स्पीकिंग (भाषी) एरिया है, बंगला स्पीकिंग एरिया नहीं है, इसलिए यह हिस्सा बंगाल में नहीं जा सकता है । इसके माने यह है कि हम लोगों को अपना काँरीडोर (रास्ता) भी नहीं मिलेगा, एक हिस्से से दूसरे हिस्से को जाने के लिए रास्ता भी नहीं मिलेगा । आखिर हम लोग सब भाग्य के ही रहने वाले हैं, हमें चाहिए कि जिस तरह से भी हो भारत को सभी तरह से स्वतंत्र बनावें और उसको पुष्ट करें । यहां यह सवाल नहीं पैदा होता कि हम भारत से बाहर जा रहे हैं या भारत से बाहर का कोई आदमी भारत का कोई हिस्सा मांग रहा है । जब हम लोगों ने स्वतंत्रता पाने के लिए और दश को मजबूत बनाने के लिए इतने इतने त्याग और बलिदान किए तो आज यह क्या हो गया है जो हमारा एक छोटा सा हिस्सा मांगने पर उसके विरोध में बोला जा रहा है ? यह रिआर्गनाइजेशन कमिशन क्यों बिठाना पड़ा, इसलिए कि वह यह देखे कि किसको कौन जगह पर क्या तकलीफ है और उस तकलीफ को कैसे दूर किया जाय ।

लेकिन आज हम उस तकलीफ को दूर करने के स्थान पर एजिटेशन मचाते हैं, उसमें बाधा डालते हैं और गड़बड़ मचाते हैं । तो फिर इसका मतलब क्या हुआ ? (समय की घंटी) हम लोगों की जो यह डिमांड है, वह एक छोट से स्थान के लिए है, जिससे कि हमारा जो रिफ्यूजी प्रब्लम है वह सेंट्रल हो जाय, रिफ्यूजीज कंसेंट के लिए जगह निकल आए । इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि हम अपने गाबाभाषी क्षेत्र को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं । हमारी यह जरूरत कोई ज्यादा नहीं है और हमारी बढ़ती हुई आपुलेशन का देखते हुए हम सबका यह फर्ज है कि वेस्ट बंगाल के लिए जो हमारी छोटी छोटी डिमांड है उनकी पूर्ति कर दें जिससे कि हमें अपना कम्युनिकेशन डेवलप करने के लिए थोड़ी सी सहायता भी मिल जाय ।

आखिर मैं मैं यह चाहती हूँ कि हमारी जो डिमांड्स हैं, उन्हें यह हाउस स्वीकार करे और मिनिस्ट्री उन्हें एक्सेप्ट (स्वीकार) कर ले । ताकि पश्चिमी बंगाल में आज तक जो तकलीफें हैं भविष्य में वे दूर हो जाएं ।

SHRI SHRIYANS PRASAD JAIN (Bombay): Madam, the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission is before the country for the last ten weeks. The leaders various political organisations and the public have commented on it. The Members of this House and of the other are debating the Report for the last one week and the impression which I have gathered from all these utterances is that most of the people are under the impression that the country is to be redistributed solely on the basis of language. It appears to me that the public and most of the Members are under the impression that the sole object of the appointment of the Commission was to suggest the redistribution of the country purely on the basis of language. The terms of Reference of the Commission and the appeal of the Prime Minister seem to have been completely ignored and I would like to draw the attention of

the House to these. This is what the Terms of Reference said:

"The first essential consideration is the preservation and strengthening of the unity of India. Financial, economic and administrative considerations are almost equally important not only from the point of view of each State but for the whole nation.**** The Commission will also investigate the conditions of the problem, the historical background, the existing situation and the bearing of all important and relevant factors thereon. They will be free to consider any proposal relating to such reorganisation."

These are very wide terms. You will observe from this that the Commission was free to recommend anything. Not only the purely language basis but other considerations will have to be taken into consideration. Madam, it was really a very difficult task and delicate too, and the Members of the Commission deserve the tribute of this House and of the nation that they have done a wonderful and marvellous job. The Members of the Commission were three very able statesmen of this country. They have taken a detached view and they have brought out a very balanced report. If this report would have been accepted *in toto* with a few minor alterations here and there. I think, that would have been an ideal one. Because the issue has been kept open, because it is said that the other various suggestions made may be taken into account and the recommendation of the Commission can be revised, this controversy has arisen. Anyway it would not be wise on my part to attempt to change the recommendations of the Commission unless the parties concerned agree between themselves, and that too should be in the larger interest of the country. The Home Minister, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant has sounded a note of caution that this report should be viewed and discussed dispassionately and with calm, and no passion should be brought in. After all, we are dealing with our own country, with our own

people, and what does it matter if some stretch of land is attached to this State or to another State.

DR. W. S. BURLINGAY: Why not then Bombay city go to Maharashtra?

SHRI SHRIYANS PRASAD JAIN: I have not touched the subject of Bombay State so far. Be patient. I shall come to deal with Bombay State a little later. I am just making a few general observations in the beginning.

Personally, Madam, I do not favour the distribution of States purely on the language basis, and I appeal to the people not to rouse passion on this account. We have had enough of this passion. We have tasted the poison while Andhra was created. We have recently seen and tasted the passion in Bombay and Vindhya Pradesh. If the Chief Minister of Bombay would not have taken sufficient care, the same thing as happened in Vindhya Pradesh might have happened in Bombay. He deserves all the congratulations for the steps which he has taken to see that the incidents which took place in Vindhya Pradesh did not happen in Bombay. It should be the duty of every right-thinking citizen to curb such a tendency as forcibly as we can. I do realise that it will be futile at this stage to go into the rationale of States reorganisation purely on language basis. What is urgent now is that this mental disease which has overtaken us should not be allowed to spread and it should be curbed as early as possible. The Government should come down with a heavy hand and should not allow the spread of these fissiparous tendencies. It would be better if all this exuberance and all this passion could be channelled for the constructive work. Madam, as you know, we are at the end of the first Five Year Plan and we have a very ambitious scheme for the next Five Year Plan. While, the need for harmonious and peaceful co-operation is more now than ever before, reorganisation of States carries new germs of problems. I would like to mention, in the context of the Five

[Shri Shriyans Prasad Jain]
 Year Plan, the safeguards specifically emphasised in the SRC Report to cultivate and build up a national conscience. There are two fundamental basic facts for national unity. One is the States, whether reorganised or not, are and will continue to be integral parts of the Union, which is more real political entity and the basis of our nationhood. The second is that the Constitution of India recognises only one citizenship, a common citizenship, for the entire Indian people with equal rights and opportunities throughout the Union without which, the Commission says reorganisation perhaps would not only be incomplete but a danger to national unity. The recommendation that relates to the administrative services should receive consideration and also safeguards for linguistic groups. If the weaker and backward areas are to be developed there will be need for an enlarged plan of expenditure.

Now, Sir, I will come to the State of Bombay. I welcome the recommendation of the SRC. I wish that the recommendation were accepted by all concerned. This was the best solution under the circumstances. The cultural, economic and social life in Bombay is so intermixed and interwoven that it will be hard to separate it. It will be a sad day when Gujarat, Saurashtra and Bombay are separated. One cannot think and go without and other. Even their profession is so divided that one has to depend on another. The administration of Bombay is a model one. The State of Bombay in its present form has the resources and efficiency to shoulder heavy burdens and responsibilities. The multilingual Bombay State has contributed to the economic well-being of the country and to all those friends who want to divide it. I will say the words of the real mother. The real mother of the child said to King Solomon, "Let us not cut the baby into pieces; Let her have the whole". If the Maharashtrian brothers do not want to remain as a partner in the

Bombay State and they want to be a good neighbour, I have nothing to say, but my only appeal to them is that they reconsider their decision, that they reconsider their attitude and see whether in the larger interests of the country it will not be more fitting that they remain in a bilingual State. If they are firm in their decision and they want to separate, I think, there is no other alternative but to carve out a new State from out of the present Bombay State, which has been suggested by the Working Committee. Though it will not be an ideal solution, it is the second best solution. I think it will be a good gesture if they accept this decision with grace, with goodwill and with mutual co-operation. They will earn the gratitude and goodwill not only of the people of Bombay but the nation as a whole. The three-State formula of the Working Committee is the only solution in the present state of mind of the people of Bombay, particularly Maharashtra.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: What we are interested in knowing from you is how the business in Bombay will suffer if Bombay goes to Maharashtra.

SHRI SHRIYANS PRASAD JAIN: I have not said even a word about it. He has just referred me to a new point and I would rather like to reply to it. So far as the business people and the industrialists are concerned, it is a wrong impression on the part of anybody to think that they have any fears for the Maharashtrians. They have no such fear. So far as the industrialists are concerned, they do not want to restrict their activities to the Bombay State. They want to go to Maharashtra; they want to go to Gujarat and they want to go all over the country. I am not advocating this out of fear, but I sincerely believe that if Bombay city is merged in any particular unilingual State the secular character of the State will vanish. I am saying so in the interest of all concerned, including the Maharashtrian people. Please rest assured that we

have no fear whatsoever, we do not want any safeguards. we do not want any assurances. We know our strength, where we are. We know wherever we go we will make room for ourselves. They might justifiably claim Bombay on any basis, but when we are discussing the whole question on a population basis, I would rather like to say one thing. The population in Bombay of the Maharashtrian brothers is about 43 per cent. Besides these Gujaratis are about 18 to 20 per cent and the rest are about 40 per cent. They have also developed the city of Bombay, they have also shaped the destinies of Bombay. They should also have some say on the future of Bombay. They should have some say whether Bombay should be a part of a unilingual State or whether Bombay city should be carved out and made a separate State. Madam I would appeal that Bombay should have a cosmopolitan and secular character and that it should be allowed to grow in the same manner as it was built. It should remain as an ideal and inspiration to the rest of the country how the different people could live together peacefully and march together for the prosperity of all.

This morning, I was hearing the speech of my leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and he said the more he went into this question of reorganisation of States the more he felt that it would have been better instead of having these States on a linguistic basis, if we had just five regions. He felt that it would have been better in the larger interests of the country. Probably it is too late now. He has also suggested that regional councils should be started and some administrative arrangement made so that the various people of the States may discuss their problems and come to some settlement. I think that would be an ideal thing but perhaps we will have to face the situation now. We cannot ignore it and we will have to take the poison which we have set for ourselves.

(Time bell rings)

Madam one thing more. There is a demand that if Bombay is to remain separate, there should be a provision that after five years it should be open to them to decide by a two-thirds majority to merge with Maharashtra if they so desired. I do not like this arrangement. I would say that, whatever decision is arrived at now, it should be final. There should be nothing kept pending. Otherwise, this controversy will go on and the life of Bombay will throughout remain unsettled. People will be thinking in terms of election. They will not devote their attention and their energies towards the progress and development of the city. Not only in this election but even in the next one, this sort of thing will go on and all through these years life in Bombay will be in a state of turmoil and in a state of uncertainty. Therefore, I would appeal to my leaders that when they take a decision on the future of Bombay—whether it remains separate or whether it remains a part of the bilingual State—it should be made clear that whatever the decision that may be taken, it is final and there will be no further reshuffling or reorganisation. Otherwise, as I have told you just now, the peace of mind of the people will remain disturbed and they will not devote so much energy and attention to constructive work as they should.

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी (पंप्सू) उ०-
सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज इस हाउस के सामने एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट जैरे गौर हैं। मैं इस कमीशन के मمبرों को इस लिए मबारकबाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने राजप्रमुख के ओहदों को हमेशा के लिए खत्म करने की सिफारिश की है। मैं समझता हूँ कि आजकल की इमोक्रैटिक दुनिया में राजप्रमुखों का हमेशा के लिए रहना शोभा नहीं देता था। इसीलिए उनके ओहदों को खत्म करके कमीशन ने जमहूरियत के काज को तर्कव्यत पहुँचाई है।

[सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी]

एस० आर० सी० नं० हिन्दुस्तान में १५ रियासतों में से १४ रियासतों को यूनिटल ग़ुअल सूबा बनाने की कोशिश की है यानी एक ही भाषा और कल्चर के आधार पर ये सूबे बनाये गये हैं। लेकिन बर्दिक्स्मती से बम्बई और पंजाब ही दो ऐसे सूबे हैं जो कि भाषा के आधार पर नहीं बनाये गये हैं, जो कि यूनिटल ग़ुअल सूबे नहीं बल्कि वाईलें ग़ुअल सूबे बनाये गये हैं। क्या ही अच्छा होता कि कमीशन इन सूबों पर भी वही असूल बरतता जिस असूल के मातहत उन्होंने बाकी १४ रियासतें बनायीं। लेकिन उन्होंने ऐसा नहीं किया और आज बम्बई और पंजाब के ये दोनों सूबे ही हमारे नताओं की सिरदर्दी का कारण बने हुये हैं। मुझे खुशी है कि माननीय पीडित नेहरू जी और उनके साथियों ने बम्बई के मुताल्लिक मराठी भाषा का एक अलग सूबा बनाने का और उसके साथ गुजराती भाषा का एक अलग सूबा बनाने का तकरीबन फैसला कर ही दिया है। बम्बई सिटी के मुताल्लिक अनकरीब ही फैसला होने वाला है। मुझे उम्मीद है कि पंजाब के मुताल्लिक भी हमारे पीडित जवाहरलाल जी नेहरू और दूसरे नेता इसी किस्म का ही कोई ऐसा फैसला करेंगे जिससे पंजाब की जनता यह महसूस नहीं करेगी कि हमारे साथ बाकी दूसरे सूबों से अलग कोई फैसला किया गया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो भी फैसला हमारे नेता करेंगे हम उसे बसरा चश्म मानेंगे। लेकिन मैं यह जरूर चाहूँगा कि उनको इस किस्म का फैसला करना चाहिए जिससे पंजाब की जनता को यह महसूस न हो कि उनके साथ कोई अलग फैसला किया गया है।

इसके अलावा मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि बावजूद यूनिटल ग़ुअल और एक कल्चर के हिसाब से सूबे बनाने के कई ऐसे सूबे हैं जहाँ पर लिग्वीस्टिक माइनारिटीज रह जाएगी। मैं चाहता हूँ कि उन लिग्वीस्टिक माइनारिटीज के लिए वहाँ की नॉड्युयत की बिना पर उन सबको सफगाईस रखे जाएं। जो सफगाईस कमी-

शन ने ठिकमंड किये हैं मुझे उनसे ज्यादा तसल्ली नहीं है। मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि अब इस हाउस में यह फैसला किया जाना चाहिए कि पंजाब में ठाट छोट के बाद जो सूबा बने उसमें कुछ और तहफफुजात रखे जाएं। मिसाल के तौर पर पंजाबी बोली को, गुरुमुखी स्क्रिप्ट को वहाँ की ऑफिशल लेंगुएज करार दिया जाय। अगर यह कहा जाय कि, साहब, वहाँ पर हिंदी और गुरुमुखी दोनों ही चल रही हैं, तो इसके लिए मैं यह अर्ज करूँगा कि हिन्दी तो हमारी राष्ट्रभाषा है ही, और अगर हम विधान में गुरुमुखी स्क्रिप्ट को नहीं रखेंगे तो जिस तरह एक बड़े दरख्त के साये में एक छोटा दरख्त कभी नहीं पनप सकता, उसी तरह से पंजाबी भाषा की गुरुमुखी स्क्रिप्ट को विधान में न रखने की वजह से वह कभी नहीं पनपेगी। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि विधान में यह रखी जाए।

इसके अलावा मैं यह भी चाहता हूँ कि नये पंजाब में कैबिनेट, पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन, सबॉर्डिनेट सर्विसेज सेलेक्शन बोर्ड में सिख और गैर सिख की तादाद बराबर होनी चाहिए। इन दोनों कमीशनों के चेयरमैन सिख और गैर सिख बाई रोटेशन होने चाहिए। इसके अलावा नए पंजाब में पहले पांच वर्ष के लिए सिख चीफ मिनिस्टर होना चाहिए और नए पंजाब का गवर्नर भी बारी बारी सिख और हिंदू हो।

इसके अलावा मैं यह भी अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि आजतक जितने भी कानून नाफिज किए गए थे बनाए गए उनमें हिन्दू शब्द के साथ सिख शब्द भी आया करता था। अभी हाल में आपने देखा होगा कि हमने हिन्दू सर्वेक्शन बिल पास किया और उसमें जहाँ हिन्दू लफ्ज हैं उसके साथ सिख लफ्ज भी हैं, लेकिन बर्दिक्स्मती से यह कहना पड़ रहा है कि शैड्युल्ड कास्ट्स आर्डर्स में हिन्दू लफ्ज के साथ सिख लफ्ज नहीं लाया गया है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि अब वह बन्द आ गया है कि फिर से शब्द हिंदू के साथ सिख का लफ्ज शैड्युल्ड कास्ट सिख हरिजननों के लिए रखा जाय ताकि वही मराज्ज

जो कि एक हिन्दू हरिजन को मिलती हैं, हमारा मिश्र हरिजन को भी मिल सके। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस तरीके से हर हरिजन को, चाहे वह जैनी हो, बुद्ध हो, आर्यसमाजी हो या सिख हो, इसी किस्म की मंगआत मिलनी चाहिए जैसी कि दूसरों को मिल रही हैं।

मैं यह भी अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि ११ करोड़ रुपया पेंप्सू की जनता से वहाँ के महाराजाओं ने डबलपमेंट के लिए इकट्ठा किया था लेकिन वह रुपया उन्होंने खर्च नहीं किया है। वह सरप्लस रुपया इस वक्त है। उसमें से कुछ फाइव ईयर प्लान में लग गया होगा। तो मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि वह जो बाकी रुपया है वह पेंप्सू के इलाके में डबलपमेंट के कामों पर ही खर्च किया जाय। इसके अलावा मैं यह भी अर्ज करूंगा, जैसा कि कमीशन ने भी कहा है, फिफ्टियाला की जगह नए पंजाब में खास होनी चाहिए। चंडीगढ़ का कैपिटल अभी एरा नहीं बना है और अगर यह कहा जाय कि वहाँ असेम्बली हाल और इस किस्म की सामान्य इमारतें नहीं बनी हैं तो गलत नहीं होगा लेकिन हमारा यहाँ बाबायदा सेक्रेटरीयट वगैरह बन चुका है, दफ्तर और रहने के लिए बड़े बड़े क्वार्टर्स वगैरह भी बन चुके हैं और वहाँ आसानी से नए पंजाब का सेक्रेटरीयट बन सकता है, इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि नए पंजाब का कैपिटल फिफ्टियाला होना चाहिए।

मेरे दोस्त जगन्नाथ जी काँशल ने कहा था कि हमारे ६० के ६० मेम्बर नई बनने वाली पंजाब की असेम्बली में होने चाहिए। मैं यह अर्ज करूंगा कि न सिर्फ वे मेम्बर ही होने चाहिए बल्कि उनके अलावा हमारे पेंप्सू के जो मिनिस्टर्स हैं वे भी उसी तरह से अगले एलेक्शन तक पंजाब के मिनिस्टर्स के साथ रहने चाहिए और वहाँ मिनिस्टर्स की तादाद को बढ़ा कर पेंप्सू के सारे मिनिस्टर्स को रखा जाय।

श्री सत्येन्द्रनारायण मजूमदार : उनको तनख्वाह कम लेनी चाहिये।

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी : वह तो मजिरी पार हैं।

एक चीज मैं आपको सामने और अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। आज सुबह दीवान चमनलाल जी ने कहा था कि आज के कुछ सिखों ने पाकिस्तान के साथ मिल कर दरिया घाघरा तक बाउंडरी बनाने का फैसला किया था। मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि उस बात की पुष्टि के लिए दीवान चमनलाल जी ने कोई सबूत नहीं दिया, जिससे कि उनकी बात दुरुस्त साबित होती। चूंकि उन्होंने ऐसा कहा है इसलिए मैं उनको चैलेंज देता हूँ कि इसके लिए एक कमीशन मुकर्रर कराइए और अगर किसी सिख ने मुस्लिम लीग के साथ कामप्रोमाइज किया हो या कोई बातचीत की हो तो कमीशन उसकी इंक्वायरी करे और अगर कोई सिख गिल्टी साबित हो, या कसरवार पाया जाय, तो उसको सख्त से सख्त सजा दी जाए। मैं यह अर्ज करता हूँ कि जिन जालन्धर डिवीजन के आर्यसमाजियों ने बिटरंगेस पैदा करके पाकिस्तान बनाया था आज वे पंजाब के अन्दर फिर वही बिटरंगेस पैदा करना चाहते हैं। आज आपको सामने जगन्नाथ जी काँशल ने कहा कि पंजाबी बोली हमारी बोली ही नहीं बल्कि हमारी मादरी बोली है और हम इसको किसी तरीके से अलग नहीं कर सकते हैं लेकिन आज पंजाबी बोली को ही ले कर पंजाब में भगडा शुरू किया जा रहा है और इस भगडा को ले कर ही सिखों और हिन्दुओं को अलग किया जा रहा है। कौन नहीं जानता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी के लिए हिन्दुओं का और सिखों का खून एक ही जगह बहा था ? कौन नहीं जानता कि सिख और हिन्दु में रोटी और बेटी का सम्बन्ध है ? जहाँ हिन्दुओं की लड़कियां सिखों के घर में जाती हैं वहाँ सिखों की लड़कियां हिन्दुओं के घर में भी जाया करती हैं। मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि मास्टर तारगसिंह—जिनको बहुत कोसा जा रहा है कि वे बड़े कट्टर एक्स्ट्रीमिस्ट हैं—का भी नाम पहले नानकचन्द वल्द गोपीचन्द था, उनके बाप का नाम गोपीचन्द था और उनका नाम नानकचन्द था। मेरा मतलब यह है कि हिन्दु और सिख में कोई भी अलग नहीं कर सकता। गूटर पंजाब प्रॉट वाले जो यह चाहते हैं कि वहाँ गूटर पंजाब बन जाए वे ही पंजाबी बोली के खिलाफ जहाद

[सुरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी]

पंदा करना चाहते हैं। पंजाबी जहाँ सिसों को ज़बान है वहाँ हिन्दू भाइयों की भी ज़बान है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि पंजाब की हालत को दुरुस्त करने के लिए इस किस्म की बातों को रोका जाय।

आखीर मैं मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि कई जगह के लोग ऐसे हैं जो कि इस कमीशन की रिपोर्ट पर ईमानदारी से सोचते हैं और समझते हैं कि अगर वे किसी एबे में मर्ज होंगे तो उनके डेवलपमेंट के काम रुक जायेंगे और उनकी तहजीब व तमद्दुन खत्म हो जायगी। मेरा मतलब हिमाचल प्रदेश से है। अगर हिमाचल प्रदेश के लोग यह चाहते हैं कि उनको अलग रखा जाय तो उनको अलग रखना ही चाहिए और उतने असें तक अलग रखना चाहिए जब तक कि उनके डेवलपमेंट के काम जो हैं वे पूरे नहीं हो जाते हैं। इसके अलावा मैं यह भी अर्ज करूँगा कि अगर हरियाणा प्रान्त के लोग और दिल्ली के लोग अपनी बोली को, अपनी तहजीब व तमद्दुन को कायम रखने के लिए अलग रहना चाहते हैं तो उन्हें अलग रखना चाहिए। आज कुल की डेमोक्रेटिक दुनिया में मैं यह अर्ज करूँगा कि हर एक शहरी को एक ही किस्म के अख्तियार होने चाहिए, चाहे वे कोई भी हों चाहे वे पंजाबी हों, चाहे वे हिमाचल प्रदेश के लोग हों, चाहे दिल्ली के लोग हों, सब को जम-हरियत के उसूल पर नुमाईदगी मिलनी चाहिए।

आखीर मैं, मैं फिर अपनी उस चीज को दुहराऊँगा कि अगर वाहई किसी साहब को यह शक हो कि सिखों ने किसी वक्त मुस्लिम लीग से कामप्रोमाइज किया था तो आओ, इसके लिए एक कमीशन बैठा दो और जो गिल्टी पाया जाय कसूरवार पाया जाय, उसको सजा दी जाय या उन आदमियों को सजा दी जाय जिन्होंने कि पहले भी पंजाब की हालत को खराब किया था और अब भी पंजाब की हालत को खराब कर रहे हैं।

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: At the *fag* end of the day and within the short time left now, it is impossible to do justice to the subject on which I have been called upon to speak. But today if you will permit me, I would merely state certain fundamental propositions which I support and I propose to give the reasons therefor some time tomorrow. My first proposition is, and this is what I stand for and as I said some time ago in this House, I am for a unitary Government so far as this country is concerned. But I know that that is an impossible proposition. It is an unreal position to take. If, therefore, that is not possible, then I would suggest, as a very real proposition, leave aside these linguistic considerations or any other considerations. Divide the country, vertically and horizontally, according to latitudes and longitudes and if you do that you will have solved the problem in a far more satisfactory manner than what you are doing today. Madam, what I say to you today may sound very unreal. Everything sounds unreal when it comes from a person who cannot deliver the goods. The other day Mr. H. D. Rajah proposed a solution of the problem. He said have four Parliaments—one towards the east, one towards the west, one towards the south and one towards the north. Well you know what he said. Now, that sounded something like a very fantastic political theory. Of course, it is in a way fantastic. But I am told that Shri Jawaharlal Nehru today in the other House propounded not this theory but something analogous to this theory

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: But that does not make it less fantastic.

7 P.M.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: You know that fantastic things have happened in this country. What about the division of this country into India and Pakistan—one Pakistan to the west and the other Pakistan to the east, both of them being part of the same country, without any link between?

Now, can there be anything more fantastic? I say that more fantastic things have happened in this country. But then I am not going to take the time of this House by dwelling on only fantastic things.

The proposition that I wish to lay stress on is this—I will state the proposition, Madam, if you do not mind and then we will adjourn. I stand for one State formed out of Vidarbha, Maharashtra, Bombay, Gujarat, Cutch and.....

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: And Rajasthan

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Well, for that matter, as I have already stated, why not the whole of India? That would then be a unitary type of State.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI CHANDRAVATI LAKHANPAL): You may continue tomorrow.

The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at one minute past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 22nd December 1955.