

**ANNOUNCEMENT RE HOURS OF
SITTINGS ON THE 23RD AND 24TH
DECEMBER 1955**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed further, I have to make this announcement.

As there is no Private Members' business for tomorrow, the 23rd instant, the whole of that day will be allotted for discussion of the motion on the States Reorganisation Commission's Report. The House will also sit on Saturday, December 24, when the discussion on the motion will be concluded.

Tomorrow the House will sit from 10 A.M. to 7 P.M. and on the 24th the House will commence its sitting at 10 A.M.

**THE STATES REORGANISATION
COMMISSION'S REPORT, 1955 —
*continued***

SHRI S. C. KARAYALAR (Travancore-Cochin): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, let me at the very outset say that broadly speaking I am in favour of the proposals contained in the S.R.C. Report. So, they deserve to be accepted.

Sir, the opinion was expressed on the floor of this House and elsewhere that the demarcation of States should have been done on other lines than those indicated in the Report. It was stated by some Members here as well as outside that bigger states ought to have been formed. For instance Dr. Subbarayan mentioned that huge States should have been carved out. And he suggested the formation of a big Southern State comprising the States of Madras, Travancore-Cochin or Kerala, and Karnataka as well. Sir, personally I am in favour of such a proposal, and I would draw the political map of India by drawing some parallel lines transversely and also longitudinally. Of course, that is a good idea which has appealed to me. But, Sir, we have got to consider the fact that we are carving out States in a democratic set-up, and it is necessary to make a practical approach to the whole question. When I say

that we have to make a practical approach, I mean that we have got to respect the sentiments and wishes of the people of our country. There is no doubt, Sir, there has been a distinct urge towards the formation of linguistic States, and it is now too late in the day to think of taking a step against that distinct tendency.

Sir, the Commission have approached the whole problem from this angle, and they have made suggestions for the creation of practically linguistic States. But that does not mean that they have not paid any heed or consideration to other principles, which they themselves have laid down in the Report. For instance, Sir, they have given due regard to economic considerations, financial considerations, and above all, to the considerations of unity and integrity of India. They have always had these considerations in their mind, and they have not departed from those principles. In making the several proposals for the formation of the several States, they have paid due regard to the administrative and other problems, as also to the economic implications involved. They have given due weight to these considerations. There is no doubt that they have given great weight to the question of language, realising as they did that it was necessary, in the present set-up of things, to give due weight to linguistic homogeneity. Giving due weight to linguistic homogeneity is not synonymous to formation of linguistic States. They have recognised the principle that in a democratic setup, it is the right of the people to have the administration of the country carried on in a language which is known to them, and it is also the duty of the State to concede the demand of the people that the administration should be carried on in the language known to them. It is this principle that has weighed with them in making the several recommendations regarding formation of States.

Sir, the Commission have been duly aware of the problems that are likely to arise

[Shri S. C. Karayalar.] to be created by the formation of linguistic States. They generally are in favour of unilingual States, and in trying to form unilingual States they have also recognised that even in unilingual States the question of linguistic minorities will arise. So, they have been very careful to see that the problem of linguistic minorities should either be eliminated or should be reduced to the minimum possible extent. That is why they have added a chapter on safeguards for linguistic minorities.

Sir, I wish to say in this connection that the Report of the Commission is to be taken as a whole, as an organic whole. Their proposals regarding the organisation of States have not to be taken independently of the proposals regarding the safeguards provided for minorities and other problems that have been dealt with in Part IV of the Report. That is very important in the interest of the national unity of India. They have recognised those things, and they have said also that these two Parts must go together. If you separate one portion from the other, the recommendations will lose all their importance and weight.

Sir, now I come to another matter. Sir, the reactions to the recommendations of the Commission have been diverse. On the one hand, you find some intelligent criticism, and on the other hand, you see a wild agitation in the country, sometimes even violent. If you analyse the causes, you will find that both the criticism and the agitation are due to an essential misconception of the nature of the States that are being reorganised. Sir, it must be remembered that the States that are being created or reorganised or rather the redistribution of the territories of India is for a national purpose. It has to be understood that the States that are being 'created' under the new proposals are States which have to be 'created' and they can be destroyed also. They are, however, not indepen-

dent sovereign States. They are States within the Union which are destructible in the language of the Report. On the other hand, the Indian Union is indestructible. If this distinction, if this concept, of the formation of States and of the Union is kept in mind, much of the criticism and agitation would, I think, be eliminated to a very great extent. I wish that the people who are now carrying on an agitation will keep this distinction in mind.

It is said in some quarters that the reorganisation of States is not an urgent problem and that the whole problem should be kept in cold storage for some time. I do not agree with that. It has become very necessary and it has become very urgent. After the inauguration of the Constitution, we had a certain reorganisation of States but the pattern, the existing pattern, is more or less on the lines which existed in pre-independence days. The reorganisation of States as it now exists is not on rational lines. It conforms to the pattern which was laid down during the British days. It is now absolutely necessary that we should reorganise the States on rational lines. Moreover, it must be remembered that there is a certain dynamic urge generated in the minds of the people, and it is necessary that the people must be taken along with the Government. It is absolutely essential that the goodwill of the people must be enlisted in order that any scheme of reorganisation may be effective. Moreover, why I say that it is urgent is because we have now entered upon an era of development, an era of planning, and for the purpose of seeing that this planning is successful, it is necessary that the several units must be set-up more or less on a permanent basis. Otherwise, it will be impossible to implement our plans in the future.

Now, I wish to come to the question of linguistic minorities and the safeguarding of the rights of linguistic minorities. The S.R.C. Report has devoted much space and time to the

•consideration of this question. There is a special chapter devoted for the purpose. They attach very great importance to that subject, as part of the formation of unilingual or bilingual States. They recognise that the question of the rights of minorities will always arise, and that it is necessary, therefore, to make special safeguards for the preservation and /for the safeguarding of the rights of minorities. They have discussed the question as to what those rights are and they have discussed also the means or the machinery by which the rights of minorities may be preserved and safeguarded. The rights of linguistic minorities may be broadly (Classified under three or four categories. The main and essential right is the right of the minorities to receive instruction in their own mother tongue. They have rightly come to the conclusion that it is the Constitutional right of a linguistic minority to receive instruction in their own mother tongue, at any rate in the primary stage, and so they have made a definite recommendation that the right of linguistic minorities to receive instruction in their own mother tongue should be recognised Constitutionally and that it must be provided for in the Constitution. That is a very important recommendation which the Commission has made. I do not propose to refer to the other rights of minorities which deserve to be safeguarded, but the fact is there that the rights of linguistic minorities are a problem which has got to be provided for in any future legislation or the Constitution. They have discussed also the question as to how the rights of minorities should be safeguarded in future. They have come to the conclusion that the task of safeguarding the rights of minorities should be left to the Governors of the States as agents of the Central Government and not in the exercise of the discretionary powers of the Governors. That is a very valuable suggestion.

I now come to my own State. I wish to refer to the formation of

Kerala State. I belong to the Travancore-Cochin State and I belong also to the Tamil area lying in between Madras and Travancore-Cochin. There is no dispute about the formation of a Kerala State. The only dispute regarding this matter is about the Tamil areas in Travancore-Cochin State. The Tamil areas broadly speaking come under three heads. One is the southern taluks of the T. C. State—four taluks—two, the Shenkottai taluk on another border, and three, Devikulam and Peermede. First, I shall dispose of the Shenkottai question. It is a very simple matter. The Commission itself has said that it is an enclave in Madras territory and that it ought to go. The only dispute with regard to Shenkottai taluk is about a portion of Shenkottai taluk which lies on the hills. The Kerala people want to retain the hill portion of Shenkottai taluk in the future Kerala State. It is a very absurd proposition. I should say that the whole taluk, the plains portion and the hill portion, is an organic unit. The idea of separating the hill portion from the plains portion would be to disrupt the economy of the taluk. The economy of the taluk has been built on the basis of the existence of the hill portion and it would be sheer folly to disrupt that economy. It is absolutely necessary even for the living of the people, so that if any attempt is made to retain the hill portion in Kerala, it would be a grave injustice to the people of the plains. It would be preposterous to do so.

Now, one or two words about the southern taluks of T. C. I would only say that the Tamil areas, the four taluks of the T. C. State, are contiguous to the Tinnevely district. The customs and manners of the people of those taluks are those of the people of Tinnevely district. When the idea is to create a State for Malayalam-speaking people, then naturally the Tamil areas which are contiguous to the adjoining State of Madras should go to that State. That is a very simple proposition. Even otherwise, it will

[Shri S. C. Karayalar.] be a problem to the future Kerala State. It will be a problem if they try to retain this area as thex- will have to make special provisions for that particular area. It will be a problem for them and they should try to get rid of this problem. With regard to Devikulam and Peermede, so much has been said about it. I would only say that the wishes of the people of this area should be duly respected. The wishes of the people have been expressed in a very unequivocal manner in the elections, and therefore that area should go to Madras. Otherwise, a problem will be created for the future Kerala State in respect of that area.

With these observations, I support the S.R.C. recommendations.

SHRI G. S. DHILLON (Punjab): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I was very much pained to listen to the speech of my hon. friend, Diwan Chaman Lall yesterday. It is unfortunate that he tried to create greater confusion in the already foggy atmosphere. At the same time I am happy that he has disclosed a mentality, that communal mentality, which we all complain of. It was a demonstration of that communal virus which is responsible for the deterioration of the relations between the two sister communities. Sir, it was nothing extraordinary in Diwan Sahib assuming the role of a nationalist. He observed that Punjab had already suffered because of the partition and that no further partitions should be allowed. But who is responsible for this? Is it not a fact that the people of Haryana want to separate from the Punjab? The speeches of the Members from Haryana in the Punjab Assembly and those of the PEPSU M.L.As in the PEPSU Assembly give a clear proof of it. Why so? They are Hindus and yet they complained that they never received a fair treatment from the Hindus of the Jullundur Division. Diwan Sahib wanted to annex Himachal Pradesh to his dominion. There are 38 Members in the Himachal Pradesh Assembly. 34 out of those

Members voted against the merger, only 4 voted for it. Can there be a better indication of the wishes of the people of that area? Moreover there is one elected Member from that area in the Lok Sabha. He made it perfectly clear that the people of Himachal Pradesh were not afraid of the Sikhs, but they were apprehensive of the Hindus of Jullundur Division whose cause Diwan Sahib espoused. Diwan Sahib assumed a patronising attitude over those people who do not wish him to do so. Rather the cat was out of the bag when Diwan Sahib referred to the resources of Himachal Pradesh being exploited by the Punjabis of Jullundur Division. These are the intentions of Jullundur exploiters. They want to deprive the poor people of Himachal Pradesh of the opportunities to develop and get rich.

Then there are the poor Sikhs at PEPSU and Punjab. They have been crying hoarse. The great Diwan is prepared to be benevolent to give them safeguards. The views of the Commission are clear on this point. When the dominant group to which Diwan Sahib belongs is so hostile to the minorities, can any safeguards be a suitable substitute for justice and fair-play? Now 55 lakhs of Sikhs, 50 lakhs of Haryana people from PEPSU and Punjab and 13 lakhs of Kohistan and Himachal people want their distinct States to be created. Where is then the minimum measure of agreement needed for a fresh proposal? The total population of the proposed Punjab would be 172 lakhs out of which 118 lakhs are against the recommendations of the Commission, and only 50 lakhs are in favour of it. Is it a democracy to allow 25 per cent, of the people, mostly exploiters, to have their own way? Are 118 lakhs more dumb driven cattle to be put into an arbitrary enclosure? They say the Sdhs are not patriots. What about the people of Haryana and Himachal Pradesh? Does it mean that only the btmirx of Jullundur Division is a patriot and all others are disloyal to the country?.

Something about Punjabi culture: My hon. friend observed that it was a mixture of different cultures. I agree to it. This shows that this culture is distinct from the culture of those regions which have remained unalloyed. Would this culture be not preserved then?

About Akali leader Master Tara Singh and his associates, I strongly repudiate all the charges levelled against them. These are nothing but tissues of lies and falsehood. I thought our Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and our Home Minister were well awake and they knew all the matters well but the great Diwan and the men of his ilk have something with them that they have not deemed it fit to pass on to our leaders. Even on 11th October 1955, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, made it perfectly clear at Amritsar that he never had any doubts about the faithfulness and loyalty of the Sikhs towards our country. As regards pre-partition parleys, with the Muslim League he made his point clear. Overtures were made both by the Muslims and the English but they were outright rejected by the Sikh representatives. In this connection Sirdar Baldev Singh has passed certain documents to Pandit Nehru. Let Diwan Chaman Lall also produce them so that a final decision is made. Or let Diwan Chaman Lall make certain specific allegations against particular individuals outside the Parliament so that there may be a chance to have a decision by a court so that this monster of lies be made to lay at rest for ever.

Whether *Guru Granth Sahib* is written in Punjabi or in any other language is irrelevant. Diwan Sahib has shown utter ignorance of the contents of *Guru Granth Sahib*. Conceding for the sake of argument that *Guru Granth Sahib* is written in Hindi, even then is it a valid argument not to allow Punjabi its rightful place? This shows that the Sikhs are not advocating the cause of Punjabi on religious or communal grounds but merely on patriotic considerations.

The only question to be asked is whether Punjabi is a distinct language as recognized in the Constitution. If it is so, what is the region where it is spoken? Further, can those who, being sons of that region deny it, be regarded as patriots?

In the end, I strongly oppose the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission with regard to Punjab and PEPSU and wholeheartedly support the demand for the creation of a Punjabi-speaking State which will satisfy the people of Punjab, PEPSU, Haryana and Himachal Pradesh. I also wish that Patiala should be the Capital of this instate. Moreover, I wish Bellary to remain with Kama'aka. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to you for having given me this opportunity of speaking on the S.R.C. U. P. is often dubbed as the State which dominates. I don't know how because for four days we have been sitting silently for our turn and have come in only now because it is necessary to convince our countrymen here and elsewhere that if U.P. is to remain one and united, it is not because there are a few Ministers in the Cabinet but it is on grounds of merit itself. We have been a united Province. In fact we were known as such. We are united today and we will remain united even in the future, and that is a matter of good augury for this country. We want that other Provinces and other States also, instead of quarrelling over these little taluks and boundary disputes, should adopt the mentality that the 6,30,000 people of India inhabiting U. P. have adopted. They have no sort of difference. For instance, I come from the Himalayan uplands of U.P. There were proposals that this Himalayan area should be linked with Himachal Pradesh right up to Kashmir and formed into a bigger Himachal Pradesh but in the month of May we held a political conference which was presided over by the President of the U.P. Congress Committee and there we

Shri J. S. Bisht. I unanimously passed a Resolution that we have not in the U.P. and that we shall always remain with the U.P. There is no desire to separate on the part of any portion of U.P. from that Province. Hon. Members have I been given copies of the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Uttar Pradesh. There you will find that when voting was taken on the Resolution that Uttar Pradesh should remain one and united, it was carried unanimously by 280 votes against nil. -Og that the Speaker remarked that 294 members were present in the House. Probably at the time of voting 14 Members were either not there or were neutral. Even if we assume that these 14 members were from among those who wanted some separation of the Western districts, I might inform the House that there are no less than 96 members from the western districts. That at once shows us the overwhelming majority of those in favour of keeping Uttar Pradesh as one unit. Not only that, Sir, from all the Press reports it must have been seen that in not a single portion has there been any meeting or demonstration or demand that any portion should be separated from the entire Uttar Pradesh. Therefore, we were rather very surprised at the note of dissent that was written by Mr. Panikkar. It is rather surprising because in many portions of the Report he himself has agreed with statements which lay great emphasis on certain aspects of this problem. In the paragraph on National Security, on page 53, the Report says:

"While the primary responsibility for defence arrangements must be that of the Central Government, a considerable burden relating to security arrangements must be borne by the State. It is, therefore, important that a border State should be a well-administered, stable and resourceful unit, capable of meeting the emergent problems arising out of military exigencies. This means that

*it is not desirable to have on our borders, relatively few large States rather than small and less resident units."

This is an important point to remember and we wholeheartedly support it and Uttar Pradesh is one of the very important border States. It has a border running along Nepal and Tibet, over a distance of 300 to 400 or nearly 500 miles. The whole of the Himalayan upland, in the Kumaon Division, it adjoins Tibet with which we have got inter-connection through the Netti Pass. The other portion is the one adjoining the border of Nepal.

Again in Chapter VII dealing with Smaller vs. Larger States, the Report lays down certain other principles. They say:

"A further point in favour of larger units is that the creation of relatively large States will lead to appreciable economy in the unproductive expenditure on administration, which the country so clearly needs at the present stage."

And secondly, they say that so far as administration is concerned, in actual practice, some of the largest States have proved to be the best administered. And thirdly the Report says:

"With the expansion of the requirements of organised social communities, modern States inevitably tend to grow bigger and it is difficult to reverse the process. In the existing conditions in this country as determined by territory and population, the ideal of self-government for very small units can, therefore, possibly be realised only at the level of local institutions."

That is to say, at the level of the Municipalities and district boards.

Therefore, it was rather very surprising that Mr. Panikkar, after having subscribed to these views in these portions of the Report, went out of his way in order to recommend

in his minority report that the Uttar Pradesh should be broken up for reasons which had been discussed and rejected by the Report itself. For instance, the Report says on page 165:

"Finer, on a close study of the working of the principle of equal representation of States in the United States of America, has come to the conclusion that, 'if America, as it is today, were to give itself a new Constitution, it is very doubtful whether it would adopt equality in the Senate.'"

And this is apart from the consideration of the fact that the Senate is a very powerful body in America, whereas the Rajya Sabha is merely a revising Chamber. That is why I put the question to Dr. Kane the other day when he was developing the point with regard to the representation in the Upper Houses. He in fact, did not catch the point clearly because he wanted me to study the political conditions in America. But my point is, in the Senate in America there is equal representation, naturally, because the Senate is much more powerful than the House of Representatives.

I would then invite the attention of hon. Members to the speech delivered by Dr. Sampurnanand, Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, while moving the Resolution in that Assembly. Here is the English version in pages 6 to 16 and 17 and it will repay reading. He has packed the whole speech with arguments as to why Uttar Pradesh is one and why it should remain as one unit. As far as the reforms go, I think Uttar Pradesh is the Province which led the way in the abolition of *zamindari*, because ours was the Province where we had the largest number of them, including the *Taluqdars* of Oudh. We have also got a uniform system of administration throughout the 51 districts. We have got a uniform law of tenancy throughout all the 51 districts. We have also got a uniform law with regard to district boards, municipalities. The whole system is well ordered and integrated.

I would also invite your attention to a particular part, an offensive part, in Mr. Panikkar's Note. On page 246 he says:

"There is or *tan* be very little *kt* common between the ' Still nomadic inhabitants of the- Garhwal and Kumaon Himalaya or of the hilly area of Bundelkhand on the one hand and the inhabitants of the fertile Ganges Valley on the other."

That is his remark. And what is the solution that he ultimately suggests? His proposal is that this very portion should be tagged on to the Gangetic Valley of the plains. That is to say, the Kumaon area should be tagged on to the Gangetic Valley, right up to Banaras and Gorakhpur. That merely shows how even highly educated and learned men land themselves in the quagmire when they base their reports on mere prejudices or prepossessions, and make such insulting remarks with regard to some people, and call the people of Kumaon nomadic people. I think he has never set foot in that part of the country at all. We strongly resent such remarks, coming from such an educated person.

Let me also point out the way in which Uttar Pradesh has treated people from other parts of the country. You will recollect that when the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms started, the first popular Minister in U.P. was Mr. C. Y. Chintamani, a gentleman who hailed from Madras. Never was a voice raised that here was a Madras as a Minister. Can anyone show any other example in any other Province where they had made as their first Minister or any other Minister a man from U.P.? I will give another point which has been quoted by the Chief Minister of U.P. He has said:

"In our State up till 3 or 4 years back, the person holding such a responsible post as that of the Inspector-General of Police, was a Bengali gentleman, Shri Ghosh, the Director of Education was a Bengali,

[Shri J. S. Bisht]

and similarly, Shri Ghoshal, the Director of Cottage Industries, Shri Bannerji, the Deputy Director of Health and the Chief Justice, Mr. Mullik, all were Bengalis. Four or five Bengalis held such big posts at one and the same time in our State."

Similarly, Sir, there never was any distinction between a Madras, a Bengali or a Maharashtrian. We welcome them all. They have held the highest posts in the State. As I have quoted just now, they have held the post of Inspector-General of Police who was Mr. Lahri, until recently. Then there was Mr. Mullik. And there was Mr. Bannerji as Director of Health. And they held the posts at the same time, and yet never was a voice raised in Uttar Pradesh that here were people coming from Bengal holding such high posts, whether on the political plane or in any other plane.

I want to bring to your notice another point with regard to U.P. It is said that U.P. is a large State. In fact, it would be much better, as the hon. Prime Minister said the other day, if India could be divided into four or five zones. Pakistan has shown us the way. In West Pakistan, they have made the whole of West Pakistan—the North West Frontier Province, Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan, etc.,—into one unit and have done away with all these language matters.

My friend from Vindhya Pradesh, Capt. Awadesh Pratap Singh, a Muslim gentleman and a Lady Member—all of them—claimed that they would like to come over to Uttar Pradesh. Why should they not be allowed to come? After all, they are not mere chattel to be transferred from one State to another at the will of somebody or be separated from some State. They say that they want to come over to us and we, on our part, have no objection. That is what Dr. Sampurnanand has said. If Vin-

dhya Pradesh is not to maintain its identity—this is what the Members of the local Legislature have also said, this is what the representatives of Vindhya Pradesh in the Rajya Sabha and in the other Sabha have said—why should they not be allowed to come over to U.P. and why should they be forced down on Madhya Pradesh where they do not want to go?

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA: The people of Sidhi and Sahuol have said that they do not want to go to U.P.

CAPTAIN AWADHESH PRATAP SINGH: Only 2 out of 18 people said that.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA: The debate in the Assembly may be looked into.

(Interruption)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Vijaiavargiya, please wait. Your turn will come.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Even to day in Vindhya Pradesh, the law and order situation is not properly maintained.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time, Mr. Bisht. You have no problem. Why should you speak at all?

SHRI J. S. BISHT: With all their mineral wealth, these people want to come to us and we are quite willing to have them.

The States Reorganisation Commission has recommended that Himachal Pradesh should be merged in Punjab. All I have to say is that these people have suffered from the worst form of feudal rule for a long period.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is better that it is merged with U.P.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: The people there want that they may be kept as a separate State for some time until

they come up to the level 01 the rest of the Punjab. We welcome the formation of Vishal Andhra as this helps the Telugu-speaking people being together. We also welcome the formation of Samyukta Maharashtra, including Vidarbha and all that.

With regard to Bombay, I hope, even if it is not to be made into a separate State, at least it would become a centrally administered area so that no one, either a Gujarati or a Marathi, has any complaint. Naturally, that city belongs to the whole of India and should be retained as it is.

श्री भैरों प्रसाद (भोपाल) : जनाब डिप्टी चेंबरमैन साहब, एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट के सम्बन्ध में मैं भी अपनी राय जाहिर करना चाहता हूँ। इस हाउस में तकरीबन सब आनररिबल मेम्बरान ने कमीशन के मेम्बरान की तारीफ की है। मैं भी उनके साथ इसमें शामिल होता हूँ।

कमीशन ने जो तजवीज पेश की हैं उनमें से अधिकतर तजवीजों से मुझे इत्तिफाक है। सब से बड़ी बात जो कमीशन ने की है वह यह है कि उसने राजप्रमुखों के ओहदे को खत्म कर दिया है। यह निहायत ही अच्छी तजवीज है। दूसरी तजवीज जो कमीशन ने की है वह यह है कि उसने पार्ट ए, पार्ट बी और पार्ट सी स्टेट्स के फर्क को खत्म कर दिया है। इस तजवीज से भी मैं इत्तिफाक करता हूँ। पार्ट सी स्टेट्स में एक स्टेट भोपाल भी है, जिससे कि मेरा सम्बन्ध है। वह भी इस कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के मुताबिक खत्म हो गई है। वहाँ की लीजिस्लेटिव असेम्बली के मेम्बरान न एक राय से उस रियासत को पाँच सालों तक के लिये और अलग रखने का सुझाव रखा था लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि चूँकि और दूसरी पार्ट सी की रियासतें खत्म हो रही हैं इसीलिये भोपाल को भी कोई शिकायत का मौका नहीं है। आज विध्य प्रदेश के मेम्बर साहबान इस बात की कौशिश कर रहे हैं कि विध्य प्रदेश अलग रखा जाय। मैं समझता

हूँ कि यह एक निहायत ही रिडीकुलस तजवीज है। जब कि तमाम पार्ट सी स्टेट्स खत्म हो रही हैं, तो फिर विध्य प्रदेश का अलग रखा जाना कोई माने नहीं रखता और विध्य प्रदेश वैसे भी अगर इस बात का दावा करे कि उस को अलग रखा जाय, तो वह गलत है क्योंकि जहाँ तक मेरी मालूमात है, विध्य प्रदेश का इंतजाम अच्छा नहीं रहा है। वहाँ पर ला एंड आर्डर की पोजीशन बहुत ही खराब रही है। हाकेंजनी वहाँ बहुत ज्यादा रही है।

कैप्टन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह : यह बात विध्य प्रदेश में ही नहीं है। मध्य भारत में भी है।

श्री भैरों प्रसाद : मध्य भारत में ऐसा नहीं रहा है और भोपाल में तो हाकेंजनी का सवाल पैदा ही नहीं होता।

कैप्टन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह : भोपाल इतना छोटा है कि उसमें हाकेंजनी का सवाल ही नहीं हो सकता है।

श्री भैरों प्रसाद : खैर, मेरा यह कहना है कि विध्य प्रदेश के अलग रहने का सवाल ही पैदा नहीं होता। रहा यह कि जो यह कहा जाता है कि इसको यू० पी० में मिला दिया जाय, तो मैं इसका विरोध करता हूँ। यू० पी० अभी खुद ही इतना बड़ा प्रान्त है कि उसमें किसी और हिस्से के मिलाये जाने की कोई जरूरत ही मालूम नहीं होती है।

श्री बी० बी० शर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : तां क्या मध्य प्रदेश उससे छोटा होगा ?

श्री भैरों प्रसाद : मध्य प्रदेश की आबादी उससे बहुत कम होगी।

श्री बी० बी० शर्मा : आबादी से क्या होता है, आबादी कोई चीज नहीं है।

श्री भैरों प्रसाद : मैं तो इस बात से बिल्कुल सहमत हूँ कि यू० पी० इस वक्त जिस हालत में है उसी हालत में उसे रहना चाहिये। राज साहबान की यह तजवीज है कि उसके दो हिस्से कर दिये जायें, मैं इसका भी विरोध

[श्री भैरों प्रसाद]

कमिशन हूँ लेकिन साथ ही साथ मैं इसका भी विरोध करता हूँ कि विध्य प्रदर्श को यू० पी० में शामिल किया जाय ।

कॉमिशन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह : तो क्या वहाँ के लोगों की इच्छा नहीं मानी जाय ?

श्री भैरों प्रसाद : कमिशन ने जो मध्य प्रदेश के बनाने जाने का सूझाव रखा है उसको मैं इतिहास अच्छा समझता हूँ । यह प्रान्त आगे चल कर के बहुत ज्यादा तरक्की करेगा और मेरे ख्याल में सिर्फ इंग्लिश के कुछ लोग यह नहीं चाहते हैं कि यह प्रान्त बने । इस प्रान्त में हर किस्म की चीजें मिलेंगी और शायद इसी विचार के लोग यह नहीं चाहते हैं कि यह आगे तरक्की कर के उनके मुकाबिले में आ जाय । यह प्रान्त एंगो होगा जिसमें कि सब खनिज पदार्थ होंगे, जंगल होंगे; और एग्रीकल्चर की, हर किस्म की तरक्की ज्यादा से ज्यादा हो सकेगी । यह प्रान्त एग्रीकल्चर के लिहाज से, मल्ले के लिहाज से, एक बहुत बड़ा मॉडल होगा और वह तमाम दूसरे प्रान्तों को और दूसरों को भी गल्ला सप्लाई कर सकेगा । यहाँ पर जंगल भी बहुत काफी हैं ।

श्री बी० बी० शर्मा : उसी जंगल में डाकू छिपेंगे ।

श्री भैरों प्रसाद : इस प्रान्त को जंगल की बल्य काफी मिक्चर में हासिल हो सकेगी । उसके अलावा, इस प्रान्त में जबान का भी कोई मवाल पैदा नहीं होता है क्योंकि साग का साग एरिया एक ही जबान का एरिया होगा, साग का साग हिन्दी स्पीकिंग एरिया होगा ।

श्री बी० बी० शर्मा : परन्तु आप तो उर्दू बोल रहे हैं ?

श्री भैरों प्रसाद : उर्दू हिन्दी में कोई फर्क नहीं है ।

कमिशन ने इस प्रान्त की राजधानी के लिये जबलपुर को तयकीज किया है । यह एक ऐसी

चीज कमिशन ने कही है जो कि उसके टर्म्स आफ रेफरेंस के बाहर की थी । आल इंडिया कांग्रेस वीकिंग कमिटी ने भी इस चीज को बरकरार रख के इस बात को नहीं माना है कि प्रान्त जबलपुर के भांगल को बतौर इस प्रान्त की राजधानी के पसन्द किया है । बहरहाल, अगर कांग्रेस वीकिंग कमिटी राजधानी के लिये जबलपुर को ही तयकीम करती तो भी भांगल के लोगों को उस पर कोई मुआलफत नहीं होती लेकिन चूंकि वीकिंग कमिटी ने यह फैसला कर दिया है इसलिए मैं वीकिंग कमिटी को इसके लिये बधाई देता हूँ ।

S.P.M.

अब मैं दूसरे सूबों की तरफ आता हूँ । जब हम पंजाब के सूबे की तरफ निगाह डालते हैं, तो मालूम होता है, कि वहाँ पर कम्युनल ईशान हद से ज्यादा बढ़ा हुआ है । अभी पार्टीशन को हुए कोई ज्यादा बरस नहीं हुए और सब लोग यह जानते हैं कि मुस्लिम लोग की कम्युनल पालिसी की वजह से हिन्दुस्तान को कितना नुकसान पहुँचा । अब यह एक दूसरी कम्युनल चीज सामने आ रही है । इस की रिसर्गिस्सिबिलिटी हिन्दुओं पर है या सिखों पर, यह मैं बताने के लिए तैयार नहीं । मेरे ख्याल में तो दोनों ही इसके जिम्मेदार हैं । जहाँ तक सिख भाइयों का ताल्लुक है, मैं यह कहूँगा कि उनको यह सोचना चाहिए कि उनके गुरुओं की तालीम क्या थी । उनके गुरुओं ने हिन्दुओं की हिफाजत के लिए अपनी कुर्बानियाँ दीं । इसी दृष्टि में गुरु तेग बहादुर ने अपनी जान सिर्फ हिन्दुओं के लिए कुर्बान कर दी । हिन्दुओं और सिखों के दीर्घयान कहीं भी हिन्दुस्तान भर में कोई फर्क नहीं माना जाता था । अब भी दोनों साइड बाई साइड रहते हैं, सर्वोत्तम में भी उनका कोई मवाल नहीं आता है । मैं तो यहाँ तक कहता हूँ कि अगर सारे हिन्दू सिख हो जायें तो मुझे कोई रंज नहीं होगा, मैं सिखों को किसी भी हालत में हिन्दुओं से अलग नहीं समझता । तो जब मैं देखता हूँ कि इस तरह की कम्युनल

स्मिट फल रही हैं तो मुझे निहायत अफसोस होता है।

भोपाल के मुताल्लिक में कहना चाहता हूँ कि भोपाल में सिखों की तादाद बहुत थोड़ी सी थी। इन चार-पांच बरसों के अंदर जब से कि भोपाल में डेमोक्रेटिक हुक्मत कायम हुई, सिखों की तादाद वहाँ बहुत ज्यादा हो गई और वे हम सबसे घुल-मिल कर रहते हैं। हममें जरा भी इस बात फर्क महसूस नहीं होता कि वे क्यों ज्यादा हैं। लेकिन अगर यह कम्युनलिज्म का जज्बा फैल गया तो इसके नतीजतन बहुत बुरे होंगे और जहाँ-जहाँ पर भी सिख और हिन्दू होंगे उनके दिलों में जज्बात खराब पैदा होंगे। जिस तरह कि मुस्लिम लीग के जमाने में तरह-तरह के प्रोपेगंडा करने से नतीजा यह हुआ कि सारे हिन्दुस्तान में जहाँ भी हिन्दू और मुसलमान साथ-साथ रहते थे वहाँ पर दुश्मनी का एक जज्बा पैदा हो गया था, वह चीज वहाँ पर पैदा होने का अंश है। इसलिए, मेरे ख्याल में या तो पंजाब को उस तरह से रहने दिया जाय जैसा कि कमीशन ने तजवीज किया है और यदि उस तरह से रहने दिया जाता है जैसी कि चेंबरमैन आफ दी कमीशन ने तजवीज की है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश को अलग रखा जाय, तो फिर बाकी पंजाब को एक साथ रहने की जरूरत है। अगर इस तरीके से ये अलाहदा कर दिये गए और पंजाब और हरियाना का किस्सा तय नहीं हुआ, तो यह देश के लिए बड़ी घातक चीज होगी। यह सूबा एक सरहद्दी सूबा है और इसके अंदर इस बात की कोशिश होनी चाहिए कि कम्युनल राज किसी तरह से कायम न हो बल्कि दोनों कम्युनिटीज के दीर्घायन ज्यादा से ज्यादा मेल रहे। सिखों का यह ख्याल है कि इसको पंजाबी सूबा बनाना चाहिए, यहाँ पर पंजाबी जमाना होनी चाहिए और उनके लिए जितने ज्यादा से ज्यादा सफगाह्स मौजूद हैं वे दिये जाय और हर कोई ऐसी मुमकिन चीज की जाय जिससे कि सिखों को शिकायत का मौका न हो। मगर यह चीज बिल्कुल गलत होगी कि वहाँ कम्युनल राज बनाया

जाय या एक फिस्ट की हुक्मत वहाँ हो। जहाँ तक बम्बई का सवाल है, मेरा ख्याल है कि वर्किंग कमेटी ने जो फैसला किया है कि ३ रियासतें होनी चाहियें, वह निहायत ही ठीक है। अगर महाराष्ट्रीय यह चाहते हैं कि संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र उनको मिले, तो किसी भी सूत में बम्बई का शहर उनको नहीं मिलना चाहिए। बम्बई का शहर ऐसा है कि कोई एक सूबे का आदमी इस बात का दावा करे कि बम्बई उसका शहर है, तो यह गलत चीज है। बम्बई में जहाँ पर महाराष्ट्रियों की तादाद बहुत काफी है वहाँ ५० पी०, गुजरात और दीगर प्रान्तों के लोग भी काफी तादाद में हैं।

श्री किशोरी राम (बिहार): जैसे कलकत्ते में मिक्सचर है।

श्री भैरों प्रसाद : बम्बई अगर महाराष्ट्र में मिला दिया गया, तो मुझे खतरा है कि उससे वहाँ की तिजारत और वहाँ की इंडस्ट्री को सख्त खतरा पैदा होगा क्योंकि जरा-जरा सी बातों में वहाँ की सड़कों पर ताकत के ज़रिये फैसले का तरीका अस्तित्व पर किया जायगा।

(समय की घंटी)

तो जब ताकत के ज़रिये से वहाँ पर छोट-छोट मसलों का फैसला होगा, तो उस हालत में बम्बई नहीं रह सकता, जिस हालत में वह आज है। इसलिए बम्बई को अलाहदा रखा जाय और अगर महाराष्ट्रियन चाहते हैं कि बम्बई उनके साथ रहे तो फिर जो कमीशन की तजवीज है वह तजवीज मंजूर होनी चाहिए।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes^ that will do.

श्री भैरों प्रसाद : मैं विशाल आन्ध्र के फेवर में हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हैदराबाद को आन्ध्र के साथ मिला कर के विशाल आन्ध्र बना दिया जाय और उसकी वजह है। वह यह है कि हैदराबाद का टुकड़ा होना लाजमी था और जरूरी था। हैदराबाद वह जगह रहा है जिसने हिन्दुस्तान को इन्तिहाई परेशानी में डाला था और

[श्री भैरों प्रसाद]

वे हालात जहाँ तक मुमकिन हो, वहाँ तक हल होने चाहियें। इसके लिए बहतरीन सूत्र यह हैं कि विशाल आन्ध्र कायम किया जाय।

जहाँ तक बंगाल की मांग है कि अपने उत्तरी जिलों से मिलाये जाने के लिए उसे कोरीडोर दिया जाय, मैं उसके फँवर में हूँ। उस कोरीडोर के न होने से बंगाल के एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को इन्विटहार्ड दिक्कत होती होगी। इस लिए उनकी इस दिक्कत को दूर करने के लिए इस बात की जरूरत है कि वह कोरीडोर उन को दिया जाय।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time

SHRI BHERON PRASAD: Thank you, Sir.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI (Nominated): Sir, I am sorry to say that I have to contravene a parliamentary convention which expects a Member of Parliament to represent the national interests of the country as a whole and not its sectional or local interests. This was a political principle which was first formulated by Edmund Burke, a principle which was later endorsed by a Privy Council judgment in a relevant case. There is a Privy Council ruling on this subject. I am sorry I have not got the actual reference. Besides I do not myself belong to any territorial constituency. If I may say so, I represent an extra-territorial constituency, the realm of letters, in this House. So I plead that I am not at all being influenced by any local prejudices, and if I may be pardoned for another personal reference, I happen to be born in Bengal, was married in Bihar, employed in U.P. and I am a tax-payer in Orissa, and I have also had some knowledge of the life in Mysore. So I claim that I can bring to bear upon a discussion of this question a perfectly detached and scientific point of view.

Now, the case of the Province to which I belong, the case of Bengal, is not on all fours with the other States of India. It is not the case of the

creation of a new Province. « is a case of restoring to Bengal some of the old areas which belonged to it. Now, Bengal like Poland has been the victim of several partitions dictated by politics. The first partition was the Partition of Lord Curzon in 1905 which was really intended to cripple and throttle the rising nationalism of Bengal, which was very inconvenient to British rule. Now Bengal's reply was the explosion of the first bomb in Muzaffarpur by Kshudiram Bose, and the Bengalis are proud of the fact that his memory has been duly perpetuated by the Government of Bihar. In fact between Bengalis and Biharis there have been the friendliest of feelings. They have been living together on terms of amity and friendship. There are many Bengali leaders in the different districts of Bihar, districts like Muzaffarpur, Bhagalpur, Patna, Gaya and so on. Now, the question of Bengal has a historical background.

After the first partition by Lord Curzon, there came the second partition of Bengal by which the British Government thought of inflicting a final blow upon the Bengali rebellious nationalism by escaping from the clutches of Calcutta, a notorious centre of terrorism and setting up a new capital at Delhi. They also took a further step of so fixing its area that the resultant was a Muslim majority Province, thereby laying the foundation of Pakistan. There are the deeper intentions underlying the second partition of Bengal. At the same time some of the Bengali-speaking areas were tagged on to the new Provinces of Bihar and Assam. I have no quarrel absolutely; I only want to present before you an objective review of the facts as they have occurred. The enormity of this mischief and penalty inflicted on Bengal was recognised by the Indian National Congress which passed a resolution which was moved by no less a person than Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru. By this resolution passed at its annual session held in December 12, 1911, the Indian National Congress urged the transfer of Bengali-speaking areas

from Bihar to Bengal. This resolution was proposed by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and seconded by the great Bihar leader, Shri Parameshwar Lai, a leading politician of Bihar. And this resolution of the Congress was at once endorsed by many prominent statesmen of Bihar who issued a statement in January 1912. In it they took up categorically the position that all the Bengali-speaking areas should be brought back to Bengal and the Hindi-speaking areas placed under Bihar. They said that portions of Purnea and Malda to the east of the river Mahananda and other Bengali-speaking areas in the Santhal Parganas, Manbhum and so on should be transferred to Bengal and this statement was signed by Deep Narain Singh of Bhagalpur, Fakhruddin and Sachidananda Sinha, later on Vice-Chancellor of the Patna University, and others. Further, before the partition was effected, there was a despatch sent by the Government of India to the Government in England. The despatch is dated 25th August 1911. In that despatch it is stated that the Bengali-speaking areas should form one Province and the districts of Sylhet, Goalpara, Manbhum, Santhal Parganas and portions of Purnea east of the river Mahananda should be included in the Presidency of Bengal. I am not at all responsible for the contents contained in the Government despatch.

Now, I come to the third partition of Bengal, namely, the partition effected by Radcliffe. As you know, the partition of India had to be effected by the self-sacrifice of Bengal, in having to lose to Pakistan two-thirds of her territory and 82,000 sq. miles of area, so that the present West Bengal is an amputated, truncated, mutilated State with only one-third of her original area and a loss in population of about 2 crores. I, therefore, come to you as a beggar on behalf of a Province that has been so much impoverished by loss of both territory and population. You can well imagine the position from the following figures. While West

4 R.S.D.—7

Bengal is now occupying an area of 30,000 sq. miles instead of the original 1,10,000 sq. miles, the area of Orissa is 60,000 sq. miles, Bihar 70,000 sq. miles, and U.P., that leviathan among the Indian States, covers an area of 1,13,000 sq. miles. Then there are other evils of partition.

Firstly, there is complete dislocation of communication between the different parts of West Bengal, between the north and the south. There is no continuous connection between Calcutta and places like Jalpaiguri, Cooch-Bihar and Darjeeling districts. On the top of all these there was created another problem as a result of partition, namely the huge and unending stream of immigrants from East Pakistan. The number of these refugees have now reached the colossal figure of about 50 lakhs and they want space in which they can get themselves settled. West Bengal has not got an inch of space to spare; already the density of population in Western Bengal has reached to about 800 persons per sq. mile as against much lesser figures for other States, I have got the comparative figures also from which we can at once see that the density of the population is such that West Bengal, situated as she is, unable to provide for another heavy influx of population. So my humble point is this. You must consider the particular strait to which Bengal has been reduced especially by this one-way traffic, by this influx of refugees in spite of the arrangements made by the Rehabilitation Department. Therefore, I claim a primary consideration from this House that the whole of India is morally bound to come to the rescue of Bengal which has lost two-thirds of her territory in order to pay the price at which India has been able to achieve her independence. Will you stand aside and watch the process of this Province being bled white by all these evils?

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

[Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji.] Sir, you are jldrnjally bound to find space for these 50 lakhs of refugees. It will not do for you to say that you will settle them in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands or in the distant wildernesses in the South. It ia not a question of mere economic rehabilitation; it is a question of their cultural rehabilita.ion; it is a question of preserving their cultural integrity and the linguistic integrity of these people. According to your own fundamental principles of the Constitution, every person has the right of education of his children in the mother-tongue. When you want to settle the Bengalis outside West Bengal, you have kindly to make provision for the children of these refugees. You must see that their education is imparted in and through their mother-tongue. If you have these fundamental aspects of the rehabilitation problem before you, you will be forced to conclude that preferably you must exhaust the resources and possibilities of finding additional Bengali-speaking areas wherever they may be. I do not care if they belong to Bihar or Orissa. Pray, settle them in Bengali-speaking areas. Then alone you will be able to solve satisfactorily this problem of rehabilitation. You must always remember that Bengal has been sacrificed at the altar of India's freedom and the whole of India is morally obliged to evolve a satisfactory solution of the difficulties of physical space that have been created by circumstances over which Bengal had no control. Therefore, I am presenting before this House a list of small areas of the total ex'ent of about 10,000 sq. miles. If out of their 70,000 sq. miles Bihar does not like to part with any of her areas, let Bihar extend a little towards Ballia and Ghazimir and take a slice out of that leviathan State of Uttar Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh may take a slice out of Vindhya Pradesh and so on.

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

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: Sir, I want only two minutes. I am pleading a very hard case, the case of a bleeding Province. Now, my point is this that you have really to take a statesmanlike view of the matter. So far as I have got time for the study of statistics, I give you a list off these small areas which may be easily parted with, namely; (1) Dhalbhum sub-division of Singhbhum district including Jamshedpur

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Do the Bengalis want territory to live or territory to rule over?

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: No question of ruling; it is a ques tion of existence. You have already made Bengal lose two-thirds of her territory; and why do you make Bengal sacrifice mone? So, I say Jamshedpur, which has a population of 54,000 Bengalis as against 13,000 Hindi-speaking Biharis—I speak all this subject to correction, it is not the result of my own research. I have simply got these figures as worked out by others. (2) Whole Manbhum district with Dhanbad and Chas Thana. (3) Dumka. Deoghar, Rajmahal. Jamtara and Pakur sub divisions of San'hal Parganas. (4) Purnea east of Mahananda up to river Mechi and Malda district.....

SHRI R. P. N. SINHA (Bihar): What about Darbhanga and Muzaffar-pur?

DP. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: About Bihar I have already referred. It was Kshudiram Bose who was *he first martyr in the national cause; it was your battle for freedom that was fought there on the sacred soil of Bihar.....

SHRI J AFAR IMAM (Bihar): Bengal is not the only Province, others have exceeded in the sacrifice for freedom.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: I am not competing with anybody in

the matter of sacrifices. Now, I am standing before you with a begging bowl. Bengal has lost 82,000 square miles of area.....

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): Will my hon. friend agree to take the whole of Bihar and the whole of Orissa?

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: I leave it to your judgment. (*Interruptions*). I am making no such demand. I told you what I agree to. I have lost 82,000 square miles of territory. In its place I want only a total of 10,000 square miles.

(*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR) : You will get your chance Mr. Rajendra Pratap Sinha.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: And lastly, the district of Goalpara of Assam where 54 per cent. Bengalis were shown in 1931 Census and 17 per cent, in the 1951 Census—because the Bengalis are a dying race! The Assamese population has been inflated from 18 per cent, to 62 per cent. Now, the conclusion of the whole matter is that my total claim amounts to only 10,000 square miles of area against the colossal loss of 82,000 square miles. And secondly, I plead that if you want a scientific plan of rehabilitation of these displaced persons, you must settle them in Bengali-speaking areas where they can keep up their cultural, integrity and social manners and customs. It is not merely a question of material or economic rehabilitation. I want the whole of India to attend to this primary problem by which one particular State has been made to suffer so much and on such a huge scale. I, therefore, say that Bengal left to herself is faced by a desperate problem which cannot be solved within the limited resources that are left to impoverished West Bengal, an amputated and truncated State. And therefore, I have come as a beggar before the House for some crumbs from the tables of the leviathan State. Let them part with only 10,000 square

miles of their territory and Bihar may be compensated by a little push towards the U.P. and U.P. again may give a little push to Vindhya Pradesh. In that way we may settle down to a very satisfactory and synthetic system, whereby all these problems that are not the creation of Bengal may be satisfactorily solved.

Now, I am prepared to answer any questions on the floor of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): Mr. Pattabiraman.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is a matter of deep regret that the publication of the S.R.C. Report has created so much heat, so much controversy and so much bitterness in this country. Sir, my humble opinion is that the Report of the Commission itself was not a necessity and it could have waited for some more time. I am sure I am not casting any aspersion on the Commission when I say that during the period of one year they could not have known the aspirations, the feelings and the desire of the countrymen as our own leaders have known. Today we have in our midst great leaders who have shared the sufferings of the people who have shared the joys of the people who have been with the people in their good time and bad time. They have known our countrymen intimately for the past thirty years and they could have been easily trusted. I am sure their knowledge of the men, their desires and their ambitions would have been better known to these great leaders of ours than these three gentlemen who had only one year before them. Anyhow it is too late to lament over it. The Commission's Report is before us and we will have to take a decision and Government is taking a decision in the matter. What I want to emphasise, coming especially from the South, is that the Prime Minister has already paid a tribute to us South Indians that we always keep our heads very cool and we are not swayed by emotionalism. Sir, keeping that perspective in the background, I beg

[Shri T. S. Pattabiraman.] to appeal to all in this country that there shall be one citizenship and it shall be respected by all. And it must be fostered in the younger generation of our countrymen that India is one and indivisible and their loyalty should be one and indivisible. With that background I would like three freedoms to be incorporated in the Constitution and guaranteed by the Constitution.

The first freedom will be that every Indian, wherever he may be born, right from Cape Comorin to Srinagar, must have a feeling that he is an Indian, that he can go and settle in any part of the country and carry on his avocation without hindrance, without any bias, without any differential treatment in the particular State. The U.P. man must be able to go to Rajasthani and the Rajasthani must be able to go to U.P. and carry on his business. Similarly, any one from Travancore-Cochin should feel that he can go and settle in Punjab and carry on his avocation. There shall be no discrimination on the ground that he belongs to another State.

The second freedom that I want to be incorporated in and guaranteed by the Constitution is that there must be freedom for all unemployed persons. All those who want employment must have the freedom to apply to any job in any part of the country, from wherever an advertisement comes. *(Interruption)* I beg to differ from my hon. friend. Most of the advertisements that are today published by the State Governments restrict it only to the domiciled persons of the respective State. For example, in the U.P. Government advertisements and the U.P. Public Service Commission advertisements, you will always find that there is a clause stipulating that the candidate must be a domiciled person of U.P. I do not know what that domicile means.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Not today. It is not so.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: I am speaking of the advertisements I saw

a few days back. I am prepared to be corrected if I am wrong.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Will the hon. Member please lay that advertisement on the Table of the House?

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: Yes, Sir. My humble submission is that everybody, wherever he may be in this country, must have the freedom to apply for any job and get it if he is fully qualified according to the qualifications prescribed in the advertisement. That freedom to apply for the job anywhere in this country will give every Indian the feeling that he belongs to one India and not to separate States.

Thirdly, the most important thing concerns the students. Today we have the plight of students being turned out for want of accommodation in many colleges, especially the professional colleges such as engineering and medical colleges, mostly due to the parochialism of the States. We find that Bombay restricts admission to the students of Bombay; Madras restricts it to the students of Madras, and all the States do like that. Among the students, among the younger generation, the feeling gets into their mind that they are not wanted in Bombay, that they are not wanted in U.P. and in other States. The student gets a feeling that he is a Madrasi first, he is a Punjabi first, a U.P. man first. That feeling must go. Professional colleges throughout the country, whether they are financed by the State Governments or by the Central Government, should be open to all the students, throughout the country and that is the only way of instilling patriotism or the feeling of oneness in the younger generation of this country. Otherwise, as things are at present you are not only denying future prospects but you are also instilling a feeling of hatred, a feeling of separatism into these young, tender minds.

So, if all the three freedoms which I have enunciated just now are guar-

anteed and safeguarded in the Constitution, I do not mind what the reorganisation is going to be, what States are going to be in this country.

I do not care whether Peermede is attached to Uttar Pradesh or whether Devikuam is attached to the Punjab. I am not worried about it. But I say that the people of this country should have a feeling that they belong to this country and there should be no discrimination because of their birth in a particular State. Part IV of the S.K.C. Report has dealt with these things in detail and I hope that this Part will receive the greatest and most sincere attention from the Government.

I do not want to speak in a dissenting tone with regard to the speeches made earlier and I would avoid it. But my friend, Mr. Madhava Menon—most unfortunately, he is not present now—pleaded for more generosity on the part of the Madras in regard to certain areas. The difficulty is that Madras itself is a poor State. It has the biggest problem not only of underemployment, but also of unemployment and of growing population. Mr. Madhava Menon said, "Aikya Kerala is handicapped for want of space for expansion. It is the smallest State with a high percentage of population." Sir, if that is so, we are not to be blamed for it. They say that they are economically backward and they will be economically strangled. I wish that Mr. Madhava Menon and friends who clamoured for a Kerala State had given consideration to this point two hundred times before they clamoured for a State. It is too late for them to start clamouring now that they must have more areas from Tamil Nad. He said that 50 per cent of the land was covered with forests or backwaters. Water is their wealth because fish can be produced. The forests produce enormous wealth. But whom are they approaching with the beggar's bowl? There is a proverb in Tamil: "*Pichai e&uthanam Perumal; athai pidunginam Hanuman.*" A beggar got some food and it was snatched away by a monkey. We have got some-thing and they want to snatch

it away. The trouble with my friends, the Malayalees, is not that they want this particular area or that particular area—they want many areas. For example, they want Devikuam for their economic self-sufficiency; Peermede for irrigation purposes; Shen-cottah for forests; Gudalur for reasons of population and Kasaragod for sentimental reasons. I would have been very happy if my Kerala friends had earlier stated and adhered to one principle and stuck to it. Even today, though I am not competent to make any offer on behalf of the people of Tamil Nad or the Madras Government, I am making a sporting offer to the Malayalees. Let them stick to one principle—either population or economic self-sufficiency, and let them have it and we will abide by any award; that will be acceptable to me. But the pity is that they have got different yardsticks to measure.

I would like to make the position with regard to Madras clear. They never wanted them to remain in Tamil Nad. If anybody wants to go, we will wish them good bye and good luck. We wished the Andhras good luck. They are better off. If some one wants to go, let him go; it is not our fault. But once you want to go, let us settle our accounts properly. There is no use if we do not do so. It must be a proper and just settlement. We cannot be generous at the expense of our own starving people.

Then, they want to take the Nilgiris I do not mind. If the people of Nilgiris want to go, let them go. But I am sure that they never wanted it, except the political leaders. We want them to remain as a united people. The Nilgiris is a backward area and we have done enough for it. If we want Devikuam and Peermede—and we never made any attempt for it—it is for their own good that we do not want to leave them. Past history has shown that for fifty years, the Tamil taluks of Devikuam and Peermede have been the graveyard of many a Government in the Travancore-Cochin State. You read through the pages of history for the past fifty years. They

[Shri T. S. Pattabiraman.] have not been able to keep law and order and subjugate these Tamil areas. I would like to ask the Malayalees whether they are willing to have a shoe that will be going on pinching and biting or they want to live in peace and work for the economic progress of their country. If they want peaceful Government, if they want economic progress and if they want peaceful life, let them, for their own benefit—I am advising them—not have these. Peermede and Devikulam will be again sore spots. They will never allow the Malayalees to progress. It is a warning. That is why, in their own Interest, we want them to leave these areas out. If they do not pay heed to this warning, it is not our fault and one day history will have its own course.

Another point that I would like to mention is about Mr. Panikkar's minute of dissent in regard to U.P. I agree with most of the arguments which Mr. Panikkar has adduced in favour of creating equal units. But one little trouble with Mr. Panikkar is that he put the cart before the horse. He adduces wonderful arguments, "but in his conclusions, I entirely disagree with him. If Mr. Panikkar feels that U.P. has been dominating and will dominate, it is not the U.P. that is to be blamed. It is the history that is to be blamed. It is a historical fact that right from Rama the great to Pandit Nehru, the Prime Minister, U.P. has not only been dominating the politics of India, but also its culture and religion. We are not sorry for it. It is a lesson for all of us—the small units—that in unity lies strength. If we want to have powerful forces in this country, it is not the way—to split U.P.—to have better units. Mr. Panikkar has failed in it. I should have been happy and would have congratulated him on his excellent treatise on political knowledge if he had recommended greater and equal units in this country. But, unfortunately, though he has given reasons, he has come to a wrong conclusion.

I do not want to say anything more on this, but only I will refer to Hima-

chal Pradesh because I have gone there and I have seen something of it. Himachal Pradesh is a backward area and it deserves to be a separate unit because it is not only a backward area, but it is on the border of great foreign powers that may any day be a danger to us. So, Himachal Pradesh deserves a special treatment and what treatment you are going to give it, I am not worried. But I am sure that our leaders will give it a special treatment.

I have no hesitation in saying that whatever may be the S.R.C. proposals we in Madras—in the South of India—shall have no bitterness or rancour or malice towards any one. In spite of, the feeling that we may lose this place or that, we may get this or that place, we assure you that the South Indians will be loyal to our leaders, stand by them and we will accept whatever they may say, because we are sure and confident that this land is ours and it does not belong to any particular individual or State.

Thank you.

SHRI R. P. N. SINHA: Sir, I would like to pay my compliments to the States Reorganisation Commission for enunciating some very wholesome principles which, I am sure, will stand the test of time and will lead to greater prosperity and unity of India for all time to come.

I welcome their general principle that the administrative and political structure of the country should be based on the primacy of the nation. It is clear to every student of history—it is a painful study of Indian history—that more often than once, regional patriotism and jealousies have set in motion powerful centrifugal forces which have brought disintegration and ruin. While making history, let us not repeat the mistakes of history. Look at the ruin the slogan "Religion is in danger" brought to us. The ink of this chapter has hardly dried up and there is another slogan which is equally dangerous, "Language is in danger." The politicians of this generation will have to stand the charge

at the bar of history. Let not posterity pass a verdict that the politicians in their game of self-seeking indulged in those slogans and Indian history repeated itself.

The House should be grateful to the Leader of this House for reminding us that there is only one form of citizenship, *viz.*, the citizenship of India and that the language—important as it may be—should not be allowed to become a dividing factor, but a unifying one.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Sir, in the name of culture, religion or language let us not fly at one another's throat. Having reached the pinnacle of glory in the international plane, by pleadings of our co-existence, let us not become a laughing stock in the eyes of the world that we have failed to practise what we preach, co-existence within our own borders. We have raised the slogans "Chini Hindi *bhai bhai*", "Russi Hindi *bhai bhai*". How much greater need there is to raise the slogan "Sikh Hindu *bhai bhai*". "Maharashtriya Gujarati *bhai bhai*", "Bengali-Bihari *bhai bhai*"

SHRI J ASP AT ROY KAPOOR: "*Sare Hindi bhai bhai*".

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: "*Sare Hindi bhai bhai*".

Let the claims of language be adjusted to the paramount need of the national cohesion which, I am glad, the Commission has also very ably enunciated. I am, however, constrained to observe that the Commission has ignored many of the basic principles which it itself enunciated and has made recommendations in clear violation of some of them, on. If I may say so, extraneous considerations, which are not worthy of taking into account in any moral or rational approach.

Sir, there is no justification in postponing the creation of Vishalandhra for another five years. Also there is no justification in not creating a Sam-yukta Maharashtra with Vidarbha and

Bombay as its capital. We gave Madras to Tamilnad on considerations which equally weigh with Bombay. Because Bombay is contiguous to Maharashtra and because there is Marathi-speaking population in majority in Bombay we should accede to the request of the Maharashtrians.

As far as my State of Bihar is concerned, again, the Commission has erred. There is a general impression prevailing in this House that so far as Bihar is concerned, it is only a question of border adjustments. I would like the House to know that it is not so, because we are asked to part with 6 per cent, of our total area and 4 per cent, of the total population of Bihar to West Bengal. Some very fundamental principles are involved which I would like the Home Ministry to examine before they accept the recommendation of the Commission in respect of Bihar.

Two portions of Bihar are recommended to be transferred to Bengal: (i) Sadar Sub-division of Manbhum minus Chas and (ii) Kishanganj subdivision east of Mahananda river. I will confine my remarks to the first, that is to say Sadar sub-division. My other friends will speak about Kishanganj.

Sir, as far as the Manbhum region is concerned, the plea given is that it is being transferred to facilitate implementation of the flood-cum-irrigation project by constructing a dam on the river Kangsabati, more popularly known as the Kasai river. This claim of Bengal is based on the ground that it is necessary for West Bengal to have control over the catchment area of this river flowing into West Bengal for the proper development of the valley. This argument was placed for the first time towards the very end of the investigation by the Commission and the Government of Bihar had no knowledge about it. This is a very strange principle for any responsible person to enunciate. It bears close resemblance to one of the arguments advanced by Pakistan in support of their illegitimate claims over Kashmir. If this argument is conceded, the

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.] reorganisation of States in India would produce fantastic results. Many rivers of Bihar have their origin and have their catchments in Nepal, U.P. and Madhya Pradesh. Can any sane person argue that Bihar should, for this reason, get parts of Nepal or U.P. or Madhya Pradesh?

In this matter the Commission was very wrongly advised by the Government of West Bengal and my grievance is that the Commission did not refer this matter to the Government of Bihar to ascertain their views on this point. * I would like to inform the House of this fact. The Commission was told that this river Kasai had no importance to the Province of Bihar. This statement is wholly incorrect. Bihar has already got a weir on this river and they have submitted projects to the Planning Commission in July last, long before the publication of this Report. This project will irrigate 5·2 lakh acres. The cost of the project comes to Rs. 549 lakhs, one of the cheapest projects in Bihar. As a matter of fact these projects will also help the Bengal projects by its flood moderating effect.

Apart from this, there is no ground for an apprehension that Bihar will not co-operate with Bengal in regard to implementing Bengal's project on the Kasai river. This is wholly unjustifiable when we know full well that Bihar has gone out of its way to accommodate Bengal in the construction of the Mayurakshi Dam and the D.V.C. project. Bihar has done that at a great sacrifice. The retention of this river in the territory of Bihar is justified on the same ground on which this area is being transferred to West Bengal, as I have shown to you that Bihar has also got projects.

Further the catchment area of this river is only 1,463 sq. miles in a few thanas only, whereas the proposition is to transfer 3,100 sq. m.», i.e., whole of Sadar sub-division whereby you transfer the catchment area of Subarnarekha in which Bihar is vitally interested and for which Bengal has no use altogether.

If the Commission's recommendations are accepted, the existing Dimna Reservoir which supplies water to the steel town of Jamshedpur and to the steel factories of Tatanagar will then go to West Bengal. Just see the logical position that is created. The reservoir which supplies water to such an important town and factory will be in Bengal, whereas the factory and the town will be in Bihar. How illogical the recommendation is apparent from this.

The Bihar Government has another project known as the Lower Subarnarekha Reservoir project. This project is meant to supply additional 100 cusecs of water to Tata Iron and Steel Factory to irrigate 25 lakh acres of land in the adjoining district of Singhbhum which has no major source of irrigation. If this area is transferred to Bengal this project will suffer and it will have its effect upon the expansion scheme of the Tata Iron and Steel Factory. It will not be in the national interest.

Then there are other two Subarnarekha irrigation schemes, which have also been submitted to the Planning Commission, long before the publication of the Commission's Report, which should be taken into account while considering the transference of this portion to West Bengal from Bihar. Now, Sir, I wonder if the Commission were not in possession of all these facts, they would not have made the recommendations that they have in respect of Singhbhum. And, Sir, as a consequence of the transfer of Sadar Singhbhum, the main lines of communication—road-rail—between Ranchi and Dhanbad and Muri, and Dhanbad and Jamshedpur will be disrupted. Now these are the industrial areas of Bihar. In order to give a line of communication between two parts of Bengal, Kishanganj is being transferred. Now, Sir, what is sauce for goose is sauce for gander. What is good for Bengal should hold good for Bihar. Why are you creating the problem for Bihar which you are out to solve in the case of Bengal? By transferring this portion the people of Bihar are going

to be affected, because the processing Industry will be transferred on the one hand, and on the other hand, the source of raw material in respect of tussar and lac. And then a large number of coal-fields will also be transferred.

Now, Sir, the other consideration is linguistic. The Commission have adopted a very wholesome principle that if an area has got 70 per cent, of its population speaking a particular language, then alone it will be called a unilingual area. Otherwise, it will be called a bilingual or multilingual area. Now Manbhum which is being transferred has got only 55 per cent. Bengali-speaking population. Therefore, it does not satisfy the requirement of 70 per cent. Now, Sir, let us see what has been done in the case of Kolar district. The Kolar district which has a 54 per cent. Telugu-speaking population was not transferred to Andhra from Mysore because of the longstanding economic ties of Kolar with Mysore. The Kannada-speaking population there is 24 per cent. only. The *status quo* there was not disturbed because there was only a marginal linguistic majority of the Telugu speakers. There is no reason why that same principle should not be applied to Bihar.

Sir, another question is with regard to the concept of homeland. The people of this area, they say, feel that all Bengalis and Oriyas living anywhere in the State have their homeland in Bengal, and they must look to Bengal for their protection and for their advancement in the matter of culture, and all that. Sir, this is a very dangerous proposition. And that is why the Commission in paragraph 155 of their Report have stated as follows:

"We cannot too strongly emphasise the dangerous character of this doctrine especially from the point of view of our national unity. If any section of the people living in one State is encouraged to look upon another State as its true homeland and protector on the sole ground of language, then this would cut at the very root of the national idea."

Therefore, if we allow such border adjustments to take place, we shall only be giving strength to the idea of homeland. As a matter of fact, Sir, the cultural and other rights of such minorities should be protected in other ways, which the Commission have recommended rather than by transferring such border areas from one State to another.

Now, Sir, it is very unfortunate that in the case of Bihar, the wishes of the people of these border areas have not been taken into account, whereas in the case of other States, the Commission have advanced the argument that the people of certain areas were against the transfer of those areas, and therefore, those areas have not been transferred. Sir, the people of this area have very bitterly opposed the idea to transfer Kishan-ganj and Manbhum. And I would, therefore, plead that the wishes of the people should be taken into account, unless there is any paramount national interest for transferring those areas. Where there is no paramount national interest and where there are no administrative difficulties, the wishes of the people, in a democracy, should have the first priority. I would even urge upon the Government to take a plebiscite in that area in order to find out the wishes of the people before transferring it.

Now, Sir, I would like to make only one or two more points in reply to the arguments advanced by my very esteemed friend, Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji. Today, Sir, he was not speaking like a scientist, but he was speaking on very sentimental grounds.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Not even like a historian.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Not even as a historian. He was not correctly informed. He is not present here now, but his main argument was that he must have some space to settle the people coming from East Pakistan. Now, Sir, the Commission have clearly stated that the Bengal Government must declare that no refugees from

LSShri Kajencra Fraxap oinna.j . East Pakistan would be settled in that area, in Kishanganj. The question that they should be settled there is now ruled out. Sir, the density of population in Kishanganj is the highest in India. There is no room for others to come and settle there. Now, as regards Manbhum, I wish *i* could quote the density of population there also. Sir, the density of population in Manbhum is 552 and in Bankura it is 498. Bankura is an adjoining district, which has a lower density. But, Sir, density of population is not the only criterion. We have got to see also the cultivated land per agriculturist. The cultivated area per head of the agricultural population in the Santhal Parganas is 72, and in the bordering district of Malda it is 77. In Midnapur it is 79 acre of land per head of the agricultural population whereas Singhbhum has only 46 acre of land per head of the agricultural population. It is, therefore, obvious that the land in West Bengal, with its better natural environments, is still able to sustain much larger population, at least on the level of the agriculturists in Bihar. Bihar is also rapidly adding to its population.

And then, Sir, let Us study the figures of revenue, which show that Bengal, after partition, has emerged out as one of the strongest and economically sound States in India, You will see, Sir, from the figures that I have got here that undivided Bengal had a revenue of Rs. 44 crores and a population of 60.8 millions at the time of partition. After partition, West Bengal was left with a revenue of about Rs. 31 crores and a population of 21.8 million, that is, with two-thirds of revenue of undivided Bengal and about one-third of the population. Thus per capita revenue of West Bengal was doubled as a consequence of the partition. Bihar, on the other hand, is economically and financially one of the most backward States in the country. Now, Sir, I have got certain figures of the average cultivated land per agriculturist. The figure for West Bengal is 826 acres, and for Bihar it

is 639 acres. Then, Sir, the cultivated area *per capita* of agricultural population is 83 acres in the case of West Bengal, whereas it is 64 acres in the case of Bihar. The proportion of population dependent on agriculture is 57.2 per cent, in the case of West Bengal and 86.1 per cent, in the case of Bihar. This shows that Bihar is industrially very backward. Then, Sir, the annual *per capita* consumption of electricity is 49.29 kwh and 4.07 kwh for West Bengal and Bihar respectively. (*Time Bell rings.*) Then, Sir, *per capita* revenue is Rs. 15-1 for West Bengal and Rs. 8-5 for Bihar. And per capita expenditure is Rs. 16-1 and Rs. 7-6 for West Bengal and Bihar respectively. Therefore, Sir, any loss of a part of Chota Nagpur which has the potentialities for industrial development will further upset the balance between agriculture and industry in Bihar, and to that extent, will weaken Bihar's economy.

6 P.M.

The Commission also has taken note of this. Therefore, I oppose the ceding of any territory of Bihar either to Bengal or to Orissa. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I join in the tribute paid to the members of the Commission by the hon. Pandit Pant. I have not got his eloquence or his expression; I will therefore, simply endorse the sentiments expressed and the tribute paid by him to the members. When the Commission was appointed, there was all praise for them from all corners, and not a single voice was there against any of the members of the Commission. It has pained me very much to hear dissenting voices since the Report has been published and the criticism from various quarters which has been levelled against the Report. I feel and feel very strongly that the recommendations made by the Commission have been made after a great deal of labour and consideration and they must be accepted *in toto*, without any change whatsoever.

Coming straight to the question of the creation of new Madhya Pradesh, I once again endorse the recommendations of the Commission including their recommendation to locate the capital at Jabalpur. All sections of the public have welcomed the formation of the new Madhya Pradesh, which is going to be the biggest and the most stable State, both politically and economically.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA:
Not biggest in population.

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: Biggest in area. Not only the S.R.C. has recommended Jabalpur as the capital of the new Madhya Pradesh but sections of the Madhya Bharat and Vindhya Pradesh Assemblies have approved of this place, and, therefore, I submit that Jabalpur should be the capital of the new Madhya Pradesh and not Bhopal as suggested in some quarters, because it has become a bone of contention and is responsible for a great controversy. Jabalpur is most centrally situated geographically and is most suited to cater to the needs of the people from all angles. It has been the nerve centre of political activities and consciousness during the past many decades. From the point of view of accommodation also, there is more accommodation immediately available there than in Bhopal. The only claim of Bhopal which has been prominently placed is that of communications. I am positive that Jabalpur is in no way less advantageous so far as facilities of communications both by rail and road are concerned. It would, therefore, be wrong to suggest that Bhopal has any advantage over Jabalpur in the matter of communications. In educational institutions also, Jabalpur stands far superior to Bhopal. I also commend to the House the memorandum submitted by the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh, Pandit Ravi Shankar Shukla, which has been circulated to Members. I do not know whether it has been received by all, but it is clearly stated there that, if the

capital is located in Bhopal, it would serve only an area of 69,908 sq. miles and a population of 1,10,7,022, whereas the capital at Jabalpur would serve an area of 1,01,292 sq. miles and a population of 1,30,12,978. On account of these considerations Jabalpur has a distinct advantage over Bhopal. My own submission is that, wherever the capital is located, whether it is located in Jabalpur or in Bhopal or in some other place, a new Chandigarh, a new capital, will have to be created and as suggested in the Madhya Pradesh Assembly, a new site should be selected. An Expert Committee should be constituted and the question of capital should be referred to that Committee, and whatever site it selects, the capital should be located there. If Jabalpur is finally rejected, then I submit that Saugor is the most suitable place for the capital. It is more centrally situated than Bhopal, but a little less than Jabalpur. It has got other advantages. Bhopal is at an altitude of only 1650 ft. above sea level. Jabalpur is 1700 ft. and Saugor is 2000 ft. above sea level. Our leaders, the Rashtrapati, the Prime Minister and our Chairman, Dr. Radhakrishnan, have all paid their visit to Saugor and they have all very highly spoken about that place. Dr. Radhakrishnan has said that Saugor reminds him of Switzerland. The Prime Minister said, when he went there, that it was one of the loveliest places and so has Dr. Rajendra Prasad. I, therefore, strongly commend Saugor for the capital of the new Madhya Pradesh.

I now come to some other aspects. There have been claims of Andhra, Orissa, Bihar, etc. and there also have been the protagonists of Jhar-khand who claim portions of Mahakosal.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Not Bihar.

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: I withdraw. I feel that these claims should be rejected, that the people of these areas have no

[Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal Malviya.] cultural affinity and they do not desire to go to any of those places. Jharkhand is a problem about which my mouth is shut, because I happen to be a member of an important Committee of Madhya Pradesh and the matter is still pending. I would only suggest that it will be harmful to the country if a separate Jharkhand is created. It is not in the interests of the country. It has got affiliations which would not serve the interests of the country, and I, therefore, oppose the creation of a separate Jharkhand.

Now, there are sections of Madhya Bharat and Vindhya Pradesh which strike a discordant note. My friend, Capt. Awadhesh Pratap Singh, has spoken in the morning and some voices have come from Madhya Bharat that they would like to have a separate existence or to be merged with U.P. So far as this point is concerned, I am emphatically of opinion that one of the best things which the Commission has done is the abolition of B and C class States and in no case they should be allowed an independent existence any more now. They have been the dens of reaction. There is no time to cite instances. Everybody knows it and on that ground I oppose their existence in any shape or form. There is no doubt that our friends, those who have been holding the reins of administration there, have done their level best. They have served these States very well but still it is desirable that if we want to neutralise all reactionary elements in these States, they should be merged and should not be allowed any independent existence.

So far as the demand of my friend Capt. Awadhesh Pratap Singh and some others that a portion of Vindhya Pradesh may be merged in U.P. is concerned, and I am sorry that this has been supported by no less a man than the Chief Minister of U.P. Shri Sampurnanand and some friends here including Mr. Bisht, my own

reaction is that this could be done only on the basis of the formula recommended by Dru Panikkar about U.K. in his note of dissent. He has allowed them territory if they divide. Firstly, there is a very small section from the people of Vindhya Pradesh who want its merger in U.P.—I am a neighbour of Vindhya Pradesh, living at a distance of only four miles from the border of Vindhya Pradesh—and I know for certain that the people in general don't want to merge in U.P. A very small area bordering U.P. may have done that but the people don't want to go to U.P.

CAPTAIN AWADHESH PRATAP SINGH: Ninety-nine per cent, want to go, I challenge.

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: I refuse to be interrupted. If they want to go, I will have no objection to their going to U.P. I will have no objection to the desire of the Chief Minister of U.P. and of Mr. Bisht that some part of Madhya Bharat and Vindhya Pradesh may go there being fulfilled, but then I am very emphatically of the opinion that this cannot be done unless the recommendation of Mr. Panikkar is endorsed. Let it be divided and let them enjoy Madhya Bharat and let them have portions of Vindhya Pradesh. Otherwise I strongly oppose it.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Otherwise U.P. and V.P.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): Please wind up.

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: Two minutes more, Sir. This House is not the forum for the subject which I am just going to deal with, but because our Leader has yesterday in the other House thrown a suggestion of Regional Advisory Committees, it has occurred to me that the new Madhya Pradesh should be allowed a Legislative Council. It is not the forum I say because of this

169 of the Constitution requires a Resolution to that effect from the respective Assemblies; but I want that this should be done now so taut along with the amendment in the Constitution, the amendment for the creation of a new Legislative Council for Madhya Pradesh may also come

One last word about Vidarbha. The Resolution of the Madhya Pradesh Assembly and that of the Working Committee of the Congress have said that the wishes of the people of Vidarbha should be ascertained, and if legislature is a body which gives the proof of the views, then a vast majority of Vidarbha Members have said that they would remain alone—and Vidarbha should remain intact, as recommended by the S.R.C. and I therefore, very strongly recommend that Vidarbha should be retained as recommended by the S.R.C.

We have seen the debates about Bombay in both the Houses and we have also heard the Prime Minister's statement yesterday. After hearing all these views, he has probably come to the conclusion that the only alternative is that Bombay State should be retained as recommended by the S.R.C.

With these words I again support in the strongest terms the Report and submit that every word of it, with certain modifications with the agreement of the different States, should be accepted. Thank you.

SHRI JAFAR IMAM: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the apprehensions which the people of Kishanpanj were feeling in being transferred to West Bengal were mentioned in the S. R. C. Report and now after the speech of Prof. Mookerji, it is clear to every hon. Member of this House that the whole problem is to rehabilitate the refugees. I have got every sympathy with them. It was not the peculiar case of Bengal. It was the case of Punjab also. The Punjab people

were also disturbed on account of the partition of the country. The Bengal people were also disturbed on account of the partition of Bengal, but I have admiration, very strong admiration, for the people of Punjab. They spread themselves all over the country, they went to Madras, Bombay, Bihar, U.P. and even to the remotest corner of India. I have seen Punjabi refugees with my own eyes in various areas of Terai. If they had also decided that they would not allow their language and culture to be disturbed, they would not have settled themselves up till now. They have also got their own language and culture. Their language and culture are different from the people of U.P., Bihar, Bengal, and Madras. They have got their own language Punjabi, and their own culture; but they did not care for that. They took it in their minds that these problems must be solved and they solved it bravely. Now the problem of Bengal is similar. People from East Pakistan came to West Bengal. Bengal has not settled the refugees yet. Bihar offered lands to the refugees, opened camps; they all came, they remained there for some time and they again went away on the instigation of the leaders of West Bengal—they were not allowed to live in Bihar. Lands in Chota Nagpur, Ranchi and other places were given to them but they were not allowed to settle there. They were to be sent to Orissa but they were not allowed to go to Orissa. Is this the way to solve the refugee problem? The whole idea behind their mind was that unless they gather so much accumulation of refugees in Bengal? they cannot claim any portion of Bihar. Just to claim portion of Bihar the refugees were accumulated in one place and Mr. Mookerji has sincerely said—he has exposed his heart and the feelings of entire Bengal—that they would not allow the refugees to be settled anywhere because they want to maintain and retain their language and culture. Culture and language are so dear to

[Shri Jafar Imam.] Bengal. And do you mean to say that the language and culture are not equally dear to the people of Bihar? About 30 lakhs of refugees are there. A portion of Purnea and Manbhum have been recommended to be transferred and if those areas are transferred, then the rehabilitation question would only be settled if the people of that area desire it and if there is accommodation. Bihar has a lot of population already and there is absolutely no accommodation for refugees. That has been clearly accepted by the Commission. How can refugees be settled there unless the people there are rendered homeless? They will have to be removed from their lands and houses. But they do not want to be transferred to Bengal. Sir, I personally have been to that area. They said that in no case they were going to live in Bengal. They do not want to be transferred to Bengal because they have seen with their eyes how the people in Malda and Dinapur and Jalpaiguri were dislocated and how the Muslims there are living. Not only the Muslims, but also the Hindus will be disturbed if that area goes to Bengal and the refugees are settled there. Everybody would be disturbed, Hindus and Muslims. The Muslims have seen in Bengal, how the people were disturbed. The refugees came and took possession of the houses of the Muslims who were living in their own houses. They took possession of the houses and they also took possession of the lands. So these people are not on their lands, they are not in their houses. That is the position of the Muslims in Bengal. That is why I say they should not be transferred.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Please do not rouse communal passions in Bengal in this way.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: They are "bhai, bhai."

SHRI JAFAR IMAM: I know that.

In February, 1955, there was a conference of nationalist Muslims under the presidency of Maulana Husain Ahmad Madni, in Calcutta. And this is what Mariana Husain Ahmad Madni said in his presidential speech, I will just read it:

ہم میں مغربی بلکال بالخصوص
کلمتہ کے ان ہزاروں خاندانوں سے
اظہار ہمدردی کرنا اپنا فرض سمجھتا
ہوں جو سہ ۵۰ کے ہلکا-ہوں میں
خانہ ویران ہوئے۔ ہر ایک باشندہ
مالک کے لئے مسکن و رہائش کا
انتظام حکومت کا پہلا فرض ہے۔
کسی مذہب و حکومت کے لئے اس
سے زیادہ شرم کی بات کیا ہو سکتی
ہے کہ باشندگان ملک کی بہت
بڑی تعداد برسوں بے خانہاں رہے
اور ایسا رویہ تو بہت ہی افسوسناک
ہے جو ایک فرقہ سے تعلق رکھنے
والوں کو اس احساس پر مجبور
کر دے کہ اس عام ملکی مسئلہ
میں بھی مختلف طبقات کے درمیان
امتیاز برتا جاتا ہے۔ یہ درست ہے
کہ جو بے خانہاں پاکستان سے مغربی
بلکال آئے ہیں ان کو ضرور آباد
کرنا چاہئے۔ لیکن وہ آبادی ہوگئے
اس طریقہ پر نہیں ہونی چاہئے
کہ خود مغربی بلکال کے مسلمان
اپنے ہی عزیز وطن میں خانہاں
برباد نظر آئیں اور اپنے مکانات ہوتے
ہوئے بھی ان میں آباد نہ ہو سکیں۔
بہر حال سب کچھ ہو رہا ہے تہذیب
و انصاف کا مطالبہ ہے کہ یہ صورت
حال جلد ختم کی جائے اور چلتی

جلد ممکن ہو اس غیر ملصفانہ
روئے کا محتاج ہو جائے - ۲۲

†[“ मैं मगरबी बंगाल बिलखसूस कलकत्ता के उन हजारों खानदानों से इजहार हमदर्दी करना अपना फर्ज समझता हूँ जो सन् ५० के हंगामों में खाना वीरान हुए। हर एक बाशिन्दाए मुल्क के लिए मस्किन व रिहायश का इन्तजाम हुक्मत का पहला फर्ज है। किसी मजहब हुक्मत के लिए इससे ज्यादा शर्म की क्या बात हो सकती है कि बाशिन्दगान्मुल्क की बहुत बड़ी तादाद वर्षों बंखानमा रहे और ऐसा रवैया बहुत ही अफसोसनाक है जो एक फिजका से तलब रखने वालों को इस अहसास पर मजबूर कर दे कि इस आम मुल्की मसला में भी मुस्लिम तबकात के दूरभ्यान इम्तियाज होता जाता है। यह दुरुस्त है कि जो खानदान बाकिस्तान से मगरबी बंगाल आए हैं, उनको जरूर आबाद करना चाहिए, लेकिन वह आबादी हरीगज इस तरीका पर नहीं होनी चाहिए कि खूद मगरबी बंगाल के मुसलमान अपने अजीज बतन में खानमा बरबाद नजर आयें और अपने मकानात होते हुए भी उनमें आबाद न हो सकें। बहरहाल सबकुछ भी हो, तहजीब व इत्ताफ का मुतालाबा है कि यह सूरतेहाल जल्द खत्म की जाय और जितनी जल्द मुमकिन हो, इस गैर मुनसफाना रवैया का खाल्मा हो जाय।”]

In 1955 if there was no such problem, if Muslims were not displaced in Bengal, then there should have been a contradiction from the State Government at once; but there is no such contradiction. Just now they say everything is settled and the people have been rehabilitated, that the Muslims have been rehabilitated. Sir, it is not a fact. They are still not in their houses. They are still not on their lands. This is the position in Bengal.

Sir. OW lay claim to Bihar area because Bihar was once part of Bengal. But Bihar, Bengal, Orissa and Assam were once all in one Province.

tHindi transliteration.

And even before that, when the Diwani was transferred by Shah Alam to the Britishers, that Bengal was right up to Agra. Then do they mean to say that Agra did not exist? Do they mean that Bihar did not exist, or that Assam did not exist? Bihar existed. Sir.

I do not know if I have got more time. How many more minutes have I?

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

SHRI JAFAR IMAM: Sir, another point I submit is this. Bengal wants a corridor. What for? For connecting the Lower Bengal with the Upper Bengal. From North to South they want a connecting link. There is already such a connection. There is a national highway which is not Bihar's property. It is a subject of the Centre. That road does not belong to Bihar, nor does it belong to Bengal. And up-till now, since the partition of Bengal, they were going to Darjeeling through that road. But now they have raised this point, that they would like to have a corridor. Is that because Bihar is Pakistan or hostile to India? What do they mean? I would say it would be anti-national and a negation of democracy if this area is granted to them on the ground that they want a link. That would be absolutely wrong. That would not be in the national spirit. That would be in the spirit of separation and this tendency should not be developed, it should be crushed then and there, here and now it should be crushed. [I would be the last man to agree to this sort of a demand that a corridor should be given to Bengal. A corridor? Are we foreigners? We are sister States under the Indian Union. Have we ever stopped these people from going to Darjeeling through Bihar? If we have, then the matter would have been taken to Pandit Jawaharlalji. It would have been taken to the Central Government. But no complaint was sent to the

[Shri Jafar Imam.] Central Government. If ever we refuse to give them passage, then in the Government of India is there. The road is not ours.

They want these areas to go to Bengal, but nobody would like it. I assure you, Sir, and I assure hon. Members of this House that I have been there and 4 lakhs of the people, not Muslims alone, but Hindus also, 20 per cent, of the population, Hindus and Muslims, in the one voice said no one would want to go to Bengal. They gathered in huge numbers, 4 lakhs of Hindus and Muslims. And let me tell you, Sir, the language of the area is not Bengali. Only 3 per cent, of the population speak Bengali. The rest of the people speak either Hindi or Urdu, and they are being asked to go to Bengal. And why? What for are they being asked to go? On account of the partition, or separation and the sufferings of Bengal. Sir, Bengal has sacrificed very much for the independence of the country. But I would point out that others also have sacrificed, if not much, they too have made sacrifices not less. Bihar also has sacrificed in the achievement of independence. Kshudiram Bose was mentioned. I have got the greatest admiration and respect for him. But there are others also who had made sacrifices, in Bihar and in other parts of Uttar Pradesh and so on. Many people were hanged and many were transported. This was not the monopoly of Bengal. And the refugees are not the monopoly of Bengal. They are the responsibility of every one of us. They are the responsibility of the Union Government. The Union Government should decide whether they are to be located in one place or no*. If they are to be located in one place, then they will have to remove the people of the area where they are to be located. They have to be removed first* and they should be settled elsewhere. Then and then alone they would be rehabilitated, because they do not

want to mingle with other populations. Otherwise, the problem would have been solved as in the case of Punjab.

The question of Punjabis has been settled. The Punjabis only wanted land and space; they were prepared to go miles and miles if only they could be given land. If now the people from East Bengal are to be given land in the areas recommended for transfer, the people in the villages of those areas must be removed. If they want to be settled in Orissa, in Bihar or in all the districts of Bihar, the matter would have been solved, but it is not so easy as they want to be settled in one block. The population in these places will have to be dislocated. Therefore, I would oppose such a thing and I would appeal to every Member in this House to remember this. After the speech of Mr. Mookerji, everything should be clear to every one of us. They want the linguistic and cultural traditions of Bengal to be retained and maintained at the cost of Bihar, at the cost of Orissa and such other places. This should not be allowed. I brought before you the example of the Punjabis. They have done tremendously well and they have solved their problem.

I have done, Sir.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH (Bombay): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have heard carefully the debate that has been going on in this House and in the other for the last few days. I would have liked an administrative unit to be created for every one crore of persons as well as the creation of five zonal councils. We are all having big areas and are neglecting certain interior areas. The cry for division and such other matters has come only because of the neglect of certain interior areas in the country. I think this state of affairs will continue even after the formation of linguistic State.

With this remark. I would come to the city of Bombay about which there has been so much controversy. First

of all. I would like to pay a tribute to Mr. Deogirikar for having said some good things about the State of Ujjain. I would, however, criticise him for what he has not said and which he should have also said about Gujarat. The States Reorganisation Commission Report is there and it was all favourable to the Maharashtrians as regards the proposed bilingual State. They would have had a majority of 48 per cent., even then they rejected it saying that they will not touch it or they were not going to accept it. I do not understand this thing at all. If they had wanted the city of Bombay, it was there; they could have had it in a bilingual State with their voice of 48 per cent. They have rejected this proposal and it is not in their own interest to have done so. When they have done it, Gujarat has not accepted. If they do not want us, then we also do not want to be with them. We would like to part company but with grace, not with bitterness which they are advocating. Now, they say that they do not want a bilingual State but a unilingual State. When they make this demand, they also qualify it. They say that they will have a bilingual State with Vidarbha. Now, what does that mean? If they have Vidarbha added on, it means that they will have a majority of 66 per cent., which will enable them to neglect the voice of the State of Gujarat and the city of Bombay. In such a position they think that they will be safe. Now, both Mr. Deogirikar and Prof. Kane said that the Maharashtrians were then suspects and were treated as such by the States Reorganisation Commission. While they say that, they are bringing in an indirect charge; they are indirectly challenging the *bona fides* of the States Reorganisation Commission, of the Draft Commission and of the J. V. P. Report.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: No, no.

SHRI C. P. PARTKH: Further Members of the Working Committee are from different States in India.

4 R.S.D.—8

These people have however, no confidence in the judgment of important persons from different States. The leaders have pronounced that the city of Bombay should be a separate State if it cannot be accepted in a bilingual State.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Mr. Parikh, you have misunderstood the thing entirely.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: I do not want to be disturbed. I have no time. My time is limited. If the hon. Vice-Chairman gives me time, I will reply to all the interruptions.

The Maharashtrians do not want to join a bilingual State unless they have a 66 per cent. majority. They say that the city of Bombay should first be with them; otherwise, they will not accept any proposal. The Working Committee has given the three State formula which is not agreeable to them. I now come to Vidarbha. The hon. Members who have spoken to them and the political leaders of Vidarbha have expressed their opinion outside and in their own legislature—have also said that they do not want to join, with Maharashtra unless they could also have the city of Bombay. Therefore, the people of Vidarbha also have no confidence in the leadership, the political leadership, of the Maharashtrians. They are afraid of the Maharashtrians. That being the case, it becomes very difficult for those who are living in Gujarat to welcome the decision to come under the domination of the Maharashtrians.

In regard to the city of Bombay, the composition of the population in that city has to be distinctly understood. In the city of Bombay, Maharashtrians are 44 per cent., Gujaratis are 18 per cent., North Indians 15 per cent., South Indians are 12 per cent., and the rest of the communities constitute the remaining 11 per cent. Although the Maharashtrians had a clear majority, being a single big community with 44 per cent. of population, they did not have the confi-

Shri C. P. Parikh.] dance to realise that they shall be controlling the destinies of Bombay city even if it be a separate State. When such is the case, naturally we have some misgivings that they want to utilise their power for utilising the finances and benefits of Bombay city to their exclusive advantage. Otherwise, why should these people, people who constitute 44 per cent, of the population, be afraid of accepting a separate State especially when they could have had Vidarbha in the Sam-yukta Maharashtra? After all, what is it that they want in Bombay? What is the glamour of Bombay? I shall try to explain that. The glamour is that Bombay city has a revenue surplus of about Rs. 12 crores. This city has the largest employment potential in the whole of India. I think, Sir, Bombay city is providing employment to labourers, both skilled and unskilled, to the extent of four and a half lakhs of which 40 per cent., are Maharashtrians. When they make this claim, they easily forget as to what is to happen to the remaining 56 per cent, of the population living in Bombay. Does it mean that by asking the city of Bombay to be given to them, they want to rule that city to their own advantage and to the exclusion of the 56 per cent, of the people living there? If we read the speeches and the pronouncements which have been made since the Dar Commission submitted its Report, we would find that the Maharashtrians thought that they were not going to get Bombay city nor the exclusive and full advantage over the city of Bombay. The whole difficulty is that they want to enjoy the economic advantages of this city, to the exclusion of 56 per cent., of people who are living in Bombay and who have come there from different States in India.

If they want to have the advantage of the city of Bombay for all the communities, then we should have no objection and all the 56 per cent, of the other communities will agree with them, but when they want to share alone the benefits of Bombay, the

economic and financial benefits which are so well known, then it is all apparent that they want it for their exclusive use, to the exclusion of other communities, Gujaratis apart to the exclusion of the communities which hail from the north and from the south, from Bengal, from Central India and other places. I think each State has a stake in the Bombay city because I think, Sir, if each State examines its record they will be able to find how many of their people have settled in Bombay. If we look at the monthly remittances, money orders of lakhs and lakhs of rupees on pay day are sent out to other Provinces, and the wage scale being four times more than what is prevailing in other States, has become the attraction for the Maharashtrian leaders. They say that they are suspected but they do not have any hesitation in suspecting the *bona fides* of the judgment which all other political leaders and all other people in India have given that either you have a bilingual State or Bombay city has to be separated. To no argument they are amenable. They say, "We should have a preponderant majority," and I think, Sir, our misgivings are aroused further on account of the arguments which have been advanced by some political leaders as well as economists—when I say 'economists' I mean economists of theory and not of practice, because these economists have also said that "we" shall have the transfer of population from the city of Bombay; "we" shall have transfer of industries from Bombay. They are also bold to say that the transfer is to go to Maharashtra. . They do not say that the transfer will go to each State according to the population that "Ves in the city of Bombay. To us Gujaratis it is immaterial what happens to the city of Bombay, but at least as a citizen of India I have every right to say that the larger interests of all the States in India will not be served unless the city of Bombay is a city of the nation I mean to say, Sir, if Bombay had been made the capital of India instead of Delhi, the economic progress of the country would have been much more rapid and the administration would

have been much more efficient, but, unfortunately, when — that is not the case, it will not be too late to make Bombay city the second capital of India, commercial and industrial capital.

Now, Sir, why there is the glamour of Bombay city has to be understood. 50 per cent, of the banking in India is transacted in Bombay. That is shared by all the States in India and not Maharashtra alone. With regard to import trade, 55 per cent, of the import trade is carried through the port of Bombay. 31 per cent, of the revenues of the Indian Union, the income-tax and the corporation tax, are procured from the city of Bombay and from all the communities, 'Maharashtrians and non-Maharashtrians, the latter accounting for 56 per cent, of the population and each State has a proportionate share in it.

Now, with regard to the people of Gujarat he has made the remark that these persons are capitalist-mind <I will say, Sir, Gujarat's history is that in 1942 in the 'Quit India' movement, the millowners of Gujarat had closed their mills for three months in order to paralyse the British Government, and if other parts and if other States would have followed that example, I think, Sir, the British would have given us independence much earlier. But this history of Gujarat is forgotten and Mr. Deogirikar and Prof. Kane have entirely forgotten this. I may say further, Sir, that I do not mind who rules Gujarat, who rules Maharashtra, who rules Bombay. If Gujarati State is formed separately Gujarat will have no objection. If the Ministers of other States are to govern Gujarat, still we have no objection. We have got that true confidence in the integrity and in the impartiality of all the other States. We are not keen to govern our own but we want to be governed by Indians and Indians alone. I think Sir, we must forget this line of argument as early as possible if we want the economic advancement of our country. This feeling Sir, will retard our progress,

and when Prof. Kane and Mr. Deogirikar advanced arguments based on linguism they forgot the economic security of India as well as the furtherance of the National Plan in order that we might establish a true Welfare State. I think Sir we shall have to make huge sacrifices and if we get involved in this tangle and this controversy and if the political leaders also do so, history will blame them for not doing the right thing and for not giving the right lead. Other nations are advancing much faster and compared to that, our progress should be considered very slow, and unless we all join hands together, unless we sink all our differences, unless we trust each other, we shall not make the rapid advance that is necessary.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHEJUR): Two minutes more.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: With regard to the further advancement of the country which we want, this can only come when there is one language in India, one food in the public hotels and one dress worn by all. As long as we do not make these sacrifices, as long as we do not evolve some system of mass co-operation and mass enthusiasm might generate more and more, we shall not make the advance which is necessary. We want to double our standard of living in a period of ten years or earlier, if possible, and for that we shall have to forget that we are Bengalis or Madrasis or Gujaratis or Punjabis. I think, Sir, we must first consider that we are Indians, Indians first and Indians last. It is all the more important as other nations are watching us as to how we are solving our problems. We have solved the problem of partition. We have solved the food problem, and I think, Sir, this linguistic problem should not come in the way of reorganisation of Provinces. What I mean to say, Sir, is that we must leave it to the Congress Working Committee to do in whatever way they like, and it is no use, I think.

LSHri C. P. Parikh.] threatening us that Congress will be routed in Maharashtra or in the city of Bjmby. That is not going to happen. There is no other party in India yet to replace the Congress for a number of year? to come, and those who are advocating or those who are giving such threats, I think, Sir, do not understand the political life of India and the way in which the masses are moving. This is all the more important because if we do not rise to the occasion, if we do not make these sacrifices, we shall not be able to perform the greater things that we cherish. Why I am saying all this is merely because we want to achieve not only harmony in India but a statu? for India in the international world. We Gujaratis who are men of business, who know what economic progress is, understand its importance. Why not our nation be among the first five nations in the world? Why should England be greater, why should U.S.A. be greater, why should Russia be greater and why should France be greater when, by reason of our culture and our civilisation, we can have much greater importance than what we are having? Why should we be diffident when we have a leader amongst leaders who can mould the destiny of the world? I think, Sir, it is unfortunate that we are talking in terms of division and we are not talking in terms of unity. With unity as our objective, I think, Sir, in the course of ten or fifteen years every home will be talking in Hindi and Hindi only, and the regional languages will gradually be forgotten, < not forgotten will have only a secondary place, and unless and until we talk in one language, we dress ourselves in one uniform and we take one food, we shall not make any rapid advance. Although you may say that Gujarati people are capitalists, I think, Sir, it is no crime to be a capitalist in the country. We have 'replaced foreigners in business and industry; that should be imown. The city of Bombay has

replaced foreigners. In Calcutta the foreigners are only being gradually replaced. I think, Sir, it is no crime to be a capitalist in this country when we are drawing wealth from East Africa, from Ceylon, from Aden, from Rangoon, Singapore #nd Hong Kong where our Indian citizens have established themselves with all their brilliance of intelligent acumen in commerce and trade. I think, Sir, therefore, it is necessary to understand the whole problem and sink our individual differences and leave the verdict to others. We should not judge ourselves.

Lastly I would say one point. In this conflict everyone has said that the S. R. C. Report is good and it should be implemented, but when it comes to his own State, Sir, he is not willing to accept it. That shows our mentality and I think, Sir, we are representatives of the masses and we should understand the problems as existing at present in their proper perspective.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the formation of linguistic States has been integral to the struggle of Indian people for national liberation and democratic form of Government. The participation of the masses of the people in the legislative, administrative and political life of the country is inconceivable without such linguistic States. This is a pre-requisite to ensure that the masses of the people take their full part in the democratic reconstruction of the country's economy. This is also necessary for laying the firm and secure foundations for building the unity of India, on the basis of democracy and equality of all this various people who would voluntarily co-operate in the common endeavour of building a united, prosperous, progressive and democratic India. Just now, an hon. Member from the other side has said that he stands for a State where there would be only one language that will be4

»spoken. He wants that all the regional languages should be forgotten; he has at least given the time of 15 years. Sir, that shows the mentality of the vested interests who want to have a unitary form of Government in our country and establish themselves and rule the country. I have to tell that hon. Member that his wishes will not fructify. The regional languages will not be forgotten. The bonds of the language and the bonds of the linguistic groups cannot be broken by anybody whatever the position 'ie may hold either in the form of capital or in the form of controlling the big business in the country.

Sir, I cannot agree with the argument which advocates bilingual States or with the arguments advanced against the formation of linguistic States. These arguments are mentioned in paras 136, 137, 141, 151, 155 and 156 of the S. R. C. Report. These arguments centre round certain ideas which in brief are that it will "encourage exclusivism", that "education as a whole is bound to suffer and will lose national character", that this "retards the pace of planned economic development of the country", that this "develops homeland concept" etc. These are the arguments advanced against the formation of linguistic Provinces and I must say that all these arguments are wrong and are based on one concept and that concept is mistrust of the people. They say that they want a bilingual State wherein all the peoples speaking different languages live together and in that way they can have bigger States. An hon. Member from that side—I think it was Mr. Bisht—advocated that and even quoted the example of West Pakistan where they tried to form one-unit Government. I do not think he is advising us to follow the methods of the Government of Pakistan in reorganising our States. If he does, it is a bad advice. Recently when we had to pass legislation forming the Andhra State, we formed it on

4 RSD—9

the basis of the experience that Andhra people had in the composite State. So that is a clear proof that if there are bilingual States you will be forced to form linguistic States if not today, at least after some years. That is a clear proof that bilingual States lead to bitterness, suspicion and animosity among the different people speaking different languages. So I cannot agree to any proposition to form bilingual States either in Bombay or in the Punjab or anywhere else.

Now, I come to the main problem. Why are they opposing the formation of linguistic States? What is the reason? Let us examine the causes. The demand for linguistic Provinces is not a demand for a separate State. It is not a negation of common citizenship. It is not weakening the Centre as the relationship between the Centre and the States is properly defined in the Constitution. The demand for the formation of linguistic States means only that out of the 14 major languages enumerated in the Constitution 11 should have one unilingual State each with two or three Hindi-speaking States as the people of the Hindi-speaking areas wish to have. My hon. friend from the other side—Mr. C. P. Parikh—advocated a bilingual State. He forgot that the Gujarati people were clamouring for a Gujarati State; he forgot the common man's ambition to have a Gujarati State where the common man can take part effectively in the legislative, administrative and the democratic life of the country. So the linguistic problem cannot be brushed aside. In the Report it has been said that they took a balanced view of things and they themselves say that they have considered every case on its own merits and after all these, they have come to the conclusion of forming at least, out of 16, as far as 13 States on the basis of language. Now, the question is how we can reorganise the country in an atmosphere wherein we can

[Shri K. L. Narasimham.] settle things peacefully and live together and bring about a powerful, united and prosperous country taking its due place in the comity of nations of the world. So, I support the view u2 having bigger States and bigger States are good on the -basis of language. Sir, I do not want to dilate on this point further with the short time at my disposal.

Now, I come to the question of border areas. With regard to border areas the S. R. C. Report has created more trouble than settling disputes between States whether newly formed or already formed. When we go through the reports of the debates in the various Assemblies we find Members belonging to the Congress Party putting up all sorts of claims, Congressmen from Bengal claiming certain parts of Bihar, Congressmen from Orissa claiming certain parts of Andhra, Congressmen from Andhra claiming certain parts of Orissa and so on. If you go through the reports you will find that it is only the Congressmen who have made unreasonable demands on the neighbouring States, demands not based on any principle and it will not be surprising to state here that Members of the Communist Party, whether in Bengal or in Madras or in Travancore-Cochin or in Andhra or in Parliament here have stated only one view. We were able to give that view because we have based our opinion on one principle and that is the reorganisation of the country on linguistic basis. So our solution for the border disputes is this. You form the States with one language and then try to minimise the minority groups there as much as possible. Take the language and the contiguity of the territory and with the village as the unit, demarcate the States. This principle can be adopted when deciding the borders of Bengal and Bihar or

n deciding the borders of Madras and Kerala or Andhra and Madhya Pradesh. Here I have to point out that in some paras dealing with border questions the Report says that they will only take the district as the basic unit for making territorial adjustments. This is the principle laid down in para. 291. But in some other paragraphs they have taken into consideration some other factors, administrative convenience and other reasons and they have taken a tehsil or a taluk here and there and made adjustments. They refused to consider the question of Parlekimedi in the border between Orissa and the Andhra States. Sir, I want to state that the Communist Party stands for the adjustment of the borders peacefully, first by mutual discussion between the States involved; if it cannot be settled by discussion, then follow a principle, that is, the basis of language and the contiguity of the territories with village as the unit; and settle the issues, by appointing a Boundary Commission and referring all such cases to the Boundary Commission. Let the Boundary Commission decide the issue once for all and let us ensure that we do not reopen the question again and again.

Now, coming to the particular cases, let us take

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR) : You will take more time?

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM: Yea. Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): Then we will continue tomorrow. The House stands adjourned till 10 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at seven of the clock till ten of the clock on Friday, the 23rd December 1955.