

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE,

AUDITED PROFIT AND LOSS ACCOUNTS FOR THE PERIOD ENDED THE 31ST MARCH 1955 AND REPORT TO THE SHAREHOLDERS OF THE HINDUSTAN CABLES LIMITED

THE MINISTER FOR PRODUCTION (SHRI K. C. REDDY) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Audited Profit and Loss Accounts of the Hindustan Cables Limited for the period ended the 31st March 1955, together with a copy of the Report to the Shareholders. [Placed in Library. *See* No. S-482/55.]

REPORT OF THE UNION PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION FOR 1954-55 AND A MEMORANDUM THEREON EXPLAINING REASONS FOR NON-ACCEPTANCE OF COMMISSION'S ADVICE IN CERTAIN CASES

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIES (SHRI N. KANUNGO) : Sir, on behalf of Shri Govind Ballabh Pant, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers under clause (1) of article 323 of the Constitution: —

(i) Report of the Union Public Service Commission for the period 1st April 1954 to 31st March 1955.

(ii) Memorandum on the Report of the Union Public Service Commission for 1954-55, explaining the reasons for non-acceptance of the Commission's advice in certain cases. [Placed in Library. *See* No. S-468/55 for (i) and (ii).]

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON OFFICES OF PROFIT

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND (Utter Pradesh): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report of the Committee on Offices of Profit. [Placed in Library. *See* No. S-480/55.]

THE INDIAN LAC CESS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1955

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI M. V. KRISHNAPPA) : Sir, I beg to move:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Lac Cess Act, 1930."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Lac Cess Act, 1930."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI M. V. KRISHNAPPA: Sir, I introduce the Bill

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

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will resume further discussion of the State Reorganisation Commission Report. I have to inform the House that there are still 63 Members to speak and we have only two days left. If all have to be given an opportunity, the House will have to sit from 10 o'clock tomorrow morning and, if necessary, continue up to 8 p.m. Each Member will restrict his speech to fifteen minutes. There will be no extension of time on any account.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VUATVAR-GIYA (Madhya Bharat): This is an important discussion, Sir, and no Member from my State has spoken.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not possible to extend the time on any account. You have to arrange between the different States and put up one or two speakers for each State.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA: Many speakers have had their say. There is much of controversy in my State. Every Member has to be accommodated to put up his point of view.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Members will have to adjust among themselves.

SHRI BARKATULLAH KHAN (Rajasthan): After all, Sir, it is not a question of finishing the debate. May I suggest that the time may be extended by a day?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, it is not possible at all.

SHRI M. VALIULLA (Mysore): At least by half a day.

DR. R. P. DUBE (Madhya Pradesh): After all, Sir, it will be very hard on the staff if we have to sit from 10 in the morning to 8 in the evening. It is such a long time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no possibility of extension. We shall try to finish it by 8 P.M. We may sit till 9 P.M. even, if necessary.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): Let us have an all-night session, Sir. Let Government arrange for our dinner.

SHRI BARKATULLAH KHAN: We can then sit till 10 or 11 in the night and finish the debate.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have no objection if all of you agree.

DR. R. P. DUBE: 10 A.M. to 8 P.M. is too long a time. What about our food?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shashi Ram will provide you.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I want to make a submission with regard to your suggestion for the restriction of speeches to fifteen minutes. While we are dis-

cussing such an important subject, the consideration should not be to finish this within a certain time but that there should be a thorough discussion. After all, it is not an unimportant subject. You will remember, Sir, that some of the States have not yet been given any opportunity so far to speak—States like U.P.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: They do not deserve any time.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Therefore, I would submit that this time-limit may be relaxed at least in the case of such of the States who have had no opportunity so far.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The time-limit will not be relaxed. If the Members so choose, they can put up an agreed and smaller list

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: May I submit that we may sit on Saturday also?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are simply taking the time of the House.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): In any case, the other House is sitting on Saturday. If we only extend for a day, I think we can complete everything and there will be no irregularity. I think consideration may kindly be given to this point of view.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will proceed on the assumption that there will not be any extension. Government will consider this thing and let us know.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH (Madhya Bharat): It must be extended by a day.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The other House is not sitting on Saturday.

DR. R. P. DUBE: That has nothing to do with us. We have nothing to do with that House. We only want that our House should sit for one day more because we have got a number of speaker

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That may not be possible, Dr. Dube.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Why, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken ten minutes, Dr. Barlingay. You will have five minutes more.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Malaya Pradesh): I have not taken ten minutes, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have ten minutes more.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: As a matter of fact, I took only two minutes yesterday, nothing more. Anyway, it does not matter.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You took six minutes. You have ten minutes more.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, during the short time at my disposal, it is obviously impossible to do justice to the subject on which I wish to speak today. I was saying yesterday that I would first of all lay down certain solution for the tract which comprises Marathwada, Vidarbha, Maharashtra, Bombay, Gujarat, Saurashtra and Kutch. The first solution I would say, would be the one State solution for all these regions. The second, failing ^{to} suggest as the second best ^{is} the two-State solution, namely, Samyukta Maharashtra and Miha Gujarat. The third, solution, failing the second solution—and that is very important—which I suggest and which is the third best is the three-State formula of the Working Committee. I would call the first solution one-State solution, the second solution the two-State solution and the third solution the three-State solution.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH (Bombay): Which is your priority?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: I have already given the priorities. May I

say at the very outset, Sir, that all these three solutions we owe to the statesmanlike approach of the Maharashtra Provincial Congress Committee? Now, what is the difficulty with regard to the first solution? As the time at my disposal is very short I will only make a brief statement and will not dilate on the arguments. Sir, nobody can possibly understand the basis of these three solutions which the Maharashtra Provincial Congress Committee has given, unless, first of all, we understand that if there had not been this problem of Bombay, what would be the solution. Sir, the S.R.C. has stated in paragraphs 142 and 143 of the Report as follows:

"142. It is obviously an advantage that constituent units of a federation should have a minimum measure of internal cohesion. Likewise a regional consciousness, not merely in the sense of a negative awareness of absence of repression or exploitation but also in the sense of scope for positive expression of the collective personality of a people inhabiting a State or a region may be conducive to the contentment and well-being of the community. Common language may not only promote the growth of such regional consciousness, but also make for administrative convenience and for a proper understanding of governmental measures by the people. Indeed, in a democracy the people can legitimately claim and the government have a duty to ensure that the administration is conducted in a language which the people can understand.

143. The objective, therefore, of community of language between the people and the Government is not only wholly unexceptionable but also highly commendable....."

Sir, I suggest with the greatest humility that nobody need be ashamed of saying that language is one of the most important considerations for determining what areas should come

[Dr. W. S. Barhngay.J within a State and what area should I not do.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh):
But it is not the only consi deration.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: As a matter of fact, that has been one of the very important criteria laid down by the S.R.C. itself. But there is a distinction which I want to make and it is this. I am not suggesting that because I belong to Maharashtra or I speak a particular language, therefore, a Maharashtrian is necessarily dearer to me than a non-Maharashtrian. That is an entirely different matter. I plead for the adoption of linguistic basis only on the ground of administrative convenience, not because I get more protection for my culture, not because I get more protection for my language, not because a Maharashtrian is dearer to me than a non-Maharashtrian. Surely, my friend, Mr. Malkani, who is sitting here beside me, has been a dear friend of mine. He is dearer to me than several Maharashtrian acquaintances. About that, Sir, I have no doubt whatever. Now, therefore, the only consideration which I want to press upon this House is the consideration of language on the ground of administrative convenience alone and no other.

Then, the second criterion is this, ; which is that of the S.R.C. itself—I am not borrowing it from any other source at all. That is the criterion which the S.R.C. itself has laid down. What is the criterion? If an alternative is given, a smaller State or a bigger State, what is the decision that the S.R.C. has given? They have decided in favour of bigger States. What for? The S.R.C. has very clearly stated that the larger the State, the better it will be. Now, apply these two criteria to the demand for Sam-yukta Maharashtra, and unless, first of all, we are absolutely clear about this, we will not understand either the problem of Bombay or the problem of Vidarbha. I have nothing to say

against Bombay as conceived by the S.R.C.; I have nothing to say against Vidarbha either. But unless, first of all, we grasp this fundamental position, we will not grasp the further proposition why the solution with regard to Bombay as given by the S.R.C. and the solution of Maha Vidarbha are unsatisfactory and why both these solutions are really negative in nature. Adopt these two criteria, and how would the S.R.C. have drawn the map of India? That is the question. How would the S.R.C. draw the map of India with regard to this particular region? I humbly suggest, Sir, that in that case, surely they would have granted what, might be called the two-State solution; that is to say, they would have granted Maha Gujarat and they would have granted Samyukta Maharashtra. That they would have ordinarily done. Now, Sir, why did they not do that? What are the arguments for creating Vidarbha? Yesterday, when Mr. Shriyans Prasad Jain was speaking, Sir, I asked him a pointed question. I asked, "Suppose Bombay is given to Maharashtra, tell us, gentleman, in what way your interests are going to suffer." As the President of the Provincial Congress Committee for Maharashtra said the other day, the only possible grouse that the Bombayites could have would be with regard to the question of law and order. There could be no other question. Now, Sir, if this were so, I would really ask the House to consider whether you would be prepared to suspect a Government by the Maharashtrians. Sir, it is a different matter if you question the *bona fides* of Mr. Deogiri-kar or the *bona fides*, for that matter, of a person like Shri Morarji Desai for whom I have got the greatest respect, I can assure you. You can do that theoretically, but questioning the *bona fides* of the entire people, the *bona fides* of a whole Government formed by the people themselves, stands on an entirely different footing. Thereby you are really attaching a stigma to the Maharashtrian community which nobody will ever be able to bear. That is why I

am saying that the solution suggested by the S.R.C. with regard to Bombay is a negative solution. (Time bell rings.)

Now, coming to Vidarbha, why don't you want Vidarbha? Is it because you hate Vidarbha? Suppose tomorrow Nagpur is made into a State, would I be sorry for it personally? It is said that Vidarbha is viable. Who says, no? I am prepared to grant all those propositions. But because you say that State must be viable, the contrary proposition does not follow that all that is viable must be a State. That is the point about Vidarbha. There is no question of not having Vidarbha. If, for instance, the S.R.C. had proposed a Vidarbha State on positive grounds, then it would have been defensible. If you really read between the lines, you will find from this very report.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time, Mr. Barlingay.

DR. W. S. BURLINGAY: I will take only a minute, Sir. So far as Vidarbha is concerned, the case is based on two negative assumptions. It cannot be joined to Mahakosal or the present Madhya Pradesh and it cannot be joined on the other hand to the State of Maharashtra. And why? Because of the S.R.C. proposal of having a bilingual State. Sir, is there any doubt that the culture, civilization and everything is common between Vidarbha and Maharashtra? Sir, we are talking of language, but let us understand the matter properly. What is it that creates a common language among the people? Has this question ever been asked? How is a language created? We talk linguism, linguism *ad nauseum*.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Barlingay, you must close now.

DR. W. S. BURLINGAY: Sir, we ought really to understand how a language is created. It is because of the prior existence of common cultural, social and other interests that a common language is created.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am fully aware of the very strong opinion in favour of the reorganisation of States on a linguistic basis and this opinion, coming as it does from persons whose patriotism is above suspicion, I respect, but I have also not the least hesitation in saying that I do not share that view. The phantom of linguism and the clan consciousness which it has aroused and which it proposes to keep alive are to my mind a great danger to the unity of India. The unity of the country demands that while giving a proper place to the different languages in this country, we do not give it an overriding consideration in the reorganisation of States. The population of the country, as it is now in a developmental stage, is bound to go in a particular manner and a free flow of population is bound to be there. If we are to encourage that attitude, I think we must be more reasonable in our fervour for linguism. I wish, Sir, I am wrong. I hope for it and I pray for it that this apprehension which I have in my mind may not be true because we have already taken a plunge in this direction. The decision was taken in a weak moment when the Prime Minister agreed to appoint the Wanchoo Commission and carved out an Andhra State. The appointment of the States Reorganisation Commission thereafter was inevitable. The inevitable has happened and we have before us now the Report of the S.R.C.

Again, without any hesitation, and with great pleasure I congratulate the Government on the appointment of this Commission without any party strings whatsoever. I have no doubt that the Government never had any intention, and would never have cared directly or indirectly to influence the Commission in any manner. The personnel of the Commission was such that it inspires confidence in us. They were persons of great ability, independence and transparent integrity. Nothing but a robust nationalist spirit has guided their consider-

[Shri H. C. Mathur.] ations. While I say all these, I am prepared to say at the same time that there is room for honest difference of opinion. There has been an error in the appraisal of certain circumstances here and there, but I further congratulate the Government on their honesty to implement the recommendations of this Commission. They are proceeding in this matter with all earnestness. It is too late now in the day to talk about shelving the Report of this Commission or to talk of shelving this burning question which is before us. It is dangerous to keep the controversy open and it would be suicidal to think of shelving this issue. We must without any delay take all the necessary steps to implement the recommendations of this Commission in the amended form as approved by the Parliament. Sir, I also think that the present is the most appropriate time for it. We are at present in a sober mood, I should say. Though passions have been aroused to a certain extent in certain sections because of the recommendations of this Commission, our international prestige has a sobering influence over us. We have at the present moment a Prime Minister who has the ability to absorb great shocks and his popularity will be of great avail to us in solving and tackling different problems at the present moment.

Sir, I very much welcome the recommendations of the Commission to which I now come. Of the various recommendations, I will give the first place to the abolition of the distinction between Part A, B and C States. This humiliating distinction and this inferiority which had been inflicted on us will no more be there. In the arrangements that we have in the country at present, Part C States are inconceivable and the merger of Part C States with the adjoining areas was almost a foregone conclusion. There has been a cry here and a cry there regarding the retention of some of these Part C States. This resistance to the merger of these Part C States

has arisen out of anxiety in certain cases in respect of their developmental needs. That is a genuine apprehension to an extent, but that is only a transient feature. Then, Sir, the second reason for the resistance is only petty mindedness and lure for power and profit, but I think this is one recommendation which has been hailed by one and all without any exception.

The second recommendation regarding the abolition of Rajpramukhs is equally welcome. I was a little surprised only the other day when I read what the Jam Saheb, the Rajpramukh of Saurashtra, said about questioning the competence of this Commission to go into this matter. I wish he reads the writing on the wall. I wish he respects the wishes of the people and I thought a man of his ability and experience should not have waited for the Report and recommendations of the S.R.C. They should themselves have taken the initiative among the Rajpramukhs, who are respectable people and against whom we have nothing personally. But there is no gainsaying the fact that this institution is an irritating anachronism and is a dead weight on democracy. The head of the State should be a person who does not belong to that particular State. The head of the State should be a person who has no vested interest in that State. The head of the State should be one who should be able to exercise some healthy influence on the administration. Whatever the efficiency and ability of the Rajpramukhs, they necessarily suffer from all the disabilities in these respects. I would go a little further in this respect and submit that the implementation of this recommendation should not wait for the implementation of recommendations regarding the reorganisation of all the States. We have a pressing demand from all the States, excepting perhaps the State of Mysore, and we feel and we strongly urge the Government to take early steps regarding this particular recommendation before the reorgani-

sation of the other States is taken up. | Because this need not necessarily be tied up with the other recommendations.

I would also strongly urge that the recommendations made by the S.R.C. in respect of the integration of the services are given due consideration. We have a little unfortunate experience in this matter both in respect of our own State as well as regarding the integration of services with the Centre. You are aware, Sir, that I have been asking questions day in and day out regarding the integration of the ex-States Railway Officers and in spite of the active consideration, as I told the other day, which the Government has given for these five years they are nowhere even today. I do not blame the Centre only for this. The state of affairs in the State of Rajasthan is still worse. The participating States which joined to form Rajasthan are still suffering under the unfortunate effects of this integration of the services from all these various States and even the Rajasthan Government had to give this explanation for the slow progress and the short-fall in the implementation of our First Five Year Plan. We could practically do nothing and I hope your attention has already been invited to the nervousness which has already appeared among the services in Madhya Bharat. I read an article only the other day. I, therefore, wish that the Government takes certain necessary steps in this matter. I think they should assure the services. The Home Minister should take steps to assure the services that the integration, the reorganisation which we are giving effect to, will be in a manner that nobody need have any apprehensions, because the unsettling effect which the integration is bound to have will be of a very serious character.

I further wish to stress the other recommendations regarding the appointment of Public Service Commissions on a regional basis, the

High Courts on a regional basis, with necessary branches at important places. These recommendations have the germ of that idea which has been expressed on the floor of this House by Mr. Rajah and on the floor of the other House by Pandit Nehru, in respect of zonal distribution of this country, into four or five big zones. And the Prime Minister has gone only a step further from the recommendations of the Commission when he wanted certain advisory councils to be set up. But if we are to proceed on right lines, if we are to develop the broad-mindedness, if we are to develop the cooperative spirit, these recommendations of the S.R.C. must be accepted.

I will now pass on to Rajasthan* Rajasthan by all account": has been in a fortunate position. In Rajasthan we do claim that Danta and Palanpur be given over to Rajasthan. The S.R.C. has not accepted that recommendation.....

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Hyderabad): I thought Rajasthan was one of those States which had no claims.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR- Well, I wish you take the information.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Thank you.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Rajasthan as I told you is one of the very fortunate States which has got very little complaint and which arouses very little controversies. I was saying that Rajasthan had claimed certain adjustments in its boundaries. Rajasthan had claimed Danta and Palanpur on the one hand and Mandasaur on the other. In respect of Danta and Palanpur, the Commission sees absolutely no grounds and I am in agreement with the recommendations of the Commission. Danta and Palanpur should in essence remain with Gujarat. Regarding Mandasaur also, it could have stayed with Madhya Bharat, though its affinity with Rajasthan is greater. But it was only for administrative reasons and because of a feeling in the

[Shri H. C. Mathur.] local population that we would like to have it. We would not press any claim over Mandsaur. My feeling is that we do not want to go in a spirit of claiming this area or that area. I would primarily like to leave it to the will and wishes of the people residing in that particular area. And if the Commission got an impression that the people in Mandsaur are not anxious to go over to Rajasthan, it was due to one fact and that was they thought that Madhya Bharat was going to stay as it is. But now that Madhya Bharat is being merged into a bigger province, Madhya Pradesh, the situation has completely altered. In the interests of the people who are staying in that particular area, in the interests of administrative convenience, it is expedient so far as I think that this area of Mandsaur should go to Rajasthan.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Is Jaipur nearer to Mandsaur than Bhopal?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I do not go in the same spirit as my friend goes and he need not get excited because I have already stated and I am going to repeat that we in Rajasthan are not anxious about Mandsaur coming to Rajasthan, particularly I am not anxious. I wish that it should be left to the people of Mandsaur. They had taken their decision in view of the fact that Madhya Bharat was not going to stay as it is. Now, because of that change if the people of that area feel the other way round, it is for them to take a decision. Rajasthan is not very anxious. It is only for the administrative convenience of that area that it is so felt that the change may be brought about. Rajasthan has got Ajmer, Abu and Loharu. Ajmer is situated in the heart of Rajasthan. There was no go-out and there was no other alternative. And if Part C States were to go, it was absolutely in the natural course that Ajmer which is in the midst of the vast area should be merged with Rajasthan and if any apprehension has been expressed, it

it has been in the other House by Mr. Bhargava, I am prepared to understand that apprehension. His apprehension is because of the state of affairs prevailing in Rajasthan. The pink city of Jaipur which is the capital of Rajasthan and which is called the Paris of India is, unfortunately, having the other attributes of that city of Paris, which is the capital of France. We have, during the course of these few years, changed our Ministries more than five times and this state of affairs naturally gives rise to an apprehension that the developmental schemes and projects of Ajmer will suffer. But, as I submitted, these are only passing phases. This squabbling among the Congressmen will not be tolerated any longer and with Ajmer coming in and with their co-operation, we hope to go ahead in all spheres of life.

I need hardly submit that this retrocession of Abu is only to vindicate a long-standing grievance. Abu, which is almost the head of Rajasthan, should have come to Rajasthan much earlier. But we waited for this Commission and they have very correctly given their decision in this matter. Sir, I had given a deep study to this subject of Abu and I had represented the case of Abu before the Commission for about an hour. I need not go at length into this question at all, because there is no dispute about it and the Commission has given Mount Abu as well as the adjoining areas to Rajasthan. Out of the 500 Princely States, this was the only one tiny State which was bifurcated and Abu and 80 villages were taken from it and given to Bombay. It was considered that this arbitrary action would, in due course, be forgotten and that the people of Abu would reconcile to the change and the Government of Bombay would be able to win them over. But what happened? What happened was that even the half-elected municipality which we had at Mount Abu had to be given up and they had to carry on with an entirely nominated municipal board. They could not introduce

Gujaratis even as an optional subject of the schools during these five years. And the people thought of boycotting the general elections as a result was that not even 10 per cent, of the people went to the polls. These are the hard lessons which have been taught by Abu and the conclusion that we draw is that it is all idle talk about culture and language which we, politicians, indulge in. It is only the will of the people concerned that will prevail. And the Commission has very clearly stated that, in spite of all efforts made, the people of Abu could not be reconciled—and have not been reconciled—to the changes.

This is my view-point that this criterion should be applied in all matters where the question of boundary adjustment is before this House. It is not the arguments, the controversies, the claims and counter-claims of politicians on the basis of language and culture which should be the guiding factor, but it is only the will of the people that should be the guiding factor. They will take all these facts into consideration when they cast their votes. Therefore, I submit that all the boundary disputes between Orissa and Bihar, between Orissa and Bengal and between Bengal and Bihar should be settled according to the wishes of the people, and we should not be guided by any other consideration. The case of Seraikella has been voiced forcefully on the floor of this House. In the case of Seraikella as in the case of all other areas, I would submit that the wishes of the people should be ascertained and boundary adjustments made accordingly.

I will now touch upon the vexed question of Maharashtra and Bombay. It demands a very serious consideration. It also demands a little bit of plain speaking. To my mind, Bombay city is now the bone of contention and all the controversy centres round this city. We are told that it is a cosmopolitan city and if it goes to Maharashtra, its cosmopolitan character and culture will be destroyed.

To my mind, Maharashtrians are great lovers of culture and they will never destroy anything beautiful. The pristine glory will never be destroyed. They love culture. But I think that it is not the culture, it is not the cosmopolitan character and it is not the secular character of this city which is in danger at all. The only forceful argument which has been advanced is the position of the Gujaratis who are in business. That is the argument which cannot be ignored. It has been submitted that the developmental progress of the city will be seriously retarded, and not only that, even the present structure also will be threatened. There may be some truth in it. I feel that if the Maharashtrians go ahead in a wise way—and I have not the least doubt that they will do so—there is no apprehension about the industry and trade suffering in any manner. The industrialists and the big businessmen may suffer. While Mr. Deogirikar spoke in this House, he did a little bit of very plain speaking. He characterised the Gujarati influence as an influence of rupees, annas and pies. He thought that Maharashtrians loved Kalidasa and Shakespeare. That is a truth which he has told and no amount of assurance to be given by our Maharashtrian friends will be of any avail. I think, it is these basic considerations which weighed with the S.R.C. and it is these apprehensions in the minds of the Gujarati friends which have been responsible for all this controversy. But, I wish to ask: Have we not already decided upon this issue; have we not already decided to go to a socialist pattern? All that I apprehend is that this socialist pattern will be only accelerated if Bombay is handed over to Maharashtrians. There can be no other apprehension whatsoever. I do not see how the Maharashtrians will destroy the trade and industrial development of Bombay; how they will disturb the cosmopolitan character of that city. This is all just a cover for the real apprehension which the big business and industry in that area has in their minds. No amount of assu-

[Shri H. C. Mathur.] ranees from Maharashtra will satisfy them that the big business will not be effected to the detriment of the monopolistic tendencies.

Passing on to Vishalandhra, I wish to submit with all the emphasis at my command that this question should not be left open for another five years, if Vishalandhra is to be formed it should be formed here and now and Telangana should go to form Vishalandhra. I am deeply anxious as everybody else here, that this question of States reorganisation should take a final shape now. Very strong and cogent arguments have been advanced for the merger of Telangana to form Vishalandhra here and now. I have listened with great care and attention to all the speeches that have been made on the floor of this House, and we have not been able to find one argument, which is of importance, which stands to reason, which inspires confidence to the effect that Telangana should remain separate. Claims and counterclaims have been made on this issue. Some of my friends have said that even at present if the opinion of the persons is ascertained, 95 per cent, of the people will vote for separate Telangana. Others have expressed that 95 per cent, of the people will vote for its merger. If that is the criterion, this criterion should be applied here and now and not after five years. The Commission has recommended that it should be after five years that the wishes of Telangana should be ascertained. But if we wait for five years many difficulties will be created. Vested interests will put so many obstacles. Therefore, it is necessary that this decision is taken here and now.

Sir, as you are looking at the watch, I would like to close. Thank you.

कॉर्टन अबधेश प्रताप सिंह (विन्ध्य प्रदेश) :
उपसभापति महोदय, सर्वप्रथम मैं आपको धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि आपने मुझे बोलने

का समय दिया। मैं प्रयत्न करूँगा कि १५ मिनट में अपना वक्तव्य समाप्त कर दूँ, परन्तु यदि कुछ समय अधिक भी लग जाय तो आशा है कि आप उसके लिए मुझे क्षमा करेंगे।

श्री उपसभापति : यह आशा निराशा की बात है।

कॉर्टन अबधेश प्रताप सिंह : उपसभापति महोदय, जिस समय यह रिपोर्ट निकली उससे ठीक पश्चात् ही मैंने कांग्रेस हार्ड कमांड तथा दूसरे व्यक्तियों को, जैसे कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर और होम मिनिस्टर साहेबान हैं, अपनी सम्मति भेज दी थी। मैंने अपनी सम्मति में विकल्प करके तीन रायें लिखी थीं। प्रथम यह थी कि कोई प्रान्त न रखे जाय। एकीक शासन-पद्धति के अनुसार यूनिटरी फार्म आफ गवर्नमेंट पूरे भारतवर्ष के लिए की जाय और उसी में भारत की भलाई है। दूसरी राय मैंने यह दी थी कि अगर यह नहीं हो सकता है तब बंचार विन्ध्य प्रदेश ने ही क्या नुकसान किया है, उसको कायम रहने दिया जाय। तीसरी राय मैंने यह दी थी कि अगर यह भी न हो सकता हो तो वहाँ के लोग उत्तर प्रदेश में मिलना चाहते हैं, इसलिए यह भाग उत्तर प्रदेश में मिला दिया जाय। ये तीन रायें मैंने दी थीं और तीनों का कारण स्पष्ट रूप से मैंने लिख दिया था। यहाँ पर उन सबको दोहराने की आवश्यकता नहीं है, और न समय ही है और न स्थान ही है, तथापि मैं मुख्य-मुख्य बातें आपके समक्ष रख देना चाहता हूँ।

जहाँ तक एकीक शासन-पद्धति के सम्बन्ध में मैंने कहा, अब तो हमारी धारणा और भी दृढ़ हो गई है कि भारतवर्ष को केवल यूनिटरी फार्म आफ गवर्नमेंट, एकीक शासन-पद्धति, ही बचा सकती है। छोट-छोट टुकड़ों के लिए हम लोग जिस तरह से लड़ें, चाहे यह हाउस हो चाहे दूसरा हाउस हो, उससे यह साफ मालूम होता है कि जिसको प्राविंशलिज्म (प्रदेशवाद) कहते हैं वह बढ़ता चला जा रहा है। हम लोग चाहे जितना

कहें और उधर उधर का लंचर (भाषण) दें, परन्तु प्राविंशीलज्म की भावना बढ़ती चली जा रही है। इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि और आगे चलकर अगर यह भावना अधिक बढ़ी तो भारतवर्ष का बालकनाइजेशन, टुकड़-टुकड़ हो जाना, अवश्यभावी है। इसके लिए मुझे हर्ष है कि आज तो श्री राजगोपालाचारी भी इस बात को कहते हैं और कल पीडित जी ने जो पांच ज्ञान की बात कही है वह भी कुछ इसी ओर आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता आ रही है। मंत्र कहने का प्रयोजन यह है कि काल यूनिटरी फार्म आफ गवर्नमेंट होनी चाहिये। स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन कमीशन (राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग) के सामने भी यह राय रखी गई थी, परन्तु शांक है कि उन लोगों ने एक ही सेंटेंस (वाक्य) में इसको खत्म कर दिया है। वे कहते हैं :

"..... One view, which is strongly held by certain sections of public opinion, is that only a unitary form of government and division of the country into purely administrative units can provide the corrective to the separatist tendencies. We feel, however, that in the existing circumstances this approach would be somewhat unrealistic. Other methods have, therefore, to be found to keep centrifugal forces under check."

कमीशन के सदस्यों द्वारा यह कहा गया है कि यह अनरियलिस्टिक (अव्यावहारिक) है, लेकिन यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है। अगर वे सीधे-सादे ढंग से यह कह दिये होते कि यह उनके अधिकार के बाहर है क्योंकि वे रिआर्गनाइजेशन के लिए अप्वाइंट (नियुक्त) किये गये हैं तो शायद अधिक अच्छा होता बजाय यह कहने के कि यह अनरियलिस्टिक है। मैं समझता हूँ कि अभी कांग्रेस पार्टी सब जगह ताकन में है। आज वह चाहे तो फेडरल स्ट्रक्चर (संघीय-गढ़ीत) को बदल सकती है, आज वह चाहे तो कांस्टिट्यूशन (संविधान) को बदल सकती है और अगर आज यह नहीं बदला जाता है तो आगे चलकर एकीकृत शासन-पद्धति

का लाना बहुत ही दुर्लभ हो जायगा। मैं तो यह कहूँगा कि शायद इम्पॉसिबिल (असम्भव) भी हो सकता है। इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि आज ही वह समय है जब हम इस पर दृढ़ता के साथ विचार करें। जो दूसरे प्रान्त हैं, चाहे वे भाषावार प्रान्त हों या दूसरे प्रान्त हों, वहाँ के नेताओं से भी मैं यह विनय करूँगा कि यदि अपने प्रान्त का मोह छोड़कर वे भी अपनी सम्मति इस पक्ष में दें तो भारतवर्ष का बहुत कुछ हित हो जायगा। उपसभापति महोदय, आप इस बात पर विचार कीजिये कि सेंटर (केंद्र) में हगको मिनिस्टर्स (मंत्री) लेने पड़ते हैं और हम प्रथम श्रेणी के सब मिनिस्टर्स वहाँ नहीं लेते हैं। बड़ी मुश्किल से श्री गोविन्द वल्लभ पन्त वहाँ उत्तर प्रदेश से आये हैं। जो अच्छे-अच्छे लोग हैं वे अपने प्रान्तों में चीफ मिनिस्टर या दूसरे मिनिस्टर्स के पदों पर रहा करते हैं। यदि वे सब प्रान्त खत्म कर दिये जायें तो वे लोग सेंटर में आ जायेंगे और जो साँ, दो साँ या तीन साँ मिनिस्टर्स, अशाक चक्र लगाये हुये घूम रहे हैं, जिनमें प्रथम श्रेणी, द्वितीय श्रेणी और तृतीय श्रेणी, लगभग सभी तरह के व्यक्ति होते हैं, उनमें भी कुछ फमी हो जायेगी। मेरा तो यही निमंत्रण है कि इन सब बातों पर इस हाउस को अच्छी तरह से विचार करना चाहिये।

अभी तो कांग्रेस पार्टी सभी जगह पर है। मान लीजिये कि कभी कुछ प्रान्तों में कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी आ गई, कुछ प्रान्तों में सांशिलिस्ट पार्टी आ गई और कुछ में जन संघ पार्टी आ गई और कुछ में राम-राज्य पार्टी आ गई, तो फिर आप देखेंगे कि इन लोगों के भगई कैसे बढ़ते हैं और उस समय सेंटर के लिये बहुत मुश्किल हो जायगा। उस समय राइट आफ सेल्फ डिटरमिनेशन (आत्मनिर्णय का अधिकार) और विशज आफ दि पीपुल (जनमत) के स्लागन्स (नार) बहुत तेजी से उठाये जायेंगे और अन्ततोगत्वा यह भी कहा जा सकता है कि हमको राइट टु सेसीड (पृथक होने का अधिकार) है और हम अलग होना चाहते हैं। जो हालत आज कामन-वेल्थ आफ नेशंस की हुई है कि उसका भी

[कॉन्टिन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह]

अन्ततोगत्या राष्ट्र दू संसिड का अधिकार देना पड़ा है कहीं वही हालत भारतवर्ष की भी न हो जाय और भारतवर्ष का बाल्कनाइजेशन हो जाय, भारतवर्ष के टुकड़े हो जायें। मेरा कहना है कि अभी समय है और समय रहते हुए ही इस हाउस को और आपको इस पर विचार करने के लिये सँवार होना चाहिये। मैं मानता हूँ कि हमारा मुल्क बहुत बड़ा है परन्तु हमको खास बिटवीन दू इन्डियन्स (दो ब्राह्मणों में से एक की स्वीकृति) करनी है। एक तरफ तो इतने बड़े मुल्क का शासन करना है और दूसरी तरफ इसके टुकड़े हो जाने का खतरा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि एक ही सेंटर से इसका शासन किया जाय यह खतरा माल लेना अधिक अच्छा है बनिस्वत इसके कि इस खतरों को उठायें कि भारतवर्ष को टुकड़े हो जायें। इस विषय पर बहुत कुछ कहा जा सकता है परन्तु समय कम है इसलिये इसके सम्बन्ध में मैं इतना ही कह कर समाप्त करता हूँ कि मुझे आशा है कि इस पर हाई कमांड, जिन् लोगो के हाथ में शक्ति है वे लोग विचार करेंगे और इस हाउस के सदस्यगण भी विचार करेंगे।

दूसरा दिक्कत मेरा यह था कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश का कायम रखा जाय। विन्ध्य प्रदेश क्यों न कायम रखा जाय? इस सम्बन्ध में स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन कमीशन की रिपोर्ट में सिखाय इसके और कोई विशेष कारण नहीं दिया गया है कि पार्ट सी स्टेट्स नहीं रहने चाहिये। सिर्फ यही कह देना कि पार्ट सी स्टेट्स नहीं रखे जायें काफी नहीं है। मैं भी कहता हूँ कि पार्ट सी स्टेट्स नहीं रखे जायें परन्तु क्या इसके माने वही हैं कि जितने पार्ट सी स्टेट्स हैं वे सब एक दूसरे में मिला ही दिये जायें। कमीशन ने भी माना है कि यह पहले पार्ट बी स्टेट था और बाद में पार्ट सी स्टेट कर दिया गया। जब और प्रदेश रह सकते हैं तो हमारा प्रदेश क्यों नहीं रह सकता है? मैं आगे चल कर दिल्लीजुगा कि अब इतने ही बड़े प्रदेश दूसरे रह सकते हैं तो क्या कारण है कि

विन्ध्य प्रदेश असंग न रखा जाय। परन्तु इसके पूर्व विन्ध्य प्रदेश के खत्म होने के सम्बन्ध में रिपोर्ट में एक या दो पैराग्राफ जो लिखे गये हैं उनकी तरफ आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करता हूँ। इसमें लिखा हुआ भौगोलिक ज्ञान मेरी समझ में तो आया नहीं। इसमें पैराग्राफ ४६२ में लिखा गया है :

"The Narbada serves as the boundary between this State and Madhya Pradesh but a number of projects to be sited on or near this border, but within the existing Madhya Pradesh State have recently been investigated. There are proposals, we understand, to build a high dam on the Narbada river in the Jabalpur district of Madhya Pradesh; and it is likely that one of the two principal canals leading off from this project will serve an appreciable portion of Bhopal territory.

Vindhya Pradesh, likewise, is in a position to benefit from the projects for the utilisation of the Narbada waters."

यह सब भौगोलिक ज्ञान मेरी समझ में तो अब तक आया नहीं है। नर्बदा अमरकंटक से निकलती है। वह तीन हजार फुट की ऊँचाई से निकलती है और वहाँ से निकल करके बिन्दुल मांडला डिस्ट्रिक्ट को चली जाती है और मांडला डिस्ट्रिक्ट से जबलपुर डिस्ट्रिक्ट को जाती है। तो अगर जबलपुर में डैम बनेगा तो उसमें इमाग क्या फायदा होगा, यह भौगोलिक ज्ञान मेरी समझ में नहीं आया। हाँ, अगर साइंस एंसी हो जाय, विज्ञान एंसा हो जाय कि समुद्र से पानी ला करके विन्ध्य प्रदेश को सींच दिया जा सके तब तो दूसरी बात है। जबलपुर में जो डैम बनेगा उससे विन्ध्य प्रदेश को भी फायदा होगा, यह भौगोलिक ज्ञान तो मेरी समझ में अब तक आया नहीं है। या तो मेरा भौगोलिक ज्ञान कम है या इसमें यह इसलिये लिख दिया गया है कि कुछ न कुछ लिख देना चाहिये कि फायदा होगा, चाहे वह हो या न हो। अब तक कोई

विशेष वैज्ञानिक चीजें सामने न आ जायें कि पहाड़ को खन कर हजार, दो हजार फिट की ऊंचाई से कॅनल निकाली जा सके तब तक तो कुछ फायदा हो नहीं सकता। आम तौर पर इस वक्त जो हो रहा है उसके मुताबिक तो यह मुझे भौगोलिक ज्ञान के बाहर की ही बात मालूम हो रही है।

दूसरी तरफ, उपसभापति महोदय, आप दखें कि हमारे विन्ध्य प्रदेश की जमीन में ५० पी० रिहंड डैम बना रहा है और उससे तमाम सीधी जिले के लोग फायदा उठावेंगे, उससे तमाम इलेक्ट्रीसिटी और वाटर बगैरह मिलेगा, लेकिन ५० पी० में मर्ज करने के लिये न कह करके यह कह दिया गया है कि जबलपुर में जो डैम बनेगा उससे फायदा होगा। आप दूसरी चीज यह भी देखिये कि ५० पी० की बलन नदी से कॅनल निकल रही है जो कि रीवा जिले से हो करके जा रही है। उससे रीवा जिले को फायदा होता है। तो ये ५० पी० की जो कॅनल रीवा जिले से हो कर जा रही है उसका ध्यान तक नहीं दिया गया है। इन सब बातों पर तो ध्यान दिया नहीं गया और सिर्फ यह कह दिया कि जबलपुर के प्रोजेक्ट से फायदा होगा। मेरा कहना है कि अगर विन्ध्य प्रदेश को मिलाना है तो ५० पी० में मिलाइये। यह जो कहा गया है कि जबलपुर में डैम बनेगा उससे विन्ध्य प्रदेश को लाभ होगा, मेरी समझ में यह एक एंसी बात है, जिसके लिये एक्सर्ट (आधार रहित) कहना तो शायद अनुचित होगा, लेकिन यह बात किसी भी भौगोलिक विज्ञान से सम्बन्ध नहीं रखती है और उसके बाहर की बात है।

दूसरा कारण जो इसमें दिखाया गया है, उसको भी थोड़ा सुन लीजिये। पैराग्राफ ३६३ में लिखा है :

"This State initially came into existence as a Part B State but was subsequently converted into a centrally-administered unit, because it was thought that, owing to its economic and political backwardness, it could not be administered

4 R.S.D.—4

as a Part B state. 'me intention "I the Government of India, when this decision was taken, was to divide Vindhya Pradesh and to merge it in the adjoining States. The considerations which led the Government of India to propose the abolition of the State as a separate administrative unit still hold good."

कमीशन के मेम्बरों का यह कहना है। मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यह तो कोई बात नहीं है कि चीफ गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया इसको मिलाना चाहती थी, इसको दूसरे स्टेटों में मर्ज (विलीन) करना चाहती थी और वही कंसीडरेशंस (विचार) आज भी मौजूद हैं इसलिये इसको मर्ज कर देना चाहिये। यह भी नहीं किया गया कि ५० पी० और एम० पी० में इसको सुविधानुसार बांट दें। फिर पॉलीटिकल बैकवर्डनेस (राजनीति में पिछड़े हुए) की बात कही गई है। कितना कांट्रॉडिक्शन (विरोधत्व) है कि जब तेलंगाना की बात आती है तो यह कहा जाता है कि चीफ आंध्र से तेलंगाना बैकवर्ड है इसलिये उसको अलग रखना चाहिये, लेकिन जब हमारी बात आती है तो कहा जाता है कि चीफ हम बैकवर्ड हैं इसलिये विन्ध्य प्रदेश को मर्ज हो जाना चाहिये। यानी, वही बैकवर्ड होना तेलंगाना के लिये लाभदायक है और वही बैकवर्ड होना हमारे लिये बहुत हानिकारक है।

1 P.M. (समय की घंटी)

मुझे तो बहुत कुछ कहना है। मैं समझता हूँ मुझे.....

श्री उपसभापति : एक मिनट में खतप कीजिए।

कॉर्टन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह : एक मिनट में तो मैं कुछ नहीं कह सकूंगा। आप मेरे ऊपर थोड़ी कृपा करें, मुझे विन्ध्य प्रदेश के बारे में अभी विशेष रूप से बोलना है।

श्री उपसभापति : क्षमा मैं आपसे मांगना चाहता हूँ।

कैप्टन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह : तो साहब, इसके माने तो यह है कि आप मुझे जो विन्ध्य प्रदेश की पॉलीटिकल बैकवर्डनेस के बारे में आइप हुए हैं उस पर कुछ नहीं कहने देंगे। अगर आप कल को एक बार फिर से मुझे बोलने का मौका दें तो बड़ी अच्छी बात होती और इस समय में बैठ जाता, क्योंकि मेरी लाश या तो भांपाल के तलयें में पड़ी जा रही है या गंगा जमुना में बहने जा रही है इसलिए थोड़ा सा ५ मिनट और बोलने का मौका आप दें दीजिए।

तो मैं अपनी बात को जल्दी से खत्म कर दूंगा। जो हमारी पॉलीटिकल बैकवर्डनेस के बारे में कहा जाता है, उसके लिए मैं कह दूँ यह बात बिलकुल गलत है, हम कभी किसी से पीछे नहीं रहे। हिस्टोरिकली (ऐतिहासिक दृष्टि से) अगर देखा जाय तो हम बहुत आगे थे। बंगाल की एशियाटिक सांसाइटी ने लिखा है कि रीवा स्टेट का जो रूलर (शासक) है वह केवल भारतवर्ष में ही नहीं बल्कि वर्ल्ड (संसार) में ओल्डस्ट रूलिंग फौमली (सबसे प्राचीन शासक परिवार) का रिप्रेजेंट (प्रतिनिधित्व) करता है। शिलालेखों और न्यूमिस्मैटिक्स ने, इस तथ्य को साबित किया है। हमारे यहां की जो बनाई हुई किताबें हैं वे अविन्द घोष के आश्रम में पढ़ी जाती हैं। जब मैं यहां गया था तब मुझे यह बात मालूम हुई। हमारे यहां की बनाई हुई जो "राम स्वयंवर" आदि किताबें हैं वह भी १०० के कोर्स में पढ़ाई जाती हैं। इसलिए यह कह देना कि हम बैकवर्ड हैं, कुछ मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। अब रहा इकोनॉमिकली बैकवर्ड (आर्थिक क्षेत्र में पिछड़े हुए) होने का सवाल, तो उस पर कहने के लिए मेरे पास बिलकुल समय नहीं है, लेकिन फिर भी दो एक बात बतला देना चाहता हूँ।

जब हमारा फाइनेंशियल इंटिग्रेशन (केन्द्र के साथ वित्तीय समझौता) हुआ था तब हम पार्ट बी स्टेट में थे। अगर इस हिसाब से इन पांच वर्षों में हमने गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया से कितना मिलना चाहिए था यह देखा जाय तो मैं आपसे केवल इतना कह देना चाहता हूँ कि ५०

लाल रूपया हमको सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट से और मिलना चाहिए। गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की एक दूसरी रिपोर्ट निकली है जिसके मुताबिक स्टेट गवर्नमेंट का जो ३२.४ परसेंट बजट होता है उसको गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया देती है। उसके हिसाब से हमको ९ करोड़ ६४ लाख रूपया मिलना चाहिए था, लेकिन मिला है ९ करोड़ ६० लाख। कहने का मतलब यह है कि हमारे राज्य को इकोनॉमिकली बैकवर्ड कहना गलत चीज है।

इसी तरह से अगर एरिया को भी लें लीजिए तो हम केरल से ज्यादा हैं। पापुलेशन के बारे में महात्मा गान्धी ने कहा था कि लोगों को चाहिए कि वे रस्ट्रेंट (रोक) रखें, पापुलेशन (आबादी) न बढ़ने दें। लेकिन अगर आप हमारे यहां के कम पापुलेशन की बात करते हैं तो मैं कहता हूँ कि हमको टाइम (समय) दे दिया जाय, हम पापुलेशन भी बढ़ा देंगे। इसलिए पापुलेशन का विचार करना तो बिलकुल गलत है। फिर अगर आप यह सब नहीं मानते तो हम ५० पी० में जाना के लिए तैयार हैं।

श्री ज० ग० कपूर : स्वागत, स्वागत।

कैप्टन अवधेश प्रताप सिंह : हमारा ५० पी० में आवागमन बराबर लगा रहता है। हमारे यहां जितने गाँजएट्स हैं, जितने पढ़-लिखे लोग हैं, सब इलाहाबाद, बनारस, लखनऊ और दूसरी जो ५० पी० की यूनिवर्सिटीज हैं वहां से निकले हैं। हमारा कोई सम्बन्ध सी० पी० के साथ नहीं है। उनको कोई नीची निगाह से मैं नहीं देखता, वे हमारे मित्र हैं। मैं वहां रह चुका हूँ, वहां की प्रीवियसियल काँग्रेस कमेटी का प्रेजिडेंट रह चुका हूँ। यह बात नहीं है कि मेरा उनके साथ द्वेष है, यह तो उपसमापित महोदय, हम अपनी जनता के लिए एक कथमाइज फार्मुला (समझौते की बात) रख रहे हैं। आपने अखबारों में देखा होगा कि आज भी सेक्शन १४४ से रीवा में रूल (शासन) हो रहा है, दो मास से वहां सेक्शन १४४ लगा हुआ है। सीधी जिलों में और दूसरी जगहों में भी यह लगा हुआ

हैं और सैंकड़ों आदमी एरंस्ट होते हैं (पकड़ जाते हैं)। मैं यह कंफ्रॉमाइज फार्मुला इसलिए रख रहा हूँ ताकि लोग ५० पी० में मिल जायें जिससे कम से कम उनको कहने का तो हां जायगा कि हम ५ घंटे के रास्ते में हैं। दिन्ध्य प्रदर्श के किसी भी हिस्से से आप रवाना हो जाइयें, आठ ५, ६ घंटे के अंदर प्रयाग पहुँच जायेंगे और रीवा से तां २, ३ घंटे में पहुँच जायेंगे। लेकिन हमें भांपाल जाने के लिए २४ घंटे लगेंगे। एक तो जबलपुर ही दूर था, दूसरे भांपाल और दूर हैं। मुझे यह चौंपाई याद आती है :

“गूह गृहीत पुनि बात वश, तीह पुनि बीछी मार।
ताहि पियाई वारुणी, कहहु कवन उपचार।”

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your five minutes are over. Now, please sit down.

CAPT. AWADHESH PRATAP SINGH: For God's sake, one minute more.

हमारे लोगों को राय क्या है वह मैं अब आपको बतला दूँ। हमारे यहाँ से १० आदमी पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर हैं, ५ एंटी मजीरिस्ट (विलीनीकरण के विरोधी) हैं, जिनमें से ५ ५० पी० में मिल जाने के पक्ष में भी हैं। अब मैं आपको जल्दी-जल्दी बतला रहा हूँ। लीजिस्लैटिव एसम्बली की बाबत मैं आपसे कहता हूँ कि हमारे यहाँ ६० वा हाउस हैं, उसमें से ४२ काँग्रेस पार्टी के सदस्य हैं जिसमें से ५ मिनिस्टर और एक स्पीकर को अलग करने पर ३६ रह जाते हैं। ३६ में से २२ ने लिखकर हाई कमांड से यह दुख्तास्त की है कि हमें ५० पी० में मिला दिया जाय। २२ में से १५ बघेलखंड के और ७ कुंदलखंड के हैं और बाकी जितने दूसरे दलों के हैं वे बिल्कुल एंटी मजीरिस्ट हैं। इसका विवरण लिखकर हमने लोगों को और पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर को सक्लेट कर दिया है।

महोदय, मैं दख रहा हूँ कि आपको कुछ बचनी सी हो रही है, इसलिए यद्यपि कहना

तां मुझे बहुत था लेकिन एक छोटी सी चीज और ५० पी० के बारे में कह देना चाहता हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No more speech; that will do.

कॉर्प्टन अबधेश प्रताप सिंह : जवाहरलाल जी ने जो "जान" की आइडिया (विचार) दी है उसका मैं स्वागत करता हूँ। ५० पी० खान अभी ६ करोड़ का है ही, विन्ध्य प्रदर्श भी उसमें मिला दिया जाय और ग्वालियर का वह हिस्सा जो वहाँ जाना चाहता है वह भी लोगों की अपनी इच्छा के अनुसार उसमें मिला दिया जाय।

श्री मीथलीशरण गुप्त (नाम-निर्देशित) : उपसभापति महोदय, राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग के सम्बन्ध में मैंने यही समझा था कि यह एक रचनात्मक कार्य है जो राज काब की दृष्टि से किया जा रहा है। परन्तु उसके सम्बन्ध की प्रतिक्रियाओं को पढ़कर मुझे विस्मय भी हुआ और खेद भी हुआ। काका गाडगील जैसे माननीय मनीषियों के भाषण सुनकर तो नहीं पढ़कर मेरे मन में भी एक छोटी सी प्रतिक्रिया हुई। वह प्रतिक्रिया इस प्रकार हुई कि क्यों न मैंने भी अपनी कुंदली बोली के बल पर सागर, जबलपुर और लखर, ग्वालियर की मांग की। कमीशन के एक माननीय सदस्य की मुझे एक कृपा भी है और मैं उनसे बहुत दिनों से परिचित हूँ यह भी मेरे लिए एक आसर की बात थी, परन्तु कीठनाई यही है कि हरी जी (डा० हृदय नाथ कुंजरू) न महाब के पान के बीड़ों से फूसलाये जा सकते थे और न पन्ना के हीरों से। जो भी हों, मेरी प्रतिक्रिया तो नहीं थी परन्तु औरों की प्रतिक्रिया देखकर मेरे मन में जो प्रतिक्रिया हुई है उसे मैंने कुछ शर्तों में प्रकट किया है और उसे मैं आपके सामने निवेदन करता हूँ :

अपना सीमायोग बुरा बन गया भला कर,

करने बैठे होम उठा वह हाथ जला कर।

सहसा सीमित हुआ हमरी में दश हमारा,

कुंचित हांगी क्यों न संकुंचित मन की धारा।

[श्री मैथिलीशरण गुप्त]

क्रोध कम्प किस हेतु, जहां थी वहीं धरा हैं,
 बाँ कोई कुछ कहै, कहां से कटा मरा हैं ?
 अब तक तो हैं कश्माल, राम जाने आगं की,
 मान रहे सब भली लंगाटी ही भागं की ।
 अहा ! पुरानी बात आज फिर नई हुई हैं,
 दिल्ली नहीं, परन्तु दर बम्बई हुई हैं !
 काका को कल नहीं, विकल मन में हलचल हैं,
 फिर भी उनको शास्त्र शास्त्र दोनों का बल हैं ।
 काका न सही, आज काक ही में हो पाता,
 तो लश्कर तो कांच कांच कर ता ही जाता !
 एक ओर तो विश्व बन्धुता की बं बातें,
 उठी दूररी ओर घहर घर में ही घालें !
 कलकत्ते की कथा और भी नई निराली,
 बंग भंग की पीर्त करे क्योकर बंगाली ?
 उन्हें राज्य पद मिलें, राज-भाषा में क्या हैं,
 कह, बिहार । तेरी उदार आशा में क्या हैं ?
 हंसती जब अब कली, ओस निप्रचय ही रोती,
 बाँद उसमें ईर्ष्याल, मनुज की सी मीत होती ।
 वह तो गद्गद हुई प्यार से सुध-बुध खोती
 बार रही हैं बार बार उरु तर निज मांती ।
 सिक्खों की क्या कहें, सदब कृपाण धरें हैं,
 पर अब भी गंजाब प्रान्त के घाव हरें हैं ।
 एक बार बंट चुका उसे अब और न बांटो,
 अपने हाथों आप अंग अपने मत छांटो ।
 फिर बिनयी वह विन्ध्य धरा में ही धंस जाता
 तो अपने में आप भगन होकर हंस जाता ।
 हम पर हंसते वही, हंसाते थे जो हमको
 समतावादी बुला रहे हैं स्वयं विषम को ।
 बा वसुधैव कुटुम्ब रूप में जिनका वानक
 निज ही पर हो गये अन्त में उन्हें अचानक ।
 सबके मन में आज भरी हैं भारी दुःखिधा,
 अपनी सुविधा रहे, बहे शासन की सुविधा ।
 बने जहां के तहां गाम, गृह क्षेत्र हमारं,

किन्तु न जाने घर रहे क्या नेत्र हमारं ।
 भारतीय क्या यथा पूर्व हम नहीं रहेंगे,
 किन्तु पाकिस्तान यहां अब और सहेंगे ?
 अबलों में भी हैं असह्य आपस की धमकी,
 दंकर लंणी पड़ी चुनाँती किस न यम की ?
 बन्धु वर की नहीं, प्रेम की लूट फलंगी,
 बहुत चल चुकी, और नहीं अब फूट चलंगी ।
 बहु-भाषी हम अलग, अलग पर अड़ जावेंगे,
 तो सब से कट आप अकेले पड़ जावेंगे ।
 बंधे नीर से सड़ें स्वार्थ में सनें सनें हम
 वा प्रयाग के मिलन तीर्थ से बड़ें बनें हम ।

SHRI VIJAY SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to take part in this historic debate, especially after the historic poem that has been cited by Shri Maithili-sharan Gupta. When I look back at the course of Indian history of the last 200 years, I am singularly struck by the fact that the present debate and the decision that this Parliament is going to take in the course of the next few months will be regarded by the future historian as an important landmark in our history. The decisions that we are going to take are not only going to affect us but a long, long posterity to come. Therefore, when this House is going to consider this important measure, we should not only bear in mind the present conditions, dismal though they are, prevailing in the country, but the long past that has gone before us and the remote future that is to come. Sir, I do hope that this august House will bear in mind this important consideration. The Report was published in the month of October. Now three months have gone by. Various eminent men of this country have spoken on this. Several papers have commented on this Report. Various political organisations have passed resolutions on this, various State Assemblies have debated this question. Not only this, but the issue has

been talked and discussed in various countries also. The issue, though it is national, has assumed a somewhat International importance.

Sinc

e independence we have solved several problems, we have solved the problem of minorities and the problem of I refugees. We were able to evolve I a Constitution for ourselves. We were able to solve the problem of the ' 600 and odd princely States. All I these achievements, big in themselves, ! have raised the status of India internationally, but the present problem that is before us is equally great; and if I am not wrong, I say that all countries of the world are eagerly waiting to see how this youngest of democracy solves one of the knottiest problems that are before us. If I am not wrong, no document, since independence, was so much discussed and debated upon, except our Constitution, as this Report. It is not possible to classify all that has been discussed and said about this Report. But one thing stands out pre-eminently and that is that the Report has been hailed in all quarters as a "splendidly balanced" document and I will not take undue time of the House if I just say what some papers have to speak about the Report of the Commission. They say:

"Of all the commissions of inquiry appointed since the attainment of freedom, the States Reorganisation Commission had the hardest task assigned to them. Considering the complexity of the problem and the fierce passions aroused by this, the Commission have provided the best basis of solution."

We must be thankful to the Members of the Commission for this Report. It should be a matter of special gratification for this House to note that one of the Members of the Commission is one of us. The Report is before the Parliament since 14th December. Various Members have spoken on it. Some Members have spoken about their respective areas, some have spoken for their respective States, some have spoken for their respective taluks and some have spoken on

general terms. But one Iking we have to note is that though many Members are justified in speaking about their respective areas from which they come because after all we must be responsible to the people who have sent us here, yet we owe the other responsibility also and that is the responsibility to India as a whole. When we were students we were reading in geometry that a part is not greater than a whole and the part cannot be more important than the whole. Therefore, the predominant consideration of Indian unity and strength must be borne in mind. The Commission has earned the eternal gratitude of the nation by placing this consideration before the Members of the House and I will not be taking undue time of the House if I read just a few lines from the Report of the Commission. The Commission says in paragraph 107:

"The first essential objective of any scheme of reorganisation must be the unity and security of India. Any movement which may tend to impair the unity of the country must ultimately affect the welfare of all the sections of the Indian people. Any measure of reorganisation which is likely to create tension and disharmony must weaken the sense of unity among the people of India and should not therefore be countenanced."

I give my whole-hearted support to this observation and commend the same for the acceptance of the House. The principle of linguistic division of India was raised in the country some 50 years ago ,in the time of Lord Curzon. As time has gone by, this idea has gained momentum. So much so, that after independence we had to appoint no less than three Commissions in this connection—the Dar Commission, the J. V. P. Committee and the present Commission. AM these facts reveal that the demand for linguistic provinces is growing insisently in the country. So far as the Indian National Congress was concerned it gave its approval to this

[Shri Vijay Singh.]
demand 35 years ago, but what was decided 35 years ago has naturally to be modified by the events that have happened afterwards. Therefore, the three national leaders who constituted the J. V. P. Committee had to make the following observations on this important subject. I will read in brief what they have to say:

"There can be no greater error than to re-think of today in terms of yesterday or to seek to solve the

problem in terms of yesterday..... Freedom and unity of India are more important than all the considerations put together. Nothing that imperils this can have our support. This is the fundamental basis for the consideration of any problem."

The social and political dynamics of the time made this purely linguistic approach slightly out of date and the Commission has, therefore, done well in keeping the following four principles before them in forming their judgment:

- (i) **preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India;**
- (ii) **linguistic and cultural homogeneity;**
- (iii) **financial, economic and administrative considerations; and**
- (iv) **successful working of the national plan.**

These are the four considerations before the Commission. Therefore, in judging the Report of the Commission, we must bear in mind all these four points. To judge the Report on any one of these principles would be wrong. Therefore, those who do not agree with it or those who find surprises here and there have merely to see whether these four principles run through the whole Report or not.

In the short time at my disposal, it is not possible for me to deal with the various problems that are raised by the Commission. The Report is a bulky one and it has raised several problems and it has propounded several solutions. Therefore, in the short time at my disposal—and I think I have ten minutes more—I will deal only with the overall effect that the Report is going to have on our country and the points that we should bear in mind in order to implement the Report.

I will first speak about the overall effects that the Report is going to have on the country. Some of the economists have held that because of the implementation of the Report, we shall have better co-ordination and the economic interests of the country will advance. Unfortunately, Sir, I do not subscribe to this view. To say that we want linguistic States in order to have proper development is to mix cause with effect. On the contrary, I feel that with proper development of the Plan, many of the demands for linguistic States would disappear and to that extent we cannot welcome the Commission's Report on this problem.

Sir, the number of States has been reduced from 28 to 16 and it may appear to many of us that since the number of States has been reduced, from 28 to 16 it will necessarily mean economy in expenditure. But that is also a superficial view. Retrenchment on a large scale is barred, for if there is retrenchment there will be a *hullagulla* in this House and we will ask why these people are going to be retrenched. Therefore, there is no economy to be expected on this score. On the other hand, the amalgamation of the Part B and Part C States into Part A States will cause a rise in the pay-scales of the services and that will mean extra expenditure. This is not only *my* idle calculation, but the Commission itself has estimated at one place that extra financial commitments on this point may run to about Rs. 10 to Rs. 12 crores. And so on

economic grounds we cannot welcome j the recommendations of the Commission.

Sir, i feel that as far as the economic aspect of the whole question is concerned, the Report and the Members of the Commission did not deal with it adequately. There are just two chapters in the Report—Chapter V and Chapter VI to deal with problems of economy—"Requirements of National Development Plans" and "Regional Planning". These are two short chapters in the Report, containing only three pages each. That goes to show that economic considerations have not been kept as much in view as they ought to have been. I think that on the whole the Report seems to have attached greater importance to political considerations. I will just illustrate what I mean by this. The predominant feature of the economic map of India is that some of the States are very rich and some are very poor, and this feature of the Indian map remains as it is. Now in the new set-up in the new map of India that is going to be re-drawn Bombay still remains the richest State, despite the detachment and attachment of certain parts. And the predominantly agricultural economy of the State of Madras remains as it is. The adjustments between Bihar and Bengal do not change the industrial character of any of these two States likewise, and the States like Rajasthan remain as poor as they were.

SHRI V. NARAYAN (Bombay): Poor?

SHRI VIJAY SINGH: Yes. in Rajasthan the people are poor. Outside they may be rich.

SHRI D. NARAYAN: Then they don't send any money to Rajasthan?

SHRI VIJAY SINGH: They do not, because you do not allow them to transfer any. They remain poor and the addition of new territory has increased their financial burden without bringing any fresh revenue.

DR. R. P. DUBE: They have lot of potentialities.

SHRI VIJAY SINGH: This is not to say we are jealous of the favourable position of these States, but my only point is to show that this reorganisation of States has not made any change so far as the economic map of India is concerned. Not only this, but unless there is to be retrenchment, the financial liabilities would be increased. There are four new States—Karnataka, Vidarbha, the great Madhya Pradesh and the Punjab. These States will demand financial assistance at the very start and this will increase the burden on the Centre. Not only this, the other States to which small territories are to be added here and there they too will ask for financial assistance. So to that extent our financial liability will increase, without bringing in any tangible returns.

Let us now look at the other aspects of the problem. We see that the Report has recommended that Andhra should be separate from Telangana. I cannot understand how that can ever be justified on economic grounds. The economics of these two regions are complementary, but they are to be kept separate. Surely there cannot be any economic grounds for that.

Vidarbha has been kept separate from Bombay State and therefore, we have divided the coal areas of Central India. I do not think this is justified on economic grounds.

• And then Himachal Pradesh has been recommended to be merged with the Punjab, though, there is a dissenting note from the Chairman. But I feel that on economic grounds Himachal Pradesh should be kept separate, so that its proper development may take place. That again shows that economic considerations have not been kept very much in view.

Next I come to the river valley projects, and the other development

[Shri Vjray Singn.] works going on. Just to illustrate the case I would take up the example of the Chambal Valley. At this time the Chambal Valley is administered by Rajasthan and Madhya Bharat. Now in place of Madhya Bharat, you will have Madhya Pradesh. That makes no difference. On the contrary, I feel if this portion of Madhya Bharat had been merged with Rajasthan, we would have got more unified control and better co-ordination, speaking strictly on economic grounds.

(Time bell rings)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are only two or three minutes more.

SHRI VIJAY SINGH: Can I have two more minutes?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, not more than two minutes.

SHRI VIJAY SINGH: Thank you. It is true that at that time, the people of Madhya Bharat- did not raise this cry, nor did we raise it from Rajasthan. But we do not give territories to any State or take away territory from another State simply because there is a political demand. That would only mean that we give more consideration to political factors than to economic factors. Therefore, I feel that the Commission should revise their opinion and the adjoining area in Madhya Bharat should merge with Rajasthan, so that we may have unified control over the Chambal Valley.

Coming from Rajasthan, i am glad to know that the Commission have accepted our demand so far as the merger of Abu, Ajmer and the Loharu tehsil is concerned. We are glad, but it only satisfies our sentiments. By giving back Abu to Rajasthan, the Commission have undone a great wrong that was done, but it only satisfies as i said our sentiments. The control of the Chambal Valley would give us something substantial, and we want something substantial and not mere shadow.

The recommendations of the Commission will have great effect on the execution of the Five Year Plan. Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao is one of those economists in the country who are of the view that the reorganisation of the States will further economic interests. But in this matter, he too is of opinion that we will have to revise our second Five Year Plan after one year. In other words, he is also inclined to support the view that there will be temporary delay in the execution of the second Five Year Plan. To that extent we cannot welcome the recommendations of the Commission. The prime need of India is economic development; other values will come afterwards not that they are unimportant but. at this stage our main concern should be to root out poverty and ignorance. It was because of this that men like Rajaji said that the Report should be shelved for 25 years. It may not be possible now, as the hon. Home Minister has said but, nevertheless, it is an important consideration. I am glad to know. Sir, that no less a man than our Prime Minister said yesterday in the other House that we must now lay greater emphasis on economic development and that the new States that were going to be formed should be grouped in suitable areas for the purpose of economic development. In other words, he also feels that this aspect of economic development has not been properly kept in view by the Commission. I whole-heartedly commend this for the consideration of the House. I hope that we shall soon formulate a definite policy on this subject and think of the backward and other States that are there.

I would now like to take two minutes to talk about the implementation of this Report. We must accept this fact that the Report is now going to be implemented without delay, whatever opinion we might have had in the past. In this connection, Sir, I would like to remind the House of what the hon. Home Minister has said. He said that, as far as possible, we should not tamper with the recommendations of the Commission. None of us has given so much

of thought to the problem as the Members of the Commission have done. It is not proper to change without proper enquiry. No doubt Parliament is sovereign, but if all the suggestions to change the recommendations are accepted, it will simply be impossible to implement them.

Another thing that I would like to suggest is that we must give final shape to our map as early as possible. Absolute finality is not possible but talking relatively we must remove the state of doubt and suspense. The proposals of the Commission to review certain transfer of areas after a number of years needs to be reviewed in this light. According to me, we must decide once for all.

The last but not the least important recommendation that we must consider and endorse whole-heartedly is about the linguistic safeguards and administrative matters. Proper attention has not been paid towards these as the hon. Home Minister said. Much of the trouble that we now feel will disappear if people are assured that their lot will not be affected adversely. What they are interested in is good Government and proper safeguards for their rights. The individuals who rule do not matter. Sir Jadunath Sarkar has rightly said:

"I am sure that half the present bitterness between people of one State and another and clamour for transfer of fringe areas to form monolingual States will die out if we can provide equal opportunities for all citizens of India in all provinces and make them realise in their daily lives that the Republic is one and indivisible and the quarrel is only the quarrel of private greed and not due to disability".

Sir, the demand for reorganisation is basically a demand of the politicians. It is these persons who want jobs and offices that clamour for readjustments. The common man is a pawn in their game. Our national leaders should realise this fact and put down all such

tendencies wherever they find these. After all, the so-called State's rights are masks for "parochialism" and "fissiparous" spirit. These things do not go with unity. Sir, the lesson of Indian history of 2,000 years is that we have always suffered because of lack of unity. Due to the efforts of the Indian National Congress and leaders like Gandhiji and Jawaharlalji, we have been able to achieve this freedom. Let us preserve this like the apple of our eye. Let us pledge that we shall guard it so long as we have breath in us.

SHRI R. M. DESHMUKH (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to thank all those Members of this House who have appreciated the point of view of Maharashtra. I also thank those gentlemen who have said many things about the difficult task that the States Reorganisation Commission had before them and the eminence and the distinctive manner in which they have discharged this very difficult task. In doing so, if I do not dilate very much on it by way of compliments, it does not mean that I do not appreciate the efforts that they have put in in solving this very difficult problem.

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

In view of the very large restriction on the time that has come in late in this debate, I would probably have to leave out many of the things that I might otherwise have said. Therefore, for fear of not leaving out the one thing which I stand for, I would begin with that first.

I come from that little territory-called Vidarbha and as a Vidarbhan, I am not really involved in the controversy that has gathered round Sam-yukta Maharashtra. We in Vidarbha are completely detached from the difficulties that have arisen in Bombay or the feelings that prevail in the State of Bombay as such. That perhaps gives us a certain advantage because we can,

[Shri R. M. Deshmukh.] in that manner, bring to bear a certain amount of objectivity on the question across the border. The Maha Vidarbha is a movement that has a long history and I think that history is very relevant in the present context when practically a large part of the controversy is gathered round the bilingual State that was proposed by the States Reorganisation Commission. Sir, in Maha Vidarbha as we used to call it, but Vidarbha as it is now going to be called, we have had the experience of a bilingual State for over fifty years and two things prominently emerged out of it. The tensions, the difficulties, the mutual recriminations and the fight for balance of power, that took place in bilingual State of what is the present Madhya Pradesh and what used to be the Central Provinces and Berar of yore have definitely confused all those who have lived in a bilingual State. Thus, a bilingual State is a serious mistake. Therefore, when I read, the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission and saw a bilingual State was being created, apart from the reasons for which it was being created, I consider it to be a monstrosity in the nation. We have had this experience in Vidarbha for the last fifty years, as I said. The first ten or twenty years saw the people of Vidarbha not having any voice in the administration of the State at all. However, feelings were accumulating, grievances were accumulating and irritations were accumulating which gave rise to the Vidarbha movement which now is over thirty years old. When this movement went on gathering force—and it has gone on gathering force—side by side with it, we saw that it had not resulted in the obstruction to the growth of national unity or the security of India. We can certainly say that there is *no* connection whatsoever between a linguistic State or a bilingual State and the growth of a sense of nationalism or the security of the country. Sir, everybody today knows and nobody needs to be told that if the nation exists, the States exist and the individuals exist and the whole of our happiness and prosperity depends on

the existence of the nation. It is out of place, therefore, to tell us at every step as if everybody's nationalism, everybody's sense of national unity and security or everybody's desire for national security is in doubt. It is overdriving the principle; it is over-emphasising the purpose that that principle is proposed to serve. That the national security and unity will be promoted in this country is never in doubt, whether a State is unilingual or bilingual. The Vidarbha movement is old and I am one of the earliest and most ardent advocates of Vidarbha. But the circumstances then were quite different. The circumstances then were that Marathwada could not be released from the Nizam's domain and nobody was going to oblige us to break up the Bombay Presidency in order to give a linguistic province; but the experience we had gained by working a bilingual province, had made us desire a province that would give a sense of security, a sense of homogeneity and a sense of stability. This Madhya Pradesh did not promote in a bilingual State although it did not hamper the growth of national sentiments. It is a very significant lesson, Sir, because it is definitely relevant in the context in which a bilingual Bombay State is proposed for creation by the S.R.C. One other result of this experience was that, although, when the S.R.C. appeared to enquire into this question at Nagpur there were differences of opinion as to whether Vidarbha should be a separate unit or Vidarbha should be a part of Samyukta Maharashtra; it is significant to note that amongst both the wings there was no difference of opinion so far as the question of separation from the bilingual State or the dissolution of the bilingual State was concerned. Now that is a very significant fact. On the one hand there has been this intense feeling to separate. On the other, growth of national unity did not suffer. If the House will remember, Sir, talking on the Andhra Bill I had the occasion to say,—perhaps in the heat of the moment the expression came along—I distinctly remember to have said, that I would much rather be in hell than be in the

Province as it was. Now that was the feeling which was exhibited and which was demonstrated to the S.R.C. when they were in Nagpur. So there is no justification for saying that a bilingual State has any particular merit which warranted the existence of that bilingual State and without which the feeling of unity or security is going to suffer. I, therefore, am definitely of the opinion, Sir, that there is nothing in a bilingual State to recommend itself to anybody, especially to those who had the experience of what a bilingual State means. As such we from Vidarbha do not accept the theory of bilingual States.

So far as keeping Vidarbha as a separate State is concerned, I will say a few words. Sir. This separate Vidarbha is stated to be and I agree is certainly a homogeneous unit. But it is a very inadequate unit. It is stated that this Vidarbha has a financial surplus and will continue to have a financial surplus of a crore and a half of rupees or more. This figure which was then placed before the S.R.C. must have been very old, because our Finance Minister of that State, who is himself a very ardent and the foremost champion of a separate Vidarbha today, has published a pamphlet under his signature reducing this surplus of one crore of rupees or one crore and a half of rupees or more, as the S.R.C. has said to near about Rs. 34 lakhs. So this surplus of a crore and a half of rupees or more referred to in the S.R.C. Report has undergone a considerable reduction within such a short space as one year.

There is another thing from which the danger of keeping Vidarbha as a separate State can be seen. It is all very well to sneak of a separate State when the Governmental functions in respect of welfare and social services are limited. It is all very well to talk about being satisfied with a balanced budget. Planning, if it is to be given the stress that it is supposed to receive, if it is to be a Province capable of adequately doing something about

this planning; then a balanced budget alone is not going to carry us very far and if the standard of the social services is not to be maintained at the present poor level, it will not take very long to absorb this little surplus. When people begin to talk about deficit Maharashtra and ask why a surplus Vidarbha should go to deficit Maharashtra, they ignore the fact that the services in general, the social services, the educational services and the medical services that the Maharashtra area renders or the Bombay Presidency or the Bombay State renders to its people is of a much higher order than what obtains in Vidarbha. Therefore, if we have to bring up our services to that standard this surplus will in no time be absorbed. This will not carry us very far.

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

SHRI R. M. DESHMUKH: I am so sorry. What I can do now is simply to say that Vidarbha should on no account get separated, and we are for a linguistic Province in spite of all the ridicule that has been poured on the idea. This is no time for doing heroic things like going back to the unitary type of Government or to have regional councils or to accept the other suggestions made here. I stand for a linguistic Province because it will satisfy all the tests that have been laid down by the S.R.C. and a linguistic Province satisfies all these tests to a much larger extent than any other alternative that can possibly be conceived of. Sir, I would only say one word about Bombay. Bombay is our nerve centre. Suppose Bombay remains separate, it will not only dislocate our life but it will dislocate itself to a far greater extent than would be the case if it were in Maharashtra. So Bombay is going to be a danger to itself and since Bombay is so important to the nation we have to be careful. It is not that we have only a selfish point of view of getting Bombay in Maharashtra but we also have larger interests. To say that we are only

[Shri R. M. Deshmukh.] wanting Bombay from a selfish point of view is to deny patriotism to us, is * to deny that we are capable of taking a broader view of things, is to deny that we possess administrative common-sense and the faculty of being able to conceive of a patriotic unity or higher unity other than on a linguistic basis. Sir, all these charges I repudiate with the utmost sincerity and with the utmost strength at my command.

I would only say that we have a border question. The district unit has been made exclusively applicable to us. It is very unfair. If the principle had been followed uniformly, it might have been another matter. There might have been something to justify it but that principle has been deviated - from in many places and there is no reason why it should not be done for us.

श्रीमती कृष्णा कुमारी (विन्ध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग की रिपोर्ट हम सब लोगों के सामने आ गई है। आयोग ने विन्ध्य प्रदेश का मध्य प्रदेश में विलीनीकरण करने की जो राय दी है वह बहुत पुरानी बात है। आज ने छः वर्ष पूर्व इसी प्रकार की बातें हुई थीं कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश को मध्य प्रदेश में मिला दिया जाय। उस समय वहां की जनता ने इस तरह के प्रस्ताव का घोर विरोध किया था जिसके फलस्वरूप सरकार को लाठी और गाली का आश्रय लेना पड़ा था। इस विलीनीकरण के विरोध का यह फल हुआ कि तीन आदीमियों की मृत्यु हो गई और ६० व्यक्ति बायल होकर अस्पताल में दाखिल किये गये। जब वहां पर इस प्रकार का नर-संहार हुआ तो हमारे माननीय प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने जो कि बहुत ही उदार हृदय हैं, द्रवित होकर माननीय सरदार पटेल से कहा था कि क्या विन्ध्य प्रदेश की इकाई को कायम नहीं रखा जा सकता है? इस खून-खच्चर से तो यह अच्छा है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश को एक अलग इकाई के रूप में कायम रखा जाय। तब से विन्ध्य प्रदेश की एक अलग इकाई बनी हुई है। इन बातों के होते हुए यह

बात अदभुत हुई कि हमारे जा बा पाट क राजप्रमुख थे, जो उस समय बीमार पड़े हुए थे, १०४ डिग्री बुखार था, उनसे डरा और धमका कर इस्तीफा लिखवा लिया गया। तब से विन्ध्य प्रदेश की इकाई बनी हुई है। आज भी उसी तरह की परिस्थिति आयोग की रिपोर्ट द्वारा हो गई है। आयोग की रिपोर्ट द्वारा विन्ध्य प्रदेश की जनता के सर पर जबरदस्ती एक नई चीज मढ़ी जा रही है, जिसको वहां की जनता नहीं चाहती है। जब से आयोग की रिपोर्ट प्रकाशित हुई है तब से विन्ध्य प्रदेश की जनता में एक तरह की बेचैनी फैल गई है। आज हर जिले में १४४ धारा लगी हुई है, सैकड़ों आदिमी जेलों में बन्द कर दिये गये हैं। इसका मूल कारण यह है कि वहां की जनता विन्ध्य प्रदेश को मध्य प्रदेश के साथ मर्ज नहीं चाहती है, वह तो उसे एक अलग इकाई के रूप में कायम रखना चाहती है। वहां की जनता की इच्छा यह है कि कम से कम विन्ध्य प्रदेश को पांच वर्ष के लिए एक अलग इकाई के रूप में रखा जाय ताकि वह अपनी हर प्रकार से उन्नति कर सके। इस सम्बन्ध में पांच एम० पी० का एक डंपुटेशन जिसमें, कप्तान साहब, उपाध्याय जी, गुलशेर अहमद, राजभानु सिंह तिवारी और स्वयं मैं थी, कांग्रेस के अध्यक्ष श्री डंबर, प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू, गृह मंत्री और मौलाना आजाद से मिला और साफ-साफ शब्दों में वहां की परिस्थिति उनके सामने रखी और बतलाया कि वहां की जनता किसी भी हालत में मध्य प्रदेश के साथ जाने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। वहां की जनता चाहती है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश एक अलग इकाई के रूप में बना रहे तब ही हमारी भलाई हो सकती है। उन्नत हो सकता है और हम आगे बढ़ सकते हैं। अगर हमारे विन्ध्य प्रदेश को किसी दूसरे प्रान्त के साथ मिलाया गया तो हमारी गरीबी दूर नहीं हो सकेगी। अगर विन्ध्य प्रदेश को मिलाया ही जाना है तो वहां की जनता उत्तर प्रदेश के साथ विलय चाहती है, जनता की इच्छा का आदर किया जाना चाहिये। किन्तु कांग्रेस कार्य समिति ने वहां

की जनता की इच्छा जाने बिना ही यह निर्णय दे दिया है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश को मध्य प्रदेश के साथ विलय किया जायेगा। कांग्रेस कार्य समिति की राय का वहाँ की जनता में यह असर हुआ कि वह इस निर्णय से नुस्त हो गई, घबरा उठी और चारों तरफ हाहाकार मच गया जो कि अभी तक शान्त होने में नहीं आ रहा है।

विन्ध्य प्रदेश को एक अलग इकाई के रूप में कायम रखने के लिए जो सब से बड़ा तर्क है वह यह है कि जब हमारा प्रधान मंत्री जी विन्ध्य प्रदेश आये थे तो वे वहाँ की जनता की गरीबी को देखकर द्रवित हो गये। उन्होंने अपने पहले भाषण में वहाँ की जनता के बारे में जो कहा वह मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहती हूँ। उनके प्रथम शब्द इस प्रकार हैं "मैंने इस महान् देश में बहुत से मुल्क देखे, बहुत से बाहर के मुल्क भी देखे, किन्तु इस प्रदेश में जो गरीबी देखी वह कहीं नहीं देखी।" अतः यह आवश्यक है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश की जनता की गरीबी को दूर करने के लिए उसे एक अलग इकाई के रूप में कायम रखा जाय। अगर ऐसा किया गया तब ही हम आँगागीकरण कर सकते हैं और अपनी जनता की गरीबी को दूर कर सकते हैं।

मध्य प्रदेश में इतनी जमीन है, इतने खनिज पदार्थ हैं और इतने जंगल हैं कि वे इन चीजों का अच्छी तरह से प्रबन्ध ही नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। तब वे किस तरह से विन्ध्य प्रदेश का अपने में विलय करके उसकी उन्नति कर सकते हैं। हमारा छत्तीसगढ़ का हिस्सा जो उस प्रान्त में मिला हुआ है वह अभी तक बैसे का बसा ही पड़ा हुआ है, उसमें किसी प्रकार का सुधार नहीं किया गया है। अगर विन्ध्य प्रदेश का विलय मध्य प्रदेश के साथ कर दिया जाय तो वहाँ की जनता किस प्रकार से आशा कर सकती है कि उनकी उन्नति की जायेगी जब कि छत्तीसगढ़ की ऐसी हालत उनके सामने है। अगर वहाँ पर किसी प्रकार का भी सुधार हुआ होता तो विन्ध्य प्रदेश की जनता मध्य प्रदेश के साथ जाने को

तैयार होती किन्तु जब उसने इन सब बातों को अपनी आंखों से देख लिया है, वह जानती है कि हमारी भलाई मध्य प्रदेश के साथ विलय होने में नहीं हो सकती है, तो यह हम सब लोगों का कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि वहाँ की जनता की इच्छा को मान्यता दें। आज हमारा देश में एक लोकतंत्रीय सरकार है, डाकू और लुटरो की सरकार नहीं है। लोकतंत्र में प्रजा को यह पूर्ण अधिकार होता है कि वह अपना मतदान किसी भी बात पर दे सकती है, उसकी इच्छा के विरुद्ध किसी भी सरकार को नहीं जाना चाहिये, यह एक लोकतंत्रीय सरकार का पहला कर्तव्य है। अगर लोकतंत्रीय सरकार में प्रजा की पुकार न सुनी जाय, प्रजा की बात न मानी जाय, उसको प्रतिबन्ध न दी जाय तो वह सरकार लोकतंत्रीय सरकार नहीं कही जा सकती है। सरकार जनता की इच्छा के विरुद्ध कोई बात उसके सर पर मढ़ती है तो वह उसके साथ किसी प्रकार का न्याय नहीं करती। इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश वालों के साथ न्याय किया जाना चाहिये। अगर किसी कारणवश उनकी एकता कायम नहीं रखी जा सकती है तब सब से उत्तम बात यह है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश को उत्तर प्रदेश के साथ मिला दिया जाय। हमारा रहन-सहन और शिक्षा-दीक्षा उत्तर प्रदेश के साथ मिलती जुलती है। उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जो रिहन्द बांध बनाया जा रहा है वह हमारी जमीन पर बनाया जा रहा है, विन्ध्य प्रदेश की बहुत सी जमीन उस बांध में शामिल है जिससे हमारी जनता को बहुत फायदा होने वाला है। हमारी बेलन और टॉस नदियाँ हमारी बीस्तियों से होकर उत्तर प्रदेश में जाती हैं। इस तरह से वहाँ की जनता को हमारी नदियों से लाभ है और साथ ही साथ हमको भी लाभ है। इस तरह से अगर विन्ध्य प्रदेश का विलय उत्तर प्रदेश के साथ कर दिया जायेगा तो वहाँ की जनता को हर तरह का फायदा होगा। विन्ध्य प्रदेश की विधान सभा ने भी यह प्रस्ताव पास किया है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश को एक अलग इकाई के रूप में कायम रखा जाय। कई आदीमियों ने यह कहा है कि विधान सभा ने डम तरह का कोई

[श्रीमती कृष्णा कुमारी]

प्रस्ताव पास नहीं किया है किन्तु मैं सदन के सामने यह प्रस्ताव रख सकती हूँ कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश की विधान सभा ने एक आवाज से यह प्रस्ताव पास किया है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश की इकाई को जूट का ट्यूट रखा जाय। इससे साथ ही साथ वहाँ की कांग्रेस समिति ने भी इस प्रकार का समर्थन किया है और प्रस्ताव पास किया है। जब विन्ध्य प्रदेश की विधान सभा और वहाँ की कांग्रेस समिति इस तरह का प्रस्ताव पास कर रही हैं कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश को एक अलग इकाई के रूप में कायम रखा जाय तो फिर वहाँ की जनता के ऊपर छुरी वदों चलाई जा रही हैं, और उन्हें क्यों दूसरे के गले मढ़ा जा रहा है? जहाँ तक मध्य प्रदेश का सम्बन्ध है वहाँ भी लुट्टे हैं और हमारे वहाँ भी लुट्टे हैं। वहाँ भी जंगली लोग हैं और हमारे वहाँ भी जंगली हैं। सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट यह बात अच्छी तरह से जानती है कि अगर उनके प्रान्त में डाके पड़ते हैं तो हमारे प्रान्त में भी डाके पड़ते हैं। बुरे को बुरा बनाना सहज है किन्तु बुरे को भला बनाना मुश्किल है। इसीलिए मैं यह चाहती हूँ कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश को उसकी जगता की इच्छा के विरुद्ध किसी दूसरे प्रान्त के साथ न मिलाया जाय।

2 P.M.

विन्ध्य प्रदेश एक ऐसा प्रदेश है जो हर प्रकार की खानों का भंडार है। हीरा, कोयला, तांबा, अभ्रक आदि अनेक प्रकार के खनिज पदार्थ वहाँ पर पाये जाते हैं। जंगलों की बहुलता वहाँ पर है। सोना-चांदी भी वहाँ मिलता है। मैं तो यह कहती हूँ कि ऐसी कौन सी चीज है जिसकी वहाँ पर खान नहीं है। उसका यदि ठीक ठीक उपभोग किया जाय तो दस करोड़ रुपये की आमदनी हो सकती है और होगी।

मैं यह फिर कहना चाहती हूँ कि हमें उत्तर प्रदेश वालों की जरूरत है और उत्तर प्रदेश वालों को हमारी जरूरत है। इस लिए विन्ध्य प्रदेश को उत्तर प्रदेश में ही मिलाया जाय।

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री हरिश्चन्द्र माधुर) : और कुछ कहना है ?

श्रीमती कृष्णा कुमारी : अभी तो मुझे बहुत कुछ कहना है। हाउस में यह भंग प्रदेश के प्रति बोलना है, इस लिए मुझे अधिक समय मिलना चाहिये।

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री हरिश्चन्द्र माधुर) : आपने तो बहुत जोरों से कहा है। आप बहुत कह चुकी हैं।

श्रीमती कृष्णा कुमारी : यह कहा जाता है कि सी स्टेट्स को सेंटर से बहुत ज्यादा रुपया दिया जाता है। मैं कहती हूँ कि कहां से दिया जाता है? हम सेंटर को कौन प्रकार के टैक्स देते हैं और फिर वही रुपया हमें खर्च के लिए दे दिया जाता है। इस समय हमें शासन प्रबन्ध के लिए रुपयों की जरूरत नहीं है बल्कि हमें औद्योगिक वृष्ण की जरूरत पड़ेगी। इस लिए भी हमारा विन्ध्य प्रदेश पांच वर्ष के लिए एक एकाई रखा जा सकता है। हमारे प्रान्त को एक एकाई रखने के लिए और भी अनेक कारण हैं।

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री हरिश्चन्द्र माधुर) : अब आपका समय हो चुका।

श्रीमती कृष्णा कुमारी : थोड़ा समय और। स्त्रियों और पुरुषों की निस्वत यह कह देना बहुत जरूरी है कि स्त्रियां पुरुषों की अपेक्षा अधिक धर्मीनष्ठ होती हैं, धर्म को ज्यादा मानती हैं। इस हेतु वे गंगा स्नान के लिए हमेशा इलाहाबाद जाया करती हैं और विन्ध्य प्रदेश से पुरुषों से ज्यादा स्त्रियां वहाँ जाती हैं।

डा० हल्ड्यू० एस० वालिंगे : मध्य प्रदेश में मिलाने के बाद वे इलाहाबाद नहीं जायंगी ?

डा० रघुनाथ प्रसाद दुबे : अब तो भोपाल का तालाब है।

श्रीमती कृष्णा कुमारी : हमें भोपाल के तालाब में नहीं जाना है। हमारे वहाँ की जनता बहुत गरीब है और वह भोपाल नहीं पहुँच सकती है।

इस लिए हमें भोपाल नहीं जाना है, बल्कि हमें उत्तर प्रदेश में ही जाना चाहिये।

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री हरिनरयण मापुर) : अब आप समाप्त कीजिये।

श्रीमती कृष्णा कुमारी : विन्ध्य प्रदेश के चीफ मिनिस्टर का यह कहना है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश की इकाई बनी रहे और इसके लिए अगर हम कुछ कहते या कस्ते नहीं हैं तो हमारी जीभ के साँ-साँ टुकड़े हो जायेंगे। इस लिए भी यह बहुत जरूरी है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश की एक इकाई बनाई जाय।

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO (Hyderabad) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, due to paucity of time, I shall confine myself only to the problems of Hyderabad and Vishalandhra. We are thankful to the Commission for recommending disintegration of Hyderabad State, which is a symbol of feudal oppression, which is a canker in the body politic of India and which is noted for the suppression and oppression of Telugu, Maharashtra and Kannada people.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore) : Ancient history.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: And we are glad that the Asaf Jahi dynasty, which ruled over the Telugu people and gave away portions of Andhra to British imperialists, is also coming to an end with the recommendations of this Commission. But naturally we expected that after disintegration, the Commission would recommend loigi-ca'ly tor the formation of Vishalandhra. They themselves argued very cogently that after disintegration, of course, Vishalandhra would be a desirable thing. After giving so many arguments, they said that a separate Telangana should be formed immediately because there are certain apprehensions in the minds of the people that Andhras might colon ibR these areas of Telangana. I do not know how the Commission could

accept such arguments as the colonisation of Telangana by Andhras in this democratic age. There also, I think, there is no question of complete viability. But perhaps they wanted to balance somehow Vidarbha with the recommendation for a separate Telangana. Anyway, I have heard and I have read also the arguments for a separate Telangana that were advanced by some of the friends. There I find neither logic nor consistency, nor democratic content in the arguments advanced by my friends who are advocating a separate Telangana. The other day my friend, who is not here now, Mr. Akbar AH Khan has talked very eloquently about the unity and security of India. But I do not understand how he can square up his demand for a separate Telangana, which is clearly a separatist tendency, with the unity and security of India. Perhaps he might think that a separate Telangana might contribute for unity and security of India, but that is beyond my comprehension. Not only that. The father of the idea of a separate Telangana, that is, Dr. Channa Reddy, Minister for Agriculture in Hyderabad has said that he is demanding a separate Telangana not because of any opportunist reasons but because he believes in small, compact States. Very good. But had they been consistent, had they been logical, they would not have sworn by the S.R.C. Report. They would not have said that everything in the S.R.C. Report is very good, because they have recommended not small, compact States but recommended the retention of U. P. which is having a population of about sixty million. And they have also recommended States like Madhya Pradesh which some other Member has pointed out as a huge colossus. Because of all these things they say that the S.R.C. Report is very good; they swear by it and they say that it should be implemented to the very letter. But at the same time, they do not understand the inconsistency in what they are saying. Telangana, as some other friend pointed out yesterday, is bigger than some other States and per-

[Shri V. Prasad Rao.] haps, I do not know why he has forgotten about—and he ought to have mentioned it>—the member States of the U.N.O. like Haiti, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Luxumberg etc.

They agreed to the retention of Uttar Pradesh; they agreed to the formation of unilingual States in Kerala, Karna-taka and not for Maharashtra including Bombay. But at the same time if these things do not come in the way of unity and security of India, I do not understand how the claim of three crores of Telugu people is going to come in the way of unity. I can quote for instance from our own Dr. Channa Reddy from the proceedings of the Hyderabad Legislative Assembly. He says:

"Nobody can refute that Bombay City belongs to Maharashtra. The demand of the Maharashtrian for Bombay City has strength in it. Nobody can refuse to make it the capital (of Maharashtra)."

It is very good. He has argued for it. But at the same time, when it comes to Telangana State and the formation of Vishalandhra, he argues that Telangana is a compact State and it is having a population of one crore and thirty lakhs. So, it should be retained. Sir, their arguments that the States should be reorganised in a small and compact way for administrative convenience do not stand to reason, because in one an(J the same breath they say that these things are good.

The arguments that are advanced for separate Telangana are:

(1) A separate Telangana State is a viable unit. (2) Andhras will dominate them if Vishalandhra is formed immediately. (3) The people of Telangana wish to have their own State.

Now, I shall take up these arguments one by one. With reference to the question of economic viability the States Reorganisation Commission has

also unwittingly accepted it that Telangana will be viable. But a close scrutiny of the financial and economic data will definitely prove that a separate Telangana State is not going to be a viable unit; but it is going to be a deficit unit. In order to prove that it is a viable unit, they have cooked up figures. They have shown wrong figures. Just like a capitalist who wants to escape from income-tax shows wrong balance sheets, they have also done the same thing, as far as the statistics for Telangana are concerned. They have applied 'sta-tricks.' They have taken the highest peak income year, that is 1951-52. The peak income revenue collections are there for that year. As for the expenditure, they have taken a different year where the expenses are lower.

For 1951-52—they have taken the income for that year—the revenue collections in Hyderabad are Rs. 29,87,49,000. But that year's expenditure has not been taken; they have taken the year 1953-54 in which it is the lowest, that is, Rs. 26,80,00,000. That is how they tried to prove that there was a surplus of Rs. 3 crores in Telangana. Not only that. So far as expenses are concerned, they have divided the same on a 60 and 40 per cent basis. But if there is to be a separate Telangana State, then all the paraphernalia of a State cannot be maintained because the expenses will not be 60 per cent; actually, it will be definitely more. I need not quote on this point at length; but it is enough if I quote from the speech of the Finance Minister of Hyderabad who should be knowing much more about the finances of Hyderabad than anybody else. He is not a supporter of Vishalandhra. He says that the Hyderabad State should not be disintegrated:

"I want to remove such misunderstanding. It has been stated that Telangana would have an income of 19 crores and an expenditure of 17 crores and thus it would have a surplus profit of two

crores. Everybody can show his own figures. He can take certain figures and omit certain others. It depends upon the will and pleasure of the Finance Minister to give out any figures. I think that some figures have not been shown. According to the Revised Estimate of 1954 the amounts of the tax Revenue and non-tax Revenue are 14 crores 17 lakhs and 4 crores 86 lakhs respectively. Thus the total income is 19 crores 2 lakhs. On the expenditure side 17 crores have been shown to be the estimated Revenue. Thus the expenditure on capital outlay has been omitted. Moreover, expenditure on estimated Revenue amounting to 345 lakhs and 84 lakhs has also been omitted. The total of both would be 429 lakhs. Thus the total expenditure will be two crores more than the total income. I just wanted to bring these items to your notice. But all these are adjustable matters. Thus many factors have to be taken into consideration while adjusting the figures. I can put forth one more combination showing the deficit of more than 4 crores instead of 2 crores. According to this combination total income would be 19 crores and total expenditure would be 23 crores 10 lakhs. I have got some other figures also.

..... The deficit cannot be reduced any more in any way. There is no question of surplus at all."

Sir, this is what the Finance Minister of Hyderabad says. Then, I do not understand how our friends argue that a separate Telangana State is going to be not only a balanced State, but also a surplus State.

Not only that. Out of the present revenues, nearly six crores are derived from the Excise Revenue. If prohibition is introduced, not only this sum of six crores will go, but they have to incur some more on the machinery to be set up for prohibition. That is why I say that the statement' that

4 R.S.D.—5

Telangana is an economically viable State is nothing but a distortion of facts; it is nothing but an untruth.

They say, on the one hand, that Telangana is going to be a prosperous State. On the other hand, they also argue that it 'is a very backward State. And so it needs protection and everything. What is the actual fact? They say that the *per capita* tax collection in Telangana is more than in Andhra. Yes, it is a fact; and there is no denying it. But the question is that the prosperity of Telangana shows only the feudal tax and the feudal oppression that was imposed by the Nizam and that is being continued there. If we refer to the Taxation Enquiry Commission's Report, it will be clear that the taxes prevalent in Hyderabad are higher than in Vishalandhra. The *per capita* land Revenue that is collected in Hyderabad is 5'04 whereas the average *per capita* kind tax that is collected from all other Part B States is 2-86. The ex-feudal States, Saurashtra and Madhya Bharat alone exceed this figure. These things do not show the prosperity of Telangana. They show only the feudal tax burden that the peasants of Telangana are bearing and nothing else.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA; What about Madhya Bharat?

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: That is what I am saying. Hyderabad is collecting more tax than other Part B States excluding Madhya Bharat and PEPSU. The major- item in the income of Hyderabad State is Excise— 4:38 per capita— which no other State in India is collecting, perhaps with the exception of PEPSTI. So, that is the unstable economy which will be having a deficit of nearly 8 crores of rupees, if prohibition is introduced. If such a State is #~rmed, I do not understand how it is going to be viable.

On the one hand, they talk of the prosperity, because they collect more.

[Shri V. Prasad Rao.] taxes. But what is the fact? They say that they are more advanced and that they are getting more income than Andhra. But what is the fact? Though the per capita tax collection in Andhra is less, they are providing more amenities for the people.

Let nobody understand that because more taxes are being collected in Hyderabad the education or medical facilities have in any way developed. From the figures that I give, you can understand how backward our Telangana is. In Andhra there are 672 high schools, in Telangana the number is 98 out of which 64 only are located outside Hyderabad city and 34 are located in Hyderabad proper. There is hardly any college in the whole of Telangana outside Hyderabad. Now, they have made a first-grade college outside Hyderabad. As regards doctors, Telangana has hardly one-fifth of the number of doctors in Andhra.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: (Mysore): What about patients?

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Patients will naturally be more. In Andhra there are nearly 600 hospitals, in Telangana there are only 89.

Not only that, Andhra has got 46 lakh acres of irrigated area by guaranteed means of irrigation, Telangana has only 11 lakh acres. All this does not show the bright picture as is sought to be painted by the protagonists of separate Telangana. There is another point. The income of Andhra is double that of Telangana, namely 565 crores as against 265 crores, according to the Chief Minister, Mr. B. Ramakrishna Rao. So, economic viability is nothing but bare shimmering and a mirage that has come about in the throats of our friends, the Separate Telangan[^]tes.

I may be allowed to mention a point in this connection, namely the element of domination. They say if Vishal-andhra is formed, the Andhras will

come and grab all their lands, take away all the jobs that are there in Telangana and occupy all their houses. They say that they will exploit them very bitterly. In one word, as the Commission has pointed out, they would colonise our Telangana. I do not understand how the S.R.C., composed of eminent people, could take to such an argument. It is fantastic to say that one part of people will come and colonise another part of the people. There is no doubt that exploiters certainly there are in Andhra, but to say that Telangana does not abound in them is a travesty of truth. You are all aware that it was the feudal oppression and exploitation in Telangana that compelled the peasants to revolt. The *zamindars*, *deshmukhs* and *jagirdars* of Telangana are most notorious throughout the world. So, if at all there is an apprehension of competition, there might be a competition between the exploiters of Telangana and the Rajahs of Andhra. As far as the people are concerned, there is no such thing as 'domination' and other things.

Not only that, the peasants of Telangana, the people of Telangana have withstood the oppression and suppression of these landlords and *deshmukhs*. Now nobody can come there and oppress them. To talk of domination is nothing but meaningless.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): Your time is up, Mr. Prasad Rao.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I understand I am given 20 minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): Yes, your time is over.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I am finishing.

Coming to the question of employment, employment opportunities are better in a bigger State than in a small state. If immediately separate

Telangana is formed to reduce the administration expenses, services are to be retrenched; the scales of pay would be cut down. But they argue the other way saying that if Vishalandhra is formed there will be more unemployment. It is nothing but gullible jingo.

Regarding public opinion, they say that 95 per cent, of the people are in favour of separate Telangana. Sir, similar slogans were adopted for independent Hyderabad, namely that 95 per cent, of the Hyderabad people were for keeping it as an independent State and not as a part of the Indian Union. Today also they say that the demand for separate Telangana is supported by 95 per cent, of the people. Sir, prior to the Police Action in Hyderabad, the Nawab of Chhatari was not allowed to go to Delhi to discuss about Hyderabad's integration. So also today the same tactics are being adopted. When the Ministers want to go to Kurnool they raise the bogey that they should not go to Kurnool to discuss the issue of jobs, though Andhra Government is prepared to give assurances regarding employment and to allay the fears of the Telangana people.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR) : You should wind up, Mr. Prasad Rao, otherwise I will have to call another name.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I will take only two minutes more. Coming to the views of the Telangana political parties, it is only one particular group that supports the cry of separate Telangana. I know for a fact that many of the Congressmen, the whole Communist Party, the majority of P.S.P. in Telangana support the demand of Vishalandhra. I do not understand how, according to them, 95 per cent, stand for separate Telangana.

Recently bye-elections for four municipal seats were held on the manifesto of separate Telangana, but all these four seats were won by people who stand for Vishalandhra. In

many cases candidates for separate Telangana forfeited their securities. This false cry is nothing but the group politics of the Congress which has a big role in shaping things. The separate Telangana demand is a product of Congress circles by some opportunists. I appeal to these people not to jeopardise the interests of 3 crores of Telugu people because of factionalism. I will request them to reconsider the position, march shoulder to shoulder with all the Telugus for the people's betterment for the realisation of Vishalandhra.

SHRI JAGANNATH DAS (Orissaj: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to state that the Report of the S.R.C. is an interesting and illustrious document in many respects. The changes adum-berated in this Report are far-reaching and are in the direction of unity and progress of India. We welcome the abolition of the office of Rajpra-mukhs. We equally welcome the creation of one class of States in India which saves people from many varieties of States, Parts A, B, C and so on, and the treasury from its unnecessary expenditure on too many States and thus too many heads and executives.

While welcoming many aspects of things in the S.R.C. Report, I have to state that I am unable to understand why such a big and thinly populated area from river Saviri to the end of the Vindhya Pradesh be carved out into a separate State in the name of Madhya Pradesh covering a wide extensive area of 1,71,200 sq. miles, 90 miles in length with only twenty-six million of people. This is an area which is more than two and a half times of Bihar and 50 per cent, more than the area of Uttar Pradesh. I must protest with all my respects for the Commission that the administration of this vast undeveloped area is neither possible nor feasible.

Sir, the Vindhya Pradesh people want to be in Uttar Pradesh. There is no reason why we should throttle those people and keep them hanging

[Shri Jagannath Das.] to an undeveloped area. Today, Madhya Pradesh may be anxious to have this vast area but if they do not follow the wise maxim of swallowing such quantity as one could digest, they will have to suffer from indigestion, and that suffering, in my opinion, is inevitable. The reorganisation of States should be done in such a way that the undeveloped areas are tagged with the developed States, so that there will be that necessary pull towards progress. From this point of view, Sir, Vindhya Pradesh should go over to Uttar Pradesh and Surjuga and Jaspur should go over to Bihar, leaving South Bastar to Orissa. This should release also Bengali and Oriya areas from Bihar so that neither the people nor the administration will suffer, and contentment will prevail all over, adding to the progress of India as a whole.

Having said this regarding the general aspects of the Report, I will now come to the claims of my State of Orissa to the two sub-divisions of Singhbhum district, namely, Sadar and feeraikella. Sir, it is an admitted fact that there are only two lakh and twelve thousand Hindi speaking people in the whole of Singhbhum district ag per the 1951 Census Report. Out of them, one lakh and eighty thousand people, according to the same Report, are regarded as floating population from Hindi-speaking areas, other than the district of Singhbhum. These people who are labourers and businessmen have little interest or stake in the district. Excluding this number, you have only thirty-two thousand Hindi-speaking people in the whole of Singhbhum district. Sir, if you refer to the Census Report, you will find that the Bihar officers had admitted in that Report that these Hindi-speaking people were concentrated in the city of Jamshedpur and in the other mining and industrial areas of the district Sir, all these things go to prove that it is absurd to claim Singhbhum as a Hindi-speaking area.

It is admitted on all hands that the British Government had introduced

Hindi as a court language for the last eighty years. The present Bihar Government spent quite a lot of money since 1937 on primary education, extending its patronage only to Hindi schools, shutting rigorously its doors against the Oriya language in these two sub-divisions and against Bengali in Dhalbhum. With all such official patronage they have failed to thrust Hindi into the unwilling throats of the population. This fact is transparent from two things, namely, that there are only 33 thousand permanent Hindi speakers in the whole district, and that the subsidiary language speakers are very few as compared with similar Oriya figures. Sir, you cannot thrust something unless the people themselves desire it. It is clear that the people in this case do not desire Hindi to be their mother tongue, because the Hindi speakers are concentrated only in the industrial and mining areas, and they have no touch or any connection with the social life or economic existence or cultural association of the masses. Sir, the association of this district with Bihar is thus an artificial one, which was created by British imperialism and which could not, therefore, thrive.

Sir, a point has been made that the Hos, to a man, opposed to their inclusion in Orissa. It is so. But those who assert this must realise that the conditions of 1932 when they opposed this inclusion in Orissa have all undergone a revolutionary transformation by one single Act, and that is the States' Merger Act of 1948 for all the inhabited areas of Mayurbhanj, Keonjhar, Bonai and Sundergarh. Today, Orissa is not distant, and it is also not far away from Singhbhum. In fact, these ex-State areas consisting of three different districts surround these sub-divisions of Singhbhum, Seraikella and Sadar, from three sides, while on the other side you find a range of mountains to the north of Singhbhum separating the district from the district of Ranchi. A reference to any historian will establish the historical association of Singhbhum with Orissa and Orissa

alone. Regarding railway communication, Sir, Bihar has none with this district, while the South-Eastern Railway connects this area with Orissa and Bengal. The Orissa deputation has shown that these two subdivisions are connected with Orissa by eight different roadways, while Bihar has only one road line. All these factors have weighed with the Adivasi leaders who today demand the inclusion of these areas in Orissa. The M.L.As. of Bihar representing Hos and Mudas, a Scheduled Caste, have spoken for the amalgamation of Seraikella sub-division with Orissa. They have all with one voice demanded the inclusion of these two subdivisions in Orissa.

Sir, I think that the S.R.C. members have not done any justice to this question of Orissa and Bengal, while they were reorganising the boundaries of these States. Sir, the Chairman himself entertained some fear. They have taken shelter under the O'Donnell Committee Report, the Simon Commission Report and other Reports. But they themselves have never gone into the question. What have they done in the case of Bellary? Justice Misra fixed the boundary excluding two taluks from Bellary. But now the whole of Bellary is transferred to Andhra. This is what they have done. Sir, it has been stated that the question of Seraikella sub-division has been finally settled. Nothing can be more absurd than this. These two sub-divisions were taken away from Orissa in the name of smooth administration during those days when Police Action was taken in Hyderabad. Now, Sir, the time has come when we have to make this demand, and I hope that the Government will render justice in this matter.

SHRI K. C. KARUMBAYA (Ajmer and Coorg): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I welcome the S.R.C. Report and congratulate its authors very warmly. I congratulate them because Part B and Part C States have been recommended to be abolished; the abolition of the institution of Rajpramukhs and the

disintegration of Hyderabad have also been recommended. So I am very happy and I congratulate them for those recommendations. For want of time, I want to dwell on the body of the Report only for a short while.

Now, regarding Telangana the recommendation seems to be a temporary one. It is recommended only for five years. Such temporary decisions are not very conducive to the future of India. Whether it is Telangana or Vidarbha or Bombay or Punjab or Himachal, the decision must be of an enduring nature at least for some years to come. I welcome the Report because we are proceeding towards a unitary form of Government, for which I have always had a great desire. Soon after we got independence, we liquidated about 600 Princely States and now the number of States have been reduced by a further instalment to 16, and our revered leader yesterday in the Lok Sabha has given us a hint that it would be better if India is parcelled out into four or five zonal States. In the long run when Hindi, the *lingua franca* of India, makes headway, I feel that India in the course of about twenty or thirty years will have a unitary Government and according to me, that will be the proudest day for India.

Now, coming to Karnataka, I am happy the Commission has recommended for the formation of Karnataka, but there are certain things with regard to the boundary which I have to mention. Karnataka must consist of the following: Coorg, the present State of Mysore including the whole of Bellary district, the district of South Kanara including that part of Kasargod taluk lying to the north of Chandragiri river and Kollegal taluk of Coimbatore district in the Madras State, the districts of Raichur and Gulbarga and the contiguous four taluks of Bidar district in the State of Hyderabad, the districts of Bijapur, Dharwar, North Kanara and Belgaum in the Bombay State and Madakasira, an enclave of Andhra State in Mysore

[Shri K. C. Karumbaya.] State. If I had time, I would have proved by facts and figures that these adjoining taluks that have been left out in the Report must naturally belong to Karnataka, but I hope that the Boundary Commission will set right those defects.

Now, I have heard the speeches of all hon. Members who spoke before me with interest. Almost everyone had something to say against the Report. There does not seem to be any agreement among them. There is agreement only in disagreement. Is there no way to solve the problem? There is only one way. We have in our midst our revered Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who is respected all over the world. Everyone of us admires his greatness, impartiality, clear thinking and correct judgment. We have had our say on the Report but now let us leave the matter to his judgment. Why should we feel shy to submit to his judgment? Will the nation rise to his call? I wish and pray that it does.

Sir, now I come to Coorg, the State to which I belong. Coorg is recommended to be merged with bigger Karnataka. Though I support the Report, 95 per-cent, of the people of Coorg are opposed to the merger. This is neither sentimental nor parochial. It is based on hard facts. Very few people here know about Coorg and its conditions and administration. So, the little time left before me I must devote to give details of the conditions that exist there. It is a Part C State, and the Report has been kind enough to say a few things in favour of Coorg, though it is generally understood that the administration in a Part C State is very unsatisfactory and the people are very backward. On page 71, paragraph 252, they say:

"Of the nine Part C States, six have legislatures and ministries; and of these only one, namely, Coorg, has been in a position to carry on so far a reasonable system

of administration without central assistance"

Please mark the words "without Central assistance". There is another paragraph. On page 97 in paragraph 346 they say:

"While the case for integration of Coorg in the proposed Karnataka State appears to us to be indisputable, we wish to take note of the claim to a distinct individuality which the people of this minor administration have put forward. We suggest that a concession should be made to this sentiment by demarcating it as a separate district of the prospective Karnataka State."

Sir, at the beginning I said that 95 per cent, of the people were opposed to the merger and the local Legislature which contains 24 Members, had passed a Resolution in 1954 in the Budget Session that the State must be kept separate, and they even presented a memorandum to the S.R.C. when it visited Coorg, including the two Ministers,—please note that all the 24 Members—that it must be kept separate; and the District Congress Committee and the various other local bodies of standing who have a stake in the country, everyone of them, represented to the Commission that the State must be kept separate. Now, it has been recommended to be merged in a bigger Karnataka and now they come forward that certain safeguards must be given to them. The local Legislature, a body of 24, passed a Resolution when the Report of the Commission was considered that the State must merge with Karnataka with certain safeguards. I am going to read those safeguards:

"This Assembly is further of opinion that having regard to Coorg having been a separate unit for over a century and with a view to maintain the present standard of progress in Coorg, the Government of India may kindly incorporate the following safeguards in the appro-

priate legislation to be enacted by Parliament in this behalf:

(1) That the present State of Coorg be kept as a District as recommended by the States Reorganisation Commission;

(2) That Coorg be given a minimum representation of five Members in the future Karnataka Legislature;

(3) That the present representations in the Two Houses of Parliament provided for Coorg be continued;

(4) That the second Five Year Plan programme as prepared by the Coorg State Government and approved by the Planning Commission be implemented fully; and

(5) That the exemption so far enjoyed from the operation of the Arms Act by the people of Coorg be continued.' "

There is another request for safeguard. The District Congress Committee representatives who came to Delhi presented a memorandum to the Home Minister and in their representation they have asked for these safeguards:

"(a) Coorg may have six representatives, in the Karnataka Assembly and one in the Legislative Council. This should be exclusive of one representation to each of the tribal and scheduled castes.

(b) Coorg should be represented in Karnataka Cabinet by one Minister who should be elected from any one of the constituencies in Coorg.

(c) Coorg may have one representative in the Lok Sabha as well as in the Rajya Sabha.

(d) Necessary financial guarantee may be provided for the second Five Year Plan, as sanctioned for Coorg, including Barapole Hydel Project.

(e) Exemptions from the operations of the Indian Arms Act, as

enjoyed now and the existing local laws regarding land tenure system of inalienability should be continued.

(f) Representation should be given to Coorg in the body to be constituted for the integration of the service personnel."

These are the safeguards, they have asked for.

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

SHRI K. C. KARUMBAYA: Coorg is the smallest State in India. It has a population of only 2,29,405. The resources of the State are enough for its maintenance and growth—even more—though prohibition is introduced

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

The former Home Minister Dr. Katju, said after the present Coorg Ministry was formed: "The administration of the State is better than many other States". Sir, I know personally that corruption and nepotism is comparatively less among Government servants. The State enjoys a good and efficient Government. It spends a lot of money over nation-building departments and they have an ambitious second Five Year Plan and the fear of the people is, if merged, they would be made to stagnate until the people of the rest of Karnataka come to their standard. They have an annual income of Rs. 50 lakhs from forest;— which is very rich and exploited according to a well-drawn im working plan. To substantiate my statement, I shall place a few facts before the House. For a population of 2,29,000; 28,807 students were going to school at the end of 1954. Out of 7,721 high school students, 2,£63 were girl students. They have 206 schools They have 11 high schools and a first-grade ic:ience college. They have 1,054 teachers for a population of 2,29,000. They have more hospitals than other parts. They have spent in 1954 Rs. 19,69,243 for education, and for medical facilities they have spent Rs. 7,95,582 and they have got

[Shri K. C. Karumbaya] for 300 villages, 415 co-operative societies; and for a population of 2 lakhs they have 60,488 members and the working capital of these societies is about Rs. 82 lakhs and odd. The co-operative State Bank has lent Rs. 15,28,000 in 1953-54 and the Government has lent taccavi loans of Rs. 2,14,000.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already taken 5 minutes more.

SHRI K. C. KARUMBAYA: I am the only speaker for.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Have 2 minutes more.

SHRI K. C. KARUMBAYA: The police force consists of 257 in number and that is a well-knit body and is very much respected by the people. The pay scale of the Government servants is higher than that of the neighbouring States and their number is also very high. Probably for 2 lakhs of people we have 2,000 Government servants. The police constable and the school master in the remotest corner get Rs. 75 a month and with regard to collection of land revenue we have not got middle-men like *malguzars*, land-lords, *jemmis*, *patels*, *shanbagues*, etc. The land system there is *ryotwari*. And the education there is as much as 29 per cent.

^{P.M.} being next only to Travancore-Cochin and Delhi, and it is higher than all the neighbouring States. Therefore, I submit, if safeguards are not given, they will have to stagnate until others come up to their level. Therefore, I would request that these safeguards be incorporated in the Bill that is to come up.

Moreover, as it is the people of the State are exempt from the operation of the Indian Arms Act. They have also a land tenure under which there is exemption of land being sold for civil decrees.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: These are all matters of detail which can be considered when the Bill is taken up.

SHRI K. C. KARUMBAYA: So I appeal to my Karnataka friends who have been very liberal and very generous so far, to help us and to see that these safeguards are incorporated in the Bill that is to come before us. Thank you, Sir.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to say at the very outset that I personally was never in favour of the appointment of this Commission. I believe, there was a mistake and I think our Government was driven to it because certain steps had been taken in the past and there was no way of getting out of it. However, the problem today

is, having gone so far where do we go from here? .

Sir, I have been listening to the debate in this House and I have been reading some of the speeches in the other House, and I have noticed that there has been a great tendency to refer back to the past pronouncements by the Congress and certain resolutions passed by the Congress and certain statements made by the Congress leaders. But I think it is very curious that although these pronouncements and all these resolutions have been referred to by those who would like to substantiate their arguments with their support, some of the others have completely ignored them. I for one, feel that no matter what has been said in the past or even in the recent present it is not the final word. One of our friends here invoked the name of Mahatma Gandhi and said that Mahatmaji was definitely committed to the idea of accepting language as the criterion. I have no doubt that that was the way Mahatmaji's mind was working. But I am quite sure that if he had witnessed some of the ugly scenes in Bombay, and some of the things that have happened in Punjab he with his remarkable and phenomenal courage would have been the first one to say that language cannot be the only criterion. I think at the present moment what we should do is to look at the picture of each particular area, and not be dogmatic

about this criterion or the other. We should have a pragmatic approach, by which I mean that we cannot have a dead uniformity for the whole of the country, but for each particular zone or each particular area, the complex social, economic and political situation will have to be examined and scrutinised and then a workable, mutually agreed formula will have to be devised and implemented. So much, Sir, as a very broad generalisation.

I think the paramount need of the hour which we all recognize, but which I think can be restated to be the national unity of India. Do we have to be reminded so often that in our whole history we have suffered from the lack of national cohesiveness, a feeling that country comes first and regions, sections or communities and religions come second? I am afraid we have paid lip service to our nationalism which obviously is still not very far advanced. Our nationalism during the freedom movement was also of a negative type, by which I mean that it was more anti-British, in the sense that they were our oppressors. But the moment they left, we found that we have revealed our true character that there are the Maharashtrians, there are the Punjabis, the Gujaratis, the Akalis, the Jan Sangh, and so on. All these things are rather disturbing. I personally do not believe that all of us should be of the same frame of mind. We certainly must subscribe to different political, economic and religious ideologies. But if we are going to grow as a strong nation, we have to learn to subordinate our sectional, parochial loyalties to the larger loyalty to the motherland.

I do not propose to go into the details about this State or that State. I shall confine my remarks to the situation in the Punjab. I think we are all agreed that it is very unfortunate that there has been a rift between the two communities in the Punjab, namely the Hindus and the Sikhs. I gather from conversations with some of my colleagues here that

they had been put to very great difficulty and cannot understand why there should be any quarrel or any rift between the Hindus and the Sikhs. They are naturally perplexed, because they know that the Hindus and the Sikhs come from the same stock. They have the same cultural background, the same religious outlook. And even today you will find in many of the Hindu homes a Sikh member with full fledged beard and turban. There are inter-marriages. There are no differences between the Hindus and the Sikhs so far as economic and political problems are concerned. But having said this, Sir, I would like the hon. Members to realise that, although there should not be any basis for this rift between the two, the unfortunate fact remains that there is a rift and due to some very peculiar circumstances, the rift has been accentuated. I think we as responsible representatives of the nation will be very well advised to accept that as a reality, that there is this problem, and not try to dismiss it simply because we do not want it to be there.

What precisely is the problem? And I speak as a member of the Congress and not as a member of any community. The problem, Sir, as it has been brought to my attention—and I have tried to study it for the last seven years, since my return from America—is this, that a section of the Sikh community has some grievances. As to how large or how small that section is, I do not propose to go into all those details, or even to accept the validity of all the claims and counter-claims that have been made. But I would merely like to report to the House the fact that a very large number of the Sikh people feel that they have certain grievances and they want those grievances to be redressed.

My friend and colleague Diwan Chaman Lall spoke as usual very eloquently and persuasively about Punjab. It is always a pleasure for me to support Diwan Chaman Lall but on this particular issue, his

I Dr. An up Singh. J

exposition of the Punjab situation has left me in a rather unhappy state of mind. I think with his skilful dialectical ability as a good lawyer, he has tried to minimise the gravity of the situation and unfortunately has been rather careless in one or two remarks that he made and which have already generated a certain bitterness among the leaders of the Sikhs. I, particularly, refer to the statement that Diwan Chaman Lall made about Master Tara Singh and his colleagues having entered into some kind of intrigue with the Muslim League. I happened to be present at the mass meeting at Amritsar where our Prime Minister spoke with reference to this particular situation. I do not remember the exact words but he said something to this effect that he had gone into this matter and examined it and found that the allegations that the Sikhs or any section thereof intrigued with the Muslim Leagues was utterly baseless. On the very face of it, it would appear preposterous that any section of the Sikh community, a community which has suffered the most due to Partition, more than anybody else in India, should at all entertain the idea of negotiating with the Muslim League. Although Diwan Chaman Lall referred only to Master Tara Singh, Master Tara Singh represents a fairly large section of the community and I do not want this impression to go round that the Sikh community as such or any section thereof had, at any time, tried to betray the best interests of India. I think this sort of misconception should not be allowed to exist.

As for the language question, Diwan Chaman Lall once again tried to dismiss it as of no consequence. You would recall that he said that the Sikh *Guru Granth* was written in Hindi. That certainly does not dispose of the problem. The *Guru Granth* has Hindi words, Persian words, Turkish words, Maharashtrian words, Telugu words, and words from a number of

other languages. The *Guru Granth* was not written primarily or exclusively for the Sikhs. It was written for the people of India and the fact that it is written in Hindi does not dispose of the claim of a section of the people in Punjab that since their language is Punjabi—and that is the spoken-language of the people—it should be accorded the same status, should be given the same rights and facilities as any other language in any other part of India. That precisely is the problem but, unfortunately a section of the Hindus, to which Diwan Chaman Lall did not refer, during the Census said that their language was not Punjabi but Hindi. Every child in Punjab knows that that is not true. Certainly, Hindi should be our national language and I, for one, feel that if either the Sikhs or any other community for whatever reason neglect to take up to Hindi immediately, they will be the sufferers in the long run. So, Hindi is the national language and Punjabi is the language of the people in Punjab. I am not advocating any particular form for the reorganisation of the State but I am merely trying to expound some of the opinions which I think are really basic in the whole problem. In regard to the services, Diwan Chaman Lall said that after all the services represented only point zero, zero, zero, zero, something of the population; it was such a minor figure to quarrel about. I think however, that the answer from the other side would be that since the percentage of people employed in the services throughout India is so small, there is great rush for the services, greater attraction. If the rush is so small, then the same thing could be said of the other people, namely, the Hindus in Punjab. Why should they be afraid if a few more Sikhs get into the services? I am not sure whether Master Tara Singh's complaint is justified or not but I have heard it from even non-Akali leaders who, in private, say that there is some discrimination.

About my specific proposals—rather tentative—I would say that nothing should be imposed upon the people, either in Punjab or anywhere else. I

would be in favour of a plebiscite if that is at all possible. I am personally in favour of a Round Table Conference of the representatives of the two communities in Punjab rather than for them to run to Delhi every other day one after the other. I have complete confidence in Pandit Nehru's impartiality but I think it is not fair to him to inflict every problem on him. It is a very sad reflection on our own leaders in Punjab and elsewhere that we cannot settle these problems by mutual agreement. My own preference is for the larger zones to which Pandit -ji alluded. I am rather intrigued by that and I think that we have been isolated from each other too long. Ask any college graduate in Punjab if he can name at least two writers from the South, one dramatist, one artist and so on, a philanthropist or a social worker. He would fail miserably. The same thing could be said of people in the other parts about their lack of knowledge about Punjab. We know a great deal about Europe, about America and the rest of the world but so little about our own country. This is so even amongst the Members of Parliament. I think we should try to provide more and more facilities for mutual intercourse on social, economic and political lines. We of this generation are called upon to build a new chapter, a greater chapter in the history of India. The past generation—and most of them are still with us—has given us the heritage of a free India. It is up to us now to build it up to a greater India in which everybody will be proud, everybody will be happy where these present bickerings and feuds would have become a matter of the past.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Sir, I join other speakers in paying tribute to the Commission for having discharged their stupendous task excellently well. I specially commend very highly their recommendations regarding the safeguards that are to be given to linguistic minorities and, inter alia, for other all-India matters. They have foreseen with immense foresight, the

possible inferior psychology that would affect the linguistic minorities in these States and they have rightly proposed these safeguards. If I have time after finishing my observations on my own constituency, I would like to revert back to that subject with a view to pointing out how far these safeguards proposed are really practicable

Sir, the Kannadigas are really grateful to the Commission for having recommended a Karnataka State. The Kannadigas are the lost sheep of this land. They have been packed in different corners of different States and in no State except Mysore have they had any voice until very recently when the Bombay Government was pleased to appoint one of their men as a Minister. That is very little consolation to the fact that they have foregone so many benefits of self-Government.

**THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY
TO THE MINISTER FOR INFORMATION
AND BROADCASTING (SHRI G.
RAJAGOPALAN) :**

**Madras and Andhra have Kannada
Ministers.**

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Yes, but not always. It was only recently that he was appointed.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: Not recently, but always.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hyderabad.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Hyderabad had no Kannadiga Minister.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Hyderabad had a Minister.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: He is a Hyderabad.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: He speaks Kannada.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: He is a citizen of Hyderabad.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: His brother is a Minister in your State.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: All the same because he is a Kannadiga I feel

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] obliged for Hyderabad too. Now, Sir, although the Commission have laid down several principles for reorganisation of States and out of the four principles that they have laid down, they have largely been guided only by one principle, that is, formation of the States on a linguistic basis.

As the House knows, I am not an advocate of linguistic provinces, but when once the Government has accepted the principle, I as a disciplined soldier raise no objection against it. But, Sir, when once we accept that principle, we have to carry it to its logical conclusion and we have to see that all areas speaking one language are formed into one unit unless overriding circumstances demand that that should not be done. With regard to Karnataka, Sir, I am surprised to find that the Commission have left out many Kannada-speaking areas, the most important being Bellary. The Commission have considered it as a minor point, but to Kannadigas it is a major point. Bellary has been scrutinised by various authorities. Sir, in the year 1921, during the organisation of Congress districts, in the Kelkar Award Bellary was allotted to Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee. Then no objection was raised by anybody against that arrangement. Afterwards, Sir, when the Madras Government itself appointed a Partition Committee, Andhra leaders were there on that Committee—the hon. Mr. Sanjeeva Reddi, the hon. Mr. Prakasam, the hon. Mr. Bhaktavatsalam and others. This Partition Committee recommended that the whole district should go to Mysore. Then no Andhra raised any objection—and there were four Andhra leaders on it. Then, Sir, Justice "Wanchoo's report says that it is a predominantly Kannada area and that it should go to Karnataka if and when a Karnataka State is to be formed. He says on page 3 of his Report, "Further this area may be assured that if and when Karnataka State is formed, it will be put in that State." Justice Wandhoo's Report has been quoted

against the demand of Karnataka for Bellary and that is because he decided that it should go to the new State. Before him the problem was about the whole district as one unit because both the Kannadigas and the Telugus of the district demanded that that district should be treated as a unit and should be allotted as a unit—it should not be broken up. Justice Wanchoo's consideration was only that and, therefore, he allotted it to the new State, but at the same time he said that this Kannada area, when Karnataka State is formed, should go to that state. Sir, Justice Misra's Report has also gone into the question of Bellary taluk and other areas also; and has definitely come to the conclusion that it should be in Mysore. While dealing with Misra's Report the Commission say that Justice Misra's argument was "linguistic gravity" and that they are going, in considering this question, to depend upon "certain principles". What are the principles that they have depended upon? Their argument is that Bellary's trade and commerce is all with Andhra. This is one argument. It was for more than one hundred and fifty years part of Andhra and therefore it should go to Andhra. That is another argument.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: It was part of the composite State of Madras.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: It was not in Andhra but in the composite Madras State, but then what they have said is that it was the unofficial capital of Rayalaseema and, therefore, it should go to Andhra. These are "certain principles" by which the Commission decided the case of Bellary. The third argument is this. To reach Bangalore by rail from Bellary, the shortest route lies only through Andhra territory, and therefore Bellary should go to Andhra—very curious arguments. And then the other argument there is friction regarding Tungabhadra and, therefore, it should go to Andhra. And then the three taluks for which there was a demand are not unilingual and therefore they should go to Andhra. Well, Sir, if we analyse

these arguments, I am really surprised how people of such eminence could have depended upon such futile arguments for their decision.

Well, Sir, with regard to trade and commerce I may submit that the Commission had no time because they had a very heavy task on their hands. They had no time to go into the merits of the details of this case and therefore, they have superficially decided. Well, Sir, with regard to trade and commerce this area is as much dependent upon Karnataka area, that is Mysore area, as upon Andhra area. In fact my district supplies most of the raw materials to Bellary market and it is my district that pays much of the money to the Bellary bazaar and they have intimate trade relations with the eastern portion of my district. Then again portions of Kalyandurg, Pavgada and Molakalmuru, they have also contact with Bellary. I do not say it has got more contact with Kannada area than with Andhra area, but it has equal contact even in trade and commerce, and being in the composite State of Madras for more than 150 years is also no argument because we are reorganising the States, we are taking out the States that have existed age-long, since Janamejaya, and we are now assigning them to other areas. Then the rail route to Bellary, it passes through Andhra, they say, which is a very absurd argument. Now the rail route to Delhi passes through many States and is it any argument to say that Delhi does not belong to Delhi State but to the other States through which the rail route passes?

Then I am leaving out their other arguments and I am coming to Tungabhadra of which they have made much and the hon. Members from Andhra here have also made use of this as a very good argument. One thing was that the Tungabhadra project has not been working satisfactory. It is an allegation. As soon as the Chairman of the Tungabhadra Project Board came to know

that such a reference was made by a member of this Commission somewhere in an interview, he refuted that argument publicly and said that there was no friction in the Project Committee and that the Project Committee was working quite smoothly. The Chief Minister of the Government of Mysore while moving the Resolution for the consideration of the S.R.C. Report denied it, and there has been no contradiction, no denial from any Andhra quarters. With regard to the merits of the case of Tungabhadra Project it stands like this and I will say that in brief. Out of the total irrigated area of 8,26,000 acres, only 1,53,000 acres are in the present Andhra State without Bellary and 6,73,000 acres are in Raichur and Bellary districts. Then out of the 5,800 cusecs of water available, only 1,000 are in the present Andhra State and 4,000 in Raichur area and 800 in the Bellary area. Now Raichur has been assigned to Karnataka. One mistake that the Commission have committed is, while reckoning the area irrigated by Tungabhadra, they have forgotten the fact that they themselves were going to assign Raichur and Gulbarga to Karnataka. Leaving them out and leaving Bellary out they have taken the statistics, which is wrong. Now, as I have said, the 6,73,000 acres are now in the present Karnataka area including Raichur and Gulbarga and the present Bellary portion. Well, Sir, this is the merit of the case with regard to this. We do not intend any ill to Andhra. On the floor of the House I hold out an assurance which I know my Government will fully support, that Mysore will not bring any trouble to the Telugus or anybody with regard to the working of the Tungabhadra Project. But the boot is on the other leg. Well, future events will show that. Therefore, there is no doubt, that Bellary should go to us. There is one primary consideration. Sir, apart from all these arguments. Bellary was part of Madras and it was assigned to Mysore. Now, Sir, as everybody knows, particularly I Members of that area in this House,

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] there was a lot of tension between the Telugus and the Kannadigas in Bellary and hon. Members who have spoken have referred to it and the Commission also have been apprised of it. They knew that there were many serious clashes between the Telugus and the Kannadigas when this district was assigned to Mysore. Well, it was assigned to Mysore and somehow people forgot their differences just as it happens in a third class compartment. If a particular passenger has no seat and if he finds that the other one who has got place to spare does not accommodate him they start fighting and it goes on but both the passengers know that they have to travel together for a long distance. After some time, after the fight, they come to terms and they become fast friends. It is like that here; the Telugus and Kannadigas forgot their differences and became friends here in Bellary. At least there is no tension now. But what has the Commission done now? They have now asked these people who were fighting, as in a third class compartment, to go to another compartment. Here they had settled down peacefully but now not only those who were fighting before will begin to fight but all of them will fight. This is the position in which the Commission have placed Bellary. The position of both the Telugus and the Kannadigas in Bellary will become serious because they are now disturbing the status quo. And apart from that they have forgotten to take into account the enormous amount of money that Mysore has spent on Bellary. Any Bellary citizen will say that he is ever grateful to Mysore for what has been done to them. During this short period so much has been done to Bellary which had not been done for the last 20 years. So much money has been spent by Mysore but the Commission has conveniently for the Andhra forgotten it. I think they have been guided by some extraneous considerations. Sir, the Government should give deep thought.

to this question and decide to keep the status quo in Bellary.

There are other areas which have been referred to by my hon. friends' Mr. Dasappa and Mr. Karumbaya Madakasira is there; it is also a major question. It is admittedly a Kannada area. Even now the Telugus do not say that it should not go to Karnataka but the Commission, simply because it was in Andhra State—it was in Madras but later on it was in Andhra—said it should remain there, although they know fully well that it is a completely Kannada area. Except in one *firka*, 90 per cent, are Kannadigas. Of course, in some areas the people speak both languages but their mother tongue is Kannada. And it is surrounded on all sides by Mysore territory and it has been admitted by everybody that it should go to Mysore, but the Commission has over-looked that. Tal-wadi, Hosur and other taluks were also referred to.

With regard to the name of the future State, I would like it to be named Mysore for very good reasons, because Mysore has been a State of international fame. In India it has been considered to be one of the most progressive States and it has a tradition of its own. Why should we lose the advantage of this goodwill? If there is a goodwill, let us keep it and there is nobody objecting to naming the new State as Mysore. As you know, and as the House knows, there is a section in Mysore who would like the new State to retain its name of Mysore and those people would also be satisfied. When there is no objection from any quarter, when the goodwill of Mysore is going to benefit all the people, it should be possible to retain the name of Mysore.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Just two minutes. Sir. I would like to

say a few words about Himachal Pradesh about which only one Member has spoken, I fail to understand the rationale behind the recommendation of the Commission in this regard. As hon. Members have pointed out, there are serious differences among the people of the present Punjab. It is like wolves fighting in the Punjab. There is no agreement between the Hindus and Sikhs. We would be taking these hilly people and throwing them to the wolves if we should integrate Himachal into Punjab. The Commission's arguments are not at all sound. They admit that it is a backward area but on that very ground they say that it should go to the Punjab. They say it lacks trained personnel and on that very ground they say that it should go to the Punjab. As we all know, ordinarily the areas that are surrounding the capital city receive greater attention than other areas. For instance, areas round about Delhi have received more attention than other areas further South. This is the natural law. Even here in a small House like this when the Chair looks at the House, naturally the benches directly in front catch the eye, not this or that side. That is natural. That being so, how can we expect these people of Himachal Pradesh to receive the same consideration and attention in the Punjab? The Constitution itself has provided safeguards for the hill tribes, Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. Although all of them are not Scheduled classes, they are backward admittedly. So, it is in the fitness of things that Himachal Pradesh should be given a separate status or some separate arrangement should be made. Of course, the Commission has provided a separate Development Board and they have provided for the grants now being given to Himachal to be continued in future also but that will be nowhere if Himachal Pradesh is placed in a composite State. Moreover, it is against the pronouncements, made from time to time, that Himachal would never be disturbed. I would

like the Government to consider the question of Himachal Pradesh as a special case.

SHRI S. M. HEMROM (Orissa): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I thank you for giving me this opportunity of participating in this debate on the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission. Sir, I would wish the hon. Home Minister to convey my thanks to the members of the Commission. They have executed the tremendous task assigned to them. If there was anything left unfinished, let Panditji's five zone system give the finishing touch.

Sir, broadly I wish to touch upon the problems of the Adivasis of the Chhota Nagpur plateau, the linguistic barriers of Adivasis, administration of Scheduled area and the exploitation of the Adivasis by the vested interests of the four surrounding States. I would like to take this opportunity to point out the practical difficulties and make the most humble suggestions.

Before considering this question of Adivasis of the Chhota Nagpur plateau, I would like to take hon. Members of this House a little back into history. It is said that the Britishers knew the Adivasi resistance from the days of Santhal Hool in the sixtieth year of the nineteenth century in Santhal Parganas of the present Bihar. The Britishers divided the Santhals by partitioning them in different districts and subsequently under four different Provinces of Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh. This divide and rule policy has practically placed the Adivasis in these four Provinces and kept them divided.

The Adivasis are scattered throughout the country but in their desire to preserve their independence and entity from the invasion of Hindus, Muslims and foreigners, it is here in the Chhota Nagpur plateau and the surrounding one-time forest plains that they settled down. This area is covered by the seven districts of

[Shri S. M. Hemrom.] Chhota Nagpur and Santhal Pargana of Bihar, Mayurbhanj, Keonjhar and Sundergarh, three northernmost districts of Orissa, Surguja and Jaspur districts of Madhya Pradesh and the tribal areas of Midnapore, Bankura, Burdwan in West Bengal. Roughly this area constitutes the proposed Jharkhand State. The Adivasis of the Jharkhand area have inherited a way of life, traditions and institutions which are common to Santhals, Mundas, Hos, Mahlis, Birhors, Oraons, Bathudis, Gonds and many more. As I have already stated, they are in a contiguous and compact area but they are partitioned and scattered in four Provinces. Leaving aside Madhya Pradesh let us consider the three State divisions of Orissa, West Bengal and Bihar.

Sir, in one respect, that is linguistically, the Adivasis are, the worst sufferers of linguistic fanaticism and linguistic imperialism. For instance, here in Parliament there are six M.Ps. speaking one and the same mother tongue, Santhali, one from West Bengal, three from Bihar and two from Orissa. We may talk to each other, but we cannot have any correspondence between us unless each of us learns Oriya, Bengali and Hindi scripts. So, we have to learn four languages. Similar are the difficulties with millions of Santhals and millions of Adivasis. Other fellow citizens of India manage with their mother tongue and *rashtrabhasha* or simply *rashtrabhasha* that is, Hindi, whereas the Adivasis are being taxed to learn more than two languages. Now, Sir, you can imagine what a colossal waste of time, money and energy is involved in it. We are also at the same time at the whims of our State Governments who abolish the age-old Hindi schools in Adivasi area overnight and force upon us the regional languages. The unanimous opinion of the Adivasis is to learn two languages only, *viz.*, mother tongue and *rashtrabhasha*. This necessitates the creation of Jharkhand which will be a multi-lingual

State, with Hindu as everyone's second language, the first language being their mother tongue.

There is another aspect and that is how these census operations at the hands of the four States have been changing the language and religion of the Adivasis and thereby dwindling the strength of Adivasis. Beside* that, the State Governments have got the Adivasis divided as Scheduled Tribes or Scheduled Castes or other Backward Classes to suit the convenience of the States by the President's Order. One type of Adivasis are Scheduled Tribes in one State, Scheduled Castes in another, Backward Classes in the third one and so on and so forth. To bring the Adivasis and their immediate neighbours under an integrated administration, the Thakkar Bapa Committee recommended a separate administration, but the award was the creation of Scheduled areas, i.e., where the Adivasis are in preponderance. The administration of Scheduled areas is different under different Governments of Bihar, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh. These Scheduled areas are contiguous and can be put under one administration and one State. The proposed Jharkhand comprises the majority of the contiguous and compact Scheduled areas.

Members of this august House, you have now realised that Adivasis are not happy under the Bihar Government, nor under the Government of Orissa, Madhya Pradesh or West Bengal. Members have expressed themselves about the conditions of Adivasis during our debate on the Srikant reports and seminars held here in Delhi. The present set up of administration has not benefited the Adivasis very much in any of the States, and for the Adivasis of Chhota Nagpur plateau State of Jharkhand, to my mind, is the only solution.

Now, I want to relate another fact also, that is, how we are suffering due to the quarrels between Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. In Bengali there

is a proverb: *Sarde sarde ladai hoi bachurer thang bhange*. That means when the bulls fight, the calves get their legs broken, wounded or damaged. Now, take the case of the Maharashtrians and Gujaratis. They have got their claims and counter-claims. There is more chance of a compromise between these two; but I do not know what is the solution for ending the quarrel among these three States of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa.

Not only are they quarreling, the three Provinces are setting Adivasis against Adivasis in order to slice portions from Jharkhand area. Now, Sir, there has been a demand for the Province of Jharkhand from various organisations and institutions and this question was also posed before the S.R.C. And here again, as far as I know, the case has not been examined by the S.R.C. and I would, therefore, appeal to the House to consider this case as a special one.

While I was listening to the debati-s. in certain instances Mr. Mahanty and Mr. Dwivedy have raised certain points. Here, again, I have to submit all these with restraint and hesitation as I have to make out a case for Jharkhand. In a very fundamental point about Hos' affinity to Oriyas and Hos' affinity to Adivasis of Munderi group of Chhota Nagpur I differ from them. I am surprised how because of their incorrect information they are misleading the Members of the House. Let them know from the anthropologist or philologist.....

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa): Who is the anthropologist? I want to know the name of the anthropologist he is quoting.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is not yielding.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Sir, I have got a right of personal information.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. 4 R.S.D.—6

SHRI S. MAHANTY:.....when he says I am misleading.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has not yielded to you. If he says that, you have some of your friends to reply

SHRI S. MAHANTY: If he with draws

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Sir, I rise on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. The hon. Member will please resume his seat.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Sir, I don't allow it. I want to know which authority he is quoting here, which anthropologist. Let us know his name.

SHRI S. M. HEMROM: I have not quoted any authority.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI S. MAHANTY: It is a speech written in Patna and being read in Delhi.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Let us know your view, not the views written in Patna.

SHRI S. M. HEMROM: There is no question of that. I want to make it clear that as far as the language of the Santhals, Hos, Mundas, Mahalis, Birhats, etc. is concerned, they speak the same language which is called by the anthropologist as 'Munderi' group of languages and they are also said to belong to the same sect called *Kolarians*.....

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY (Orissa): You accept Hos are in a majority?

SHRI S. M. HEMROM: This is our difficulty; the Adivasis are pulled asunder, torn to pieces and smashed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time, Mr. Hemrom.

SHRI S. M. HEMROM: Sir, Mr. Dwivedy has raised this point quoting Shri Sidiu Hemrom, a Member of the Bihar Legislature. He should know that the Hemrom *gotra* is also found among the Santhals, Hos and Mundas. So, why should they differentiate between these Adivasis? There is more affinity between the Hos, Santhals and other Adivasis, but not with Oriyas.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI S. M. HEMROM: Sir, one minute more and I will conclude. In this Report the Chairman of the Commission in his note of dissent on Hima-chal Pradesh has made a special reference to the hill tribes, and he has made certain recommendations. I hope the Government accepts the words in favour of Himachal Pradesh. I also request all the Members of the House to consider the application of those principles to the hill areas in letter and spirit, in regard to the Jharkhand area. Thanks.

SHRI R. THANHLIRA (Assam): Sir, speaking on principle, I hold that the redrawing of our political map on linguistic lines is not conducive to the unity and solidarity of India, because I am of the opinion that, if our administrative boundaries are demarcated on linguistic basis only, then what is called provincialism and the feeling of being the owner and ruler of the States will be in the minds of the people and this will go surely against the national unity. I have the experience of this matter even in my own place. I think the House will remember that once I moved a Resolution here for changing the name, of my own district. My own district was once named Lushai Hills and that was after the name of one of the many sub-tribes of that district. Because it was named after one of the sub-tribes, the other people—the other

sub-tribes—could not feel at home;—There was the feeling among the Lushi tribe that as the district was named after the name of a particular sub-tribe, the district belonged to them and that they were a sort of rulers or possessors, so to say. So, actually it was not conducive to the unity of the district itself. And if this is true of a district, I think that, it can, to a great extent, be true of the larger areas also.

So, while we talk of the reorganisation of the States in India as a whole, I think that we should rather think in terms of the economic development of the country as a whole. Our main aim should be to develop economically and socially whatever areas need to be developed. Until and unless we think in terms of national development and economy, we miss our point very much. I would very much prefer that every State, even after redrawn, should be composite and multi-lingual, so that everybody in every State will be able to enjoy equal citizenship and feel quite at home and happy. I am also of the opinion that the naming of any State after a particular community is very dangerous. That is also true in the same way as redrawing the States on a linguistic basis. Sir, I would very much like that, when the States are redrawn, they should be named as far as possible, not after any particular community. So long as we think in terms of linguism and this community-wise character. I think that the oft-quoted saying "I am an Indian first and last" is only a lip-service. I think that in the heart of hearts, many people will always think in terms of their own community, if the States are named after particular communities.

Coming as I do from Assam, I will now confine my speech to that State. Assam has been treated differently more than once. When the country was divided into two parts—India and Pakistan—referendum was taken only in two areas and one happened to be in Assam. After the Partition, Assam suffered very much from economic

point of view. Besides that, we have three types of administration in Assam, at the moment. There is, firstly, the North-East Frontier Agency which is constitutionally in Assam, but which is not administered by Assam Government, but by the President. So, it has a very peculiar type of administration in a way, being in one, State, but administered by some other Agency. Secondly, we have got some autonomous districts which have their own District Councils for the administration of their local affairs and customs, the like of which are not found in other States. The third is the regular administration as is found in all areas. So, in many ways, Assam is getting differential treatment, I would say.

As far as the North-East Frontier Agency is concerned, I know that they are quite backward—and perhaps the most backward area in the whole of India. It is good that, at the moment, they should be administered by the Centre because the Centre have more resources. But all the developmental works and schemes done for the North-East Frontier Agency should be done with a view to completing its integration with the administration of Assam as soon as possible. Otherwise, there is no meaning in the North-East frontier—A-g-e-y-e-y—being—m—Assam Frontier Agency being n

^{P.M.} Assam constitutionally. In the S.R.C. Report we have read about the importance of consolidating the frontier areas under one administrative unit. That is a very good point. But the States of Manipur and Tripura, which we have been expecting to be merged in Assam, have not been recommended for merger in Assam by the Commission. Although Tripura has been recommended, Manipur has been left out. Personally, I believe, that is very unfortunate for Assam as well as for Manipur.

Regarding Manipur, the Assam Pradesh Congress Committee and the Government of Assam, I believe, submitted a memorandum to the effect, that Tripura and Manipur may be merged in Assam if the people

generally agree. After the Report has come out we have seen protests in Tripura against its merger in Assam and also the people of Manipur are not willing. I think, in the interests of the solidarity and administrative efficiency in the border areas of India, Manipur and Tripura should be immediately merged in Assam. I think it is in the best interests of the people of Manipur and Tripura themselves. My friend from Manipur, Mr. Tompok Singh will not agree with me, but I would say on this floor that instead of Manipur being administered by the Centre from Delhi, which is hundreds of miles away from Manipur, the administrative work will be more speedy if it is merged in Assam. Because for any problem, or any trouble they can easily approach any officer and any minister of Assam Government; they can always jump on their necks. Even in the interest of their own administration I think it is much better that Manipur should come immediately within Assam.

SHRI NGANGOM TOMPOK SINGH (Manipur and Tripura): It is a matter of opinion, and that cannot be applied as a principle.

SHRI R. THANHLIRA: I am giving my opinion, of course. I demand merger of Manipur and Tripura from another consideration also. Sir, as you know, Assam is a very peculiar State. More than half of its area is composed of hill areas inhabited by hill tribes. Though the area occupied by them is very large, it is very thinly populated. Because of their small population the representation in the State legislature is very small. At the moment they are not happy. They do not feel quite secure. If Manipur and Tripura are merged in Assam, their unhappiness and feeling of insecurity would be very much lessened because Manipur and Tripura are inhabited mostly by the tribals.

Sir, it is beyond me to understand why, when Tripura has been recommended to be merged in Assam, Manipur has been left out.

(Time bell rings)

[Shri R. Thanhlira.]
I have got many things to say.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind it up.

SHRI R. THANHLIRA: Really speaking I do not find much difference between Manipur and Tripura. I have got some knowledge of Manipur. I had been there for many years. Manipur and Tripura are both my neighbours. I am in between them. I have got some knowledge of these areas. In Tripura itself we find thousands of Manipuris. The other tribes living in Manipur are very much allied to the tribes in Assam. So, I do not find any reason why Manipur should be kept outside Assam. Moreover, it is not quite in the interest of the administrative stability of the eastern part of the country, bound as it is on every side by foreign countries.

Now, a few words about the hill State may not be out of place. I think, you are aware that with the appointment of S.R.C. there was a demand for the creation of a hill State in Assam because the people of the hills think that if they have their own State in Assam, things will be much better and brighter for them. For that they have got so many reasons. It may not be possible for me to speak on all those reasons. These reasons have also been voiced in the State legislature of Assam recently. Let me make some clarification on certain points. In the S.R.C. Report I find certain things which are very injurious and damaging to the people of the hills. In paragraph 689 of the Report it has been mentioned that the demand for hill State is due to the influence exercised by the British and missionaries. They feel that even among the hill tribes has sprung up a sort of a new class influenced by the West which has lost contact with the other rural population. I think this statement is quite wrong and absolutely unfounded. Residing as I do among the hill tribes, I very well know that there is no class or caste distinction

as exists in the plains. In the hills we all feel like brothers and sisters, with no class or caste discrimination or anything of that sort. Actually it is a wrong conception. Whenever we speak of backwardness of people here and there it has become a sort of fashion to put the blame on the British people or Christian missionaries. This is a very wrong attitude.

Again, in Para 685 of the Report it has been mentioned that the demand for a hill State has got sort of a separatist tendency. I think that is a very big charge against the tribals. It is very clear from the memorandum submitted by the hill tribes that they were not asking for a State outside India; what they were asking for is a State within India.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA:
What is its population?

SHRI R. THANHLIRA: The population is nearly two million.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind it up. It is time now.

SHRI R. THANHLIRA: We should appreciate that the tribal people, who are mostly people of the hills, are to a great extent different in manners, culture and language from the people of the plains. The S.R.C. Report has also made some recommendations for the safeguards of the minority. But simply putting down these things in the form of recommendations will not do any good to the tribals, and will not safeguard their interests. So, Sir, whatever safeguards are going to be provided for the tribals, they should be put down in the Constitution itself, so that, the tribals may know where they stand. Otherwise what will happen? So many safeguards may be given to us by our Chief Minister, but when our Chief Minister is not in that office tomorrow, his successor may not remember all those things. So, I think it will be in the best interests of the tribal people, if these safeguards are put down in detail in the Constitution itself. Thank you.