

THE STATES REORGANISATION
COMMISSION'S REPORT, 1955—

Continued

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have still twenty names to speak, and I will call on the Home Minister to speak, at 4 o'clock. Members will strictly confine themselves to 15 minutes each.

DR. R. P. DUBE (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, yesterday I was speaking about the unfounded accusations levelled against the S.R.C. members and the work they have gone through in preparing this Report.

The chief topic of my speech was about the capital of new Madhya Pradesh, but I find from this morning's papers that the wind has been taken out of my sails, because I find that the Chief Ministers of the provinces concerned have got together and have agreed to have Bhopal as the capital.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So, you can save some time of the House,

DR. R. P. DUBE: But I would still ask the Government to reconsider the matter and as such I think I must carry on with my speech. Thousands of representations and evidences were submitted to the S.R.C. They were all examined and then the Members sat together and discussed all points before putting their decisions on paper. There is no person or body of individuals who can please everybody. What we should judge and appreciate before passing any judgment is the *bona fides* of the persons who brought out the Report. I personally think that those people who are not satisfied are the ones who can never be pleased whatever one may do for them. The Commission has done what they thought fair and good to all concerned as well as for the country. Had it not been for the terms of reference and had they known the trouble and the holocaust that followed the publication, perhaps they would have agreed to the views which are expressed in the memorandum that was

submitted by the Cantonment Board of Jabalpur, in which it was suggested that India should not be divided into linguistic provinces but should be divided into Six States, in which some will be bilingual and some even trilingual. After all, it does not matter so long as people feel that they are all Indians. I cannot understand the present mentality. During the time that the Congress was not the ruling power and before we won independence, they wanted to do propaganda among the people, and this propaganda could not be done in one language, because different languages were there in different provinces, and that was the reason for the Congress in creating linguistic provinces for its organisation. But now the times have changed and things have improved. We are now independent. I see no reason why all of us should not feel that we are Indians first and Indians last and try to live as brothers. Why should the Maharashtrians feel that Maharashtrians alone are their brothers and Gujaratis are their half brothers? They were living together as brothers all this time. Evidently they have become half brothers only since the publication of the S.R.C. Report. I personally feel that it is not too late yet. They say, "It is never too late to mend". I personally think that India should be divided into only six provinces and nothing more, because after all we are only discussing the question. The Bill has not come before us. In fact, I would like to have only five provinces. Southern, Western, Northern, Eastern and Central.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO (Hyderabad): If it is made into one, it will be still better.

DR. R. P. DUBE: Now sixteen or seventeen provinces have been created but still they are not satisfied, and I do not know how one province would satisfy people. It is all very nice to talk about it, but I think it is a bit difficult to act upon. Either you go to one extreme or the other extreme. I prefer to remain in the middle.

Now, I think that I would like to say something about the capital of Madhya Pradesh. I personally think—and it is not myself alone but the people of Madhya Pradesh and Vindhya Pradesh and everybody thinks that Bhopal is not suitable: Well, the reasons that I could give against Bhopal are the following. A capital is the nerve centre of a State. It is the centre of administration. It is the pivot on which all activities, political and administrative revolve. It serves as the epi-centre from which political, social, cultural and economic forces radiate to different parts of the State. The capital should reflect the cultural life of the State in its true perspective. It should have all the facilities that the complex machinery of a Welfare State demands. The people of the area should feel that their State headquarters is situated at a place which is most suitable and accessible to all and in the location of which most of the people give their support. The capital in other words should represent the cultural fusion of the area and should symbolise the political aspirations of the people concerned. The selection of the capital is thus very important. The decision to locate the capital appears to have been taken to satisfy politically the leaders of the two out of the four States. I need not speak about it because things have gone too far now. Still I cannot resist putting my point of view. To talk about Jabalpur and Bhopal, what has Bhopal got? Bhopal is nothing better than a Tahsil town. Barring the Lake and about ten or twelve bungalows where the officers live and the State buildings of the Nawab which are under his occupation, there is nothing to commend. It cannot claim to be the capital of the biggest State (at least in area) that is going to be in the Indian Union. The town has no amenities, not even proper sanitation or drainage, roads, parks or even a good marketing place. It is not even in the centre of the proposed State. About the availability of buildings, it has not even the plinth that is avail-

able for the capital. The available plinth area is only 3·5 lakh square feet while Nagpur, which it at present the capital of Madhya Pradesh has got a plinth area of 10—12 lakh square feet. I personally think that when the capital of such a big place is made in Bhopal, it will require at least 15·16 lakh square feet. That means you will have to build a capital absolutely new. They claim—I was told when I went round on deputation—that Bhopal has a lovely climate. I would like the attention of the House drawn to what is said about it. I will quote a passage from page 97 of Volume III of the *Central India States Gazetteer* (Bhopal State). Captain Laurd and Munshi Kudrat Ali say that:

“One most notable feature about Bhopal City is all-prevailing sand-stone dust, which covers everything—houses, trees and even pariah dogs with a red pall”.

That is the beauty of Bhopal. Let me tell you what the *District Gazetteer* says about Jabalpur City.

“The climate is comparatively good and Jabalpur is generally considered the most desirable of the plains stations in the Central Provinces of which it ranks as the second city.”

Speaking generally, the winter of Jabalpur is better than that of Bhopal and although the summer temperature rises a few degrees higher than in Bhopal, there is never any hot winds which we call ‘loo’ and it is very pleasant in Jabalpur after sunset. As such, there is very little to choose between Bhopal and Jabalpur. Historically there is nothing of importance except for the Buddhist Stupas in Sanchi. Bhopal is comparatively more recent than Jabalpur. The history of Bhopal dates from the 18th century. Jabalpur on the other hand is historically famous since the 9th century. It is hardly necessary for me to go into details in these matters as the existence of Tripura and Garha which almost now form part of Jabalpur are known to every Indian. Politically there is nothing worth men-

[DR. R. P. DUBE.]

tioning about Bhopal during the British time while Jabalpur has played a more glorious part in the struggle for independence, being the headquarters of the Congress province of Mahakosal.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: What about scenic beauty?

DR. R. P. DUBE: I will just tell you. Please have patience and hear. What visitor to Jabalpur can ever forget the famous Marble Rocks which is said to be one of the wonders of the world. It is surrounded by natural sceneries and has plenty of picnic spots close to it where one could go and forget one's worries. Compared with Jabalpur, Bhopal is relatively backward in the matter of industrial development. Large mineral deposits in the vicinity of Jabalpur hold out a good promise for future industrial development. It has 80 to 90 industrial establishments of all kinds—potteries, glass factory, oil, saw, flour, dal, electric engineering, telegraph, telephone etc., too numerous to mention here in detail. It is also well connected with roads and railways and has an aerodrome as well. In fact, Jabalpur covers the most part of the proposed State within a radius of 300 miles while Bhopal only covers 40 per cent. of the area—which proves that Bhopal can only cater for 40 per cent. of the population. Baster, the area where 45 lakhs of scheduled tribes stay is about 600 miles from Bhopal. Jagdalpur is 750 miles from Bhopal. Jabalpur has a water supply which caters for the needs of nearly 3 lakhs people that inhabit the place and in a short time it will be able to cater for more people at the rate of 30 gallons per day per head, even if the population increases to 5 lakhs. The Bargi project which is in the Second Five Year Plan and which has already been surveyed and will be completed in the next five years. When that materialises 10 lakhs of people can get water and as much water as they want. Medical facilities

are splendid and I need not talk of them. I will talk about education. What can Bhopal boast of? It has only one college—the Hamidia College which has just been taken up to graduate standard in Arts etc. We have 18 colleges in Jabalpur, 15 High Schools for boys and 7 High Schools for girls. We have colleges of every kind.

AN HON. MEMBER: In the districts?

DR. R. P. DUBE: In the town. We are going to have a University as well. We were having our University last year but they postponed it for the next Five Year Plan. There are 4,500 students in the College alone. There are 400 professors in Jabalpur. It is not a small town. But I cannot understand what my trusted great leaders saw in Bhopal. May be the culture of Bhopal. I am very sorry that I feel hurt about it—I say have it somewhere else, in a place which at least exhibits the culture of the province—not Bhopal, my dear good man—not Bhopal, my dear Sir. I am very sorry I am not talking in the Parliamentary language. You must excuse me, Sir. I say that I am very sorry for this choice.

(Time bell rings).

I think I have five minutes more. Bhopal has only two municipalities in the whole State with a population of 7-8 lakhs and there is a Tahsil in Chhatisgarh which has the same population if not more than that of Mahasamand. The income of both municipalities is Rs. 12,66,000.

It may be assumed that Bhopal may have an income of Rs. 10 lakhs at the most. But as against that figure, the income of the Jabalpur Corporation during the last four years is as follows:

	Rs
1952-53	... 30,69,810
1953-54	... 32,72,087
1954-55	... 35,08,510
1955-56 (budgeted)	... 35,92,430

DR SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Jabalpur has

already got a corporation, it is not a municipality.

DR. R. P. DUBE: Yes, and let the House see the amount of money that they get. And it will take another 20 years for Bhopal to become a corporation.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): My hon. friend seems to omit that in Jabalpur there is a medical institution known as Dr R. P. Dube.

DR. R. P. DUBE: Yes, yes and that institution is standing here before you.

Sir, the S. R. C. visited Jabalpur and Bhopal and made the suggestion about the location of the capital at Jabalpur after a spot investigation. I request that one of the members of the High-Powered Commission should inspect the place before finally deciding about the location of the capital.

In the end, I would strongly urge and humbly implore that the location of the capital of the new State may kindly be decided on merit and public convenience and not on political considerations inasmuch as it affects not only the people of the present generation, but also the generations to come and their children and their children's children.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are now coming to the end of this great debate, and as days roll by, the interest in the debate also is flagging. I rise to participate in this momentous debate because I feel that I would be failing in my duty if I did not put forth my views on this subject which is vital to our country, when we are going to embark on a plan of economic advancement.

Sir, one or two features have emerged from this debate. One is that there are two sections in this House, as well as outside the House. One section is of the opinion that there should be the division of this country, or rather the re-organisation of the States of this country, mainly on the basis of language. There is an equally strong

opinion on the other side, which is now gathering momentum that it would be unwise to reorganise the States of this country mainly or solely on the basis of language. Sir, those persons who claim that the only rational approach to the problem is to have the criterion of language, not only referred to the present day situation in this country, but in order to support their claims, they brought in ancient history and sometimes medieval history also. Those persons who were pressing their claims for particular territories even went to the length of suggesting that this particular area or that particular area was being ruled by a particular king in ancient times. Those persons who believed in the liquidation of the princely order, in order to support their claims now rely upon those very princes and their kingdoms. Sir, what is the ultimate analysis? Actually one feels hurt when one is told that the question of language and culture is only a guise, only a camouflage in order to press the claims for some other object. But if you look to realities, if you carefully go through the memoranda which had been submitted by the various contesting parties to the Commission, you will be struck by one thing. You will find that everywhere there is no talk or idea of giving away something, of parting with something; but always everybody came forward with demands, that he wants a particular territory to be included in his State. The question of linguistic provinces is not a new one in this country. This problem has been examined from the days of our freedom struggle and at that time those persons who are today quoting the princely order, they also relied upon the very weighty words of the Father of the Nation. The Father of the Nation wanted this country to be reorganised on the basis of language. Sir, we must always remember that decisions which had been taken in the past must have been taken on the political and social conditions existing at the time the decision was taken. After all the reorganisation of the

[Shri P. T. Leuva]

States is not a question of fundamental importance, that there cannot be any change of opinion subsequently, in the conditions of modern times. In the days of our struggle, the main consideration was that we had to weld together the people of this country. We had to forge the links between the people so that the strong organisation might go forward for the purpose of carrying out the fight. The question of administering the States in those days was not our consideration at all. For that reason it was necessary that in order that the people might be able to run the organisation in a better manner, in order that the solidarity of the various units in that organisation might be achieved, it was necessary that we must have States, that we must have the Congress organisations and political party organised on the basis, as far as possible of language. But the leaders even of those days never thought, never believed that the principle which they were enunciating in those days would be extended to this, may I say, though it may be logical, but to this absurd length. Sir, what is the basis for this linguistic demand? The whole idea is that the people who are speaking a particular language, if I may say so, the dominant language of the unit, those people only shall have the right to govern that State. There cannot be any other explanation except this, that in a State only the persons speaking the language of the dominant group shall have the right to run the administration, shall have the right to govern that State. This is one of the arguments raised by the proponents of the linguistic States, that the people must know what the Government is doing, that the people must know and feel that they have a share in the administration of the country. I can have no objection if people want to have a share in the administration of the country. But if we take this argument a little further, it would mean that in a State only the persons speaking the language of the dominant group have the right or

are fit to govern the country. There cannot be a more absurd argument than that. After all, we are the citizens of India and every such citizen has got as much right as any person speaking the language of the dominant group, to govern the country, to run the administration. But coupled with this argument of linguism sometimes the claims have been raised that we had a historical past, that our culture is the same, that it has affinity with these people and that, and therefore, all these areas should be kept together so that we might run our administration.

Now, Sir, this argument of the historical past is very dangerous because the memory of the past is revived. In medieval times, in ancient times, by accident of history, a group of persons speaking one particular language might have held sway over a territory and now they want to revive those very ideas; they want to revive this idea that at one time they were the rulers in this particular area and that they should again become rulers of this particular territory. Every time, culture and history have been brought in in order to press the claim of linguism. What are our aims? What do we want to establish in this country? Those persons who speak about linguistic States vehemently say that they are for the security of the State and for the unity of this country. I have begun to hate one phrase which has become very common in this country and that is, "unity in diversity". I feel that this phrase has done much harm to this country than any other slogan. Everyone who wants to press his personal claim, individual claim—it might be regarding a territory, it might be regarding culture, it might be regarding language—says that this is the culture of India and that we are united only in diversity. I would request the hon. Members and those friends to again read the history of this country. This country was united culturally not because of different languages. India had always one culture and one language. What was that language?

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: One language?

SHRI P. T. LEUVA: If my hon. friend has some patience.....

SHRI M. BASAVAPUNNAIAH (Andhra): Ample.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA:.....if he has got a receptive mind, I would tell him that India did have one language. I mean, the social and cultural heritage of our country is based on our holy scriptures and the Sanskrit language.

SHRI M. BASAVAPUNNAIAH: Never.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA: By merely saying "never", you cannot alter history. Look at the Telugu language. Is not this language bearing the impress of Sanskrit literature? Who was Ramanujacharya? From where did he come?

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Not a Telugu man.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA: Who was Shankaracharya? Look at the greatest philosophers and saints of ancient India. From where did these people come? In what language did Ramanujacharya write his commentary on Geeta and the Upanishads? It was one of the greatest forces.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: But then that was not the language of the common man even then.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order order.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA: Unfortunately, those persons who believe that their language is the best language in the country always bring in this argument that Sanskrit was never a common language of the country. Culture would never have flourished in this country unless and until the language was understood by the common man. It might be that in course of time we might have become uncivilised, we might have become illiterate. I might accept that argument but what I say is that the common heritage of this country and culture of this country is essentially based on Sanskrit literature, that is essentially based on the

holy scriptures of this country. Go to the Southernmost part of the country, Travancore-Cochin, go to Madras, go to Assam, the Northernmost part of the country, Kashmir, go to Bengal, go anywhere you like. What do you find? The highest form and culture and poetry developed in all these places not in any local language but always in Sanskrit. Otherwise, there could not have been any unity in this country. The Sanskrit language and the culture which flowed from that language always united the people. What do we find today? A Brahmin from Madras or Travancore-Cochin reads Geeta; he studies the Upanishads. Go to Assam, the same thing happens. I had an occasion to see a dance programme. What did I find there? I found the Manipuri dancers depicting the story of Radha and Krishna. The same story is presented by the dancers from Travancore-Cochin. Go to the heart of India, go to Lucknow; you get the Kathak form of dancing. There also the same story of Rama and Krishna, Radha and Krishna, is depicted. What was the basis? The basis is essentially our culture. It was not based on any territory. Our culture was always based on this fact and on the literature which our sages gave to us. What do we find today? We say that the Bengali language is the richest language in this country. Persons coming from South India say that Tamil is the best language in the country. The Marathis, the Gujaratis, everyone would put forward the same claim and in this fight we always forget that all these languages had one common origin, the Sanskrit language. Those persons who had studied carefully would come to only one conclusion and that is that Sanskrit was the only language which was accepted as a common language in this country. Today, in order to press our claims, we might say that our language has got a Dravidian origin but those who say like this might do well to study their own language and find out for themselves as to how many Sanskrit words are to be found in their own language.

CAPT. AWADHESH PRATAP SINGH (Vindhya Pradesh): More than 60 per cent.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA: It is no use laughing or smiling it away. It is a question of study. If you do not wish to listen to reason, I cannot help it.

I, therefore, submit that if this country is to progress, if this country has to make any contribution, then we will have to develop a composite and a synthetic culture. Let us forget this slogan that we want to establish unity by diversity or in diversity. I do not believe that diverse elements can ever bring about unity. Therefore, any claim which is based on the question of linguism is a dangerous thing. I am not a solitary man. This question was examined by the Dar Commission also. It appears to me that people have now started forgetting about the Dar Commission. Let those persons who have got any feeling for this country, those who believe in the unity of this country, go and study the Dar Commission's Report, especially the last chapter. The arguments which are being advanced in favour of linguistic States today were, without the change of even a comma, advanced before the Dar Commission. The Dar Commission examined every material which came before it and came to the final conclusion that linguistic States would give rise to group loyalties and territorial loyalties. In this country you cannot have group loyalties; you cannot have territorial loyalties.

SHRI A. S. RAJU (Andhra): The Dar Commission Report is not our Geeta.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA: It does not suit you but those persons who studied that problem have come to that conclusion. I might inform my hon. friend that several persons who were concerned with the demand of linguistic States were associated with the Commission as associate members and they were certainly the persons who represented the view-point of the particular States and they did tender advice to the Commission. After looking into that

advice, after considering the pros and cons, the Dar Commission came to the conclusion that it would be dangerous to the unity and security of this country if the demand of linguism is allowed any further sway.

(Time bell rings)

I have hardly begun and I am told that today we have got sufficient time even if we have got 20 speakers.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have exceeded the time limit by three minutes.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA: I know, Sir, but what can I do? The problem is so vast and the State from which I am coming is so vitally affected that if I am not able to put my view-points before the Government.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please take five minutes more and finish.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA: In five minutes more, I will not come to my problem at all.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We cannot help it. There are 20 speakers more.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA: Even if we have got 20 speakers we will be able to.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Every speaker will demand the same thing. Please try to finish by 10-45.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA: Now, Sir, the Dar Commission examined this question of linguistic States and they came to the conclusion that no State should be formed on the basis of language. After that, Sir, this problem was again examined by the committee which is known as the J.V.P. Committee. That committee in the year 1949 came to the conclusion that linguistic States were not desirable. That J.V.P. Committee's report was accepted by the Working Committee of the Congress, the foremost organisation of this country. Then again, Sir, the question came before the States Reorganisation Commission. That Commission also came to the conclusion that if the linguistic States are allowed to develop that particular

type of tendency which is visible now, it would be dangerous to the unity of the country. Read every line of the Report, and you will find the undercurrent that the Commission is not happy over the demand which is based on the linguistic principle. Wherever in the Report you go, you will find that the undercurrent is that linguistic States will do more harm to the country than good. The same arguments which were advanced before the J.V.P. Committee and before the Dar Commission were advanced before this States Reorganisation Commission. Therefore, Sir, the States Reorganisation Commission, after considering all these factors, came to the decision that language should not be the only criterion or the sole criterion for reorganising States, and, Sir, they had the guidance from the Resolution of the Government of India itself. The Government of India in its Resolution did say that language cannot be the sole criterion for deciding the issue of the reorganisation of States. My friends ask me, then why so many States have been formed which are linguistic. In fact, Sir, if you read the various stages through which the different States have passed and have now acquired that particular status, you will find that the demand for linguistic States arose in areas where the particular territories were not getting a fair deal. And, Sir, this is not my opinion only. I am supported by the J.V.P. Committee's report where they have observed so and especially regarding Kerala and Karnataka they have said:

"We also realise that some of these linguistic areas, notably Kerala and Karnataka, have rather suffered in the past from their association with larger multilingual provinces."

The demand for linguistic States arose not because a language was suffering, not because a particular culture was not being developed, but because the particular territories were not getting a fair deal and particularly because the Kannada areas were,

as a matter of fact, tagged on to a very large multilingual State and were neglected.

Now I come to the question of Bombay and I shall finish after dealing with it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: People who enforced discipline should not be indisciplined.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA: I agree.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Therefore please wind up.

SHRI P. T. LEUVA: So, Sir, my point is that the demand for linguistic States was essentially based on the backwardness of the areas and not on the question that the language was suffering or that the culture was at a disadvantage. There were three particular parts which raised the claim for linguistic States in this country. Of course Andhra was the foremost; second, Kannada and Kerala and the third was Vidarbha. The Commission, after examining the various issues, came to the conclusion—that chapter is very important and they have laid down a very fine principle—that where there is a composite State, that composite State should not be disturbed unless and until there are weighty reasons to do so. That is their firm opinion. They believe the composite States will do good to the unity of this country and therefore they came to the conclusion that, if there is a composite State and if there is no injustice done to any party, then the composite State should continue. Therefore, Sir, so far as Bombay was concerned, they came to the conclusion that this composite State of Bombay should continue because they found from their examination of the various factors that no injustice was done to any party, and the facts are there. Mahratta population in that particular area is 1,23,00,000. Gujarati population is 1,13,00,000. The revenue which is derived from the Gujarati part of Bombay State is round about 15 crores of rupees a year and the revenue which is derived from the Mahratta

[Shri P. T. Leuva]

population is 13 crores of rupees, but the expenditure incurred in Mahratta area is 17 crores of rupees a year while the expenditure incurred in Gujarati area is 15 crores of rupees a year. On the examination of these facts, the Commission came to the conclusion that in view of the fact that no part is being done any injustice it would be a wrong thing on principle to disrupt the economy which has already developed, because round about the city of Bombay the economy of Gujarat and Maharashtra has developed.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:.....
and Mr. Leuva supports that view.

Mr. Muhammad Ismail. Before he begins I may tell the House that it will be the Prime Minister who will be replying to the debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: At what time, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House will know the time shortly.

JANAB M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL SAHEB (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, under the conditions prevailing in our country, I am one of those who think that it is not desirable to reorganise the country on linguistic lines, to have language as the main basis for cutting and reorganising the country. No doubt language is a fundamental factor in the set-up of men's minds. Men are deeply attached to it. They have of course got their right to be proud of their language and to have every facility to develop the language and the culture. To say that they are entitled to some facilities for development is one thing, but it is another thing to say that States should be formed on the lines of the languages. It is not good, Sir, for the country, under the conditions which are prevailing here, to over-emphasise the importance of language and it is not necessary for the development of language to put such over-emphasis on the matter of language. Language is a factor which marks off and distinguishes a man from man. Sir, you would know that in the world

most nations are formed because of their particular language. It is such a factor, Sir, which distinguishes and marks off, as I have already said, one group of men from another. During the British regime it was fortunate, Sir,—though it might have been done by the Britisher unconsciously or for their own administrative convenience—that the several language groups of the people in India were thrown together and were made to feel that language was subordinate to the oneness of feeling, and that cementing factor, Sir, that has been forged during that regime ought not to be impaired in any way at present. But, Sir, it is really regrettable to see that the States Reorganisation Commission, though they have enunciated and put forward so many factors and conditions for reorganising the country, considerations, such as administrative and economic, financial viability and so on, in actual fact they have recommended the reorganisation mainly on the basis of language. It is the consideration they have given to one language group and another that has influenced them in making at least their major recommendations. I would have liked very much that though they have divided the country on the basis of language, they might have created one Southern State as has been demanded recently by a number of important people. Such a State might consist of Tamilnad, Kerala and Karnataka. Of course, Andhra also might come in and they have got according to me every reason to come in but since they were given their separate identity only recently, they, like new bridegrooms, might not like just as yet to give up that identity. Therefore leaving them out for the present, a Dakshina Pradesh might have been created out of the three language territories which I have mentioned, i.e., the territories of Malayalam, Tamil and Kanarese. It has got many advantages. It would have given a bold vision to the people and a broader outlook in the matter of nation-building work and it would have served, to the other parts of the

country, as an example of how different linguistic groups can live together. The Commission has indeed taken note of some such proposal as that but their proposal is not quite the same as I am putting forward. They have made mention—they have not seriously considered—of a Southern State consisting of the Tamil area and the Malayalam-speaking areas. Even there they are halting in their consideration; they are anything but thorough. In paragraph 309 they give very sound reasons for such amalgamation and for the creation of a composite State. But they are not recommending even the amalgamation of these two areas together. Their reason for not doing so is not really convincing. While they mention some of the advantages they simply say that the people of these areas have not welcomed this idea. They simply say that they have not welcomed it; they do not say that they have opposed it. Though there are certain cases in which in spite of the expressed wish of the people they are making their own recommendations, here the Commission has not made any recommendation. If they thought that this proposal had attractive points about it as they allege, they might have recommended the formation of such a State. They might have canvassed it and they might have impressed upon the people that such an idea ought to be given a trial. However, the Commission has come out with whatever recommendations they thought fit to publish. Though it is not desirable to divide the country and to reorganise it on a linguistic basis, the thing has been done and the Commission has given its recommendations. It has raised expectations in the minds of the people and passions have been roused. Now we cannot apply a direct check or brake upon the tide that has been generated in the country. It has now to be tackled in the best way that is possible so that the troubles and the controversies might be minimised as far as possible and the conflicts may be reduced as much as it is possible for us to reduce. And for that in reorganising the States care and pre-

caution should be taken to see that no bone of contention is left in the reorganisation. We must see that no room is left for future conflict. And when one examines the various recommendations of the Commission from this point of view, one has to regretfully admit that there are several loopholes through which the present controversy might escape to the future as well.

Now, taking the area in which I am intimately interested, I may say that I am a Tamilian having Tamil as my mother-tongue. Take the controversy between Kerala and Tamilnad and then take the dispute between Andhra and Tamilnad. I would very much wish that all these controversies be put an end to by forming a Southern State of which I have already made mention. Now, that is not to be. The people are not in a mood to consider that proposal at the present juncture. So the next consideration is that no future conflicts should be allowed by the proposals that are given effect to at present. For example, the recommendation of the Commission with regard to the Southern taluks of Travancore-Cochin has not been as thorough and as just as it might have been under the circumstances. They recommend only four taluks to be transferred to Madras. More important than that is the case of Devikulam and Peermede. Now, it cannot be made out at this stage that the majority of the population which consists of Tamils is only floating population. What do you mean by floating population? It has been proved by the last elections that the majority of the people there are Tamils. They have elected the Travancore Tamilnad Congress candidates by a vast majority. If it is a floating population which is on one day here and on another day in another place, how can these candidates get their votes in this place? So it is not right to say that it is the floating population that makes the majority there. It is not based upon facts. It has been a part of Tamilnad; it has contiguity with Tamilnad and historically also it has been Tamilnad all along. There-

[Janab M. Muhammad Ismail Saheb] fore in justice and naturally also it must belong to Tamilnad.

With regard to the economic advantages, really speaking the Commission has simply made note of what one party said, when they speak of the economic advantages which derive to the Travancore-Cochin State from this particular area. The real fact is that the waters of this area are really a source of trouble to Travancore-Cochin, as has been pointed out by my friend Mr. Abdul Razak, whose arguments I adopt but which I do not want to repeat at length here. As pointed out by him, the problem in Travancore-Cochin is how to get out the water from the valley bottom in Travancore and Cochin, whereas the problem in Tamilnad is how to get more water.

11 A.M. And all along Tamilnad has been asking for the use of these waters. Therefore it is of real benefit, solid benefit, to Tamilnad, whereas it is really a source of trouble, in many respects to Travancore-Cochin. Therefore, from every point of view, Devikulam and Peermede ought to have been added to Tamilnad and I hope that it is not yet too late in the final set up to include these areas in Tamilnad, so that it may not create any difficulty for Tamilnad in the future, thereby serving as an element of conflict between these two neighbouring States.

Then, coming to another point with regard to Kerala State, the States Reorganisation Commission has rightly recommended the inclusion of the Laccadive and Amindive Islands with the Kerala State that is to be formed. These islands are on the West Coast, they are almost adjoining to the Malabar District. All along they have been suffering there. They have no manner of facilities at all which any civilized nation would have been in possession of. They have no communications excepting the primitive countrycraft which ply between the islands and the mainland only during certain seasons. They have no medical facilities

worth the name and there has not been any law at all excepting one Regulation in that area. And they have been suffering and when they have been on the look out to enjoy democratic rights, it is not right, as being reported nowadays, to make them a Centrally administered area. As a matter of fact, I am one of those who think that the area that is being kept under Central administration must be reduced as much as possible. It must be brought down to an irreducible minimum and every section and every part of the country must be brought under regular democratic control. That applies to the Delhi State also. Delhi State which has been having the democratic right for some time now ought not to be deprived of the right at all, and particularly in the metropolitan city of India. The same consideration applies to the Laccadive Islands and also to the Amindive Islands. The people of those islands are all a homogeneous stock except a small portion of them who come or who are reported to be of Malaya-Indonesian stock, speaking a different language called "Mahal". But the vast bulk of these people speak Malayalam. They follow the Malayalam social customs and habits. They follow the *Marumakkattayam* law and in every other respect they are akin and they are the same as the people of the mainland of Malabar. They naturally form part of Malabar, and, therefore, I say the Commission has rightly recommended (*Time bell rings*) their inclusion in the State of Kerala and I hope that it will be given effect to. The people of these islands that is, the Laccadive Islanders' Welfare Association and Jamiat-e-Jajira have submitted a memorandum to the authorities pointing out how necessary it is for them to be amalgamated, to continue with Malabar and Kerala and it is very cruel that they should be deprived of the democratic right, and they should be compelled to go to Delhi even for getting small amenities.

Then, another question with regard to Kerala is.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time.

JANAB M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL SAHEB: Not even five minutes since I began, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No.

JANAB M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL SAHEB: Then regarding Malabar, there is one more point. The people of Malabar as well as the people of Travancore-Cochin have decided that Kerala State should be formed with these two territories. The Congress Committees of these two areas, as well as the Muslim League, have passed resolutions demanding that a Kerala State should be formed with Malabar as a part of it. Now, Sir, even such responsible leaders as Mr. Rajagopalachari and Mr. Kripalani have made themselves responsible to certain statements to the effect that the people of Malabar do not want such amalgamation. I do not know wherefrom they got this information. The people of Malabar, then as well as now, are strongly for the formation of a Kerala State with Malabar as part of it. There are one or two more points which I want to say

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, little did I imagine when this debate began that I would have to take part in it. I thought that I would have nothing more to do than to listen again to the views expressed by the representatives of the States and interests before the States Reorganisation Commission during its visit to the different States. But I find now that it will not be right of me to continue to maintain the silence that I had imposed on myself. I intervene in the debate not to reply to the criticisms of the Commission's Report or to justify any of its recommendations, but only to explain the principles on which it acted and to deal with certain statements reflect-

ing on the fairness and integrity of the Commission. I have just said that I do not intend to stand up in defence of the S.R.C.'s proposals. The members of the Commission were human beings. Like all human beings they were liable to err. They were conscious of the great responsibility that was placed on them and they strove their best to make recommendations that would reconcile conflicting interests and release the energies of the people for constructive purposes. They may have, however, made mistakes and if Parliament and Government putting their heads together can find better solutions of a lasting nature for the problems that face the Commission, no one will rejoice more sincerely than the members of the Commission.

Sir, I said, when I began, that my object in intervening in the debate would be to explain the principles on which the Commission acted and to deal with statements suggesting that the Commission had acted in certain respects from certain motives or under certain influences. But before I do so, I should like to draw the attention of the House to those recommendations of the Commission which have an all-India character. The formation of linguistic States. Sir, has been repeatedly asked for in the past on the ground that by creating greater contentment among the people, it would strengthen the unity of the country. But I am sorry to say that during the long debate that we have had on the Commission's Report, very little attention has been paid to those recommendations which bear on the creation and development of those forces on which the strength of the Union as a whole depends. Four or five Members did refer to those recommendations. But, unfortunately, the House as a whole has almost neglected them. The interests of the States that were championed by the Members seemed to engross their minds to the exclusion of vital considerations without bearing which in mind we cannot have a strong nation.

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

I found, Sir, from the report of the speech made by the Home Minister in another place that he referred to those recommendations at some length. I shall, therefore, not mention them in any detail today. But it is necessary to say that even if all the recommendations made by the Commission in regard to the reorganisation of the States were rejected by Parliament, it would still have to consider the recommendations made by it in the Fourth Part of its Report. It is necessary to give adequate attention to these recommendations and, I believe, to give effect to them to make people feel that they are in effect, as they are in theory, the citizens of one great country and to develop the forces on which the integrity of the Union depends and to create a stronger machinery for the development of the economic resources of the country. I know, Sir, that the Home Minister said in another place that these recommendations of ours have not met with the approval of the States. This is not surprising. But I may be permitted to say that it was not the intention of the Commission in making these recommendations to detract from the autonomy of the States or to reduce the power which they legitimately enjoy. The Commission was compelled to make these recommendations because, as a result of the examination of the problems entrusted to it, it found that it was necessary as much in the interest of the States as in the larger interest of the country as a whole that the position of the Centre should be strengthened. It is the independence of this country that is the foundation of the autonomy of the States. It is the strength of the Union that is the source of the strength of its component parts. It is necessary therefore, in these circumstances for the sake of the States themselves to give that power to the Centre. That would enable it to create those conditions which are necessary for raising the standard of living in our

country and drawing the people of the various units more closely together.

I hope, Sir, that when the proposals of the Government are laid before Parliament, we shall be able to say that the suggestions of the Commission bearing on this cardinal point have received adequate attention. Here again, I shall not say that the Commission has said the last word on the subject. After a full examination of the matter in consultation with the States, the Central Government may find it necessary or desirable to alter some of the Commission's proposals. I do not think that any member of the Commission will complain if any changes are made. But what I plead for is that the attention of the country and the Parliament should be directed first to those recommendations which strengthen the foundation of the Union. Those recommendations relating to the reorganisation of the States come afterwards, however important they may be.

Now, Sir, I wish to say a few words about the principles on which the Commission acted in submitting a plan for the reorganisation of the States. I find from the debate that the Commission has been supposed either to have ignored the main principle which it was expected to give effect to or that, while in effect it had created linguistic States, it had been unjust to certain States whose composite character it had maintained.

Dealing with the first recommendation and without trying to justify the individual recommendations of the Commission, I venture to draw the attention of the House to the Commission's terms of reference which were laid down by the Government of India, in their Resolution dated the 29th December 1953.

"The language and culture of an area have an undoubted importance as they represent a pattern of living which is common in that area. In considering a reorganisation of

States, however, there are other important factors which have also to be borne in mind. The first essential consideration is the preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India. Financial, economic and administrative considerations are almost equally important, not only from the point of view of each State, but for the whole nation. India has embarked upon a great ordered plan for her economic, cultural and moral progress. Changes which interfere with the successful prosecution of such a national plan would be harmful to the national interest."

I may as well read out another passage from the Resolution, because it has been suggested in certain quarters that the Commission went beyond its terms of reference in making certain recommendations. The Resolution that I have referred to goes in to say as follows:

"The Commission will investigate the conditions of the problem, the historical background, the existing situation and the bearing of all important and relevant factors thereon. They will be free to consider any proposal relating to such reorganisation."

Now, it is quite clear from this, Sir, that the terms of reference of the Commission were wide, and that it was empowered to take any question it liked into consideration, and therefore to make any recommendation that it thought necessary for the proper solution of any problem. In making its recommendations, however radical they might seem to be to some people, it cannot in view of the wording of the Government Resolution, be charged with having travelled beyond its legitimate province.

Now, Sir, I shall draw the attention of the House to the manner in which the Commission has interpreted its terms of reference. Analysing paragraph 4 of the Government Resolution, it says that the principles

that emerge may be enumerated as follows:

- (1) preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India;
- (2) linguistic and cultural homogeneity;
- (3) financial, economic and administrative considerations; and
- (4) successful working of the national plan.

It is obvious, Sir, from these things that the Commission could not have taken the linguistic principles only into account and proceeded to redistribute the States on that basis. It was enjoined to take certain other considerations into account, and indeed, it seems to me that the security and defence of the country, and the successful implementation of the plans for its economic development were given a higher priority by the Resolution than any other consideration. But it was said in the course of the debate that whatever the terms of reference might have been, the Commission has, as a matter of fact, redistributed all the States but three on a linguistic basis. Well let us see, Sir, what strength there is in this objection. Is the Commission responsible for this state of things, or did the Commission, when it set itself to work, find that the States had been so constituted that a majority of them were, generally speaking, unilingual?

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): And rightly so.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: My hon. friend, Shri Mazumdar, says "And rightly so." Well, I am not here concerned with the question whether the States as they were, before the Commission began its labours, had been rightly formed or not. I am here merely drawing the attention of the House to the state of things that existed when the Commission's investigations commenced. Taking Part A

[Shri H N. Kunzru.]

and Part B States together, there are 18 States at present. As the Commission was not concerned with Jammu and Kashmir, there remain only 17 States to which its recommendations apply. Now let us take Part A of Schedule I to the Constitution, and let us see how many States were unilingual when the Commission began its work. Out of the 10 States, Andhra, Bihar, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, and for all practical purposes Madras, were unilingual States. Andhra was formed before the Commission's enquiries began. You thus see, Sir, that out of ten States in Part A, as many as six were unilingual. Now, Sir, let us take the States in Part B of the First Schedule. Travancore-Cochin, Saurashtra, Rajasthan and Mysore were unilingual States. Now, in accordance with the Commission's recommendations, Saurashtra is to cease to exist as a separate State. But Hyderabad, because of its disintegration, would become a unilingual State. You thus see that the Commission was called upon to redistribute the States at a time when about eleven States were unilingual. It is not, therefore, correct to say that the Commission so redistributed the States as to create thirteen unilingual States and to punish the remaining three by making them or keeping them as composite. Well, Sir, Hyderabad was disintegrated. It was plain that the Karnataka and Marathwada areas could not both be tagged on either to Mysore or to Maharashtra. The logic of the facts made Hyderabad a unilingual State. I hope, Sir, that this will remove any misapprehension that may exist in the minds of hon. Members regarding the work of the Commission in connection with the reorganisation of the States.

DR R B GOUR (Hyderabad) : Why not tag on the whole of Bidar to Hyderabad? There are Karnataka and Marathi areas in that part ..

SHRI H N KUNZRU : I am not now dealing with anything else, or

justifying the recommendations of the Commission, though I could, if I liked to do so. But I am not going to involve myself in that question. I am dealing only with certain matters of principle on which the entire Report rests. The time for considering all the details will come later.

There is one other objection of a general character that has been urged and that is that whatever the Commission's terms of reference might have been, it was surely not asked to ignore the wishes of the inhabitants of an area. Can it say that it has acted everywhere in consonance with the wishes of the people? Now, the Commission considered this matter very carefully and while giving full weight to the wishes of the people, it came to the conclusion that as every State formed part of a larger whole, its wishes can be given effect to only in so far as they were not inconsistent with the good of the whole. Where the wishes of a small area conflicted with the larger interests, the Commission thought that the interests both of the smaller and the larger area compelled it to recommend a solution which should be on a broader basis than what was desired by the smaller area. I wish to read out the exact words used by the Commission in regard to this matter :

"Before we conclude our examination of the principles which should govern the solution of the problem of reorganisation, it remains for us to indicate how the different principles proposed by us can be applied to each case."

I have already pointed out how the Commission analysed its terms of reference but it had to integrate them and to apply them as a whole to every case. Now, dealing with that matter, it says

"The problems of reorganisation vary from region to region. It has to be kept in mind that the interplay for centuries of historical, linguistic, geographical, economic and other factors has produced peculiar

patterns in different regions. Each case, therefore, has its own background. Besides the problems of reorganisation are so complex that it would be unrealistic to determine any case by a single test alone. All the committees and commissions which have previously gone into the matter such as the Dar Commission and the J. V. P. Committee have rightly expressed themselves against a monistic approach to the problem. We have, accordingly, examined each case on its own merits and in its own context and arrived at conclusions after taking into consideration the totality of circumstances and on an overall assessment of the solution proposed."

As regards the wishes of the people of each State, specifically, it says:

"It cannot be denied that in a democratic country the wishes of the people of even small areas are entitled to the fullest consideration, but it is equally undeniable that such areas must be subject to some essential limitations. Thus, for instance, if the principle of self-determination were to govern the internal reorganisation of States there will be no limit to the possible demands for separate States. Every linguistic or every minority group might demand a State for itself and the wishes of the people could be swayed by purely temporary considerations. The acceptance of such demands would lead to the division of the country into a large number of small units. The wishes of the people of different areas as a factor bearing on reorganisation have, therefore, to be considered together with other important factors such as the human and material resources of the areas claiming statehood, the wishes of substantial minorities, the essential requirements of the Indian Constitution and the larger national interests."

I am sure, Sir, that the vast majority of the Members of this House will fully endorse the principles that the Commission had set before itself

and on which it tried to act to the best of its powers.

Now, it is my painful duty to deal with some observations that are likely to create suspicion in the minds of Members of Parliament regarding the impartiality of the Commission and its fairness. I am glad to say that these observations found no place in the speech of my hon. friend, Mr. Deogirikar, who spoke with a restraint worthy of the dignity of this House and of the importance of the problems that we have to consider. These observations were made in another place, but since they have been made in Parliament, it is necessary that the only person present in Parliament who is in a position to speak authoritatively on the subject should say something with regard to them. It has been said that, although the Commission came to the conclusion that Bombay formed geographically part of Maharashtra and that the creation of a separate Bombay State would not conduce to the promotion of national interests, it did not have the courage to say that it should be included in Maharashtra, and it is hinted that although it wanted at first to include Bombay in Maharashtra, its courage failed it subsequently. It has been implied, indeed strongly suggested, that it refrained from recommending the inclusion of Bombay in a unilingual State of Maharashtra, because of the political pressure that was brought to bear upon it. It has been said that a high Congress authority toured every province of India in May last and tried to canvass opinion in favour of a composite Bombay State. It has also been said that a meeting was held at the house of the Chief Minister of Bombay at which the creation of a bilingual State of Bombay was agreed to and that thereafter certain things came to pass. Now, Sir, I do not know whether a high Congress authority toured the country last year or not. I do not know whether any meeting was held in the house of the Chief Minister of Bombay to consider this matter or

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

not, but I can say with perfect confidence and with perfect truth that nobody dreamt of bringing the slightest pressure to bear on the Members of the Commission, and I hope that it will not be asking too much of the hon. Members of this House to believe that had such pressure been brought to bear upon the Members, it would have been completely disregarded by the Commission. Do you think that when the Prime Minister and the Home Minister of India refrained from interfering with the judgment of the Commission in any manner, any lesser authority could have dared to approach the Commission with regard to any matter? I am sorry that a canard should have been circulated tending to discredit the Commission in the eyes of the people as a whole or of the people of certain States. But since it has been circulated, I think it is my duty to make it clear that there is not an iota of truth in the allegation that the Commission ever came to any conclusion with regard to the State of Bombay except that embodied in that Chapter of its report which deals with the Bombay State. It never came to any other conclusion and it could not therefore have changed that conclusion under any influence whatsoever. It considered this matter, so far as I remember, in the month of August and then all the Members of the Commission came unanimously to the conclusion that the Bombay State should be bilingual. Let there be no mistake about it. I would like those who are slinging mud at the Commission are doing so knowing that their propaganda does not contain even a grain of truth.

Another statement that has been made is that the Commission was guilty of lack of procedural propriety and rectitude in dealing with the representatives of Maharashtra and Gujarat. The suggestion is that while the Gujarati witnesses were asked whether they would be willing to remain in a bilingual State, the Mara-

thi-speaking witnesses were not given any chance of expressing their opinion on this point. Here again I say categorically that wherever we went, we placed various alternatives before the people and we followed the same procedure when we visited Poona, Bombay and Ahmedabad. We did not discuss merely the proposals placed by the witnesses before us but we asked them to consider certain other proposals that might later on be regarded by the Commission as superior to their own proposals and this practice was followed not merely in Gujarat but also in Poona and in Bombay when the Commission met the representatives of the Samyukta Maharashtra Parishad. I am sure that those representatives of Maharashtra in this House who discussed the future of Maharashtra with the Commission.....

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI (Bombay): On a point of information. While the hon. Member is on this, may I ask him...

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU Will the hon. Member allow me to complete my sentence?

..... will bear witness to the truth of what I have said. Every person was asked whether in the event of the Commission not approving of the establishment of a Maharashtra State with Bombay in it would he be prepared to consider certain other proposals relating to the future of Maharashtra?

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: I would like to know, while the hon. Member is on this question and wants to convince this House, was any note shown to any of the persons or leaders of Maharashtra on this subject which gave them an impression about certain conclusions of the Commission and which subsequently did not come out to be according to it?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: That statement which was made, I am sorry to say, by the Revenue Minister of Bombay has already been replied to by the Commission and it has not

been challenged by the Revenue Minister of Bombay.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I think he has challenged it.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Will he tell what the challenge is?

DR. R. B. GOUR: I think he repeated his old statement even after the Commission's statement from Delhi.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: If he is so irresponsible as to do it, I don't know how to deal with him. Let me repeat, Sir.....

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: The Congress High Command is silent about it.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: What does the Congress High Command know about the procedure that we adopted and about how we came to any particular conclusion? How could the Congress High Command give any reply on that point? It is the Commission and Commission alone that can deal with this matter and deal with it finally and with authority. Let me repeat—I have already said that the charge that the Commission once came to, at one time, a particular decision with regard to Maharashtra but changed it subsequently is completely unfounded and I repeat it that the Commission never having included in its Report a Chapter recommending the creation of a unilingual Maharashtra including Bombay, that Chapter could not have been shown to anybody. We in fact, sat down to consider our recommendations only, so far as I remember—I will not be positive—towards the end of July. The report was written in the month of August and September. How could this Chapter have been shown—this Chapter in our report in which we are alleged to have recommended the creation of a Maharashtra including Bombay to have shown to anybody?

SHRI D. NARAYAN (Bombay): May I ask, when did the Revenue Minister see him last?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: So far as I remember, he saw me in 1954. I

have not met the Revenue Minister of Bombay in the year 1955 at all to the best of my recollection.

SHRI D. NARAYAN: I mean, the Commission—not you alone.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Look at the boldness of these people, who, knowing nothing about the procedure adopted by the Commission, are still nevertheless ready to fling a stone at it and to charge it with double-dealing.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH (Bombay): Suspicion and suspicion.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Surely the atmosphere in this House ought to be such as to prevent such people from throwing unfounded, or casting unfounded aspersions on a responsible body.

SHRI D. NARAYAN: On a point of explanation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not now.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Madhya Pradesh): But that explanation may be very important.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him go on. Dr. Barlingay.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Sir, all these attempts show a desire to wound or hurt, while being afraid to hit. It would be better if hon. Members came forward and said boldly what was in their hearts.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: There is nothing in our hearts, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: You will please allow them to say.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not now.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Let them say. Although more time will be taken, I beg of you to let these people say the worst they can say in this House where their statements can be challenged and definitely replied to. I

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]
do not want them to go about saying things outside which it would be difficult to contradict.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, what is it, Mr. Narayan?

SHRI D. NARAYAN: Sir, I only want to say that I never meant any aspersion on the Commission or on the hon. Member, Dr. Kunzru. I have the greatest regard for Dr. Kunzru and the other members of the Commission. What I meant to say is this, that I knew something of it for I heard it from the tongue of the Revenue Minister himself.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Have you any better information? If you have any better information, I want you to place it before the House and he may then be able to challenge it.

SHRI D. NARAYAN: I have only to give my personal explanation, that I meant no aspersion, for I have the greatest possible regard for him. I only gave that information so that the point which he has been clarifying may be more clarified.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is all right. He has said that the Revenue Minister saw him in 1954 and never in 1955. If you have better information, you please give it.

SHRI D. NARAYAN: I have not got any. I only intended that what he had been clarifying should be clarified better. I believe him fully.

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa): In this connection, it is better that I raise another point at this stage, if you permit me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: About Bombay?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Yes. It seems the Commission issued the contradiction through its Secretary on October 26, 1955, and I imagine that on that date, the Commission had no existence. Therefore I feel if any contradiction was to be issued, in all fairness it should have been issued

by the members of the Commission individually.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is a technical matter.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Members of the Commission?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is enough.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Mr. Hiray never said he met the Commission. He said only that a member of the Commission revealed to him the Report. He need not necessarily be Dr. Kunzru.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: My hon. friend, I am very sorry to say, is repeating the same unworthy allegation. He is not taking the responsibility for it like a man, but is saying it in a sneaky way that we still did that thing which we deny having done.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: We do not hold any brief for Mr. Hiray. Mr. Gour was only giving an information, that is all.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: As to the particular form in which this statement issued by the members of the Commission appeared, I cannot say; but the statement that was issued was drafted by the members, considered by them and issued by them. That is the reply. It was not the work of the Secretary of the Commission which, it is said, had ceased to exist. It had not actually ceased to exist, technically. In any case it was not the work of the Secretary, but it had been prepared by the members themselves.

I was saying that the last time that the Commission met the representatives of the Samyukta Maharashtra Parishad was in June last. And so far as I remember Mr. Hiray was not in the delegation of the Parishad that met the Commission. In any case, as the writing of the Report did not begin till August, how could anybody have shown any chapter of the Report to Mr. Hiray even if he

came along with the deputation of the Samyukta Maharashtra Parishad in the month of June?

Sir, I am sorry this point has taken up so much time. But I hope that in view of its importance, you will not think that the time spent in dealing with it has been wasted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You take your own time.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: The Commission has also been charged with having failed in its duty to present an interim report. It has been said that the Commission was asked to present interim reports and that it failed to do so. Here again, I request hon. Members to turn to the terms of reference of the Commission. This is what the Resolution says with regard to the submission of interim reports. It says:

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

You will see that we were not given a directive that we should submit an interim report. Government felt that we would probably submit interim reports. But the Commission, after considering the matter, came to the conclusion that it would be impossible to deal even with the broad questions of principle, without seeing the picture as a whole, and therefore refrained, and I think very wisely refrained, from making any interim report. Indeed, the course of events since the publication of the Report and the discussions in Parliament particularly, have convinced me of the rightness of the course followed by the Commission.

Now, in the end, Sir, my hon. friend the Home Minister speaking in

another place yesterday said that had not some unfortunate words crept in the Commission's Report, the people of Maharashtra would have accepted the Commission's proposal with regard to the future of Bombay city. I do not know what those words are; but I can say with perfect truth that there were no problems to which we gave greater attention than the problem of Bombay and the problem of Punjab. In a way, we took extra care to see that nothing was said in the chapters dealing with these questions that would give the slightest offence. Not being partial to one State or opposed to the other, there was no reason why we should give expression to sentiments which seemed to favour one community at the expense of another. We were not only willing, we did not merely consider it our duty to be fair to all communities, but were anxious that not a word should be said by us which would give the slightest offence.

Yet, the Home Minister said yesterday that some unfortunate words had crept into our Report which had offended the Maharashtrian. I have gone through the relevant portions of the Chapter on Bombay again and I have failed to discover anything that could give the slightest offence even to the most sensitive Maharashtrian. The real thing is, as was observed in another place, that the people of Maharashtra feel that although their representatives would be in a majority in the Legislature of the composite State, that majority will not consist exclusively of Congress Members. Now, Sir, was it any part of the duty of the Commission to propose the formation of States in such a way as to ensure the Congress a majority in the elected Legislatures?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): May I know what portions give this meaning to the hon. Member? Will the hon. Member kindly refer that portion to me?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Mr. Saksena.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I think my hon. friend's interruption has no bearing on what I said. What I said was that an observation was made in another place which showed that the opposition to the recommendation of the States Reorganisation Commission with regard to Bombay was based on the ground that although the representatives of Maharashtra in the composite Bombay Legislature would be in a majority, this majority would not consist exclusively of Members of the Congress. Well, it was no part of the duty of the Commission to form States on this basis. I hope that the Government of India will also not look at the question of the formation of States in this light.

Lastly, Sir, I come to one or two matters which concern the Government of India. In dealing with so important a matter as that discussed in the Report of the Reorganisation Commission, Government may not find it possible to accept all the recommendations exactly as they are; changes may be found necessary. It is desirable to secure the agreement of the interests concerned as far as possible but there are two observations that I should like to make on this point. While agreement is desirable, the theory that nothing should be done without agreement could be pushed too far. The desire for agreement should not go so far as to come into conflict with the larger interests of the country and any solutions that may be proposed by common consent should be of a lasting nature. They should not be such as to lead to greater trouble in future. I am tempted to make these observations because of certain things said in regard to the small States in another place yesterday. If the desire of Government for agreement goes so far as to compel them to do nothing contrary to what even four or five lakhs of people demand, then I venture to think that no reorganisation of States will be possible. No State or no group of people that enjoys any right at the present time would be prepared to give it up if it knows

beforehand that it will not be deprived of it without its own consent. I hope, therefore, that in dealing with matters, particularly those that relate to small States like Tripura and Manipur, Government will bear in mind the principles that I have referred to and the manner in which the Commission has acted, namely, so as to propose solutions of a lasting nature which will be conducive to the development of the States and of the Union from which the States derive their strength.

SHRI A. B. REDDY (Andhra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I congratulate the States Reorganisation Commission for having tackled this problem very ably. Their recommendations with regard to the abolition of the system of Parts A, B and C States and the institution of Rajpramukhs are highly commendable. They have rightly recommended that the linguistic minorities should be safeguarded. On the whole, I must say, this Report was well received by the general public and the dissatisfaction expressed here and there is only inevitable when a problem of dynamic importance has to be tackled. They have considered all aspects of the problem, the linguistic, cultural, administrative and economic grounds. Their recommendations with regard to the merger of Bellary, Siruguppa, Hospet and the sub-taluk of Mallapuram with Andhra is welcome to the Andhras as setting right the injustice done to the Andhras. The States Reorganisation Commission, after very serious consideration, have recommended the merger of these taluks with Andhra on administrative and economic grounds and to facilitate the control over the Tungabhadra headworks and the canal system. The Andhra State is vitally interested in this project and the hydro-electric works on account of the importance of these projects to the Rayalaseema districts and also as the only source of power and water available to Andhra. This project is conceived of as an insurance against the recurrence of famine

in the Rayalaseema area. The devastating famines in the years 1950-51 and 1951-52 are green in the minds of the people there. As everyone is aware, Tungabhadra project is the life-line of Rayalaseema as this area cannot be benefited by any other project.

Regarding the execution of the works, in spite of the formation of a Joint Board, work has been greatly hampered in the execution of the hydro-electric project and the high level canal. There is also the desire on the part of the Government of Mysore to change the area and modify the general concept of the area to be benefited by this project. This is also clear from the speech made by my hon. friend, Mr. Govinda Reddy, the other day. He said that out of the total irrigated area of 8,26,000 acres, 1,53,000 acres are in the present Andhra State without Bellary and 6,73,000 acres are in the Raichur and Bellary Districts. That is far from the truth as he has conveniently omitted the area to be benefited by the high level canal which will irrigate 3 lakh acres of land in Rayalaseema.

Taking the high level canal into 12 noon consideration, the project, according to the S. R. C. Report, will irrigate 6,74,000 acres in Andhra and 4,50,000 acres in Raichur which is now being added on to Karnataka. Even if the S.R.C. recommendations are not implemented, the irrigation in Andhra will be more than on the other side.

Then, Sir, regarding the hydro-electric project there, Sir, Andhra is entitled to 80 per cent. of the power because the capital outlay on the hydro-electric project between Andhra and Mysore is in the ratio of 80 : 20. Further Karnataka has already got control over the project and the canal system on the Hyderabad side as this area, Raichur, has been assigned to Karnataka. So it is but natural that the Andhras should have similar control over the headworks of the Tungabhadra project on the Southern side and the canals for the suc-

cessful working of the same, and this is possible only if the S.R.C. proposals are implemented.

You are aware, Sir, I may repeat again, that the Rayalaseema is subject to serious famines, periodic famines, and it has become a famine zone. To eradicate the famine the project was thought of and it is almost completed. They have also got one vetoing power by having control over the canal on the Northern side which has gone to them. So I request them not to vest a double veto in the Mysore State.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore): Whom is he requesting? It is not in our hands. You must request the people.

SHRI A. B. REDDY: I am requesting the Government.

SHRI CHANNA REDDY: He is requesting the Government of India.

SHRI A. B. REDDY: I may say once again, Sir, they have got surplus electric power and they are selling it to Bombay and Madras.....

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): To Andhra also.

SHRI A. B. REDDY:and we are badly in need of power for five districts of Rayalaseema for industrial development and for agricultural purposes. The water in the hydel canal is to be rationed to four districts, and we have no other major project. Our cry is only for the bare existence. So the S.R.C. proposals may be accepted *in toto*. In regard to the transfer of the three taluks of Bellary to Andhra, I appeal to my Kannadiga friends to be charitable and generous towards the poor famine-stricken area of Rayalaseema. They must realise that we are leaving 20 lakhs of people in their Karnataka area, and Kolar district which is predominantly a Telugu area and is also contiguous to Andhra. If my friends from the Karnataka area are not prepared to concede to our request, they must be prepared to part with Kolar and other Telugu areas.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: So you are prepared to part with Bellary, the three taluks, if you get Kolar.

SHRI A. B. REDDY: Then you accept one principle. If you accept one principle either linguistic or administrative, we must agree to it. We cannot demand as you are demanding both. As a matter of fact Kolar people are prepared to come over. It is evident from the Resolution of Mr. Govinda Reddy in the Mysore Legislative Assembly—they are also demanding. If not to-day they will realise it one day and they will demand it. So I only request my hon. friends from the Karnataka not to claim for two principles on the same border area, Kolar on the administrative basis and the three taluks of Bellary district that are now proposed by the S.R.C. to be merged with Andhra, on linguistic basis. They cannot blow hot and cold; in the same breath they are demanding Kolar on administrative and economic grounds and Bellary on linguistic basis.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: They are not demanding. The people want it.

SHRI A. B. REDDY: No, Sir, the people of Kolar are also willing to remain with Andhra.

Then, Sir, I come to Parlakimedi area on the Orissa side. This area, Sir, was given to the Orissa State when the Orissa State was formed in the year 1936, just to satisfy the whims and fancies of the Raja of Parlakimedi. In spite of the recommendations made by the commission that was set up to go into the question then, the British Government gave this area to the Orissa State. Now, though it is predominantly a Telugu area, we are not demanding it purely on linguistic basis. We want it for the successful implementation of our Vamsadhara project. We have got so many of our irrigation sources there, but the *ayacuts* are lying in the present Andhra State. There is no geographical contiguity for this area with the Orissa

State. So, Sir, we are demanding it only on this basis, and I hope, Sir, we will get that area also.

Then I come to the formation of Vishalandhra and I welcome the formation of Vishalandhra, Sir. I wish to say, Sir, from the floor of this House that the fears of the Telangana people, mainly of the uneducated and backward people that the Andhras would come and exploit them are unfounded. It is not with that intention, Sir, that the people of Andhra are demanding the formation of Vishalandhra immediately. We are anxious that our rivers, Krishna and Godavari, should have one control over them for the successful exploitation of those rivers.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA (Andhra): Tungabhadra also.

SHRI A. B. REDDY: Quite so. We feel that if these three crores of people are allowed to have two States, there will be a lot of waste by way of having two administrations, two Governors, two High Courts, etc. So the people of Andhra are united in their voice for the formation of Vishalandhra early. At the time of the formation of Andhra State, the people of Rayalaseema had similar fears that the well educated Andhra people would come and exploit them. Their fears were not proved in course of time. So I assure the people of Telangana that their fears are also not founded and that they would be well off with their brethren in the Andhra area.

(Time bell rings.)

Then I come to Raichur district, which has got Gadwal and Alampur taluks, which are predominantly Telugu areas. They are now proposed to be transferred to the Karnataka State. This is very unfair, Sir, and I request that they may be allowed to remain with the Telangana State, which will be merged with Andhra when Vishalandhra is formed.

Then there are other areas in Gulbarga and other districts which are

predominantly Telugu, and I request that they may also be retransferred to the Andhra area.

(Time bell rings.)

Just one minute, Sir. We have got other border disputes with Madras State and other areas. We have got border disputes with Madhya Pradesh. So I request that a boundary commission be appointed to go into these questions early and settle them one way or the other.

Thank you very much.

SHRI BARKATULLAH KHAN (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, there could have been some other time but this to make this Report public. Unfortunately the time chosen to make these recommendations public is very inopportune. The general elections are approaching very fast and knowing the politicians as I do, I can safely say that most of us as a class have gone out to play to the gallery. Perhaps there was no alternative. Either you play to the gallery or your rival plays to the gallery. Therefore it was more or less decided by the politicians generally that they will play to the gallery and in playing to the gallery this Report has only helped in shrinking the stature of provincial politicians to the bare minimum. This is one result. The Commission should have been appointed either by the Constituent Assembly and the matter should have been dealt with then and there or failing that I believe this Commission should have been appointed now and it should have been asked to submit its recommendations after the next general election when Parliament could have thought over it in a much more calm and quiet manner but unfortunately, as things are, this Report has brought to light many controversies. I hope that these controversies will die a natural death but at the moment the fact is that the Report has raised many controversies. The States have come down with absurd claims on their neighbours. They have come down with the idea as if they are

independent States and they have got the right to demand as much territory of their neighbours as possible to expand. This is our attitude and this attitude is very harmful and wherever the interests of any State are affected, that State goes out of its way to claim and to shout and to go to the Press on every little matter and to create public opinion here in Parliament. However, I have been one of those who felt that this country needed a very strong Government and that all our energies should be directed towards the betterment of our standard of living and not to waste them on silly controversies and as such I may just claim that probably I am the only Member in Parliament who has the distinction of not appearing before this Commission or submitting any memorandum to it. However, that is a different point. But since the Pandora's Box has been opened and since the controversies have come up, I want to take part in this debate only to put the point of view of those States which have got nothing to do with me. I would not like to be so bold as to come and plead for the case of my State because that will be looked upon as something very partisan.

To begin with, as Mr. Kunzru just now said, the States Reorganisation Commission had one idea in its mind and that was that the will of the people should be taken into consideration but I am sorry to say that the will of the people has not been taken into consideration in many places. In making its recommendations the Commission has not kept in mind the desire of the people living in particular areas. To illustrate my point, I would come to Himachal Pradesh. It is a small Hill State which has been recommended to be merged in the Punjab. It is a very simple thing. Anybody can come round and say that such a small State has no right to exist and therefore it should be merged but the Commission should have taken into consideration the desire of the people, the problems of those people.

[Shri Barkatullah Khan.]

and over and above, the resources of that State, whether that State is in a position to exist as a separate unit in the Union. As I understand, Himachal Pradesh is a State which is mostly governed by matriarchal system. If you are going to merge the area which is predominantly matriarchal into an area which is predominantly patriarchal, it is not advisable. Over and above that, the bigger unit is more educated, economically more advanced and, if I may say so, vocally more vehement; if you are not going to consider all these things, then you are creating trouble for the people who are being merged into the bigger unit. The second point to be taken into consideration is the question of resources. All I can say about Himachal Pradesh is that this State has got huge tracts of jungles. If you allow this State to cut these jungles, it can meet its own budget without demanding a pie from the Centre. But it cannot cut its jungles because these jungles exist in the catchment area of our rivers. If Himachal Pradesh is doing that much for the country as a whole, then I think the country has an obligation to support the State.

Now, I come to the question of Samyukta Maharashtra. There have been certain sources who have criticised Maharashtra. But allow me to say, Sir, that Maharashtrians have played a very dominant and important role in the history of this country and we have no right to doubt their sincerity and loyalty to the country. If the Maharashtrians demand a State of Maharashtra, I do not see on what grounds we could refuse them. We cannot satisfy the Maharashtrian people with a little State like Vidarbha. I would therefore humbly suggest after hearing the debate here and following the debate in the other House, that the time has now come when you cannot force the Gujaratis to live with the Maharashtrians. The Gujaratis have also contributed a great deal to the freedom struggle of the country and

you cannot force them to live with the Maharashtrians, nor can you force the Maharashtrians to live with the Gujaratis. Therefore the only reasonable and sensible solution is to separate these two States. Maharashtra should be separate; Gujarat should be separate. And as regards Bombay city, I sincerely believe that this is not the time to take a decision on it. Today the temper is very high; everybody is keen to have Bombay city. It has become the bone of contention and somebody has to come and deliver the Judgement of Paris. Let there be a calmer atmosphere; let the tempers cool down and let the people have some sense of responsibility and then we can decide the fate of Bombay city.

Another point that has struck me is about Bihar. The people of those areas proposed to be transferred to Bengal have been living in Bihar for a long time; culturally they are a part of Bihar but now they are forced to go and live with Bengal; I think this is not a desirable thing to do when you know that they are a part of one State and the wish of the people also is to live in that State. Why take them out and force them to live in Bengal? Bengal is thickly populated and these areas are also equally thickly populated and if you force these people to go into an area which is equally thickly populated there is no possibility of their making any progress and there is no possibility of bringing in refugees and putting them there. This is the most significant point.

Now, I want to make one suggestion about the Punjab. What do we want to do about the Punjab? I do not think our leaders have given any clear-cut indication as to what is in their mind. And not knowing their mind I feel rather reluctant to come and give a suggestion but I can say only this that if you want to solve the problem of the Punjab you have to solve it in a more humane way. You have to consider the question of bridging the

gulf that has started to form between the Sikhs and the Hindus. The debate that has taken place, the speeches that have been delivered and the part that the newspapers have played by encouraging the scope of controversies have gone a long way to stir up emotions and create an impression as if these two sections of the Punjab are not going to live together. We have got to think over this very calmly. Given an opportunity the Hindus and the Sikhs can always bridge the gulf. They have suffered; they have paid a heavy price. They have lived together and they can still live together. If you remove this tension which has somehow crept in, I am sure that the problem of the Punjab can be solved and I do hope when it is being considered my humble views on humane approach to this problem will be taken into consideration.

Now, I come to the last but one chapter of the Report which is supposed to be the most important. I refer to paragraphs 842 to 844 relating to industrial location plan. They say that an industrial location plan should be made and I hope that such a plan will come out soon because much money is being proposed to be spent by the Centre on new projects in the different States so that there may be no feeling that only those States which have already got large industrial undertakings get more assignments for new projects from the Centre. When this question is being settled, I hope Rajasthan will not be ignored because Rajasthan still claims to have some of the most important raw materials which are not easily found in other States. For example, in Rajasthan you will find zinc, you will find tungsten, lead and copper. The only problem that has come again and again before us in Rajasthan and the one stick that has been taken by the Planning Commission to beat us with is that we don't have better means of transport. If we do not have better means of transport, it is not our fault. You never like to develop the underdeveloped area and

you now come round and say that we don't have it. What can we do? I will suggest that when these things come for consideration, it will also be taken into consideration that there should be no major gulf between the two parts of India—the one which is industrially very advanced and the other India which is industrially very backward.

Now, coming to the last point—I am looking at the watch—it is about the language. About language I think this Commission has made very strong recommendations and those recommendations, if implemented, will remove the fears of linguistic minorities and will lead to very happy results. But unfortunately there have been occasions when certain regional languages have been ignored on one ground or the other. Take for example, Urdu. It is part of India. It lived in India, it is living in India. It took birth in India; it reached its highest place in India. And all of a sudden we found that due to controversies Urdu has been put as a very back number. Urdu is the mother tongue of many Hindus and many Muslims. It is not the language of Muslims. You find Kayasthas writing to their families in Urdu, the Muslims writing to their families in Urdu and Muslims like me write in Hindi, but that is something very different. The question is that a man whose mother tongue is Urdu is being made to feel as if he is learning a language which is simply alien in character and, therefore, it shall not be encouraged. My humble submission is that anybody who knows Hindi can also know Urdu as his mother tongue. They are not mutually exclusive. Urdu does not become absolutely a rival of Hindi. Far from it, Hindi has got on the top; Urdu is at the bottom, but Urdu has got its place in the country. Let that place remain for it. Those students who want to take Urdu as their mother tongue, may be allowed to take it. The facility should be given and I hope such arrangement will be made whereby people from U.P. at least will have

[Shri Barkatullah Khan]

that satisfaction, because in my part I hope my State is considering this proposal and it might be accepted

Lastly, I would say that the time has come when we should look within. Having spoken on these SRC recommendations, the time has come when a clear lead should be given and given very soon. Let not the whole issue be left in the melting pot for a long time. If it is allowed to drift as it is drifting today, I am afraid the controversies will reach a point where everybody will be forced to get involved into it, because your friends say something, your next door neighbour says something, your friends and relations say something. Either you contradict them or you accept them, because you cannot afford to remain neutral. Therefore, a time has come when a clear lead should be given and I hope a clear lead will be given very soon. We are looking forward to the speech of our Prime Minister today and I hope he will be able to give some guidance to us in this respect.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: Mr Deputy Chairman, I never liked this idea of formation of linguistic States.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before you continue I have to inform the House that the reply will be by the Prime Minister at three o'clock.

(Interruption).

SHRI J S BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): Will there also be a speech by the Home Minister?

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. The reply for the Government will be by the Prime Minister.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: and that we were heading for trouble. The idea of linguistic States indicates that two adjoining people talking different languages do not like to sit together in the same Legislature to transact business for mutual interest, mutual benefit. Each one wants to be separate from the other, because he feels that his own

language should be dominant in his own part and that his counsel should be heard by the people to whom he belongs. This separatist idea has been the curse of our country in the past and if we allow it to go ahead, I am sure we would be heading for trouble and disaster. Bombay has been a composite State in this country and there are many provinces which had such composite formation. The Gujaratis, the Maharashtrians and the Karnataka people formed Bombay State over a period and Bombay happened to be the capital of such a composite State. In fact, if we look to the city of Bombay itself it has got people speaking a variety of languages, including a language coming from South India. A large population from Maharashtra, equally from Gujarat and likewise foreigners have made Bombay a place of residence. It is a cosmopolitan city. And, therefore, it was unfortunate that the idea of splitting this State should have taken root and at least some sections of the population should have preferred to have it split into different languages. I am glad that the Commission have not thought fit to accept that idea, and though they have separated Karnatak areas from Bombay State I am glad that they have kept Maharashtra, Bombay and Gujarat together. In these days when the means of communication, transport and exchange of ideas are expanding, it is unwise to split big areas into small areas and make each State a small State. No doubt Maharashtra now gets Marathwada from Hyderabad State, but intermingling of different people, of different ideas, is an advantage, so that this country which has got a number of languages, people of different ideologies should come together, just as they come in this unique assembly, the Parliament from all parts of the whole country. It was unfortunate that even people speaking only two languages could not sit together and found it necessary to split themselves up into two Legislatures, one of Maharashtra and the other of Gujarat, and probably a third of Bombay City State. Sir I

do not like that idea and I have always felt that it is in the interests of both these people to have one bigger unit, as recommended by the States Reorganisation Commission. It has been suggested by some people that it was to pacify the fears of the businessmen that a composite State has been recommended. Well this is far from true, because the businessman does not want a small State. He wants to have as big an area as possible, so that trade and commerce can move freely and can have a better capacity for its operation. The businessman is not afraid of Mount Vesuvius. He is prepared to go there if there are prospects of profit and he is prepared to operate there in spite of the big risks that are involved in a volcano. And that is what you find even today at different places. He is not afraid of Maharashtra; he is not afraid of Gujarat; he is not afraid of Bihar or Bengal. He is prepared to go anywhere, where he can start his shop and do business. And, therefore, bigger the scope for his business, the better he feels and he is prepared to operate wherever it is possible for him to do so. Therefore, those who suggest that the recommendation of the S.R.C. for a composite State is in the interests of the business people or the capitalists of Bombay, I am afraid, are not telling the truth. They always say that it is for the sake of 300 business people that the eleven lakhs peoples' interests have been sacrificed. That is far from truth. The 300 people are not afraid at all because when some of the people from Bombay approached some businessmen, they said, "Look here, we are not afraid whether Bombay goes with this State or with that State. Wherever there is the possibility of business, we go there and look to our business. Therefore, we do not want to enter into politics. If you like, you can have Bombay or anybody else can have it. We look to our business wherever it is possible." So this idea of creating suspicion or class prejudices is most undesirable. Whether Bombay should be in Maharashtra or in Gujarat or it should be a composite

State should depend on the wishes of the people of Bombay. They can say whether they would prefer to have a composite State or whether they would like to give it to Maharashtra. And if they think that their interests are with Maharashtra or otherwise, I am sure nobody can prevent that. It is not the economic consideration, the investment of capital or even the geographical nature of the territory that should be the dominating factor in deciding whether a particular part should join with another part. But it is the wishes of the people that should be the guiding factor in determining to which area the particular people should belong.

From that point of view, Sir, I feel that the eleven lakhs of people who say that Bombay should join with Maharashtra are afraid of the other twenty-four lakhs of people who probably feel otherwise. Therefore they prefer the composite State. The composite State is in the interests of the Maharashtrians as well as the Gujaratis and the recommendation of the S.R.C. in regard to Bombay city itself is ideal. Though the Commission has recommended linguistic States for either provinces, I feel that their recommendation in this case has been very good. I wish that they had gone a step further. I would appeal to the Gujarati people that they accept the inclusion of Vidarbha also in their State so that that can become a bigger State. We do not want small States as has been recommended in the case of Vidarbha or Kerala. They are too small for anything.

Some people think that Vidarbha is a surplus State. Well, surplus or deficit State, is the creation of the Finance Ministers. If you spend a little and put more taxes, you can become a surplus State. But the real consideration in forming a State should be not to make it smaller in these days when means of communication are available, the aim should be towards making each State bigger and bigger and from that point of view, the idea enunciated by the Prime Minister in the Lok Sabha is an

[Shri Lalchand Hirachand Doshi] ideal thing for the consideration of this House as well as the whole country—dividing the whole country into four or five regions instead of having 18 or 16 States. If we have these four or five big regions at this stage, the idea of dividing them into smaller principalities gathers round towards each zone and each small region instead of looking for itself will look for the whole zone and ultimately for the whole country. That is the idea which needs to be encouraged and I am sure that, when we get the zonal area, we will certainly encourage the ideal, for the unity of India. For this reason, I feel that dividing the Western Zone into smaller units, that is, the Maharashtrian State, the Karnataka State or the Gujarat State or the Vidarbha State or the Bombay State is inadvisable. Our endeavour should be to make the State as big as possible not only to include Maharashtra, Bombay and Gujarat as recommended by the S.R.C. but to include Vidarbha and if possible, Rajputana itself, so that we can form a complete Western Zone, or Western State which will be a much bigger unit from the country's point of view.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: What about Mysore and Karnataka?

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: Why can't you do it? We welcome you. I am not objecting to the renaming of Bombay State. We will call ourselves as good Mysoreans as my friend, Mr. Dasappa is. I have no objection.

The main consideration is that we want a bigger State so that our energies will not be frittered away in small communal ideas as hitherto. Some of the Mysore people have been thinking about their little State and are unable to think about bigger ideas. I am sorry that these communalistic ideas are unnecessarily bothering our heads. We should think more and more on bigger lines, about bigger problems and bigger objectives in order that the economic develop-

ment of our country for which we have been endeavouring ever since our independence was obtained should be achieved. We should achieve that objective faster and quicker. If we divide ourselves into smaller principalities as some friends are saying.....

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I would like to know whether Karnataka desired to get out of Bombay because of your love.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: I am glad that my friend has interrupted in such a fashion. Karnataka has a desire to stay, but what can be done? But should we not think of bigger ideas? They do not like to stay with Mysore as well. Mysoreans do not want to join Karnataka because neither of them thinks of bigger units.

My suggestion is the forming of bigger States and I am glad that the Prime Minister has come forward with this idea, though he wants to start it as a cautious proposition of having Advisory Councils.

I am quite sure that the reaction of the smaller principalities—as recommended to be linguistic areas—has been so big that we have disliked thoroughly this idea of linguistic States. We want bigger States and still bigger States to come because in the past it was difficult to manage big areas. Then, the means of transport or communication were limited. Now we are expanding. Our ideas are not restricted to one country or two countries. We are thinking in terms of the whole world. In such a case if we are small States we can never achieve our objective. Therefore our endeavour should be to become bigger and bigger so that different ideas, different philosophies can be merged together to form one Indian State. For this reason, Sir, I dislike this formation of linguistic States, and I would strongly recommend the S.R.C. formula with the inclusion of Vidarbha as far as Bombay is concerned, subject, of course, to the approval of the people of Vidarbha or the people of the other States like

Mysore, if they are prepared to Join that State.

SHRI V. S. SARWATE (Madhya Bharat): Mr. Deputy Chairman I thank you for accommodating me. I listened with rapt attention to what the hon. Member of the Commission just now said which a man of his learning, longstanding experience in public life deserves. I would like to inform him, Sir, that if the hon. Members cannot refer to all the points or speak on all the points raised in the S.R.C.'s Report or in the debates here, it is only due to the shortness of time. Due to this shortness they have to restrict themselves to such matters as are extraordinarily important and vital. It is not possible for them to refer to any other matters.

Following the same principle, I would like first to submit that language alone can be the fundamental basis in the reorganisation of States. No doubt, there would be some other considerations also, but they would be minor. Sir, one hon. Member, who spoke before me, said that he did not believe in the slogan "Unity in diversity." He is free to believe or not to believe in that slogan. But the fact is that such unity does exist. For instance, we here come from separate regions, where people speak separate languages and their customs and manners are all different. But all the same here we are united in striving for the greatness of the Republic of India. This is unity in diversity. And, Sir, to say that there was only one language—the Sanskrit language—in India is a myth. There were different languages in India. No doubt Sanskrit was there, but all the same, people in different regions spoke different languages. If anybody has studied the Sanskrit literature, it would be clear to him that there were so many regional languages, and the saints and poets of the old days did their great works in their own particular languages. Democracy itself requires that every person should have his own personality, but all the same, he must unite with others for the progress of democracy. That is the

basis of democracy. Therefore, to say that language should not be the fundamental basis of reorganising the different States is not correct. The S.R.C. themselves have carved out fourteen out of the sixteen States on the principle of language. Let us take for instance Kerala or Karnataka. They have divided even a taluk, not only a district, but even a taluk, and have transferred it from one State to another, simply on the ground that there was linguistic homogeneity. That has been the principle observed in the reorganisation of fourteen out of the total sixteen States. Naturally therefore that has given rise to certain invidious feelings in the people of the remaining two States. Whatever logic there may be for such distinction, it does not remove feelings of distrust, because the people of those particular States are going to be very much affected thereby. For instance, Sir, a composite State of Bombay has been proposed by the Commission. Quite right. One may have no objection to that. But the point is that they say that they think that the long association of Gujarat and Maharashtra and their goodwill would make this experiment of having a bilingual State a successful one. All right. If this is the argument advanced for that State, apply it to another State also which is composite and bilingual, namely, Madhya Pradesh. Madhya Pradesh was formed as long back as 1861, nearly a century ago. Sir, there is no time. Otherwise I would have read out something from the Report itself in support of my arguments. It has been said that the money spent on Vidarbha people is not as much as spent on the people of Mahakosal. The S.R.C. does not find evidence for this allegation. It has also been stated that the demand made by the Vidarbha people for a separate State is gaining momentum. Therefore S.R.C. says they have given it to them. But that same argument could have been extended in the case of Bombay. The demand for a Samyukta Maharashtra has also been gaining momentum. But there S.R.C. do not accept the demand. They do it only in the case of

[Shri V. S. Sarwate.]

Vidarbha. I cannot understand why they have created that tiny State of Vidarbha and disintegrated Madhya Pradesh. That State has got a population of only 7·6 millions, whereas the population of U.P. is nine times that of Vidarbha. They have disintegrated the State of Madhya Pradesh and have created a separate State of Vidarbha. I think, Sir, that is not justified, and that is against all the principles which they have followed in the case of their other recommendations. In certain cases they have said that *status quo* should be maintained, as far as possible, unless there are very cogent reasons which affect the security and the safety of the country. But my question is this. If Madhya Pradesh were to continue in its present form, what is the danger to the security and safety of India? I am very sorry that I may have to differ in this respect from the previous speakers. But my submission is that if the States are moderate in size, they would be easy to be controlled and administered. A big State is very difficult to control from many points of view. The proposed State of Madhya Pradesh is 1,000 miles in length and 1,000 miles in breadth. Therefore, just imagine the trouble that would be caused to its people in attending the courts and other places in that big State.

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

Let us, Sir, see in this connection the map of the State of Madhya Pradesh. That would give us the real idea as to the difficulties and the hardships that would be caused to the people. It has a tiny head, a big belly, and very small feet. One will have to travel nearly five hundred miles or even seven hundred miles to go to the High Court. Just imagine the difficulties that are bound to be caused to the people.

1 P.M.

I submit that this new Madhya Pradesh will be the biggest State in the country, and in this State there would

be a great deal of difficulty for any Minister to control the authorities on the spot. In olden times the Secretary of State for India had to depend upon the Viceroy, the Viceroy had to depend upon the Governors and the Governors had to depend upon the Collectors. So, the Collector was the ultimate authority to whom the people had to look to. That was bureaucratic Government then and that would be the state of things again, if big sized units are now created. They say that there are difficulties in the case of Uttar Pradesh. It is said that it is a well-knit administration and so it should not be divided. If so, don't divide, but don't create another experiment of a big State. So, I would suggest—that it is probably too late in the day for me to say so, but all the same I must do my duty—that this new Madhya Pradesh should form two States. I would give the relative figures if these two States are formed according to my suggestion. One State will be of Mahakosal of which the area will be 1,30,000 sq. miles, and of the other State of Madhya Bharat. Bhopal and Vindhya Pradesh, it will be 78,000 sq. miles. The population of Mahakosal would be 1,37,00,000, and of the other State 1,73,00,000. The expenditure figures cannot be given as there are no separate figures for Mahakosal and Vidarbha in those of the present Madhya Pradesh. Even the Commission has not given any figures relating to this. They say, 'We are convinced' that there will be a surplus in the new Vidarbha State. My humble submission is that it is not enough for them to be convinced but they will have to convince others also of the justifiability of what they say, but they have never cared to do that. They say that they have no doubt that in the long future there would be a substantial surplus of revenue over expenditure. God knows what grounds they have to say so. As far as Mahakosal is concerned it is at present in deficit. That much I can say whereas in the new State of Madhya Bharat, Bhopal and Vindhya Pradesh the revenue would be Rs. 28·10 crores and the expenditure

would be Rs 28 48 crores, the deficit is only Rs 38 lakhs which can easily be met from cash balances or from any other source. So the best solution would be not the creation of a Madhya Pradesh as suggested, but two States, one Mahakosal, and other Madhya Bharat, Bhopal and Vindhya Pradesh. There are certain observations made by the Commission which I would take this opportunity to say something about. Mr Panikkar himself has made some of these observations in his note of dissent. It has been said that the bigger the unit the lesser the proportion of administrative expenses. This is wrong. The administrative expenses depend on the way you spend your money. I would say further that Madhya Pradesh as at present constituted would probably have the same percentage of administrative expenditure as the newly proposed Madhya Pradesh, because Mahakosal which is the biggest area, forms part of both. The proportion of expenditure in the case of Madhya Pradesh is 23.1 per cent the same as that of Madhya Bharat. So, even when Madhya Pradesh is made bigger it does not have a lesser percentage of expenditure. (*Time Bell rings*)

I would now deal only with one important point. The SRC says at one place that there is a consensus of opinion in favour of the new Madhya Pradesh. I do not know what material they have for this, but I submit that so far as I know, this is not correct. On the other hand there has been an opinion to the contrary. I will give you the facts. In October 1955 after the Report was published, the Madhya Bharat Pradesh Congress Committee passed a resolution in which they said that Madhya Bharat should be a separate entity. The Chief Minister of Bhopal was present at the meeting, because Bhopal comes within the jurisdiction of the Madhya Bharat Congress Committee. He was a party to this resolution. After the Working Committee's resolution had been passed probably in deference to that he moved in the Vidhan Sabha of Bhopal a contrary resolution supporting the

creation of new Madhya Pradesh. At that time in October he was against the formation of Madhya Pradesh. Then I have before me a summary of the proceedings of the Madhya Bharat Legislature, and from this summary it is clear—this was after the resolution of the Working Committee and the Working Committee and the Congress desired and the Constitution also wants that every man should express his views freely—that 36 people spoke against the formation of new Madhya Pradesh while 28 spoke in favour. Of these 23 were of the Congress Party. Thus a majority of the members were in favour of the retention of Madhya Bharat. So, the observation of the Commission that there has been a consensus of opinion in favour of the creation of Madhya Pradesh is, as these facts show, without foundation.

SHRI S PANIGRAHI (Orissa) Mr Vice Chairman I should congratulate the Commission for certain important and essential changes proposed in the Report. The changes are done in the interest of the solidarity, unity, harmony, peace and progress of India and we welcome them. Among the important observations are the abolition of Part C States and the constitution of one class of States throughout India. Equally important is the abolition of Rajpramukhs. We also welcome the breaking up of the Part B States and the disintegration of the Hyderabad State. We welcome the decision that these areas are being integrated in the neighbouring Part A States on linguistic and other principles. The motion under discussion now relates to one of historic measure of recent times affecting vitally the life, hopes and aspirations of the entire Indian nation. We have been advised to take caution to realize the unity, security and the oneness of the Indian nation. I had the opportunity to see some of the cartoons in the journals. Those cartoons in the papers have suggested that there will be large scale resentment on the provisions and disorderliness in the society throughout the country for which security measures are being taken. Some people are apprehensive about the heat

[Shri S. Panigrahi.]
that may be produced in the course of these discussions but on my part I am not at all apprehensive, much less afraid, of the situation that may arise out of the discussion. In such a cold weather and when some parts of India are affected by cold waves causing anxiety and concern to the Central Ministries, it will not be harmful in any way to have some heat generated here or there. It will provide some warmth in our attitude in the long run. But coming to the Report itself, I submit that we, the people of Orissa have received the Report with a rude shock, surprise and disappointment. The problem of redrawing the map of Orissa State has been completely ignored and overlooked by the Commission.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: And with cold douche also

SHRI S. PANIGRAHI: The question has not received any attention of the Commission. Before going into details, if one looks into the Report itself, it will be found how summarily it has been disposed of. The whole problem of Orissa has been disposed of only on three pages and that too, after considering the problems of all other States—the neighbouring States of Bihar, Bengal, Andhra and such other States. When any question is discussed at such a late stage, when there is no chance of giving any proper consideration, the problem neither can be considered in a dispassionate manner nor any just decision can be given. The Commission seems to have come to the conclusion, after being pre-occupied with all the thoughts relating to other States and having formed decisive ideas about them. I am not hereby blaming the Commission. The members of the Commission are established personalities of high status, reputation, goodwill, impartiality and integrity. They are broad in mind not to be influenced by any sense of parochialism but I am unable to appreciate the manner and the mode in which the matters have been dealt with with regard to Orissa. Before going to any general comments, I

should directly come to some areas of Madhya Pradesh which reasonably should have been integrated into Orissa, namely, Phuljhar, Deobhog and Bastar. I am pained to state that the Commission in para. 745 should have said that the popular opinion was opposed in Madhya Pradesh to Orissa's claim on the Oriya-speaking areas. Nothing could be more untrue than this. If the two Members of the Commission have cared to refer to some portions of the O'Donnell Committee's report, they would not have come to this conclusion. In para. 46 it has been mentioned:

"The Zamindar of Phuljhar, a Raj Gond by origin, is against the inclusion of Phuljhar in a Province of Orissa, and alleged that the people wished to remain in the Central Provinces with which by communications and trade the zamindari was more closely connected. A Muhammedan Malguzar and a cultivator gave evidence to the same effect. The Oriyas produced some fifteen witnesses who supported their claim, but with two exceptions all these witnesses were Oriyas etc."

I don't want to read out the whole para. In another para. it has been mentioned that the Deputy Commissioner of that time wrote a letter to his higher authorities in which he mentioned that:

"I have personal knowledge only about the western boundary of Orissa. On the western boundary Phuljhar is certainly more an Oriya-speaking country than Hindi-speaking. It is my personal knowledge that over 100 witnesses from Phuljhar stayed at Sambalpur for about a week waiting to give evidence before the Orissa Committee. (O'Donnell Committee was called so). When about 15 of them were examined by the Committee, it gave them the impression that their claim was accepted and they said so in the garden party which was given by the Raja of Borasambar. I can also personally testify to the strength of their feeling as I was interpreting their evidence which was given in

Oriya to the Committee. In my opinion the proposal to exclude Phuljhar is not fair to the people of Phuljhar."

I don't want to go into the details of the Census Report because I am conscious of the limitation of the time. I want to submit before you two important observations with regard to the Phuljhar area of Madhya Pradesh. One is by Mr. Chitnavis, Deputy Commissioner of Sambalpur in 1904. He says:

"The fusion of the Oriya-speaking people will not, however, be as complete as the Government of India seem to think. There will still be left under the C. P. Government scattered divisions of Oriyas with an aggregate population of 196,010 according to the Census figures of 1901 distributed as under:

Phuljhar	..	45,772
Raigarh	...	26,239
Sarangarh	...	19,176
Raipur	...	26,433
Bastar	..	18,390"

Another gentleman Mr. Andrew Fraser, Lt. Governor of Bengal, in the same year expressed his views as follows:

"The greatest administrative inconvenience has been experienced inasmuch as there is no other part in the Central Provinces where Oriya is spoken. The people in the interior know Oriya and do not know Hindi. They stand by their mother-tongue, and they felt the pressure which was brought to bear upon them to adopt Hindi as a great grievance and oppression."

Even the present Finance Minister Shri C. D. Deshmukh of the Government of India, while settling the Phuljhar Zamindari in 1931 observed as follows:

This can be found out from the Census Report of 1931, Volume 12, C. P. and Berar, Part I:

"In Phuljhar there is just a trace of Bhoinas, who are credited to have been the builders of some of the ancient forts now in ruins (like the

one at Pirda) but there is a substantial stratum of other aboriginals such as Binhjwars and Konds and a large proportion of the semi-aboriginal tribes like the Gonds, Saoras and Gandas. The bulk of the population, however, consists of Uria and Daria (Chhatisgarh) immigrants, the most important of whom are Kultas from Sambalpur and Agharias from Chandrapur and Sarangarh. It is principally the industry and enterprise of these last two castes that has made Phuljhar the flourishing tract it is today."

I have mentioned this because the Kultas and Agharias are part and parcel of Bolanghir and Sambalpur communities. These extracts from these documents will clearly show how the Commission did not care to examine or scrutinise all these things in detail and they gave their observations as passing remarks and ignored the claim of Orissa.

Then I want to submit to the House that there is the Sankara area and that area even now is within the postal jurisdiction of Orissa. The postal work in Sankara villages, Deobhog and Bindra-Nawagarh are conducted from Titilagarh. There is little of road communication with Madhya Pradesh. But there is a very good road connection for these areas of Phuljhar with those of Bargarh and Kalahandi district of Orissa. It would be unfair to the people and unfortunate for the Government if all these undeveloped areas are left under the jurisdiction of a Government which covers practically one-sixth of India, and Madhya Pradesh is about a sixth of India.

Now I come to another area, namely, South Bastar between the rivers Saberi and Indravati which is now in Madhya Pradesh and for which Andhra has put forth a claim.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): You have to wind up now, you have only a minute or two more.

SHRI S. PANIGRAHI: Very well, Sir. In paragraph 480 of the Report

[Shri S Panigrahi.]

it is said that they would concede the claim of Andhra to Bastar if Andhra's claim to Koraput is conceded. So, they have admitted that the question of Bastar is similar to that of Koraput. But my submission is that when the claim of Andhra for Koraput has been rejected by the Commission and when it has been retained in Orissa, because of Orissa's claims, Bastar should have been conceded in favour of Orissa.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI H C MATHUR): It is time. That will do the time is over

SHRI S PANIGRAHI: I will finish in a minute. I will just refer to Singhbhum, Seraikella and Kharsawan. If the relationship of a king with another king decides the nationality of the people of these areas, then my cause stands greater chance of being accepted. It has been mentioned that some of the rulers of Seraikella were related to the Porahat Raj family. It is a question of past history. We have Rajas in Orissa now who are intimately even today related to the Seraikella family. As regards Singhbhum, I beg to submit that it has been put forward on the plea of the demand for Jharkhand that Singhbhum should be allowed to remain in Bihar. But on the same principle, Singhbhum should come to Orissa, because in Orissa the population of the Ho community is greater and they will be in a contiguous area. The tribal people in Orissa are greater in number and the Government of Orissa takes greater care for the improvement of the tribal areas. As an example, I may mention that in spite of having a large number of tribals in Bihar, they have no Minister in their cabinet who belongs to the tribal family. But in Orissa one of the Ministers himself belongs to a tribal family and he is very much interested in the uplift of these tribal people. On all these grounds I want that Sadar subdivision of Singhbhum at least should come to Orissa. I do not here want to refute some of the charges and allegations and observations made against Orissa or against

the case of Orissa. There is no time for it. So I would conclude now.

SHRI R. C. GUPTA (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I am really thankful to you for giving me this opportunity after all, which I get most probably, because I will act like a stop-gap, since there seems to be no one else in the House who has not spoken.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): No, there are.

SHRI R. C. GUPTA: Well, I would like to take this opportunity to speak on this motion because I have to say certain things on which I feel very strongly. I would have saved the time of the House by not speaking, if I did not feel very strongly on certain matters. The time is short and so I would not like to go into the matters which have so far been touched upon by the various hon. Members of this House.

I particularly would refer to the Note of Dissent of Sardar Panikkar, and to certain observations contained in that Note. The insinuations in that Note so far as my State is concerned is that it has a dominating voice and the other States should be afraid of this influence and therefore, the integrity of this State must be broken up. Another undeserved, unpatriotic and most unsavoury and incorrect statement that has been made in that Note is with regard to the hill people of my State, and they have been styled "nomadic". I do not know wherefrom Sardar Panikkar got these ideas. In this very House, Sir, there are three hon. Members who have come from these hill areas. The foremost Member from this hill area is the Home Minister Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant. Another is Mr. Bisht and the third is Mr. Tamta. So there are three hon. Members from this hill area and they are very respected Members and they occupy very high positions in life, so far as the Uttar Pradesh is concerned and one of them so far as the whole country is concerned. How could Sardar Panikkar say that they are nomadic or that they belong to that

tribe? As to where he got this idea he has not mentioned, nor has he given any reason or authority in support of that statement.

With regard to the other accusations that U.P. is dominating and, therefore, it should be divided, I take equally strong objection. As a matter of fact the genesis of the formation of this Commission was the demand for reorganisation in the South. U.P. never demanded any reorganisation. As a matter of fact, several States in North India did not clamour for any division or reorganisation of States. The demand came from the South and it was on account of the quarrels and the differences in the South that previously Andhra was separated from Madras; still, the quarrels went on, the differences grew and, as a result thereof, this Commission was appointed. This is one of the main reasons why this Commission was appointed. If the reasons are these that if people quarrel amongst themselves and they cannot be settled and if division is to take place to satisfy such persons the division of bigger families which have been living peacefully and quietly and without doing any harm or injury to others be also resorted to, then of course this position is quite correct. So far as U.P. is concerned, U.P. has been one indivisible whole for a very very long time. Sardar Panikkar has said that the process of integration of U.P. commenced in the year 1775. Well, this may be said to be a fact so far as latter portion of the history of U.P. is concerned. From time immemorial, from the ancient times, U.P. was one and it was a bigger U.P., bigger than what it is today. So, to say that integration of U.P. began in the year 1775 is not quite correct. Let us admit for a moment that it is correct; even then, near about 175 years have elapsed and we have been living peacefully and quietly without doing any harm to any State in the country. The only reason that Sardar Panikkar gave is that there is a suspicion in the minds of the people that U.P. might use its votes in the determination of matters in the

Parliament to the prejudice of other States. Has he got any justification for this statement? The U.P. people have been in the Parliament for a long time now. Could he cite one instance when they have voted on the ground that they belong to U.P.? Have they not voted with the Party? Have they not looked to the interests of the country as a whole? Could he give one instance which might even suggest in the remotest degree that U.P. has ever voted against the interests of the country? I therefore, wish to repudiate these charges which he has levelled against the inhabitants of U.P. I may cite some instances on this matter, U.P., as a matter of fact, has been a place where everybody has found accommodation

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): A congenial home.

SHRI R. C. GUPTA: As a matter of fact, the complaint of the U.P. people has been that U.P. has been the dumping ground from all sides. This can be justified not by the mere statement of mine but also by the statement of the present Chief Minister of U.P. Even today you will find that the Vice-Chancellors of four out of the five Universities are from outside U.P. In the Lucknow University, Dr. Radha Kamal Mookerji is the Vice-Chancellor. He is the brother of our revered friend, Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji. He is a Bengali, coming from Bengal. In Agra University, Mr. Mahajan is the Vice-Chancellor. He is a Marathi from Bombay. In the Allahabad University, Mr. Jha is the Vice-Chancellor at the present moment and he comes from Gujarat. His predecessor was Mr. Banerjee who came from Bengal and his predecessor was Shri Bhattacharyya who also came from Bengal. Now, coming to Banaras University, Dr. Ramaswami Ayyar is the Vice-Chancellor and he comes from the South. Aligarh is the only University which has a Vice-Chancellor from U.P. If you examined other positions, the high offices of U.P., you will find that there also the position is the same. The I.G. of Police was

[Shri R. C. Gupta.]

a Bengali up to this time of course, lately Mr. Mathur has come and taken over charge on the retirement of Mr. Lahiri, a Bengali gentleman. The Chief Justice of Allahabad High Court was a Bengali, Mr. Malik. The Director of Public Health and Medical Services was also a Bengali, Mr. Banerjee. In these circumstances, I do not know from where this notion came? At least I cannot say. U.P. has never, for a moment thought on the lines of provincialism or casteism. Therefore, the charge against U.P. on this ground is baseless.

U.P. is one of those Provinces—and U.P. is proud of that—which has sent two persons to Parliament—they are Ministers in the Central Cabinet—who are not residents of U.P. They are Maulana Azad and Dr. Keskar. Maulana Azad comes from Bengal and Dr. Keskar comes from Madhya Bharat. Both of them have been elected from U.P. and U.P. is proud of them. U.P. does not repent for it. Even if there are a dozen people like that i.e., persons of eminence, U.P. is prepared to elect them.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: That shows your hospitality.

SHRI R. C. GUPTA: The only fault of the people of U.P. is that they are not vocal. They do not raise their voice of protests on these minor matters. Even in the first Five Year Plan and the proposed second Five Year Plan, what is the position assigned to U.P.? If you look to the population, if you look to the area,—if you look at it from any point of view that you like—the amounts that had been given to U.P. are much too small in comparison to what had been given to other States. U.P. has never complained; U.P. has never grudged the amounts given to other States. U.P. might have demanded more for its own development but that is a different matter. Let us go a little further, and examine what the position of U.P. is in the matter of the River Valley Projects, and in the matter of the all-

India institutions. Not one, out of the 24 or 25 All-India institutions that had been established all over the country has been established in U.P. Not one of the river valley projects that had been established in the country had been established so far in U.P. excepting the Rihand Dam which is one of the projects to be taken up in the Second Five Year Plan. This project would benefit not only U.P. but also Bihar and Vindhya Pradesh.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: So far as I know, the Drug Research Institute is located in Lucknow.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Because we are sickly.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: I have been there.

SHRI R. C. GUPTA: Yes, that is there but you can't call it an all-India Institute because it is manned by one or two persons and the head of this institution is also a Bengali.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): The unkindest cut is from Bengal.

SHRI R. C. GUPTA: Another grievance of Mr. Panikkar is that the State is very big. That is correct but all sorts of epithets had been used by some of the Members of this House against U.P. Some gentlemen called it a monster; others called it an elephant, others have called it a giant and so on and so forth. If really it is a monster it must be dissected and cut to pieces. I may tell you, Sir, that I do not hold any brief for U.P. or any other State, but I hold brief for myself and I am prepared to say this.....

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: It is benevolent monster

SHRI R. C. GUPTA: If you say benevolent monster I can agree with you, but if it is really a monster, it is a man-eater, as is suggested to be, because everybody is afraid of it—nobody is afraid of a benevolent monster—then of course it must be cut to pieces. This seed of poison, of U.P. being a monster, is being inject-

ed into the body politic of U.P. so that there may be a tendency of separatism there also which did not exist so far. Because the people find that the people of U.P. are not fighting amongst themselves when everybody else is fighting even for small matters, for a village, for a *tehsil* or for a district, because U.P. is not fighting for anything, the idea is that this poison should also enter into U.P. What I wish to submit is this that U.P. has never had this monstrosity against any other State. There has never been any occasion before. Now if you look to the area, U.P. comes fourth. There is no complaint so far as that matter is concerned. U.P. in the matter of population only comes at the top. This is not the fault of U.P. If the population has grown at a rapid pace, then nobody can complain. It is possible—because population is a very potent factor—that there may be an epidemic tomorrow and half of U.P. might be washed away. Then in that case what will they do? Will they unite again the area they are now going to separate? What will happen if the population goes down? Now Madhya Pradesh is going to be the biggest State in area. Supposing the growth of population there is very large or some people from the neighbouring places go and occupy Madhya Pradesh and the population there rises to 8 crores or 9 crores, would you like to divide again Madhya Pradesh? So population is a variable factor.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): You have to wind up. You have already taken 15 minutes.

SHRI R. C. GUPTA: Shall I stop?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): If you have anything important to say just have a few minutes more.

SHRI R. C. GUPTA: I think I am saying all important things. From my point of view this is a very important matter and I will say a few words more. The Commission has laid down in paragraph 93 of the Report four principles for reorganisation of States. U.P. does not satisfy all those four con-

ditions and therefore no question of the division of U.P. arises. The fifth and the most important condition is the demand from the public. The two Members whose report is the majority report have completely repudiated the charge that there is any demand whatsoever for division of U.P. Now the people do not want division. Conditions specified for division do not exist. Then on what grounds are you intending to divide U.P.?

Then one more point and I finish. In spite of all the objections from my friends in this House and also Sardar Panikkar's report, I would still plead that U.P. being a poor country, an agricultural country, it would be much better if Baghelkhand from Vindhya Pradesh is united to U.P. For one reason, U.P. has no minerals, no mines, nothing of the kind. Baghelkhand people are willing to come. They have again made representations and as a matter of fact the quarrel between Baghelkhand and Bundelkhand would also disappear if Baghelkhand area is included in U.P. Baghelkhand is that area which is near the proposed Rihand Dam. 300 acres of land of Vindhya Pradesh is already under Rihand dam area and it is very near U.P., 40 miles from Allahabad. Therefore if Baghelkhand people are willing, it would be much better both for Baghelkhand and U.P. that this area is included in U.P. Sir, the last sentence that I would say is this that I would join Rabindra Nath Tagore in his famous prayer that let us forget all these things, let us work for a united and strong India. Our salvation lies in that. If it is proper and possible to divide the whole country into four or five parts, why not all the South Indian States form one State? If all the South Indians unite, then the population of South Indians including Andhras would be 9,48,00,000, one and a half times the U.P. population. We U.P. people have no objection. Let them unite, let them form one South block and I dare say we shall be benefited mutually. In fact I would pray that they unite in that manner. The prayer of Rabindra Nath Tagore which

[Shri R. C. Gupta.]

I join is, "O Lord, prevent these domestic walls being raised which will prevent us from coming into larger unity and freedom, make us. O Lord, feel that we are children of the same soil, bind us in common traditions, common fortunes, as well as misfortunes. Combine us, unite us." This is all that I have to say.

SHRI M. VALIULLA (Mysore): Sir, I am not here to completely praise or to completely bury the S.R.C. Report. The point is there are certain things for which they deserve our congratulations. So far as I am concerned, I belong to the Karnataka territory and I am glad that the dream of our childhood has come to be realised now. From the very beginning we were thinking that we would continue to remain united and together. It so happened that, some 150 years ago after the British came in, they divided the country into many parts, and now that the British have gone away and we are again going to be united, it is a matter over which we feel happy and congratulate the S.R.C. For the pains they have taken to see that the Kannadigas come together we are very thankful to them.

DR R. P. DUBE: Mr Vice-Chairman, may I request the speaker to go a little slow.

SHRI M. VALIULLA: Is it a point of order?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): We are now used to Mr Valiulla.

SHRI M. VALIULLA: The Commission have taken great pains to go round and collect a lot of evidence, have gone through them and then they have come to some conclusions, but they have blundered also, without knowing that they have blundered. Some of our leaders have come to the conclusion that in all respects the Commission's Report may not be accepted. There is one thing about the question of Bellary. As can be seen from Misra's and Wanchoo's reports some taluks of Bellary were given to Mysore and the Mysore Administration

took the Bellary region into consideration and appointed officers. Bellary came into our State and economically also it is going up. Now what has happened is this. This Commission said that Kolar district is in Mysore and therefore as against that, to balance it, Bellary should be given to some other State. The question is not at all comparable for this reason that Mysore is considered to be a paradise and nobody wants to go out of it. There is an interesting joke about Mysore. Some people were found tied to trees in paradise and the question was asked, as to why they were tied to trees. The answer was that these people belonged to Mysore and if they were let loose they would go back to Mysore because they preferred Mysore to paradise. So nobody wants to go out of Mysore. Thus the question of Kolar district going out can never arise. The Commission without assigning any strong reasons, without knowing whether the people were willing at all to go out of Mysore, put Kolar on one side and Bellary on another for the purposes of comparison, and said that some portions of Bellary should go out. When the Andhra University was formed then also it was decided that Bellary was part of Kannada area. According to Wanchoo's and Misra's reports Bellary is to be in the Kannada State. And Bellary people are agitating. Even today you must have read in the papers that a lot of agitation is going on. There is no denying the fact that they want to come to Mysore. Here is a case where even when the people want to be here, you want to push them away. They are not willing to go away from Mysore. How can the Commission compare one with the other? There is no meaning at all. Simply because some 54 per cent. people talk Telugu in some taluks of Kolar district that does not mean that the people are not willing to remain with Mysore.

Now, the Commission said that they were not going to consider anything below the district level. That is how they started and this principle has been practised against us in many

respects. From district level they have descended to taluk level and from taluk level they have come even to hobli level. When they apply these rules, they apply them unnecessarily against us. When they do not consider the district level, when they have given Raichur and Gulbarga from Hyderabad, they should have given the four taluks of Bidar also. They belong to the Hyderabad State as it is. They have a Kannada majority; they are economically feasible and when all the criteria are satisfied, they should have been given to us. On the basis of taluk level, Hosur in Salem District should have been given to us. They are Kannada people and they want to come to Mysore. If they come to the taluk level, let it be in our favour also; that is my point. Mostly, it has gone against us. Sir, no one principle has been applied consistently.

With regard to the other States, it is not for me to say but anyhow the Commission say that they are going to have big States. They say that they do not want City States or small States but still when they want to see that some advantages should be given to particular groups, they say, "Let us create Vidarbha". Not that I am speaking against Vidarbha as such. I am speaking on the general principles. They are not properly applied in all cases and we find on reading the Report that many extraneous considerations have crept in. That is not good.

With regard to Bombay City, it is the Bombay people alone who will be able to decide as to which side it should go. Recently the Municipal Corporation of Bombay has decided that it should go with Maharashtra. Sir, the Congress also is wedded to help the poor people and they have passed a resolution that they will have a socialistic pattern. Sir, the Maharashtrians are poor people and you say that you have love for the poor people. We should therefore be just to them. I also feel that we should not do anything against natural things. Only when you go against Nature all sorts

of difficulties arise and people start quarrelling. There is no point in your telling them "you are bad fellows, you are quarrelling", after you have provoked them and that is why such things have happened. That is my view with regard to Bombay. Thank you.

SHAIK GALIB (Andhra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, let me add my humble voice to the chorus of praise to the three eminent countrymen of ours for having tackled the arduous task of reorganising the States on a linguistic basis. They have suggested some far-reaching changes, rather historic changes, by suggesting the abolition of Rajpramukhs, Nawabs and Rajas. They have done away with them but they have not done away with their Privy Purses. They have also suggested to the Government to take up some more All-India Services, also in the matter of appointment of High Court Judges, Public Service Commission Members etc.

Sir, I being a Telugu man would like to speak something about Vishalandhra. Here in this House we heard one solitary voice against Vishalandhra, that is that of Prof. Ranga. He was against the immediate formation of Vishalandhra and our comrades were against Bellary. Sir, the urge for Vishalandhra is a longstanding one. The whole of the Telugu-speaking area was under the Nizam's rule some 200 years ago. With the advent of the British when they succeeded against the French, the whole of the Circar area and the Ceded Districts were taken away from the Nizam and the remnant districts which are called Telangana were under him. And they were called Telangana because they belonged to the Telugu area. The other districts were added on to Madras; recently they were separated to form the State of Andhra. All these territories which have remained separated for two centuries are now to come together to form Vishalandhra for the good of our own people and it was with this object in view that the disintegration of Hyderabad was thought of. Now, some leaders of Telangana have got some suspicion

[Shaik Galib]
about the people of the Circars because of their advanced state of education and other things. Really, we are far in advance of Telangana and therefore we want to take them along with us for they will have their development in rapid strides if they come along with us. Otherwise, they will be slow in their progress. As a matter of fact in the district to which I belong we have got 143 High Schools and 15 Colleges and the number of educated people is quite large. After the police action most of the people from the Circars were appointed in High Schools and Colleges of the Telangana area and we teach very good Telugu to the people of Telangana. In Telangana, agriculture is also in a backward state. In most of the villages there you do not get coolies for agriculture. Most of our people who went there could not get coolies and they took people from their own districts and got them settled and in spite of difficult conditions those people were able to succeed in getting that area well cultivated and to improve that area.

As regards the Muslims in our province, in Andhra, most of them are in good Government positions. We have got one I.G. of Police who is a Muslim; we have got several Collectors, several Deputy Collectors, Sub-Judges, District Superintendents of Police and one D.I.G. who are all Muslims. So the Muslim friends of Telangana need not have any misgivings that they will not get their opportunity if they join with us. If they join with us they can get into the judicial and political places of importance and they need not have any fear.

Lastly if the Vishalandhra people joined hands—that is what we did during the recent elections—we can do away with the Communists, whatever remnant is there after the last elections.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Hyderabad): We also co-operated with you.

SHAIK GALIB: Certainly; with the co-operation of the people of Telangana we did away with the Commu-

nists and if we join hands and fight the next elections from Vishalandhra we can dump them in the Nandikonda reservoir. We will send them bag and baggage to their Fatherland.

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM (Madras): At least for this reason you should form Vishalandhra.

SHAIK GALIB: Certainly, we will form Vishalandhra to do away with you. Now, let us join hands to do away with these people.

2 P.M.

Lastly, I say that the separation that was done some two hundred years ago has been ended recently by our Pratibha Bharat Ratna Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru by laying the foundation stone of the Nandikonda project. And I hope we will do well to join hands to make the Telugu area a very predominant one, culturally a well-knit unit. My hon. colleague, Shri Akbar Ali Khan, may be a Minister there in my place if he joins hands with us.

With these few words, I commend this Report for acceptance with a slight change for Vishalandhra.

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव (राजस्थान): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इससे पहले कि मैं और कुछ कहूँ, मैं इस एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट के निर्माताओं को बधाई देना चाहती हूँ। यों तो कोई भी चीज मुश्किल से ऐसी होती है जिसमें दो दृष्टिकोण न हों और फिर यह तो भारतवर्ष के नदशों को ही बदलने वाली चीज है इसलिए यदि इसमें कोई दो दृष्टिकोण हों या कोई विरोध हो तो बहुत आश्चर्य की बात नहीं है। एक चीज का दोनों दृष्टिकोणों से सही कहा जा सकता है परन्तु फिर भी हमें देखना यह है कि उन दोनों दृष्टिकोणों में अधिक सही दृष्टिकोण क्या है। जहाँ तक मैंने एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट को देखा है मैं समझती हूँ कि इसके निर्माताओं ने सभी दृष्टिकोणों पर विचार किया है और सभी दृष्टिकोणों को मिला कर के—हालाँकि कुछ गौण दृष्टिकोणों में उनका विरोध भी हुआ है तो भी—अच्छी से अच्छी रिपोर्ट बनाने का प्रयत्न

किया है इसलिए हम लोगों को चाहिए कि हम इस रिपोर्ट का विरोध न करें बल्कि इसके निर्माताओं को बधाई दें और धन्यवाद दें।

सब से पहले मैं धन्यवाद और बधाई इसलिए देना चाहती हूँ कि इसमें प्रत्येक राज्य को बराबर बनाने का प्रयत्न किया गया है। पार्ट "ए" और पार्ट "बी" स्टेट्स का जो अन्तर था वह बहुत ही अनुचित अन्तर था और उसको दूर करने का इसमें सुभाव दिया गया है। साथ ही साथ पार्ट "सी" स्टेट्स को समाप्त करने का भी सुभाव है। मैं इस सुभाव को एक बहुत बड़ा सुभाव मानती हूँ और बहुत ही सुन्दर सुभाव मानती हूँ। दूसरे, इस में राजप्रमुखों के स्थानों को समाप्त करने का सुभाव दिया गया है। वह भी एक बहुत ही सुन्दर सुभाव है और उससे सारे प्रान्त और सारे राज्य एक ही सूत्र में बंध जाएंगे और सब जगह एक ही प्रकार का शासन होगा।

मैंने देखा है कि सभी लोग यहां पर कुछ न कुछ कह रहे हैं। ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है जैसे कि कुछ लोगों से कोई चीज छीन कर ली जा रही है और वे लोग ऐसा समझते हैं जैसे कि किसी को कुछ ज्यादा दे दिया गया है। हिन्दुस्तान तो हिन्दुस्तानियों का रहेगा ही और जो स्थान इधर से उधर जोड़ गए हैं, वे भी वहां ही रहेंगे और जो जहां के निवासी हैं, वे भी वहीं रहेंगे तो फिर ऐसा सोचना कि हमसे कुछ छीना गया है या दूसरे राज्य में कुछ मिला दिया गया है, कोई माने नहीं रखता। यह कोई सोचने की बात नहीं थी। फिर भी यह सोचा गया कि हमारे प्रान्त में से कुछ भाग चला जा रहा है और दूसरे राज्य में मिलाया जा रहा है। यह अनुचित है। यदि विचार किया जाए तो यह आपको मालूम पड़ेगा कि शायद ही ऐसा कोई प्रान्त हो, जिसमें से कुछ भाग इधर उधर न किया गया हो। फिर यदि हम इधर उधर करने ही का विरोध करते हैं तो इसके माने यह होते हैं कि हमने एस० आर० सी० कमीशन को ही बंकार बैठाया। राज्य जैसे थे यदि वैसे ही रहने थे तो फिर इस कमीशन की आवश्यकता ही क्या थी। जिस वक्त हमने इस आयोग की नियुक्ति की थी उस समय ही

यह विचार कर लिया गया था कि यह नियुक्ति ही इसलिए की जा रही है कि हमारे राष्ट्रोन्नति की दृष्टि से हमारे विभिन्न राज्यों के रूप में कुछ अन्तर की आवश्यकता है और उसमें अन्तर होगा। उसका आधार क्या हो, यह हमने उनके ऊपर छोड़ा था।

यहां पर भाषावार प्रान्तों के बारे में मैं बहुत कुछ सुन चुकी हूँ। यह मैं मानती हूँ कि भाषा एक देश या एक राज्य की संस्कृति का बहुत बड़ा अंग है परन्तु उसके साथ साथ मैं यह भी कह सकती हूँ कि कुछ अन्य अंग भी ऐसे महत्वपूर्ण हैं जिनका कि भाषा से भी अधिक कभी कभी महत्व होता है। जहां तक मेरा जानना है वह यह है कि इस आयोग ने भाषा को बहुत महत्व दिया है परन्तु जहां पर भाषा के महत्व पर ही जोर देने से कोई गलती होने वाली थी, वहां पर दूसरे अंगों को भी, जैसे कि भौगोलिक, आर्थिक अथवा ऐतिहासिक मुद्दों को भी, बहुत महत्व दिया है। यह कह देना बिल्कुल गलत होगा कि सारे राज्य भाषा के आधार पर बनने चाहिए। यदि भाषा के आधार पर ही हम राज्यों का बटवारा करने चलेंगे तो कई राज्य तो बहुत ही छोटे हो जाएंगे और कई राज्य बहुत बड़े हो जाएंगे। यदि हम हिन्दी को एक भाषा मान कर केवल हिन्दी बोलने वालों का राज्य बनाना चाहें तो वह इतना बड़ा राज्य हो जाएगा कि कई दूसरे राज्य मिल कर भी उसका मुकाबला नहीं कर सकेंगे। इसलिए मेरा ऐसा मानना है कि केवल भाषा के आधार पर ही राज्यों की रचना करना बहुत अनुचित बात है। इसको महत्व देना तो उचित है परन्तु केवल इस एक बात को ही महत्व देना अनुचित होगा। हमको तो यह देखना है कि हमारे देश की संस्कृति क्या कहती है, हमारे देश का हित किस में है और हमारा राष्ट्र किस प्रकार से उन्नति करेगा। अगर हमारे राज्य में से कुछ भाग दूसरे राज्य में चला जाता है और उससे हमें व्यक्तिगत नुकसान होता है अथवा व्यक्तिगत राज्य का नुकसान होता है परन्तु देश को उससे फायदा होता है तो हमको उस नुकसान को नुकसान नहीं मानना चाहिए बल्कि बड़ी प्रसन्नता से उसे स्वीकार करना चाहिए।

[श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव]

यहां इस रिपोर्ट के सम्बन्ध में काफी वाद-विवाद हुआ है। बहुत से तर्क दिए गए हैं और दिए जा सकते हैं परन्तु हर एक तर्क व्यावहारिक नहीं होता। तर्क के साथ साथ व्यावहारिकता को भी देखना बहुत आवश्यक है और यह देखना भी आवश्यक है कि कौन सा तर्क ठीक है। आप जानते हैं कि किसी भी ला कोर्ट में हर मामले में दोनों तरफ के वकील अपने अपने तर्क देते हैं परन्तु जब यह देखता है कि कौन सा तर्क अधिक उपयोगी है और कौन सा तर्क अधिक मानने के योग्य है। तो यही देखने की आवश्यकता है।

राजस्थान के विषय में मैं यह स्पष्ट रूप से कह देना चाहती हूं कि इस रिपोर्ट से राजस्थानी बहुत प्रसन्न हैं और इसके लिए वे कमीशन को बधाई देना चाहते हैं, परन्तु यदि हमारी भावना यह हो और हम यह सोचने बैठ जाएं कि हमारे राज्य में से क्या लिया दिया गया है तो हम भी इस रिपोर्ट में कुछ अवगुण निकाल सकते हैं और कह सकते हैं कि हमारे यहां से सिरोंज ले लिया गया है या फलाना इलाका ले लिया गया है। इस तरह के अवगुण आसानी से निकाले जा सकते हैं। परन्तु यह सब उचित नहीं होगा।

जब हमने इस आयोग को नियुक्त किया था तब हमने पहले ही सोच लिया था कि उसके जो सदस्य नियुक्त करें वे ऐसे योग्य व्यक्ति हों जो कि किसी प्रकार के पक्षपात की भावना से और किसी राज्य विशेष की भावना से रहित हों और वे जो कुछ करेंगे उसको स्वीकार करने का प्रयत्न करेंगे। इसी भावना से हमने इस आयोग की नियुक्ति की थी। इसलिए मैं इसको सब से अच्छा मानती हूं कि आयोग ने जो अपने फैसले या सुझाव दिए हैं उनको हमें बिल्कुल, पूर्ण रूप से, मान लेना चाहिए।

हमें पृथक्त्व की भावना को छोड़ देना चाहिए क्योंकि इस खींचातानी से हमारा ही नुकसान होगा। यदि देश को नुकसान होता है तो फिर हमारा व्यक्तिगत नुकसान भी उससे कुछ हल्का नहीं होने वाला है। भारतीय संस्कृति एक बहुत सुन्दर संस्कृति है और भारतीय संस्कृति का

उद्देश्य हमारे सामने होना चाहिए। हमारे सामने यह उद्देश्य नहीं होना चाहिए कि एक राज्य की दूसरे राज्य से आपस में खींचातानी कर के एक को गिराने और दूसरे को उठाने का प्रयत्न किया जाए। यह जो कहा गया कि भाषा के आधार पर ही सभी राज्यों का निर्माण होना चाहिए, इस विचार को छोड़ कर के हमें यह सोचना चाहिए कि इस कमीशन की जो रिपोर्ट है, वह देश के हित में उत्तम है और इसे हमें स्वीकार करना चाहिए।

यहां एक प्रश्न यह भी उठा कि पंजाब में हिन्दी और पंजाबी दो भाषाएं हो जाएंगी। इस सम्बन्ध में भी मैं अपने विचार आपके सामने प्रकट करना चाहती हूं। पंजाबी और हिन्दी में कोई विशेष अन्तर नहीं है। इस प्रकार के अंतर को यदि आप सोचने लगेंगे तब तो हर एक राज्य में कई कई भाषाएं निकल सकती हैं। राजस्थान को ही आप लें तो उसमें भी मेवाड़ी और मारवाड़ी, भाइशाही और कई प्रकार की भाषाएं हैं जिनमें थोड़ा बहुत अन्तर है। इसी तरह से यदि ५० पी० को लें तो उसमें भी बृजभाषा है, अवधी है, हिन्दी है, जिनमें कि थोड़ा बहुत अन्तर अवश्य है। यदि हम इस प्रकार की छोटी छोटी भिन्नताओं के ऊपर विचार करने लगेंगे तो फिर हम लोगों के लिए किसी प्रकार का भी नक्शा बनाना असम्भव हो जाएगा। इसलिए, श्रीमान्, मैं आपकी मार्फत सदन के सारे सदस्यों से यह प्रार्थना करना चाहती हूं कि वे इस तरह से न सोचें। यदि हम आज केवल भाषा के ऊपर ही जाएंगे और केवल एक भाषा का प्रान्त बनाएं तो फिर बाद में उस भाषा के अन्दर से उपभाषाएं भी निकलेंगी और उपभाषा वाले यह कहेंगे कि हमारे भी अलग अलग छोटे छोटे राज्य बनने चाहिए क्योंकि हमारी जो उपभाषा है उसको दूसरे भाग के उपभाषी लोग नहीं समझ पाते हैं। इस प्रकार से भाषा के प्रश्न को बहुत अधिक महत्व देने से हमको नुकसान ही होने वाला है।

अब मैं राजस्थान के बारे में जरा सा कह देना चाहती हूं। अब की मांग राजस्थान बहुत दिनों से कर रहा था और राजस्थान वाले पूरे प्रकार से यह मानते थे और मेरा जहां तक अनुमान है,

अन्य प्रान्तों वाले अन्य राज्यों वाल भी यह मानते थे कि आबू जो राजस्थान से अलग किया गया था वह अनुचित था। आज इस आयोग ने यह निश्चय किया कि सचमुच में आबू राजस्थान का ही भाग है और इसको राजस्थान को देना चाहिए। इसके आ जाने से राजस्थान को बड़ा लाभ हुआ है और इस बात पर उसे बड़ी प्रसन्नता है। इसके लिए मैं फिर आयोग को धन्यवाद देना चाहती हूँ।

पार्ट "सी" राज्य जितने भी हैं उनके बारे में पहले ही निश्चित हो चुका है कि उसको समाप्त कर देना है। अजमेर भी "सी" राज्य में आता है और इसलिए अब वह अलग एक यूनिट नहीं रह सकता। तो उसे किसी में भी न मिला कर राजस्थान में ही मिलाना सम्भव था। इसलिए अजमेर को राजस्थान में जो मिलाया गया है वह बहुत ही उचित कदम है।

और भी छोटे छोटे भाग हैं जिनके बारे में थोड़ी बहुत कंट्रोवर्सी है। मैं उनके बारे में कुछ अधिक इसलिए नहीं कहना चाहती हूँ क्योंकि यहां तो छोटी मोटी कंट्रोवर्सी चलती रहती हैं। परन्तु मेरा मानना है कि अन्त में जो बात राजस्थान के बारे में एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट में दी हुई है वही उसके लिए लागू होगी। इसलिए उनके बारे में छोटी छोटी चीजें उठाना मैं नहीं समझती हूँ।

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने दूसरे सदन में एक सुझाव दिया कि सारे हिन्दुस्तान के चार पांच हिस्से कर के उनके प्रादेशिक जोन्स कर दिए जाएं और उनके लिए सलाहकार समितियां बना दी जाएं जो यह विचार करें कि किस प्रकार का फाइनल नक्शा हिन्दुस्तान के बड़े बड़े राज्यों का बन सकता है। मैं उस सुझाव का बहुत स्वागत करती हूँ और उसे बहुत ही अच्छा मानती हूँ। जब हमारा उद्देश्य ही यह है कि हम बड़े बड़े राज्य स्थापित करें और छोटे को समाप्त करें, अर्थात् जिसमें देश के भाग कम से कम हो सकें तब जितना ही हम मिल मिल कर रह सकें उतना ही ज्यादा अच्छा है। आज हमारा आवागमन और यातायात इतना बढ़

गया है कि हम यहां हिन्दुस्तान में क्या विदेशों से भी इतनी जल्दी बातचीत कर सकते हैं और इतनी जल्दी आ जा सकते हैं। तो देश में छोटे छोटे टुकड़े करने से कोई लाभ नहीं होगा। इसलिए हमको इस ओर कदम बढ़ाना है कि बड़े से बड़े राज्य बनें और उसके लिए जो प्रधान मंत्री का सुझाव है वही कामयाब हो सकता है। यह बात ठीक है कि इसने लिए समय चाहिए, इसीलिए यह सुझाव रखा गया है कि सलाहकार समितियां बनाई जाएं, जोन्स बना कर के। फिर यह समितियां जो कुछ उस पर विचार करेंगी उसके बाद हम आगे कदम लेंगे और मैं मानती हूँ कि इससे हमको और देश को बड़ा लाभ होने वाला है।

मैं यह सब कह कर बस इतना कहना चाहती हूँ कि हमारे यहां जो खीचातानी है उसे हम समाप्त कर दें। हमारे सदन के जो इतने माननीय मेम्बर हैं, जिनको बहुत अनुभव है, उनको यह खीचातानी शोभा नहीं देती। हम लोगों को सब को अच्छी भावना से इस रिपोर्ट पर विचार करना चाहिए। मैं समझती हूँ कि एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट में जो सॉल्यूशन रखा गया है उससे अच्छा शायद और कोई नहीं हो सकेगा। इसलिए उसमें जो महत्वपूर्ण सुझाव दिए गए हैं उनको पूरी तौर से मान लेना चाहिए।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इसका पूरी तौर से समर्थन करती हूँ।

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad) Mr Vice-Chairman, we have been discussing the S.R.C. Report for nearly five days and there is a feeling growing among the Members that the trend of discussion is not very encouraging. It seems that India is going to be distributed into various States and there is an agitation between the several parts for grabbing this area or that area. I think that this feeling is wholly wrong. Our great national leader, Mahatma Gandhi, agreed to the reorganisation of States on linguistic basis because he felt that it will be a real convenience. The House also should look at it from this point of view that it is after all an administrative convenience.

[Shri Kishen Chand] nience if a particular State has got one language, because that language can be used and understood by everybody in the Legislative Assembly, it can be used and understood by the services, and it can be used in all the rural records. Therefore, it has a great convenience. But if we, on the basis of language, think that people speaking other languages are going to be driven out from that particular area and it will be an entirely unilingual State cut off from the neighbouring States, that view would be wrong. There will be border areas where there will be bilingual regions and even in the rest of the State, there will be people speaking other languages.

The fault really is that we appointed a highpowered Commission which toured the whole country, took nearly 1½ years and submitted a Report which is being discussed. I think that the whole thing should have been done in a much shorter period.

Now, this idea has not been fully augmented, and the hon Prime Minister has introduced a new idea of four zones. Well, people have started thinking on the lines of zones now. I submit that it is again making the issues more complicated. By postponing this issue of linguistic States, we are going to worsen the situation and not improve it. I feel the sooner we implement the SRC's recommendations, the better it is for the country. I really congratulate the Members of the Commission for the very fine Report that they have submitted. There will be differences of opinion. After all, the judgments of the highest court are not approved by everybody or by both the parties. Some defects may be found here and there in the recommendations made but on the whole, the Report is very good.

In regard to only two points the SRC has made a departure and that is about the bilingual State of Bombay, Vidarbha and the merger of Telangana in Andhra. If they had really suggested one State for Maharashtra, one for Gujarat and one for Vishalandhra

there would have been no question. The Report would have been entirely consistent and it would have been adopted. I submit that it is very essential that there should be a separate Gujarat State and a separate Maharashtra State and one State for Telugu-speaking areas.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI A separate Bombay State

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I am very glad the hon Member has asked this question because the whole discussion is centred round the City of Bombay. The Maharashtrians want Bombay because they think that geographically it is a part of Bombay State and because 42 per cent of the population of Bombay city speak Marathi. I think that this contention is not justified. The whole of India is interested in the fate of Bombay. Bombay is the economic centre of India. It has got highly developed industries. It is the biggest and the finest port that India has got. The port of Bombay cannot be compared with the port of Madras or Calcutta. I think that the development of Bombay is being hampered because it is the capital of Bombay State. If Bombay is not the capital of Bombay State and if proper attention is paid to Bombay City State, I am sure that the growth and development of Bombay City will be at a very fast pace and it will benefit the whole country.

SHRI J S BISHT You are making City State in one place and abolishing it in another State.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND I am going to explain what I mean by the City State. Unfortunately, there are no other words to express it. After all, Parliament is wise enough to devise a new type of set up for Bombay. The Bombay City State will be really a glorified Corporation—a glorified Corporation that will look after law and order and justice. But because it has no hinterland, the whole question of land revenue collection, forests and so many other things which arise on account of the presence of rural areas will not be applicable to the City State.

of Bombay. The hon. Member can ask me later on why don't you make Delhi a city State? But except the question, the analogy does not apply in the case of Delhi. I think that if we are going to develop an export market, we want more ports. If the Bombay State continues as a bilingual State as envisaged in the S.R.C.'s recommendation, the imposition of, say, Sales Tax, the import and export duties, the restrictions on production, all these things will be hampering the growth of Bombay. If the port of Bombay is developed on a greater scale, I am sure, it can easily become an international port, and later on, possibly an international free port.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Why not make it a Centrally-administered area?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Well, Sir, practically it is a Centrally-administered area, when the Bombay City State is not going to have a Legislative Assembly, and the Bombay City State probably will not have a Governor. Parliament will have to devise a new set up for that, once that idea is accepted. The Maharashtrians should come forward and say that in the interests of India it is essential that Bombay should be a separate City State. If the Bombay City State develops as an industrial centre, its products will after all be sold in various other States, and the sales tax will be imposed. Why is there a desire for taking Bombay? The Maharashtrians think that Bombay is a surplus State; it has a surplus of nearly Rs. 12 crores; and if Bombay city is included in the Maharashtra State, they are going to get these Rs. 12 crores. Is it right and fair that the whole of India should contribute Rs. 12 crores to the Maharashtra State, because the products of Bombay are sold in other States?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: What about Calcutta?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir we cannot make all these cities as international ports. Then, let us examine Madras. The British Government of India tried their level best to develop

the Madras Port, but they failed to do that because there is a shallow range for nearly a hundred miles on the East coast of Madras, and the big ships can never enter the Madras Port. Madras will always remain a secondary port. In the case of Calcutta, even now the Hooghly basin is getting silted up, and if proper precautions are not taken, even small ships will not be able to enter the Calcutta Port. The big ships enter the port only at the time of a tide. So there are these difficulties; and this is a technical matter. Therefore it is no use merely asking "Why not the Madras City State and the Calcutta City State?" There are geographical differences, and there are different conditions prevailing at different places. In that case I would ask: Why did we not have Calcutta or Madras as the Centre of the Reserve Bank or as the Centre of the State Bank of India? Why did we select only Bombay?

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Because of financial reasons.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: So that means the hon. Members realise that there is a fundamental difference between Bombay and Madras or between Bombay and Calcutta.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: But Calcutta has jute and tea markets.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: If the argument of the hon. Member was correct, we should have made Calcutta as the headquarters of the State Bank of India. So, I am saying that there is a fundamental difference between Bombay, as at present constituted, and Calcutta. We must see the part that Bombay is playing in the economic life of the country. And besides, Sir, we have developed the Cochin harbour for our naval headquarters, and Bombay is also being utilised partly for our naval headquarters. If Bombay becomes a City State, and if the Centre spends large amounts of money, it is very easy to further develop the Bombay Port as naval headquarters. Further, Sir, from the ocean point of view, Bombay commands the whole of the Indian Ocean, whereas Calcutta and

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

Madrās are so situated that they are not able to command the Indian Ocean to the same extent as Bombay and Cochin are able to command. So, from all these points of view, it is very essential that Bombay should be made into a separate State, even if the Maharashtrians and the Gujaratis are able to evolve a common formula, it would be in the interests of India if Bombay is made into a separate City State.

Sir, I am not going to enter into any arguments with my friend, Shri Deogirikar who said that the Maharashtrians were poets and poetic-minded. But that is exactly the reason why Bombay, which is the economic headquarter of India, should not be given to them. Either his claim is wrong or his statement is wrong. Nobody is giving Bombay City to the Gujaratis or to the Maharashtrians or to anybody. Bombay city belongs to the whole of India, and we are all interested in its proper development. To say that 43 per cent. of the population of Bombay is Maharashtrian, and therefore Bombay should go to Samyukta Maharashtra is not correct. May I in this connection give the analogy of Madras and Calcutta? Well, in Madras 80 per cent. of the population consists of Tamilians. But you cannot take that city away or give it to somebody else. Similarly, Calcutta has got 80 per cent. of the population which is Bengali speaking and therefore, you cannot take away Calcutta from Bengal.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

DR. W. S. BURLINGAY: Suppose the population had been 51 per cent.—I mean Maharashtrians.....

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: If it was 80 per cent., there would be no question about it. The problem would not arise in that case.

Sir, I come to my State of Hyderabad. It has been suggested that the residuary Hyderabad State, after separating Marathi and Kanarese-

speaking districts, should remain as a separate unit. I submit, Sir, that in 1950, at Nizamabad, the Congress decided after a very careful consideration that Hyderabad State should be disintegrated, and its linguistic units should join the neighbouring units. Nothing has happened during this period to change the situation which existed in those days. And I think it is very essential that Telugu speaking parts should be joined up with Andhra to form Vishalandhra. Sir, the argument has been advanced that Telangana is a viable unit and it is a surplus State. The hon. Members will be surprised to learn that it is a surplus State, because there is a subvention of nearly Rs 3 crores which comes from the Central Government. If the Centre gives that subvention of Rs 3 crores to any deficit State, that State can easily become a surplus State. If Hyderabad continues, after disintegration, as a separate State, there will be no justification for giving that subvention of Rs 3 crores to it. And if that subvention is not given, in spite of the excise revenue of Rs 5 crores, Hyderabad will be a deficit State to the extent of Rs 3 crores, and if the excise revenue goes away, then I do not know what will happen to Telangana? It will be a hopeless thing. It will not be able to continue for even a short period as an economic unit, unless the Centre goes on giving huge subventions to it, for which there will be no justification. Sir, I suggest that Hyderabad should be immediately joined up with Andhra to form one Telugu speaking State and I do not mind whether it is called Hyderabad or Andhra or Vishalandhra. That is immaterial. Sir, I will not at all argue about the question whether this particular district should belong to this State or that State. That is a matter for experts. A Boundary Commission will have to be appointed, and they will decide all these questions of details. It is quite useless to discuss here all these matters of details. And I do not think the hon. Members here will be in a position to say whether this taluk belongs to this State or that State. These small things can be

decided by a boundary commission. I am going into the picture of unilingual States. If Hyderabad and Andhra are merged into one Telugu State and if Vidarbha is merged with Maharashtra in Samyukta Maharashtra minus the Bombay city and Gujarat is made into one Gujarati-speaking State, the picture will be that the whole of India will consist of 16 unilingual States, and we would have achieved the ideal. There is no point in shelving the issue. If we leave open the question of Bombay, it will crop up again after a few years and it will prove to be in the meantime a thorn in the flesh of our country.

Then, I come to Madhya Pradesh. It has been said that Madhya Pradesh is very large in area. Then the best course will be that parts of Bastar should be taken out of it. The whole of Bastar is populated by scheduled tribes, primitive tribes, and there is no language affinity between the language spoken in Bastar and the language used in the rest of Madhya Pradesh. If you take away Bastar from Madhya Pradesh, it will be far better. Bastar can be distributed between Orissa and Andhra, and the result will be that these empty spaces will be better developed by Andhra and Orissa.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ (Madhya Pradesh): They have already been very well developed. We have developed Bastar immensely.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: If I had known about this assertion, I would have brought statistical figures, because Bastar was for a very long time attached to Hyderabad in many ways, and Hyderabad has been always thinking of developing Bastar.

SHRI KANHAIYALAL D. VAIDYA (Madhya Bharat): May I know if the hon. Member has been to Bastar?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: It is not very essential. If one goes by train or by motor, one's knowledge of Bastar will be less than when one reads half a dozen books written by people

who know much about it. Does the hon. Member believe that tourists who come from America know more about India from seeing parts of India, than Indians who may not have seen these particular parts, but may have learnt a good deal about these parts from books? I say that it will be for the Commission to examine. But claims have been made by the neighbouring States of Andhra and Orissa to parts of Bastar and the Commission has stated that a strong enough case had not been made out. I am looking at this from the point of view of development. If you think that development will be retarded, then don't give it. It has to be examined. This point has got to be examined. I suggest that some portion of Madhya Pradesh may be given to Bihar. The reason why I say that some parts of Madhya Pradesh should go to Bihar is this: Bengal delegates have asserted that they want some more space for people coming from East Bengal, and it is not possible to give them space otherwise. (Interruption) This space can be given by giving some part of Bihar to them, the part which is in dispute, half a district or quarter of a district, and to compensate Bihar for this loss, it can be given some portions of the Jharkhand area of Madhya Pradesh. Then everybody will be satisfied and everybody will get his due share and in the bargain, Madhya Pradesh which is 171,000 sq. miles will be brought down to 145,000 sq. miles.

SHRI JAFAR IMAM (Bihar): Your solution to the problem is that Bihar should be compensated by Madhya Pradesh?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: This thing has got to be examined from that point of view. There are certain disputed areas. The Bengalis say that it is predominantly a Bengali area, whereas the Biharis say that it is predominantly a Bihari-speaking area. I am only suggesting that, if the whole thing is looked from this point of view, it may be possible to satisfy everybody. If it is not possible, well, leave it. We are all thinking in the best interests of our country. Because it

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

occurred to me, I am suggesting that that type of adjustment may be made and we may be able to satisfy all people.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: What is his conception, his plan? Only the boundaries will be shifted or the population also will be shifted?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Only the boundaries should be shifted. But the result will be that, when the boundaries are shifted, some population may naturally go there. The people may think that it is an open area, let us go there.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Oh!

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Then I come to Punjab. Hon. Members have said that Punjabi is a separate language. My small knowledge of the Punjabi language and its grammar compels me to state that Punjabi cannot be considered to be a distinct language. It was included in the Constitution as a separate language to satisfy a certain sentiment. I am sure that, if the Constitution-makers had thought that it would be used as a handle later on for asking for a Punjabi Suba, they would not have included it. The test of a language is its grammar, and the grammar in Punjabi and Hindi are exactly the same, and if the grammar is the same, a few words here or a few words there cannot change the language. So, I suggest that there should be one province comprising of Punjab, PEPSU and Himachal Pradesh. Now, in the newspapers one reads that the Congress Working Committee is thinking of a separate Himachal Pradesh. The moment the executive Government shows weakness, it leads to agitation and this is most harmful to the interests of the country. We have a wavering policy. We should make up our minds finally and once we decide that Himachal Pradesh, PEPSU and Punjab should form one State, then everything will be all right. All the headworks of Bhakra Nangal and other schemes that may be taken up by Punjab later on will be situated

in Himachal Pradesh, and for the efficient working of the schemes it is essential that Himachal Pradesh should continue to be part of Punjab. Therefore it is necessary that Himachal Pradesh, PEPSU and Punjab should be formed into one province.

I do not see why hon. Members are bringing up the question of U. P. or other places which have been retained as at present. They are all right. They are serving a useful purpose in the development of our country and we wish them all progress.

With these few words, I conclude by saying that I welcome the idea of unilingual States, and I do wish that the problems of Vidarbha, bilingual Bombay, Telangana and Andhra are solved by converting them into unilingual States, no doubt with Bombay city being constituted into a separate State.

SHRI T. J. M. WILSON (Andhra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, almost every aspect of this question has been discussed and thrashed out and I have only one or two things. I shall be very brief. The first, naturally, is the formation of Vishalandhra and there is such a degree of unanimity on this issue that I am encouraged and my task is made easier by the remarks that have been made by the speaker who preceded me just now and the very forcible plea that he has put in for the immediate formation of Vishalandhra. I believe that this question is happily not in doubt any more because the formation of Vishalandhra is the logical conclusion and the necessary corollary of the various principles adumbrated by the Commission in their Report, viz., the linguistic homogeneity, the geographical contiguity, financial viability, administrative convenience and the successful working of the Second Five Year Plan. What the Commission had stated about smaller States—that they afford the spring-board for personal ambitions and rivalries—applies with equal force to Telangana which would be a small State and what the Commission had stated with regard to Himachal Pradesh about the plea of backwardness of

that area—what they have said is outright rejection of that plea—that applies with equal truth to the Telangana State. Therefore I believe that there is nothing more that I should say from my side for the immediate formation of Vishalandhra. We have travelled far away from the Greek City States and no modern State today has or can have a direct democracy and a direct vote nor can any modern State condemn a vast portion of its population as slaves which the Greek cities have done in the past in order to deny them the rights of citizenship and the right of vote and thus have the direct Government—what was called direct democracy—excepting perhaps a very small number of countries that are existing even today which we rightly call uncivilized and barbaric. I am therefore confident that we shall soon start on the great adventure of affording amenities and opportunities as a result of much larger and adequate resources that will be at our disposal in the Vishalandhra to the vast population of Andhra Desa and I am sure that all the leaders of Telangana, in spite of their present suspicion and differences, as well as of Andhra would unite in this noble endeavour. Before I go to the second matter I would mention something about Bellary. On Bellary much has been said by the Karnataka Members of this House and I may assure this House that we Andhras are not making any claims to territories which are not our own and the position taken by the people of Andhra and the Government of Andhra is that all that we want of Bellary is the successful functioning of the Tungabhadra project. I may venture to say that this is a stand which is not in the present fashion of making claims and putting pressures but is an example of moderation and is well worth emulating. The second matter which I would mention is—and that is the outright condemnation—the new fashion that has come on almost everybody to-day, i.e., the condemnation of the linguistic basis of the States and the S.R.C. proposals. While it is necessary

and even essential today in the heat and in the passion and in the midst of these claims and counter-claims, while it is necessary and essential that somebody and particularly the person who is in charge of the destinies of this country should strike a note of warning and should inveigh against the fissiparous tendencies that are likely to be engendered by the linguistic States and to emphasise and stress the oneness of this nation and the nationhood of this country, while it is certainly essential, what, I ask, is the basis, can be the basis or should be the basis, for any division of the country into States? Once you have accepted the principle of federalism as the principle that would govern the relations between the Centre and the States and among the States themselves, what, I ask, is the guarantee or security that once these States are formed—whether they are formed on any basis or no basis at all—whatever is the basis, what guarantee is there that those four or five States would not tend to be exclusive which, I believe, is the apprehension and objection to the linguistic States? If the apprehension is that there had been a certain background in this country of local patriotism—there had been many petty principalities in the past—is it not also true that we have established a strong centralised Government almost for the first time in the history of this country and that if we have done it we have risen above our past and done something which is unique? Language has been and shall remain—it is difficult to change man however much you may change matter—one of the most important binding factors besides race and religion. History and the formation and the development of nations and States bear an ample testimony to this; and after a background of friction and non-development of certain areas which are certainly among the chief causes that led to the agitation years ago for the linguistic distribution of the country, I say it is appropriate today that we should start and go ahead with reorganisation of the States with the

[Shri T. J. M. Wilson.]

hope and faith that they would function not exclusively but would develop in conformity with our nationalism which has never been aggressive, in conformity with our culture which has always been known for its tolerance and charity and that all the States with their rich variety and vitality would contribute to the strength and unity and security of this country.

May I, in conclusion and in all humility, strike a personal note and lay claim to a certain amount of credit though it has not been forthcoming voluntarily from this House for the success that we have made in the recently formed Andhra State which was in fact the chief thing that has created the atmosphere and confidence to go ahead with the formation of new States. Thank you.

SHRIMATI BEDAVATI BURAGOHAIN (Assam): Mr. Deputy Chairman, first of all, let me congratulate the three eminent Members of the Commission who shouldered the responsibility of redrawing the internal map of India on the basis of the principles of unity and security of India, linguistic and cultural homogeneity, economic and administrative soundness and the successful working of the National Plan. No State, however big or small, wants to be integrated or disintegrated to its neighbouring State. So it is very natural that a certain amount of heat is to be generated from the minds of the people. With regard to Assam, I welcome the Commission's Report. Considering all the facts and figures from various aspects, the Commission has rightly upheld the view-point put in the memorandum by the Assam Government and the Assam Pradesh Congress Committee. We are really so happy to see that not an inch of our State is to be disintegrated; rather it has been proposed to add some areas to the State. We welcome the Commission's recommendation of Tripura's merger with Assam. As a Part C State, it cannot remain as a separate entity. It must go either to Bengal or to Assam. But Bengal does not

demand it. So it is for their good as well as for the greater good and safety of the country as a whole that this border State which is contiguous to Assam and is connected by road and air, should come under the administrative control of Assam.

Sir, Assam occupies a strategic position and she is the sentinel of the North-eastern gate of India. She has many problems to solve. The peace and tranquillity of the Indian Union depends upon Assam. This State is surrounded on all sides by foreign countries, except a narrow corridor with the rest of India. The Commission itself has said that Assam is a backward and under-developed State. So with the merger of Tripura, we hope that the Central Government would make adequate grants for the development of the State.

Regarding Manipur, the Commission has recommended its merger ultimately with Assam. We would have been more glad if the Commission had recommended its immediate merger with Assam, as in the case of her sister state of Tripura. Of course, it depends upon the sweet will of those people whether they join with Assam or not. We are not forcing them. A good number of Manipuris are in Assam. Besides, the tribal people in Manipur will not find any difficulty to merge with Assam. This relationship of Manipur and Tripura will not be a new thing. If we go back to history it will be revealed that from time immemorial, Manipuris and the Tripura Kings were allies of the Ahom kings and the other kings of Assam.

The decision of the Commission to retain the North East Frontier Area as Centrally administered area has been a profound disappointment to the people of Assam. Certainly we do agree with the Commission that for strategic reasons, this area should continue to be Centrally administered for some time. But I would like to remind the House that the Advisory Sub-Committee that was set up by the Constituent Assembly for the Excluded and Partially Excluded Areas—more

popularly known as the "Bardoloi Committee"—while submitting its report to the Government in July 1947, made certain far-reaching recommendations and among them was the ultimate transfer of power to the State Government when administration is fully established in this area. Since then, eight years have elapsed. What is a more regrettable episode is that even now, the Commission does not hold any hope of future integration of N.E.F.A. as in the case of Manipur though they respectfully submit that N.E.F.A. is a part of Assam.

I would like to mention a few things here about the hill people and those in the plains. Before the advent of the British there was a healthy relationship between the hill people and the plains people. But the British created a feeling of isolation by keeping them separate from us. For administrative purposes, they devised various policies. There was hardly any contact between the tribal people and the hill people. The administration of these areas was mostly in the hands of the British officers. No attempt was made to improve the communications and even the old established roads deteriorated due to lack of proper repair. Let me also add here that the people of the hills and those of the plains were interlinked through commerce and trade and their medium of talk was Assamese. Even today the lingua franca among the different hill tribes is Assamese. So, to promote better understanding between the hill and plains people, and for the sake of unity and security not only for Assam but for the whole of India, I feel that some immediate measure should be taken for its early administrative integration with Assam.

With these few words, Sir, I support the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission. Thank you, Sir.

श्री टी० पांडे (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदय, समय बहुत कम है। आपने बड़ा अनुग्रह किया कि मुझे समय दिया। इसके लिए मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Anybody who wants to speak? Mr. Raghavendrarao? He is not here.

SHRI AKHTAR HUSAIN (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it was a great pleasure to us to hear one of the members of the Commission give an explanation of the Report about which many insinuations were made in the past. It was heartening to learn from our esteemed colleague that the Commission acted as an impartial body and was not in any way influenced by any considerations or in any way yielded to any pressure from any individual or authority. The main basis or reason for appointing such distinguished members to serve on the Commission was that they should make recommendations strictly on merits and in the best interest of the country—persons in whom the country could have trust and confidence, persons who would not in any way be swayed from the path of righteousness or from the dictates of the national interests. After hearing the speech of the hon. Member, Sir, I was reminded of the Persian saying:

تصلف را مصلف نگو کلد بیان

That is to say, the author is the best commentator of his own word. In view of the extremely lucid explanation that has been put forward before the House by our learned and esteemed colleague, I think all doubts that had been created and the suspicions that had been deliberately engendered should now be set at rest.

I would like to mention my own view about the size of the States. It has been suggested that the State of Uttar Pradesh should be split up into more than one unit. Supposing it is split up even into two units, we will have then two Legislative Assemblies, two Legislative Councils, two Rajyapals, two High Courts and every institution would be doubled. Now, will that lead to any improvement in the administration or will it

[Shri Akhtar Husain.]

add to the cost of the administration? If it adds to the cost of administration—and it is bound to—then I submit it would not be in the best interest of the country, to spend twice the amount on certain overhead expenses, than what is being spent at the present moment. One of the arguments of the protagonists of partition of the State of Uttar Pradesh is that it is such a large State that a Minister cannot go to every district frequently. I would like to express my own view that it is not the function of a Minister to act as an inspector of every small school and every small society or small tehsil or treasury. It is P.M. the function of the Inspectors and should be left to them. The Inspectors are employed for that purpose. The function of the Ministers is to guide the policy, enforce it, implement it and to see that the work of the administration is carried on efficiently and in a proper manner.

I do not think there is more for me to say. The leaders of the country have already spoken and expressed their views. The hon. Prime Minister is now going to benefit this House by his weighty guidance and I would just conclude by saying that the critics of U.P. have not succeeded in making out a case for its division.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I feel a little diffident in taking part in this debate in this House. I almost feel like an interloper because I had not been present here in the course of this debate and then, to presume to intervene is perhaps not quite correct.

Sir, these great debates have been going on in both the Houses more or less simultaneously and it is a little difficult to be present in two places at the same time. I am intervening chiefly because, if I may be quite frank with this House, I do not want my colleague to speak again. As many of the Members of this House might

know, he delivered a great and noble speech yesterday in the Lok Sabha but perhaps everybody does not know that during these days when he has been in charge of these two debates, apart from the other heavy burdens he carries, he has been ~~actually~~ unwell and in great pain. Nevertheless, in spite of these, he has discharged this heavy burden with the great ability that he possesses. Obviously I cannot discharge this business of speaking towards the end of this debate with that facility or knowledge that he possesses. Nevertheless, since it is my duty not to let him speak and to speak myself on this occasion, I shall venture to place some considerations before this House.

We have had, in this House and in the other House, what have been called marathon debates. Hundreds of Members have participated in them and have discussed a subject which, as we all know, sometimes raises a great deal of passion and Members, as others outside, hold very strong opinions. Sometimes, the smaller the area concerned, the stronger the opinion about it. In spite of this fact, I may, with all respect, say that the debates have been conducted in both the Houses with sobriety and with a desire to find out what should be done. Most of the speeches, I suppose, inevitably concerned themselves with particular problems which have been raised in the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission. That is yet inevitable and yet many of these problems, or some of them, could hardly be considered—I am referring more to the border problems at the present moment—without a great deal of attention being paid to maps, charts, figures and all kinds of details. In fact, it is rather difficult for any large body of men or for Parliament normally to go into these details. It is not possible and it was chiefly for this reason that the States Reorganisation Commission was appointed consisting of three able and impartial persons, the best we could find for the purpose so that they may pay this

particular attention and then give us the benefit of their advice. Obviously the ultimate judge and arbiter was going to be Parliament but obviously also, when a Commission of this kind goes deeply into these matters and presents its recommendations, they are entitled to the greatest respect and it is only because of some very strong reason that one could by pass those recommendations.

Now, this has been my approach, if I may, say so, and broadly speaking our Government's approach, to these problems. Also, one has to keep in mind all the time the basic principles on which we should proceed. Language has been discussed here a great deal. It is true that because of the geography of India, certain languages, broadly speaking, prevailed in certain areas of India. It is true also that language is a very important bond and a very important element of culture in a people. So, quite apart from the particular desire to have linguistic States, to some extent, these are automatically there and they occur.

Having said that, it must also be remembered that however carefully you may define a linguistic area, you can never define it precisely because there are many areas which are bilingual, multi-lingual, overlapping with each other. That is right. Obviously you should not confine people in India speaking one language to a particular area and if you perhaps succeed in some measure in confining them now or creating so-called linguistic States now, what will happen ten or twenty years hence? Are you going to stop people from moving from one State to another? The Constitution says that there should be freedom of movement, freedom for the people to go and do their business and everything. Movements of population will take place when we develop. As we undoubtedly are going to develop economically and otherwise, it follows necessarily that there will be movements of population to industrial areas wherever they develop. Are you going to develop an industrial area and

reserve it completely for the people living within a few miles or few square miles of that area? Surely, if that is done then it is difficult to make much progress. In fact, one test of an advancing country is how mobile its population is. It is the sign of a backward country to have static population. Therefore, we should, whatever we may decide today in Parliament, remember that we cannot isolate linguistic groups. Further, we should not do so and it is improper to isolate them. In any event, whatever you may decide or do today, you cannot maintain it in the future unless you go behind all the principles laid down in the Constitution, social, economic and industrial progress of the country, etc.

Now, a great deal of stress has been laid on language. I certainly admit that language is a very important and vital factor in an individual or group's life. We have to consider it in all its importance. But, even in the terms of reference of the States Reorganisation Commission, we have not confined ourselves to language alone. We laid the greatest stress on the unity and the solidarity of India. Anything that affects that should be discarded—if it affects that—I do not mean to say that language necessarily affects it but if our approach is such that we lay great stress on some factors regardless of the other factors, the most important of which is the unity and solidarity of India; others, of course economic matters, defence matters are equally important, geographical and other matters have to be considered all together.

Now I would submit that after the achievement of political freedom in this country, there are many problems before us, industrial and economic growth, etc. but I would place as the most important problem for India to face and to solve the problem of the emotional integration of India. We integrated all the old Indian States—that was political integration. That was necessary, but the other thing, the emotional integration, is

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

not a legal or a constitutional matter. You may help by constitutional devices or you may obstruct it. It is of the most vital significance that we should have this emotional integration of India. Now what has been happening in the last month or two, since this Report came out, has been something that rather hurts once's conception of the emotional integration of India. It lays emphasis on differences and not on similarities, on points in common. That is a bad thing. I think that that is rather a temporary phenomenon—I do not mean to say that there is no basis for it. Of course there is, but this aggravation of that feeling probably, I hope, is a temporary phenomenon and is likely to grow less. So I should like this House to consider this in this particular aspect, because the moment you forget this particular aspect, you lose yourself in interminable wrangles about petty things which may appear important to each one of us because we happen to live in that area or are connected with it, but which has to be looked at from the point of view of the whole of India. As I ventured to say in the other House the other day, hon. Members who are here, represent, may be, certain States or certain constituencies, but the Members of Parliament in either House essentially represent India and not a particular corner of this great country of ours, and therefore we should always try to keep that picture in view. None of us may be big enough to take in the whole conception of India, but at any rate we should keep it as an ideal to remember always and sometimes to pull us up when we become rather parochial in our thinking.

Now, first of all I should like to congratulate the States Reorganisation Commission on the work they have done. That does not mean that anyone of the Members here or I agree with every word that they have said or every view that they have expressed. That does not follow. But I must confess that I approached this Report

naturally with certain views, conceptions, preconceptions and the rest, but at the same time with this conviction that these three persons have given much more thought to it and have had much more access to material than I had, in spite of my official sources, etc. They have given concentrated attention to certain matters, and my reactions are based more on, well, on superficial reading or at any rate without that deep study. It may be of course and sometimes is, I admit, that you may have a very able scholar, a professor examining a problem, he is so clever and able that he is lost in his cleverness and ability and an ordinary man with some knowledge of human nature may give a more suitable answer than the professor to a difficult question. That may be so. It may be that a politician's outlook supplies some element in judging a situation which is important, which concerns human beings, while the very able scholar's outlook may be too scholarly and rather not so much in contact with human beings or the masses. I am not by any means saying that the eminent Members of the States Reorganisation Commission were lacking in any of these qualities. Anyhow I approached this report, as I approach every report, with respect for the people who have studied the question. I reacted in various ways to it. Some parts here and there surprised me because they were new ideas—not that I was against them. My general approach towards the problem of States reorganisation in the past has been rather in favour of small States; when I say a small State, I do not mean a small State with all the paraphernalia of the big State today because that would be quite impossible. A multitude of Governors, a multitude of High Courts, a multitude of public services, all over spread out—that would become quite impossible—but broadly speaking, my original approach was in favour of small States tied up together, a number of States in larger groupings. Now the more I have thought of this matter—and we have given obviously a great deal of thought to it, more especially since the

publication of this Report—I confess that I have changed my opinion, and I have become converted to the idea of large States and, in fact, I am rather sorry that in this respect they have recommended some small States, and I say this for a variety of reasons. First of all, hon. Members must realise, must know, how our thinking in this country, I mean as a whole, has gradually changed. Our thinking used to be preeminently political—of course a country fighting for its freedom is hundred per cent. political, almost hundred per cent. You can think of nothing else—it is like a disease. But, having achieved freedom, one begins to take into consideration other problems and obviously the most important problems are economic and social. There may be a trace of politics, there may be a trace of international problems, and all that, but essentially a country, situated as we are, begins to think more and more about economic and social problems, and we are thinking of this Five Year Plan and some of the legislations we bring become more and more economic and social, that is to say, our country's thinking has become much more economic and social than political. That is a sign of growth, of advance, of tackling real problems, instead of having rather empty debates about high principles. Take this second Five Year Plan which we are discussing, and we are discussing it certainly with certain broad ideals before us, certain broad objectives, certain trends, where we want to go to; we call them a socialistic pattern of society; we refer to raising our income by a certain percentage every year, industrialisation, what not, equalisation of these things. But when we come to them, all these things in detail, come to grips with the subject, then gradually all kinds of new approaches open out, sometimes conflicting approaches, difficult problems. What are the real problems of some countries which are struggling over this question of internal advance. They are not essentially political problems. They are not international problems except in so far as the

international problem impinges upon those problems, to the manner of development. Now, Sir, the relation of industry with agriculture, the relation of heavy industry with light industry, the place of cottage industry, these are the real problems one has to face along with the problem of resources which our Planning Commission is facing from day to day. Now if you think in terms of planning and also in terms of economic advance and the rest, a large number of small States come in the way. Very much so. The more the smaller States, the more difficult becomes the question of planning. That was one reason why gradually I became convinced in favour of the larger States.

Also a curious position has arisen and is likely to perpetuate itself unless something is done. The House knows that there are in the world rich countries and poor countries. Now, the rich countries tend to become richer; the poor countries may not become poorer but their rate of advance is much slower. Simply they have got to pull themselves up by the boot straps. They have not got the resources. The rich country, even if it is wasteful, it has enough to invest. It has enough surplus left over for progress. The poor country has to work terribly hard to have any surplus left at all. It would just keep on at the marginal subsistence. That applies to individuals as to countries. Looking at this from the point of view of our States and provinces, we have today provinces which are relatively wealthy, which have surplus; we have provinces which suffer from chronic deficits. Now the tendency is that the richer province has greater resources for development and so it develops faster. The poorer province has poor resources. It may be helped by the Centre; it is helped by the Centre but no amount of help from the Centre really makes up for that essential difference between the rich province and the poor province unless of course the poor province has mineral or other resources which come to its help. Partly, the States are divided by the resources they have,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]
 mineral and like resources, because ultimately their development will depend upon those resources partly, and partly on many other causes, past development and the advance it has made, whatever it is. Now, we find that even when the Government of India helps the States—we have some principle according to which we give help and normally speaking, some help goes to every State—normally speaking, we say “We shall give you, say, 50 per cent. if you do this and you provide 50 per cent. for it.” Let us take some form of education although Education is a State subject. We say, “All right; for the next three years we will give you 50 per cent. for building schools if you provide 50 per cent.” The rich State provides the 50 per cent. and takes our 50 per cent. also. The poor State does not provide, it cannot provide and does not get even our 50 per cent. We may say “we will give you 100 per cent.” but that becomes a problem for the Finance Commission, for our Ministry, always to judge which is richer and which is poorer. This difference in States in this way to some extent is inevitable. The richer and poorer States are increasing the difference between the rich parts of India and the poor parts of India. That difference can be bridged somewhat by help from the Centre and it should be of course. But in a large State there are rich areas and poor areas which balance each other within the State and thereby a certain measure of equality comes in in the development of that State because the State applies sometimes the riches acquired in its rich areas to its own poor areas and the whole State gradually develops uniformly. That is the advantage of the big State which helps poor and rich areas. But if you have small States, relatively small States, if they are rich they remain rich and become richer and if they are poor, they remain poor and do not make much advance. That is another reason why I came to the conclusion that big States are better. Certainly, they are better from the point of view of planning, certainly,

they are better from the point of view of economic resources being applied.

Now, almost every major scheme of ours—take any river valley scheme—affects more than one State, two States, three States, sometimes four States and we have to go through strange devices for the four States to function together in regard to that scheme. We have Boards and other things consisting of representatives of different States meeting together from time to time, but the fact remains that there is not much of a smooth working because three or four States are concerned. And these big schemes and all economic and development plans suffer because they concern several States and each Government decides separately and it takes a long time for them to find a common policy. If there are big States, then a State deals with many of these problems itself and it is easy for a uniform policy to be pursued. I will not go further into this argument but I was merely wishing to point out to this House how my own mind has undergone a certain change in this matter and begun to prefer the big State idea rather than the small State idea.

DR. P. C. MITRA (Bihar): One State?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Well, that would be ideal. But I am not sure that that would be ideal; in some ways of course it would be very helpful. There are other aspects of the question which would suffer. Anyhow, at the present moment it is not a practical proposition. As I have just said, in whatever way you divide the States, there are bound to be bilingual and multi-lingual areas. First of all, the joining States will go on quarrelling about them as they are quarrelling at present, each giving its own proof that one language population is greater than the other or some other reason and this conflict continues. The only way to deal with this is first of all to have enough provisions either in the

Constitution or by convention or by law, whatever it may be so that no person in a bilingual area—and when I say a bilingual area I refer to any area in India which is even unilingual but where there are other persons speaking other languages—suffers in the slightest, so that he can have the fullest facilities for the use of his language in that area whatever his language may be, provided always that the number is adequate. You cannot have it for every small group, for every 10 or 20 persons, but if the number is adequate, the fullest opportunities for him to develop his language, to the use of his language in schools for medium of instruction, in official work etc. should be given to that person. There may be other matters too which today create some difficulty—let us say, Services. Sometimes there is some complaint. Now, these things are capable of adjustment in a large measure by safeguards etc. put in and by conventions and practices. It is true, of course, as the Commission itself has pointed out, that nothing in the wide world, no amount of safeguards or legislation can really take the place of goodwill. If there is illwill and hostility, that will out somehow or other. That is a basic question which cannot be disposed of by legislation but by creating that atmosphere of emotional integration of India and the atmosphere of considering that the larger interests are more important than the narrow interests. Therefore in the whole of this Report I thought that the most important part was the last two or three Chapters which refer to these safeguards. It may be that we can think of some other safeguards too but personally I accept all of them. There are one or two which personally I am prepared to accept but I am afraid which many of our Chief Ministers will not be prepared to accept. We would leave that out but broadly speaking, if we have those, or any other reasonable safeguards to ensure that no linguistic area or other minority suffers in regard to any vital matter, then a great deal of this difficulty disappears.

Another reason I may point out about the small and big States. We are thinking in terms of language but there are other matters too. There are other kinds of minorities. Now, in a big State where there are various balancing factors, balancing in the sense of people of different groups etc., the minority is likely to have a better position than in a State where everybody is of the same opinion except that small minority. Then it is ignored more or less. Therefore, minorities—whether they are religious minorities, linguistic minorities or any other type of minorities—are likely to be better off in a big State than in a relatively small unilingual State. Of course, there is, I think, another basic reason that anything which helps in broadening our outlook, in broadening our minds is a good thing, anything which narrows our minds or outlook is a bad thing from the cultural point of view. Now, one of the principal reasons why we have insisted in the past on language being the medium of our work or in our public organisations like the Congress, why we have insisted for the last thirty-five years on doing our work in the provincial language was that that was the only way of keeping in touch with the masses. Obviously, we have to use the language of the masses if we are to remain in touch with them. If we go on using English, however good the English language may be and however much we may advance in the English language, we lose touch with our masses. They cannot follow us; they cannot co-operate with us. We cannot make them understand what is happening. It becomes essential for us to use the language of the masses in order to break down the barriers that have grown up in the past between them and the elect few who know perhaps English and some other language. Therefore, language is most important and when I say language it means not only the language, let us say, of this area, the Hindi language which is called the *Rashtra Bhasha* but all the great provincial languages. I cannot do my work in Hindi in Bengal or in Maharashtra or in Tamilnad. I

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

can go and deliver a speech. They may understand me, some of them, but essentially work has to be done in the language of that State in order to reach the people. Therefore, I attach the greatest importance to language and I want to make a distinction between what is called linguism and the importance of languages. The importance of languages has to be borne in mind. They have to be encouraged; they have to be used, used to this extent that one language does not impose itself upon another. Maybe that many people will have to learn more than one language. I do not think any person is educated if he only knows one language, it does not matter how clever he may be in that language. Today a person should know two, three, or maybe more languages before he can be considered to have enough education and culture and wide knowledge. Of course, in any scientific or technical subject it is quite impossible for a person to be up-to-date unless he knows at least enough to read books in three or four languages. He can not do it otherwise. If this country grows up and forgets the foreign languages, notably English, which we know to some extent, it does not matter how clever we are in Hindi or Bengali or Tamil or Telugu or Marathi, whatever the language may be, I have no doubt that we will become second-rate, because it so happens that a great deal of modern knowledge is in other languages—technical knowledge, scientific knowledge, all kinds of knowledge are there. Therefore, it becomes essential for a really educated person in India not only to know one, two or more languages of India but also to know a foreign language. This seems rather extraordinary to people here. They are surprised. In the Punjab there is a good deal of shouting about: "Are we to learn Hindi and Punjabi? Both?" as if that is a terrible burden for anyone to carry. Quite apart from the political aspect of it why should not everybody know Punjabi and Hindi?

I do not see anything at all. It is a good thing if for nothing else to get on with his neighbour, to be friendly with his neighbour. And we have to get used to the idea of our people, at any rate. Any person who presumes to call himself educated has to learn a number of languages, at least two, maybe three Indian languages and a foreign language which normally will be English. It may be French or German or Russian or Chinese. In fact, we will have to learn Russian and Chinese a little bit more because we do not know enough of them. They are our great neighbours and those languages are going to play an important role. All kinds of important books are even now coming out especially in Russian. Therefore, I should like this House to distinguish between the idea of importance of language—with which I entirely agree, it is of the highest importance—and linguism, that is applying it strictly to State boundaries. I do not see how one leads to the other. They overlap to some extent, of course, and if we want that language to be used in our official work, etc.—as we do want to—naturally in a State that would be done. But there is no reason namely, if there are two languages, why work in that State should not be done in two languages, if not in the whole State, maybe in that part of the State where the second language is dominant. There is no reason at all. Let us say, even if it is a little burden on the people, surely that little burden is a better thing to choose than conflict and even irritation of your neighbour which comes in the way of your growth and progress. So that I would beg this House to consider this from this point of view of distinguishing language growth and language encouragement, which is highly important, from linguism, which means a certain narrow approach to the problem, looking at a linguistic area as a political area, as an administrative area, as a socio-economic area and ignoring other factors. Of course you may, you can make a language area, political area and largely it is so and

you will make it more so, I do not mind, provided you are not rigid about it, about your boundaries. But not all the laws that you may pass can make a language area an economic area necessarily. It cannot, because an economic area depends on other factors, on resources, minerals, coal, iron, water power, electric power and a hundred and one things. You cannot produce them out of the language. It is that area that will produce them. So, those factors which are of the highest importance today in our development are necessarily ignored when a person talks of linguism pure and simple.

The other day I ventured to suggest in the Lok Sabha that at any rate even if we, by force of circumstances, have to submit to these present divisions and the suggested divisions, let us at least have some large zonal councils in the country. I suggested there may be four or five councils, one for the North, one for the South, one for the East, one for the West and one Central (loud applause). Now, the whole idea was, I suggested that perhaps when a beginning is made it might be that these zonal councils are only advisory. Otherwise, it is difficult to get a move on because of vested interests. I should say by 'vested interests' I am not referring to them in the economic sense, but in the political sense. Each State is a vested interest to persons, if I may say so, like me and you and others. That is to say, the politician's vested interest comes in the way. So, I said let it be an advisory one dealing with, to begin with, certainly economic questions, all kinds of things, river valleys, etc. which are common; dealing, of course, with all border matters, because between almost every two States in India there are often border questions—not very vital. Sometimes they are important. Sometimes border questions have been pending between two States for the last ten, twenty years, not settled; minor questions or major questions, because each State sticks to

its own opinion. It is almost like this, they look upon these States as their personal zamindari and two zamindars quarrelling over a bit of land. So, there are economic matters and there are many other common matters which they could discuss and gradually the scope of common discussion and common subjects may increase. I do not know—in future, if the States are agreeable, one could even invest some few powers to these zonal councils. However, the whole idea was to check this tendency in India towards too acute a State consciousness which has been encouraged even more by these arguments about linguism and the like. And I was happy that, as here, when I mentioned it in the Lok Sabha there was a great appreciation and almost, if not unanimous, near unanimous appreciation of this idea, because the fact is that while all of us are arguing about our disputes, about this border territory or that, all of us are beginning to feel some prickings of conscience. Are we going along the right lines? Some, of course, say so openly. Others may not say so openly, but, nevertheless, they feel it. Are we not encouraging disruption and dissipated tendencies in India too much. Anything which suggests some kind of a common idea may immediately be acclaimed because it does not come into conflict with their particular interest. Broad principles can be easily accepted especially when they do not come in conflict with some particular interest. But this is an important matter and I do hope that whatever form, whatever ultimate decision might be adopted by Parliament in regard to the reorganisation of States, one of them will be this—the formation of zonal councils with certain subjects allotted to them—or, indeed, the states can allot any common matters and they can discuss any matter. I would suggest that this zonal council should have some representative of the Centre so as to keep them in touch—I am rather blunt—lest a number of States should gang up against the Centre. That is a possibility and this would also possibly help in

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]
bringing about a certain balance in India.

Now, it is complained that North India—more especially Uttar Pradesh which is a very big State with a big population—is too heavy, that the scales in favour of North India weighed too much as compared with South India. To some extent, that may be true. North India is a bigger chunk than South India. But it should not be true essentially in working and this idea of zonal council, of course, if there had been big States—would have taken place. But if unfortunately in the North we have bigger States and in the South smaller States, again that difficulty will arise. Now, with the zonal council, there might be a little better balancing of this aspect too.

This House knows that there are certain phrases current in some parts of the world which originated largely from India. There is the phrase "Panch Shil"—the Five Principles—the last of which is peaceful co-existence. And we have talked about it a great deal and other people have talked about in the international sense. And I believe that these ideas are spreading and affecting people's minds. Now, we stand up before the wide world for peaceful co-existence between nations. It does seem odd that there is a lack of peaceful co-existence between States. It is an extraordinary business. All our high-falutin language and our good advice to the peoples of the world falls flat. What will they say when they see such huge excitement about this question of States. I can understand the excitement about such matter. But when that excitement goes beyond a certain limit, when it becomes one which leads to violence or to acute hostility between people of different States or different languages, then it becomes dangerous. And we must agree that much has been said and much has been done in India which is beyond that limit of peaceful excitement, if I may say so, all reasonable

approach, however excited one may be. Now, essentially the reasonable approach is this. The reasonable and democratic approach is to put forward your view-point with all the strength that you possess, with all the ability that you possess, but to be prepared to agree finally to whatever decision Parliament or whatever body takes,—that is to say, to submit to adverse decisions, to submit to decisions which are against your own wishes. Why? Because any other course of action means upsetting the basic fabric of the nation. Now, that is the most vital matter of all. Nobody should take a step which might lead to that. Of course, democratic functioning means full discussion with everybody having the opportunity to discuss the matter; then some decision is taken, presumably by a majority, and then accepting their decision whatever it is, it being always open to the minority to try to convert the others at a later stage, if necessary. Now, I talk about majority and minority. Democracy, of course, means that the majority will prevail. It is obvious. But democracy means also something else than this. It does not mean, according to my thinking, that the majority will automatically function regardless of what the minorities think, because the majority, by virtue of its being in majority, has the power. Therefore, it has the greatest responsibility thrown upon it to function more or less as a trustee of the minority and always to consider the feelings—the interests—of the minority, not of course disliking it. Sometimes, a minority overpresses its claims and presumes to dictate to the majority and demands surrender from the majority. No majority can surrender, but it is equally important that the majority should never place a minority in such a position of helplessness that its views are not considered. And when I use the words "majority" and "minority", I am using them whether it is a religious majority or minority; whether it is a linguistic majority or minority or whether it is any other type of majority or minority. Democratic func-

tioning means that the minority, whatever it is, has its full play and its views are fully considered and not over-ruled. Well, if the majority functions otherwise, then it is not functioning truly as a democratic organisation and it goes wrong. It is odd that we are giving in some places in India an exhibition of something opposed to peaceful co-existence when we claim that this should be the policy of nations. What is still worse is this. I am not talking merely of some excited persons or group of persons misbehaving. It does not matter if in a moment of high excitement somebody misbehaves provided he pulls himself up later. What matters even more than this are those basic dislikes that people begin to nurse in their bosoms and which vitiate and spoil the atmosphere of all common work. That is terrible. I remember Gandhiji saying somewhere—he, a man of non-violence and Ahimsa, said—“If you have a sword in your bosom, take it out and use it instead of keeping it in your bosom.” Better have it out. It is better than to nurse these dislikes and hatred within yourself and vitiate your life and your neighbour's life and everybody's life. And they come in the way of any kind of real, effective and common working. And this real, effective and common working is absolutely essential.

I come to the Second Five Year Plan. In the Planning Commission, we ponder over it, we discuss it. A panel of economists—best economists in India—come and we discuss it. They are not of the same opinion. They differ of course. But, nevertheless many of them are of one opinion. They advise us on all kinds of new aspects of problems which come up because we are not discussing it in the air. We deal with hard realities. And among the hard realities, we have got to see how the people of India can function. It is a financial matter on the one side, and an administrative matter on the other. It is also a technical matter concerning technical knowledge and technical training. Yes,

all these are necessary. But there is that big factor which is quite important. And that is: How will the millions of India function? And in that functioning there is another aspect also. What burden they can carry? In an under-developed nation, before you get the advantage of any advance, you have to carry certain burdens. If you have to build a house, you have to dig deep the foundation, and you have to work hard. The house will only come up later. And the house of our new India, and the mansion of this new India, that we are trying to build, requires hard work to be done, and a good deal of digging and a good deal of austerity. We talk in terms of resources. The question of resources depends a good deal on whether we can live a relatively hard and austere life, all of us. Of course, you would say, and rightly, that the great majority of the people of India do live terribly austere lives, and we should bring some relief to them. Now, I do not, for a moment, suggest that their austerity should increase. But it is inevitable that some part of the heavy burden that the country will have to carry, if we can fulfil big programmes, will fall even on the common people. That again does not mean that they will have to suppress or depress their present standard of living. But they may not be able to get the advantage of the cent. per cent. advance, because part of it will have to be channelled towards further advance in that sense. But you can never ask them to do that unless those who are better off set them an example. Therefore all these problems do arise, but when compared to the larger issues, they are only petty matters, because we have to see them in the larger context of these important recommendations made by the Commission.

Now, Sir, the House realises no doubt that I am not in a position, at the present moment, to inform the House of any final recommendations that our Government will make, not that the Government cannot sit down and come to conclusions. We have sat

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]
 down, and we have some ideas on the subject, many ideas rather, and after all we will come to some decisions, and it is only a question of days now, or a question of weeks, if you like. But there is a tremendous desire to get the largest possible measure of agreement. It was easy for us more or less to adopt the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission, may be, with some variations here and there. It is a well thought-out Report. But we wanted the largest measure of agreement. It was therefore natural for this process of trying to achieve agreement being carried out unofficially rather than officially. Officially, it becomes formal, and people begin to behave rigidly, as if they are appearing in a court of law. If they think that they are getting something less than their ultimate demand, they pitch their voice at its height, and it really becomes impossible to get on. Therefore, as I said, these matters, very often, have to be dealt with unofficially and privately. We have dealt with them in that way—as individuals, as private persons, as Members of the Congress Organisation. And we have tried to find out what would represent this largest measure of agreement, without, of course, giving up any very basic principle. Broadly speaking, I am prepared to say that I value agreement more than even the pure merits of a question, because however good, logical and reasonable something might appear to you or to me, if the very persons who are going to function under that reject it or dislike it, or feel frustrated about it, the whole object of that meritorious deed is defeated. Therefore we searched for agreement. In some cases, we have been fortunate enough to get that agreement, even though people felt rather strongly about those matters, and in other cases, well, we are struggling hard. And it may be that we may be able to get, if not complete, at least some measure of agreement. So, that has been our difficulty and that has involved a certain amount of

delay in proceeding with rather more concrete decisions in Parliament. But obviously this matter cannot go on in this way indefinitely. It is bad for the country, and I hope that before very long, these formal—I need not call them decisions, because final decisions will be taken only by Parliament—recommendations will be no doubt placed before the country, and then, ultimately, Parliament will have to take a decision.

In this connection, Sir, I would like to refer to the case of Bombay. Now, the hon. Members know very well what the recommendation of the States Reorganisation Commission was in regard to the Bombay State and the surrounding areas. And I may again say, as I have already said, that I knew nothing about it till I had the Report. That was the first time when I knew about it. I knew about the general structure of this recommendation. And the moment I read the recommendation, I liked it. It appealed to me—this attempt to solve a difficult problem. Of course, there can be no absolutely final solution of anything, and if anything is wrong, it can always be remedied later. But obviously, this was a good and a wise attempt, without doing any injury really to any strongly-held opinion of either Maharashtrians or Gujaratis or any other people living in the city of Bombay. And that was the opinion of most of my colleagues too. It was a good decision and we could have gladly put it forward to the country with our strong recommendation for its acceptance. In fact, I have not changed my opinion about that. I still think that it is the best decision. But again, in our search for agreement, we met our friends from Maharashtra and others. And we were given to understand that for some reasons our Maharashtrian friends did not like it at all. In fact, they were strongly opposed to it. I still think that their opposition, if I may say so with all respect to them, is not logical or based on a cool, real and objective consideration of this question, but

rather on certain reactions. However, the fact is that they said so, and we were driven to the course of suggesting something else. And even when we suggested something else, we intimated our preference to the States Reorganisation Commission's decision. But we said, "Well, if that is not acceptable, let us have these three States." In effect, the question was of choosing a lesser evil. And when we suggested the three-State formula, we did not say anything in the air. We said it because at that time, we were particularly given to understand that that would be agreeable to the various parties, not to everybody, of course, but to the various parties concerned.

Otherwise, why should we
4 P.M. say something which we do not like very much? The only reason for saying so was that we thought it was agreeable. We were given to understand that. That is the position. If that is not agreeable, then there is no question of asking anybody to accept something which we dislike and others dislike. We go back to the States Reorganisation Commission's formula, or to whatever agreement comes. We have had to face all these difficulties, and in the meanwhile, the city of Bombay presents rather a sorry spectacle. I am very fond of Bombay not merely because it is a beautiful city but it has been the pride of India. Bombay is as much mine and every Member's here as of any resident of Bombay. Bombay took a great part, a very fine part in our struggle for freedom and we all rejoiced, and for this great proud city of Bombay to become a scene of mutual hatred, hostility and conflict, is painful. I would appeal to all those people in Bombay to think of these larger questions. I do not wish them to give up any of their ideas, but we must approach this question with some goodwill, amity, and without hatred and malice. One thing is absolutely certain that, whatever the decision, it does not matter what decision Parliament gives or we give or anybody else gives, if there is this hatred and conflict

between large sections of the people of Bombay, then Bombay will suffer. There is no doubt about it. So, I do hope that this will be avoided. Of course it is a matter of a short time now before final recommendations are made and ultimately final decisions are taken by Parliament, but even that short time is too long for conflicts, hostility and hatred, and it does a great deal of damage to our cause. Many of the hon. Members of this House have gone through all kinds of experiences in the past during our struggle for freedom and during those terrible days after the partition here in Delhi City, Punjab and in Pakistan on the other side, and any of us who saw those days can never forget them. We have waded through blood and tears to reach where we are, and it is well that we remember that and how easy it is to destroy this fabric that we have built up in India during the last eight years, a fabric which is increasingly having the respect of the world, and for us ourselves to undermine it and destroy it would be tragedy indeed. Therefore we have to go ahead with this matter and try to judge everything of course on the merits but always seeking the largest goodwill and agreement, and I hope that after this rather flush of excitement and hostility has played itself out, people will begin to think more quietly and objectively and remember that, if any of them give up their particular claims to the other party, they are likely to give something infinitely more precious and valuable in exchange and that is the goodwill of that other party. That counts for much more than any bit of territory anywhere.

I think that the discussions that this House has had will help in the consideration of this problem, help us and help others. The main object of these discussions was that every aspect of these questions should be thoroughly explored because sometimes one is apt to ignore some aspect which does not come up before one's eyes, so that the country may also think of those

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]
 aspects. In fact, we thought it rather improper for Government to come to any decision before these discussions had taken place in both Houses of Parliament, so that the Government might be in the possession of all these viewpoints. Now that these viewpoints have been expressed forcefully and with much skill by hundreds of Members of Parliament, we have passed that stage and we shall now go ahead, I hope with the goodwill of this House

and the other House, to shoulder this burden of decision and come with such decisions as appear right and proper to us, keeping in view always the unity and solidarity of India and the needs of her people.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned *sine die*.

The House adjourned *sine die* at seven minutes past four of the clock.