

MOTION RE REPORT STATES REORGANISATION COMMISSION

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the motion regarding the S.R.C. Report. Today is the last day and I wish to give as many hon. Members chances to speak as I can and therefore, again, I repeat my appeal that the hon. Members who may be called upon today will take a very short time, 5 or 10 minutes is a period which I do not believe can be put to any use.

An Hon. Member: At least 15 minutes should be given.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore, it may be 15 minutes and nothing more than that. But still, I can say that it may be 20 minutes at the most and not a second beyond that. Hon. Members who may be called upon to speak will bear that in mind. The discussion comes to a close today at 5-30 p.m.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): May I request....

Mr. Speaker: No request unless it is a point of order. The hon. Minister will reply at 5-30 p.m. There are five hours now roughly speaking. **Mr. Kelappan.**

श्री रामजी बर्मा (जिला देवरिया-पूर्व) :
माननीय अध्यक्ष जी, मैं अपने एडजर्नमेंट
मोशन के सिलसिले में कुछ निवेदन करना
चाहता हूँ ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यदि आपको निवेदन
करना है तो पीछे से मेरे चैम्बर में निवेदन
करें। सभागृह का समय बेकार लेना ठीक
बात नहीं है ।

Shri Kelappan (Ponnani): I am very thankful to you for the opportunity given to me. I very much regret to say that the States Re-organisation Commission has produced a very disappointing and controversial Report. From the recommendations,

one is led to think that the Commission did not squarely face the problem and recommend the re-organisation on some sound principles. It has the look of a patched up affair. It was mainly a case of appeasement and yielding to pressure. I shall not be very much wrong if I infer that most of the States are dissatisfied with the recommendations. We saw the prolonged cheers with which the House greeted the suggestion of the Prime Minister that the whole country may be divided into a few zones. In their anxiety to make out a case for linguistic States, the Commission have made certain generalisations which will not stand the scrutiny. I propose to examine some of these recommendations, because they are dangerous and may cut at the root of the unity and security of the country. At page 35 of the Report it is said.

“The States of the Indian Union can achieve this internal cohesiveness only if they are constituted on a unilingual basis, because language being the vehicle for the communion of thought and feeling, provides the most effective single bond for uniting the people. Linguistic homogeneity, therefore, provides the only rational basis for reconstructing the States, for it reflects the social and cultural pattern of living obtaining in well-defined regions of the country.”

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA
in the Chair]

It is not a fact. We know that social and cultural differences exist in spite of the unity of language. Social and cultural patterns, if at all, are dependent more on religion and caste than on language. We have to divide this country in the name of religion. Even though people speak the same language, it is our experience that caste and customs sometimes lead to communal clashes and even to breaking of heads in

[Shri Kelappan]

spite of a common language. Also, in my opinion, unity depends upon education and on the income of the people. It is more a horizontal division than a vertical division. I mean that though people speak different languages, people in the same state of mind have got almost the same mode of living. So also, the poor people among the different religions have the same way of living. The S.R.C. Report says:

"In multilingual States, political leadership and administrative authority remain the monopoly of the dominant language groups, and linguistic minorities are denied an effective voice in the governance of their States. Even where there are substantial minorities having adequate representation in the cabinet, the representatives of linguistic minority groups find it impossible, owing to party discipline and other factors, to do anything effective to safeguard the interests of minorities. Similarly, in multilingual States welfare activity as well as development plans are unequally and unfairly distributed, the areas inhabited by the dominant language groups developing at the expense of other areas. The demand for unilingual States, therefore, aims at securing for minorities a fair deal not only in the social and cultural spheres, but also in the political and economic fields."

I am not able to follow this reasoning. Is it the contention that in a unilingual State, there will be no linguistic minorities? Is it proposed to exchange population? If there is such a proposal, even if certain areas are exchanged, there will still be linguistic minorities. What is their safety? How can these minorities get a fair deal? Let me give an instance. From the Kerala State, it is proposed to separate five taluks of Travancore and add them to the Madras State. The Tamil population of these five taluks will not be more

than 6 lakhs. The total linguistic minorities consisting of Tamils, Telugus and Kannadigas will be not less than 10 or 12 lakhs. So, there will be left in Kerala 6 lakhs, mostly Tamils. But, they are scattered throughout the State. The linguistic problem will remain unless exchange of population is contemplated. I ask how the separation of these five taluks is going to solve the minority problem? How will the so-called unilingual State secure the interests of linguistic minorities. I shall quote one more passage to show to what absurd and dangerous conclusions this kind of reasoning will take us. The report says:

"The political atmosphere, vitiated by linguistic differences, has now permeated into the administrative structure as a whole. Important administrative posts tend to become the monopoly of the members of dominant language groups and appointments and promotions are no longer governed by considerations of administrative purity, efficiency and fairness."

Here is a confession that minority language groups cannot expect to get justice at the hands of the majority. The Commission forgot that there is an Indian Union in which the Hindi-speaking States form about 40 per cent of the population, and so they, have 40 per cent of the Members in the Parliament. There is no possibility of removing this large population from the Indian Union. In the words of the S.R.C., they would permeate into the administrative structure and monopolise all the important administrative posts. This is an argument for breaking up the Union. The Dravida Kazagam is complaining that the Hindi north is dominating the Central administration. So, if they want to get out of the Union, are they not justified? If other language groups also feel that a unilingual Union is not in the interests of the minorities, will they not be justified in demanding a separate State? The Commission, in their anxiety to make out a case for unilingual States, have

landed themselves in absurdity. I am not so pessimistic. We have a cultural heritage which does not narrow down our loyalties to language or religion, but transcends these narrow bounds. The agitation for unilingual States has only aggravated our linguistic bigotry and added to linguistic bitterness. The remedy lies in not emphasising language so much. The J.V.P. Committee and the Dhar Commission and the Congress Working Committee hold the view that security, unity and economic prosperity must be the primary considerations. Unless we cultivate loyalties other than those of language, the Indian Union will lose the allegiance not only of the citizens, but of the States as well. In a bi-lingual or tri-lingual State, all language groups stand to gain. They will get equal recognition and equal treatment. We must understand precisely what a unilingual state is. In a unilingual state, other languages are not recognised. In the Legislative Assembly, only one language, the language of the State will be permitted. Similarly the Government publications, the Gazette and everything will be in one language. What I say is, where you cannot have an area where cent per cent of the population speak one language, the other minorities will be ignored and they will find it difficult.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has only three minutes more. He, may go on. I am only just warning him in time so that he may not miss any important point.

Shri Kelappan: We did not really ask for a linguistic State. You will find in the memorandum submitted by the Aikya Kerala Committee, it is definitely stated:

"Let it be understood at the very outset that we do not claim the proposed Kerala province as a mere linguistic area. There are bi-lingual and multilingual areas in the north, east and south. As a result social contract between people of the adjacent territories where different languages are spoken."

So it is not a linguistic state that we asked for.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon-cum-Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Are you for a Kerala State?

Shri Kelappan: Yes. The Kerala State extends from South Canara to Cape Comorin. It is the land lying between the Western Ghats and the sea. It is geographically a compact area, with the same climate, with the same products, with the same culture if I may say so.

I said in the beginning that the Commission did not form the States on any rational or sound basis. You will understand it if you look at the population and the area of many of the States. You find that there are States with very large areas. Kerala is the smallest State with the densest population. You will find that the area is 14,000 square miles. There are others with 170,000 square miles and 150,000 square miles. Similarly, if you look at the population, you will find that there are States with populations ranging from 4 million to 63 million. That shows that the States will have different representation in the Centre. The Deputy-Speaker, when he was asking for Visal Andhra said that he wanted a bigger State because bigger States will have a greater pull in the Centre. Yesterday, when Shri Tandon was speaking, I was surprised, he did not like the U.P. to be split up. In a federation, one important thing is that all the States must have the same status. If the States are to have the same status, they must have equal representation also. If one State has 86 Members in the Parliament and another has only 6 or 10, you cannot say that they have equal representation. Our claim for territories for Kerala is based on the ground that it is the smallest State with the highest density of population. We have a claim for bi-lingual areas in the neighbourhood. Again, yesterday, when Shri B. Shiva Rao spoke, he said that he did not really insist on even a part of Kesargode being added on to Karnataka.

[Shri Kelappan.]

For, that would really have been a weak claim. You will find that in Kasaragod taluk, about 72 per cent. of the people are Malayalees. There are about 101 villages in Kasaragod. In all these villages, excepting one, the majority of the people speak Malayalam. The same thing is true of Gudalur also. There also, you will find that the majority of the people speak Malayalam. Further, at one time, it was part of Wynaad taluk in Malabar; in fact, the whole land belonged to two of the jenmis. So, there is absolutely no case for adding it on to Tamil Nad.

As I said in the beginning, we do not stand by the linguistic idea in a welfare-State, I believe it is the duty of every State to see that the other States also live. If we are large-hearted enough to say that we shall live and at the same time allow others also to live, then it is the duty of a most all the States, in fact, of all the people to see.....

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has taken twenty minutes already. And that is the greatest amount of time available today for any hon. Member. I would therefore, request the hon. Member to kindly resume his seat.

Now, I call upon Shri M. H. Rahman.

شری ایم - ایچ - رحمن (مراد آباد)
ضلع — مدھیہ) : محترم چھوڑمہن
صاحب - ہم کئی دنوں سے حد بندی
کمیشن رپورٹ پر بات چیت کر رہے
ہیں - جس زمانہ میں اسکا چرچا ہوا
تھا اس وقت میرا خیال یہ تھا کہ یہ
معاملہ یہ مسئلہ وقت سے کچھ پہلے
ہے - بہتر ہوتا کہ ابھی ہم اپنے اقتصادی
اور اکنامک پروگرام اور پلس ورکشہ
پروجکٹوں نے بارے میں جو دور دھوپ

کر رہے تھے - توجہ دے رہے تھے -
اسی پر اپنی توجہ دیکھتے - محترم
پبلت جی بے حوالہ دیا تھا کہ جس
طرح ایک بڑی شخصیت سردار بلہہ
بھائی پٹیل نے ۶۰۰ ریاستوں نے
مسئلہ کو حل کرنے ہمارے بھارت
کی ایکٹا پھدا کی اسی طرح ہم لوگوں
کو اس مسئلہ کو بھی دیکھنا چاہئے -
لہکن میں یہ سمجھتا ہوں کہ
بیشک اس عظیم شخصیت نے جس
طرح ۶۰۰ ریاستوں کو ختم کر کے
ہمارے بھارت کی ایکٹا پھدا کی وہ
معاملہ آج حد بندی کمیٹی کی
رپورٹ کے بارے میں مجھے نظر نہیں
آتا - میں تو یہ محسوس کر رہا ہوں
اور میرا یقین ہو گیا ہے کہ جو کچھ
میں نے سوچا تھا وہ ٹھیک تھا - اس
لئے کہ جو بحث اس وقت تک
ہماری لوک سبھا میں ہوئی اس میں
میں نے تو یہ دیکھا کہ بعض دفعہ
یہ معلوم ہوتا تھا کہ یہ لوک سبھا
نہیں ہے - بلکہ ایسی جنگی کونسل
ہے جس میں ایک سٹیٹ سے دوسری
سٹیٹ کو یا گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کو
الگیہم دیا جا رہا ہے - اس سے صاف
اندازہ ہوتا ہے کہ کاش اس وقت ہماری
توجہ اس کے بجائے اپنے اقتصادی پروگرام
کی طرف ہوتی تو زیادہ بہتر ہوتا -
لیکن جب یہ مسئلہ سامنے آ گیا ہے
تو مجھے بھی جلد باتیں کہنی
ہیں -

پہلا مسئلہ یہ ہے کہ حد بلندی کمیشن کی رپورٹ ہمارے حد بلندی یا باوندری کمیشن کے پاس سے ہمارے سامنے آئی ہے۔ لیکن اس نے زبان پر بھی بہت کافی بحث کی ہے۔ اور دکھنی ہندوستان کے اندر لینگویج یا زبان کے مسئلہ پر ستھت بنانے میں بہت کافی مضبوط اور امپارٹڈ حصہ لیا ہے۔ لیکن میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اُتری ہندوستان میں اس طرح سے اس مسئلہ کو نہیں لیا گیا۔ ابھی کل ہمارے محبوب لہڈر پنڈت جواہر لال نہرو نے اردو کے بارے میں بہت زبردست تقریر فرمائی تھی لیکن میں ابھی تک یہ سمجھنے سے قاصر ہوں کہ اردو کے مسئلہ کو صرف لیکچر یا تقریروں کے ذریعہ بیان کو دینے سے حل کیا جاسکتا ہے یا نہیں۔ شری تقدن جی نے بھی جس طرح وضاحت کے ساتھ کل اردو کے بارے میں فرمایا تھا اس سے مجھے بڑی خوشی ہوئی۔ لیکن یہاں تو اگلے قدم کا سوال ہے جس میں شاید ان کو بھی اختلاف ہوگا۔ میں یہ کہتا ہوں زبانوں کے مسئلہ کے بارے میں ایک اسٹھت ایک لینگویج کے اصول پر بہت توجہ دی گئی ہے۔ لیکن یہ کوئی چیز نہیں ہے۔ ہم اس پر چلنا نہیں چاہتے۔ اگر ایک اسٹھت میں دو یا تین لینگویج ہوں تو ہم اس کی سرکاری اسٹھت کو تسلیم کریں۔ جب کہ ہم ہندی کو پورے بھارت

کی سرکاری زبان تسلیم کر لیا۔ قومی زبان تسلیم کر لیا تو کسی بھی زبان کے بارے میں یہ سمجھنا کہ وہ ہندی کا درجہ حاصل کرنا چاہتی ہے ہوک نہیں ہے۔ یہ سمجھنا کہ اردو ہندی کی رقیب ہے اور اگر اردو کو کوئی علاقہ دیا جائے گا تو اس سے ہندی کو نقصان پہنچے گا۔ اس پر مجھے اختلاف ہے۔ ہماری ۱۴ زبانیں ہیں جس طرح بلگلا - گجراتی - مراٹھی - تامل-ملیالم و ہیرہ کو ستھت لینگویج کی حیثیت دی جاتی ہے اس طرح سے کیا وجہ ہے کہ اردو کے مسئلہ میں وہی پوزیشن اختیار نہیں کی گئی۔ میں ادھر توجہ دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ بعض لیکچروں اور تقریروں میں - عدو سے عدو الفاظ میں ادا کر دینے سے کسی زبان کا مسئلہ سرکاری طور پر حل نہیں ہوتا۔ آج ایک ایسا مقام اور ایسا علاقہ بتلانا چاہئے جیسے یو۔ پی۔ ہے۔ بہار ہے۔ دہلی ہے۔ جس طرح دوسری زبانوں کے علاقے ہیں جن میں کہ وہ زبانیں سرکاری حیثیت پا کر پہلیں کی اور پہولیں کی۔ اس طرح سے اردو بھی سرکاری حیثیت پا کر پہلے پہولے اور صحیح طور پر اپنے قدموں پر کھڑی ہو سکے۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ رپورٹ میں اس کی طرف توجہ نہیں دی گئی ہے اور اس کے ساتھ انصاف نہیں کیا گیا ہے۔ آج اس ہاؤس کو اس طرف توجہ دینی چاہئے۔ اور ہمارے پرائم

[شری ایم - ایچ - رحمن]

مستتر صاحب کو بھی توجہ دہلی چاہئے۔ اس لئے کہ اس کوئی علاقہ ہمارے سامنے موجود نہیں ہے۔ سینٹارکس میں ضرور اس کا ذکر آتا ہے جیسے کہ یہ کوئی مائٹاری ہو گئی ہے۔ جیسے بھارت کی اور زبانیں ہیں اس طرح سے اردو بھی ہے۔ یہ ہندو مسلمان کا سوال نہیں ہے یہ بھارت کی زبان ہے لیکن وہ کسی سٹیٹ کی زبان نہیں ہے۔ جس طرح اور زبانوں کے پاس ان کے علاقے ہیں اسی طرح سے اردو کے لئے بھی ایک علاقہ چاہئے۔

ایک آنریبل ممبر: آپ کون سا علاقہ چاہتے ہیں۔

شری ایم - ایچ - رحمن: میں یو۔ پی۔ کا مطالبہ کرتا ہوں۔ دہلی اور یو۔ پی۔ میں اس کو سرکاری ریجنل لیگویج کی حیثیت حاصل ہونی چاہئے۔ دہلی صوبہ میں بھی اس کو یہی جگہ ملنی چاہئے۔

جلاب کل مات کرتے کرتے ہمارے

شری ٹنڈن جی نے توجہ دلائی تھی کہ اردو زبان تو ضرور بھارت کی ہے لیکن ان کو اس سے اختلاف ہے کہ لہی بھی بھارت کی ہے۔ میں بہت ادب سے ان کی خدمت میں عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ یہ ٹھیک ہے کہ اردو لہی ہندوستان کی نہیں ہے۔ وہ عربی سے لی گئی ہے۔

فارسی سے بھی لی گئی ہے۔ دونوں ہی رسم الخطوں سے وہ بلی ہے۔ لیکن میں ان کی توجہ اس طرف دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ کسی زبان کے رسم الخط کا دوسری زبان کے رسم الخط سے فائدہ اٹھانا؛ وہی عیب کی بات نہیں ہے۔ سندھی زبان نئے دوسری زبانوں سے فائدہ اٹھایا ہے۔ لیکن جو لہی آج ہم بھارت میں اردو کے لئے استعمال کر رہے ہیں وہ عربی لہی نہیں ہے۔ عربی لہی سے ہم نے فائدہ ضرور اٹھایا ہے لیکن اس سے فرق کر دیا ہے۔ جو عربی کا رسم الخط ہے اس کو نسخہ کہتے ہیں اور جو اردو کا رسم الخط ہے اس کو نستعلیق کہتے ہیں۔ اس طرح سے اردو اور عربی لہی میں کافی فرق ہو جاتا ہے۔ اردو کو بھی بھارت کی ہی چیز سمجھا جاتا ہے۔ اس لئے میں نے آپ کی اور ہاؤس کی توجہ دلائی کہ اردو کا مسئلہ نہایت ضروری اور اس بات کو حل کرنا چاہئے کہ اردو کو کیوں کوئی علاقہ نہ دیا جائے۔

جہاں تک دوسرے سوالات ہیں ان میں مائٹاری کا سوال بھی آیا ہے۔ میں مانتا ہوں کہ مائٹاری کو حفاکارتے دے کر امداد دی جاتی ہے۔ لیکن بعض موقعے ایسے ہوتے ہیں کہ محض سینٹارکس یا حفاظت سے بھی مائٹاری کا کام نہیں چلتا۔ اس کے مطالبے پر در کرنا چاہئے کہ جو چیز مانگی

جا رہی ہے۔ - و چیز طلب کی جا رہی ہے وہ کہا ہے۔ اور اس کو کہا دقت یا پریشانی ہے۔ اور اگر پریشانی ہے تو وہ چیز سینگارڈز سے حل ہو سکتی ہے یا نہیں۔ میں اس مسئلہ کے متعلق مانتا ہوں۔ کشنگلج کی مثال پیش کرنا چاہتا ہوں۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ وہاں ساڑھے تین لاکھ انسان ہیں جن کا مطالبہ یہ ہے کہ ان کو بلکال کا حصہ نہ بلایا جائے۔ میرے نزدیک ایک ہی بڑی وجہ ہے جس سے ان کی پریشانی ظاہر ہوئی ہے۔ ۱۹۵۱ء کے فسادات نے زمانہ میں بلکال میں جہاں بھجڑے مظلوم رفوچیز آ رہے تھے یہاں کے مسلمان بھی فسادات کی بنا پر اکھڑ گئے تھے۔ اس وقت کچھ مسلمانوں کے ہسٹے کا سوال پیدا ہوا۔ حکومت نے اس پر توجہ دی اور وعدہ کیا کہ وہ مسلمان جو پاکستان نہیں گئے وہ ضرور وہاں ہسٹے جائیں گے اور ان کو ضرور مکان دئے جائیں گے۔ لیکن آج آٹھ برس ہو گئے ہیں لیکن پھر بھی ہزاروں مسلمان ایسے موجود ہیں جن کے بارے میں میں کہہ سکتا ہوں کہ وہ ہوزہ و راجھور جگہاں گوری اور بہت سے ایسے ہی مقامات میں پڑے ہوئے ہیں جو کہ بھارت کے ہی رہنے والے ہیں۔ وہ یہاں کے ہی باشندے ہیں اور پاکستان بھی نہیں گئے۔ ان کے باوجود بھی وہ اپنے گھروں سے - ضرور ہیں۔ آج تک ان کو گھر نہیں ملے۔

ایک آرٹر بلکال گورنمنٹ نے نکالا جس میں اس نے کہا کہ جب تک رفوچیز کا انتظام الٹرنیٹو طور پر نہیں ہو جائے گا اس وقت تک ان کو مکانات نہیں ملوں گے۔ میں اس چہرے کو صحیح نہیں مانتا ہوں۔ ان کو رفوچیز کے ساتھ ملانا ٹھیک نہیں ہے۔ یہ وہ لوگ ہیں جو ہندوستان میں ہی رہ رہے ہیں اور پاکستان بھی نہیں گئے۔ یہ آدمی جو اپنے گھروں سے محروم کر دئے گئے ہوں یہ بھجڑے اپنے گھروں کو دیکھ دیکھ کر حیران ہوتے ہیں کہ اپنے ہی گھروں میں ان کو جانے کی اجازت نہیں ہے۔ ایسی حالت کو دیکھ کر جو باہر کے بسنے والے ہیں وہ بھی حیران ہونگے کیونکہ ہو سکتا ہے کہ پھر یہی چیز ان کے سامنے آئے۔ ان پر اسکا کیا اثر پڑے گا یہ سوچنے کی بات ہے۔ - سینگارڈز سے یہ سوال حل نہیں ہوگا۔ ایک علاقہ جو بلکال کو چاہئے بہار اسے کات کر کہوں دے دے جس سے کہ ان رفوچیز کو ہسٹے - اس سے چاہے اس کو جلدی بھی تکلیف کہوں نہ ہو؟

اب میں کچھ دوسرے سوالوں کی طرف آتا ہوں۔ - مائڈرٹیز کا مسئلہ ہے۔ اگر کوئی شخص ایسی بات کہتا ہے جو ایک فرقہ پرستی کی بات ہو تو میں نہیں چاہتا کہ وہ بات مان لے۔ جائے اس کو

[شری ایم۔ ایچ۔ رحمن]

بالکل بھی نہیں مانا جانا چاہئے اس کو پبھنگ دینا چاہئے اور اس کو پھروں تلے روندھ دینا چاہئے۔ لیکن اس کا یہ مطلب نہیں ہے کہ مائٹارٹی والے کوئی بھی بات کہیں اس کو فرقہ پرستی کی بات ہی آپ کہتے جائیں۔ یہ مناسب نہیں ہے۔ مائٹارٹیز کہہ جو دقتیں ہوں ان کو دور کرنے کی کوشش کی جانی چاہئے۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں پنجاب کا مسئلہ ہے وہ بھی ایک مائٹارٹی کا مسئلہ ہے۔ ہماچل کو الگ رکھنا چاہئے اور پیہسو اور پنجاب کو ایک کر دینا چاہئے۔ فضل عاٰی صاحب نے رپورٹ دی ہے اور جو کچھ انہوں نے کہا ہے یا تو وہی مان لیا جائے یا آپ دوسری طرح سے اے حل کریں یہ آپ کو سرفی ہے۔ لیکن میں چاہتا ہوں کہ مائٹارٹیز کا جو مسئلہ ہے اس کو اسی طرح سے تالا نہیں جانا چاہئے بلکہ ان کی جو تکلیفات ہیں ان کی جو دقتیں ہیں جو پریشانیاں ہیں ان کو دور کرنا چاہئے ان کو ہر طرح سے سہتسفاٹی کرنا چاہئے۔ ان کو مطمئن کرنے کی بات سوچنی چاہئے اور ایسا راستہ اختیار کرنا چاہئے جس سے کہ ان کے دلوں میں بھروسہ پیدا ہو۔ بہادرتی کے ایک ٹکڑے کو ادھر سے ادھر کر دینے میں کوئی حرج نہیں ہے۔ دولت نب

ہوتی ہے جب ان کی ہر بات کو فرقہ پرستی کی بات کہ کر تالا دیا جاتا ہے۔

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): May I just tell the hon. Member that the level of this debate has been high in both Houses, and may I beg of him not to bring in any other kind of considerations, however high my respect for him may be?

Mr. Chairman: I think every hon. Member keeps this in mind, and to say to an hon. Member while he is speaking that he should raise the level of the debate is to cast an aspersion upon him. It is not fair.

An Hon. Member: He must withdraw it.

شری ایم۔ ایچ۔ رحمن : میں گوارہ کر رہا تھا کہ درحقیقت ان مسئلوں کو اس طرح سے دیکھنا چاہئے اور اس طرح سے ان پر نظر رکھنی چاہئے جس سے کہ مائٹارٹیز کو تسلی ہو کہ ان کی باتوں کی طرف بھی دھیان دیا جاتا ہے اور ان میں بھروسہ پیدا کرنے کی کوشش کی جاتی ہے۔

تلنگانہ کا مسئلہ بھی اسی قسم کا ہے۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ وشال آندھرا بلانا تھوک بات ہے لیکن اس کے ساتھ ساتھ تلنگانا کو متعہ ملنا چاہئے کہ بجائے سینٹارڈز کے وہ ایک سنگت رہ سکے اور ایک سنگت کی طرح سے ہی وہ چلے اور اس کے بعد آپ آہستہ آہستہ وشال آندھرا میں اس کو شامل کر سکتے

ہیں۔ ابھی تک اس کو ایک سٹیٹ کے روپ میں ہی رکھنے دیا جانا چاہئے اور بعد میں ریشال آندھرا میں شامل کریں۔

یو۔ پی۔ کا جو مسئلہ ہے اس کے بارے میں میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ مجھے خوشی ہے کہ آج یو۔ پی۔ کے ممبران اس بات کو سوچتے ہیں کہ جو بات سارے ہندوستان کے فائدے میں ہو وہی کی جائے۔ بہت سے لوگ ہیں جو یہ چاہتے ہوں کہ اس کا پارٹیشن ہو۔ میں ان میں سے ہوں جو یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ پارٹیشن نہ ہو۔ ہم اس کو ایک اور مضبوط دیکھنا چاہتے ہیں۔ اگر یو۔ پی۔ کے پارٹیشن سے سارے بھارت کو فائدہ پہنچتا ہے تو اس کے لئے کوئی بھی قربانی ہمیں کرنے کے لئے تیار رکھنا چاہئے۔ لیکن اگر ہندوستان کو فائدہ نہیں پہنچتا ہے اور صرف اس لئے کہ چند ممبر یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ یو۔ پی۔ کا پارٹیشن ہو ہم کو یہ نہیں کرنا چاہئے۔ میں اس کو کوئی ریونیول بات نہیں مانتا۔

جہاں تک دلی کا سوال ہے مجھے اس میں بہت دلچسپی ہے کانسٹیٹیوٹس اسمبلی میں جب لالہ دیشمندھو کہتا جی نے دلی سٹیٹ کے بارے میں آواز اٹھائی تھی اس وقت میں نے ان کی تائید کی

تھی۔ میں نے ان کو سیکلڈ کیا تھا۔ جیسا کہ دوسرے آرنہیل ممبرز نے کہا ۱۹۱۸ میں حکیم اجمل خان صاحب نے انہیں نیشنل کانگریس میں سب سے پہلے اس مسئلہ کو اٹھایا تھا۔ آج محض اس لئے کہ کچھ کانگریسی آپس میں لڑ رہے ہیں اس واسطے آپ دلی کو الگ سٹیٹ نہیں رکھ سکتے ہیں اس کو مناسب خیال نہیں کرتا۔ یہ چیز ریونیول نہیں ہے۔ اس طرح سے دلی کی حکومت کو ان افسران کے ہاتھ میں ان حکام کے ہاتھ میں سونپ دینا ٹھیک نہیں ہوگا۔ ۲۰ لاکھ لوگوں کو ان افسروں کے رحم پر چھوڑ دینا اچھی بات نہیں ہے۔ ان کو ترقی کرنے کا پورا موقعہ ملنا چاہئے۔ میں چاہتا ہوں کہ دلی کو ضرور ایک مستقل سٹیٹ کا درجہ دے دیا جائے۔ اس کو ایک کارپوریشن کا درجہ دے کر تال نہیں دینا چاہئے۔ یہ سٹیٹ جس جمہوری نظام کے قابل ہے وہی نظام اس کو ملنا چاہئے۔

مدھیہ پردیش کا جو صوبہ بنا ہے میں اس کا سواکت کرنا ہوں۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ پردیش اسی طرح سے بنایا جانا چاہئے تھا۔

جہاں تک گجرات اور مہاراشٹر کا تعلق ہے جس کے بارے میں کہ یہاں پر بہت زبردست تقریریں ہوئی ہیں ان کو سن کر تو میں تو سا گیا تھا

[شری ایم۔ ایچ۔ رحمن]

اور سوچنے لگا تھا کہ خدا جانے اب
کیا ہوگا۔ یہاں پر چیلنج دئے گئے۔ اور
الٹیمیم دئے گئے۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں
کہ جو حل کانرس ورکنگ کمیٹی نے
تجویز کیا ہے اس کو مان لینا چاہئے
وہ فیصلہ بالکل صحیح ہے۔ بمبئی
سٹیٹ کو الگ ہی رکھنا چاہئے اسے
الگ رہ کر ہی ترقی کرنے کا موقع ملنا
چاہئے۔

یہ مدبرے وچار ہوں جو میں آپ
کے سامنے رکھنا چاہتا تھا اور میں
چاہتا ہوں کہ ہاوس ان پر فور کرے
اور صحیح فیصلے کرے۔

میں ایک بار پھر کہنا چاہتا
ہوں کہ جہاں تک اردو کا تعلق ہے اس
کو سرکاری علاقائی زبان کی حیثیت
دی جائے۔ جہاں تک مائٹرائیز کا
تعلق ہے میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ
سینٹرائز دے دیئے سے کام نہیں چلے گا۔
اس طرح سے ان کے مسئلے حل نہیں
ہو سکتے ان کو پوری طرح سے ہمیں
سہمدائی کرنا چاہئے ان کو مطمئن
کرنا چاہئے۔

ان چند لفظوں کے ساتھ میں اپنی
تقریر ختم کرتا ہوں اور امید کرتا ہوں
کہ جو خیالات میں نے آپ کے سامنے
رکھے ہیں ان پر ہاؤس فور کرے گا۔
اتنا کہہ کر میں آپ کا شکریہ ادا
کرتا ہوں۔

[English translation of the above
speech]

[Shri M. H. Rahman (Morabadad
Distt.—Central): We have been dis-
cussing the S.R.C. Report for a num-

ber of days. When the issue was first
raised I was of the view that it was
rather premature to consider it. It
would have been much better if we
had continued to focus our attention
and concentrate our energies on
the economic programme and the
Five Year Plan as we are doing.
Our respected Premier, Shri Nehru,
referred to the solution of the problem
of the six hundreded and odd
princely States by their integration
as brought about by the great Sardar
Vallabh Bhai Patel and exhorted us
to view the reorganisation issue with
that background in mind. But in
my opinion the S.R.C. Report does
not deal with the problem in the
same spirit. I have become convinc-
ed that the view I had taken of the
matter was correct. In the course of
the debate which has been taking
place here, often it appeared as if
it was not the Lok Sabha but a War
Council where ultimatums were being
given by one State to another State
or to the Government of India. It
is obvious that it would have been
much better if we had concentrated
on our economic programmes instead
of dealing with this problem. But
now that this problem has come to
the forefront. I would like to make
a few observations.

The first thing is that this S.R.C.
Report has dealt with the language
problem at a great length. In the
southern part of India the considera-
tions of language have played an
important part in the formation of
States. But, I think, in the northern
part of India, the problem has not
been tackled in the same manner. Only
the other day our beloved leader,
Shri Jawaharlal Nehru spoke ele-
quently on the problem of Urdu. But I
am still at a loss to understand whe-
ther the problem of Urdu can be solv-
ed simply through speeches. I was
also pleased at the fact that Shri
Tandon dealt exhaustively with the
problem of Urdu in his yesterday's
speech. But here we are discussing
the next step with which he may not
agree. The principle 'one state, one
language' has been given great pro-

minence in solving the problem of language. But I think this principle need not be followed. Even if there are two or three languages in a State we ought to recognise their official status. When we have recognised Hindi as our national language it is not proper for us to think that any language wants to usurp the place of Hindi. I am totally opposed to the view that Urdu is the rival of Hindi and that if an Urdu-speaking region is formed, it would do harm to the cause of Hindi. We have fourteen languages. Why is it that Urdu has not been dealt with in the same manner in which the problems of Tamil, Malayalam, etc. have been taken up and the status of a State language has been bestowed upon them? The problem of a language cannot be solved in an official manner merely by speeches however eloquent be the words chosen for the occasion. There should be a territory like Uttar Pradesh, Bihar or Delhi where Urdu can stand on its own legs and prosper as a State Language just like other languages. I think no consideration has been given in the report to this aspect and justice has not been done to it. Today our House as well as our Prime Minister ought to pay attention to this. As there is no territory before us which this language can claim, it has, no doubt, been mentioned in the safeguards as if it is a language of a minority. Urdu is just like other languages of India. There is no Hindi-Muslim question involved in it. This is a language of India but it does not belong to any State. Just as other languages have a territory, it should also have one.

An Honourable Member: Which region do you want?

Shri M. H. Rahman: I claim Uttar Pradesh for it. In U. P. and Delhi it should have the status of a regional language of the State.

In the course of the speech. Shri Tandon had mentioned yesterday that Urdu was, no doubt, an Indian language, but he was not prepared to admit that its script was also Indian. I very respectfully beg to submit

that it is true that Urdu script is not Indian; it has been taken from Arabic and Persian. It owes its origin to the script of both these languages. But it is no discredit for a language to borrow from the script of another language. Sindhi language has benefited from other languages. But the script we are using today for Urdu in India is not Arabic. We have, no doubt, borrowed from the Arabic script but then we have changed it. Arabic script is known as *Naskh* and Urdu script is known as *Nastalique*. Urdu is also looked upon as one of the languages of India so it is necessary to solve the problem of this language. This problem should also be tackled as to why Urdu should not be given a territory.

Along with other questions the question of minority has also been dealt with. I admit that minorities are helped through provision of safeguards but there are occasions when mere safeguards do not serve the purpose of a minority. Its claim should be looked into as to whether it can be solved by means of safeguards. In this connection I want to quote the example of Manbhuan—Kishanganj. I think there are three hundred and fifty thousand people there whose demand is that their territory should not be merged with Bengal. I think this is one major cause which express their uneasiness. In the days of riots in 1951, when so many harassed refugees were coming into Bengal, the Muslims of this place were also uprooted on account of the riots. At that time the question of resettling some Muslims came up. The Government thought over this and promised that the Muslims who had not gone to Pakistan would surely be settled and given houses. Although eight years have passed, there are thousands of such Muslims about whom I can say that they are still in Howrah, Dinajpur, Jalpaiguri and many such other places. They are Indians and did not go to Pakistan but they are still without houses of their own. They have not yet got houses. The

[Shri M. H. Rahman]

Bengal Government have issued an order to the effect that until alternative arrangements are made for refugees, no houses will be allotted to them. I do not think it to be proper. It is improper to treat them at par with the refugees. These are people, who have lived in India and did not go to Pakistan. These poor people, who have been deprived of their homes, are surprised at the fact that they are not allowed to enter their own houses. This state of affairs will surprise the outsiders also because it is possible that they might have to face the same plight. What effect will this produce on them? Safeguards will not solve this question. Why should Bihar give those territories to Bengal which the latter claims it needs for rehabilitation of refugees and suffer the consequent inconvenience?

Now I come to some other questions. There is the problem of minorities. If a person says something, which smacks of communalism, I do not want that it should be accepted. On the other hand that should be thrown away and also trampled upon. But this does not mean that whatever the people in minority say should be dubbed as communal. It is improper. We should try to eliminate the difficulties of the minorities. I look upon the Punjab problem also as a problem of the minority. Himachal Pradesh should be kept separate and Pepsu and Punjab should be merged. Either whatever Shri Fazl Ali has said in the report should be accepted or you solve it in some other way. But I want that the problem of the minorities should not be evaded like this, but their troubles and difficulties should be eradicated. They should be satisfied in every possible way. We should adopt such a course, as would generate confidence among them. There is no harm in transferring one territory of India from here to there. The difficulty arises when the real issue is evaded by dubbing it as communal.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): May I just tell the hon. Member that the level of this debate has been very high in both House, and may I beg of him not to bring in any other kind of considerations, however high my respect for him may be?

Mr. Chairman: I think every hon. Member keeps this in mind, and to say to an hon. Member while he is speaking that he should raise the level of the debate is to cast an aspersion upon him. It is not fair.

An Hon. Member: He must withdraw it.

Shri M. H. Rahman: I was saying that as a matter of fact these problems should be viewed in a manner which would convince the minorities that their problems are also paid heed to.

The problem of Telengana also falls in this category. I think it is right that Visal-Andhra is being created. But along with this, Telengana should be afforded opportunities of remaining and functioning as a separate State instead of just being granted safeguards. After that you may merge Telengana with Visal-Andhra in due course.

As regards the problem of U.P., I am happy that the hon. Members from U.P., hold the view that whatever is in the interest of the whole of India should be done. There are many people, who want that U.P. should be partitioned. I am one of those who want that it should not be partitioned. We want this state to remain an entity and become stronger. If the partition of U.P. benefits the whole of India, we should be prepared to make any sacrifice for this. But if India does not gain by this, we should not partition U.P. simply because some members want this.

In the Constituent Assembly, when L. Deshbandhu Gupta raised his voice in favour of a Delhi State. I supported him. As the other hon. Members have said, Hakim Ajmal

Khan raised this issue in the first instance in 1918 in the Indian National Congress. I do not think it proper that today you do not want to retain Delhi as a separate State simply because some Congressmen are quarrelling among themselves. This thing is not reasonable. It is not desirable, to hand over Delhi to officials. It is not proper to leave 20 lakh people at the mercy of these officers. They should be afforded full opportunities for progress. I want that Delhi should be given the status of a permanent State. The issue should not be evaded by making it a corporation. This State should have the democratic form of Government, which it deserves.

I welcome the proposed State of Madhya Pradesh. I think that this State should have been formed as is proposed.

As regards Gujarat and Maharashtra, the strong speeches concerning them, which were delivered here terrified me. Challenges and ultimatums were thrown this way and that. I think the proposal of the Congress Working Committee should be accepted. That decision is perfectly right. Bombay State should be kept separate. That State should get opportunities for progress by remaining separate.

These are my views which I want the House to consider and arrive at correct decisions.

Once again I want to say that Urdu should be given the status of a regional State language. As regards the minorities, I think safeguards alone will not serve the purpose. Their problems cannot be solved in this manner. We should satisfy them completely.

I conclude with these words and hope that the views which I have put before you will be considered by the House.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): For nine days now we have been discussing the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission, and it is no surprise that so much interest has been evoked because we are now going to redraw the map of India, at least in partial pursuance of that principle, the linguistic principle, which Government and the States Reorganisation Commission still fight shy of but which the people have taken to their hearts and will not permit to be flouted.

I listened the other day to the Prime Minister and I wondered how far the Congress leadership had slid back from its earlier championship of the linguistic principle. The States Reorganisation Commission itself has remarked how with the assumption of responsibility by the Congress, there was a perceptible change in its outlook, and the J.V.P. Report, for example, said that language was not only a binding force but also a separating one. And the other day the Prime Minister also took as his theme the subject that language was a disruptive force and that, therefore, multi-lingualism was something good for the country. Nobody makes a fetish of the principle of linguistic States, but there is no doubt that it is basic to the idea of the reorganisation of States. There might be other considerations, economic, financial or political, but they are auxiliary considerations. And that is why we feel that if this India of ours which our people have decorated with a multifarious civilisation is really to develop and grow to the full stature of our being, then the people living in every part of this country must have a feeling that they are sure of their heritage, and it is only then that they can contribute to the common weal.

I fear that the States Reorganisation Commission has proceeded in a piecemeal fashion and has made some *ad hoc* recommendations but it has not taken a very definite stand on a matter of principle and that is my grouse against it. All the same I recognise that on account of the

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

popular movement, on account of the martyrdom of men like Shri Ramulu a situation has been created when the linguistic principle can no longer be disregarded and today we are on the eve of redrawing the map of our country at least to a considerable extent on the basis of the principle of linguistic States.

As far as we are concerned, we believe in the unity of India because we know that if we are going to build our country either for the defence of our freedom or for our economic development, then, it is necessary that our country should remain one. We also know that the fundamental unity of India has been underlined by its long history throughout the millenia. Therefore, there is no question about our adherence to the idea of the unity of the whole country. At the same time, when we hear about linguistic fanaticism we know that this challenge has got to be thrown back in the face of the accusers. It is only the basis of our unity, the unity of the people who live in different areas, who speak different languages, who have recognisably different cultures of their own, who, at the same time, belong to the overall pattern of Indian life, it is only on the basis of the unity of these people, it is only on the basis of their desire to be near each other and to be friendly with one another that we can build the India of our desire. And, that is the principle on which we proceed and that is why we said, on the basis of linguistic unity, on the basis of contiguity, on the basis of the ascertainment of the people's wishes—wherever that ascertainment becomes necessary on account of lack of absolutely reliable data—it is on the basis of these three principles that we have to proceed. But, I fear that Government sometimes speaks with a voice which suggests that it is the administrative efficiency which bothers them. If it was only the administration which bothered the States Reorganisation Commission, then, surely, Mr.

Anthony's desire would have been fulfilled and we could have had India divided into 5 or 6 zones and the end of the matter would have happened. That is impossible because the people won't tolerate it. The people want to be masters of their own homes in their own areas and that is why we are happy that, at any rate, to a considerable extent that the victory of the people is symbolised in the States Reorganisation Commission's Report.

But it is on account of the opportunism, the *ad hoc* attitude of the S.R.C. that we have so many clear discrepancies, so many incongruities in its Report. Bombay, for example, has been discussed very much and I am afraid that with my very modest ration of time I cannot give much time to Bombay. But, I do not understand how the argument can be put forward that because in Bombay a cosmopolitan sort of life has developed, therefore, Bombay cannot go to Samyukta Maharashtra even though Bombay really and truly belongs to Maharashtra. I know the S.R.C. has paid a tribute to the non-Maharashtrains of Bombay for being generous enough to live in a bilingual State with their Maharashtrian brothers. If they are so generous why are they objecting so strenuously to living in a Maharashtrian State? If they have any misgivings, certainly, certain guarantees can be given and the Maharashtrian friends have come forward over and over again and have told us and the country that these guarantees would be forthcoming. But, we know the Bombay magnates, those who really own Bombay are afraid of the idea of Samyukta Maharashtra, they are afraid of the democratic spirit of the Maharashtra people who really should rule the roost in Bombay city. That is why I do not like this emphasis on cosmopolitanism. I was amazed the other day when the Prime Minister talked about this cosmopolitanism. I can understand internationalism but cosmopolitanism.

is rootlessness. Cosmopolitanism means that you have no home of your own. I remember the Prime Minister wrote a very good book, his autobiography, the best he has written so far. And, there, he said about himself that he had "an exile's feeling", "out of place everywhere, at home nowhere." It is a very genuine statement and it appeals to me. I feel that way on many occasions (*Interruption*). But, at the same time this feeling comes on account of the multi-lingual atmosphere to those who live in a marginal kind of society. I come from Calcutta which is of course Bengali city, but it is the largest Hindi-speaking city in India. Greater Calcutta is the largest Hindi-speaking city in the world. But we do not want to make Calcutta a cosmopolis. I do not think my friends from Bombay would like to make a cosmopolis of Bombay. Let our friends of Bombay who love Bombay come forward and say that they have no objection to be with their Maharashtra fellow-countrymen. That would be the solution of the problem.

In regard to Punjab also—I do not see my hon. friend Sardar Hukam Singh here—he made a very persuasive speech championing the case for a Punjabi-speaking State. The Akalis have sometimes placed their demand in a communal way, and so have the champions of Maha Punjab. But what has the S.R.C. done? The S.R.C. has really yielded to the Maha Punjab demand by merely omitting to include Delhi and a few districts of U.P. in the Punjab and they have added to it the Himachal Pradesh. Therefore, it is really conceding a communal demand. I say that the Punjabi-speaking people have a right to their own State. If there are some Hindus and others who are rather suspicious about their position in Punjab State, some special guarantees should be given to them. I am sure my hon. friend Sardar Hukam Singh would give those guarantees. Punjabi-speaking State is a demand which is absolutely in conformity with the principle.

It does not hinder the interests of the people. If there are some people who are suspicious we should certainly disabuse their minds of the suspicions and I therefore feel that a Punjabi-speaking State should certainly be conceded to by Government after considering the recommendations of the Commission.

Then the tribal problem has not been touched at all as far as the recommendations of the Commission are concerned. I know my friend Shri Jaipal Singh talked about his Jharkand idea. I do not hold with the Jharkand idea because I know that at the present moment in the present context of things we cannot and should not have a fully tribal State of that character. But, what we want is that all these tribes must have their own rights guaranteed and their wishes must be consulted. I want for example, that the Sixth Schedule should be basically revised so that the regional autonomy of the districts might be enlarged. I know that the Commission has recommended that a committee should go into the matter. But, I wish that regional autonomy should be enlarged. I know in Assam there is a demand for a tribal State. I do not hold that view. But, I say, at the same time that there must be ampler provision for regional autonomy in those areas. There must be a basic revision of the Sixth Schedule and once we revise those provisions on which the rights of these tribes are going to be guaranteed, then we can apply those principles to the Santhals, to the Hos, to the Mundas and the Oraons and others. The Santhals are different in different States. There is no case for a Jharkhand State. My friend Shri Jaipal Singh has made friends with those who are in power today by saying that he is holding it up for the time being and is postponing his demand for a Jharkhand State and he is siding with the ruling group in Bihar. Perhaps he is trying to win some plaudits. But I say he is betraying the interests of his own people when he does not come forward in demanding that there

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

should be ampler rights for those people. I say this because in West Bengal and Bihar there are Santhals. I want to consult them; I want to find out very definitely from them whether they want to come under the Government of West Bengal or Bihar—if he wants to come to West Bengal let him come and if he wants to go to Bihar let him. But I say is, his interest must be consulted. That is why in West Bengal in the Darjeeling district we said that there must be some provision regarding the regional autonomy of the Gurkha people who live there, autonomy within the State of West Bengal. No doubt we do not want them to go out because that will be making matters very much worse, but inside West Bengal they must have these provisions. Therefore, in regard to these tribes, wherever they are, we want that something must be done. But, the Congress Government has done nothing in that regard; they have given no thought to this matter and they are supposed to be proceeding with the task of States Reorganisation (*Interruption*).

In regard to the problem of my own State, and the States contiguous to it, I am sure, I am called upon to make some observations and I shall make no bones about it. (*Interruption*) when the Prime Minister made an affirmation the other day, he said nothing is more unimportant than the problems relating to West Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Assam. I think nothing is more thoughtless than this kind of affirmation on the part of the Prime Minister. The S.R.C. itself has said that it is a major problem and I say it is a major problem because it affects the attitude, the well-being and the psychological situation in the North-Eastern provinces of India.

1 P.M.

If you can make so much of Bombay—the Prime Minister goes out of his way to offer all kinds of plaudits about its being a cosmopolitan

centre and so on and so forth—why do you forget that in the Calcutta region, in Bengal, Bihar, Assam and Orissa is concentrated the wealth of India—more than one-third or nearly one half of the total economic wealth of India? As far as we know at present, it is concentrated in that area. To Calcutta, which is the headquarters of West Bengal, people come from not only West Bengal, but from Bihar, Orissa, Assam, Andhra, Madhya Pradesh and all sorts of places. We want that the relation between Bengalis, Biharis and Assamese and Oriyas must be as cordial as we can make it. How are we going to settle certain problems? Certain claims are made; certain counter-claims are being put forward. We can only settle these claims on the basis of certain principles. I am happy that on the basis of principle and not on the basis of chauvinism or on purely administrative considerations I can very largely agree with what has been said by my hon. friends from the Congress Party. Actually as you know, in the West Bengal Legislative Assembly, they could pass a unanimous resolution in regard to certain areas and I would beseech my friends from Bihar and Assam to try to understand the position as I place it.

There are certain areas which today, West Bengal feels, should come to West Bengal. When I sit here in this House and speak I do not speak merely as a Bengali, I certainly speak as a Member of this august House, representing the whole country and it is my business to convince this House that there are certain claims which Bengal or Bihar or Assam is making, which are genuine and which should not be discountenanced. It is from that point of view that I approach it.

I do not say that because West Bengal has a refugee problem we should get more land. We feel as strongly as anybody else in regard to the acuteness of the refugee problem but we know that by getting some land from Bihar or X or Y

State, we shall not be able to settle the large number of refugees we have and solve the refugee problem. We cannot do that. Also we cannot say that there are certain catchment areas somewhere which we must control. We have a Centre and there could be a consultative apparatus with regard to these. We cannot claim merely on that basis. We cannot say that our population is very large like that of Travancore-Cochin in relation to our territory and therefore we want more land. We do not say that. I do not say that. Even Shri Atulya Ghosh did not say that because we have suffered in the past we want more land—we do not say that. But we are entitled—Bengalis are entitled to have the contiguous land which is inhabited largely by Bengalis, whether it is in Assam or Bihar or Orissa. Similarly it applies in the case of others.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary (Saran South): Why not refer it to a plebiscite...?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. I would request hon. Members not to put questions today that way. If he begins to answer and expand we do not know whether many hon. Members will get their turns. I request the hon. Member also not to mind that question.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: My position is this. As far as the SRC's recommendations regarding certain lands from Bihar to come to West Bengal are concerned, I would say that the whole of Purulia sub-division including Chas Thana should come to West Bengal on the basis of language, contiguity and the wishes of the people. I would also certainly say that Dhalbhum sub-division should go to West Bengal. I do not say that Jamshedpur city should come to West Bengal. I am glad that on the other side, Shri Barman also said that we need not claim Jamshedpur though I have got some figures given to me by Dr. Safa quoted from some records of the

Jamshedpur Municipality which suggests that in Jamshedpur the Bengali majority is very large. Bengali is by far the largest single linguistic unit. I do not claim Dhanbad also even though it can be very well argued that it should come to us because I say that unless we can convince our Bihari friends, unless our Bihar friends recognise the justice of this claim, unless Bihar is ready at least to give up possession of certain areas which it has had for some time and therefore got attached to it and has developed some complexes about it, unless I can put Bihar to agree to do that, I do not claim those areas. The other areas, I would certainly claim. From Assam I cannot claim the whole of Goalpara but West Bengal ought to have Dhubri sub-division. I do not say to Bihar: "You get some land from U.P. and you give us some." I shall proceed on the principle of language, contiguity and the wishes of the people. Where the facts as ascertained are very clear, give the lands to West Bengal or Bihar to whichever State it may be. Where the facts are not clear, let boundary commissions be appointed and let fresh investigations be made. The Census figures of 1951 have been described by parties on this side and on that side as being a fake. They have been made out by our own people under our own administration and our people are making complaints about it. These complaints are being very seriously made and even the S.R.C. says that they could not accept these figures and therefore something must be done. Let there be an ascertainment of the linguistic contiguity of certain areas and then we can decide finally in regard to where the boundary is going to be.

That is what we want to say with regard to West Bengal's claim. We feel that as far as Purulia along with Chas is concerned, West Bengal's claims are unanswerable; as far as Dhalbhum is concerned, West Bengal's claims are unanswerable; as far

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

as Dhubri is concerned—not including the rest of Goalpara—West Bengal's claims are unanswerable and therefore these should be allotted to West Bengal. Similarly, in regard to Serai-kella and Kharswan, I feel that Orissa's claims are unanswerable. I do not say that we cannot settle all these matters.

In regard to this, I want to point out one thing. We have noticed it umpteen times in the country, leaders of the Congress Party and the Congress Governments in one State or the other were using language of the most heinous sort and provoking each other. We have one Central Government and we have one big ruling party which is supposed to be harping all the time on the unity of the country, and yet Shri A. Ghosh goes and gives a statement which Mr. Mahamaya Prasad Singh contradicts in extremely venomous language. The Assam Congress makes a statement which Bengal contradicts with equal vigour and venom. This kind of unseemly thing goes on all the time. It goes on because there is no matter of principle on which we can agree to discuss around a round table and find out a solution. I do not understand why as a Bengali I shall fight a Bihari or Assamese....

Mr. Chairman: I want that he must not fight at all. His time is up. I will therefore request him to kindly resume his seat. I have allowed twenty minutes, almost twenty-one minutes. He was present today when the Speaker announced fifteen minutes ordinarily and twenty minutes in extraordinary cases could be given.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I shall finish now, Sir.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): Yesterday you allowed Maha Punjab 45 minutes.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Basu should not make an interjection like that.

If he takes up the whole time, Punjab has not got more time than the other. But at the same time there were very contentious matters so far as Punjab was concerned. As was indicated before this is not the time to quarrel over the time; we are quarrelling about boundaries; we need not do the same with regard to time; we need not take the time of the House on that. I can say that all the parties do not take the time proportionately. After all time is of common concern to all of us and nobody is right in saying that on the basis of the time taken by Punjab, the other provinces got less or no time. That is unfair.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I do not want to enter into any controversy. I just want one minute and I hope you will permit me at least that much concession.

Mr. Chairman: I shall certainly give you more than one minute.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I have referred to certain principles. I say repeatedly that on the basis of these principles, there has got to be a re-ascertainment of certain facts by whatever agencies Government decide—may be boundary commissions and that sort of thing. I feel that in regard to Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Assam region, it is so important that it is necessary to bring about this kind of adjustment. I feel that as far as the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission are concerned there are some good things which we can get into operation straightaway. There are certain other things which may be improved upon and I feel that if we sit round a table and try to work out principles which are absolutely non-chauvinistic, principles which are essentially linked with the linguistic idea, principles which do not militate against the idea of unity and security of the whole country; if we sit round a table and evolve on the basis of principle a *modus operandi*. I submit we can surely bring

about a reconciliation in regard to the controversy that is raging in respect of Bengal, Bihar, Assam and Orissa which are in all aspects very important regions of our country. In that way we shall be able to make a contribution in regard to the States reorganisation which would be worthwhile, and which would be in conformity with the wishes of our people.

Mr. Chairman: Shri R. N. S. Deo

Shri Dhulekar (Jhansi Distt.—South): Sir, some of our friends from U.P. have asked for Jhansi and Jaipur. I want to speak against it. Jhansi people do not want to go.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member fully knows that a list has been given by the hon. Speaker after consulting all interests and while the Speaker was saying this all other requests of this nature were turned down. I do not think the hon. Member should, therefore, take up the time of the House by making such sort of interferences.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: (Kalahandi-Bolangir): Mr. Chairman, the Home Minister gave us the belief that the Report bore a stamp of ability, thoroughness and objectivity. I wished that these were true. If it had been correct, things would have been otherwise in this country. But, unfortunately, Sir, the SRC Report is more political than judicious. Its chief characteristics are lack of clear principles, policy of appeasement of the strong and influential, neglecting the claims of the weak and its recommendations are vitiated apart from the fact that it is full of inconsistencies and contradictions. They are vitiated because they are based on expediency rather than on justice, equity or fair-play.

Sir, why is it that public feeling in Orissa has been completely outraged by this Report of the SRC? I would give you a few clear instances of how the SRC has completely ignored Orissa's claim. Our main grievance is that it has not only dismissed Orissa's claims on most

superficial and unreasonable grounds, it has not only summarily rejected our claims but it has completely ignored even to consider our claims.

One of the main claims of Orissa for the last more than 50 years has been for the Singhbhum Sadar in particular and yet in the Report of the SRC neither in the section dealing with Bihar nor in the claims of Orissa you find any mention of Singhbhum Sadar. Far from considering the case on its merits they have not even taken the trouble of examining it.

You will be surprised to hear that while the SRC has recommended that the enclaves should be merged in the respective area in the case of all other States, in the case of Orissa an enclave of Madhya Pradesh which is existing in Orissa has not even been recommended for merger. So, you will appreciate how superficially they have considered Orissa's case.

Now, I will draw your attention to a serious irregularity in the very appointment of this Commission. Sir, you know that the Chairman Shri Fazal Ali has dissociated himself in the consideration of border disputes involving Bihar and he has not participated in the recommendations relating to those disputes. Now, it is surprising, and we are told that Shri Fazal Ali before acceptance of the office of the Chairman of this Commission had intimated to the Prime Minister that he would not participate in these border disputes. If this is a fact it is very amazing that Parliament was kept ignorant about this and it is also amazing that the Government did not take the trouble of arranging to associate a third member with the other two members of the Commission while considering these border disputes relating to Bihar. This has completely vitiated the findings so far as these disputes are concerned. It is difficult to assess the extent of the influence this attitude of the Chairman has wielded on the other two members, but the fact is there that directly or indirectly this show of the Chairman

[Shri R. N. S. Deo]

of his deep attachment to the State of Bihar has undoubtedly had an influence on the other two members.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Purnea-cum-Santal Parganas): Sir, I rise on a point of order. The hon. Member is challenging the motive of the Chairman. He can question the judgment of the members but he cannot question the motive of the members. He cannot say that the whole thing was purely the Chairman's show. No aspersions can be cast like that. He can question the judgment and not the motive of the members which he is doing all the time.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: I have not made any aspersion on the Chairman at all.

Mr. Chairman: Since the hon. Member says that he has not made any aspersions nor did he mean to cast any aspersions it is not a point of order.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I request you, Sir, to tell me whether he can say: "show of the Chairman"?

Shri R. N. S. Deo: There is no question of any aspersion being cast on the Chairman. I would like to make it clear that if I have respect for the members individually, if I have love for any one of them, it does not mean that I must love their dogs or their views also.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I did not mean that.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: Now, Sir, these unnecessary interruptions are only taking away the time allowed to me.

I now proceed to draw your attention to the fact that the whole attitude of the members of the Commission in considering this Bihar border disputes was vitiated. They took a very unreasonable attitude in considering our claims and that will be quite evident from the Report itself.

In view of the shortness of time I will make only a little brief men-

tion of our different claims. As you know, Sir, the claim of Orissa was for certain border areas in the north and south as well as in the west. This arose from the very background of the Oriya Movement. You remember, the Oriya-speaking tracts were dismembered under the British rule and they were tagged on to different Provinces, tied on to the apron-strings of different Provinces. They were neglected everywhere. They remained backward and they could not have scope for full expression or development. Therefore, this movement for the unification of all Oriya-speaking tracts under one administration was started more than half a century ago. The Utkal Union Conference or Utkal Sammilani, whose President I have the honour to be, was started in 1903. After great agitation and a lot of effort, the Oriyas were fortunate enough to get a truncated and a small province in 1936. But still many Oriya-speaking tracts were left outside Orissa because there was no separate Government of Orissa to safeguard the interests of Oriyas, and many tracts which ought to have come to Orissa were left out and our demand still remains, and the agitation still remains. Now that the question of reorganisation came up, we placed forth our demands in the north, south and on the west. I shall now briefly mention our various demands. I would not go into the details. My friend Shri V. V. Giri stated that he was starting with No. 1 State, that is, Andhra, and he was speaking as No. 1 on that State. I was surprised that he should have had such a great fall from a world State and a world citizenship to Parlakimedi Berhampur and Koraput. I should make it clear that this demand for Koraput district is absolutely unfounded. The Andhras or the Telgu-speaking people constitute only 6.2 per cent. of the population there. So, there is no justification for this claim. I had spoken on the Andhra State Bill and the facts and figures that I had quoted then during that discussion still hold good. So, I would not go into those details. Regarding Ganjam, only 14.58 per cent. are Telegu-speaking. They have

no case there at all. Berhampur town is surrounded by Oriya speaking villages and it is impossible to consider how Berhampur can be claimed by Andhra. As a matter of fact, even on linguistic basis or on population basis too, they have no such claim. Regarding Parlakimedi, there seems to be some misconception, because Parlakimedi taluk of the present Orissa State is not the same as the Parlakimedi estate of old. As a matter of fact, the whole of Parlakimedi estate was not transferred to Orissa and only tribal areas and the Oriya-speaking tracts were included in the Orissa province. As a matter of fact, our counter-claims for certain Oriya-speaking pockets which are contiguous to Orissa but which are in Andhra State are more valid and ought to be considered on their merits. Similarly, our claims to certain other Oriya-speaking pockets which are contiguous to Orissa but are in Andhra State and which, for various reasons, have been unjustly included in Andhra, should also be considered and our case should be examined on its merits.

I now come to the west. Our claims on Bastar have been made out. But we do not claim the whole of Bastar. The only thing to which I would like to draw your attention is that, now that they have decided to disintegrate Hyderabad, there should be no sanctity about the entity of the whole Bastar State. Bastar, as you know, is a non-man's land; linguistically speaking, it is a non-man's land, and that case should be properly considered. The position of Oriyas contiguous to Orissa, where the language of Oriyas is predominant and the affinity of the tribal people with Oriya should also be considered and those areas should be conceded to Orissa, and the other areas contiguous to other States should be parcelled out to the respective States.

I then come to the other two areas claimed by Orissa from Madhya Pradesh—Phuljhar and Bindra-Nawagarh. In respect of Bindra-Nawagarh, the portions concerned are only those that lay in the ex-zamindari area. It is very surprising and painful that in

rejecting our claims for these areas, the high-power body like the SRC should have made such a blatant misstatement/of fact. The SRC have said that there is "overwhelming public support for their retention in the present Madhya Pradesh". I am sorry to say that this is an absolute misstatement of fact. The O'Donnell Committee never found anything of the sort. What that Committee found in the case of Phuljhar was that the zamindar of Phuljhar was against its inclusion in Orissa and alleged that the people were against merger with Orissa. They said that "a Mohamadan Malguzar and a cultivator gave evidence to the same effect." They had said that fifteen witnesses supported the Oriya claim, but with two exceptions, all these witnesses were Oriyas. "It was quite clear to us that there is no public opinion in Phuljhar. Save for a few individuals, the population is ignorant and indifferent". How, on the basis of this ignorance and indifference, the SRC came to the conclusion that there was overwhelming public support against Orissa? This passes one's understanding.

There is another fact in this connection which I must bring to your notice. There were over a hundred witnesses in favour of Orissa waiting to be interviewed by the O'Donnell Committee, but they did not give them a hearing. This will be found from the report of the then Deputy Commissioner of Sambalpur to the Orissa Government on this subject. As regards Brindra-Nawagarh, the O'Donnell Committee observed that "not a single witness was produced in support of the belated claim for the admission of this tract which we have no hesitation in rejecting". Now, when that Committee did not examine a single witness even and rejected it on the ground that it was a belated claim, how can the States Reorganisation Commission draw the conclusion that there was overwhelming public support? That also passes one's understanding.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): They have taken no evidence.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: Not a single witness was examined; but yet, the SRC had the audacity to say that the O'Donnell Committee found overwhelming public support for this measure. This is an absolute misstatement of fact. We should have expected this Commission to have gone into this question a little more thoroughly. When the Commission has done such a blatant injustice to Orissa, they have denied even an inch of land to us and which should have rightly come to us, I hope that the Chair would be a little more fair and not grudge a few minutes to me.

Mr. Chairman: But my difficulty is there are 21 or 22 more Members yet to speak. At 5-30, the hon. Home Minister is to reply. If I give one minute more to every Member, the last Member on my list will have to go without making a speech. Otherwise, I should be very anxious to allow you to continue your speech. If hon. Members want that the Members who are last on this list may be blacked out, I have no objection!

Shri R. N. S. Deo: I would not take much time. I wanted a few more minutes just because of the interruptions. Because of that, I request you to give me a few more minutes.

Mr. Chairman: The interruptions did not take away more than one of two minutes.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: I now come to the claims of Orissa in the north—relating to the Seraikella and Singhbhum Sadar sub-divisions. At the outset, I would like to explode this theory of Jharkand. I think it is high time that this bubble of Jharkand is pricked and this bogey is laid to rest and Jharkand is given a decent burial once and for all. What is this Jharkand demand? Let us now consider it. You will be amazed to see that this very name Jharkand has been misappropriated by my friend Shri Jaipal Singh. He has made it

exclusively his own. But I will remind you of Kabir's bhajans:

“कब से छोड़ी मथरा नगरी,
कब से छोड़ी काशी,
भारखंड में भाय बिराजे,
बृन्दावन के वासी।”

This is the bhajan with regard to Lord Jagannath of Puri. There, Orissa is referred to as Jharkand and Orissa was known as Jharkand and so many rulers of the Orissa States enjoyed the title of Jharkand Badshah, especially in Sambalpur and in Jaipur of the Koraput district. Now, what is this conception of Jharkand? Shri Jaipal Singh himself has said that Jharkand means jungle area. In this atomic age he wants a jungle State. This is what he demands. He said, “Do not disrupt Jharkand. We want reconsolidation and re-integration of Jharkand”. He talked of 11 Chota Nagpur States and also 11 seats for the Jharkand party which is, by the way, not correct. It should be ten and not eleven. Apart from that, this point about eleven States of Chota Nagpur is an absolute fiction of his imagination. I should like to inform this House that this south-west frontier agency ultimately was called the Chota Nagpur Commissionership and it included 25 States at one time. Why does he arbitrarily choose 11 States to suit his purpose? There was the Patna group of States including my own and then the Phuljhar and Bindra-Nawagarh areas which we are claiming. Then there was the Sambalpur group of 10 States and also the Sirguja and Singhbhum group of States.....

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: I am finishing. He chose some of these States to suit his purpose, and that is his Jharkand. He also arbitrarily chose a particular period of history leaving out the past as well as the present. I say that there is no basis, logically or otherwise for what he said. You know that the adivasis are neither linguistically nor racially one. I do not understand the basis of the arguments of my hon. friend.

As regards the other things...

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. I would request the hon. Member to resume his seat. He has taken more than 20 minutes.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: I am just winding up. In conclusion, I would only draw the attention of the House to what our Prime Minister said, namely, that obviously there are difficulties in settling the border disputes because there is logic in the claims as well as the counter-claims. What is more important is not the personnel which decides these matters, but the principles on which they are decided. Lord Curzon said in 1911 in the House of Lords that the Oriyas are a non-agitating people.....

Mr. Chairman: May I know if this is winding up? It is an entirely new argument. If I allow this, I must allow time for developing this argument, which means another five minutes. I think that hon. Member must resume his seat.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: I will finish with one sentence. My appeal to the Government and to this House is this. For God's sake, please do not drive the people of Orissa and the Oriya-speaking tracts to take to the agitational approach for redress of their grievances.

Shri M. Khuda Baksh (Murshidabad): I am obliged to you for giving me this opportunity to speak on this problem of re-organisation of States. Allow me at the outset to welcome the suggestion that our honourable Prime Minister made at the conclusion of his speech, but I think he was rather diffident about the creation of zones. If I may say so, I think we should not be deflected from the serious consideration that we are giving to the rational drawing up of boundaries, because even in those zones States shall exist. Now that we are engaged in our task of drawing the boundaries anew, we should see that they are drawn rationally. I was amazed to hear the honourable Nominated Member when he suggested that the Report should be shelved for 20 years. I was

in complete agreement with the hon. Home Minister when he said that the Commission was not appointed a moment too soon, because now we enjoy a leadership in our country which has a truly national outlook. They think and act in terms of the entire nation. It is from them that the different States can expect justice and fairplay. From the way provincial jealousies and rivalries and impatience are growing in the country, I shudder to think that if these important matters were left to their own care, the country may come to grief.

Coming to the Report, I have to be very cautious in the language that I use, because when one sees first the composition of the Commission, one has to choose his language. To criticise the Report is one thing. To criticise the authors of the Report would be quite another thing, I agree. But we cannot also be blind, we cannot also refuse to take note of certain things which would naturally flow from our study of the Report. At page 82, there is a small paragraph—paragraph No. 676—where it is said that the Chairman of the Commission, Shri Fazal Ali, did not participate in the Bengal-Bihar disputes because of his long association with the province of Bihar. I was amazed that he should have chosen to dissociate himself from the consideration of the problem. Supposing he were the Chief Justice of the Patna High Court and a case was referred to him for adjudication in which a Bengali was a party, would he vacate his seat of the Chief Justiceship and refuse to determine the case?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): He was really a Judge. |

Shri M. Khuda Baksh: That is exactly what I would draw the attention of the House to, because I felt that that kind of statement was remarkable. He has been a Judge, he has a trained judicial mind and for him to refuse to adjudicate on an issue in which a particular State is a party is remarkable. I feel that he himself lost confidence in his sense of judicial impartiality or judicial sagacity. There-

[Shri M. Khuda Baksh]

fore, I feel that when the Chairman felt himself unequal to the task, the Report cannot inspire confidence.

Shri Jaiware (Santal Parganas-Hazaribagh): It is to our disadvantage.

Shri M. Khuda Baksh: Therefore, I submit that the Report, especially the portion of it that pertains to the dispute relating to Bengal, Bihar and Assam, wherever Bihar is a party, should only be considered by this august and honourable House as a basis for discussion and the collective wisdom of this House should evolve a lasting, peaceful and harmonious solution for the problem. The Commission has agreed that it is a major problem. The way the Commission have treated this tends to create an impression that it is a minor problem, a border dispute. It has tended to minimise the magnitude and the urgency of the problem. Therefore, I would most humbly suggest that the Report suffers from a sort of distorted perspective. For Bengal land has become a question of life and death. Bengal with her mounting unemployment, the continuous influx of refugees, the imbalance between industry and agriculture forced by partition, and last but not the least, the enormous disparity between revenue and expenditure, must get some land, if it is not to suffocate and die. Therefore, it has been ably pointed out by some of the previous speakers that it is not only the problem of Bengal but the problem of the whole of India.

What Bengal has claimed is just linguistically, culturally, economically and, last but not least, historically. Even those who are acquainted with the very outlines of Indian history know that the areas that have now been claimed by Bengal formed part of Bengal. It is not that we are demanding portions of Bihar; we are only demanding those portions that we had lost in course of history, due to the exigencies of British imperialism in India.

What areas have been claimed by Bengal? Bengal has claimed the

entire Kishanganj Sub-Division and Gopalpur of the Sadar Sub-Division, Kadoya, Amur and Katihar Thana comprising an area of 2,537 square miles and a population of 12.7 lakhs. Then, in Santal Parganas the following areas: Jamtara, Dumka and Rajmahal, Pakur Sub-Division and Daminika of Godda comprising an area of 4,010 square miles with a population of 5.5 lakhs; and then Manbhum District comprising an area of 4,112 square miles with a population of 22.8 lakhs; and then Dhandbhum Sub-Division comprising an area of 1,167 square miles with a population 6.1 lakhs. Then it has claimed in Assam the district of Goalpara comprising an area of 3,987 square miles with a population of 11.1 lakhs. The total comes to 15,930 square miles with a population of 68 lakhs.

I am afraid within the time at my disposal I shall not be able to explain to the House the different data that I want to use in support of my contention; but I should be failing in my duty if I did not draw the pointed attention of the House to the inter-censal variations between the different censuses undertaken, especially the decrease in the Bengali population between the 1931 census and the 1951 census, because this will prove, as nothing less can prove, that the census operations were manipulated. Everybody in this House has said that the figures were unreliable, but I want to point out that the figures were manufactured, cooked up in order that they may subserve a certain purpose and a certain end.

Referring to the variations in the percentages between 1911-1931 census figures and 1931-1951 census figures it says that between 1911 and 1931 Manbhum had an increase of 24.31 per cent in the number of Bengali-speaking people and decrease of 1.5 per cent in the number of Hindi-speaking people. Now, the figures during the 1931-1951 census are that the percentage of the Bengali-speaking people dropped by 19 per cent and that of Hindi-speaking people rose by 204.4 per cent. In the Sadar Sub-Division

the percentage of the Bengali-speaking people dropped by 23 per cent. while that of Hindi-speaking people rose by 706.96 per cent. And in Dhanbad while the percentage of the Bengali-speaking people rose by 5.7 per cent. that of the Hindi-speaking people rose by 83.31 per cent.

If this does not constitute, what I would call, a biological absurdity, I would like to know from the House and especially from any Bihari friends, what does.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Biological marvel.

Shri M. Khuda Baksh: Or, as my hon. friend says, a biological marvel. I stand corrected.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Shahbad South): Mr. Chairman, will you kindly give us a chance to reply, because he wants a reply from his Bihari friends. Had he not mentioned so, I would not have asked for this.

Mr. Chairman: In this game, the hon. Member will very well remember that if he is pleased to put a question himself then another hon. Member will want time to reply.

Shri M. Khuda Baksh: I have asked for a reply, and if my hon. friend gets an opportunity to speak I should like to hear him very much; but I feel certain that these are data collected from the printed census records and he cannot....

Mr. Chairman: He gave certain figures and he wanted a reply from the other side.

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : हमको भी समय मिलना चाहिए ।

Shri M. Khuda Bakshi: There is another thing. They have included Santhalis and they claim that they speak Hindi. But all Santhalis, even my friend from the other side....

Sir, you are ringing the bell. I should like to have a few more minutes.

Mr. Chairman: Two minutes more.

Shri M. Khuda Baksh: Two minutes will not at all be enough, because I have to refer to several matters.

Mr. Chairman: Then he should have started with them in the very beginning.

Shri M. Khuda Baksh: I have to refer to the charges of communalism made by my Bihari friends. Bengal has a special claim, because Bengal agreed to partition. If we had not agreed to partition, where would your tea be; where would your city of Calcutta be; where would your jute and jute mills be? And Bihar would have had to look after the border of Eastern Pakistan. Therefore, we should consider all these things on their merits.

But now that you, Sir, want to limit the time of my speech, I have to go over and refer to the speech delivered by a very very eminent Bihari, a Member of this honourable House who raised the communal question. And he said that the Mussalmans of the areas proposed to be transferred to West Bengal were apprehensive of the Government of West Bengal. Of course, the Chairman of the Commission was not associated with that portion of the report, but I am bound to say that it was extremely unfortunate that that portion should have been included in the body of the report. If the Commission really felt solicitous about the welfare of the minorities that were proposed to be transferred to another State, they should have sent confidential notes to the Government concerned and not embodied it in the report; because that has given a handle to my friends in Bihar to whip up communal passion and the communal bogey, which they have raised even on the floor of this House. You might recall, when this question was being put before the House I got up and interjected the hon. Member. And I felt that this House had every legitimate reason and it was pertinent for this House to be told in precise terms what those apprehensions were.

[Shri M. Khuda Baksh]

As far as I could hear, he said that if any hon. Member wanted to know what those fears and apprehensions were, he could approach him in private and he would be given a satisfactory reply. But I felt that when the subject was mentioned in the House and he could not take the entire House into confidence, there was not much point for anybody to go and obtain any elucidation or clarification or even instances from my friend about the apprehension in the Muslim mind.

I have been a humble servant of the Mussalmans of the State I come from. I also held office under the Nehru-Liaquat Pact; I was the first Minority Commissioner in West Bengal. Therefore I can claim to speak with some authority on the subject.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: For the entire Muslims?

Shri M. Khuda Baksh: Not for the entire Muslims. I do not lay claim for myself to such exaggerated importance (*Interruption*) I can tell you I was very closely and intimately connected with the Mussalmans of Bengal and also the Mussalmans of Bihar. In my capacity of Minority Commissioner hundreds of Biharis approached me; because we are a contiguous State and there is a certain area towards the north where the Mussalmans are fairly in a concentrated population. And therefore in my extensive tours I came across Mussalmans of Bengal as also Mussalmans of Bihar.

Shri Syamanandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): Will my hon. friend go to Purnea and find for himself? There is no use of speaking on the floor of the House.

Shri M. Khuda Baksh: I am perfectly willing to go and find out with any hon. Member of the House. But, the House should bear in mind, where communalism has been allowed to be whipped up and the Muslim population of that area to be demoralised

(*Interruptions*) it would be difficult to go and make a proper assessment of their state of mind.

Shri Syamanandan Sahaya: Now, the cat is out of the bag.

Shri M. Khuda Baksh: People go there and say, this is what is going to happen, this is what you are going to see. After all, if they were really solicitous of the Muslim population, would they have relegated these people to this position of comparative unimportance? They should certainly have started something for the amelioration of their condition. Where is it? Now they say that they have this scheme and that scheme. I think that it is not only unfair and uncharitable, but it is highly dangerous to whip up communal passions. (*Interruption*)

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Shri M. Khuda Baksh: I want to tell my Bihari friends in no uncertain language that it is absurd to think that the areas that are now proposed to be transferred will ever come back to Bihar, because it has been proved that it is a requirement not for Bengal, but for the Government of India, for the defence of India. The Muslims are going there not to please Shri B. C. Roy or Khuda Buksh or other individuals there. But, they are going to Bengal because they need to go there to subserve a national purpose. The Bihari friends tell them that they need fear. It is fantastic to suggest that the Muslims in any part of India are better or worse of than the Muslims in any other part. Lakhs and lakhs of Muslims are coming back from East Bengal. I would plead with you, Sir, to give me a few more minutes....

Mr. Chairman: He has already taken more than the usual time.

Shri M. Khuda Baksh:...because I feel very strongly and it is important....

Mr. Chairman: I have given more than the usual time. Why should he

complain? He must finish in a minute.

Shri M. Khuda Baksh: I am coming to the conclusion.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: He is on an important issue.

Shri Velayudhan: It is important so far as the minorities are concerned.

Mr. Chairman: I do not want to be guided by the hon. Member. It may be important or unimportant; I have given him more than the usual time.

Shri Velayudhan: I never said so.

Mr. Chairman: Why all this excitement? It is an ordinary matter. Let us hear.

Shri M. Khuda Baksh: I want to take the House to 1946 when there were communal riots. It was Shri Jawaharlal Nehru who said that on Noakhali pales into insignificance. He was referring to no other place than Bihar. He also threatened aerial action against the communal elements in Bihar. Now that the Muslims have migrated to Pakistan, I should like to ask my Bihari friends a simple question: find out from East Bengal how many Bihari Muslims are there and how many are West Bengal Muslims, and also, of those who have returned, how many are Bihari Muslims and how many are West Bengal Muslims. This reminds me of two immortal lines of Tagore:

तुमी महाराज शत्रू होले, 
आमी आज चोर बाटे,

When we claimed Dhanbad and other portions, it was suggested that Bengal was casting its eyes. We made claim to what belonged to us. In an exuberance of retort, it was said so. Today, we have our India Office Library in England. We claim it as a matter of right. These two towns Jamshedpur and Dhanbad may be the crown jewels in the crown of the

Biharis friends. But, they belong to us. We have also claimed the Kohinoor: is it not? It is not casting our eyes. Perhaps we are casting our eyes, longing impatient eyes, to be reunited to our long lost brethren, long lost friends who are Bengalis in Bihar. I also welcome the Muslims in the West Bengal to come and tell them that in Dr. B. C. Roy and in his administration, they would find a better leader and better Imam than all the Imams of Bihar put together,.....

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: He is a great man of India: not only of Bengal.

Shri M. Khuda Baksh:...and ginding their destiny and in their hour of tribulation, they will find a better friend in him a better sahayas than all the sahayas of Bihar put together.

Shri Bimalaprosad Chaliha (Sibsagar-North Lakhimpur): I had the privilege of attending the Hyderabad session of the Congress in which this question of Reorganisation of States was elaborately discussed. In that Congress, I had the privilege of hearing three illuminating speeches by three of our revered leaders. One of them was Maulana Azad; the other was Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and the third was Shri Gadgil. Maulana Azad said that notwithstanding any earlier decision in this respect, the question of reorganisation of States should be given up in the best interests of the nation. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's view was that this is not the time to open the Pandora's box when our hands are full with more important works of the nation. Shri Gadgil, however, placed his case very strongly and said that the enthusiasm that would be generated in the country as a result of the reorganisation of States on linguistic lines can be canalised for national reconstruction. The matter, however, was not finally decided there. Ultimately, it seems that a compromise was arrived at and

[Shri Bimalaprosad Chaliha]

the States Reorganisation Commission came into existence, with this difference that the emphasis in the matter of reorganisation was shifted from linguistic reorganisation to other consideration which are also very important.

Since this Commission came into existence, the tension that is prevailing in the country, in the different States is really very unfortunate and cannot be lost sight of. We have in the past paid heavily as a result of such tensions and I hope our experiences of the past will be kept in mind so that we do not have to face similar unpleasant happenings. So far these recommendations are concerned, in our country, there are some who feel that they are worthy of consideration and some who feel that they are not worthy of consideration. Some feel that justice has been done, while others feel that justice has been denied to them. It is indeed a very good idea on the part of the Congress Working Committee to try to find out solution for the conflicting views which still exist. I hope that as a result of the efforts on the part of the Working Committee, they will be able to arrive at a happy solution in respect of all these conflicting views. For that purpose, it becomes our bounden duty, not only of those who are under the banner of the Congress, but I suppose, it is the bounden duty of everybody in our country to extend full co-operation to find out a solution. Various suggestions have been made for keeping in abeyance these recommendations, in view of the dissensions in the country. But personally, I do believe that we shall only be adding to our worry by shelving this Report, when we have proceeded so far. I also cannot agree with those who feel that a vast country like India could be governed by a unitary system of government. Therefore, we have to make the best of these recommendation that have been made by the Commission, and lead them to a finish, preferably once and for all.

2 P.M.

One of the main criticisms that have been levelled against the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission is that the Commission has not applied the same standards in re-determining the boundaries of all the States. My submission is that if the Commission have not applied the same standards, it is because it is impossible to do so in a vast country of innumerable varieties. I personally would not blame the Commission for it. I for my part would have been happy if the Commission had found it possible to recommend uniformity in respect of population of the different States. Since number counts in democracy, I believe that such uniformity in respect of the population of the different States would have been conducive for better governance of our country. Perhaps, practical difficulties stood on the way of making recommendations of that kind.

So far as the recommendations in respect of the State of Assam are concerned, I am grateful to the Commission that they have substantially accepted the views of the Assam Pradesh Congress Committee as represented in the memorandum submitted to the Commission. As a matter of fact, this area is so situated that there could not be any other recommendation than what the Commission has made. We would, however, have been happy if the Commission had emphasised the need for better coordination between the administration of Assam and the administration of the North-East Frontier Agency.

We cannot but look with concern at the troubles in the Tuensang division, in N.E.F.A. which have necessitated military operations in that area.

Assam welcomes Manipur and Tripura as equal partners. I find that there is some misunderstanding with

regard to the stand of Assam in respect of Manipur and Tripura. There is no reluctance on part of Assam to accept Manipur and Tripura. On the other hand, Assam will be only too glad if they are associated. It is true that in the memoranda and also in the various statements. That have been made, no great assertions were made for the integration of these two Part C States with Assam. If that was not done, it was only for this reason, namely, that we did not like to show a sort of territorial ambition. But when in the best interests of the country the Commission suggests the integration of these States with Assam, they are welcome; and Assam would gladly welcome them.

It will indeed be very unkind on the part of West Bengal to take us to be unsympathetic towards the various problems of West Bengal with which she is faced, because of the fact that we have not been able to agree to transfer certain territories to West Bengal from Assam.

Now, the latest position is that there is a demand for merger of Goalpara with West Bengal. Without saying anything from my side, if I may be permitted to quote what the great leader of India, Dr. B. C. Roy, said in the West Bengal Legislative Council, I think my purpose will be served. This is what Dr. B. C. Roy said in the West Bengal Legislative Council on 6th December 1955:

"I know the same arguments will hold good in case of Goalpara. Don't be deluded into thinking that getting Goalpara will be necessarily advantageous to us, if the people don't like it. I doubt very much whether the people there are willing to come to Bengal. They have got more cultural affinity with the people of Kamrup area. Secondly, comes the communication. The communication is to be made through Cooch-Bihar. Due to this communication difficulty, Cooch-Bihar is a problem to us on many

counts. It will be still more difficult to have an area which we cannot develop properly."

In view of such a statement by a great leader, I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything further.

The Prime Minister and also the Home Minister have rightly laid great stress on the final chapter of this Report. It is in respect of protection of minorities and the safeguards to be provided for them. We also consider these recommendations to be very important.

With regard to domicile rules, however, I would submit that so far the people of those States which are backward and under-developed are concerned, some kind of protection is necessary for them. If the domicile rules which exist today have gone too far, certainly they should be revised. At the same time, I think it is our duty also to see that the people of the backward and under-developed States receive due protection.

Shri N. R. Muniswamy (Wandiwash): At the outset, I would like to offer my heart-felt thanks to the members of the States Reorganisation Commission for the laborious task that they have done in producing this magnificent report, which, unfortunately, has created enthusiasm as well as passion. It has created enthusiasm in the sense that certain States get a larger area; it has created passion in the sense that certain States have not got proper justice from the Commission.

I am a pessimist by nature. Once we accept this division of our country on the basis of linguism, I am afraid, in the long run, it may lead to certain other difficulties also. But at any rate, mine would be a lone voice or it would be a cry in the wilderness, in case I do not go along with the current of the thought and opinion of the country as well as this House. It is too late for me to say anything against it. But let me also fall in line with the Report. There

[Shri N. R. Muniswamy]

are a few aspects which I wish to place before this House so far as this Report is concerned.

Either we must accept this Report without any change, or we must accept it with certain modifications; the third alternative would be to defer it altogether. Let me take the question of acceptance first. From the various speeches delivered here, I find that it is unlikely that it will be accepted *in toto* because we have been observing that a good deal of agitation is there, and conflicting opinions have been expressed in this House as well as outside. In view of that, it is not possible for anybody to accept it *in toto*.

The second alternative is to accept it with certain modifications, either with addition or subtraction, in which case, it is something like an award. I only insist that in case it has to be accepted with certain modifications, it may be remitted back to the Commission with certain observations or terms of reference requesting them to send it back to us so that the Commission may be given their due weight and due regard. I do not think that that procedure will now be adopted as it will take a longer time than what we expect and the Government also are serious and honest in pushing through the division of this country on a linguistic basis. As such, it may not be possible for them to refer it back to the Commission to send their Report modified in the light of the opinions expressed in this House or by the Government.

The third alternative is to defer it or postpone it. The reason for my saying that it should be postponed is that we are having an over-ambitious Second Five Year Plan of an outlay of about Rs. 4800 crores, and we have to expect a good deal of support and enthusiasm by the people in pushing through these projects. As such, if after creating these new States in spite of opposition, agitation and difference of opinion, people are dissatisfied, they may not be able to offer their full support. Therefore, I say it may

be deferred for a period of five or ten years.

Another point is that next year election is to take place, and the time at our disposal is only about a year. It is not possible or practicable to put through all the formalities and other things so that we can have election without difficulty.

There is another point I wish to stress. There are several territories and boundaries which are very much hotly disputed by the people. People living in those territories have to be asked whether they are willing to go this side or that side. The Report of the Commission is not a necessary corollary to the Constitution. The appointment of the Commission has been the result of certain circumstances. When a non-official resolution was moved here urging the re-organisation of States on a linguistic basis, there were several opinions expressed here, and the Leader of the House was tooth and nail against it. He said there were more important things to be done in this country and therefore, he was not for carving out States on a linguistic basis. Happily by passive methods, by the sacrifice of a life by satyagraha, we got Andhra. As a necessary consequence of that evidently the ruling party thought that it would be better to have linguistic States by appointing a Commission which will go into these questions very elaborately and in detail. Now after the Report is out, I say with some regret that this baby which they have produced has not been acceptable to all the people in the country. Some are of the opinion that its limbs are not proportionate to its body; some are saying that it has sunken eyes and hollow cheeks. In that way, they are criticising the baby, and it is owned neither by the body which appointed the Commission nor by the people to whom it has been presented. Therefore, I say, until this baby grows well, until the idea of linguistic States grows, it is better that we defer it. Otherwise, it will have serious repercussions in

the long run as has happened in several East European countries with different languages, each country possessing its own autonomy, its own principles and its own ideas. Similarly, I am afraid that these States which you have carved out—17 in number—might develop this attitude and it may affect the solidarity and security of India.

The basis on which the Commission have proceeded is the maintenance of the unity and security of India. But in the long run, after 15 or 20 years, the result may be different. We have seen in our country and in this very House as to who is who; people who talk of the solidarity of India, when they come to their own State talk with such force and vehemence as to undermine the whole State. In the long run, linguistic sectarianism will develop to this extent. At one stage, India was divided on the basis of religion. Now, we are dividing India on the basis of language. These may take the root of separate and independent States and we may not have a very strong centre.

Therefore, I would respectfully appeal to this House to join with me—though mine may be a long voice—in asking for deferring the implementation of this Report for some more years until we realise the objectives of our Second and Third Five Year Plans and other things.

As an alternative, I wish to suggest that if we really want to have a strong and unitary government, instead of having 17 States, it is better to have 300 districts, each district to be administered by a Commissioner. Fifty districts will be under the control of a Governor with a Development Council, as suggested by the Leader of the House. That would be in the shape of a zone. (*Interruptions*) Each zone will have about 50 districts and each district will be managed by a Commissioner....

An Hon. Member: District Board?

Shri N. E. Muniswamy: This is my suggestion. If we really want to have

a very strong and unitary Centre, we have to adopt this arrangement, otherwise, in 20 or 25 years, we will see in this country what has happened in the East European countries. That is my apprehension. I am not saying anything against the proposed redistribution, because it is too late in the day, but I am putting this proposal as an alternative. Not that I am against the SRC recommendations, but in view of what I have said, you will agree with me that it is better to defer implementation of the Report or otherwise have the alternative I have suggested.

The broadest principle which the Commission have adopted is language. There are other aspects also which they have taken into account, administrative convenience, economic development of the territory etc. We are having 14 languages recognised as regional languages. Every language is having a separate State, but Urdu and Punjabi do not have a State each. Urdu is out of the question now. I do not insist that we must have an Urdu State. But Punjabi is there. There is a good deal of difference of opinion in regard to carving out a Punjabi State in the sense that it will lead to difficulties and other things. But I am afraid that the persons who spoke in support of not having a Punjabi Suba—not that I belong to Punjab—have not really put forward their reasons for doing so. I have not seen anybody who has advanced any argument against carving out a Punjabi Suba. They have not been plain in their reasoning. They are having something in their sleeves. They never come out with an open case. If they say, 'No, we do not want to have a Punjabi Suba for these reasons' and then state the reasons openly in this House, other Members of the House coming from South India and other parts of the country would appreciate it. I as an impartial man ask why Punjab alone should be discriminated against. I say this with a certain amount of vehemence and a certain amount of responsibility. We have recognised the Punjabi

[Shri M. R. Muniswamy]

language as such. It is one of the regional languages specified in the Constitution. Why are we denying a State to that language? I do not see any particular reason why they are not entitled to have it.

There is a lurking suspicion against the Sikhs. It may be so. But if we have got mistrust towards our servant, we should either dismiss him or tell him that we suspect him. Let him rectify himself. Similarly, if we feel that they are not sincere, they are dishonest, disloyal and we mistrust them, let us say so openly, and let them rectify it. If people feel that they are not entitled to it because it will be dangerous to India let them say so. I have been closely watching the deliberations in this House; Such things have not been put before this House; nobody has come out with such an open case against a Punjabi Suba.

Shri Ram Das (Hoshiarpur-Reserved-Sch. Castes) rose—

Shri N. R. Muniswamy: I am not giving way.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. He shall have his own time to say what he wants to say. His name is there on the list. But to interfere like this will be taking away the other hon. Member's time.

Shri N. R. Muniswamy: I do not mind the interference. But, as I am coming from South India I have an impartial view of these things. I do not know the full facts as to deny it. If you are denying them a Punjabi State let us say it plainly. The other day the Leader of the House said that they must pull together. I quite appreciate that they must pull together and act as one, against the rest. But we are pulling against each other. If we deny such a thing let us plainly say that we deny that; that they are not entitled to it. Say that they are not entitled to have the Punjabi State.

I am running against time. I wish to say something about my own State. In the Report I see nothing has been said about Pondicherry and Karaikkal.

Shri N. M. Lingam (Coimbatore): They are not yet our territory.

An Hon. Member: They won't go to Andhra.

Shri N. R. Muniswamy: I shall read a quotation from the Report. This is what they say:

"We do not think that it is necessary or desirable at this stage to fetter the discretion which is vested in the Government of India in terms of article 243 of the Constitution in respect of the administration of these territories."

That would mean that they are not taking the responsibility of saying to which State after the *de jure* transfer these portions would go. As it is, it is being administered by the Central Government. But, taking into consideration the contiguity of these places, Pondicherry and Karaikkal, they must have expressed their opinion that after *de jure* transfer these must certainly go to Madras State and none else.

As regards the islands, the Andamans and the Nicobars on this side and the Laccadive Islands on the other, I find from the Report that these Laccadive Islands should go to Kerala State. My respectful submission is that instead of giving these islands to the Kerala State, they can as well be administered by the Central Government for this reason that these islands have to be developed and so they must certainly be administered by the Central Government. On one side you are having the islands administered by the Central Government and on the other, in the Arabian sea, you are giving it to a State. That is my suggestion.

As regards Peermade and Devikulam, I am not going to discuss them very much. It has been very well put forth by my hon. friend Shri Nesamony

and answered on the other side also. A reference has been made by Shri Thomas that the Tamils who live there are only labourers and workers. I wish only to disillusion him on that aspect. In Peermede and Devikulam, there are about 65,000 acres of cardamom estate owned by the Tamils about 6,500 in number and about 15 tea estates also owned by Tamils; as against this subject to correction from the other side—6,500 acres of cardamom estates are owned by 2,000 Malayalees and 12 tea estates are owned by Malayalees. From these figures, you will really find that these Tamils are not labourers but they are really masters and not servants. It may be true that some years back they might have migrated to that part of the country. It may be true or may not be true. I only say that the people living in those areas must be consulted before transferring those parts to one State or the other.

I am finishing Sir. I wish to say something about boundary disputes. There are boundary disputes in every State, in Madras, Andhra and also in the north. Until those boundary disputes are finally settled, I think, it is better that those areas are administered by the Centre so that at the next election the wishes of the people may be ascertained. Until then they should be administered by the Centre and not by the States to which they are being assigned.

Here we have got 16 or 17 States and it would be something like the United States of America—the United States of India. In the long run each state will be expressing its own individuality and entity much against the solidarity and security of India. We will be generating enmity and animosity among the States. We have seen in this House how Members have been voicing forth their views in such vehement tones. A good deal of passion and animosity has been emitted in the speeches. I say, in these circumstances, that it is better that we delay the implementation of the recommendations of the S.R.C. Report

for some years, some 10 or 15 years— if not for that period at least for a reasonable time—so that we may be in a better position to know every view. Otherwise, it will impair the progress of the economic development of the country. Let us at least postpone it till the next election and let the next election be held on the basis of the recommendations of the S.R.C. so that the candidates may contest the elections on that basis and we can find out whether particular areas want to go to the States to which they have been assigned.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (जिला बनारस-मध्य) :

इस हाउस के माननीय सदस्यों ने जो भाषण दिये हैं वे इसी सिद्धान्त पर दिये हैं कि भाषा के आधार पर ही प्रदेशों का निर्माण किया जाना चाहिये। मैं भौगोलिक, आर्थिक और नाविक दृष्टि से इस विषय पर विचार करना चाहता हूँ।

ग्राज भारतवर्ष में २८ प्रदेश हैं और एस० आर० सी० ने जो सुझाव दिया है उसके मुताबिक १६ प्रदेश ही हिन्दुस्तान के रह जायेंगे। इसके बाद जो सुझाव कांग्रेस वकिंग कमेटी ने दिया है यदि उसको स्वीकार कर लिया जाता है तो हिन्दुस्तान के १७ प्रदेश होंगे। लेकिन यदि आप सामुद्रिक दृष्टि से विचार करेंगे तो आप को पता चलेगा कि एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट के अनुसार सामुद्रिक ७ और लैंड लोकड स्टेट्स ६ होंगी। जो सुझाव कांग्रेस वकिंग कमेटी ने दिया है और जिसको मैं उचित मानता हूँ उसके हिसाब से ६ मैरिटाइम स्टेट्स होंगी और ७ लैंड लोकड स्टेट्स होंगी। इस वास्ते में कांग्रेस वकिंग कमेटी के सुझाव को सैनिक और नाविक दृष्टि से अधिसंख्या मानता हूँ।

अब मैं पापुलेशन जो इन स्टेट्स की होगी उस पर आता हूँ। ६ मैरिटाइम स्टेट्स की पापुलेशन लगभग २० करोड़ की होगी और

(श्री रघुनाथ सिंह)

७ लैंड लोकड स्टेट्स की आबादी तकरीबन १७ करोड़ होगी। इसका अर्थ यह हुआ कि भारत एक मैरिटाइम स्टेट होगा और यह एक लैंड लोकड स्टेट नहीं होगा। भारत की वही स्थिति होगी जो कि यू० एस० ए० की है या जो कि इंग्लैंड की है।

मैं आपका ध्यान इस नक्शे की ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। दक्षिण और उत्तर का सवाल नहीं है। २४ पैरेलल का सवाल है। अगर इस नक्शे को आप ध्यानपूर्वक देखेंगे तो आपको पता चलेगा कि २४ पैरेलल के उत्तर के जो प्रवेश होंगे वह सब लैंड लोकड प्रदेश होंगे और जो दक्षिण के प्रदेश होंगे वह सब मैरिटाइम प्रदेश होंगे। इस वास्ते कांग्रेस वर्किंग कमेटी ने एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट में जो परिवर्तन किया है यदि वह मान लिया जाये तो उससे यह होगा कि करीब ३ करोड़ की आबादी मैरिटाइम स्टेट्स में और आ जाती है। इस प्रकार से भारतवर्ष की अधिक आबादी मैरिटाइम स्टेट्स में आ जाती है।

मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि आखिरकार यह जो लैंड लोकड स्टेट्स है जिनकी आबादी १७ करोड़ के करीब होगी इन में कौन लोग होंगे। इसमें ज्यादातर हिन्दी स्पीकिंग एरिया के प्रदेश आते हैं, आसाम को छोड़ कर के बंगाल, उड़ीसा, आन्ध्र, मद्रास, केरल, कर्नाटक, महाराष्ट्र, बम्बई और सोराष्ट्र या गुजरात यह मैरिटाइम स्टेट्स हैं और आसाम, बिहार, उत्तर प्रदेश, मध्य प्रदेश, राजस्थान, पंजाब, काश्मीर लैंड लोकड स्टेट्स हैं। बंगाल, उड़ीसा, कर्नाटक और आंध्र, इन चार प्रदेशों के पास कोल और आयरन हैं, हिन्दुस्तान के पास इस वक्त केवल एक शिप-यार्ड है। मेरी यह प्रार्थना है कि ये चारों प्रदेश अपने यहां एक एक शिप-यार्ड और बनायें। लैंड-लोकड स्टेट्स यह कहेंगी कि हम को कौनसी

पोर्ट मिलेगी। तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि राजस्थान का काम कांडला से चल सकता है, मध्य प्रदेश के लिये कांडला, बम्बई और विशाखापत्तनम हैं। पंजाब और काश्मीर के लिये भी कांडला है और उत्तर प्रदेश, आसाम, और बिहार के लिये कलकत्ता है। जैसा कि हम यूरोप में देखते हैं, स्विटजरलैंड एक लैंड-लोकड स्टेट है, लेकिन इटली की जेनेवा पोर्ट से उसका काम चलता है। हम भारतवर्ष के लोग एक हैं—चाहे उत्तर हो या दक्षिण हो, हमारा एक यूनिट है। इसलिये हम को इस सिद्धांत को मानना होगा कि हिन्दुस्तान में जितने पोर्ट्स हैं—हारवर हैं, जैसे वे इस वक्त सैट्रली एडमिनिस्टर्ड हैं, उसी प्रकार वे फ्यूचर में भी सैट्रली एडमिनिस्टर्ड रहेंगे? बंगाल में कलकत्ता, उड़ीसा में पाराद्वीप, आन्ध्र में विशाखापत्तनम, मद्रास में मद्रास, केरल में कोचीन, और कर्नाटक में मंगलौर या माल्पे हैं। कर्नाटक के कारवार पोर्ट को भी एक अच्छे शिप-यार्ड में कनवर्ट किया जा सकता है। कर्नाटक के पास कोल और आयरन दोनों हैं, इसलिये उस को अवश्य कारवार पोर्ट को विकसित करना चाहिये और एक शिप-यार्ड स्थापित करना चाहिये। इस के बाद महाराष्ट्र के पास बम्बई है, वहां भी एक शिप-यार्ड चल सकता है। सोराष्ट्र के पास कांडला है और वहां भी एक शिप-यार्ड बन सकता है।

अब मैं सैनिक दृष्टि से थोड़ा विचार करना चाहता हूँ। भारतवर्ष का स्थान भारतीय महासमुद्र के बीच में आता है। अगर हमने भारतीय महासमुद्र में अपना महत्वपूर्ण स्थान रखना है, तो हमको हिन्दुस्तान को एक मेरी टाइम नेशन बनाने की आवश्यकता है। हिन्दुस्तान की पार्टीशन के पश्चात् उसके दोनों सिरों पर पाकिस्तान हो गया है। आज दुनिया से हमारा सम्बन्ध लैंड स्टेट्स से नहीं है, बल्कि समुद्र से है। इसलिये यह आवश्यक है कि हमको

अपने सोलह प्रदेशों में से नौ मैरिटाइम प्रदेशों को और डेवेलप करना चाहिये, हर एक स्टेट में एक एक शिपयार्ड होना चाहिये और हमारी मैरिटाइम एक्टिविटीज को और आगे से चलना चाहिये ।

शिपिंग डाकुमेंट्स के सम्बन्ध में यह मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि शिपिंग के सम्बन्ध में जो पत्र-व्यवहार होता है, वह हिन्दी में हो । प्राचीन समय में द्रावणकोर-कोचीन में कैनल सिस्टम था । आज यह सिस्टम भंग हो गया है । मेरे कहने का आशय यह है कि वहाँ पर कैनल सिस्टम को अच्छी तरह डेवेलप करना चाहिये । साथ ही साथ ब्रह्मपुत्र नदी और गंगा नदी को इतना अच्छा बनाना चाहिये कि कानपुर तक हमारे जहाज आ सकें और गोहाटी तक भी आ सकें, ताकि हमारे यहाँ इन्टर-स्टेट नेवी-गेशन चल सके ।

हमारी पोजीशन अमरीका और यू० एस० एस० आर० से भी अच्छी हैं । अमरीका के दोनों तरफ—पैसिफिक महासागर और अट-नांटिक महासागर में—पोर्ट्स नहीं हैं और यही स्थिति यू० एस० एस० आर० की भी है । दुनियाँ में सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान एक ऐसा देश है, जिसके पैनेनसुला में दोनों तरफ अच्छी अच्छी पोर्ट्स हैं । इस बात की बड़ी आवश्यकता है कि उन पोर्ट्स का विकास किया जाये ।

संजित जी ने हिन्दुस्तान को पांच क्षेत्रों में बाटे जाने की जो सजेसन दी है, उसके सम्बन्ध में मेरा सुझाव यह है कि पूर्वी क्षेत्र में आसाम, बंगाल, बिहार और उड़ीसा हों, दक्षिणी क्षेत्र में आंध्र, मद्रास, केरल हों, दक्षिण-पश्चिमी क्षेत्र में कर्नाटक, महाराष्ट्र और सौराष्ट्र या गुजरात हों, पश्चिम क्षेत्र में काश्मीर, पंजाब और राजस्थान हों और मध्य क्षेत्र में उत्तर प्रदेश और मध्य प्रदेश के क्षेत्र हों । यदि इस प्रकार के पांच क्षेत्र बना दिये

जायें, तो उन में से तीन क्षेत्र मैरिटाइम होंगे और दो लैंड-लोकट होंगे । अगर हम पोर्ट्स को सेंट्रल एडमिनिस्टर्ड रखते हैं, तो हिन्दी स्पीकिंग पीपल को या लैंड-लोकड स्टेट्स को कोई चिन्ता नहीं होनी चाहिये । इन पोर्ट्स से हमारा काम अच्छी तरह से चल सकता है और हमारी नेवी और नाविक शक्ति दिन प्रतिदिन अच्छी होती जायेगी । जैसा कि आप जानते हैं, आज हमारी नाविक शक्ति हाफ परसेंट आफ दि वर्ल्ड फ्लीट है । इस को लेकर हम एक मैरिटाइम स्टेट नहीं हो सकती है ।

अन्त में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस वर्किंग कमेटी का रेजोल्यूशन एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट पर इम्प्लवमेंट है, इस लिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि हम को कांग्रेस वर्किंग कमेटी की सजेसनज को बुनियादी तौर पर मानना चाहिये और इस प्रकार हमारी जो नौ मैरिटाइम स्टेट्स बनने वाली हैं, उन को इम्प्लव करना चाहिये ताकि भारतवर्ष संसार में एक सर्वश्रेष्ठ नाविक देश हो सके । धन्यवाद ।

Shri N. M. Lingam: Before I begin to deal with some of the major recommendations of the SRC, I would say a few words on the position in the Madras State. Claims have been made by my friends from Kerala on the Gudalur taluk in the Madras State. Some hon. Members have also opposed the claim. I claim to speak with some authority on the question because that happens to be a part of my constituency.

The Commission itself when it received a representation that this area should go to Kerala toured the area and found that there was no basis for the claim made. So we find in the Report not even a casual mention of this claim by the sponsors of the Aikya Kerala movement. Even linguistically it cannot go to Kerala. Malayalee population there is only 39 per cent. and the majority are non-Malayalees. There is then the all important question of the wishes of the people. I

[Shri N. M. Lingam]

have received a heap of telegrams and every day I am receiving them to the effect that this area should not be merged with the proposed Kerala State.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): What is the Tamil population?

Shri N. M. Lingam: That is irrelevant to the question because we are concerned with the strength of the Malayalee claim.

There is then this fact that it forms part of the Nilgiris district which forms a distinct administrative unit. It is situated at the meeting place of the Eastern and the Western Ghats and the three taluks there are complementary to one another. In one we have a national park and in another a game sanctuary. This particular taluk has in fact got the game sanctuary. It is also the source of hydroelectric power to the Madras State. The Moyar river in which one of the projects is located goes along the eastern borders of the taluk. If this small place is detached from the Nilgiris, the entire value of the district goes. It is a hill station and there is no barrier between these taluks except that Gudalur is at a lower level; and communications are easy. If you break this place, you break the whole district and that means you disturb the beauty spot in the whole of India. I may say it is the jewel of India and the venue of national and international conferences and the summer headquarters of the Government. As I said it is a health resort for the whole country. By taking away this, you will be creating very difficult conditions for the entire district. So, I would very strongly oppose the claims made on this taluk. Even on economic grounds, I would say that it is so small that it is not going to serve the purpose for which it is claimed. The Kerala State says that there is no living space. Here more than half the area of 275 square miles comprises plantations and forests. There is very little scope for colonisation. Thus

while it means everything to the existing set-up it means precious little to the new State.

I now pass on to the question of Devikulam and Peermede. This also has been discussed at length in this House. It was also debated in the Madras Assembly. Linguistically these areas must form part of the Madras State, but the Commission has said that the population in these places comprises partly a large floating population of Tamils and therefore they should go to Kerala. I do not quarrel with the proposal to have it in the Travancore-Cochin State on economic grounds because I know five important taluks are being detached from the present Travancore-Cochin State and merged in Madras, and so it is the responsibility of the House to see that the new State is strengthened in every possible way; but when they come to claim it on linguistic grounds I have to enter a caveat because we do not want to quibble with figures and we do not want to say that a certain population is floating population. We do not want to question the accuracy of the census figures. I would only ask my friends to be honest and say that it is necessary for the economic viability of the State. If they say that very few people who have the interest of the country at heart will object to their claims. So, there is no use. I feel, analysing the figures or discussing them because statistics prove nothing and disprove nothing.

I now come to the main recommendations of the Commission. From the trend of the debate it looks as if we can go on discussing the merits of reorganisation of States till the end of time, but even so certain broad conclusions emerge. One is that, although language is only one of the considerations for the reorganisation of States and other important factors like economic viability, geography and historical associations have to be taken into consideration in the last analysis

language alone, to the exclusion of every other factor seems to decide every issue. Thus, of the 14 languages mentioned in the Eighth Schedule of our Constitution every language has a State except Gujarathi and Punjabi. So, whatever our intentions were when the Commission was appointed regarding the reorganisation of States, we have to face the fact that India has come to be divided largely on a linguistic basis. There is no use deluding ourselves that this is not so. At any rate we should not cover this hard fact by platitudinous hyperbole.

The second impression that one gets is that the consequences of reorganisation are going to be gravely unsettling; especially financial and economic dislocation that will be caused is almost unforeseeable. It is unfortunate that the Commission with its excellent Report has not done justice to this aspect of the matter. The treatment of the financial and economic consequences is neither adequate nor of an expert nature.

If only the Commission had submitted an interim report and indicated to us the magnitude of the changes they proposed to make and the cost it would involve, probably the House and the Government could have had second thoughts on the time and mode of reorganisation. But, now that is neither here nor there. At the same time we must also be fair with the Commission in having made some salutary recommendations. I refer in particular to the recommendations of the Commission for the abolition of Part C States, for the abolition of the institution of Rajpramukhs and the abolition of the distinction between Part A and Part B States.

When one looks at the new political picture of India the first impression that he gets is that in three strategic areas—we have the problem States of Bengal, Travancore-Cochin and the Punjab—the situation is unhappy. I do not pretend to have a ready-made solution for any of these. The Bengal

question is too complicated to be decided straightaway but the fact remains that the Government is faced with the problem of West Bengal; we are only evading this issue now. Travancore-Cochin is also a small State linguistically. It is a linguistic unit. It is a unit by itself. But, taking the density of population and the area I do not know what the future is going to hold for that State. I personally would prefer a southern State of Madras and Travancore-Cochin and I visualise a time when these two will be merged.

Shri Achuthan (Crangannur):
When?

Shri N. M. Lingam: When the protagonists of Aikya Kerala feel that it is useless to keep on harping on the slogan.

Shri A. M. Thomas: May I ask a straight question to the hon. Member? May I know whether your Chief Minister and the Congress Party is in favour of a southern State?

Shri N. M. Lingam: I would say that it should be said to the credit of Madras Ministers that they do not shun or disown anybody. It is because they had a practical appreciation of the position, a realisation of the feelings of the people at present that they do not want to bless this movement; otherwise Madras is always ready to embrace people, whoever wants to join with it.

Shri Achuthan: Leaders have to lead; they are not to be led.

Shri N. M. Lingam: Sometimes they have also to be led.

Now that we can afford to have more States than envisaged in the Commission's Report my own feeling is that we could have two States in Bombay, in Uttar Pradesh, in the proposed Madhya Pradesh and in the

[Shri N. M. Lingam]

entire Andhra area. In each of these areas we could have two States because the trend nowadays is towards intensive development. Unless the States are of compact size we cannot bestow adequate attention to the development of these areas. The Commission in a two-page report on bigger versus smaller States have dealt with this question but no clear conclusions follow from this.

Then there is another important factor. The States are of unequal size, unequal in area, in population, in resources and, last but not least, in political influence. There is such a thing as the centre of gravity in politics. Gravity of numbers counts everywhere in this world and I would remind the House that it is not an accident that our President hails from Bihar and our Prime Minister from U.P. It lends strength to them. They have the background of the strength and they are conscious of it. Perhaps it is good to imagine a time when the Prime Minister of India hails from Manipur. He will have to face the music in this house all the time. That position would be most unenviable.

Shri Mohanlal Saksena (Lucknow Distt. *cum* Bara Banki Distt.): What about the President of the Congress?

Shri N. M. Lingam: So, in the interest of stability of the country, States of more or less equal strength have to be carved out.

Now that we have community projects and national extension services these require attention. Almost every house and every family has to be attended to. I find that the Government is more or less committed to accepting the recommendations of the Commission, judging from the speeches of the Prime Minister and the hon. Home Minister. In the circumstances I can only suggest that we should always plan in such a way that our districts would have greater autonomy. Unless that is done we simply cannot

manage these unwieldy States. The local bodies are either dead or dying. There is too much centralisation of power and functions. So, in the new set-up unless we see to it that the maximum power devolves at the district level we cannot successfully implement our welfare schemes.

Then, Sir, much is said about unity of India, but it is forgotten that India stands deathless. It has a message to the world. It has stood for national ideals. Every nation and every individual has a central purpose, a central scheme around which other activities revolve. In India it is non-violence and truth, call it spiritually, call it religion; that is the foundation of her existence, the *raison d'être* of her being. So, let us not talk much about this culture—about these different cultures in different areas. As long as the common culture stands, as long as that fundamental basis of the nation remains strong, we need not be afraid of linguistic claims or claims for different areas and different cultures. This very spiritual basis of India's existence may not have been noticeable always, but we must remind ourselves of the fact that even Sankaracharya had established *maths* in Badrinath, Sringeri, Dwarka and Puri—in all the four corners of India, and people in the north go to the south, to Rameshwaram, on pilgrimage. So, this fundamental unity has been very noticeable all through.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): On a point of order. I was going out of the House on the road, and there I saw a lot of people gathered there and terrible *lathi charges* were going on. Many of the people could not cross the street. People are being driven on to the road side.

Mr. Chairman: I have heard the point of order. Is it a matter to be

brought to the notice of this House? It is not a point of order.

Shri Velayudhan: It is in the Parliament House building—the premises of Parliament House.

Mr. Chairman: Is it for this House to consider it?

Shri Velayudhan: The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs is here and he should make a statement before the House about it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. His point has been heard and a ruling has been given. It is not a point of order.

Shri H. N. Mukherjee: Within the precincts of the House certain events are happening which Members of Parliament report here and which might be taken note of by the hon. Minister who is present in the House. Could not the Member ask the House to take note of it and ask the Minister to do something about it?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member knows that the road outside is not within the precincts of this House. At the same time, it is a matter which the hon. Member should bring to the notice of the Home Minister. But the Chair is helpless in the matter. The Chair has got no jurisdiction over the roads.

Shri Velayudhan: The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs is here.

Mr. Chairman: It is not a point of order to be raised in this House. Why should the hon. Member take the time of the House this way? The Chair or the House is not responsible for it. It is a question of law and order in the streets of Delhi.

Shri Velayudhan: It is within the Parliament premises.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Member know what the Parliament premises are?

Shri Velayudhan: Of course, I know. There are the Rules of Procedure and it is mentioned there.

Mr. Chairman: I would request the hon. Member to tell me what are those rules and orders and how does the jurisdiction of the Chair extend to the streets of Delhi. There is no point. Shri N. M. Lingam will please proceed.

Shri N. M. Lingam: I was saying that in our country, political integration and social cohesion have been the effect and not the cause of a spiritual and cultural renaissance. So, I would submit that the proposed reorganisation of the States is not going to endanger the unity of the country. On the other hand, every shock that the country has received since the attainment of Independence has helped to galvanize the people. I am sure that the proposed reorganisation of the States would only help to strengthen the solidarity and the strength of the country.

I would like here to utter only one note of warning to the Government. They should not resign themselves to a policy of hustle. They should see that the changes proposed to be implemented are effected only where they are convinced that it will bring more good than harm and that they will be of a lasting character.

Lastly, different languages are being introduced in the university stage. It is disturbing. When we want to develop the unity of India by having all-India services, this trend is disturbing. I am glad that the hon. Deputy Minister of Home Affairs said yesterday that the Government have planned for the South Indian languages to be taught in the universities in the north. That will be useless unless the universities go slow with the pace of Hindi—using the medium of instruction.

श्री देवगम (चवस्सा—रक्षित—अनुसूचित आदिम जातियां) : सभापति महोदय, मैं सब से पहले आपको बहुत धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि आपने मुझे इस राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग की रिपोर्ट पर चल रहे वादविवाद में बोलने का अवसर प्रदान किया। इस भवन के सामने मैं जो अपने विचार रखूंगा वह केवल मेरा अपना निजी मत ही न समझा जाये बल्कि जिस निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से मैं चुन कर यहां आया हूँ, वहां के दो लाख मतदाताओं का भी वही मत है। मैं सिंहभूम जिले से आता हूँ जिसके कि लिये बड़े जोरों में संघर्ष चल रहा है। सिंहभूम जिले में सन् १९२० में जब चुनाव हुए थे तो उस वक्त शेड्यूल कास्ट और शेड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स के लोगों के लिये कोई रिजर्वेशन नहीं था और हालांकि वहां से और आदिवासी लोग भी असेम्बली की मेम्बरी के लिये उम्मीदवार थे, हमारे बंगाली और बिहारी भाई भी राज्य विधान परिषद् की मेम्बरी के लिये उम्मीदवार थे लेकिन सब के सब हारते आये हैं और सन् १९२० से वहां आदिवासी उम्मीदवार ही एम० एल० ए० होते आये हैं। बहुत मैजिस्ट्री में आदिवासी लोग ही जीतते आये हैं। मर्दूम-शुमारी के आंकड़े यह भी प्रमाणित करते हैं कि सिंहभूम आदिवासी-प्रधान जिला है और यहां पर बहुत काफी तादाद में आदिवासी लोग रहते हैं। अब रहा यह सवाल कि सिंहभूम जिला बंगाल में जाये, बिहार में जाये या उड़ीसा में जाये, इस सवाल का फैसला केवल आदिवासी लोग ही कर सकते हैं और दूसरा कोई नहीं कर सकता। मुझे तो ऐसा लगता है कि छोटा नागपुर जिस में कि मेरा जिला सिंहभूम है, एक धनी विधवा है जिसको बरने के लिये बहुत से प्रार्थना पत्र आये हुए हैं, और न जाने वे किन गुणों पर मुग्ध हो गये हैं जो सब के सब इसको अपने में मिलाने के लिये लालयित हैं और इस विधवा की हित कामना के लिये चिन्तित हैं, अब वे लोग अपना हृदय

टोल कर देखें कि ऐसा वह उसकी शुद्ध हित-कामना की दृष्टि से कर रहे हैं अथवा उसके धन की लालच से उसको बरना चाहते हैं। खैर, जो भी हो, मैं उन सभों को धन्यवाद देता हूँ जो हमारे लिये इतने उत्सुक हैं लेकिन मैं यह स्पष्ट कर देना चाहता हूँ कि यह झारखंड किसी को भी बरसाना नहीं पहनायेगा।

मैं सारे संसद् सदस्यों को लयाद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि बंग भंग होने पर केवल बंगाल ही नहीं बल्कि समूचा भारत देश क्षुब्ध हो उठा था, उसी तरह अगर आप इस आदिवासी अंचल के टुकड़े करेंगे तो भारत में जितने भी हमारे आदिवासी इधर उधर बसते हैं, वे क्षुब्ध हो उठेंगे और इसलिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि आप आदिवासी क्षेत्र के टुकड़े मत कीजिये और उसे एक रहने दीजिये। हिमाचल प्रदेश के श्री गोपीराम, मध्य प्रदेश के माननीय सदस्य श्री उइके और बिहार के आदिवासी अंचल के सदस्यों और अन्य पिछड़े वर्गों के सदस्यों के भाषणों से तो मुझे यही मालूम पड़ता है कि भारत के कल्याण के लिये भारत में बसने वाले आदिवासी अंचलों को बांट कर इधर उधर तितर बितर मत कीजिये क्योंकि आपके द्वारा ऐसी हेर-फेर करने से वे अल्पसंख्यक बना दिये जायेंगे। उन का विश्वास उन में नहीं है। आदिवासियों को ऐसा लगता है कि जिस तरह ब्रिटिश शासन में हम सब भारतवासी महसूस करते थे उसी तरह आज आदिवासियों को आत्म-निर्णय का अधिकार नहीं है। आज जिन के पास शासन की बागडोर है उन का आदिवासियों को विश्वास नहीं है। आदिवासियों के हृदय यहीं पुकार रहे हैं कि :

“सन्तरी ही चोर हो
तो कौन रखवाली करे।
उस बाग का क्या हाल हो,
माली जो पामाली करे।”

३ म० प०

यह सभी आदिवासियों का हाल है चाहे वह बिहार के रहने वाले हों चाहे बंगाल के या उड़ीसा के रहने वाले हों। आप सर्विसेज की लिस्ट देखिये कि उन में कितने आदिवासी हैं, काटेज इन्डस्ट्री में उन को कहां सहायता मिलती है। बेलफेयर डिपार्टमेंट में उन की देखभाल करने के लिये उन के अपने आदमी नहीं हैं। इरिगेशन की बात में बराबर कहता आया हूं इस भवन में, कि हमारे जिले में ढाई लाख रुपया खर्च हुआ कई स्कीमें बनीं, लेकिन हतभाग सिहभूम दो वर्ष के अन्नाभाव और जलाभाव से तड़प रहा है। पुलिस बाहर वालों का, गैरआदिवासियों का ही पक्षपात करती है। मैं ने इस भवन में फाइव इमर प्लैन का जिक्र करते हुए कहा था कि फारेस्ट वेल्थ को सब से पहले आदिवासियों को एक्स्प्लायट करने का हक मिलना चाहिये, वह भी बिल्कुल नहीं मिलता। इस कारण वे आदिवासी महसूस कर रहे हैं कि उन्हें बहुत सहायता नहीं मिली है। इन आदि निवासियों की पुकार यह है :

“आजाद हुआ है देश किन्तु आजादी की

हल्की सी किरण यहां तक पहुंच नहीं
पायी है।

बढ़ गयी निराशा की सीमा दुःख व्याधि
बहुत,

पर सुख की गोरी सुबह न अब तक
आयी है।”

सरकार से मेरा निवेदन है कि आदिवासियों तक सच्चा स्वराज्य अभी नहीं पहुंच पाया है। मैं आप को एश्योरेंस देता हूं कि अभी हम को जरा भी देश के शासन परिवर्तन का पता नहीं चला है। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट

ने जो डिवाइड एण्ड रूल की पालिसी अपनाई थी उसको आप न अपनायें। हमारे यहां के हो, संथाल और मुंडा बीरसा-क्रांति नहीं करेंगे, वह भारत का मुख उज्ज्वल करेंगे। आज उड़िया भाई, बंगाली भाई हम सब लोगों को अलग अलग करने के लिये षड्यंत्र किये हुए हैं। यह लोग ही भाइयों से कह रहे हैं कि उड़ीसा में तुम्हें बहुत सुख मिलेगा तुम को बहुत सी सुविधायें मिलेंगी। मैं उन से निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि वह लोग इस का प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं कि हम लोगों में आपस में प्रेम सम्बन्ध न रहे। लेकिन हो, संथाल और मुंडा सब एक ही पेड़ की शाखें हैं, उन के एक से ग्राम हैं एक ही भाषा है, उन का एक सा ही रहन सहन है। साइकालाजी के अनुसार भी सब एक हैं। यह कह कर कि हो लोगों को बहुत सुख मिलेगा, उन को हरे हरे बाग दिखा कर उन को लुभाने की चेष्टा आप लोग न करें। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि उनके खूनी हाथ कैसे उन लोगों के पास आ रहे हैं। खरसवां का जलियांवाला बाग और उड़ीसा का जलियांवाला बाग अभी तक हमारे दिल में हरे बने हुए हैं। उन लोगों ने क्यों आत्म बलिदान किया? क्यों जान दिया? इसीलिये कि वह लोग उड़ीसा में नहीं जाना चाहते थे, उन्होंने हमेशा इन का विरोध किया है। आखिर उड़ीसा के हमारे भाई क्यों हमारी जान खाते हैं? हमारे यहां के लोग बिहार में आना चाहते थे, झारखंड में मिलना चाहते थे, लेकिन चूकि आप झारखंड नहीं बनाना चाहते थे इस लिये यह हजारों की संख्या में भुन गये। उड़ीसा के लिये आप कम्यूनिकेशन बैरियर हटाने की बात कहते हैं, कहते हैं कि रांची में जाने के लिये माउटेन बैरियर है लेकिन हमारे हृदय में बैरियर बन गई है उड़ीसा में जाने के विरुद्ध, एक व्याधि उत्पन्न हो गई है। आज उड़िया लोगों के प्रति ही लोगों में यकीन नहीं है। उन का इलाका उन से अलग है, उन की भाषा नहीं मिलती और न उनके

(श्री देवगम)

रीति रिवाज मिलत हैं। शायद वह मिल भी नहीं सकते। ऐसी हालत में यह कहा जाता है कि सिंहभूम के चार लाख 'हो' लोगों को उड़ीसा में जाना चाहिये। उड़ीसा में मयूरभंज, क्योन्नर और मुन्दरगढ़ में सिर्फ १ लाख 'हो' हैं, वे क्यों नहीं हमारे पास आते, उन्हीं लोगों को क्यों नहीं झारखंड में मिलाया जाता। उड़ीसा में जो हमारे हो भाई, मुंडा भाई और संथाल भाई हैं वह लोग क्या कष्ट पा रहे हैं वह भी मैं आप को बताऊं। वह लोग अपना चावल, दाल, मुर्गा करी इण्डस्ट्रियल एरिया, जमशेदपुर में, बेचने के लिये, नहीं ला सकते, एक तरफ से दूसरी तरफ पैर नहीं रख सकते हैं।

[SHRIMTI SUSHAMA SEN in the Chair.]

यह लोग भी क्या हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के लोग हैं? यह दोनों तो आपस के ही लोग हैं? क्या उड़ीसा और बिहार के बीच में इस तरह का व्यवहार होना चाहिये जैसे कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान में होता है? जो भी हो, इधर भी हो है और उधर भी हो है, मुंडा और संथाल भी हैं, उन दोनों के ब्याह शादी एक साथ चलते हैं। लेकिन अगर वह लोग अपना चावल, दाल और दूसरी चीजें ले जाना चाहते हैं तो वह नहीं ले जा सकते। उड़ीसा सरकार इस में बाधा देती है।

एक और प्रथा हम में है मैं उस की भी याद आप को दिलाऊंगा। हम लोग लड़कियों को खरीदते हैं शादी करने के लिये। आप इस पर नजर न डालिये कि यह अच्छा है या बुरा, लेकिन वह रिवाज है। मयूरभंज और क्योन्नर के आदिवासियों के साथ और बिहार के आदिवासियों के साथ शादी ब्याह चलता है। जैसे यहां पर दहेज इत्यादि चलता है उसी तरह से हम लोग लड़की वालों को गाय बैल

इत्यादि देते हैं। हम को उन को एक तरफ से दूसरी तरफ पहुंचाना भी मुश्किल हो जाता है। यह सब है, इस लिये मैं चाहता हूं कि आदिवासियों के अंचलों को एक साथ मिला कर हम लोगों की असुविधाओं को खत्म किया जाये।

श्री एम० पी० मिश्र (मुंगेर—उत्तर-पश्चिम) : कल हमारे बंगाल प्रान्तीय कांग्रेस कमेटी के सभापति श्री आतुल्य बाबू का भाषण हुआ और हम ने उनके भाषण को बहुत ध्यानपूर्वक सुना। उनसे हम एक बात में बिल्कुल सहमत हैं और वह यह कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो कहा कि बिहार और बंगाल का जो झगड़ा है वह कोई अहमियत नहीं रखता, वह बहुत मामूली सी चीज है, उसको न वह मानते हैं और न ही हम मानते हैं। इस मामले में हम दोनों की राय एक है प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो कहा वह ठीक नहीं कहा। हम कहना चाहते हैं कि राज्यों के बंटवारे में, राज्यों को फिर से बनाने में एक प्रांत क्या एक जिला क्या, एक गांव क्या अगर एक इंसान की भी अगर उसकी इच्छा के विरुद्ध गलत ढंग से इस हिस्से से उस हिस्से में धकेल दिया जाता है तो हम उसको अन्याय मानते हैं और हमारे लिये यह वह चीज बड़ी अहमियत रखती है। हम आठ रोज से जो बहस इस हाउस में हो रही है उसको सुनते आ रहे हैं। बंगाल की तरफ से जो भाई भी तकरीर करते हैं, चाहे वह आतुल्य बाबू हों और चाहे चटर्जी साहब हों, चाहे कोई भी हों, वह यही कहते हैं कि पश्चिमी बंगाल लूट-बंट गया, बंगाल गरीब हो गया है, बंगाल बहुत मुसीबत में है और इसलिये बंगाल को कुछ इलाका चाहिये। कभी शरणार्थी भाइयों का नाम लिया जाता है, कभी बंगाल की आर्थिक बुरवस्था की बात की जाती है। कभी भाषा का नाम लिया जाता है और कभी किसी और चीज का नाम लिया जाता है।

इतना ही नहीं अपनी बात को मनवाने के लिये कूच और बम की धमकी दी जाती है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि देश का बंटवारा हुआ यह केवल बंगाल के लिये दुर्भाग्य की बात नहीं थी, यह सारे देश के लिये एक दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण बात थी।

लेकिन मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जो बंगाल का बंटवारा हुआ उसमें बंगाल को कितना फायदा रहा और कितना नुकसान। यह बात मैं चाहता हूँ, इस हाउस के सदस्यों को जान लेनी चाहिये। बंटवारे पर पश्चिमी बंगाल को पूरे बंगाल की ४० प्रतिशत भूमि मिली जब कि पूर्वी बंगाल को ६० प्रतिशत। अब आबादी की बात को आप देखिये। कुल आबादी का ३६ प्रतिशत पश्चिमी बंगाल के हिस्से आया और ६४ प्रतिशत पूर्वी बंगाल को गया। अब आप देखिये इनको आबादी कम मिली और जमीन भी ज्यादा मिली लेकिन फिर भी यह चाहते हैं कि इनको और जमीन चाहिये। इनका यह नारा है कि अपने लोगों को बसाने के लिये इन को जमीन चाहिये। यही नारा साम्राज्यवादी देशों का नारा रहा है। यही नारा जापान का था, यही नारा जर्मनी के डिक्टेटर हिटलर का था, यही नारा इटली के मुसोलिनी का था कि अपनी आबादी के आदमियों के लिये उन्हें जमीन चाहिये। हम इस बात को मानते हैं कि इमोशनल आधार पर, भावना के आधार पर बंगाल को घाटा हुआ है। इतना भौतिक फायदा उठाने के बाद भी बंगाल का भावनात्मक घाटा, यदि एक थाना या एक जिला ले लेने से अगर वह पूरा हो सकता है तो हम बिहार के लोग खुशी खुशी देने को तैयार हैं। लेकिन इस तरह से उसका घाटा पूरा नहीं हो सकता है। यह एक मजाक हो जायगा। हृदय के घाव इस तरह नहीं दूर किये जा सकते। मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि संयुक्त बंगाल की आमदनी थी ४४ करोड़ की और जो आमदनी

पच्छिम बंगाल के बंटवारे के बाद रह गई वह ३१ करोड़ रुपये की रह गई। इसके मुकाबले में ७ करोड़ की आबादी में से उसके हिस्से सिर्फ दो करोड़ २० लाख की आबादी आई। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि आमदनी तो उसके हिस्से दो तिहाई आई लेकिन आबादी जो आई वह सिर्फ एक-तिहाई। इसका अर्थ यह हुआ कि रातोंरात में पश्चिमी बंगाल के हर इन्सान की आमदनी औसतन दुगनी हो गई। इस पर यह कहते हैं कि हमारी आर्थिक दशा बुरी है, हमें बिहार चाहिये, हमें आसाम चाहिये, हमें उड़ीसा चाहिये। अब जो यहां पर पिछले आठ रोज से दुःखी होने, मुसीबत में जकड़े होने का नारा लगाया जा रहा है तो हो सकता है कि इस हाउस के मेम्बर भी यह सोचने लग गये हों कि बंगाल सचमुच बड़ी मुसीबत में है। मैं इस हाउस की ही बात नहीं करता लेकिन जो कमिशन के मेम्बर थे उनके दिल में भी शायद यही खयाल आया कि यह लोग बहुत तकलीफ में हैं इनकी मदद करनी चाहिये। कमिशन के मेम्बरों के दिमाग में भी यही बिठा दिया गया कि बंगाल एक बहुत बड़ा राज्य था और अब वह चूँकि छोटा सा रह गया है इस लिये उसकी मदद की ही जानी चाहिये। मैं इसके लिये प्रायोग के मेम्बरों को दोष नहीं देता। बड़े-बड़े न्यायाधीश भी अपने उपवेतन मन से प्रभावित होकर फैसला देते हैं। उनके दिमाग में यह बात बस गई थी कि बंगाल को बड़ा नुकसान हुआ है। और उसका घाटा पूरा होना ही चाहिये। एक बार आसाम उससे अलग हो गया, फिर बिहार अलग हो गया, फिर बंगाल को तकसीम हो गई। आसाम और बिहार बंगाल के अपने हिस्से नहीं थे और अगर वह अलग प्रान्तों के रूप में आ गये तो कौन सी बड़ी बात हो गई। आंध्र मद्रास से भी तो अलग हो गया है? अब अगर मद्रास यह कहे कि मुझे मैसूर मिलना चाहिये तो यह कहाँ के इन्साफ की बात है? बंगाल की यही मांग थी कि उसके हाथ से बहुत राज्य चले गये

श्री एम० पी० मिश्र]

हैं इसलिये उसे श्रीर प्रदेश के हिस्से मिलने चाहियें। इस मामले में कमिशन की सहानुभूति उनके साथ हो गई। आयोग ने किशनगंज बंगाल को इस लिये दे दिया कि उसको एक कौरिडोर चाहिये। पश्चिमी बंगाल के दो टुकड़े हैं और इसी आधार पर उसने कौरिडोर की मांग की। मैं पूछता हूँ कि क्या इस तरह की कौरिडोर की मांग अपने ही देश में चल सकती है। इसी आधार पर कल पाकिस्तान कहेगा कि हमें पश्चिमी और पूर्वी पाकिस्तान के दरम्यान सम्पर्क स्थापित रखने के लिये उसके बीच जो १३०० या १४०० मील की दूरी है, उससे होकर कौरिडोर चाहिये। कौरिडोर का मतलब क्या होता है, यह इतिहास को मालूम है। कौरिडोर की मांग पर ही दूसरी लड़ाई छिड़ी थी। हिटलर ने पोलैंड से कौरिडोर की ही मांग की थी जिसकी वजह से दूसरी लड़ाई छिड़ी थी और जिसकी लपेट में दुनिया के कई देश आ गये। मुझे अफसोस है कि कौरिडोर का नारा कमिशन ने मान लिया है। इसको मानने का मतलब यह होता है कि एक प्रदेश का आदमी दूसरे प्रदेश में नहीं जा सकता है और अपने प्रदेश में जाने के लिये उसे कौरिडोर की आवश्यकता होती है। यह वही बात हुई कि यू० पी० के लोग यह कहें कि झांसी जाने के लिये हमें विन्ध्य प्रदेश हो कर कई मोल का सफर करना पड़ता है और विन्ध्य प्रदेश के लोग कहें कि हमें उत्तर प्रदेश से गुजरना पड़ता है, इसलिये विन्ध्य प्रदेश को अलग-अलग कौरिडोर चाहिये। एक प्रदेश के लोगों को अपने दूसरे जिले में जाने के लिये किसी न किसी प्रदेश में से हो कर जाना ही पड़ता है और ऐसा एक देश में हुआ ही करता है। अब हमारे यहां जिस तरह से पुर्चलिया को हम से काट दिया गया है, उसके कारण हमें घदबाद से जमशेदपुर जाने के लिये बंगाल से होकर जाना पड़ेगा। इसका मतलब तो यह हुआ कि हमको भी कौरिडोर चाहिये।

कहा जाता है कि बंगाल बहुत गरीब है। मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि बंगाल के सिर्फ ५७ प्रतिशत लोग खेती पर जीते हैं और हिन्दुस्तान का कोई भी सूबा ऐसा नहीं है जिसमें इतने कम लोग खेती पर जीते हों। यहां के लोग और उद्योग धंधे भी करते हैं और उन पर भी जीते हैं। अब आप बिहार की बात सुन लीजिये। बिहार में ८६ प्रतिशत लोग खेती पर जीते हैं जब कि १९४१ में सिर्फ ७४ प्रतिशत लोग खेती पर जीते थे। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि १४ साल के अन्दर खेती पर निर्भर करने वालों की संख्या १२ प्रतिशत बढ़ गई है। और भी बिहार की गरीबी की बात सुन लीजिये। वहां के लोगों की औसत आमदनी भारत में सभी प्रान्तों से कम है। जमशेदपुर बिहार में है, घनबाद बिहार में है, सिधरी बिहार में है, डी० बी० सी० बिहार में है, लेकिन इन सब जगहों में बिहारी लोगों को, बिहारी नौजवानों को नौकरी नहीं मिलती और बाहर के लोग वहां पर काम करते हैं। मैं टाटा के लोगों से, मैं भारत सरकार से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह सब चीजें बिहार की भूमि पर होते हुये भी क्या वजह है कि बिहार के नौजवानों को, बिहार के पढ़े लिखे लोगों को वहां पर नौकर नहीं रखा जाता है। क्या यह इसलिये है कि वहां के लोग गरीब हैं या इसलिये कि वहां पर बेकारी नहीं है। मैं मानता हूँ कि बिहार एक पिछड़ा हुआ प्रदेश है और उसकी आवाज बिल्कुल तेज नहीं है। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि बंगाल के पास एक जायंट नेशनल प्रेस है। मैं यह भी जानता हूँ कि वहां के चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब, डा० बी० सी० राय, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू को जवाहर कह कर पुकारते हैं। डा० राय के लिये मेरे दिल में आदर है बंगल के लिये हमारे दिल में आदर है। हम बंगला बोलना जानते हैं, हम बंगला लिखना पढ़ना जानते हैं। हम बंगाल में बहुत दिनों तक रह चुके हैं। शायद कुछ लोगों को मालूम नहीं है कि

नेता जी सुभाष चन्द्र बोस की पार्टी में मैंने अपने जीवन के १० साल बिताये हैं। लेकिन मैं इतनी बात जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ कि बंगाल में, जिसको मैं बहुत नजदीक से जानता हूँ, ऐसे लोग हैं जो इस देश को अभी तक अपना देश नहीं समझते हैं। आप कलकत्ता शहर में चले जाइये वहां पर हम लोगों को हिन्दु-स्तानी कहा जाता है और अपने आप को वह बंगाली कहते हैं।

मैं एक बात और बताना चाहता हूँ। बाबू बंकिम चन्द्र चट्टोपाध्याय का नाम बहुत आदर से लिया जाता है। आप जानते हैं कि जो बन्दे मातरम गीत उन्होंने बनाया उस को कांग्रेस ने राष्ट्रीय गीत के रूप में अपनाया, इसके मूल में क्या है? इसके मूल में सप्त कोटि बंगालियों का जिक्र है। लेकिन जब कांग्रेस ने इसको राष्ट्रीय गीत बनाया तो सप्त कोटि नहीं त्रिश कोटि कर दिया। पिछले ६ रोज से मैं बहस सुनता आ रहा हूँ। जो बहस हुई है उसने एक बात सिद्ध कर दी है।

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): I think the hon. Member should take the background of the Vande Mataram song. That was originally in a novel written by the author.

श्री एम० पी० मिश्र । सभानेत्री जी, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि बंगाल और बंगालियों के साथ एक बड़ा इतिहास जुड़ा हुआ है। वे बहुत आगे बढ़े हुए थे और उनकी भाषा तथा संस्कृति बहुत ऊँची और शानदार थी, लेकिन उन्होंने इस देश को अपना नहीं समझा। और इतिहास ने उन के साथ मजाक किया और उन्हीं की भाषा बोलने वाले लोगों के एक भाग को दूसरे देश में

ढाल दिया। अब इस बात का बदला वे बिहार, उड़ीसा और आसाम से लेना चाहते हैं।

एक बात आयोग ने मानी है, सरकार ने मानी है और इस हाउस को भी माननी होगी। पुरुलिया और किशनगंज बंगाल को दिये गये हैं, परन्तु इस विषय में उनकी राय ली जानी चाहिये। हम भारत सरकार को एक चेलेंज देना चाहते हैं। १९५७ के चुनावों के लिये वोटों की सूची तैयार है। पुरुलिया और किशनगंज में भी वह तैयार होगी। भारत सरकार के लिये यह केवल छः सात दिन की बात है। इतने समय में वह वहां वोट ले सकती है। अगर वहां पर ५१ प्रतिशत—५० से एक भी अधिक—लोग बंगाल को जाने के लिये तैयार होंगे तो हम हाथ उठा कर उनको बिदा करेंगे। परन्तु मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि वहां पर यह स्थिति नहीं है। अगर यह बात मंजूर नहीं की जाती है, तो यह उन लोगों के साथ ज्यादती है। हम लोग मतगणना के लिये तैयार हैं, प्लेबेसाइट के लिये तैयार हैं। भारत सरकार अपनी तरफ से वह चुनाव कराए। जिस प्रकार काश्मीर से फौज हटाने की मांग की जा रही है, उसी तरह हम बिहार की पुलिस वहां से हटाने लिये तैयार हैं दिल्ली के लोग वोट लें।

किसी ने और भाषण दिया कि लोगों को कहा जाता है कि वे मुसलमान हैं और फिरका-परस्ती का नारा बुलन्द किया जाता है। हम कहते हैं कि यह बड़ी खराब बात है। यही मनोवृत्ति थी, जिसने देश के टुकड़े कर दिये और उनमें से एक टुकड़ा पाकिस्तान बन गया। यहां पर अब भी चार करोड़ मुसलमान बसते हैं। अगर उनके साथ अन्याय हो और वे कुछ कहें, तो उनको कहा जाय कि तुम फिरकापरस्त हो, तुम बोल नहीं सकते। अगर यही मनोवृत्ति जारी रही तो इस तरह तो एक पाकिस्तान और बन

[श्री एम० पी० मिश्र]

जायेगा। किशनगंज के मुसलमान हिन्दी और उर्दू पढ़ते हैं।

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary: For the last three days, speaker after speaker from Bengal and Orissa have abused Bihar. Let him reply.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The Speaker has put down 15 minutes as the time limit. He has also sent word that no speaker should exceed that time.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary: Everybody is allowed 15 to 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

श्री एम० पी० मिश्र: आखिर में मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे लोग हिन्दी और उर्दू पढ़ते हैं। बंगाल में हिन्दी और उर्दू के पढ़ाने लिये कोई इन्तजाम नहीं है। कलकत्ता में लाखों हिन्दी पढ़ने वाले हैं। लेकिन उनके लिये स्कूल नहीं है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : स्कूल है :

श्री एम० पी० मिश्र : नहीं हैं, मैं जानता हूँ—वे नाम के लिये हैं। किशनगंज के मुसलमान उर्दू पढ़ते हैं। उनकी संस्कृति और रहन सहन बंगालियों से अलग है और बिहार से मिलता है और वे बिहार में ही रहना चाहते हैं। अगर वे बोलें, तो कहा जाता है कि वह साम्प्रदायिकता है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि साम्प्रदायिकता के नाम पर मुसलमानों को दबा कर रखना ही साम्प्रदायिकता है वे लोग अपना हक मांगते हैं यह साम्प्रदायिकता नहीं है। मैं यही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि पुरु लिया और किशनगंज के लोगों की राय

ली जाय और वे लोग जो फैसला करें, बिहार और बंगाल उसी के अनुसार चलें।

Mr. Chairman: I say that time allowed for each speaker is 15 minutes because the Minister is going to reply at 5.30 We have to finish the list before that.

श्री जी० एस० भारती (यवतमाल) : सभानेत्री महोदया, राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग का प्रतिवेदन पढ़ने के बाद मेरी यह राय हो गई है कि पुनर्गठन के जटिल प्रश्न पर आयोग ने जो सिफारिशें की हैं, वे न्याययुक्त हैं। इसलिये मैं आयोग के प्रतिवेदन का स्वागत करता हूँ।

आयोग के सदस्यों की निष्पक्षता प्रामाणिकता और राष्ट्रीयता पर मुझे तनिक भीसन्देह नहीं है। उक्त प्रतिवेदन का कार्यान्वित करने से स्वर्गीय सरदार वल्लभ भाई पटेल का जो अंधूरा छोड़ा हुआ कार्य पूरा होकर कई टुकड़ों में बंटा हुआ भारत एक होगा तथा कई शताब्दियों पहले की विशालता उस को प्राप्त होगी। इसलिये मुझे हर्ष हो रहा है। इस ऐतिहासिक प्रतिवेदन के लिये मैं आयोग के सदस्यों को धन्यवाद देता हूँ। भावीकाल उनका कृतज्ञतापूर्वक स्मरण करेगा।

इस प्रतिवेदन की कहीं-कहीं कटु आलोचना हुई है। फिर भी चन्द सिफारिशों को छोड़ कर अन्य सारी सिफारिशों का देश ने स्वागत किया है। आयोग का लक्ष्य था राज्यों का पुनर्गठन कर भारत का एकीकरण करना, परन्तु कुछ लोगों ने उसे भूल से भारत का बंटवारा समझ लिया और जो मिले सो ले भागना, इस धुन में अधिक से अधिक मिलाने का आन्दोलन छेड़ दिया। परिणाम यह हुआ कि इधर-उधर

बहर फौला और अत्यन्त कटुता बढ़ी। कहीं कहीं शान्ति भी भंग हुई। आयोग ने राज्यों के पुनर्गठन के लिये जो सिद्धान्त निर्धारित किये, उन सब सिद्धान्तों का यथोचित पालन कर अधिक से अधिक लोगों को सन्तुष्ट करने की उस ने भरसक कोशिश की और इस में आयोग को सफलता भी मिली। जहां असन्तोष दिखाई देता है वहां के लोग पुनर्गठन योजना के किसी एक सिद्धान्त की, जो उन की मांग की पुष्टि करता है, आड़ लेकर अपनी मांग का समर्थन करते हैं। देश भर में और इस महान सदन में काफी चर्चा के बाद भी अब तक किसी ने भी ऐसे अधिक अच्छे सुझाव नहीं रखे, जिन से सब का सन्तोष हो। इस से यह स्पष्ट है कि आयोग की प्रमुख सिफारिशों में रहोबदल न करते हुए उस पंचनिर्णय मान कर कार्यान्वित करने के अतिरिक्त इस महान सदन के सामने दूसरा कोई मार्ग नहीं है।

महोदया, मैं विदर्भ से आता हूँ। वहां की जनता विदर्भ का पृथक राज्य बनाने के लिये पचास वर्ष पूर्व से कोशिश कर रही है। संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र की कल्पना का जन्म १९४६ में हुआ है। अकोला के माननीय सदस्य मेरे मित्र श्री खेडकर और मैं पिछले बीस वर्षों से विदर्भ प्रदेश की मांग का आन्दोलन करते आ रहे हैं। श्री खेडकर महा विदर्भ परिषद् के अध्यक्ष थे। आयोग की नियुक्ति के बाद उन्होंने मे अध्यक्ष पद से इस्तीफा दे दिया और तब से वे संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र की मांग का समर्थन करने लगे हैं। अकोला के माननीय सदस्य ने अपने भाषण में कहा कि मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा में संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र की मांग के समर्थन में प्रस्ताव मंजूर हुआ है। किन्तु उन्होंने ने यह बताना टाल दिया कि नवविदर्भ के आठ मराठी जिलों के विधान सभा सदस्यों की कुल संख्या की सत्तर प्रतिशत से भी ज्यादा संख्या के

सदस्यों ने विदर्भ की मांग का समर्थन किया है। यह मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा की कार्यवाही का अधिकृत किबरण पढ़ने से मालूम होगा। इतना ही नहीं

एक माननीय सदस्य : मतदान किधर हुआ ?

श्री जी० एस० भरती : Resolution is different from the speeches delivered by the hon'ble Members. We need not go into it at present.

इतना ही नहीं, उक्त विभाग की नगर पंचायतें, जनपद और कांग्रेस प्रतिनिधियों की बहु संख्या भी विदर्भ की मांग के पक्ष में है। अकोला के माननीय सदस्य ने विदर्भ की स्वयंपूर्णता के सम्बन्ध में मध्य प्रदेश के मुख्य मंत्री तथा वित्त मंत्री का हवाला दे कर सन्देह प्रकट किया है। मध्य प्रदेश के वित्त मंत्री श्री बियाणी ने मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा में आयोग के प्रतिवेदन की चर्चा के समय जो अधिकृत अंक दिये हैं उन को पढ़ने से विदर्भ स्वयंपूर्ण है यह सिद्ध होता है।

महोदया, संयुक्त महाराष्ट्रवादी कहते हैं कि एक भाषा का एक ही प्रदेश बनाना चाहिये। अब तक मेरे यह समझ में नहीं आया कि यदि राज्य स्वयंपूर्ण हो तो एक भाषा के दो राज्य क्यों न बनाये जायें। संयुक्त महाराष्ट्रवादी कहते हैं कि विदर्भ छोटा है, इसलिये उसे महाराष्ट्र में मिलाया जाये। किन्तु विदर्भ छोटा राज्य क्यों और कैसे बना यह में संक्षेप में बता देना चाहता हूँ। बैतूल, बालाघाट, छिन्दवाड़ा और बन्हानपुर जिलों में बटा हुआ मराठी विभाग और मराठी से मिलती जुलती हलबी भाषा का भूतपूर्व बस्तर राज्य मध्य प्रदेश में और संलग्न आदिलाबाद जिला तेलंगाना में तथा संलग्न मराठवाड़ा के नार्दंड पंभणी थिले महाराष्ट्र में जोड़े गये हैं। एक भाषा का एक ही प्रदेश, महा प्रदेश

[श्री जी० एस० भारती]

विशाल प्रदेश के आन्दोलनकारियों का विदर्भ शिकार बन गया। इसलिये विदर्भ छोटा दिखता है।

मराठवाड़ा और विदर्भ चार सौ वर्ष तक निजाम के आधिपत्य में थे। केवल लोकमत महाराष्ट्र में मिलने के पक्ष में है इस आधार पर उसे महाराष्ट्र में मिलाया गया। मैं संयुक्त महाराष्ट्रवादियों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या लोकमत के बल पर विदर्भ को अपना पृथक अस्तित्व रखने का हक नहीं है? संयुक्त महाराष्ट्रवादी कहते हैं कि विदर्भ छोटा है, इसलिये उसे हमें निगलने दिया जाये।

महोदया, सब पड़ोसी मद्दा बनने के इच्छुक प्रदेशों को महत्तर बनने की महत्वाकांक्षाओं को संतुष्ट करने के बाद भी विदर्भ छोटा नहीं है। भारत सरकार ने नव राज्य निर्मित का जो नक्शा प्रकाशित किया है उस को देखने से पता चलेगा कि नव विदर्भ का विस्तार केरल से ढाई गुना और पश्चिम बंगाल से भी बड़ा है। विदर्भ की मांग किसी पड़ोसी प्रदेश पर अतिक्रमण नहीं करती है। भूमि उपजाऊ है, जनसंख्या कम है, विदर्भ स्वयं पूर्ण है और उस के पास परिपूर्ण राजधानी है। जनमत पृथक अस्तित्व के अनुकूल और आयोग का निर्णय पृथक विदर्भ के पक्ष में है। इसलिये संयुक्त महाराष्ट्रवादी भाइयों से मेरी प्रार्थना है कि वे विदर्भ को छोटा भाई समझ कर उसे आशीर्वाद दें।

इतने पर भी यदि संयुक्त महाराष्ट्रवादी अपने हठ पर डटे रहें तो माननीय गृह मंत्री से मेरी नम्र प्रार्थना है कि विदर्भ का पृथक अस्तित्व नष्ट करने के प्रथम वे लोकनायक भाषव श्री हरी अणे, भूतपूर्व राज्यपाल, बिहार का, आयोग के सामने प्रस्तुत किया हुआ स्मृति पत्र अवश्य पढ़ लें। डा० अणे कांग्रेस

अध्यक्ष थे। उन की बाणी से १९२० में जब कि मैं युवक था हम बापू का सन्देश सुनते थे। आज वही डा० अणे पुना में रुग्ण शय्या पर पड़े हैं। डा० अणे विदर्भी हैं। उन की अन्तिम इच्छा है कि वे नव विदर्भ प्रतिमा अपनी आंखों से देख लें। इस तपोवृद्ध देशभक्त की अन्तिम इच्छा पूर्ण हो ऐसी विदर्भ की जनता की इच्छा है। विदर्भ न्याय का इच्छुक है। इस भावना के साथ मैं विदर्भ की मांग का समर्थन करता हूँ।

साथ ही यह भी कह देना चाहता हूँ कि इस महान सदन का निर्णय जो भी हो वह कल्याणकारी समझ कर मैं उसे वंदन करूंगा !

एक बात और कह कर मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करूंगा। इस सदन में एक संयुक्त महाराष्ट्रवादी माननीय सदस्य ने गुजराती भाइयों को जो कुछ कहा उस का मराठी भाषा भाषी होने से मुझ को बहुत खेद है। गुजराती भाइयों को मैं कह देना चाहता हूँ कि महाराष्ट्रवादियों के इस भाषा आन्दोलन में उन के कटु वाक् पर प्रहार से संत विनोबा और डा० अणे भी बचे नहीं हैं। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि विदर्भ और महाराष्ट्र की ९९ प्रतिशत मराठी जनता आप की प्रेमी है। वह बापू को पिता मानती है और सेवाश्रम को मंगलघाम समझती है। यह जान कर गुजराती भाई हम को महत्व से देखें।

मेरी हार्दिक इच्छा है कि अब भी जहाँ मतभेद है वहाँ विचार विमर्श से कोई संतोषप्रद मार्ग ढूँढ निकाला जाये।

महोदया, सम्राट अशोक का अघूरा छोड़ा हुआ विश्व में चिर शान्ति स्थापना का कार्य पूर्ण करने के लिये कृतसंकल्प हमारे पूज्य नेता भारत रत्न श्री नेहरू पूर्व-पश्चिम मिलन के सर्व कल्याणकारी कार्य में व्यस्त हैं।

वीभाग्य से इस 'महामंगल' में वे सफलता की ओर बढ़ रहे हैं। तबयुग के इस ऊषाकाल में भारतीयों का यह परम कर्तव्य है कि राज्य-पुनर्गठन के सम्बन्ध में भारत सरकार का अन्तिम निर्णय जो भी हो उस में सन्तोष मान कर बरेलू समस्याओं में नेहरू जी को निश्चिन्त करें।

अन्त में भगवान बुद्ध की पवित्र विचार-धारा की संस्कृत भाषा की एक पंक्ति जिस का अर्थ यह है कि जगत में मनुष्य को सन्तोष होने पर सर्व विशेषतायें विशेषता रहित हैं, कह कर मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ।

तुष्टौ च सत्यां पुरुषस्य लोके,
सर्वे विशेषा ननु निविशेथा ।

श्री राम बास : सभापति महोदया, इस आठ साल के अर्थ में हमारी सरकार ने दो बातें ऐसी की हैं जो कि हमारे इतिहास के अन्दर बहुत महान समझी जायेंगी। एक तो कांस्टीट्यूशन का बनाना और दूसरा स्टेट्स रिआयनाइजेशन का काम।

इस के मुताल्लिक मुझे बहुत कुछ कहना था लेकिन थूँक वक्त बहुत थोड़ा है इस बास्ते में अपने मतलब की बात कहता हूँ। पंजाबी सूबे की जो मांग है वह पंजाब की मांग नहीं है इसको इस सदन को अच्छी तरह से समझ लेना चाहिये। यह स्तिर्फ एक फिर्के की मांग है और उस फिर्के का नाम है अकाली दल। मेरे पास एक पम्प्लेट है जिसके राइटर हैं आनरेबल सरदार हुकम सिंह जी। उन्होंने उस में लिखा है :

"But that much accommodation could never be accepted. Hence the Akali Dal put forward the demand on linguistic and cultural considerations."

चूँकि ऐसा हुआ इसलिये अकाली दल को यह जरूरत महसूस हुई कि वह पंजाबी सूबे की डिमांड रखे। यह पम्प्लेट सब के पास

पहुँच चुका है। पर मैं कहता हूँ कि यह सारे सिखों की डिमांड नहीं है, न यह सारे हिन्दुओं की डिमांड है, न यह सारे हरिजनों की डिमांड है। हरिजनों ने अभी अमृतसर में अपना एक कनवेंशन किया और उस के अन्दर यह पास किया कि हमें मास्टर तारा सिंह जी की पंजाबी सूबे की मांग मंजूर नहीं है। उस के बाद जालंधर में दूसरे हरिजनों ने एक बड़ा भारी कनवेंशन किया, ५, ६, नवम्बर को, और उस के अन्दर सर्व सम्मति से पास हुआ कि हमें वह पंजाबी सूबा जो कि मास्टर तारा सिंह जी मांगते हैं मंजूर नहीं है। उस के बाद जो अहुलकालिया सिख हैं उन्होंने ने होशियारपुर में जलसा किया और उस जलसे के अन्दर सर्व सम्मति से यह पास हुआ कि हमें मास्टर तारासिंह जी का मांगा हुआ पंजाबी सूबा मंजूर नहीं है। उस के बाद रामगढ़िये सिख जो हैं उन्होंने ने फगवाड़े में, जो कि उन की इक्टिविटी का सेन्टर है, एकत्र हो कर यह पास किया कि हमें मास्टर तारा सिंह जी का पंजाबी सूबा मंजूर नहीं है। हम उस को नहीं लेना चाहते नेशनल सिखों ने भी अमृतसर में एक कनवेंशन किया और उन्होंने भी यह नहीं कहा कि हमें मास्टर तारा सिंह का पंजाबी सूबा चाहिये, तो उन्होंने कुछ मांगों की हैं जो कि उन से मिलती जुलती हैं। वह पंजाबी सूबा क्या है, यह मैं आप को बताना चाहता हूँ। जनवरी सन् १९५५ में मास्टर तारा सिंह का एक इंटरव्यू श्री भीम सेन सच्चर के साथ हुआ जिस में उन्होंने ने यह कहा कि हम सिक्ख लोग एक इंडिपेंडेंट सूबा चाहते हैं और उस इंटरव्यू के दौरान उन्होंने ने, यहां तक कह दिया :—

"I will say that even if we get one village, we should like to have it as with that we do not feel that we are slaves, *gulami!*"

वह कहते हैं कि हमें इंडिपेंडेंट सूबा हो और अगर एक गांव भी आप मुझे इंडिपेंडेंट

[श्री राम दास]

दे देंगे तो मुझे उस से तसल्ली हो जायेगी क्योंकि मैं समझूंगा कि मैं गुलाम नहीं हूँ । इस के अलावा सरदार हुसम सिंह ने जो फम्फलेट दिया है उस के अन्दर वह इस तरह कहते हैं :

"All the heavens would not have fallen if one small State had contained parity in population and consequent influence and political power with all other units as well as the Centre which have a majority of one single community."

यह बिल्कुल गलत बयान है क्योंकि यह पार्लियामेंट केवल मात्र हिन्दुओं की नहीं है बल्कि इस में तमाम धर्मों और वर्गों के प्रतिनिधि मौजूद हैं और यह सेकुलर गवर्नमेंट है और धर्म निरपेक्ष राज्य है और इस के अन्दर हिन्दुओं का कोई जिक्र नहीं है लेकिन उन के दिल के अन्दर तो वह पंजाबी सूबे वाली बात बैठी हुई है और इसलिये वह चाहते हैं कि उन्हें इंडिपेंडेंट सूबा मिलना चाहिये, स्वाहा वह एक ही गांव क्यों न हो । आगे चल कर उन्होंने कमिशन के मेम्बरस के बोना-फाइडीज को क्वेश्चन किया है । कमिशन की रिपोर्ट के मुतालिक बयान करते हुए उन्होंने ने साफ कहा है कि यह कोई सवाल हल नहीं करती और हमें यह रिपोर्ट मंजूर नहीं है । मैं उसी इंटरव्यू में से पढ़ कर आप को सुनाना चाहता हूँ कि मास्टर तारा सिंह ने उस वकत जब कि रिपोर्ट पूरी लिखी नहीं गई थी और कमिशन के मेम्बर दौरा कर रहे थे, तब यह कहा था :

"We will continue our agitation before the award of the Commission, and even after the award of the Commission if the Commission does not accept our demand."

अगर कमिशन हमारी इंडिपेंडेंट पंजाबी सूबे की डिमांड नहीं मानता तो हम

उस से पहले भी एजिटेशन करेंगे और उस के बाद भी प्रान्दोलन करेंगे । अगर कमिशन के मुतालिक अकाली दल का यही ख्याल था तो अकाली दल को उन के पास अपना रिप्रेजेंटेशन भेजने और उन के सामने अपने क्लेम को प्लीड करना बेकार था । अगर जज पर जिस के कि सामने आप का क्लेम जाता है उस पर आप को एतमाद नहीं है तो उस के सामने आप को अपना क्लेम ले जाना और प्लीड करना कोई मानी नहीं रखता । हम देखते हैं कि अदालत में मैजिस्ट्रेट या जज के पास जब मुकद्दमा फंसला होने के लिये पेश होता है तो दोनों पक्ष अपना अपना क्लेम प्लीड करते हैं और सबूत और गवाहियां पेश करते हैं जिस के कि उन के पक्ष में फंसला हो जाये और जो फंसला होता है वह दोनों पार्टीज पर मान्य होता है । लेकिन यह रबैया अस्तियार करना कि जो मैं चाहता हूँ के वही फंसला हो, मुनासिब रबैया नहीं है । पंजाब के अन्दर आज कल यही हो रहा है । अगर डिप्टी कमिशनर मैजिस्ट्रेट या जज अकाली दल के बरखिलाफ कोई कदम उठाता तो चारों तरफ से शोर मच जाता है कि उस हाकिम को फौरन वहाँ से तबदील किया जाये और अखबारों और जलसों में इस बात का मतलबबा किया जाता है कि इस अफसर को वहाँ से हटा कर वहाँ भेज दिया जाये और फलां अफसर को उधर से हटा कर इधर भेज दिया जाये । अकाली दल वाले यह चाहते हैं कि जो कुछ हम मांगते हैं, वह हमें मिलना चाहिये । अब अकाली दल वालों की जो यह एक अलग पंजाबी सूबे की मांग है इसके सम्बन्ध में सारी पंजाब की संस्थायें एक स्वर से

कह चुकी है कि हमें यह पंजाबी सूबा मंजूर नहीं है ।

पंजाब के अन्दर एक क्रिस्म के लोग रहते हैं जिनको कि हरिजन कहा जाता है । उनकी हालत नागुफताबेह है । बहुत बुरी हालत के अन्दर वह रह रहे हैं । हिन्दुस्तान में गुलामी उठ गयी लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि इन जाटों के गांवों से गुलामी नहीं मिटी और वहां गुलामी नहीं है बल्कि गुलामी दर गुलामी मौजूद है और उन आभागों और मुसीबतजदा भाइयों को आज बड़ा खतरा महसूस हो रहा है । कल जब बंडित ठाकुरदास भार्गव बोल रहे थे तो उन्होंने कहा था कि मैं अमृतसर गया था और अमृतसर के दोस्तों ने मुझ से कहा कि यहां लिस्टें बन चुकी हैं कि कौन सी लड़की किस के पास होगी और कौन से मकान किस को मिलेंगे और कौन किस जगह को लूटेगा । मैं आपको और हाउस को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि गांवों के अन्दर भी लिस्टें बन गयी हैं जिनमें यह लिखा गया है कि कैसे कैसे वहां पर गड़बड़ की जायगी, अगर आपका यकौन न हो तो खुद जाकर इसकी तहकीकात करा सकते हैं । और अज्र अकालियों की तहरीक उसी मुस्लिम लीग की जहरीली तहरीक की तरह चल रही है जो हमारे देश के लिये बड़ी अहितकर सिद्ध होगी । इसके साथ ही मैं सिक्खों की यह शिकायत भी ठीक नहीं समझता कि देशवासियों के दिलों में हमारे प्रति खामख्वाह यह बहस है कि हम देश के प्रति लायल नहीं हैं जब कि वाक्या यह है कि हम सिक्ख लोग देश के बड़े लायल हैं और हमारे मुताल्लिक ऐसा शक लोग क्यों रखते हैं । मैं आपको उसकी वजह बतलाता हूँ । एक मौके पर ज्ञानी गुरुमुख सिंह मुसाफिर ने इस तरह कहा है :

"Criticising Master Tara Singh, he regretted how he had helped

the British recruitment campaign during the war when the country had launched the Quit India movement. This had given the impression to the outside world that Sikhs were not in favour of the freedom movement. He regretted how some of the Akali leaders had behaved most indiscreetly during their recent visit to Lahore when Giani Kartar Singh had taken out a jeep displaying the Akali demand for a Punjabi Suba. This had created suspicion in the minds of their countrymen that Sikhs were seeking help from a foreign power".

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Ram Das: A minute or two more. You have given more time to other Members.

Mr. Chairman: No, no. No one has got more than 15 minutes.

श्री राम दास : यह किस का बयान है । यह ज्ञानी गुरुमुख सिंह मुसाफिर जी का जो कि इस सदन के माननीय सदस्य हैं और जो कि पंजाब प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी के प्रेसीडेंट हैं और जो कि सिक्खों के अन्दर एक बहुत अहम पोझीशन रखते हैं और जिनके अलफ्राज के मुताल्लिक किसी को शक और शबहान नहीं हो सकता, वह ऐसा कहते हैं, अखबारों के अन्दर यह सब लिखा गया

श्री० रणबीर सिंह (रोहतक) : अखबार की रिपोर्ट सच्ची नहीं होती ।

श्री राम दास : जी हां, जो आपके मतलब की हो, वह तो सच्ची है और जो आपके खिलाफ पड़े वह गलत हो गयी ।

श्री० रणबीर सिंह : यह तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर कहते हैं, खाली मैं ही नहीं कहता ।

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Your time is up.

श्री राम दास : देखिये अकाली मोर्चे के बाबत अखबार क्या कहता है । ग्यानी जैल सिंह, सदर पेप्सू कांग्रेस ने अपने एक ताजा बयान में फ़रमाया है कि मास्टर तारा सिंह की नारेबाजी का मोर्चा विदेशी साम्राज्यियों के इशारे पर लगाया गया है । और यह चीज कोई हिन्दू नहीं कहता कोई महासभाई नहीं कहता बल्कि ग्यानी जैल सिंह सदर पेप्सू कांग्रेस कहते हैं.....

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The hon. Member must resume his seat now.

श्री राम दास : यह तार मुझे अभी सिक्ख डिप्रेस्ड क्लासेज की तरफ़ से मिला है, बस मैं इसको पढ़ कर खत्म किये देता हूँ । वह तार इस तरह है :

"Molestation of our womenfolk, denying us right to lead honest life and untold atrocities have been committed on our community of depressed class Sikhs by the Akalis....."

Pray reject the very idea of Punjabi Suba and grant Visal Punjab amalgamating present Punjab Himachal and PEPSU."

हरिजन, अग्रर उस जगह पर आप पंजाबी सुबा बनायेंगे तो कभी सुरक्षित नहीं रह सकते । और अग्रर ऐसा हुआ तो वही हालत बनेगी जो सन् १९४७ में देलाने में आई और हमारे भाई एक जगह से दूसरी जगह उजड़ कर चले गये ।

अभी लाहौर में जो क्रिकेट मैच खेला गया उसके बाद पाकिस्तान के हाई कमिश्नर राजा मखनफ़रअली खां ने यह ऐलान किया कि अब भारत से सिख लोग बिना रोकटोक के आजादी के साथ ननकाना साहब जा सकते हैं । ननकाना साहब सिक्खों का पवित्र तीर्थ स्थान है । पहले यह हालत थी कि जब सिक्ख यात्री वहाँ पर आते थे तो उनको

बसों के अन्दर बिठा कर पस्दे डालकर ले जाया जाता था और पुलिस और संगीनों के पहरे में वे वहाँ पहुँच पाते थे जब कि अब उन्हें "perfect permission to go to Nankana Sahib" हासिल है ।

"With open arms, we are prepared to take you as a result of one cricket match. Let there be three or four matches more. We will see what happens then."

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी (जिला हमीरपुर) : मुझे बड़ा खेद है कि हम ने इस सदन को आज तक एक शाब्दिक मल्ल युद्ध का अखाड़ा बना रखा है, आम देखिये कि विभिन्न राज्यों से एक पहलवान के बाद दूसरा पहलवान खड़ा कर दिया जाता है जो कि एक दूसरे की निन्दा और घृणा के वातावरण को पैदा कर के देश भर में एक विषाक्त वातावरण का सृजन कर रहे हैं । यह हमारे लिये अत्यन्त घातक हो रहा है । हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने पिछले दिन कहा था कि उद्जन बम और परमाणु बम सम्बन्धी जो परीक्षण हैं उन से संसार में हाहाकार मचा हुआ है । हमारे देश में हिंसा प्रदर्शन इन्हीं अणु बमों के समान हैं । लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन प्रदर्शनों के मूल में ये भाषण हैं जो देश भर में अखबारों के जरिये जाते हैं । जब कोई आदमी, चाहे वह बम्बई में हो, चाहे कलकत्ते में हो, चाहे अमरीका में हो या विलायत में हो, इन अखबारों को और इन भाषणों को पढ़ता है, जब वह महाराष्ट्र के विचारों को पढ़ता है या पंजाब के विचारों को पढ़ता है तो उस के हृदय में बलबले उठते हैं और वह सोचने लगता है कि उसे क्या करना है । उसे उत्तेजना के लिये प्रोत्साहन मिलता है । इस तरह के वातावरण में राज्यों का पुनर्संगठन करना कभी भी सम्भव नहीं हो सकता है । पुनर्संगठन:

करने का तरीका यह है कि हम तमाम राष्ट्र के छोटी के नेताओं को इकट्ठा करें और उन से मिल कर के कहें कि महाशय जी, आप दो दिन में, तीन दिन में या एक सप्ताह में मिल कर हमें एक सर्वसम्मत सुझाव दे दीजिये, कोई ऐग्रीड प्लान दे दीजिये । और मेरा विश्वास है कि हमारे नेता जिन्होंने भंगरेजों के खमाने में अपने देश की गुलामी को दूर करने के लिये कंधे से कंधा मिला कर, महात्मा जी के साथ सत्य और अहिंसा की लड़ाई की थी आज हिंसात्मक नहीं बन गये हैं । उन के अन्दर अहिंसा की वृत्तियां आज भी मौजूद हैं और वह हमारे प्रधान मंत्री और गृह मंत्री का साथ देना चाहते हैं । लेकिन हमें ऐसा वातावरण बनाने की आवश्यकता है जिस से देश के अन्दर शान्ति स्थापित रहे और दूषित वातावरण सदा के लिये दूर हो जाय । पुनर्गठन आयोग की नियुक्ति और उस के प्रतिवेदन का यह मंशा नहीं है कि हम आपस में लड़ाई करें, इस का मंशा यह है कि हम देश भर में ऐसे राज्यों का निर्माण करें जिस में प्रशासन का खर्चा कम हो, भाषा और संस्कृति तथा विचारों का समन्वय हो सके और हम सब देश भर के उत्थान की तरफ जा सकें । पुनर्गठन का यह मंशा कदापि नहीं था कि हम आपस में झगड़ा पैदा करें । इस लिये मेरा सुझाव है कि एक गोलमेगोल कान्फरेन्स बुलाई जाय जिस में देश के सभी राज्यों के प्रथम प्रथम नेता हों और वह मिल कर तमाम झगड़े की बातों को तय करें ।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो हमारा पुनर्गठन आयोग है उस के सदस्यगणों ने जो काम बिधा है वह अद्भुत काम है । सभी ने उस की तारीफ़ की है, मैं भी उसकी तारीफ़ करता हूँ । लेकिन आश्चर्य की बात यह है कि उन्होंने संघर्षमय समस्याओं की ही अधिक महत्व दिया है । जिस समय आकाश में उल्कापात होता है

उस समय हम उन सितारों को नहीं देखते जो वहां अपनी धुरी पर घड़िग बराबर चमकते रहते हैं । हमारा ध्यान केवल उन नक्षत्रों की तरफ़ जाता है जो आपसी संघर्ष से विस्फोट करते हैं और जो अन्त में टूट जाते हैं । जो संघर्षमय समस्याएं महाराष्ट्र और पंजाब आदि की हैं उन की ओर ही हमारा ध्यान केन्द्रित है, लेकिन कुछ ऐसे टुकड़े भी देश के हैं जिन्होंने हमेशा आप का साथ दिया है । जिन्होंने बड़े बड़े संघर्षों की लड़ाइयां लड़ीं और वीरता का परिचय दिया । मैं उस क्षेत्र से आता हूँ जिस का नाम बुन्देलखंड है । इस क्षेत्र के एकीकरण तथा समस्याओं को आयोग ने ध्यान नहीं दिया । मैं आज महाराष्ट्र के भाइयों से कहता हूँ कि क्या महाराष्ट्र के भाइयों ने और बुन्देलखंड के भाइयों ने साथ साथ संघर्ष नहीं किया है ? जिस समय हमारे ऊपर विदेशी सत्ता षड़ षाई और सिवाजी ने उसके विरुद्ध युद्ध छेड़ा उस वक्त क्या छत्रसाल ने बुन्देलखंड में अपना झंडा नहीं फहराया ? इसके पूर्व चंदेसों के समय दिल्ली के सम्राट पृथ्वीराज को महोबे में परास्त किया था । उनकी उत्कृष्ट कला और संस्कृति के उदाहरण लखुराहो में अब भी विद्यमान हैं । सन् १८५७ के गदर में अंग्रेजों के राज्य के विरुद्ध बुन्देलखंड में जो विस्फोट हुआ था वह औरतों की सेना के द्वारा ही हुआ था । वहां पर बन्दूक चलाने वाली, तलवार चलाने वाली, तोपें चलाने वाली और बड़े से बड़े मोर्चे को साधने वाली वीरांगनायें ही थीं और उस सेना ने अंगरेजों के छक्के छुड़ा दिये थे । अगर हमारे एक सेनापति ने विश्वास-घात न किया होता तो अंगरेजों को झांसी छोड़नी पड़ती । वह कभी भी उस को गिरिध नहीं कर सकते थे । बुन्देलखंड की कहानी आज तक भी सब के मुंह पर है। और उस की सीमा का भी स्पष्ट उल्लेख मिलता है ।

[श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी]

इन विषयों पर कवि ने कहा था :

“छत्ता तेरे राज में

धक धक धरती होय,

जित जित घोड़ा पग धरे

तित तित फले होय ।

इत जमुना उत नर्मदा,

इत चम्बल उत टोंस,

छत्रसाल सों लड़न की

रही न काहूँ हींस ।”

उस बुन्देल खंड के पोरों को अंगरेजों ने तोड़ा । और इसके पश्चात् उन्होंने सोचा कि प्रब बगावत के बाद इस बुन्देलखंड के बीरत्व को नष्ट कर दो । अतएव उस के टुकड़े टुकड़े कर दिये गये । एक टुकड़ा उत्तर प्रदेश में, एक टुकड़ा मध्य प्रदेश में, एक टुकड़ा ग्वालियर में और अन्य स्थानों में बांट कर हम को अलग अलग कर दिया । स्वतन्त्रता के पश्चात् हम आशा करते थे कि अब हमारे क्षेत्र का पुनः विकास होगा परन्तु अभी तक निराशा ही है ।

आप देखिये कि हमारे इस बुन्देलखंड में कितनी समस्याएँ हैं । वहाँ अच्छी सड़कें नहीं हैं, वहाँ रेल नहीं है, डाक और तार नहीं है, नदियों पर पुल नहीं हैं, वहाँ भूख के परमाणु बम उदरों में फूट रहे हैं । आप यहाँ संघर्ष की बातें कर रहे हैं । कोई कहता है कि हमें कलकत्ता चाहिये, कोई कहता है कि हमें बम्बई चाहिये, कोई कुछ चाहता है कोई कुछ चाहता है । परन्तु हमारी समस्याओं पर कोई विचार नहीं करता है । हां उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने जरूर हमें कुछ साधन दिये हैं जिस के कारण हम लोग कुछ सुविधा पा सके हैं, लेकिन बुन्देलखंड के बाकी लोगों की बात मैं पूछता हूँ, वह आखिर कहां पड़े हुये हैं, उन्होंने हमारी क्या खोज खबर प्रब तक ली ? आज हम उत्तर प्रदेश के बटवारे की बात कहते हैं, मैं कहता हूँ कि खूब कीजिये

लेकिन साथ साथ हम लोगों के ऊपर भी तो कुछ ध्यान दीजिये जिन का अब तक कोई विकास नहीं हो सका । मेरे पास स्टेट्स मिनिस्ट्री का व्हाइट पेपर है, मेरे पास संविधान है जिस में हम को बराबर के अधिकार दिये गये हैं, प्लानिंग कमिशन ने भी बराबरी से विकास करने के लिये कहा है, एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में कामर्स और इंडस्ट्रीज के मंत्री ने बताया कि हम छोटे उद्योगों की स्थापना के लिये बराबर ध्यान रखते हैं सभी मंत्री इसी तरह की बातें कहते हैं, लेकिन बुन्देलखंड में आप को एक इंडस्ट्री नहीं मिलेगी जिस में कि लोग कुछ रोजगार कर सकें । हमारे किसान लोग पुराने हलों से दिन भर परिश्रम कर के फी बीघा दो तीन मन गल्ला पैदा करते हैं । ऐसी परिस्थिति में बुन्देलखंड की समस्या को हल करने के लिये क्या किया गया ? मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि बुन्देलखंड को एक भाग विध्य प्रदेश में शामिल है शेष बंधेल खंड है । कुछ भाग मध्य भारत, भोपाल आदि में शामिल है । वहाँ के लोगों ने आजादी की लड़ाई में, हर संघर्ष में हिस्सा लिया है । इस की बात तो हमारे लोक-सभा के सदस्य रनदभन सिंह जी भी बतलायेंगे । राज भान सिंह तिवारी ने बतलाया है और राज्य सभा में दो तीन लोगों ने बतलाया है इस का भविष्य क्या हो । मैं विध्य प्रदेश से कान्स्टिट्यूट एसेम्बली का मेम्बर था । मैं सीमा के क्षेत्र से चुना गया हूँ । हमारा घरखारी का क्षेत्र वह क्षेत्र सन् १९५० में छीपवत क्षेत्र विलीनी करण अधिनियम द्वारा उत्तर प्रदेश में शामिल हो गया । हमारी भावना उत्तर प्रदेश के साथ है, लेकिन उन के साथ भी हमारी सहानुभूति है जो दुखी है । अगर आप उन को मध्य प्रदेश में मिलाते हैं तो यह होगा कि वह नागपुर जायें उच्च न्यायालय के लिये और भोपाल जायें राजधानी के लिये तथा इन्दौर जायें राजस्व

के सम्बन्धी कार्यों के लिये । लेकिन अगर उन को इस यात्रा के लिये खर्च चाहिये इस के लिये वह खर्च कहां से लायें ? वह अपना गल्ला बेचने जायें कानपुर और इलाहाबाद और वहां अपना गल्ला बेच कर जबलपुर, नागपुर और भोपाल की सैर करें, वना उन का काम नहीं हो सकता, उन की कोई पूछ नहीं हो सकती । इसलिये मेरी सरकार से अपील है कि या तो विध्य प्रदेश के लिये पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू कोई अलग प्रदेश का निर्माण करें नहीं तो अगर हम को मध्य प्रदेश में डाला गया तो इस से हमारा कोई फायदा नहीं हो सकता । यहां पर सवाल इस बात का है कि अगर उन को किसी प्रदेश से मिलाना ही है तो क्यों न उन को उत्तर प्रदेश से मिलाना जाय जहां पर कि उन के पूर्ण सम्बन्ध हैं और आगे भी और बढ़ सकते हैं ।

मेरी प्रार्थना यह है कि आप बुंदेलखंड के मसले को इस तरह हल करें कि बुंदेलखंड के नेताओं को बुला लें और उन से बात करें । हम लोग इस में आप को पूरा सहयोग देंगे ।

जहां तक पंजाब का सवाल है, मैं हिमाचल प्रदेश की कुछ बात कहना चाहता हूं । हिमाचल प्रदेश 'ग' भाग के राज्यों में से ऐसा राज्य रहा है जहां पर पार्टी सी स्टेट्स ऐक्ट का बहुत अच्छी तरह से पालन किया गया है । दूसरे राज्यों में उस का सही तौर से पालन नहीं हो सका, दूसरी जगहों का प्रशासन ठीक नहीं रह सका, इस लिये उन के विलीनीकरण की समस्या खड़ी हो गई । लेकिन हिमाचल प्रदेश ऐसा राज्य है जहां की संस्कृति विशेष है, जहां के लोग कर्मठ काम करने वाले हैं । ऐसी हालत में कोई कारण नहीं है कि उन के रास्ते में रोड़ा घटकाया जाय ताकि वह एक बैकवर्ड एरिया बना रहे ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप को प्रस-
लिपत का पता नहीं है ।

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी : इस लिये मैं चाहता हूं कि हिमाचल को कुछ दिनों के लिये आप पथक् रहने दें ताकि वह अपनी समृद्धि कर सके ।

सिखों का भी मसला हल हो सकता है । आप कांगड़ा और कुल्लू को हिमाचल में मिला दीजिये । इसी तरह से मैं मानता हूं कि सिखों का भी सवाल नहीं रहेगा ।

जहां तक महाराष्ट्र का प्रश्न है और गुजरात का प्रश्न है या बम्बई का प्रश्न है, इन लोगों की बड़ी बड़ी समस्यायें हैं । यह समस्यायें यहां भाषणों से हल नहीं हो सकती हैं । इस के लिये मैं चाहता हूं कि गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र के भाइयों को इकट्ठा किया जाय और कहा जाय कि वह कोई ऐग्रीड सोल्यूशन लायें । अगर कोई ऐसा सोल्यूशन मिल सका तो उस में हम उन का साथ देंगे ।

इसी तरह से हम बंगाल और बिहार का भी हल सोच सकते हैं । एक छोटे से क्षेत्र के मिल जाने से बंगाल अमीर नहीं हो जायेगा, न एक छोटा सा क्षेत्र निकल जाने से बिहार ही गरीब हो जायेगा । वहां पर तो बिचारों के मिलने का सवाल है । हम एक दूसरे की बातों को सुनें, उन की दिक्कतों को समझें, तो काम बन सकता है । कौन यह हिस्से पाकिस्तान में जा रहे हैं, सिर्फ बंगाल में ही तो जा रहे हैं हमारे हिन्दुस्तान में ही तो रहेंगे, इस के लिये जरा सी बात के लिये लड़ाई झगड़ा क्या करना है ? इस बीच के लिये बंगाल और बिहार की जनता में दूषित बाताबरण फैलाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है । आपस में बैठ कर हम को मसलों को हल करना चाहिये ।

इन शब्दों के साथ, सभानेत्री जी, मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूं कि आप ने मुझे समय दिया ।

श्री रनबमन सिंह (शाहदोल-सीधी-रहित-अनुसूचित आदिम जातियां) : मैं आप को कोटिश: धन्यवाद देता हूँ जो आपने मुझे बोलने का अवसर प्रदान किया है।

4 P.M.

एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट पर मुझ अन्य प्रदेशों के बारे में विशेष कुछ कहना नहीं है, मुझे तो विन्ध्य प्रदेश के बारे में आप के सम्मुख शब्द शब्द कहने हैं। मैं विशेष रूप से इस के बारे में कहूँगा क्यों कि इस का भविष्य क्षत्र में पड़ गया है। इस बात का मुझे अफसोस है कि जनतंत्र के नाम पर इस को खत्म किया जा रहा है। मैं तो यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसा करने में जनमत की कोई परवाह ही नहीं की गई है। जब सितम्बर के महीने में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री वहाँ पर गये थे उस वक्त एक गुप्त कान्फेंस हुई थी जिस में की पार्लियामेंट के सदस्य और विधान सभा के सदस्य सम्मिलित हुए थे। उस वक्त यह कहा गया था कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश की स्थिति में कोई तबदीली नहीं की जायेगी यदि यहाँ के लोग इस को एक अलग इकाई के रूप में रखना चाहेंगे। यह भी कहा गया था कि जनता की भावनाओं का भी ख्याल रखा जाएगा। इन सब बातों के होते हुए भी और इस तरह का बचन देते हुए भी, मैं सरकार से कोई जवाब तलब तो नहीं करता और न ही ऐसा करने की कोई गुसलाखी कर सकता हूँ और न ही एस० आर० सी० ने जो रिपोर्ट दी है, उस पर कोई टिप्पणी करता हूँ, मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ का जनमत इस के खिलाफ है। विन्ध्य प्रदेश की असेम्बली में यह पास किया गया है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश को एक यूथक इकाई के रूप में ही रहने दिया जाए। यह चीफ मार्च सन् १९५५ में पास हुई थी। इसके बाद भी गैर कांग्रेसी मंत्रियों के अतिरिक्त कांग्रेसी मंत्रियों ने भी और प्रान्तीय कांग्रेस कमेटी ने यह पास किया है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश को अलग

ही रहने दिया जाए और इसको किसी दूसरे प्रदेश में विलय न किया जाए। उसके बाद जब एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट प्रकाशित हुई तो २३, २५ और २८ नवम्बर को फिर से असेम्बली की बैठक हुई। उसमें भी ४१ कांग्रेसी मंत्रियों में से २४ मंत्रियों ने यह तय किया कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश की इकाई कायम रहे। इन सब प्रस्तावों के पास होने के बावजूद भी सरकार उनकी इच्छाओं की ओर कोई ध्यान नहीं दे रही है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि बहुमत के सुझावों को ठुकराना या बहिष्कार करना क्या यह जनतंत्र के उसूलों से मेल खाता है। अवश्य ही बहुमत के सुझावों पर विचार किया जाना चाहिये और जो वह चाहते हैं उसको पूरा किया जाना चाहिए।

इसके अलावा ७ नवम्बर को पार्लियामेंट के १० में से ७ मंत्रियों का एक डेपुटेशन गृह मंत्री महोदय के पास गया और एक मैमोरेण्डम उनको दिया जिसमें यह लिखा हुआ था कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश को इसी तरह से कायम रखा जाए प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी का भी एक डेपुटेशन उसी तारीख को मंत्री महोदय से मिला था जिस ने भी यही मांग की थी। इन मांगों पर कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया गया है। इसके कोई दो तीन दिन बाद समाचारपत्रों में प्रकाशित यह फैसला हुआ कि प्रस्तावित मध्य प्रदेश की राजधानी भोपाल हो। उस समय हम को यह हैरानी हुई और साथ ही यह आभास हुआ कि जब जबलपुर को राजधानी बनाने का सुझाव था तो भी हम उसमें मिलने को तैयार नहीं थे तो अब हम कैसे मिल सकते हैं। अर्थात् अब विन्ध्य प्रदेश की अवश्य अलग रखेंगे क्योंकि अब उसके विलय का प्रश्न ही नहीं उठता। अब सोचने की बात है कि जो सात मंत्री गृह मंत्री जी को मिले उनमें से ५ कांग्रेसी थे और दो पी० एस० पी० के; फिर भी कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया गया। इसमें राज्य सभा के मंत्री भी थे और लोक सभा के

भी। अगर इन चुने हुए मंत्रियों में से बहुमत की कोई सुनवाई नहीं होती है तो मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि किस की बात को सरकार सुनेगी, और किस की राय को यह स्वीकार करेगी? क्या वहां के सदस्य जो विन्ध्य प्रदेश चाहते हैं और यहां के सदस्य जो उनसे इतिफाक करते हैं, सारे के सारे ही बेईमान हो गए।

यह कहा गया है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश छोटा होने के कारण रह नहीं सकता है। इससे खर्चा ज्यादा पड़ता है। इसके उत्तर में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश से भी तो स्विट्ज़रलैंड, हॉलैंड, बेलजियम, आयरलैंड छोटे हैं, लंका भी तो छोटी है लेकिन वह विकासयुक्त रह रहे हैं। बात यह है कि वहां पर सरकार से विकेंद्रीकरण की ओर ज्यादा जोर दिया जाता है। अगर हमारी सरकार राष्ट्रीयकरण की ओर अधिक जोर देती है तो इसमें मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है। लेकिन देखने वाली चीज यह है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश एक पिछड़ा हुआ इलाका है और इस बात को हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी भी जानते हैं और दूसरे नेता भी जानते हैं। वहां पर हर किस्म के साधन मौजूद होते हुए भी वहां की जनता गरीब है और पिछड़ी हुई है। जो वहां के आदिवासियों की हालत है वह तो बयान ही नहीं की जा सकती। वे लोग जंगलों में और पहाड़ों में इधर उधर भटकते हुए फिरते हैं और सौ सौ मील का फासला तय करके गठड़ी बांध कर राजधानी में आते हैं, जब कभी उनको आने की जरूरत पड़ती है। जैसा कि द्विवेदी जी ने कहा कि उन लोगों का भोपाल में जाना या इन्दौर में जाना कितना कठिन हो सकता है जिन का कि अबतक उन्होंने नाम तक भी नहीं सुना है, इसका आप खुद ही अन्दाजा लगा सकते हैं।

विन्ध्य प्रदेश की जनता का किसी अन्य प्रदेश के साथ कोई व्यक्तिगत मतभेद या सामाजिक मतभेद या जा-देशिक कोई और मतभेद नहीं है। इसका विरोध तो केवल इसलिए है कि चूंकि हम ज्यादा पिछड़े हुए हैं चूंकि हम ज्यादा

अशिक्षित हैं, चूंकि हम ज्यादा गरीब हैं, चूंकि हमारे प्रदेश में अभी तक भी सड़कों का अभाव है, आवागमन की सहूलियतें हमारे प्रदेश में उपलब्ध नहीं हैं, हमारे आदिवासी क्षेत्र बहुत ज्यादा पिछड़े हुए हैं, इस वास्ते जब तक हम दूसरे प्रदेशों के लेवल पर नहीं आ जाते तब तक हम को किसी दूसरे प्रदेश के साथ न मिलाया जाए। विन्ध्य प्रदेश की जनता यह चाहती है, वहां की सरकार यह चाहती है कि जो भी वह करे राष्ट्रीय हित में करे, देश की जनता के लिए कार्य करे। उसकी किसी के बारे में कोई बुरी भावना नहीं है परन्तु अभी ऐसा कोई समय नहीं है और यदि ऐसा मौका देश के सामने आ ही गया तो जनता की तरफ से वे स्वयं में अपनी तरफ से यह दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ और मैं चुनौती देता हूँ कि अगर कोई ऐसा भवसर आया राष्ट्र या देश के हित के लिये जब कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश की जनता के बलिदान की आवश्यकता पड़ेगी तो वह किसी प्रदेश से पीछे नहीं रहेगी। वह अपने आप को सब से पहले बलिदान करने को तैयार होगी। पहले भी उसने कई बलिदान किए हैं और देश को आजाद कराने में उसका भी हाथ रहा है। सरकार के दिल में इसके बारे में कोई सन्देह नहीं होना चाहिए और विश्वास रखना चाहिए कि राष्ट्रीय हित में वहां की जनता बलिदान करने को हमेशा तैयार रहेगी।

वहां की सरकार जनता के उत्थान के लिए जो कुछ भी हो सकता है वह कर रही है और उनकी गरीबी को दूर करने की कोशिश कर रही है। जिस चीज की भी एक शासन से अपेक्षा की जा सकती है वह वहां का शासन कर रहा है। प्रान्त का निर्माण, वहां के निवासियों की सुख सुविधा, न्याय और शासन की सुविधायें सब को उपलब्ध करना, सड़कों का निर्माण, शिक्षा की सुविधायें पहुंचाना, पिछड़े हुए इलाकों की तरक्की करना, लोगों की निर्धनता को दूर करना, रोजगार देना, सब क्षेत्रों की प्रजा को सुरक्षित और समुन्नत करना, इन सब चीजों को ध्यान में रखने से ही सुख-

[श्री रनवमन सिंह]

शान्ति और देश की समृद्धि भी बढ़ सकती है। चूँकि वह प्रदेश बहुत पिछड़ा हुआ है इस लिए वह बड़े प्रान्त से मिलना स्वीकार नहीं करता है। यदि हम नदी नालों के तैराक बड़े बड़े समुद्री तैराकों के साथ यदि धकेल दिये जायेंगे तो आप ही बताइये कि क्या हम जिन्दा बच सकते हैं। हम अवश्य ही डूब कर मर जायेंगे। इस वास्ते हम यह चाहते हैं कि कम से कम १० साल के लिए विन्ध्य प्रदेश को फलने फूलने का मौका दिया जाए और उसके बाद यदि आप चाहें तो हम को किसी भी दूसरे प्रदेश के साथ मिला दें, हमें कोई एतराज नहीं होगा।

२३ तारीख को जो दुखद घटना वहाँ पर हुई उसका मुझे अत्यन्त खेद है और मैं इस चीज को बहुत बुरा समझता हूँ। लेकिन यह उस चीज का प्रतीक है कि वहाँ की जनता यह नहीं चाहती कि हम को किसी अन्य प्रदेश के साथ मिलाया जाए। हमारे माननीय सदस्य श्री मोती लाल जी ने यह कहा कि यह वहाँ की सामन्तशाही के कारण हुआ है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ सामन्तशाही को पांच छः साल हुए हलाल करके दफना दिया गया था। आपको उस मुर्दे का भूत अगर सता रहा हो तो मैं नहीं कह सकता। साथ ही आपने खण्डों का नाम भी लिया है। इसका कोई झगड़ा नहीं है। हो सकता है कि पहले जो स्टेट्स थी उनके बीच में आपस में बुन्देलखण्ड के बारे में कोई झगड़ा रहा हो लेकिन अब कोई मतभेद नहीं है।

जो मित्र इस विषय में तर्क करते हैं, उन्हें सोचना चाहिए कि जिस राज्य में आप के खंड के तीन मंत्री मौजूद हैं और जहाँ आप बहुमत में हैं, यदि आप इस सूरत में भी वहाँ का धक्का सहन नहीं कर सकते, तो क्या आप भाशा कर सकते हैं कि नई व्यवस्था में, जहाँ कि मुश्किल से आप के खंड के एक सदस्य

को मंत्री बनने का सौभाग्य प्राप्त होगा, आप चार प्रान्तों का धक्का बर्दाश्त कर सकेंगे। आप इस प्रकार के मतभेदों पर मत जाइये। कुछ भाइयों ने कहा है कि अपनी उदारता और सद्भावना का परिचय दीजिए और देश की एकता, सुदृढ़ता और भलाई के लिए प्रस्तावित मध्य प्रदेश को स्वीकार कीजिए। मैं उन की बात को मानता हूँ, लेकिन मैं साथ ही यह भी कहूँगा कि यदि वे भाई इस प्रस्ताव को थोड़ा सा नाम बदल कर मध्य प्रदेश के बजाय विन्ध्य प्रदेश रख दें और जबलपुर उसकी राजधानी रख दें, तो मैं इस को उन की उदारता और सद्भावना का प्रतीक मानूँगा और इस का स्वागत करूँगा।

हमारे कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने उत्तर प्रदेश में मिलने की बात की है। हमारी उत्तर प्रदेश के प्रति कोई दुर्भावना नहीं है और न ही कोई झगड़ा है, लेकिन हम को सब से ज्यादा डर इस बात का है कि उत्तर प्रदेश के साथ मिलने से हमारे यहाँ के पांच लाख आदिवासियों का हित नहीं होगा, क्योंकि वहाँ पर इस समय ३२ लाख से ज्यादा आदिवासी होते हुए भी उन की गणना आदिवासियों की सूची में नहीं हुई है और उन के कल्याण के लिए कोई कार्य नहीं किया गया है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : विश्वास रखिए, वहाँ पूरा न्याय होगा।

श्री रनवमन सिंह : इस लिए अपने प्रान्त के आदिवासियों के हित के लिए हम उत्तर प्रदेश में जाना पसन्द नहीं करते हैं। मध्य प्रदेश के बारे में भी मेरा यही विचार है। अगर सरकार इस बात पर तुली ही हुई है, तो सुरगुजा, रायगढ़, कोरिया, चांगभखार, जसपुर, सारंगढ़, सकती और जसपुर आदि राज्यों की हमारे साथ मिला दिया जाय। इससे विन्ध्य प्रदेश का क्षेत्रफल चालीस हजार

बर्ग मिल हो जायगा और जन संख्या साठ लाख हो जायगी। अगर इस तरीके से एक नया प्रान्त बना दिया जाय, तो हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं होगी। क्योंकि वहां की भी जमात विन्ध्य प्रदेश की ही भांति पिछड़ी हुई है।

मैं यह भी बताना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा प्रदेश किसी भी बात में कम नहीं है। हमारे यहां हर तरह के खनिज पदार्थ, लोहा, कोयला, तांबा, हीरा, इस्पात और युरेनियम इत्यादि उपलब्ध हैं। विन्ध्य प्रदेश की गोदी इन सभी पदार्थों से भरी हुई है। अगर हम को थोड़ा सा मौका मिल जाय और केन्द्रीय सरकार का दृष्टिकोण हमारे प्रति सहानुभूतिपूर्ण हो जाय, तो कोई कारण नहीं है कि हमारा प्रदेश किसी भी प्रदेश से पीछे रहे।

मुझे यह भी अर्ज़ कर देना है कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश का नाम एक राष्ट्रीय गान के साथ लगा हुआ है, इस लिए उस के अस्तित्व को न मिटाया जाय। आप मेरे सुझाव को मानें या न मानें, मगर मैं नम्रतापूर्वक यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप विन्ध्य प्रदेश की गरीब जनता का ख्याल नहीं करेंगे, उस की इच्छा का आदर नहीं करेंगे, तो वह तो सात बरस के एक बालक के समान है, इस लिए वह बगैर मचले नहीं रहेगी। तब सरकार साठी गोली से उसे भले ही काबू कर ले, लेकिन उस अवस्था में स्वतंत्रता का कोई अर्थ नहीं रह जायेगा। स्मरण रहे कि सन् १९४९ में श्री जब मर्जर का प्रश्न उठा था उस वक्त ३ आदमी बलिदान तथा ५०, १०० आदमी घायल हुये थे, तभी सरदार पटेल ने मर्जर करने से बचाया था।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश के अस्तित्व को कम से कम दस साल के लिए समाप्त न किया जाय और उसको एक पृथक इकाई के रूप में रहने

दिया जाय। या ऊपर लिखे राज्यों को मिलाकर एक बृहद प्रान्त बना दिया जाय। ये ही मेरा अन्तिम सुझाव है।

श्री आर० एन० सिंह (जिला गाजीपुर—पूर्व व जिला बलिया—दक्षिण-पश्चिम):
सभानेत्री जी, मैं आपका आभारी हूँ कि आपने मुझे भी समय दिया। मैं उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों से आया हूँ। कोई भी आदमी ऐसा नहीं होगा, जो कि अपने प्रान्त का बटवारा चाहता हो, लेकिन मैं ही एक ऐसा आदमी हूँ, जो कि उत्तर प्रदेश का बटवारा चाहता हूँ। मैं ऐसा क्यों चाहता हूँ? इसलिए नहीं कि उत्तर प्रदेश एक बहुत बड़ा प्रदेश है—जैसा कि पणिकर साहब ने कहा है, बल्कि इसलिए कि उत्तर प्रदेश के पश्चिमी जिलों के लोग पूर्वी जिलों के लोगों के साथ रहना नहीं चाहते हैं। यह निश्चित है और मैं आप से यह भी कहूंगा कि कांग्रेस पार्टी के बहुत से सदस्य उत्तर प्रदेश का बटवारा चाहते हैं, लेकिन उन के ऊपर पार्टी का बन्धन लगा हुआ है, जिसकी वजह से वह कुछ कह नहीं सकते हैं—उन को मौका नहीं दिया गया है।

मैं उत्तर प्रदेश का बटवारा इस वजह से भी चाहता हूँ कि वहां की भाषाएं दो हैं। उत्तर प्रदेश की भाषाएं दो नहीं हैं और उसकी संस्कृति भी दो नहीं हैं। भाषा और संस्कृति के सम्बन्ध में हमारे टंडन जी बहुत कुछ जानते हैं और कह भी चुके हैं, इसलिए मैं उस में नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ। संस्कृति के सम्बन्ध में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने भी जो कुछ कहना होता है, वह कहते हैं। जब हमारे देश की संस्कृति दूसरे देशों से मिलाई जाती है और कहा जाता है कि हमारी संस्कृति चीन और जर्मनी आदि से मिलती है, तो अगर हम अपने घर में यह कहें कि हमारी अलग अलग संस्कृति है, तो मैं उस को गलत समझता हूँ। मैं बटवारा चाहता क्यों हूँ? इसलिए कि उत्तर प्रदेश के

[श्री आर० एन० सिंह]

पश्चिमी जिलों के भाई पूर्व के लोगों के साथ नहीं रहना चाहते हैं। मैं आप से निवेदन करूँ कि उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने पूर्वी जिलों को डेवेलपमेंट इत्यादि के लिए कुछ रुपया दिया। इस पर पश्चिमी जिलों के भाइयों को कष्ट हुआ और उन्होंने कहा कि पूर्व के लोगों को इतना रुपया क्यों दिया जा रहा है। इस पर पश्चिम के भाइयों ने पूर्व के लोगों को एक सर्टिफिकेट भी दिया—जिस सर्टिफिकेट का जिक्र उत्तर प्रदेश के सिंचाई मंत्री, श्री कमला-पति त्रिपाठी, ने वहाँ की असेम्बली में किया। वह सर्टिफिकेट क्या है? वह कहते हैं—जिस आदमी ने कहा है, उस का उन्होंने रेफरेंस दिया है—मुझे खेद है कि हमारे कुछ साथियों ने उत्तर पूर्वी जिलों में किए जाने वाले खर्चों को अधिक बताया है। उस के लिए उन्होंने एक सीधे सीधे सर्टिफिकेट दिया है कि जितने पूर्वी इलाके के रहने वाले हैं, वे भिखारी हैं, दरिद्र हैं, नंगे हैं, दीन हैं, भूखे हैं। पूर्वी प्रदेश के साथ बड़ी सहानुभूति दिखाई गई है। यह बात हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश के पश्चिमी प्रदेश के भाइयों ने कही है। वे पूर्व के लोगों के साथ नहीं रहना चाहते हैं। इस कारण मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रदेश का जरूर बटवारा होना चाहिए। क्यों? इसलिए कि इस प्रदेश में वे मेल से नहीं रहेंगे और उन में द्वेष की भावना रहेगी। इसलिए उनको दबा कर एक साथ क्यों रखा जाये?

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों के लोगों ने कितना त्याग किया है, परन्तु १९०१ से—भंगरेजों के समय से इतना पैसा पश्चिमी जिलों पर खर्च किया गया, कि आज वे जिले डेवेलपमेंट हैं और सिंचाई के लिए और खेती करने के लिए उनको सुविधा मिली हुई है। दूसरी ओर भंगरेजों के समय से ही कांफ्रिडेंशियली इलाहाबाद से पूर्व पटना तक का क्षेत्र लेबर एरिया घोषित था और देवरिया, गाजीपुर, झांझमगढ़

और छपरा आदि सब उसमें शामिल हैं। इस तरह से हम तो पीछे रहे, लेकिन हमारे पैसे से पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश के भाइयों को सिंचाई के और दूसरे बड़े बड़े साधन मिले जिससे वे आगे बढ़ गये। और अब वे कहते हैं कि हम तो अधिक पैदावार करते हैं और ज्यादा तरबकी कर सकते हैं, इसलिए हमको अधिक रुपया मिलना चाहिए। इन दरिद्रों को देने से क्या फायदा है। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि उत्तर प्रदेश का विभाजन होना चाहिए।

दूसरा प्वाइंट यह है कि उत्तर प्रदेश के हमारे बहुत से साथियों ने और जो कि पार्लियामेंट के और असेम्बली के सदस्य हैं उन्होंने अपने हस्ताक्षर करके एक मेमोरेण्डम कमीशन के पास भेजा था। शायद उन लोगों की संख्या ७९ थी। उनमें कांग्रेस पार्टी के लोग भी थे। लेकिन उन पर पार्टी का दबाव पड़ा, इसलिए कुछ ने अपना नाम वापस ले लिया। जिन लोगों ने यह मेमोरेण्डम दिया वे चाहते हैं कि उत्तर प्रदेश का बटवारा हो।

इसके अतिरिक्त मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब कमीशन के तीनों सदस्यों ने उत्तर प्रदेश में गढ़वाल टेहरी और कुमायूँ में जाकर वहाँ के लोगों से बात की तो उन्होंने कहा कि हम उत्तर प्रदेश के साथ नहीं रहना चाहते। इसके बारे में उत्तर प्रदेश असेम्बली की २२ नवम्बर की कार्रवाई में लिखा है।

श्री सी० डी० पांडे (जिला नैनीताल व जिला अल्मोड़ा—दक्षिण-पश्चिम व जिला बरेली—उत्तर) : कुमायूँ वालों ने ऐसा नहीं कहा।

श्री आर० एन० सिंह : शायद आपको इससे असुविधा होती है। मालूम होता है कि आपके ऊपर भी दबाव पड़ा है। इसीलिए आप ऐसा कहते हैं। तो मैं आपसे यह निवेदन करता हूँ कि उत्तर प्रदेश के पश्चिमी जिलों

के लोग चाहते हैं कि जहां से उत्तर प्रदेश झांसी के पास से ढेड़ा होता है वहां से लेकर और मध्य प्रदेश का कुछ भाग लेकर एक प्रान्त बना दिया जाय । मैं इसका समर्थन करता हूँ । इससे उनको सुविधा होगी । उत्तर प्रदेश यहां से वहां तक बहुत लम्बा है, इतने लम्बे प्रान्त की जरूरत नहीं है । दूसरे प्रान्तों के भाई भी यह अनुभव करते हैं और एतराज करते हैं कि उत्तर प्रदेश बहुत बड़ा है । मैं तो कहता हूँ कि अगर आप इस देश में शान्ति रखना चाहते हैं तो उत्तर प्रदेश को बांटिये । अगर आप सको नहीं बांटेंगे तो देश के अन्दर शान्ति और व्यवस्था नहीं रह सकती । मैं यह भी कह दूँ कि और प्रदेशों के भाइयों को केवल इसीलिए द्वेष नहीं है कि उत्तर प्रदेश बहुत बड़ा है । द्वेष इसलिए है कि यहां पालिया-मेंट में उत्तर प्रदेश के लोग अधिक से अधिक संख्या में हैं । वे पालियामेंट के सदस्य ही नहीं हैं बल्कि मिनिस्ट्रों में भी उत्तर प्रदेश वालों की संख्या ज्यादा है । इसलिए ख्वाहमख्वाह उन लोगों को इस बात से द्वेष है ।

दूसरी एक और चीज मैं उत्तर प्रदेश के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ । पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश के भाइयों को एक दुःख यह भी है, कि उत्तर प्रदेश में पूर्वी प्रदेश के मिनिस्टर कुछ अधिक हैं । इसलिए वे चाहते हैं कि पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश अलग हो जाय । तो मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि जब सब जगह के लोग ऐसा चाहते हैं तो क्यों न उत्तर प्रदेश को बांट दिया जाय । पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश के लोग भी ऐसा चाहते हैं पर वे इस विषय में बोलते नहीं क्योंकि वे अपने घर को बांटना नहीं चाहते । लेकिन ऐसा देखा जाता है कि जब किसी परिवार में बहुत सा बढ़ जाता है और परिवार बढ़ भी जाता है तो घर का मालिक परिवार के कमजोर लोगों को अलग करना चाहता है । इसी तरह से आज उत्तर प्रदेश के पश्चिमी जिलों के लोगों के पास पैसा है, उनके पास खेतों के साधन हैं और वे सम्पन्न हैं । इसलिए वे चाहते हैं कि हम अलग हो जाय । मैं भी यह कहता हूँ कि उनको अलग

हो जाना चाहिए और सरकार को भी इस पर विचार करना चाहिए कि उनको अलग स्थान दिया जाय ।

दूसरी बात यह है कि जो लोग उत्तर प्रदेश से अलग होना चाहते हैं उनको अलग क्यों न होने दिया जाय । साथ ही साथ विन्ध्य प्रदेश के भाई जो कि उत्तर प्रदेश में आना चाहते हैं उनको क्यों न आने दिया जाय । मैं समझता हूँ कि उनको उत्तर प्रदेश में मिलने का मौका दिया जाना चाहिए । मैं कहता हूँ कि जो आना चाहते हैं उनको आने दीजिये और जो जाना चाहते हैं उनको जाने दीजिये इसके लिए रास्ता साफ होना चाहिए ।

अन्त में एक बात और कह कर मैं समाप्त करना चाहता हूँ । मैं चाहता हूँ कि जैसा प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा था कि पांच जोन बनाये जायें वह ठीक है, मैं भी उसका समर्थन करता हूँ । साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी कहूंगा कि हमारे टंडन जी ने कहा था कि ऐसा करना कोई बहुत प्रैक्टिकल नहीं होगा । एक देश है, प्रदेश है, जिले हैं, इनके अतिरिक्त आप जोन या पंच प्रदेश और बना लें, इससे हमारा कोई लाभ नहीं होगा । आजकल पंचशील का नाम बहुत लिया जाता है । अगर इन पांच जोन्स का नाम पंच प्रदेश रख लिया जाय तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह एक अच्छी चीज होगी । आज मैं देखता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार का और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी का ज्यादातर मुकाब अशोक काल की बातों की और ही अधिक है । अशोक के समय में भी १६ प्रदेश थे, आज भी १६ प्रदेश बनाये जा रहे हैं । साथ ही मैं यह भी कह दूँ कि इससे हमारे कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों को भी संतोष होना चाहिए क्योंकि रूस में १६ प्रदेश हैं और हमारा यहाँ भी १६ प्रदेश बनने जा रहे हैं ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : उनके लिए आपकी डिमांड क्या है ?

श्री आ ए० ए० सिंह : मेने बतलाया किच तरह से उत्तर प्रदेश का विभाजन होना चाहिए । मैं अधिक न कहकर अपना स्थान ग्रहण करता हूँ ।

Shri Seshagiri Rao (Nandyal): I welcome the reorganisation of the States. It is high time that we got rid of the existing States which are formed on no set principles.

Mr. Chairman: I might remind hon. Members that there is just one hour left. There are several Members who wish to speak. So, all hon. Members who are going to speak from now will please take less time,—as little as possible.

Shri Seshagiri Rao: I will finish within ten minutes. It is also high time that we took away the distinction between Part A and Part B States. The States Reorganisation Commission calls this reorganisation as a rational reorganisation. What is the rationality behind it? They consider linguistic homogeneity, economic viability and administrative convenience. So, any objection that is put forward against the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission should not be merely on linguistic basis. The Commission have also considered that they cannot create watertight linguistic States. That is why they have given three chapters at the end to say what safeguards should be provided for the minorities. When the Commission feels that they cannot create watertight compartments, any objection to the proposal on a linguistic basis alone is not relevant. Let us consider that all the States have a certain role to play in a particular place in Maha Bharata—that is, India. Let us feel that a boundary shall be in this place or in a different place. Let us consider as to how each State could be carved out, so that each State may thrive well economically and administratively. I now understand that

there is a conflict between Karnatakas and the Telangana people with Andhra. I feel very much that, the people of Karnataka whose history has been so intimately inter-twined with the Andhras from 1000 A.D. to 1565 A.D. should have petty differences over a particular taluk here and another there. What I want to emphasise and tell my Karnataka friends is this. There are two big States in which Andhra is interested. They are Mysore and Hyderabad. In Mysore there is a majority of Karnataka people, but there are also 30 per cent. Telugu-speaking people. In Hyderabad also there are 45 per cent. of Telugu-speaking people and only 10 per cent. of Karnatakas. So, the Andhras are claiming the Kolar District from Mysore. In Hyderabad the Kanarese-speaking people are only 10 per cent.; why should they fight for Bellary, Hospet and Siruguppa taluks?

As far as the Tungabhadra project is concerned, there are two sides—northern side and the southern side. I say that on the southern side the entire administration should be left to Andhra, so that the administrative convenience is very much looked after. Otherwise, if there are two or three Governments dealing with the Tungabhadra Board, certainly, there are bound to be certain conflicts and the people cannot get what they want. This project has been constructed mainly for the Rayalaseema people. When the dam site was to be constructed at Mallapuram, the people objected that it should not be constructed there, because Mallapuram was going to be an Andhra area and the project was meant only for the Rayalaseema people. Let us not go into that. I would suggest that since the Andhra people are not going to say that they should have some portion from Mysore, let them not quarrel over this small thing. After all, it is a question of only two taluks and when they are getting 2 districts in which their people are in the majority, they should not be serious about this.

Coming to Vishalandhra, some of my Mysore friends are saying that they do not want to join the Karnataka people, because they are very far off. Here the Telangana people are saying that they do not want to join, because they are backward people. The forward people do not want to join the backward people and the backward people do not want to join the forward people. Let us not think like this. If we are backward people, certainly we should join the forward people and see that we improve. If we are forward people, it is our duty to improve the backward people and not leave them alone. Let us consider it in that way and have Bellary also for Vishalandhra, so that the Rayalaseema people will get adequate benefits.

I want to submit only one thing to this House. In expressing our observations, it is not a question of claim that we are putting forward. It is not as if Andhra claims Kolar or Bellary. We are just putting our suggestions, so that we may decide how best we can carve out our States. It is not as if we are claiming any bit of territory. The whole thing will be in the Indian Union, whether it is Karnataka or Andhra or any other State. So, my submission is, let there be Vishalandhra with Bellary and Kolar, so that the entire administration of the Tungabhadra Project will be under one Government. Thank you.

डा० सत्यबाबी (करनाल—रक्षित-अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : मुझे इस बात के लिए दुःख है कि महापंजाब के पक्ष में ४, ५ लोग बोले हैं और ३, ४ घंटे उस पर वक्त लिया है और यह मेरी बदकिस्मती है कि मुझे ऐसे वक्त पर बोलने का मौका मिल रहा है जबकि मुझे अपनी बात १०.१५ मिनट के अन्दर खत्म कर देनी है और मैं इस घोड़ी सी ढेर में बोल कर यह इम्प्रेसन जो लोगों के दिमाग में धायब रूढ़ा हो गया है कि हरियाना के लोग महापंजाब के हक में हैं, अगर इसको हटा सकू तो

में समझूंगा कि मेरा मकसद पूरा हो गया और मैंने काफी बोल लिया। यह हाउस इस इम्प्रेसन में न रहे कि जो बात महापंजाब के हक में कही गई है चाहे वह कहने वाले हरियाना प्रान्त से थे या वह जालंधर डिवीजन के थे, वह प्रावाज तमाम पंजाब की प्रावाज है।

भाज आप यह जो पंजाबी और हिन्दी भाषा के सम्बन्ध में और हिन्दू सिक्ख के सम्बन्ध में झगड़े की बात सुन रहे हैं, उसके बारे में मैं आपकी यह गलतफ़हमी दूर कर देना चाहता हूँ कि यह तमाम का तमाम झगड़ा जालंधर के लीडरों का है और इसमें हरियाना प्रान्त और हमारे अम्बाला डिवीजन के आदिमियों का कोई झगड़ा नहीं। न हमारे यहां पंजाबी और हिन्दी का झगड़ा है और न हमारे यहां सिक्ख और हिन्दू का कोई झगड़ा है। हमारे यहां सिक्ख भी रहते हैं और हिन्दू भी रहते हैं लेकिन हमारे यहां उनके बीच कोई झगड़ा नहीं है। जिस वक्त यह कमिशन बना, उस वक्त दूसरों की तरह स हम भी उनके सामने गये, हरियाना के एम० एल० एज, भरतपुर और झलवर के सब मेम्बर्स देहली में इकट्ठा हुए और यहां बैठ कर हमने आपस में मशविरा किया और मुझे उस रोज की मीटिंग का प्रेसीडेंट होने का फ़ख्र हासिल था, उस मीटिंग के अन्दर हमने यह फ़ैसला किया कि हरियाना प्रान्त बनाने की तहरीक जो पिछले १०० साल से चली आ रही है, आज फिर इस बात का मौका आया है कि हम उसको दुबारा भ्रजसरे नौ ताजा करके अपने नेताओं के सामने रखें और उस मीटिंग में हमने यह फ़ैसला किया कि हमें पंजाब से अलहवा हो जाना चाहिए। मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि यहां बहुत सी बातें कही गई हैं कि हिन्दी और पंजाबी में कोई फ़र्क नहीं और हिन्दू पंजाबी और सिक्ख में कोई फ़र्क नहीं है, मगर मैं आपको बताता हूँ कि फ़र्क क्या है। यहां आप सुनते हैं कि जब एक हिन्दू दोस्त बोलने के लिए उठे होते हैं तो वह सरदार साहब को चप्पा कड़

[डा० सत्यवादी]

कर पुकार लेते हैं और सरदार साहब जब बोलने के लिये खड़े होते तो वह हिन्दू दोस्त को भाई कह कर पुकार लेते हैं और बात भी बिल्कुल ठीक है। उनके घरों में आपस में एक दूसरे के वहां शादियां होती और रोटी बंटी का व्यवहार चलता है, उनका मरना जीना एक है, उनके कानून एक हैं, उनका रिवाज एक है और उनका लिबास एक है, यह सब तो है, लेकिन आपने देखा कि जिस वक्त अपनी भाषा पंजाबी लिखाने का सवाल आता है और हालांकि वहां के सारे के सारे लोग पंजाबी बोलने वाले हैं लेकिन वह उस को डिस्मोन करते हैं और वह कहते कि हमारी भाषा पंजाबी नहीं है और कमिशन वालों ने कहा है कि वहां का जो हिन्दी तबक़ा है वह एक खास तबक़ा है। आज हरियाना के बोलने वालों पर यह एतराज किया जा रहा है कि वह अकालियों का साथ देने वाले हैं, उसके लिये मैं कहूंगा कि यह जो महापंजाब की तहरीक है वह जनसंघ की तहरीक है जैसे कि वहां के लोगों ने अपनाया हुआ है और मझे इस बात का अफ़सोस है कि आज जनसंघ की लीडरशिप के पीछे मेरे कांग्रेसी भाई भी चले जा रहे हैं। हमें बतलाया जाता है कि अगर पंजाबी सूबा बन गया तो उसमें सिक्खों की पापलेशन ५५ फ़ीसदी हो जायेगी और हिन्दू माइनारिटी में हो जायेंगे। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर आपको इससे इतनी ख़बराहट क्यों है अगर सिक्खों की मेजारिटी बन जाती है तो क्या हुआ, वह तो हमारे जमाई हैं, तुम्हारे चाचा हैं और भाई हैं और तुम्हारे ससुर हैं और इसी तरह अगर हिन्दुओं की मेजारिटी बन जाती है तो सिक्खों को क्यों ख़बडाना चाहिये क्योंकि हिन्दू उन के भाई हैं और जमाई हैं। और बाप है, फिर यह सब क्या झगड़ा आपस में चल रहा है? यहां तो हम सब इस बात को कहते हैं कि हम सब एक हैं लेकिन जब हम कहते हैं

कि आप पंजाबी पंजाबी इकट्ठा होकर एक जगह बैठ जाये तो आप कहते हैं कि हमारी ज़बान पंजाबी नहीं है। मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि वहां के लोगों का हाल क्या है, जालंधर डिबीजन में सब के सब पंजाबी बोलते हैं और उर्दू लिखते हैं लेकिन जब अपनी भाषा लिखवाने का सवाल आता है तो कहते हैं कि हमारी ज़बान हिन्दी है। अजीब झगड़ बना रक्खा है इन लोगों ने और हकीकत यह है कि टुकड़ों पर एक दूसरे से लड़ रहे हैं और इस सारे पंजाब के झगड़ में पावर पालिटिक्स काम कर रही है और इस झगड़ में हम हरियाना वालों को तबाह किया जा रहा है। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि पंजाबी और हिन्दी बोलने वाला इलाक़ा, उसको आप बागड़ी बोलने वाला इलाक़ा कह लीजिये यह दोनों मिलना चाहते हैं और इनके साथ साथ जैसा कि हमने पिछले दिनों सुना था कि उत्तर प्रदेश के ६७ मैम्बरान असेम्बली ने एक मेमो-रेंडम दिया था कि हम वहां उत्तर प्रदेश से अलहदा होना चाहते हैं तो हमने कहा कि ठीक है, आप वहां से अलहदा होना चाहते हैं और हम यहां तकलीफ़ में बैठे हुये हैं, आज से नहीं बल्कि ५० वर्ष से और १०० वर्ष से हम मुसीबत उठा रहे हैं, इसलिये हम दोनों को इकट्ठा मिला दिया जाय। मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि यह हरियाना प्रान्त के निर्माण की तहरीक आज की तहरीक नहीं है, यह बहुत पुरानी तहरीक चली आ रही है और हरियाना प्रान्त अलहदा बनाने की तहरीक राउन्ड टेबल कान्फ़ेंस के दौरान उठाई गई थी और मांटेगू रिपोर्ट में यह चीज कही गई थी कि यह बिल्कुल कुदरती तौर पर एक सूबा है और मैं आपको याद दिलाऊँ कि यह एक नुक़्ता था उन चन्द एक वक्तों में जिनकी कि बाबत महात्मा गंधी और मिस्टर जिन्ना के बीच इतिफ़ाक़ हुआ था। यह हरियाना का इलाक़ा हिन्दी बोलने वाला इलाक़ा

है। जमुना के दोनों तरफ का इलाका इकट्ठा कर दिया जाय। उस समय भाखड़ा डाम की स्कीम हमारे सामने नहीं थी। उस समय वह चीज थी कि तमाम पंजाब को पांच दरिया सेरआब करते हैं और जमुना का कुछ पानी पंजाब में तकसीम होता है और कुछ यू० पी० में और इस जमुना की बादी को, जमुना के इलाके को एक कंट्रोल में लाया जाय ताकि पानी का झगड़ा न हो और इसलिए यह मांग की है कि हरियाना के रहने वाले और यू० पी० के मेरठ डिवीजन वाले लोगों को एक साथ में मिला दिया जाय और दोनों इलाके के लोग एग्जीक्यूटिवरिस्ट्स हैं और करीब ६७ फ्रीसदी और ८७ फ्रीसदी लोग इन इलाकों में खेतीबाड़ी का काम करते हैं। यह उनकी माशरत है। मैं आप से कह रहा था कि वह लोग आप को बोखा देते हैं। उन्होंने यह बात बताई है कि सारे पंजाबी एक हैं। लेकिन यह बात नहीं है। मैं आप को हिन्दू और सिखों के साल्लुकात की बात बतलाऊँ। मैं हरियाना के हिन्दुओं की बात बतलाता हूँ। ६ साल हो गये हैं, पंजाब से हमारे बहुत से दोस्त आये हैं जिनमें हिन्दू भी हैं और सिख भी हैं। वह लोग मेरी कान्स्टीट्यून्सी में भी बैठे हुए हैं। मैंने नौ साल के अर्से में हरियाना के हिन्दुओं और पंजाबी हिन्दुओं की शादियां आपस में कहीं नहीं देखीं। लेकिन जो हिन्दू और सिख पंजाब से आये हैं हरियाना में उनमें मैं ऐसी बचासों शादियां बतला सकता हूँ जिन में कि सिखों ने हिन्दुओं में और हिन्दुओं ने सिखों में शादियां की हैं। जब हमारे साथ अपनी रिश्तेदारियां पसन्द नहीं करते तो आप हम को क्यों अचने साथ लेते हैं? जब सच्चर फार्मूला बना तो कहा गया कि हिन्दी बाको तुम्हारे साथ जुल्म हो रहा है दरअसल यह जुल्म वा हमारे ऊपर। आज वह कहते हैं कि हम हिन्दी बोलते हैं। मैं आप से अर्ज करता हूँ कि आप जोनों को पंजाब के साथ जाना चाहिये। वहाँ आप पंजाबी जवान के आधार पर सूबा बनायें

चाहे फारसी जवान के आधार पर बनायें। बहरहाल यह आप की लड़ाई है, आप हम को इसमें न लीजें। हरिजनों की तरफ से बात कही गई है। मर्वुमशुमारी के दिनों में भी हमें टूल बना कर जालंधर डिवीजन में पिटा दिया गया था। लेकिन उस वक्त भी हमारे यहाँ कोई झगड़ा नहीं हुआ था। अगर कोई कान्फेंस वह हुई है तो उसमें हरियाना के हरिजन नहीं थे जितने भी उसमें आये थे वह जालंधर डिवीजन के थे।

मैं अब जरा सी बात ही कह कर अपना सान लेता हूँ क्योंकि मेरे पास ज्यादा बक्त नहीं है। जवान के आधार पर हैदराबाद को तकसीम कर दिया गया है, इस तरफ भाषा के आधार पर पंजाब के निर्माण से इंकार किया जा रहा है। हिमाचल प्रदेश के गले के ऊपर छुरी चलाई जा रही है। भाई टेकचन्द ने हिमाचल के एक मिनिस्टर की बात पर दांत उखाड़ने की बात कही थी अगर हिमाचल पंजाब में मिल गया और कल परमार साहब ने कोई बात कह दी तो शायद उन का सर फोड़ने पर उतर आये मैं कहता हूँ कि वह सीधे सादे लोग हैं। उन बेचारे हिमाचल बाकों को इस पंजाब से अलग ही रहने दें। बहरहाल मैं कहता हूँ कि हिमाचल की मांग को मंजूर किया जाय।

मैं दिल्ली के बारे में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब हम डिमाण्डेसी का डिबोरा हर बक्त पीटते हैं, तो दिल्ली से डिमाण्डेसी को क्यों समाप्त किया जा रहा है। इस लिये आप को दिल्ली के बारे में भी सोच समझ कर कोई कदम उठाना चाहिये।

श्री बाबुबारे (परभणी) : आप ने मुझे समय देकर जो उपकार किया है, उस के लिये मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

मैं एल० धार० सी० के सदस्यों की हैदराबाद के डिस्ट्रिक्टेशन पर वा बिभाजन

[श्री बाबुभारे]

पर बघाई देता हूँ और बन्धुवाद देता हूँ । हैदराबाद वह इलाका है जो त्रिभाषिक कई सदियों से एक जगह रक्खा गया था, उसको आप ने डिवाइड करके अनेक भाषा के इलाकों को अपने अपने प्रान्त में मिलाने का प्रयत्न दिया इसके लिये बन्धुवाद देता हूँ । मगर जिस तरह से आपने कर्नाटक को कन्नड़ी विभाग में मिला दिया उसी तरह से हमारे मराठावाड़ा के इलाके की जनता जो चाहती थी कि बम्बई सह संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के साथ मिला दिया जाय वह आपने हमारे वास्ते नहीं किया । इसी तरह से जो वहाँ की तैलगू बोलने वाली जनता थी वह ज्यादा तादाद में यह कहती थी कि उसको विशाल आंध्र में मिला दिया जाय, लेकिन एस० आर० सी० ने ऐसा नहीं किया । इसलिये मैं उन से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप को एक ही उसूल को लेना चाहिये था । अगर आपने बेश के विभाजन के लिये भाषा का उसूल मान लिया था और जिसके अनुसार आपने १४ इलाके तय किये थे, उसी के अनुसार आप को इस तैलगू बोलने वाले इलाके को भी विशाल आंध्र में मिला देना चाहिये था । उस को आप ने नहीं मिलाया । अच्छा होता कि इसी तरह से बम्बई को भी संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र में मिला दिया जाता । हैदराबाद से, खास कर मराठावाड़ा इलाके में जगह जगह कमीशन घूमा, क्या वहाँ पर एक भी ऐसा सदस्य मिला जिसने कहा हो कि बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र में नहीं होना चाहिये ? उन लोगों ने एक मुख से कहा कि संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र बम्बई के साथ होना चाहिये । उस के बाद भी उन्होंने हैदराबाद के सर्जामदार के हाथ से हमें निकाल कर यहाँ मांडवलवारों के हाथ में डाल दिया । हम लोग १५० सालों से मराठावाड़ में रहते आये हैं । हमारी सब की स्वाहिश थी कि हम सब मराठी बोलने वालों के साथ ही हम बम्बई सह संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र में रहें । मगर कमिश्नर ने ऐसा नहीं किया

हमारे महाविदर्भ से आने वाले भाई भारतीयजी ने कहा कि वहाँ की जनता अलग रहना चाहती है । मैं उन से यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर वह इस नारे को लेकर पार्लियामेन्ट की सीट से इस्तीफा दे दें और मेरी चुनौती मान कर इलेक्शन लड़ लें तो इस का फैसला हो सकता है । इस से उनको पता चल जायेगा कि वहाँ की जनता की क्या आवाज है । मैं तो यह कहता हूँ कि विदर्भ की जनता एक मत से कहती है कि उसे संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र जिसकी । राजधानी बॉम्बे हो उनके साथ मिलाया जाय । भारतीयजी ने कहा है कि विदर्भ की जनता पचास सालों से विदर्भ के लिये कोशिश कर रही है कि विदर्भ अलग रहे । मैं कहता हूँ कि यह बिल्कुल गलत है, महाविदर्भ के महाराष्ट्रीयन लोगों ने महाराष्ट्र के साथ मिलने की अपनी इच्छा जाहिर की है । एस० आर० सी० ने वहाँ की जनता की आवाज के खिलाफ महाविदर्भ को अलग बनाया है । मैं आप को बतलाऊँ ऐसा उन्होंने क्यों किया । चूँकि उन को मराठी बोलने वालों का इलाका बम्बई प्रान्त वार्डलिंगवल बनाना था इसके लिहाज से उन्होंने वह समतोल करने या बैलेन्स ठीक करने के लिये मराठी स्पीकिंग एरिया की काट छांट की है । मराठावाड़ा के पांच जिलों को बम्बई प्राविन्स के साथ मिला दिया है । लेकिन और भी ऐसे छः ताल्लुके हैं बीदर जिले के जिन में से तीन निलंगा, उदगीर, अहमदपुर तो पूरी तरह से मराठी बोलने वाले हैं और तीन भालकी, संतपुर, हमनाबाद में कम से कम आधे लोग मराठी बोलते हैं, साथ ही अदीलाबाद जिले के भी चार ताल्लुके ऐसे हैं जिन के किनवट, राजूरा, उटनूर और बोथ मराठीभाषी हैं । उन को भी कमिश्नर ने हम से अलग कर दिया । वह भी हमारे साथ आने के लिये तैयार है लेकिन कमिश्नर ने बन्धुवाद का खयाल नहीं किया ।

में तो समझता हूँ कि जो लोग खुशी से हमारे साथ आना चाहते थे उन को न आने देने की - एक ही वजह हो सकती है कि उन को बम्बई प्रांत बाइलिग्वल स्टेट बनाना था, दोनों जगह की जनता को एक जगह लाना था नहीं तो अगर हमारी मैजिस्ट्री हो जाती तो विस्कत होती ।

इसके साथ साथ बेलगांव जिले का जो मराठी इलाका है उस को भी हम से अलग कर दिया है । वहां पर साढ़े चार लाख जनता मराठी बोलने वाली है । जहां के लोग मराठी बोलने वाले हैं । उन इलाकों को मराठी बोलने वाले प्रांत को न देकर उनको कर्नाटक में मिला दिया, उन लोगों को यह खयाल नहीं आया कि बीदर के लिये जिला यूनिट कायम करके पूरे का पूरा जिला कर्नाटक में मिला दिया जब बेलगांव का सवाल आया तो उसको उन्होंने जिले का यूनिट क्यों नहीं माना यहां पर तालुका यूनिट माना ? बीदर और मराठवाड़ा को जब एक बनाने का सवाल सामने आया तो कमिशन को जिला यूनिट की याद आई । दोनों के बारे में उन्होंने एक नियम अख्यार नहीं किया । बांडर के बारे में भी उन्होंने मनमाने उसूल बना कर जिस जवान का इलाका उस स्टेट को देकर प्रांत बनाये लेकिन सिर्फ मराठी स्पीकिंग एरिया के लिये कोई एक नियम नहीं अपनाये । इसलिये मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने जो भी अन्याय किया है वह मराठी स्पीकिंग एरिया के लिये ही किया है । इसके लिये मैं खेद प्रगट करता हूँ । और गवर्नमेन्ट से मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि महाविदर्भ का इलाका जो मराठी बोलने वालों के साथ आने को तैयार है वह और मध्यप्रांत में बचा हुआ मराठी प्रांत और मराठवाड़ा के जो इलाके कर्नाटक या तैलंगाना में गए हुए हैं उनको, मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार एक जगह करके जितने भी इलाके मराठी बोलने वाले हैं वे सब एक जगह करके संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र बना दें ।

अब मैं बम्बई के मामले पर आता हूँ । मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि अगर बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र की राजधानी न रखा जाये तो उसकी जो प्रहमियत है वह खत्म हो जायेगी । बम्बई में जो कारोबार इस वकत है वह नहीं रह सकता । हम ने यह कहा है कि जो संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र बनेगा उसकी राजधानी बम्बई ही होगी । इस सूरत में लोगों के बहां से चले जाने या उन के रेलेटिव्ह के चले जाने का सवाल ही पैदा नहीं होता है । मराठवाड़ा से या महाराष्ट्र से जो भी चीज आती है वह बम्बई में ही आती है । यहां राजधानी न रहने से वह चीजें भी यहां आना बन्द हो जायेंगी । जो लोग बम्बई को अलग रखने की बात सोच रहे हैं मैं उनसे इतिफाक नहीं करता हूँ । जो बम्बई को अलग रखने की बात करते हैं और कहते हैं कि यहां माइनोरिटीज की हिफाजत नहीं हो सकेगी । यह डर उनका निराधार है । वहां पर जो व्यापार करते हैं वे मराठी भी हैं और दूसरे लोग भी हैं । सब तरह के लोग वहां पर बसे हुए हैं । वहां पर वे शान्तिपूर्वक अपना व्यापार करते आ रहे हैं । और वैसे ही आगे रहेंगे ।

माननीय सदस्या मणिभेन पटेल ने कहा कि बहां के जो अल्पसंख्यांक लोग हैं उनकी राय ले ली जानी चाहिए । मैं उनको बतलाना चाहती हूँ कि माइनोरिटीज को वहां पर किसी किस्म का खतरा नहीं है और न ही उनकी राय लेने की जरूरत है । हमारी सेंट्रल गवर्नमेन्ट के पास काफी अस्तयारात हैं, वह भी उनका इस्तेमाल कर सकती है । इसी तरह का एक डर राज्य सभा में एक मੈम्बर ने भी जाहिर किया है । मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि डर किस बात का है । यह भी कहा गया कि झगड़े होते रहते हैं और गड़बड़ी पैदा होती रहती है, इसलिए बम्बई को अलग ही रहने दिया जाये । क्या इसका यह मतलब है कि बम्बई के अलग रहने से यह झगड़े जो

[श्री माधव रेड्डी]

हैं यह बन्द हो जायेंगे। क्या इसका यह मतलब है कि मराठी बोलने वाले लोगों को वहाँ से निकाल दिया जाए। यह नहीं हो सकता है। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे डर की कोई बात नहीं है। बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र में मिला ही दिया जाना चाहिए।

आखिर में मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस वक्त जो महाराष्ट्र बनाने की तजवीज है उसके बजाय दोनों इलाके महा-विदर्भ और बम्बई प्रान्त और मराठी इलाकों को लेकर संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र बम्बई को राजधानी रख कर बना दिया जाना चाहिये।

Shri Madhao Reddi (Adilabad): Within the short time at my disposal, I want to refer to one or two points raised by my hon. friends Dr. Jaisoorya and Shri R. N. Reddy. I am reminded also again and again of the wild and undignified attack made by Shri M. A. Ayyangar the other day on the people of Telangana. It was a great surprise to us, coming as it did from a person of the calibre of Shri M. A. Ayyangar. The people of Telangana take his whole speech as a great insult to them. On behalf of the people of Telangana, I want to register my emphatic protest against the wild attack and the ugly insinuations that he chose to make the other day. I am sorry he is not here today, but I would like to submit that his speech, instead of helping his cause, has created a very bad impression in Telangana, and as such he has spoiled his case. The whole speech made by Shri M. A. Ayyangar the other day is * * * not worthy of any reply at all.

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): Then, why bother about it?

Shri Madhao Reddi: But there are a few points which I must answer.

Shri M. A. Ayyangar ridiculed the financial viability of the Telangana State and said that if prohibition

were introduced and the high-scale of taxation were reduced, the Telangana State would become a deficit State. I would like to tell him that this prohibition is not a problem for Telangana alone. It is a common problem to all the States. If prohibition were to be introduced in the other States of India, they would also become deficit States. Regarding the high scale of land taxation, my hon. friends Shri M. A. Ayyangar, Shri R. N. Reddy and Dr. Jaisoorya have pointed out that there is at present in that area what they call the feudal structure of taxation, and that if this feudal taxation is decreased, Telangana would become a deficit State.

I belong to the Opposition. As such, I have no desire to give any certificate to the achievements of the Congress Government, but I would like to tell my hon. friends that the facts of history cannot be distorted. The fact is that the Hyderabad Government has during the last six years introduced land reforms; they have fixed a ceiling on land holdings, and now the surplus lands are being taken away and distributed among the poor peasants. Naturally, therefore, there is an anxiety on the part of the poor peasants that they may not be deprived of the benefits that they are getting now.

An Hon. Member: They will not be deprived.

Shri Madhao Reddi: But they will be deprived if Vishalandhra comes into existence. I would like to tell my hon. friends these champions of the people, who have been denying the right of self-determination to our people.

Shri B. Y. Reddy: The people want Vishalandhra.

Shri Madhao Reddi: No, the people do not want Vishalandhra.

Shri Raghaviah (Ongole): The Planning Commission have categorically stated.....

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

Shri Madhao Reddi: I am not giving way. I do not want any interruptions to be made. I shall answer my hon. friends. I shall take point by point.

My hon. friend has said that the people do not want a Telangana State. I am here to prove to what extent the people of Telangana have expressed themselves on this matter. They have clearly, and beyond any doubt, expressed their strong opposition to Vishalandhra. As many as 150 institutions in Telangana have expressed themselves in favour of a separate Telangana. As many as 30 municipal committees, 100 village panchayats 53 students' unions, 8 Bar associations, and 1 municipal corporation of Hyderabad have passed resolutions in favour of a separate Telangana State. 20 towns have observed complete *hartal* 10 Telangana conventions were held in different places, attended by thousands of people, and they had passed resolutions opposing merger. On the 25th of last month, there was a complete *hartal* in the entire cities of Hyderabad and Secunderbad, unprecedented in the history of these two cities. And what is remarkable in this agitation is this. In spite of what my hon. friends Shri R. N. Reddy and Dr. Jaisoorya have said, namely that there was *goondaism* and all that I can tell them that what was remarkable in this whole agitation was the discipline of the people. I would like to take this opportunity to salute the brave people of Telangana who had, under provocative circumstances, maintained peaceful and calm behaviour, in contrast to what had happened in Rewa, in Punjab, in Bombay and other places.

No doubt, it is a fact that Dr. Jaisoorya has been insulted there. I am very sorry for that, and I want to apologise for that.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member need not make any personal remarks.

Shri Madhao Reddi: It is not any personal remark. I am apologising to him for the treatment that has been meted out to him in Telangana. But that does not mean that there is

goondaism in Telangana. That is completely distorted. That is not a fact.

Shri B. Y. Reddy: Karimnagar: If it is not *goondaism* them what is it?

Shri Raghaviah: It is boisterousness.

Shri Madhao Reddi: It is not *goondaism*.

I would like to stay a word now about the Commission's proposal in regard to Telangana. They have suggested that if the majority of the Assembly elected after 1961 decided in favour of unification, then the issue would be decided, and Vishalandhra would be formed. But now that recommendation is being distorted by Government.

The Congress Working Committee's advice in this connection is not at all commendable. I know that the Congress Working Committee is meeting today, I do not know what decision they are going to take. But if they feel that they can force this decision on the people of Telangana, they are perfectly mistaken. Even if the people of Telangana are deprived of the leadership of the Congress, I am sure they will take up this issue and fight upto the last, until they achieve their goal.

Lastly, I would appeal to my Andhra friend—I have got many friends in Andhra—not to be so sentimental about Vishalandhra. I know that they have been dreaming of Vishalandhra for quite a long time. I know they have been passionately attached to this goal. I know that they have been singing the songs of the glory of the Andhras and the glory that would be of the *mukkoti* Andhras, I can appreciate their sentiment. But I also wish that they should appreciate the sentiment of the people of Telangana in this respect, and respect their wishes, and not force any decision on them at this stage, because after all, even if Vishalandhra is formed at this stage,—I would like to tell to them Hyderabad is not going to be a peaceful home for them.

5 P.M.

Shri B. Y. Reddy: It is going to be contested. People welcome Vishal-andhra.

Shri Madhao Reddi: I tell my friends that people are not in a position to receive them at this stage.

Interruptions by several Hon. Members

Let us have an election.

Some Hon. Members: Yes, yes.

Shri Raghavalah: Let him contest.

Shri Madhao Reddi: I am prepared to contest. I am prepared to face election against my Communist friends.

Shri Raghavalah: He will be ousted *(Interruptions)*.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): Let this not be decided here.

Shri Madhao Reddi: I was saying that this issue should be decided after the elections, because my hon. friends will get a chance to judge their strength. Then we will give our Andhra friends the reception which they deserve.

Therefore, I would like to tell my friends not to precipitate the matter at this stage. Let the Assembly after the elections of 1957 decide the issue one way or the other. Thank you.

Shri P. G. Sen (Purnea Central): I come from a portion that is just below the Himalayas—Purnea—and the people over there are opposed to a man to this transfer recommended by the SRC. You have been pleased to give me an opportunity to speak and I am thankful to you, for giving me a few minutes' time.

I say that that portion of land contains three to four lakhs of Muslims, and we have been charged with fomenting communal frenzy. I say that from that portion, three MLAs have been returned to the Bihar Assembly, and an area predominantly Muslim has sent two of its Hindu representatives. You can just imagine what this joint electorate has done.

I am bold enough to say that we are being charged with this communal tension and communal frenzy to be provoked. You would not have seen me here if this sort of things are prevalent in Purnea. Claims and counter-claims have for years been pouring in our ears and the electorate is sufficiently enlightened over this question. You must know that my opponent who backed out from the Congress took up this issue to fight me. Thank God I came out victorious with an overwhelming majority. Just think of the position there.

There is a weekly organ "Rashtra-sandesh" in Purnea that is being published by the District Congress Committee. I will read one or two lines from the issue dated 12th December, 1955.

Mr. Chairman: I am afraid there is no time for all that.

Shri P. G. Sen: You are always afraid. But the Members are otherwise interested to hear me.

The headline says:

किसानगंज में सत्याग्रह—सभाओं और जलूसों की घूम

Is it communal frenzy? Is it communal tension? This population comprising there to four lakhs do not want to be transferred to West Bengal either on administrative grounds or on the ground of geographical contiguity or on any other ground including defensive purposes. We are hearing here that it is required for defensive purposes. May I ask you whether, if it is required for defensive purposes, it does not require the depth of a State? Will it not be a very fallow type of land and will that serve your defensive purposes?

Then again I have been hearing the argument about language. I say I had to learn Kaithi. Kaithi is the script. They speak Surajpuria. As regards the boys who go to schools, Muslim boys read Urdu and Hindu

boys read Devnagari. I tell you I had to learn Kaithi first. My father knew Kaithi, but he never knew Devnagari script. You will find mention there also that Kaithi is the script. Still, they claim that it is a Bengali area. There is no meaning in it.

Then they want it on the ground of geographical contiguity. This point has been hammered. I ask, will those sullen and disgruntled people be very good men, when they say that they do not want to leave their own surroundings which they have created for themselves? These people who have been living in their hearts, the SRC Report has made them to live in their lips. Now, they have launched a peaceful satyagraha there. About 1082 persons have been arrested. You do not like to hear that. But that is a fact, and the fact cannot be ignored.

Then again the argument that we are in India and there should be oneness and integrity has also been hammered in our ears. That is why I tell you that you would not have seen me here but for this oneness and integrity.

The question is this: if the question of Bengal is to be tackled, the solution lies elsewhere. There is a bottleneck and that bottleneck is at the Sakrigalli Ghat. There should be a bridge at Farakha. Until and unless you solve the problem of transshipment, the question will not be solved and contiguity will be meaningless.

Then again, our Chief Minister has been charged...

Mr Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up. (*Interruptions*)

Shri P. G. Sen: This is a very vital thing. The SRC has also expressed its grave concern. The Commission has said that the Muslims of that area would view with concern the transfer of that area to West Bengal. No one had told you this. Still it is in the SRC Report. How can you still say that we have propagated communal frenzy? The revered Pandit H. N. Kunzru saw the demonstrators—lakhs and lakhs of people. He took out a

car and went to the interior, and then he interviewed the people and asked their opinion.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary: Is it palatable to know the truth?

Shri K. K. Basu: Even then he has recommended.....

Mr. Chairman: I must call on the next speaker.

Shri P. G. Sen: One minute more.

The Chief Minister of Bihar has been charged. Thought, when expressed, is half murdered. And what remains in a part of a sentence? Only a part of a sentence remains. I will read it. He says:

"We have been accused in some quarters of encouraging, and even inciting, communal feeling among the Muslims. This I assert, Sir, is a wholly false and vicious accusation. We have not said a word, and we shall not say now, about the position of Muslims in West Bengal."

These things must be taken with reference to the context in which he said them. Such things should not come out from responsible persons, especially from Members of this House.

Shri B. Das (Jajpur-Keonjhar): Perhaps I would be the last speaker before the hon. Home Minister replies to the long debate for over 9 days. When the States Reorganisation Commission was appointed, I welcomed it not only because it will adjust boundaries of certain States—I am an aggrieved man; I come from Orissa and I want certain boundaries to be adjusted—but I thought our Constitution needs amendment. Our Constitution wanted a unitary Government and so the States were formed. But I find that the Members of the different States are talking as if they are parts of a federal Government and not of a Union. They are talking not of the unity and security of India but they are talking of individual States. I never thought that the States Reorga-

[Shri B. Das]

nisation Commission Report would create such bitterness and controversy as it has. Now, the hon. Home Minister will reply and I do not forecast what he will say. But the Home Minister, as the head of the internal security of India has the sole right to look into the controversies that are being stated on the floor of this House and also in the Press and see that a proper award's given by Government.

Even through my friend Shri Giri is for a World State yet he wanted certain portions of two areas from Orissa. He even went to the extent of saying that the Government of India should depute special officers to decide and settle the boundaries.

Whatever the States Reorganisation Commission's view may be in the matter the Constitution guarantees certain protection to the linguistic minorities. When the Fundamental Rights gave the right of education to the minorities in the mother tongue they did not tie down anything. There were conferences but nothing has been done. The constitutional guarantees to linguistic minorities must be given and every group of individuals speaking a certain language must receive primary education in their mother tongue. The Oriyas have been living in different States and the Governments of those territories be it Madras, be it Andhra, be it C. P. or Bihar, had not bothered to carry out their part of the responsibility. Therefore, there should be constitutional guarantees.

As I said, I am speaking for Orissa and I would like to quote here the resolution passed unanimously by the Orissa Legislative Assembly on the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission. If I quote those few lines, that sums up my views and perhaps the views of many thoughtful people. That resolution says:

"While appreciating and accepting broadly the general principles on which the States Reorganisation Commission have passed their recommendations in their

report for the solidarity and National Unity of India, such as:

- (1) One class of States in the whole country,
- (2) Abolition of the office of Rajpramukhs,
- (3) Safeguards for protecting the interests of linguistic minorities,

this Assembly notes with deep regret and disappointment that the Commission has completely ignored the claims of Orissa so far as the readjustment of its boundaries is concerned. A perusal of the recommendations reveals that the Commission have not given any consideration to the facts and arguments advanced by the State Government in their memoranda in regard to the matter.

"This Assembly, therefore, urges upon the Government of India to review the recommendations of the Commission in the light of the just and legitimate claims put forth by the State Government in their memoranda and take such measures as are necessary to readjust the boundaries of the Orissa State so as to integrate with it the areas claimed, particularly, the Sadar and Seraikela sub-divisions of the Singhbhum district in Bihar, the Phuljhar Zamindary Area (Mahasamund Tahsil A), Bindhra-Naugarh (Devbhog), Sankara tract and four tahasils of Bastar, namely, Jagadapur, Kondgan, Dantewara and Konta in Madhya Pradesh."

As I have said, it is for the hon. Home Minister, who must see that the internal security of India is maintained, to adjust the boundaries be it of Orissa, be it of Bengal or Assam or be it of any other State. Here we have shown our temper against one another but the Government must consider the final shape and adjust the boundaries of all these States.

The Prime Minister told us the other day that there is a lot of controversy and dispute over boundaries. He said that there should be zonal Advisory Councils for groups of five States. I welcome that suggestion and I welcome that India should be divided into five groups where people can discuss as representatives of State Governments and States people in an advisory capacity, of course, but not those five States should be governed by one Council. The Central Government that is super-imposed should be the Union Government of India. Thereby a certain amount of goodwill may be generated and there will be harmony among the groups of States and the people of those States. Perhaps this bitter controversy, this exhibition of the bitter controversy which we have seen will not exist after five years.

I would like again to refer to the hon. Member Sri V. V. Giri who spoke about Orissa. During 1932-34 after great efforts and discussions between the Members from Orissa in the old Legislative Assembly and the Council of States and the hon. Members of the then Madras Presidency, part of Parlakiuedi States was put in Orissa by agreement. It is a small portion. The statement which was made on that subject actually surprised me. This morning, it was said by the Maharaja Saheb of Patna that the Telugu population of Thoraput District there was 6½ per cent. Sri Giri is advocating for one World State and how can they claim these bits from Orissa.

The States Reorganisation Commission was a necessity. But the implementation of their recommendations on safeguards may be postponed for another five years. The Central Government must be a unity Government. People are already talking as it is all complete autonomy in their States, as if they do not live on the charity of the Union Government. The States now existing or to be formed live on the charity of the Central Government on the distribution of money for their expenses and for planning and development. It is no

use for the people thinking in that way as if they are independent Governments. It will go against our national unity, solidarity and security. I do hope that whatever the disputes on boundaries be, they will all be decided by the Home Ministry and the Government in a satisfactory way. The safeguards mentioned in the last chapter of the SRC Report should be incorporated in the Constitution and the Constitution must be amended. I hope that probably in the next session, the hon. Home Minister will bring a Bill to amend the Constitution to fit in some of those recommendations contained in the last chapter. I am particularly anxious that the Linguistic minorities and their children must have primary education in their mother tongues in every State. No State including Orissa should think that it is doing some charity for these small linguistic minorities. I do hope that the hon. Home Minister may tell us something about their attitude towards the safeguards and when the Constitution (Amendment) Bill will come.

Mr. Chairman: There are just about two minutes more for the hon. Members to speak. I shall give two or three minutes to one hon. Member and then I shall call upon the hon. Home Minister. Shri R. R. Shastri.

श्री आर० आर० शास्त्री (जिला कानपुर मध्य) : मुझे इस समय कोई इस विषय पर व्याख्यान देना नहीं है। मैं तो केवल इस लिए दो मिनट के लिए बोलने के लिए आया हो गया हूँ कि श्री आर० एन० सिंह के भाषण से कहीं एक गलतफहमी न पैदा हो जाय और उस गलतफहमी को दूर करने के वास्ते मैं बन्द एक शब्द सदन की सेवा में रखना चाहता हूँ।

अभी तक जितने भी भाषण उत्तर प्रदेश के मेम्बरों के यहाँ पर हुए, सब ने एक स्वर से उत्तर प्रदेश के विभाजन का विरोध किया है। लेकिन प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी की तरफ

[श्री धार० धार० सास्त्री]

उत्तर प्रदेश के केवल एक सज्जन ने बोलते हैं। उस की मांग की कि उत्तर प्रदेश का विभाजन होना चाहिए और वह हमारे मित्र श्री धार० एन० सिंह हैं। एक सज्जन ने मुझ से पूछा कि इस सम्बन्ध में प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी की क्या राय है और क्या पार्टी की वही राय है जो श्री धार० एन० सिंह ने इस सदन में रखी? मैं उसके लिए सिर्फ इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो कुछ उन्होंने यहां पर कहा है वह उनकी निजी राय है और यूपी० की प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी की राय विभाजन के एकदम विरुद्ध है। उत्तर प्रदेश की विधान सभा ने भी इस तरह का प्रस्ताव पास किया कि उत्तर प्रदेश का हरगिज़ विभाजन नहीं होना चाहिए और वहां किसी ने भी उसके खिलाफ़ बोट नहीं दिया। जितने भी सदस्य उत्तर प्रदेश के विभाजन के लिए बोले हैं वे सब उत्तर प्रदेश के बाहर के हैं, उस प्रान्त के किसी मेम्बर ने विभाजन की मांग नहीं की है। उत्तर प्रदेश एक है और वहां की जनता उसको एक बनाये रखना चाहती है। अगर किसी कोने से एक आध शस्त्र ने उसकी वकालत की भी है तो वह ऐसे लोग हैं जो कि राजनीति से अलग होकर घर बैठे हुए हैं और राजनीति में पुनः अपना स्थान बनाने के लिए इस तरह की मांग पेश करते हैं। विभाजन के लिए उत्तर प्रदेश की जनता की मांग कदापि नहीं है और न ही किसी राजनैतिक पार्टी की ही ऐसी मांग है और खास तौर पर प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी की वह मांग नहीं है जो कि यहां पर श्री धार० एन० सिंह ने पेश की।

Shri K. K. Basu: Before you call upon the hon. Home Minister to speak, I want to clarify one point. We have no motion on which we are going to take vote. There is a motion for discussion and the discussion has just concluded. I would only like to know

this. Whatever the hon. Home Minister is going to say—is it the opinion of the Government or is it his personal opinion or reaction? Government have said that they have an open mind and I want to know whether they have come to any conclusion after hearing the discussion here. That point has to be clarified.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Distt. West): That open mind is being clarified now.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): I trust that he will have no grievance with me after listening to me.

I had the privilege of initiating the discussion on the States Reorganisation Commission's Report some days ago and I am very glad to have this opportunity of making a few remarks at this stage.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

The grand debate that has been going on since the 14th has established parliamentary records which will ever remain blazing in the annals of democracy and of our own Lok Sabha. During the 54 hours that this discussion has been continuously going on, nearly 125 speakers had occasion to express their differing points of view. I have with your permission, Sir, to congratulate the House for the high level that has been maintained throughout this discussion. I wonder if other Parliaments which have had very long experience have shown equal ability, eloquence, restraint, dignity and decorum.

A lot of latent talent has been revealed during this discussion. Hon. Members sitting in the back benches or the benches that lie between the front and the back have almost shown unrivalled capacity for argument and for lucid exposition of their views. They could perhaps well surpass some of those like me who happen to be sitting here.

Our country's experience so far as democracy is concerned is only a recent one. It has had a rich heritage and many hallowed traditions have come down to us, but democratic institutions have grown only in recent years. This Parliament has had hardly a life of more than six years since the introduction and adoption of our Constitution. Still it has shown that maturity, that sagacity and that perspicacity of which any House could well be proud.

I should also, Sir, thank you for the admirable way in which you have regulated the course of the debate. Every section of opinion had the opportunity of giving full vent to its feelings and to reason out its own case. Besides, no point was missed and no irrelevancy was tolerated or introduced. This is something which is unusual even in discussions over ordinary subjects.

But, this particular Report and the proposals that are contained in it had not only roused sharp controversy, but had in some places given ground even for commotion, turmoil and disturbances.

Hon. Members have strong feelings. Here, they represent not only their constituencies but are also influenced by the strength of their own convictions. Yet, though forceful, virile and sometimes vigorous in the expression of their opinions, no one has transgressed the limits of decency and dignity. That questions of such a controversial character which have convulsed many parts of the country should have been discussed in such a calm, dispassionate and, yet, forceful way, is a tribute to the hon. Members of this House and to the adaptability and capacity of our own people and of our Members for learning and practising good things.

Sir, this success in democracy is not merely a political achievement. Democracy is no doubt linked with

political organisations, but the peaceful method of approach is at the base of democratic success; and the qualities that we have inherited, that our people have inherited, serve to point the way towards the achievement of the best that democracy could possibly yield. Along with freedom of thought, freedom of action and freedom of decision for matters of a personal type we have also acquired the art of expressing our own views in an unhampered way. And yet we are always prepared to submit to the verdict of the majority without sulkiness, resentment or cussedness. It is these qualities which fit in with the democratic way of life.

The tolerance that has been the characteristic of our country, the readiness to appreciate other man's point of view and the spirit of accommodation, adjustment and adaptation that has been the main feature of life in this country from yore enables us to get prepared for a successful working of democracy. It is because of these gifts that we were able to hold elections on the basis of adult suffrage without any sort of a disturbance or ripple on the surface in any part of the country. Nowhere else in the world had so many millions gone to the polls with a complete right to indicate their choice in a free and unfettered manner, without anybody ever interfering with them.

This House has been working since the coming of independence. Many are its achievements which have resulted in marked progress in social, economic, educational and cultural spheres. But the way the debate has been conducted on this Report reveals the inner impulse which throbs in unison with the tenets of democracy.

Sir, we have seen the discussion in the course of the last ten days being conducted with due regard for the views of the Opposition. The nature of the discussion, the differences that have come to the forefront and the earnestness with which hon. Members have pleaded for their own different

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

points of view must have brought home to them the complex and the intricate character of the problems that the Commission had to handle. When hon. Members with every desire to appreciate the view of their own colleagues, neighbours, comrades and friends have not been able so far to reach agreed decisions and these differences have persisted inspite of their natural desire, I believe, to resolve and compose them, one can understand how difficult must have been the task that was entrusted to this Commission. That will enable us to appreciate the good work that they have done in a realistic and, perhaps, in a vivid way. The Commission have handled these questions in an objective, balanced and sober manner. Neither passion nor prejudice nor bias has come in their way. Nobody here, I think, imagines that they were influenced by any extraneous considerations. So, once again, I would like on behalf of this House to place on record our appreciation of their labours.

It is inevitable that in matters of this type which have been the subject of prolonged controversy the proposals or recommendations do not commend themselves to all parties at one and the same time. But the fact that such recommendations have been made with the best of intentions in order to advance the cause of the country cannot be disputed. The Commission had placed before itself the principles which were to guide it in its scrutiny and examination of the entire material which had bearing on the issues it had to tackle. The Commission naturally took utmost pains and left no stone unturned. Besides hearing thousands of esteemed citizens travelling over thousands of miles, studying thousands of documents, they had also taken special care to consult again and again those who were in a position to assist them, except perhaps the members of Government. So, the Commission did all it possibly and humanly could, to arrive at correct conclusions. I am not surprised that their proposals have not been accept-

ed unanimously and universally. Otherwise, it will be an inane world in which such live issues could be so easily and summarily disposed of. Our people have their virility. They have their vitality and they live in different regions. So, it is but natural that the Commission's recommendations should not have been tamely accepted by every one. But, while trying to examine those proposals, assessing the reasons and grounds on which they are based with due care, we should not forget that the Commission consisted of persons who are widely respected. The recommendations were of various types, but they were based, as I said, on certain principles. These principles were indicated initially in the resolution which was issued when the Commission was appointed. They were also declared on the floor of this House by the Prime Minister and it has to be borne in mind that nobody ever raised any question against the propriety, soundness or correctness of those principles. So, unless we find that these principles were wrong or that in their application the Commission had tripped or followed a perverse course, we have to examine the proposals in the light of the criteria set forth by them.

I have seen little discussion in this House about those principles. I infer that generally the House is in agreement with them and that the consensus of opinion supports them. If it be so, the task becomes a bit lighter. Then one has only to see whether these recommendations do or do not satisfy the tests laid down by the Commission. If they do, they have to be accepted at least till something better is evolved. If they do not, we have reason to single out the particular direction which has not been observed and see that the necessary changes are made accordingly. But the approach has to be an integrated one. All the criteria and all the tests that have been laid down have to be simultaneously applied. To single out one of them and to leave the others is naturally to get into a trap, for, if a number of

tests are prescribed and only one of them is borne in mind, then, the approach is partial and can be said to be vitiated. But looked at from this point of view, I presume that the recommendations of the Commission generally will be seen to be sound. I am not yet in a position to give expression to any views on behalf of Government. Those will be reached in the course of the next few days and will be embodied in the Bill that we hope to place before this august Parliament some time in the latter half of February. In the magnificent speech that the Prime Minister made the other day, he made it clear that none of us are yet in a position to make any announcement on behalf of Government. We have been continuously giving thought to this thorny subject. We have, however, only one desire. Now that this House has discussed this matter at such length and is seized and possessed of the varying series of opinions over these proposals, it should be possible for the hon. Members who are commonly interested in different issues to meet together and to reach an agreement. For, whatever we may do, however sound be our decisions, unless they carry with them the support of the legions of the country and of its various parts, the States will not have a very auspicious start. They will be faced with difficulties at the very outset. Even if the start be good, the States will have their teething troubles, but we should not aggravate the malady or add to it. It should be our effort to see that agreement is reached wherever possible and the area of difference is reduced to the minimum. If we do not do that, the debate that we have held here will not have yielded adequate and commensurate results. I would appeal to hon. Members now to examine the proposals in the light of the observations and criticisms made by those who hold views different from their own and then to see whether any middle-course can be devised; whether anything can be accepted and whether we can now make a start with the unanimous goodwill and support of everyone in this House. Delay in

these matters leads to complications. It does not reassure people and it adds to the arena of dispute. Many things which were not indicated when the Report was published have lately been pressed forward with great vigour. If we allow this mental attitude to grow, then the chances of reaching an agreement become more and more slender. After all, whatever the local legislative assemblies may do, this great House owes a responsibility to the whole of India. It cannot afford to look at things from an acute or an obtuse angle. It is an angle that should necessarily be right. And, if it is right, there is no reason why the conclusions reached collectively by the House should not be sound. So, as the Prime Minister reminded us the other day, everyone who is here does not represent a tiny corner of this land, but the vastness of this country; its traditions, its aspirations, its faith and its hope in and for the future. So, everyone has to approach the sacred task with a determination to find a satisfactory solution.

The Commission, while closing its Report in the last chapter, laid emphasis on the unity of India. I imagine that every hon. Member in this House understands and appreciates the significance of the unity of India. No region can prosper unless the security and the unity of India are completely ensured and guaranteed for today, for tomorrow and for ever. So, that should be the first, the foremost and the dominating consideration. In this land of diversity, sometimes people are apt to be taken in by the superficial features. What we see in different regions only indicates the richness of our culture. So, we have to adjust our regional affinities with national interests and demands. That is what the Commission was asked to do. Every individual, every citizen, every region must have unfettered scope for progress, for self-expression and for self-advancement. There should be no hindrance, no obstacle, no impediment in the way. So, if we look at these things from a comprehensive and adequate aspect, if I may say so, then

[Pandit G. B. Pant.]

there will be no difficulty in reaching satisfactory conclusions. But, if we ignore the supreme demand of unity and allow ourselves to be caught up in different separate isolated units, then our future will be bleak, if not black. So, let us remember what the Prime Minister told us about this aspect. I believe that every Member here realises that. In fact, our days of glory were the days of our unity. We sent our messengers to countries far and wide 2,500 years ago. After that too, whenever we were united and integrated, we not only raised the level of life in our own country, but we did something also for others. And, our independence was unique. So was the other chapter of darkness. The British established their empire in our country not by their strength, might or prowess, but because of our compartmental divisions and sectarian tendencies. Little by little they grabbed and swallowed up everyone. Now, we have to guard ourselves. While the States have to be carved in accordance with their natural affinities, the supreme objective of strengthening the unity, the cohesion of the nation and the country has to be given the first and foremost pivotal consideration. I noticed the applause with which the casual suggestion of the Prime Minister that there should be four, five or six regional councils in the country was hailed by the House. That indicated in a way that whatever may have been the approach to start with in the course of the discussion, hon. Members had come to realise the dangers that lie ahead if we concentrate too much on regional affinities, whether of language or culture and ignore the fundamental basis of our very existence. That idea had been hailed by the House and it will receive a concrete shape. I am not yet in a position to say how it will ultimately materialise. But, at least we can have councils with advisory powers or status. So far as the economic and developmental requirements of the country are concerned, these linguistic affinities do not mark the bounds of the various territories. Rivers do not

determine their course in accordance with the languages of the people living on their banks. Mountains do not determine their height in accordance with the languages of the people who make them their homes. The mines that lie deep down in the bosom of the earth do not follow any regional pattern, much less any linguistic pattern. So, for the purpose of economic development at least, if not for anything else, it would be desirable to have Councils of this type. Besides, they would serve to heal the wounds that separation may cause in some places. Old friends may divide on account of this reorganisation. Yet, they may be bound together through these Councils. And this the process of reorganisation and integration and economic advancement could coalesce and synchronise. These Councils seem to have a great future. But, all great things have small beginnings. We shall, for the present, give them a start and see that they go on growing from strength to strength, gaining more and more power through fellowship, through understanding, and through mutual regard for the needs and welfare of each other.

6 P.M.

As I said a few minutes ago, I am not in a position to say anything on behalf of the Government. But, I have followed the trend of discussions here and I find, as I said, that there appears to be agreement in this House about certain matters: matters which seem to me to be of great moment. I have already referred to the principles on which the recommendations are based. There are other Parts, especially Part IV, which deals with linguistic safeguards and measures, that have been devised and suggested for strengthening the unity and integrity of the country and of the various regions. No one has said anything against those recommendations. The safeguards are meant for the protection of linguistic minorities, for ensuring fair recruitment to the public services, and opportunity of receiving instruction through the mother-tongue.

for owning or cultivating land, for taking part in trade and business and other things. As hon. Members know, our Constitution recognises only the citizenship of India. It does not recognise the citizenship of U.P. or Delhi, or for the matter of that, Bombay or Calcutta, great cities in their own ways, but yet tiny places as compared to this vast, big and ancient land. Everyone of us has today the good luck and the good fortune of calling himself a citizen of this great country, of calling himself a partner in the sovereignty of this land along with all others who live in it. That is a status of which any one could be proud and one could not have wished for anything better or superior. It is not only that. We have, besides, thanks to our leadership, acquired a place in the international sphere which we did not expect even in our dreams. Through these principles of co-existence and peaceful approach towards problems, we have made a mark on other countries and also on the field of international diplomacy. So, let us, while examining these proposals, remember the responsibility that we owe to our principles, to our avowed declarations. Let us guard against any charge of insincerity being levelled against us. For, if we fail to observe in the domestic field what we ask others to follow in the international field, that contradiction would look extremely anomalous if not worse. We have to bear all these things in mind.

So far as these proposals are concerned, we have to remember that what is necessary is not only full scope for the progress of culture, language, etc., in a particular State, but also for the maximum development of the personality of every single citizen living in every nook and corner of this land. If we keep that in view, then, we have to attach considerable importance to these safeguards, and also to the other suggestions that have been made, such as the recruitment to these All India Services from all over India, and the allotment to one State of at least one-third of the recruits from others. Similarly, in the case of High

Court Judges, inter-state transfers should now be allowed. The Public Service Commissions, it has been suggested in the report, should be appointed by the Central Government. There was a difference of opinion in the Chief Ministers' Conference and they did not approve of it. There are also suggestions for the centralisation of certain services, such as the Service of Engineers, Health Services, Forest Services, etc. It is really strange and somewhat odd that today there should be restrictions in some of the States against the acquisition of property by persons who have not lived in those States at least for 20 years and who cannot guarantee that till their death they will live there and die on that soil and nowhere else. These things have to go and every citizen has to get equal opportunity everywhere. All these barriers, to the extent possible, should be demolished and removed. Whether you are in one region or another, as an Indian citizen, you should have equal right with every one else. That should be our goal and to the extent possible, we should carry out this policy. It becomes much more necessary now.

I hope that when these regional areas are carved out, most of the work will be done in the regional languages. We want these languages to thrive, to prosper, to grow rich. But, we have also to remember that while linguistic divisions may facilitate the conduct of public work within the borders of the respective States, the urgency of having a common language for inter-regional communication and for Central purposes is all the more emphasised and marked out. It will be necessary for people living in different regions to cultivate the languages of other regions, and at the same time for all to cultivate Hindi so that people may be able to carry on their tasks, whether commercial, industrial, or official, through a common medium. It is not a question of one language or of the other. But we want a common medium. We will need it for trade; we will need it for business; we will need it for commerce, and we will need it

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

above all also for unifying the various regions which will, to some extent, be now separated from each other.

Having dealt with the main points, I may say a few words about what perhaps interests many of the Members here more, *viz.*, the different States. As to that, I am not going to say anything about the minor questions—I say, minor, in the sense that they are relatively confined to border areas, and do not suggest the complete merger of one State in the other or complete reformation of any particular State.

So far as the formation of new States is concerned, with respect to some, I think the consensus of opinion is for reorganising them, such as Karnataka with Mysore included in it. Similarly, about Kerala, there seems to be a general opinion that Kerala should be formed.

Shri Matthen (Thiruvellah): No.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I said, generally. 'Generally' provides for the possibility of some dissensions.

An Hon. Member: That is only a lonely voice.

Pandit G. B. Pant: So far as the new Madhya Pradesh is concerned, I admire the ingenuity of the Commission, because I like big things.....

Shri V. G. Deshpande: There is sharp difference of opinion regarding Madhya Pradesh.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I am giving my summing up of the collective opinion of this House. The opinion, so far as I have been able to study it, generally of the Members of this House seems to be in favour of the new Madhya Pradesh. As I said, I like it, because we will have a State bigger than Uttar Pradesh. And I wish that there may be many States bigger than Uttar Pradesh, because I have lived and laboured in Uttar Pradesh, and I have enjoyed the advantages that

accrue from being in charge of the administration of a big State. I know what it means, and I know what benefits flow from it, benefits which harm nobody, but which advance all who live within that State. So, I would like still bigger States to be carved out, because then the economy is stabilised, the weaknesses of one are made up by the strong points of the other, and there is the need, the imperative need, of developing and cultivating a spirit of accommodation and understanding. Otherwise, we cannot function in the midst of millions of people. There is no room for narrowness and for a carping sort of—I would not say meanness, but—pettiness in big States and among big people. So, I like this proposal. As I said, I would warn again that I am not speaking for Government.

But in spite of being a Home Minister, I think I have not lost my individuality, and it has not been merged completely, hopelessly or irrevocably, in the office that I hold. So, in certain respects I still continue to cherish certain things, and to try to form independent opinions.

Then, as to the other two States, Punjab and Bombay, I hope that agreed solutions will be possible: I cannot see why they should not be possible.

As to Punjab, there are Sikhs and Hindus living in every village, in every town.

Shri M. P. Mishra: In every family.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Their hamlets, their houses and their palaces had joined each other. There can be no happiness in the land, whatever be the mechanism that you may devise, unless all of them join together and bind themselves with indissoluble ties of fellowship and comradeship. The people of Punjab are virile; they are also shrewd. I would not

like to say whether they are deep or not. Depth is not always a covetable quality. But they can manage things very well. And I do not see why they should not succeed in evolving something which will hearten us, and strengthen everyone there. But whatever be the formula that is devised by others, it is difficult to get at anything unless the close neighbours who live together in hamlets and hutments, houses and palaces, share a common outlook, and accept or devise or propose that formula jointly; for, if it were a compact block within which all were agreed, there would be no difficulty.

We are anxious, I may say, to give satisfaction to the Sikhs. They are a brave people. They have—if you look at it from a narrower point of view—saved the Hindu religion from time to time by their sacrifices. They have raised the standard of valour, bravery and courage in this land. So, we have nothing but affection and respect for them. But it is our duty to see that the arrangements that are made do really ensure to their advantage and lead them to greater joy and sweetness and progress in life. If these are denied, then no formula can serve a useful purpose.

I think, so far as Himachal Pradesh is concerned, opinions differ. Some are in favour of merging it in the Punjab. Others are against it, while the people of Himachal Pradesh themselves, so far as the proceedings of their Legislature indicate, are in favour of maintaining their separate existence. The question has to be considered, taking into account all these relevant factors.

So far as Bombay is concerned, I think this House devoted the major portion of its time to the discussion of problems connected with Bombay. It is but natural. Bombay holds a place of pride in our country. It is worthy of all the attention that can be bestowed on this great city, and the people who are concerned with

it are also people to whom every citizen of India has reason to be grateful. Maharashtra gave us Lokmanya Tilak, Gopal Krishna Gokhale and several other leaders who not only in the present but in the past led our country from step to step to this goal of independence. Gujarat will ever remain enshrined not only in the annals of our land but those of the world for having produced a Gandhi. So far as Gujarat and Maharashtra are concerned, we would have to do all that we can to see that a solution that is acceptable to all is devised and evolved. We are determined to do that, and we are determined to succeed in that. And if we fail, it will not be the failure of Gujaratis or of Maharashtrians, but of us all, because we must be able to serve them, to assure them that what we wish is the greatness of this country, to which they can contribute more than anybody else. To that end, we will do all we can. We will labour hard. The Gujaratis and the Maharashtrians complement and supplement each other's qualities. One has more of valour and, perhaps, the other more of discretion. But all have to go together. One may serve as an engine and the other as a brake. But that is how the train will march on and march faster and faster as it goes on. So we have to find a solution, and we shall find it.

The Commission recommended a bilingual State. They had occasion, I understand, to make vague suggestions—or clearer ones—from time to time about it. I have said more than once that personally, I am in favour of the bilingual State. But I am not in favour of anything that is not acceptable to Maharashtrians and Gujaratis. My own personal preference counts for little. What I would be prepared to accept is anything that they accept. This bilingual State has its merits, and I am afraid that it did not receive that dispassionate consideration which I wish it had received. The arguments which were advanced in support of this State

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

hurt the sentiments of Maharashtra leaders. And they are a sensitive and a proud people—I am using the expression in the good sense. They are intolerant of anything that smacks of humiliation, and for that, they have to be admired. So if some unfortunate words had not crept into the Report, I still think that perhaps the fate of this recommendation might well have been a different one. But in the prejudice created by certain observations which, unfortunately, happened, as I said, to creep into it, the proposal was, from the start, considered to be unworthy of any respectful attention or consideration.

Now after that, seeing that our Maharashtra leaders and comrades were not in sympathy with that proposal, the Working Committee, after due consideration, suggested another. I have noticed that responsible Members of this House have said that they have not rejected the Working Committee's proposal, though they are not enamoured of it. Well, in this political field, few are enamoured of anything, and often, we have to compromise with the second, third or fourth best. So it is there. But we wish, above all, that there should be goodwill behind every solution, and that all should meet together. Men like Shri Gadgil, who has given his entire life to the service of the country, men like Shri Shanker Rao, who has had only one vocation in life, that is the service of the people of this country, have to find a way out, that will lead to the progress of this country, and to the healing of wounds. Neighbours who have lived together for ages should not part in a fit of anger, passion or heat or hatred. We are there to help them, to assist them. There is Shri Morarji Desai, one of the purest of men which our country has produced. I do not see why these friends should not sit together and hammer out a solution. It will come, and it must.

Then there are other minor things which have also been the subject of

discussion in the Report and about which proposals have been made. Taking from the extreme east, the Commission had suggested the merger of Tripura in Assam. Well, opinion in Tripura seems to be generally against the merger, and in this House too, even Shri N. C. Chatterjee, I think, was against the merger of Tripura in Assam. So, all that has to be borne in mind:

So far as Assam itself goes, it has its problems, but they are more of a domestic character. Still it may be possible to consider whether any links cannot be forged to bring Assam and Tripura and Manipur closer, without in any way interfering with their autonomy. There has been a demand on behalf of Manipur, and also of Tripura, that they should be given some voice in the management of their affairs. I fully appreciate their wishes in that regard, and I hope something will be done towards that end.

The question of the tribal people has been, I believe, engaging the attention of some of the leading Members of this House. It has been constantly before Government. I have repeatedly said that it is my regretful belief that we have not done our duty by them. So, whatever from the States may take, I hope they will pay due attention to the needs and requirements of the tribal people and the Centre will also take an intimate and close interest in measures designed for their uplift.

From Assam next we come to Bengal, Bihar or Orissa. So far as these States go, there are certain matters affecting border areas or certain areas which may not be called border areas in these States which have to be considered and about which, I think, in this House a number of speeches have also been made. But, they call for very careful consideration and it is difficult for me to say which way the balance of opinion

in this House lies. They will have to be weighed in the scales.

Then, after these, we come to U.P. I have not much to say except that I plead for mercy, for generosity and also for charity of judgment. I would, however, assure the House, we do not want to have this U.P. if it comes in the way of the advance of a single State in this country. Let U.P. be broken to pieces if it can thereby serve the nation better. U.P. is not bigger than India and U.P.'s existence can be justified only so long as it succeeds in serving India in its present form and shape. Never will it depart from this ideal and once it does so, it will deserve to be broken up.

Then there is very little to say about Madhya Pradesh except that..

An Hon. Member: Vishalaudhra.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I am coming to that.

There is very little to say about Madhya Pradesh except that I would like to express my gratitude for the people of Madhya Bharat, Bhopal, Vindhya Pradesh, Ajmer, PEPSU and others whose entire States are now being merged in other States and who have willingly, to a large extent, agreed to accept the proposals of the Commission in the larger interests of the country. They have shown a commendable spirit. The people of Vindhya Pradesh, especially of Baghelkhand area desire to be tagged on to U.P. Well, I leave the judgment to this House whether their wishes should be accepted or not.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar): Hundreds of them are behind bars in V.P.

An Hon. Member: Those who want merger?

Shri Nand Lal Sharma: No: those who do not want merger.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I have not heard any report so far. But, if the reference is to the people who invaded the Council Chamber on a particular day and showed such an outrageous lack of taste in the matter, then, I must confess that I have little sympathy. If there are others, I would like to look into the matter and should be glad if I could have details.

I have also said about Ajmer. I wish to submit that in the case of these States that are being merged it will be the duty of the new States that are being formed to see that at least their capital cities do not suffer on account of their merger; some offices, the High Court, the Accountant-General's Office, the PWD offices, the Public Service Commission Office or something or other should be transferred to every one of these localities so that all of them may continue to enjoy the advantages which were theirs when they were smaller and confined to only a tiny bit of territory.

An Hon. Member: That applies to Kutch too?

Pandit G. B. Pant: That applies to every State that is being merged.

I would next refer to Gujarat and Saurashtra; but they do not call for any long discourse because they were prepared for the bilingual State and Gujarat and Saurashtra are now willing to accept the three-State formula too.

If there were any difference, then, it would be necessary to discuss the position. As it is, nobody here has said anything against it.

Having disposed of that and Bombay and Maharashtra, we come to Telangana and Kerala—and we have Malabar with it. I do not know how far the people of Malabar like the change. But the speeches delivered in this House do not indicate that there is any difference of opinion between the different segments that will constitute Kerala hereafter.

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

Hyderabad, as hon. Members know, has now been divided into three parts, some of the districts—Marathwada—going to Maharashtra, some going to Karnataka and some forming the new Telangana. The Commission had suggested that Telangana should be unified with Andhra after 5 years if two-thirds of the people are in its favour. *Prima facie* it does not seem to be in the interests of any smaller unit to be kept apart because the prospect of its being merged in another State comes in the way of the progress of both, and arrangements that are finalised in a way facilitate the progress of either and of both. So, theoretically, it would be much better if the two States could be unified now. Opinion in the House, so far as I have been able to analyse it, is by and large in favour of immediate unification.

An Hon. Member: No, no.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I am only trying to analyse but this does not conclude the matter completely. It still remains open to you to convert others.

Having disposed of this and having referred to Mysore, I wonder if there is any other State.

Shri N. R. Muniswamy (Wandiwash): What about Pondicherry?

An Hon. Member: What about Vidarbha?

Pandit G. B. Pant: There was a suggestion that Vidarbha should remain separate from the bilingual Bombay State. The working Committee suggested that Vidarbha and the other districts of Maharashtra might unite now and form a big Maharashtra State. This formula was placed before the country. We still think—I personally think, I must say—that it would be good if Vidarbha and other Maharashtra districts were unified just now and started together because there is

much in common and it should be possible for the people living in Vidarbha and in other parts of Maharashtra to reach an understanding among them. We are prepared to help them in the process and there is no reason why with our united efforts, we should not succeed.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: What about Delhi?

Pandit G. B. Pant: About Delhi? There is always shade under the lamp. It is not only because of the proposals that have been made regarding Delhi but also because I forgot Delhi altogether. I think there has been a firm opinion in this House and also outside that Delhi being the metropolis of India should have the advantage of guidance from the Centre. Delhi is lucky and Delhi's good luck will continue.

Shri Namblar (Mayuram): What about border disputes and border adjustments?

Pandit G. B. Pant: Border adjustments will be made and will be made in a satisfactory way; so that they may satisfy all reasonable people. I have refrained from making any rash and unreasonable observations, Sir, I thank you.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: May I know from the hon. Home Minister if his attention has been drawn to the proceedings of the Madhya Bharat Assembly supplied to us wherein he will find that 36 members have opposed the merger and only 26 have spoken in favour of the merger?

Pandit G. B. Pant: Yes; I take your word for it.

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I want to know from the hon. Home Minister with regard to the dispute between the Madras State and the Kerala State about Devikulam and Peermede.

Mr. Speaker: He has already said about the border disputes. They are minor points as he has said. I do

not think there is anything for me to put by way of a question to the House. But I find that there are some amendments tabled by some Members. Originally they were withdrawn. Subsequently I have received amendments from Dr. Jaisoorya.

Dr. Jaisoorya: I sent it before. I withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: So that is not pressed. I have not placed any of them before the House but I wanted to be clear. There is another by Shri Trivedi; I have not yet put it before the House. He is not here. So that falls through. Shri Sreekantan Nair is also not here. He has withdrawn his amendment. So, there is no amendment.

Now, before I adjourn the House, I should just give some statistical information. I entirely agree with the hon. Home Minister when he described the deliberations in this House as a great debate. It is great in every sense of the word. In all 124 Members have participated in this House by way of speeches and 145 hon. Members have sent in memoranda upto 6 P.M. today—that is the time limit fixed. So, there is further material for the hon. Home Minister—more of memoranda than speeches.

As generally the printing of debates takes a long time the Lok Sabha Secretariat is making special arrangements for quicker printing of these debates specially and I hope the debates and the memoranda will be before us—I cannot promise the time, but—not before long.

I must in the end thank the hon. Members for the co-operation that I had received in the regulation and conduct of the debate, though as

every day passed I was practically getting to the end of my nerves. I thank the hon. Members for the co-operation.

*Written Statements of Members

Shri Telkikar (Nanded): At the outset let me congratulate the S.R.C. for the bold decisions they had taken about the disintegration of Hyderabad State, the abolition of the institution of Rajpramukhs and the doing away with the distinctions between Part A, B and C States altogether. I also express my gratitude for joining Marathwada of Hyderabad State to the State of Bombay. No doubt they have done a splendid job and I join hands in paying S.R.C. a tribute they deserve.

But let there be no misunderstanding that we who disagree with the S.R.C. recommendations in any way doubt the capacity, the integrity and fitness of the personnel to deal with the question. It is not so. There is nothing wrong if some one does not accept the report *in toto*. After all, they too are human beings and are liable to err. It is the common experience of this august House to see that the Government Bills most carefully drafted by experts are being largely improved in this House. This is the very reason why Parliament is required to go into the merits and demerits of the report.

Now taking into consideration the short space at my disposal I will confine my statement to that aspect of the report which deals with the formation of 'Samyukta Maharashtra' with Bombay as its capital.

The S.R.C. report has suggested only 16 States instead of 27, out of

*Written statements of views of Members in regards to the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission—Vide Para No. 2710 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part II dated the 20th December, 1955.

[Shri Telkikar]

which 14 would be based on the principle of language as predominant factor. This clearly shows that the acid test would be the language and it would be set aside only in cases where other important considerations are offended.

Now let us see whether there are any principles liable to be offended.

(1) Linguistic and cultural homogeneity is there.

(2) People speaking one language, having the same culture, so far scattered in different States, but now craving to come together are bound to be united among themselves and as their desires are fulfilled their relations with the neighbouring States are also bound to be friendly. This unity among themselves and the surrounding States is a guarantee for security of India as a whole.

(3) According to the S.R.C. Report, Maharashtra will be deficit to the extent of Rs. 6 crores; but the Greater Bombay will be surplus to the extent of Rs. 12 crores. Therefore combined it will be a surplus State and financially viable. This is exactly the reason why Bombay the integral part of the State, should be made the capital of the State and not be cut off from its hinterland for balancing the economy of a State to which it has no geographical contiguity.

(4) According to the S.R.C. report the weight of the argument is in favour of larger States. Samyukta Maharashtra with a population of 3 crores and an area sufficiently large with adequate resources assume the responsibility of a full fledged State.

(5) As for the wishes of the people, the Marathi-speaking people of the city of Bombay and the States of Madhya Pradesh, Hyderabad and endeavour of different language Bombay, desire it in the heart of their hearts.

(6) In all the areas to be combined there is geographical contiguity.

(7) There are roads and railways joining every part of the State to be formed, thereby ensuring complete alignment of communications.

(8) In view of the fact that there are sufficient resources and all have agreed to come together and solve their problem amicably, the smooth working of the Plan is ensured.

(9) Even on the point of totality of circumstances governing this case, we do not see any unsurmountable difficulties in the formation of Samyukta Maharashtra with the city of Bombay as its capital. None of the principles enunciated by the S.R.C. is required to be offended. The House will excuse me if I submit, Sir, that if the formation of Samyukta Maharashtra has offended anybody according to report it seems to offend the Gujarati industrialists of the city of Bombay.

Now let us examine the arguments advanced against it.

(1) Marathi speaking districts of Madhya Pradesh do not subscribe to the idea of Samyukta Maharashtra therefore the Maharashtra opinion is by no means unanimous.

The other day President of the Madhya Pradesh Congress Committee, Shri Khedkar had given the true picture of Vidarbha. He emphatically asserted that the people of Vidarbha in general are prepared to join their brethren in Samyukta Maharashtra even though they are required to starve with them.

(2) It is not predominantly Marathi speaking unit and it has acquired its present position by the joint endeavour of different language groups and that cannot be legitimately claimed by one language group. These arguments would have

some validity if the city of Bombay had been situated on the border of the two linguistic States. There is no question of claiming Bombay by any language group other than the Maharashtrians for their own linguistic State. Gujaratis, the next language group in population in Maharashtra cannot claim it for the simple reason that the area they inhabit i.e. Gujarat, is at a distance of 100 miles from the boundaries of the Greater Bombay. If at all they are interested they are interested in depriving Maharashtra of their legitimate share for the sake of a section of Gujarati industrialists, the important section of the people referred to by S.R.C. Even the question of majority and minority of a linguistic group is irrelevant in a case like this. It is no doubt an important factor in connection with a city on border to decide to which side it should go. It is possible to have a city where 95% of the population may speak a language other than the language of the surrounding areas. Yet it cannot rightly be claimed that it should be a separate unity but the surrounding areas will have the right to retain it on the ground of geographical contiguity.

(3) The claim that it is developed by all, also sounds very strange. Africa is developed by Europeans and so Africans should not claim it. Hyderabad was built by the joint efforts of Marathas, Kannadigas, Telugus and Moslems. The money flowed from all the three linguistic areas of the State to develop that magnificent city. But our revered leader Swamy Ramanand Tirth taught us not to covet what legitimately belongs to others on the basis of geographical contiguity, even though it would have been possible to claim the city to be administered as separate State on the basis of the same grounds which are advanced in connection with the city of Bombay. But not even a single Maharashtrian or Kannadiga ever claimed it. Therefore I appeal to my

non-Maharashtrian friends in Bombay to allow us to have Bombay for our Capital for the very reason for which we justify Madras, Calcutta, Hyderabad and Baroda to be the part and parcel of the respective States of Madras, Bengal, Hyderabad and Gujrat.

(4) Nobody can understand how integration of Bombay in Maharashtra will lead to rapid decline in its importance. We are confident even after inclusion it will continue to be the meeting place of all communities and a convenient centre for their joint labour and enterprise. Maharashtrians are the largest single language group with a population of 44%. If Konkanis and 4% Mullims who speak the Marathi language are added to it the Marathi speaking population of the city would be 52%. It has been accepted that it is geographically an internal part of Maharashtra and if deprived of its hinterland its further growth would be arrested, that it depends on Maharashtra areas for power, water and space for its further expansion: so what are the conclusions arrived at by S.R.C.? They are:

(a) The constitution of Greater Bombay into a separate administrative unit will also not be free from serious difficulties. Its administration as a central enclave may be regarded as a retrograde step.

(b) It cannot be exclusively claimed by Gujratis as it cannot form part of Maha-Gujarat.

(c) If the separation of the city from Maharashtra is administratively not desirable, the effects on the growth and development of the city in future may prove to be equally adverse, if Greater Bombay were to form part of Maharashtra, but were administratively independent of Gujrat. The likely psychological dissatisfaction of the Gujrati and

[Shri Telkikar]

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

When all the arguments are in favour of Samyukta Maharashtra and when none of the principles laid down by S.R.C. is being offended, it is this possibility of dissatisfaction of Gujratis and other industrialists that has forced the S.R.C. to take the wrong decision of such a bilingual State, which does not satisfy the Marathi speaking areas of India as a whole. By this decision the Gujratis had the consolation of bringing together all the Gujratis in one State, but Maharashtrais had not even the satisfaction of all the scattered Marathi-speaking areas being consolidated in one State. Had that been the case, they would have accepted even the bilingual State as an experiment for the time being, on the insistence of S.R.C., but the S.R.C. did not do even that. We Hyderabadis are a backward community, and that is why our progress seems to be very slow. Marathwada people tired of the complications and difficulties arising out of the multilingual State of Hyderabad wanted to join the unilingual State of Samyukta Maharashtra, but the S.R.C. joined us to a bilingual State without Vidarbha. No doubt it was a progress from a multilingual to a bilingual State. Thanks to the Congress High Command, they went a step further and suggested the formation of Samyukta Maharashtra including Vidarbha, by which we shall now be able to get an unilingual State, and also our desire to come together will be satisfied. The only question of Bombay remains.

We firmly believe that our demand for the city of Bombay is just and we are confident to win in the long

run. Truth knows no defeat. And to refuse Bombay city to Maharashtra is to negate the aspirations of 30 million people. Can such a discontented people strengthen the unity and security of India?

The S.R.C. has praised Maharashtrais. I assure the framers of the report and the leader of the House that they will stand to the test. I love Maharashtrais, being one of them, but I love Gujratis more. They are of a compromising nature. There can be no greater compliment to them than the fact that they have given us—India—nay to the whole world a great personality, the father of the Nation—Mahatma Gandhi. Who is there in India who is not proud of him and proud of the community which has produced him.

Maharashtrais and Gujratis are the contestants. The S.R.C. is anxious to ensure that the legitimate aspirations of the Maharashtrais are met. Congress High Command, with the best of intentions is trying to find out the solution. Our demand for the city of Bombay is just and in case it is accepted we have shown our readiness to accept any conditions for the sake of ensuring the safety and welfare of the minorities. Above all, our beloved leader Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the prince of peace, is sure to settle the problem to the entire satisfaction of both the parties and by the time we meet again in the Parliament we shall see that the problem is solved. With this confidence I conclude my statement and appeal to this august House to support our just demand which will be a great service to the country and the nation.

Shri Chattopadhyaya (Vijayvada):
The re-organization of States heralds the birth of a great new India. It is a momentous step we are about to take—and, therefore, it is

urgent, most urgent, that the step we take be with extreme caution and careful calculation. One wrong step—and the Re-organisation of states might lead to a Dis-organisation showing us all into one single state—of panic, mutual hatred, heart-burning and disruption.

There are some who have ardently advocated the putting of this whole business of States Re-organization into cold storage. I fear, that those who do so are not aware of the fact that history often forces the hands of men and nations—and forces us with its own demands—the fulfilment of which no power on earth dare challenge or stop. The Logic of History often runs contrary to the logic of men. Even the Prime Minister admitted this yesterday when he said that force of circumstance; which is the force of history—compelled him to accept the disintegration of Hyderabad contrary to his wish. So, on this historic occasion—we need to approach this burning problem historically and not hysterically. I am certain we are all today out on a magnificent venture and adventure—and are anxious to reconstruct our country on a basis of friendship, understanding, co-operation and a large all-India vision. I am also sure that our Government at every step, will be dispassionate and ruthlessly just—and—in the larger interest of the country as a whole—will not allow reasons of the continuance of its old *status quo* to come in the way of its; final decision based on a clear cut well-balanced judgment.

We have heard many speakers all these days—almost a century of speakers, both eloquent and otherwise, who have talked out the problem almost threadbare. We have even heard a somewhat unbalanced case for a balanced-State—we have heard of this, that and the other. One hon. member talked of Maha Telangana. Why should we not come to a compromise, and call the new merger of Telangana and Andhra—

Maha Telangandhra. It might have a favourable psychological effect—especially on the minds of those in Telangana, who might still entertain suspicion and doubt. Maha Telangandhra! What's in a name? A state by any other name would be a state. But levity apart—I should like to dwell only on the aspect of Vishalandhra for two reasons. The first reason is—that I was born and bred in Hyderabad—though not educated there. In fact, I have never been educated, I am one of the few privileged ones of my class—who have escaped the handicap. The second reason is that during my electioneering campaign I had given the people of Andhra the passionate promise of the formation of Vishalandhra in the course of a few years. Today, I almost stand before as a prophet, the proverbial prophet who is not honoured in his country. But it had nothing really to do with prophesy but stern Historic Logic which carries with it its own unalterable and impeccable calculations.

The disintegration of Hyderabad has, for a long time past, been a foregone conclusion. Ever since Police Action, during my frequent visits to Hyderabad. I have felt very strongly that—although the disintegration on the surface, was neither visible nor obvious—that disintegration had already started in the hearts of the people there, we welcome the disintegration of Hyderabad and the removal of the Raj Pramukh who, for in the past, had accumulated along with his wealth, ill-fortune of ill-deeds resulting in the hatred and enmity of the people of Hyderabad. The logic of such disintegration, is simultaneously the logic of reintegration.

I wish to congratulate the Commission on its most eloquent arguments for the formation of Vishalandhra. Every syllable of it is worth its weight in gold. Every detail of that argument is irrefutable. Certainly, the

[Shri Chattopadhyaya]

Commission has argued the case with far greater weight than the various advocates have so far done. But then you will remind me there are also arguments offered against the formation of Vishalandhra. But, they are hardly worth any consideration—overriding the arguments of the Commission in favour of Vishalandhra. There are only two arguments advanced against Vishalandhra and both of them seem most unfounded and highly imaginary.

Certain sections in Telangana are afraid of the domination of the advanced areas of Andhra. This, I take it, is a most unfortunate and unnecessary Inferiority Complex—why, for that matter. All over the country there is an uneven economic and cultural development. It is nothing new. To oppose the unification of a Linguistic Group on such an illusory basis is madness.

The argument of disparity in the social and agrarian legislation of these two areas of Telangana and Andhra—and the period of Five Years suggested—to level the disparity. This is the high water mark of childishness and absurdity—what sort of argument is it. During the coming five years, the Andhra State, if kept apart and separate—would also register further advance side by side with Telangana. If the horse which has had a clear lead of past two years, is not going to stand in one spot for two years to come, in order to give the other horse a chance of running neck to neck with it. Since, Sir, the Andhra State was created two years ago—during which it has already reached a certain point of progress. If kept apart the question of building a Capital at Karnool will arise—which means a fabulous waste of Capital...and the creation, at the same time of separatist and disruptive tendencies. You will see then, that these two arguments offered against the formation

of Vishalandhra are hardly arguments at all.

Further—let me remind the House that two-thirds of the Legislators, after the 2nd General Elections—shall have to agree to the merger of Telangana and Andhra in the formation of Vishalandhra.

This two-thirds principle, which is most mischievously significant, has, in no case throughout the entire country, been imposed on any other disputing Parties, for example, Vidarbha, Himachal, the merger of Bhupal and in fact, all other States which are arbitrarily recommended to be amalgamated into "this, that or the other States."

It is a healthy sign,—a sign which we do not notice too often—that the Congress Working Committee has awakened to the reality of the situation and contrary to expectation and the Commission's Recommendation, recommended, without equivocation, the formation of Vishalandhra here and now. Our demand goes a step further and asks for an immediate unhesitant decision for the implementation of the recommendation.

You will ask, perhaps, how can we push it down the throats of the people? What people? The Government of Hyderabad stands for Vishalandhra—an overwhelming majority of the Members of the Hyderabad Legislative Assembly have expressed themselves in favour of Vishalandhra. Even two-thirds of the Members hailing from Telangana have joined in the chorus. We want Vishalandhra. The entire Andhra Legislative Assembly and all political Parties in Andhra, including the Congress Party, has joined in the grand chorus. We want Vishalandhra. So, if in the face of such a united demand, a narrow stratum of vested interests raises its funny voice against the formation of Vishalandhra, let us not fall into the

error of mistaking it for the mighty and resounding voice of the people themselves.

Since the Prime Minister has unequivocally expressed himself in favour of Vishalandhra it seems to me a foregone conclusion that there will not be any more argument against it and even if a cry be raised here and a cry there, it would only prove to be a voice in the wilderness.

The time has come for us all to reconstruct our great country, in the process we have to break—not destructively but constructively.

All birth involves travail, the sense of travail prevailing throughout the country is the inescapable proof of the birth of a great new India—a greater India which is about to mark a new era for the countries of the world.

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga Central): I wish to place on record my deep appreciation of the hard work that the members of the S. R. C. have done in connection with the reorganisation of States which was entrusted to them by the Government of India.

No one can deny the importance of the sound and solid principles and the various factors suggested by the Commission on which the reorganisation of states in India should be based.

The Central idea of national unity and security and the general welfare of the people concerned have been rightly made the basis on which the political geography of India should be shaped.

They have tried their best to weigh all relevant factors and considerations such as national unity, security, administrative, economic, financial, geographical, historical, linguistic and cultural. They have tried to carve out such units as will be viable from all points of view.

But great as the task was the Commission has in some cases failed to apply sound principles and the result

has been unjustified proposals. I welcome most of the recommendations regarding safeguards for minorities as also the suggestions for creation of All India services of Engineering, forests and medicines.

I have heard the arguments advanced by my West Bengal friends in the Parliament for amalgamation of certain areas of Bihar. The States Reorganisation Commission has recommended the transfer to West Bengal of an area of about 800 square miles in the Purnea District with a population of 3 to 4 lacs. It has also recommended the transfer of the Sadar Sub-division of Manbhum minus one Thana. The area proposed to be transferred from the Sadar Sub-division of Manbhum is about 3,000 square miles with a population of about thirteen lacs. Let me tell the House straightaway that on no ground the proposed transfer is justified.

In the case of the transfer of a portion of the Kishanganj Sub-division, the ground of transfer given by the Commission is that this transfer would make West Bengal geographically a contiguous unit and that it would give West Bengal administrative control over the National Highways connecting the Central Bengal with North Bengal. The Commission has also said that this transfer would be convenient and desirable from administrative point of view and that West Bengal would get control of the Indo-Pakistan border in the eastern region along its entire length. The principle of corridor is dangerous and it cuts the very root of the national unity. The Constitution provides that any State can make full and free use of the National Highways. The West Bengal can, therefore, make use of the National Highways in the District of Purnea for going to North Bengal. No transfer of any area from Bihar to West Bengal is, therefore, necessary.

I may also mention that on the ground of language and culture the transfer of a portion of Kishanganj

[Shri Shree Narayan Das]

Sub-division to West Bengal is unjustified. Local dialect is admittedly Kaithi which is allied to Hindi and which is used all over Bihar. Hindi was the sole court language of the District even before Bihar was separated from Bengal. The record of rights has always been in Hindi. The local population has never asked for education in or through the medium of Bengali. The Commission also felt called upon to say that in view of the overwhelming evidence produced before it, that the predominantly Muslim population of the area would justifiably view with concern its transfer to West Bengal on the ground that their linguistic and cultural right might suffer and to recommend that on the transfer of the area to West Bengal, it would be necessary for the Government of that State to take effective steps for the recognition of the special position of Urdu in the area for educational and official purposes.

Social ties, marriages etc. of the people of this area are in the rest of Bihar and not in West Bengal. The transfer of this area will upset all this and will affect the social and cultural ties of the people of this area with the rest of Bihar.

The wishes of the people are definitely against the transfer of this area to West Bengal. They expressed their wishes against the transfer before the Commission by assembling before it in lacs. They have held thousands of meetings, taken out processions and passed resolutions in protest of the proposed transfer. They have offered *satyagraha* on this issue and courted imprisonment. Such are the wishes of the people. We cannot ignore their wishes and the recommendation of the Commission for the proposed transfer have, therefore, to be undone.

As regards the control of the Indo-Pakistan border by West Bengal, I may only say that West Bengal will not be able to make security arrangements in depth on another border in its State.

Now, I take up the case of the Sadar Sub-division of Manbhum. The Commission has rightly observed that the arguments advanced by Bihar against the transfer of this Sub-division are well balanced. The main ground on which this Sub-division is proposed to be transferred is that West Bengal has to execute some River Project on the river Kasai. The Commission has also observed that this river is of no real importance to Bihar and it is of considerable importance to West Bengal. I may point out in this connection that the Bihar Government has a Project to be executed in the Second Five Year Plan at a cost of Rs. 5.5 crores. This Project will irrigate about three lac acres of land in Manbhum and yet the Commission says that it is of no importance to Bihar. The execution of the Project by the Bihar Government will help the West Bengal Project in this river in its lower region. Where is, then, the necessity of the transfer of the Sadar Sub-division of Manbhum to West Bengal?

The Commission has held that no area having less than 70% of the speakers of one language should be transferred to another State and yet it has recommended the transfer of the Sadar Sub-division of Manbhum which has only 55% of the Bengali speakers. Most of whom are Bihari tribes and castes.

A part of Kishangunj Sub-division has been recommended for transfer to West Bengal by the Commission in order to provide means of communications and link between North and South Bengal but this principle is contradicted by the Commission while recommending the transfer of Sadar Sub-division of Manbhum to West Bengal. The industrial towns of Dhanbad, Jamshedpur, Muri and Ranchi will have practically no rail or road communications through Bihar if the Sadar Sub-division of Manbhum is transferred to West Bengal.

There is one important point, which I want to bring to the notice of the House. The Dimna Nala, a big water Reservoir which supplies water to Jamshedpur will go to West Bengal in the case of the transfer of the Sadar Sub-division of Manbhum. I ask the House to judge as to how far this will be fair to take away the source of water supply to Jamshedpur to West Bengal.

With the transfer of the Sadar Sub-division of Manbhum to West Bengal, Bihar will be deprived of its Tasar and Shellac industries and a large number of collieries.

पंडित एस० सी० मिश्र (मुंगेर उत्तर पूर्व) : मैं आपको धन्यवाद दिये बगैर नहीं रह सकता कि आपने मुझ जैसे कमजोर गले वाले को भी मौक़ा दिया कि चाहे वह अपने विचार राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग की सिफ़ारिशों के मुताबिक़ लिख कर दें । हमारी यह लालसा लगी ही रही कि इस लोक-सभा में भी कांग्रेस के सोशलिस्ट पैटर्न आफ सोसाइटी का नमूना थोड़ा बहुत देखता ।

हमारे देश की एक बड़ी बदकिस्मती इस ज़माने में यह है कि हमारे देश का प्रथम नेता हमारे देश की जनता के समकक्ष सोच नहीं सकता । उसकी सम्पूर्ण बनावट ही ऐसी है कि उसकी प्रथम प्रतिक्रिया जनता की प्रतिक्रिया के ठीक विपरीत ही हो सकती है और होती है । मैं यह नहीं कहता कि वे एक दूसरे पर लट्टू नहीं हैं । घन विद्युत और ऋण विद्युत जैसे एक दूसरे से विपरीत हो कर एक दूसरे से बड़ा प्रबल आकर्षण रखते हैं वैसे ही और सम्भवतः ठीक उसी कारण से हमारी जनता और हमारे नेता पंडित नेहरू में भ्रगाध और भ्रगाट्य आकर्षण है । लेकिन इसी कारण हमारे देश का बहुत सा सवाल जो जल्द इस ही शक़ता या देर से हल होता है, मसलन बेकारी को रोज़गार देने का सवाल, सुख

और सुविधा को बराबर बराबर बांट देने का सवाल, जनता की भाषा में राजकाज को उतारने का सवाल, बगैरह बगैरह :

मेरे यह बार बार दोहराने से भी कोई लाभ न होगा कि जनता का बोझ तब तक कम नहीं हो सकता है जब तक उसकी ही समझ की बोली में राजकाज कम से कम दफ़्तरों और न्यायालय का कार्य नहीं चलने लगे । समाज के ऊपरी स्तर को—पढ़े लिखे लोगों को—जन्हें श्रमानुपात से कहीं अधिक सुख और सुविधा भोगने की आवत लग गई है उसको वे त्यागना नहीं चाहते हैं । सम्हल कर हम बाहें जो बोलें गफ़लत में हमारा मन हमेशा उसी गौरव-शील अवस्था के लिये लालायित रहता है “दस बीस साल और पुनर्गठन कार्य रुका रहता तो क्या बिगड़ता”, “दोभाषिये राज्य राष्ट्रीय एकता में सहायक होंगे” बगैरह बगैरह जितने नारे हैं सब उसी भ्रन्तर्तम लालसा के उद्गार मात्र,—गरचे अनजाने हो सकते हैं ।

राष्ट्रवादियों ने जिस भ्रान्तरिक शक्ति को ३५ वर्षों से जागृत किया उसी को अब कांग्रेसी नेता सुला देना चाहते हैं । कुन्ती ने खिलवाड़ में सूरज देवता को बुलाया था कांग्रेस ने तो बहुत गांभीर्य के साथ इस जनशक्ति को जगाया और बुलाया था । अब पंडित जी मुझावज़ा दिये बगैर ही उन शक्तियों को सुला देना चाहते हैं, यह कैसे होगी ? हां, पहले भाषावार राज्य बना लें । बाद में रीजनल कौंसिल बना कर चाहें तो उनकी शक्तियां कम कर दे, लेकिन एक बार जब तक भाषावार राज्य गठित नहीं हो जाते हैं देश में तोड़फोड़ होते ही रहेंगे और हमारा बहुत सा वक्त जो दूसरे काम में लग सकता था वह बरबाद होता रहेगा

[श्री एस० सी० मिश्र]

यह जो पुनर्गठन आयोग ने पंजाबी भाषी राज्य को इन्कार किया है और महापंजाब का सुझाव दिया है वह क्या उसी असन्तोष और उसी संघर्ष को जिलाये रखने की सलाह नहीं है। दलील यह दी गई है कि सीमा पर बड़ा सा राज्य हो। महोदय, अंग्रेजी जमाने में भी पश्चिमोत्तर सीमा प्रान्त एक छोटा ही सूबा था और कच्छ गुजरात एवं मणीपुर आसाम छोटे से ही राज्य रहेंगे। सरहद की हिफाजत केन्द्रीय सरकार ही कर सकती है, बड़े से बड़ा सूबा उसे नहीं कर सकता। सिमाने पर एक बड़ा सा हचपच राज्य बना दीजिये तो सिमाने की हिफाजत किसी की नहीं रहेगी। सिमाने पर एक छोटा सा सिख राज्य कायम कर दीजिये, सिख जाति हमेशा अपनी यह जवाबदेही महसूस करेगी कि उसे सिमाने का पहरा करना है।

हिन्दू बहुसंख्यक पंजाब या बनने वाले महापंजाब को तो हमारे प्रधान मंत्री यह सलाह दे सकते हैं कि आप यह दिखाओ कि आप सिखों को भी सन्तुष्ट रख सकते हैं लेकिन सिखों को वे यह नहीं कह सकते कि लो, पंजाबी बोली का राज्य अलग बना देते हैं—अम्बाला के रोपड़ तहसीलों को लेता हुमा घग्घर नदी के उत्तर उत्तर हिन्दुस्तान की सीमा तक, पेप्सू के मुख्य अंश को लेते हुये और हिमालय को छोड़ते हुये—और अगर उसमें तुम्हारी यानी सिखों की मजॉरिटी (बहुसंख्या) होने वाली है (जिसका इस लेखक को बहुत सन्देह है) तो तुम यह दिखाओ कि तुम हिन्दुओं को भी सन्तुष्ट रख सकते हो। पंजाब हमेशा पांच नदियों का देश माना गया है। सिन्ध से सतलुज तक उसे घसीट कर हिमाचल और हरियाना में मिलाना पृथ्वी शास्त्र पर भी अन्वेषण करना है।

काश्मीर से नेपाल तक पहाड़ी इलाकों का एक अलग ही राज्य बनना चाहिये क्योंकि पहाड़ियों की अपनी भाषा है अपना रीति-रिवाज है अपनी स्वतन्त्र इकाई है। उन्हें नष्ट न कीजिये। भोजपुर हिमाचल प्रदेश, टेहरी गढ़वाल, पौड़ी गढ़वाल और अल्मोड़ा उनका स्वाभाविक क्षेत्र है उन्हें दे दीजिये। वैसे ही हरियाना वालों को पंजाबियों में नहीं धकेल कर ठेठ हिन्दोस्तान का अलग राज्य बनाइये। प्रधान मंत्री जी से कहिये, सन्देह, संकीर्णता और उसकान के वातावरण में पढ़कर प्रकृत पंजाब को इन्कार करने की भूल न दिखावें। सिखों पर थोड़ा भरोसा रखें। सिखों को राष्ट्रिय बनाने का सबसे बड़ा तरीका यही है कि उनका होमलैंड बनता है तो उसे बनने दें और उन्हें कहा जाये कि अल्पसंख्यकों को सन्तुष्ट रख के दिखा दो। हालांकि होने वाला यह है कि अगर यथार्थ में पंजाबी भाषी क्षेत्रों का राज्य बनाया गया तो सिख निरपेक्ष बहुसंख्या में नहीं होंगे—उन्हें दूसरों के साथ मिल कर ही राजकाज चलाना पड़ेगा।

दिल्ली के आसपास का इलाका, हिन्दी की चार बोलियों का इलाका—खड़ी, बांगरू, ब्रज और कन्नौजी बोलियों को मिला कर ठेठ हिन्दोस्तान का सूबा बनायेगा। अम्बाला से शाहजहांपुर, कुरुक्षेत्र से कानपुर, हिमालय की तराई से करौली धौलपुर; यानी बांगरू भाषियों का करनाल, रोहतक और हिसार; खड़ी बोली का मेरठ और रुहेलखंड डिवीजन मय भाषे अम्बाले के; ब्रज भाषियों का मथुरा, अलीगढ़, आगरा मय भरतपुर, करौली, धौलपुर के (जो करौली, धौलपुर, भरतपुर इस समय राजस्थान में जुड़े हुये हैं) कन्नौजी बोली का कानपुर, कन्नौज इटावा और फर्रुखाबाद एक बढ़िया और सुन्दर 'ठेठ हिन्दोस्तान'

राज्य बनात हैं, जिसकी राजधानी मेरठ दिल्ली या आगरा हो सकती है ।

ठेठ हिन्दोस्तान से दक्षिण ग्वालियर को राजधानी बनाते हुये बुन्देलखंड का राज्य बनना चाहिये, जिसमें मौजूदा मध्य-भारत के पांचों उत्तरी जिले, उत्तर प्रदेश का झांसी, जालौन, हमीरपुर (यमुना से दक्षिण का इलाका), विन्ध्य प्रदेश का औरछा, पन्ना और दतिया, मध्य प्रदेश का सागर, दमोह, नरसिंहपुर होशंगाबाद और छिन्दवाड़ा शामिल होंगे । यह राज्य प्रस्तावित ठेठ हिन्दोस्तान से दक्षिण नर्मदा यानी महाराष्ट्र राज्य तक फैलेगा और पश्चिम में राजस्थान को छूता हुआ प्रस्तावित दक्षिण कौशल राज्य या मौजूदा जबलपुर इलाके तक जायगा ।

मौजूदा उत्तर प्रदेश के बचे हुये मध्य हिस्से यानी लखनऊ और इलाहाबाद के इलाके, बुन्देलखंड यानी रीवा और छत्तीस गढ़ इलाकों को लेते हुये महा कौशल राज्य बनायेगा जिसकी राजधानी मजे में इलाहाबाद हो सकती है । राजकीय सुविधा एवं भूविद्या के अनुसार अगर इसे बहुत लम्बा इलाका माना जाये तो इसके दो भाग हो सकते हैं—उत्तर कौशल जिसकी राजधानी लखनऊ रहे और दक्षिण कौशल जिसकी राजधानी जबलपुर बने । यों आप देखेंगे कि मेरी प्रस्तावित योजना में यू० पी० और सी० पी० उत्तर प्रदेश को मिला कर चार राज्य बनाये गये हैं जो आकार, जनसंख्या आदि में दूसरे राज्यों से बहुत बेजोड़ नहीं होंगे ।

क्रूल इसके कि मैं बिहार की तरफ बढ़ूँ मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग ने जो उज्जैन को मध्य प्रदेश से जोड़ने की राय दी है वह बेहूदी और

इतिहास विरोधी है । बीकानेर का किसान सदियों से अपने ढोर डंगर को मालवा हांफता आया है जब कभी उसके यहां अकाल पड़ा है । वह पंजाब को अपना अंश नहीं जानता । मगर मालवा को जानता है । नदियां जैसे पृथ्वी के ढलान के अनुसार मार्ग पकड़ती हैं वैसे ही पुराने युग की जनपद या महा जनपद बनाने वाली जातियां भूशास्त्र और अर्थशास्त्र के ढलान के मुताबिक ही अपना फैलाव लिया है । भाषा की एकता के साथ आप जो हमेशा आर्थिक सम्भावना (इकानामिक वायेंबिलिटी) के उपपद को जोड़ते रहते हैं उस अपव्यय को रोकिये । पुरानी जातियों का फैलाव आर्थिक और भौगोलिक आधार पर ही हुआ था और इसी से एक भाषा भाषी प्राज भी आर्थिक और भौतिक सम्भव आधार पर ही हैं । मध्यभारत का मालवा अंश यानी उज्जैन, इन्दौर, भेलसा, भोपाल और खंडवा राजस्थान में धरीक होना चाहिये जहां भरतपुर, धौलपुर और करौली राजस्थान से अलग हो जाना चाहिये ।

बिहार की ओर बढ़ते हुये मैं एक बात कहूंगा । उत्तर प्रदेश के गोरखपुर और बनारस कमिश्नरियां मुख्यतः भोजपुरी बोलने वाले हैं जो भोजपुरी आपके राष्ट्रपति जी की बोली है । इन पांचों छहों जिलों का आहार भेष और विचार बिहारियों जैसी है । १९४२ के गदर में भी यह साफ हो गया था और पंडित जवाहरलाल जी को भी मानना पड़ा था कि बिहार का भाई चारा किसी से है तो उत्तर प्रदेश के पूरबी हिस्सों से है । मैं यह नहीं कहता कि आप इन दोनों कमिश्नरियों को बिहार में ही दीजिये मगर ये प्रकृत एकता बनाते हैं बिहार के साथ उत्तर प्रदेश के साथ नहीं । गोरखपुर देवरिया का मजदूर (रिक्सा खींचने वाला); बलिया गाजीपुर का किसान

मिर्जापुर का लाठीवाल जितना आपको बिहार के शहरों और गांवों में मिलेगा उतना उत्तर प्रदेश के पश्चिमी या मध्य जिलों में नहीं ।

बंगाल बिहार के दावों प्रतिदावों के बारे में मैं कुछ नहीं कहूँ तो पंडित जी के शब्दों में "पैरोशियल" (स्थानीय) होने का दोष लगेगा । पुरुलिया यानी मानभूम जिले में निश्चय ही ऐसे लोग हैं जो बंगाल में जाना चाहते हैं लेकिन पूर्णिया के किशनगंज सब डिवीजन का एक एक मुसलमान बंगाल में बांधे जाने के बजायें मौत के गले बांधा जाना ज्यादा पसन्द करता है । उसे भय है पूरब पाकिस्तान में रोज दिन होने वाले धक्के मुक्के का असर उसके ऊपर ही पड़ेगा और हमेशा उसका जान माल खतरे में रहेगा । मानव भावना अगर कोई चीज है तो सदन में बैठे हर बंगाली बेरादर को मैं यह सोचने के लिये आह्वान करता हूँ जिसमें वैज्ञानिक मेघनाद शाहा भी शामिल हैं कि क्योंकि किशनगंज के हर मुसलमान के दिल में इस बात की टीस पैदा कीजिये कि बंगाल के मुस्लिम बहु संख्यक हिस्से यानी पूरब पाकिस्तान से तो वह अलग रखा गया और अब मुस्लिम अल्प संख्यक बंगाल पश्चिमी बंगाल में बांधा जा रहा है । पाकिस्तान की कचक बार बार उनके हृदय में पैदा न कीजिये । वे वफ़ादार हिन्दोस्तानी नागरिक बन चुके थे और बिहार के साथ पाकिस्तान से लड़ते भी मगर बंगाल के साथ तो हमेशा वे देशद्रोही और लांछित ही माने जायेंगे । बिहारी भाइयों से भी मैं कहता हूँ कि उन अंशों को बंगाल में फौरन जाने दीजिये जहां मतगणना लेने पर दो तिहाई लोग या ६० प्रतिशत भी बंगाल में जाना चाहें । हां, इतना प्रबन्ध कर

लीजिये कि सीमा के पास दस बीस मील तक जो लोग इधर या उधर हटना चाहें सम्पत्ति समेत हट जायें—बंगाल हिमायती बंगाल की तरफ़ चले जायें और बिहार हिमायती बिहार की तरफ़ ऐसी इजाजत दे देने से ही बहुत सा आक्रोश मिट जायेगा और सम्भवतः कोई इधर उधर भागेगा भी नहीं । लेकिन ऐसा रास्ता नहीं निकाल दिया गया तो दंगे भी हो सकते हैं और घसीटा घसीटी भी बढ़ सकती है ।

समाप्त करन से पहले क्योंकि आपने दो पूष्ठों की हद बांध दी है, यह कहना न छूटे कि बम्बई को अलग राज्य बनाना या दू भाषिया राज्य बनाना वैसा ही प्रयत्न है जैसा कि सिखों को अपने में नहीं माने देना । अहिंसा अहिंसा जपते जपते कहीं हम ऐसे बानिया तो नहीं बन गये कि सिख मराठा नाम से ही हमारी कंपकंपी छूटने लगती है और हम बगलें झांकने लगते हैं । मिहरबानी करके ऐसी कोई कारवाई न काजिये जिससे मराठों या सिखों में यह भावना फैले कि उनका सम्पूर्ण विश्वास नहीं किया जाता है और उनके उद्भव को तरह तरह से रोका जाता है । कच्छ और काठियावाड़ के साथ गुजरात का राज्य अलग बनाइये और बम्बई समेत संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र को अलग ।

दक्षिण के भाइयों को तो मुबारक देता हूँ कि उन्होंने चाहे मारकाट मचा कर ही सही, तामिल तेलगू, मलायालम और कन्नड़ के अलग राज्य बना ही लिये । वे फूल फूलें और भारत के मुकुट को सुशोभित करे । आमीन !

वंदित डी० एम० तिबारी (सारन—
दक्षिण) : गत एक सप्ताह से जो दृश्य इस

सदन में दृष्टिगोचर हो रहा है, वह अभूत-पूर्व है, ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि यदि इस अवसर का उचित उपयोग न किया गया, तो हमें जीवन भर पछताना होगा, जिन लोगों ने, देश की स्वतन्त्रता के लिये, सहर्ष अपने सर्वस्व का होम कर दिया था, वे ही आज परिस्थिति के प्रकोप से विखिन्नकारी प्रवृत्तियों के शिकार हो रहे हैं, और राष्ट्र की एकता संकट में पड़ गयी है। तरह तरह के भेदभाव हमारे देश में निरन्तर पनपते जा रहे हैं, और स्वाधीनता संग्राम के काल में हमने जो बल अर्जित किया था, वह क्रमशः क्षीण होता जा रहा है। अपनी संकुचित दृष्टि के दोष से हम वृक्ष के मूल के बदले उसकी डालियों को सींच रहे हैं। यदि ठीक समय पर मल का उचित पोषण न हुआ तो यह भांशका है कि डालियां अवश्य सूख जायेंगी और हमारा राष्ट्र रूपी वृक्ष मृत-प्रायः हो जायेगा।

में ऐकिक राज्य पद्धति (युनिटरी फार्म ऑफ गवर्नमेंट) को मानने वाला हूँ। इस सदन में, इस विषय की चर्चा होने के बाद, मेरा यह विचार और भी दृढ़ हो गया है कि यही शासन पद्धति हमारे देश के लिये उपयुक्त है, इतिहास के अनुशीलन से यह पता चलता है कि अतीतकाल में भी भारत में इस शासन पद्धति का प्रयोग सफलतापूर्वक किया गया था। सम्राट अशोक, चन्द्रगुप्त मौर्य तथा मुगल बादशाह अकबर के शासन-काल में, इस प्रकार के प्रयोग किये गये थे। निस्सन्देह, उस युग और वर्तमान युग में बहुत अन्तर है, किन्तु फिर भी, मेरा विश्वास है कि राष्ट्रीय एकता के आदर्श को अपना कर, हम भारत में ऐकिक राज्य की स्थापना सहन कर सकते हैं। इतिहास से हमें यह भी शिक्षा मिलती है कि यदि हम अपने देश में अनेक राज्यों को अलग अलग

विकसित करने का प्रयास करेंगे तो पार-स्परिक भेदभाव और संघर्ष का बढ़ना अनिवार्य होगा, इसका परिणाम यह होगा कि हमारी राष्ट्रीय एकता नष्ट हो जायेगी और भ्रान्तरिक दुर्बलता के बढ़ने पर वैदेशिक आक्रमणों की आशंका भी, स्वभावतः बढ़ेगी। इसलिये हमें पूरी शक्ति लगा कर विखिन्नकारी प्रवृत्तियों को रोकना चाहिये। इसका एकमात्र उपाय यही है कि सम्पूर्ण देश में एक ही शासन सूत्र रहे। हमारे प्रावर्णीय नेता और प्रधान मंत्री पंडित जवाहर-लाल नेहरू ने भी इस विचार का समर्थन किया है और कहा है कि सम्पूर्ण देश को ५ क्षेत्रों में विभक्त कर दिया जाये और प्रत्येक क्षेत्र बहुभाषी हो। ऐसे आयोजन से देश सुदृढ़ होगा, यदि वर्तमान स्थिति में यह नवीन व्यवस्था सम्भव न हो, तो राज्यों का पुन-संगठन निश्चित सिद्धान्तों के आधार पर ही होना चाहिये, ताकि किसी को कोई शिकायत न हो। इस प्रसंग में, मैं आपका ध्यान अपने पड़ोसी देश पाकिस्तान की ओर आकृष्ट करना चाहता हूँ। वहां राज्य के विभिन्न हिस्सों को एक सूत्र में बांधने का अच्छा प्रयास हो रहा है।

यदि राज्यों का पुनसंगठन सर्वमान्य एवं निश्चित सिद्धान्तों के आधार पर किया जायेगा, तो देश की एकता बनी रहेगी और विभिन्न राज्यों का पारस्परिक सद्भाव भी बना रहेगा।

बिहार, पश्चिम बंगाल और उड़ीसा राज्यों के सीमा निर्धारण के विषय में, मेरा विचार है कि ऐसा कोई आयोजन नहीं होना चाहिये, जिससे कटुता और मनो-मालिन्य की वृद्धि हो। यह बात सत्य है कि १९११ ई० तक बिहार, बंगाल, उड़ीसा और आसाम एक ही प्रान्त के अंग थे। यदि वे पुनः एक साथ मिलाये जा सकें तो

पंडित जे. ए. सिन्हा]

ग्रन्था है । किन्तु यदि उन्हें अलग अलग रहना है, तो उन्हें भले पड़ोसी की तरह परस्पर सम्भाव और बन्धुत्व के साथ रहना चाहिये और उन्हें एक दूसरे का भ्रंग-भंग कर लाभ उठाने का लोभ नहीं होता चाहिये । जिस समय बिहार, उड़ीसा और आसाम बंगाल के साथ थे, उस समय हर जगह बंगालियों का ही दबदबा था । उस समय बंगालियों की जो दर्दनाक अवस्था थी, उसकी चर्चा कर मैं बुझी हुई भाग को भड़काना नहीं चाहता । मैं तो सिर्फ़ यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि अब हम सभी लोग भाई भाई की तरह रहें और परस्पर स्नेह एवं सहानुभूति का भाव रखें । एक दूसरे की झुर्राई कर स्वयं लाभ उठाने की कुचेष्टा नहीं करनी चाहिये । बिहार अपने क्षेत्र के बंगालियों के साथ जो व्यवहार कर रहा है, उसका प्रमाण तो यही है कि हमारे राज्य से अनेक बंगाली सज्जन इस सभा में आये हैं, किन्तु क्या पश्चिमी बंगाल के दार्जिलिंग, जलपाईगुडी, मालदा आदि हिन्दी भाषी क्षेत्रों से भी कोई भ्रबंगाली सदस्य निर्वाचित आ है ?

आज, बंगाल के नेतागण, हिटलर की नीति का अनुसरण कर, अपने राज्य का विस्तार करना चाहते हैं । वहाँ के समाचार-पत्र बहुत शक्तिशाली हैं, उनके बल से वे अपने स्वार्थ साधन के निमित्त घनघोर प्रचार कर रहे हैं, और प्रचार के द्वारा सत् पर पर्दा डाल कर अपने दुर्बल पक्ष को सबल बना रहे हैं । जब १९१२ ई० में बिहार और उड़ीसा का प्रान्त अलग हुआ तो बंगालियों का ही बोलबाला था । इसलिए यह नहीं कहा जा सकता कि उस समय जो क्षेत्र बिहार में रखे गये, वे बिहारियों के दबाव से रखे गये । १९३६ ई० में जब उड़ीसा बिहार से

अलग हुआ तो बिहारियों ने कोई भी आपत्ति न उठाई, बल्कि सहयोग प्रदान किया है ।

आज भी न्याय और श्रौचित्य की मांग यह है कि पश्चिम बंगाल के हिन्दी भाषी क्षेत्र, जिनमें दार्जिलिंग, जलपाईगुडी, दीनाज-पुर, और मालदा प्रमुख हैं, बिहार में मिला दिये जायें । हमने इसके लिये आयोग के समक्ष स्मृतिपत्र प्रस्तुत कर मांग भी की थी । किन्तु आयोग ने हमारी मांग पर ध्यान नहीं दिया । फिर भी, हम हो-हल्ला नहीं मचा रहे हैं । किन्तु पश्चिम बंगाल, बिहार के कुछ सीमावर्ती क्षेत्रों को हड़पने के लिये व्याकुल है । और इसके लिये नाना प्रकार के कुचक्र रचे जा रहे हैं ।

भारत के विभाजन के फलस्वरूप बंगाल प्रान्त दो भागों में बांटना पड़ा, इससे बंगाल का क्षेत्रफल अवश्य घट गया, किन्तु, यह कहना अमपूर्ण है कि विभाजन के कारण पश्चिमी बंगाल की आर्थिक स्थिति बिगड़ गई । वस्तुतः यह विभाजन पश्चिम बंगाल के लिये वरदान सिद्ध हुआ और उसके फल-स्वरूप वहाँ की आर्थिक अवस्था और भी सुदृढ़ एवं उन्नत हो गई । पश्चिम बंगाल में अविभाजित बंगाल का ४० प्रतिशत क्षेत्र-फल रह गया । किन्तु जनसंख्या का केवल ३६ प्रतिशत अंश उसे मिला । इसी प्रकार, राजस्व सम्बन्धी वार्षिक आय के ४४ करोड़ रुपये में से ३१ करोड़ रुपये अर्थात् दो-तिहाई अंश पश्चिम बंगाल को मिले, यद्यपि जनसंख्या का केवल एक तिहाई भाग ही मिला । फलतः विभाजन के कारण पश्चिम बंगाल की आर्थिक स्थिति बहुत सुधर गई, बिगड़ी नहीं । बिहार और पश्चिम बंगाल की वर्तमान आर्थिक स्थितियों का तुलनात्मक अध्ययन करने पर यह स्पष्ट पता चलता है कि पश्चिम बंगाल बिहार से बहुत आगे है ।

पश्चिम बंगाल में प्रति व्यक्ति राजस्व पन्द्रह रुपये से अधिक है, जब कि बिहार में लगभग साढ़े आठ रुपये हैं। पश्चिम बंगाल में प्रति व्यक्ति व्यय प्रायः सोलह रुपये है, जबकि बिहार में लगभग साढ़े सात रुपये मात्र है। सामाजिक सेवाओं के निमित्त पश्चिम बंगाल प्रति व्यक्ति पांच रुपये व्यय करता है। पश्चिम बंगाल का विकास सम्बन्धी प्रति व्यक्ति व्यय साढ़े सात रुपये है, जबकि बिहार में केवल ४ रुपये हैं। इस से यह स्पष्ट है कि बिहार की आर्थिक स्थिति पश्चिम बंगाल की तुलना में बहुत बुरी है। अतएव, पश्चिम बंगाल की स्थिति को सुधारने के अभिप्राय से बिहार के किसी भी भाग को पश्चिम बंगाल में मिलाना कदापि उचित न होगा। उड़ीसा की धोर से बिहार के सिंहभूम जिले पर, विशेषकर सरायकेला-खरसांवा सबडिवीजन पर, जो दावा किया जा रहा है, उस के विषय में मुझे यह कहना है कि उड़ीसा और बिहार के निवासियों का पारस्परिक सम्बन्ध सदैव बहुत अच्छा रहा है। यह मैं बता चुका हूँ कि जब उड़ीसा बिहार से अलग हुआ, तो बिहार ने उस का स्वागत किया। यह बंद की बात है कि बंगाल के साथ साथ उड़ीसा भी बिहार के विद्यत हो गया है। उड़ीसा के दावे का खोजलापन तो इसी बात से स्पष्ट है कि राज्य पुनर्संगठन आयोग ने उसे खारिज कर दिया है। फिर भी, बंगाल के प्रचारकों से प्रोत्साहन पाकर उड़ीसा वाले भी बिहार विरोधी प्रचार कर रहे हैं और बिहार की भूमि को हड़पने की कुचेष्टा कर रहे हैं। सरायकेला-खरसांवा के विषय में, यह याद रखने की बात है कि १९४८ ई० में पहले उक्त दोनों देशी राज्यों के क्षेत्र उड़ीसा सरकार के अधीन रखे गये थे। किन्तु उड़ीसा वाले उन्हें संभाल न सके। फलतः गोलीकाण्ड हुआ और सैकड़ों आदमी मरे तथा घायल

हुये। जनमत के विद्रोह को देख कर, सरदार पटेल सदृश लोहपुरुष को भी अपना फैसला शीघ्र ही बदलना पड़ा। अब ऐसी कोई परिस्थिति नहीं उत्पन्न हुई है जिसके कारण उस निर्णय को पुनः रद्द किया जाय और उस क्षेत्र को पुनः उड़ीसा में मिलाया जाये, जो लखर बलीलें उड़ीसा की धोर से दो गई हैं, उन पर विचार कर, आयोग ने उन्हें खारिज कर दिया है, भाषा, संस्कृति, प्रशासन की सुविधा अथवा जनता की इच्छा, किसी भी आधार पर सिंहभूम जिले का कोई भी अंश उड़ीसा राज्य में कदापि नहीं मिलाया जा सकता। अतएव, मेरा निबन्धन है कि बिहार, पश्चिम बंगाल और उड़ीसा की सीमायें ज्यों की त्यों रहें, उनमें कोई परिवर्तन न किया जाय।

श्री विभूति बिष्य (सारन व चम्पारन) :
राज्य पुनर्संगठन आयोग ने बिहार के कुछ सीमावर्ती क्षेत्रों को पश्चिमी बंगाल में मिलाने का सुझाव दिया है, उस के विषय में अपने विचार प्रकट करने के पूर्व मैं आयोग के प्रतिबन्धन के संबन्ध सामान्य रूप से दो शब्द निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ, सब से पहले मुझे यह कहना है कि आयोग ने देश के विभिन्न राज्यों के पुनर्संगठन के लिये जो विविध सुझाव दिये हैं, वे किसी निश्चित सिद्धान्त के आधार पर नहीं दिये गये हैं, एक स्थान के लिये जो सिद्धान्त मान्य समझा गया है, वही किसी अन्य स्थान के लिये आयोग को अमान्य प्रतीत हुआ है, उदाहरण के लिये, "भाषा के आधार" के सिद्धान्त को आयोग ने सामान्य रूप से अनुचित माना है, फिर भी आयोग ने कई स्थानों पर भाषा के सिद्धान्त के आधार पर पुनर्संगठन के सुझाव दिये हैं, दूसरी बात यह है कि "जनता की इच्छा" के सिद्धान्त को आयोग ने अनेक स्थानों पर स्वीकार किया है और उसी के अनुसार अपने सुझाव दिये हैं, किन्तु कुछ अन्य स्थानों पर जनता की इच्छा की धोर अथवा सीमा की गई है,

[श्री विभूति मिश्र]

उदाहरण के लिये बिहार के प्रश्न को ही लीजिये, बिहार राज्य के मानभूमि और पूर्णियां जिलों के जिन क्षेत्रों को पश्चिमी बंगाल में मिलाने का सुझाव दिया गया है, वहां की जनता किसी भी दशा में पश्चिमी बंगाल में जाना नहीं चाहती फिर भी आयोग ने वहां की जनता की इच्छा के प्रतिकूल उन क्षेत्रों को पश्चिमी बंगाल में मिलाने की सिफारिश की है, मद्रास, आन्ध्र, विदर्भ, सौराष्ट्र, मंसूर, हैदराबाद, आदि के विषय में सुझाव देते समय, आयोग ने जनता की इच्छा पर पूरा ध्यान दिया है, किन्तु, बिहार की जनता की इच्छा की उपेक्षा की है।

पूर्णिया जिले के पूर्वी क्षेत्र को पश्चिमी बंगाल में मिलाने के पक्ष में आयोग ने यह तर्क दिया है कि पश्चिमी बंगाल के उत्तरी और दक्षिणी भागों को मौलिक दृष्टि से, एक साथ मिलाने के निमित्त पूर्णिया जिले के पूर्वी भाग को बिहार से काट कर पश्चिमी बंगाल में मिलाना आवश्यक है। आयोग ने इस बात पर पूरा ध्यान नहीं दिया है कि उक्त भौगोलिक एकता की अपेक्षा उस क्षेत्र के लाखों निवासियों की सुविधा का प्रश्न अधिक महत्वपूर्ण है। वस्तुतः पश्चिमी बंगाल के उत्तरी और दक्षिणी भागों के बीच सम्बन्ध स्थापित करने के लिये रजपथ, रेलपथ आदि की सुविधायें पर्याप्त परिमाण में सुलभ हैं। यदि उनमें कुछ कमी हो, तो उसकी पूर्ति की जा सकती है। जैसा कि श्री चक्रवर्ती राजगोपालाचारी ने, १९५१ ई० में, इस सदन में, भारत के गृहमंत्री की हैसियत से कहा था, भारत सरकार स्वयं उक्त क्षेत्र में परिवर्तन और यातायात की यथेष्ट व्यवस्था कर सकती है किन्तु, बंगालियों के लिये बिहार को विदेश मान कर, बिहार के कुछ भ्रंश को काट कर पश्चिम बंगाल में मिलाना उचित नहीं है। उक्त क्षेत्र के निवासी हिन्दू और मुसलम

हैं, उन्हें पश्चिमी बंगाल में जाना बिल्कुल नापसन्द है, वहां जाने पर उन्हें भाषा संबन्धी तथा विविध प्रकार की असुविधायें भी होंगी। जनतंत्र की मांग है कि उनकी सुविधा पर भी ध्यान दिया जाय।

मानभूमि बिले के सदर सब-डिबीजन (चास ऐबेन्व्यू थाना को छोड़ कर) को पश्चिम बंगाल में मिलाने के सम्बन्ध में, आयोग ने स्वयं यह स्वीकार किया है कि इस विषय में पक्ष और विपक्ष में जो तर्क उपस्थित किये गये हैं। वे प्रायः समतुल्य हैं। इस सुझाव के पक्ष में सिर्फ एक ही विशेष कारण बताया गया है। वह कसाई नदी सम्बन्धी तर्क है। आयोग का कहना है कि कसाई नदी बिहार के लिये उपयोगी नहीं है और पश्चिम बंगाल को उसका उपयोग करना है, इसलिये उक्त नदी की चाटी का क्षेत्र पश्चिमी बंगाल में मिला दिया जाय। यह तर्क बिल्कुल हास्यास्पद है और दुर्बल है, यह बात गलत है कि बिहार राज्य के लिये कसाई नदी उपयोगी नहीं है। हाल ही में, बिहार सरकार ने, अपनी द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना के अन्तर्गत कसाई नदी सम्बन्धी एक सिंचाई योजना स्वीकृत की है। इस योजना का कुल व्यय लगभग साढ़े पाँच करोड़ रुपये होगा और इससे मानभूमि जिले की लगभग तीन लाख एकड़ जमीन की सिंचाई होगी। इसके विपरीत बंगाल की योजना से मानभूमि की कोई लाभ नहीं होगा उस से बंगाल के अन्य क्षेत्रों को लाभ होगा। इसलिये इस तर्क के आधार पर मानभूमि जिले का कोई भी भाग पश्चिम बंगाल में नहीं मिलाया जा सकता।

अतः मैं यह अपील करता हूँ कि पश्चिमी बंगाल की मांग स्वरिज कर दी जाये और बिहार की सीमा में कोई हेर-फेर न किया जाये। बिहार का दावा मालदा दीनाजपुर, जलपाई-गुड़ी, दार्जिलिंग पर स्वीकार किया जाये।

उड़ीसा का दावा एक दम लिया है ।
उसको प्रायोग में खारीज किया है तो
एकदम सही है । मैं प्रधान मंत्री के
जोनल वाले सिद्धान्त को मानता हूँ ।

Shri Kanavade Patil (Ahmednagar North): This problem of State Re-organisation has affected more or less the whole of India. It is the duty of everybody of us at this critical hour to use language which will not excite or create passions. We should not overlook the unity, security and solidarity of India while we reorganise Indian States.

It has been generally accepted now that language is one of the important factors which the S. R. C. has taken into account while making proposals for re-organising States. It is the belief of many of us that the reorganisation of Indian States on the basis of language will strengthen and not weaken the Union of India. Many hon. Members in their speeches have narrated their experience of bi-lingual and multi-lingual States. In their opinion the basis of the new state must be primarily common language. They also use the world culture as one of the factors. I humbly submit that in fact India has common cultural and social traditions which have held all the different parts of India together up-till-now. The word "culture" is capable of being defined in several ways. I do humbly believe that we must not overlook that we are citizens of one common motherland and hence we are Indians first and Indians last. It is my submission that in our passions for creating linguistic States, we should not overlook the larger interest of India.

Keeping the above principles before my eyes I will now refer specifically to the case of Bombay State. In my humble opinion the High Power Commission has not take into account the most justifiable case of the people of Maharashtra for having Samyukta Maharashtra State with the city of Bombay as its natural capital. Arguments advanced by the S.R.C. Report

for keeping Bombay State as bi-lingual state excluding the Maharashtra from Vidharbha are not convincing at all. I entirely agree with the views expressed by Shri Deogirikar the Hon. Member of Council of State in his speech delivered in that House regarding the language and reasoning expressed in S.R.C. Report while making out a case for not giving Bombay in Samyukta Maharashtra.

Attempts have been made by certain Hon. Members to show that we Maharashtra are communal and provincial in outlook. I humbly refute the charges. All throughout our history we have always stood firmly for the common cause of India. We were never narrow-minded in our outlook towards all India issues. Maharashtra has a very glorious historical and cultural traditions. I may not repeat the history here. We are proud of every part of India. We are proud of Maha Gujarat which has given us the Father of Nation—"Mahatma Gandhi" and "Sardar Patel". We are proud of Punjab the brave land of warriors which gave us historical figures like Guru Govind Singh, Lajpat Rai, and Sardar Bhagat Singh. We are proud of U.P. which gave us a gem amongst men — Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, the torch-bearer of democracy and peace in the world. We are equally proud of Bengal, Rajasthan, Bihar, Andhra, Madras and all other brother States. Maharashtra gave India Shivaji Jnaneshwar, Tukaram and Ramdas who saved India from the foreign invaders.

It has been stated by many speakers including the Prime Minister in this debate that the people of Maharashtra have played a very vital role in the history of India. I humbly say that, in all the history, we have given sufficient contribution for the growth and preservation of Indian institutions. Maharashtra also sacrificed to the best of their ability for the freedom of India. What are the reasons, then, for denying the people of Maharashtra their just and proper claims for the

[Shri Kanavade Patil]

Inclusion of the city of Bombay within Maharashtra as its natural capital. It is unfortunate some attempts have been made by certain interested parties to create mistrust about the people of Maharashtra. Whatever it is and inspite of the recommendations of S.R.C. report for keeping Bombay State as bi-lingual, the Congress Working Committee has given us three States formula, as an alternative, keeping Bombay city as an independent city State. It is my humble opinion that Bombay and Maharashtra are so closely related to each other that separate Bombay City State may result in seriously jeopardising the economic life and prosperity of both Bombay City as well as Maharashtra. In my opinion reorganising Indian States on linguistic basis will not be inconsistent with the solidarity and progress of India, as the Central Govt. is already vested with more powers. The M.P.C.C. in its resolution passed in its meeting held in Poona on 17-11-55 has already thanked the Congress Working Committee for bringing the three Marathi linguistic groups living in three different states—Madhya Pradesh, Hyderabad and Bombay—together in one common Marathi-speaking State. I endorse that resolution, and I hope they will reconsider the question of Bombay City in the light of the recent expressions of views of the majority of the Members of the Bombay Corporation in favour of Maharashtra.

The S.R.C. Commission has not followed any principle while disposing the border districts between states. I do appreciate the labour undertaken by the Commission for which I thank them but I do feel that they have not properly considered the cases of Districts Belgam and North Kanara (Karwar) in Bombay State. They have put up Chandigarh Taluka from Belgam District in Maharashtra because it has 92.4 Marathi-speaking population but they have not included Belgam, Khanapur, Atani, Chikodi, Hukeri and Rajbagh Talukas from Belgam District in Maharashtra

although the Marathi-speaking population in these Talukas is 49.8, 54.8, 18.6, 42.1, 15.2, and 5.8, p.c. respectively and the same area is contiguous to Maharashtra. Similarly they should have included in Maharashtra the contiguous Marathi-speaking areas from Karwar District in Maharashtra. It is said that few thousand people speak Kokani in five talukas of Karwar but it is known to everybody that Kokani is a dialect of Marathi language.

I submit that some basic principle must be accepted while settling the disputes of these border areas and we should give contiguous areas to the State to which it belongs even if it results in desolving the Taluka units.

Dr. S. N. Sinha (Saran-East): The report of the S.R.C. leaves an impression of undue and distinct over-emphasis on the question of the languages. The economic factors and the long mutual affinities of the people in a large number of bi-lingual belts, have not been given consideration, they actually do deserve. As a result, the report has whipped up a harmful spirit of State rivalries in considerable parts of the country.

Unfortunately, the question of the reorganisation of the States has assumed the proportion of major political controversies. For a moment, the atmosphere of tolerance and understanding have subsided, and in some cases, even national interests are being obscured, put in background or even forgotten. This confusion, in turn, has generated a passion and ill-feeling to an extent that the wrong tendencies have become the dominating topic of some of the State Assembly debates.

The parochial outlook and the excitement for a wrong cause of regional sentiment is bound to affect our national interests adversely, and retard the speed of our progress which has been constantly on the move since our independence.

For an example, what the S.R.C. report calls — “some adjustments in two eastern districts belonging to Bihar”, has not only brought estrangement or bitter feeling but has also deeply disturbed the good relations existing between some of our Eastern provinces. Jawaharlalji has correctly said in his speech on the present debate — “With the greatest respect for our friends in Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, I would say that nothing is more unimportant than their problems.” Precisely for the reason that the boundary problem between Bihar and Bengal is so unimportant, the simple, proper and wise recommendation by the S.R.C. would have been—*Status Quo*. The poverty stricken and calamity ridden province of Bihar should have been left untouched to continue in its existing form. The transfer of a portion of Bihar territory is not going to solve any of the problems of Bengal, rather it may prove of some disadvantage to them and add to their post-partition complicated problems. At any rate, the present timing of the transfer of the Bihar territories is most unfortunate, because it is bound to derail considerably some of the big joint-projects of both the provinces upon which to a great extent the prosperity of a large number of people of both the provinces depends.

Besides, both Bengal and Bihar should get rid of their thinking in terms of their “Jamindari” habits. Any people have the right to resent to be bundled off from the authority of one State to the other. They are human beings and their sentiments must be respected. One can not transfer by a mere paper transaction between two States the economic link or the deep mutual affinity of the people of a state they have been living with enjoying all the rights and privileges conferred on all the citizens by our splendid constitution. It would be wrong to yield to the greatly exaggerated tendency of a kind of “persecution complex” shown by some groups to secure their support for certain

demands. Correct action in this respect would be to strengthen the existing constitutional guarantees to linguistic minorities wherever they may exist. Any sympathy for the wrong complaint of “persecution” would hamper the growth of a common nationhood.

Another queer reason is put forward that if certain parts of Bihar state are transferred to Bengal that would be for the sake of the defence of India. This reason does not hold ground for the simple reason that the defence of India is the responsibility of the Centre, and for that purpose, it is immaterial where the state borders are already existing. Rather, the disturbing of the borders at present is earlier going to create new complications not in line with the defences of the country. In short, the S.R.C. report has unnecessarily given birth to new problems, especially in our vital Eastern regions, by recommendations like — “some border adjustments”. In this respect, it would be wise and beneficial to all concerned to agree for a *Status Quo* on the Bihar borders.

What is more important is to think about vital matters, in wider terms and with a far broader outlook. Here first and foremost comes the Unity, security and the future prosperity of India. It is in this background and perspective that we have to see the reorganisation of the States of our Indian Union. Once more, here again, the necessity of the strengthening of the Centre can not be emphasised enough.

Technically speaking, the most suitable and practical apparatus will be what Jawaharlalji has called—“Zonal councils for groups of States.” The Centre will be associated with it for dealing with economic problems in regards to various projects and to ensure the better utilization of natural resources for the benefit of the people of the whole area. That zonal council will also deal with multitude of border problems that might arise and thereby

[Dr. S. N. Sinha]

would be able to avoid unhealthy inter-state rivalries. Such zones may be—North, East, West, South and Central, which could start off with common advisory councils.

Only this way the vital short-coming of the S.R.C. report will be eliminated—by putting proper emphasis on the most important factors—the common economy and co-operative working, through which only, the political wisdom and the determined strength of the Indian people can and will carve out a happy life for the whole country.

Shri Niranjan Jena (Dhenakal—West Cuttack—Reserved—Sch. Castes):
I wish to state in connection with the discussion of the S.R.C. Report. From the very outset I regret to say that the Commission have not paid any attention to the case of Orissa. There are certain principles which were formulated by the Commission to strictly observe and follow it, but in the case of Orissa how far these principles have been applied, I doubt. This is a very grave and important matter. When the Commission raised the question of Orissa for reorganisation, the Chairman stated at the end of the Report that owing to my long connection with Bihar, I have refrained from taking any part in investigating and deciding the territorial disputes between Bihar and West Bengal and Bihar and Orissa. Therefore the Chairman has not participated in the discussion in regard to the boundary disputes between Orissa and Bihar. Now it is to be observed how far it is justified on principles and also the other two members of the Commission who had to decide the boundary disputes have neither given any importance nor thoroughly examined the case of Orissa with its adjoining border areas. They only referred to the reports of some Committees namely Phillip-Duff Committee, Attlee Committee and O'Donnell Committee which were constituted 25 or 30 years ago during the

British regime for the boundary purposes. Now the situation has been entirely changed. On the base of those reports they have come to the decision. Now I come to the Singhbhum district which is the border district of Orissa. Before the merger of the States, these two States Saraikela and Kharswan were the princely States ruled by the Oriya Kings. If you look into the history of Orissa you will find that these States are called Orissa States along with other Orissa gadjat. The population of the whole Singhbhum district is 14,81,000 and out of this according to 1951 census the number of Oriyas is 298,000 while the number of Hindi-speaking people is 213,000, Hos 413,000 and the Bengali-speaking people are 268,000. Now it would be observed that out of the total population according to the 1951 census 1.92 lakhs were found to be immigrants and of this 1.80 lakhs have come from Hindi-speaking area. Most of the Hindi-speaking people are living in the industrial areas and towns of the Singhbhum district. The Oriya speaking people 298,000 are the permanent residents of the Singhbhum district. Now it is clear that the Oriya speaking people are in great majority in Saraikela and Kharswan and Sadar Singhbhum if Hos and Mundas are taken together who have been also inclined to the inclusion with Orissa. Because they have their close relationship in every aspect of life with Hos and Mundas who are living in the neighbouring districts of Orissa namely Mayurbhanj, Keonjhar and Sundergarha. It has direct communications with Orissa and is geographically more contiguous to Orissa than to Bihar. I therefore claim that these two States Saraikela, Kharswan and Sadar Singhbhum are the parts of Orissa which should be merged with Orissa. The representatives of the people of this area in the Parliament as well as in the Bihar legislative Assembly supported our demand that these areas of the Singhbhum district should go to Orissa according to the Oriya majority in these parts. In the

case of Oriya speaking areas in Madhya Pradesh, I would like to say that there are Oriya speaking people in great majority in Phuljhar who are 53 per cent. of the population according to the census of 1951 and hence this area should be merged with Orissa. In some parts of Bastar district there are Oriya speaking people who form a great majority according to the 1951 census. I, therefore, claim that these portions should go to Orissa. Lastly I am to say that the Adibasi in Orissa as well as on the border areas of the adjoining States are Oriyas in culture and language though they have a separate dialect of their own. Century long association of Adibasis and Oriyas at every level of social activities has created a composite culture in Orissa. So coming to the Southern border of Orissa State, namely, the Adibasi areas on the Orissa Andhra border, I can say the adjustment of boundaries resulting in the transfer of Adibasi areas from Andhra State to Orissa State is inevitably necessary in the larger interest of the Adibasi as a whole. When the Orissa State is formed in 1936 a demand was made for the merger of all the tribal areas on the Orissa and Andhra borders with Orissa State. I, therefore, invite attention to the memorandum submitted by the Orissa Government to the S.R.C. in respect of these areas.

श्री आर० एस० तिवारी (छतरपुर-दतिया टीकम गढ़) : राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग ने जो प्रतिवेदन देश के सामने पेश किया है कि जिस को माननीय गृह मंत्री पंत जी ने महा सभा के सम्मुख विचार के लिये रखा है उसका मैं स्वागत करता हूँ। श्री तारीख २३ नवम्बर को विन्ध्य प्रदेश की विधान सभा में जो जो घटना अवैध लोगों ने नियम भंग किया ऐसे लज्जाजनक कार्य की निन्दा करता हूँ।

आयोग ने भाषा, सांस्कृतिक, धार्मिक, सामाजिक, राजनैतिक तथा स्वरक्षा के आधार पर प्रान्त रचना का विचार यथासम्भव दिया है जो विचारणीय है। कुछ सदस्य कहते हैं कि भाषावार

प्रान्त रचना देश में प्रगतिशील न होगी। कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि अभी राज्य पुनर्गठन की रिपोर्ट को लागू ही १०-१५ साल तक न किया जावे आदि बातें चल रही हैं। भारत जैसे विशाल देश में अनेक भाषाओं का बाहुल्य है और बहुत से राज्यों को सरदार पटेल ने जो कि आवश्यकीय ढंग से एक दूसरे राज्यों में मिला दिये गये वे विवादग्रस्त चल पड़े इस कारण सरकार के निकट भविष्य में कार्य के लिये निष्पक्ष कमीशन की नियुक्ति से रिपोर्ट तैयार की गई। और उसने कुछ भाषायों जो ऐसी हैं जैसे : तेलुगू, तमिल कन्नड़, मलयालम, बंगला, मराठी, गुजराती, हिन्दी आदि हैं। कुछ भाषाओं का सम्पर्क दूसरी भाषाओं से अधिक है, भाषाओं का सम्पर्क कुछ कम है, जैसे तेलुगू कन्नड़, मलयालम। इन क्षेत्रों के लोग परस्पर नहीं बोल सकते हैं। कुछ का सम्बन्ध है, जैसे बंगाली, गुजराती, मराठी, हिन्दी साथ रहते रहते एक दूसरे की बातों को अच्छी तरह से समझते हैं और इन भाषाओं वाले एक साथ रहते हैं। उस कठिनाई को दूर करने के लिये केवल भाषा ही नहीं, बल्कि भौगोलिक, सांस्कृतिक, धार्मिक, सामाजिक, स्वरक्षा आदि पहलुओं को भी ध्यान में रखते हुए निर्माण किया गया है, भाषा और संस्कृति एक दूसरे के सहयोगी हैं। अनभेल विवाह की तरह अंग्रेजों ने एक दूसरे के अनुपूरक इस लिये मिला दिया था कि जिससे राजकीय कार्यों को तथा दो आदमी के बीच अंग्रेजी द्वारा समझाया जा सके ताकि विदेशी भाषा अंग्रेजी फले फूले और दुष्ठा भी यही। आज भारत की भाषाओं में अंग्रेजी भाषा ही सब कुछ है। आज़ादी मिल जाने के बाद अब संविधान में हिन्दी राष्ट्र भाषा मान ली गई है। जो अंग्रेजी भाषा का स्थान ग्रहण कर लेगी। और अब इसे सारे देश को राष्ट्र भाषा होने की बजह से सब लोग सीखेंगे देश में एक दूसरे से मिलने जुलने और बोल बाल से ही सब बातें प्राप्त होती हैं। सभापति महोदय, मैं पहले ही

[श्री आर० एस० तिवारी]

प्रान्त निर्माण का समर्थक रहा हूँ। वृहत् बुन्देलखण्ड प्रान्त के निर्माण का आन्दोलन आज से १२ साल पूर्व चलता रहा है जिसकी सीमा बड़ी लम्बी चौड़ी और आबादी भी एक सौ चालीस लाख से अधिक है। कहावत है :

इत जमुना उत नर्मदा, इत चम्बल उत टौंस।
छत्रसाल सों लड़न की रही न काहूँ हौंस ॥

इस में मध्य प्रदेश के आठ जिले, ग्वालियर, विन्ध्यप्रदेश और उत्तर प्रदेश के झांसी, जालौन, हमीरपुर, बांदा, जिले आ जाते हैं। इस बुन्देलखण्ड का इतिहास भारत के अन्य इतिहास से पीछे नहीं है। यहाँ के लोग वीरता के लिये भारत में प्रसिद्ध हैं, हमेशा बाहरी लोगों से लड़ाई करते आये हैं, किसी को घंसने नहीं दिया है। छत्रसाल महाराज, जब औरंगजेब का सरदार बंगस चढ़ आया था, उस समय १७२४ ई० में उनकी आयु ८० साल की हो चुकी थी, शिवाजी से मिले और बाजी राव पेशवा को एक पत्र लिखा और सांडनी द्वारा भेजा। लिखा था :

जो बीती गजराज पर, सो बीती अब भाय,
बाजी जात बुंदेल की, राखो बाजी राय।

बाजीराव पेशवा ने खाना नहीं खाया। शीघ्र ही कई लाख घुड़सवार फौज लेकर इलाहाबाद जाकर बंगस सरदार को घेरा और मार भगाया। और महाराज छत्रसाल के दो लड़के हृदयशाह और जगतराज के बाजीराव पेशवा को अपना तीसरा बड़ा लड़का मानकर सवाया राज दिया जिसमें झांसी, सागर नगर ये हृदयशाह जगदयशाह को १ हिस्सा और पौन हिस्सा जगतराज को दिया था। तब से हिन्दी, मराठी का मिलान हुआ है। मैं आज भी चाहता हूँ कि चार जिले बुन्देलखण्ड के झांसी जालौन, हमीरपुर, बांदा जिले बुन्देलखण्ड

के जिलों के साथ मिला दिये जावें। लेकिन हमारे उच्च नेताओं ने और कांग्रेस कमेटी ने जो निर्णय किया है उसे मैं अपनी सहमति मानता हूँ और नव निर्मित विन्ध्य प्रदेश का स्वागत करता हूँ। कुछ लोग उत्तर प्रदेश के बड़े होने का विरोध करते हैं। मैं उसके बड़े होने से भारत का गौरव समझता हूँ। मैं तो चाहता हूँ कि उत्तर प्रदेश, नया मध्य प्रदेश, बिहार, राजस्थान और उत्तर भारत के अन्य राज्यों का एक प्रान्त हो। लेकिन शासन दृष्टि से इस समय चलाना कठिन होगा। इसलिये एक भाषी राज्य होते हुए भी अब अलग प्रान्त रखे गये हैं। भविष्य में उत्तर प्रदेश के बराबर ही प्रान्त रखना पड़ेंगे उत्तर प्रदेश की एक भाषा है, एक संस्कृति है, एक अच्छा संगठन है। बुढ़काल ५वीं सदी में भारत के ६ राज्य थे, ७, ८वीं सदी में १० राज्य और ९वीं सदी से १६वीं सदी तक ६५ राज्य हो गये जैसे जैसे राज्य विभक्त होते गये गुलामी में जकड़ते गये थे।

राष्ट्रपिता बापू के करो या मरो के आन्दोलन त्याग, बलिदान से १९४७ के १५ अगस्त को देश स्वतंत्र हुआ और देश की आन्तरिक राज्य व्यवस्था स्वरक्षित कर ली और इसी बीच कई राष्ट्रों से लेकर एक न्याय मुक्ति विधान बनाया गया जिसमें सब भारतीयों के हितों की रक्षा है और प्रान्त बढ़ाने, घटाने, परिवर्तन करने की व्यवस्था रखी गयी है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके द्वारा गृह-मंत्री जी से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब विन्ध्य प्रदेश का बड़े प्रान्त से मिलन होने जा रहा है, क्योंकि विन्ध्य प्रदेश की विधान सभा की रिपोर्ट से भी सिद्ध हो गया है कि ३८ सदस्यों ने भाषण दिये जिसमें १५

सदस्यों ने विन्ध्य प्रदेश की इकाई रखने पर ५ सदस्यों ने उत्तर प्रदेश में विलय के बावत और १८ सदस्यों ने राज्य पुनर्गठन की रिपोर्ट का समर्थन किया है आपके ऊपर जो बीतती आयी है उसे सुन लें ।

विन्ध्य प्रदेश इस स्वतन्त्रता के अल्पकाल में चौथी बार विलय हो रहा है सर्व प्रथम बुंदेलखंड के ३४ राज्यों का मिल कर विन्ध्य प्रदेश निर्माण हुआ । इस की राजधानी बुंदेलखंड नौगांव बनाई गई फिर दूसरा थोड़े समय बाद बुंदेलखंड के नेताओं ने स्वीकार किया कि राजधानी रीवा हो और चारमिनिस्टर हमारे हों । हमने स्वीकार किया फिर नौगांव से रीवा राजधानी बनाई गई फिर तीसरे बार चार लाख की जनगणना वाला वह भूभाग के राज्य चरखारी सरीली, जिगनी, समथर, बावनी, भ्रष्टगढ़ी, के राज्य तथा चित्रकूट के राज्य उत्तर प्रदेश में मिला दिये गये । अब चौथी बार मध्य प्रदेश में मिलन होने जा रहा है । जब कि उत्तर प्रदेश के कुछ ग्राम आज भी छतरपुर, टीकम गढ़, जिलों में द्वीपवत हैं, मिल जाने चाहिये ये नहीं दिये गये । शासन की दृष्टि से अवश्य बीच के भूभाग मिलने ही चाहियें यह सब परेशानी विन्ध्य प्रदेश को रही । जिस कारण उन्नति कार्यों में बाधा पड़ती रही है । पहले भी छोटे छोटे राज्यों में वह दोनों से प्रगति में बाधक रहे हैं इसलिये विन्ध्य प्रदेश को पांच वर्ष तक विशेष देख रेख में रखा जाय जैसा कि हिमाचल प्रदेश को समय दिया गया है और केन्द्र से उसे सहायता दी जावे और उसे नीचे की बातों के अनुसार केन्द्र से सहयोग प्राप्त होना चाहिये :

१. योजना आयोग ने जो धन राशि द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना के व्यय के लिये निर्धारित की है वह धन राशि उसी हिस्से में व्यय की जावे ।

२. शिक्षा हाई स्कूल तक निःशुल्क रहनी चाहिये जैसा कि अभी है । टैक्नीकल विद्यार्थियों को छात्रवृत्तियां ।

३. नये मध्य प्रदेश की उच्च न्यायालय की ब्रांच तथा रैवेन्यू बोर्ड, रीवा, नौगांव में रहनी चाहिये ।

४. स्कूलों और कालिजों की संख्या में कमी न की जावे और उन कालिजों में जो विषय पढ़ाने के बाकी रह गये उन्हें पूरा कराया जावे ।

५. कर्मचारियों को न्यायवृत्ति स्थान प्राप्त रहें, वंचित न किये जावें ।

६. विन्ध्य प्रदेश तथा योजना आयोग द्वारा स्वीकृत द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना वहीं के मंत्री की देख में रहे ।

७. सीमाओं का पुनर्गठन भारत सरकार द्वारा निष्पक्ष करा दिया जाये ।

८. राजधानी तक सीधी सड़कों का निर्माण शीघ्र कराया जावे ।

९. विन्ध्य प्रदेश के पश्चिम से पूर्व जाने के लिये रेल मार्ग के लिये अविलम्ब कदम उठाया जाये ।

Shri Banerjee (Midnapore—Jhargram): Partition created many troubles for West Bengal and the influx of refugees from Eastern Pakistan is more than three millions. So apart from any other question, Bengal has a need for land which originally belonged to Bengal but now it has been formed a part of Bihar and Assam. With due regard to S.R.C. I submit that instead of looking at the language they have gone through many other aspects as for culture, administration etc. which misled the S.R.C. to come to a correct findings. To my mind, acceptance of the linguistic basis for the re-organisation of West Bengal State is essential and vital in order to provide the Bengali-speaking people—its natural inhabitants as a constituent unit of the Indian Union.

[Shri Banerjee]

Accordingly the under-mentioned areas and territories should form the integral part of the reorganised West Bengal:—

- (a) Dhalbhumgarh Sub-division of Singhbhum District including Jamsedhpore.
- (b) The whole of Manbhum district including Dhanbad Sub-division and Chas thana.
- (c) Dumka, Deoghar, Rajmahal, Jamtara and Pakur Sub-division of Santal Parganas.
- (d) The territories of Purnea Dist. east of Mahananda river upto river Mechi—joining Maldah where the river enters the district.
- (e) The district of Goalpara in Assam.
- (f) Tripura and Cachar District with arrangement for a link with West Bengal.
- (g) The Andamans and Nicobar Islands.

All these are homelands of Bengal except Andamans and up-to-date Bengali speaking population predominates over all these territories. They were part of Bengal upto 1911. Then in order to unite Bengal (East and West) the British Government cut Sylet, Cachar and Goalpara from Bengal and placed them under Assam and cut part of Dhalbhum, Purnea and Manbhum, Santal Parganas and placed them under Bihar.

In 1912 the then great leaders of Bihar Sri Dipnarayan Singh, Sri Sachnand Singh, M. Fakuruddin, Sri Nanda Kishorelal and Sri Parmeshwar Lal in a resolution of Congress frankly stated that these portions placed under Bihar should go to Bengal.

In 1921 the Congress provinces were formed on linguistic basis—Manbhum was included in Bengal Province.

In 1928 in the all Party known as Nehru Report (Motilal Nehru) it was definitely stated that provinces should be formed on the basis of language.

Dhalbhum sub-division consists of Dhalbhum Parganas only (within Singhbhum district). A substantial portion of Dhalbhum Parganas is in Midnapore District, West Bengal (That does not form a part of Dhalbhum sub-division). The proprietor of Dhalbhum State Shri Jagadish Dhanbal Deb lives in that portion of Dhalbhum Pargana, i.e., in Midnapore District and the revenue of entire Dhalbhum Pargana is deposited in Midnapore Collectorate within West Bengal. Jamsedhpore consists of about 13 or 14 villages taken on lease by Jamsedji Tata from the proprietor of Dhalbhum in the year 1903 or 1905, as such it is integral part of Dhalbhum Parganas—the whole area is totally Bengali-speaking Jamsedhpore contains about 2 lakhs of population of which one lakh is Bengali-speaking. Ninety per cent. documents are written in Bengali and the rest are in English.

Manbhum was in Bengal upto 1911 and it was within Bengal province from 1921 to 1935 (when Congress took the office—it goes to Bihar Congress).

S.R.C. only gave Purulia Sadar sub-division to Bengal minus Chas Thana. It is absurd. Dhanbad sub-division was excluded stating it is industrial area and these will be a loss of income in Bihar. If one man's property is given to another by force justice requires that it should be restored to the real owner whatever loss the usurper may suffer, but S.R.C. forgot that Bokaro coal is more than the total coal of present Bengal and the coal of Dhanbad sub-division.

These places of Santal Parganas are inhabited by Bengali-speaking Santals. The Santals came there from 1709 A.D. They also speak Bengali as second language and not Bihari.

The part of Kishanganj sub-division of Purnea is predominantly Bengali-speaking. S.R.C. gave a small portion and it is not very clear in its statement. This portion is also necessary for joining North Bengal with South which I demanded.

Goalpara is predominantly Bengali-speaking area. It is needless to say after appointment of S.R.C. the Bengalis were outraged by the Assamese people.

Kachar and Tripura are entirely Bengali speaking but they are not given to Bengal as there is no contiguity, but why it should be placed under Assam Government?

Shri S. V. Ramaswami (Salem): Thirteen out of the proposed sixteen States are recommended on basis of unilingualism. Parochialism has been let loose in the country. People have gone down to the level of thinking in terms of corridors, as if one State is foreign to another. We are daily witnessing exhibitions of linguistic midsummer madness.

The South is hit hardest. The great Madras Presidency of 25 districts has been mutilated and reduced to small State of 11 districts, all within 3 years. The Travancore-Cochin State with a dense population of 136 lakhs has been confined to 14,000 sq. miles. Reduction in size has opened the eyes of some to the need for a Dakshina Pradesh. But mutual suspicions and jealousies are so great that power politics stands in the way of such summation. Some have suggested putting the S.R.C. in cold storage; others have urged the abolition of all the existing States and form four only in four directions; still others press for the cutting up of big States to equalise their size. These are councils of despair. Constructive statemanship suggests a different approach to counter these centrifugal and disruptive tendencies. Integration and consolidation of States is not practical politics in the near future. We must develop centripetal forces on the economic

plane and lend all support to them. The inter-State Water disputes Bill and the River Boards Bill are steps in the right direction. The recommendations of the S.R.C. for setting up inter-State Public Service Commissions is yet another welcome step. But these are not enough. Four Zonal Economic Councils may be formed. Travancore-Cochin, Madras, Karnataka, Andhra and Hyderabad will be covered by the South Zone; Bombay, Vidarbha, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan will form the West-Central Zone; Orissa, Bihar, West Bengal and Assam will form the Eastern Zone; U.P., Punjab, Jammu & Kashmir with Delhi will form the North Western Zone. Obviously the Zonal Councils will be only deliberative and advisory and (not legislative at any rate for the present) for even the existing Federal structure is cumbersome. These Councils will deal with all inter-State matters. River Valley Projects, Irrigation and Power Schemes, Highways, Waterways, exploitation of minerals etc. and all matters relating to the maximum utilisation of the resources of multiple States for the rapid progress of the Nation as a whole.

It will be noticed that this grouping is approximately equal in population. The South Zone will have 94.8 millions; the West-Central 89.9 millions, the Eastern 89.3 millions and the North-Western 80.5 millions of people. In area too three Zones will be approximately equal, South being 248,130 sq. miles, the East 250,290 sq. miles, the North-West 264,230 sq. miles. Only the West-Central will be 391,740 sq. miles and this is because of the extensive areas in Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh. This more or less equal grouping will help remove the antagonism between the South and the North and the suspicions of the small about the big States. The expenditure under the Second Five Year Plan can be allocated equally between them. It will help people get over the narrow State outlook and foster a sense of kinship among the group of States. It will be more realistic and

[Shri S. V. Ramaswami]

useful. It will be complementary to the National Development Council. It will help turn men's minds away from petty jealousies and the thirst for power to deeper interest in the economic development of large regions. The inter-dependence of States for a speedier execution of great projects for mutual good and rapid realisation of economic prosperity of the masses, will be high-lighted. The primacy of the Nation will stand out more prominently for the common man in the background of these Zones.

The States can be rearranged in five groups also. Madras, Kerala, Karnatak and Andhra including Telangana, can form the *South Zone* with 94·8 millions; Bombay, including Vidarbha, and Rajasthan the *West Zone*, with 63·8 millions; Madhya Pradesh and Orissa, the *Central Zone*, with 40·7 millions; U.P. and Punjab, including Delhi the *Northern Zone*, with 82·2 millions; Bihar, Bengal and Assam the *Eastern Zone*, with 74·7 millions (Jammu and Kashmir is not included).

The population of the Central Zone is only 40·7 millions, though extensive in area. It is good to keep this undeveloped area thus, so as to provide room for relieving pressure of population in other Zonal groups.

It will be seen that this grouping broadly conforms to the River Basins, which will greatly influence the pattern of future regional development.

If we look round we will see that already there are many Inter-State enterprises functioning. The Tungabhadra is between Andhra and Karnataka; the Nandikonda, between Andhra and Hyderabad the Muchkand, between Andhra and Orissa; the D.V.C. between Bihar and Bengal; the Bhakra-Nangal, between Punjab, PEPSU and Rajasthan. We must seek to extend this area of inter-State cooperation to cover a wider range of subjects and wider areas. For instance, the Ramapadasagar Scheme may be put through to make the waters of the Godavari and Krishna, which are now going

waste into the sea available to parched up Madras also, not merely for irrigation but also for inland water transport. The waters now going into the Arabian sea along the Western Ghats can be turned to flow eastwards to irrigate the lands in the peninsula, and the power generated from many such schemes like Periyar, can be used for starting industries right along the West coast, from Cape Comorin to Satara in Bombay State. Such schemes can be thought of *ad infinitum*, elsewhere also, for the benefit of the Nation as a whole.

To further underline the importance of the Zonal Councils as occupying an intermediate position between the Centre and the States, a new article may be added in the Chapter on the Directive Principles of the Constitution to the effect that "The State may endeavour to form Zonal Economic Councils of two or more States to foster a sense of inter-dependance among neighbouring States." It would add to the dignity and importance of these Councils if they are formed in pursuance thereof, than by mere executive action under Article 263. The suggestion is well worth consideration.

Shri M. M. Gandhi (Panch Mahal-cum-Baroda East): In the interests of national unity the safeguards recommended by the Commission with regard to (1) Linguistic minorities, (2) Public Service Commissions, (3) All India Cadre of Services etc. should be accepted *in toto*.

With regard to the recommendations about the Bombay State, I would submit, they are the best. Every disinterested and impartial person commends them. But to work them proper spirit of cooperation, goodwill and toleration is needed. We of Gujerat, although in minority in the proposed Bombay State, accepted it out of spirit of cooperation. But it appears, out of linguistic aspirations and for variety of reasons this proposal has not found favour with Maharashtrians. It would appear that almost all shades

of opinion in Maharashtra are against this proposal. Under the circumstances this composite State is impossible. If it is forced despite this strongly-felt opposition to it, it would create problems rather than solving them. Thus the only alternative is the creation of Maharashtra and Gujerat. This brings up the question of Bombay city. In view of the cogent reasons given by the J.V.P. Committee, the Dhar Commission, S. R. Commission etc. this city of Bombay shall have to be kept out of either of these two States with a provision for such economic and other relations of this Bombay city with these two States. Gujerat, Saurashtra and Kutch is closely and intimately connected with Bombay city and the prosperity of Gujerat, Saurashtra and Kutch largely depends upon Bombay. Of the five lakhs of Gujerati speaking people in Bombay city, more than 90% of them are middle class, lower middle class and labour in petty trades and employment. Bombay is the largest employment Centre and people in Gujerat, Saurashtra and Kutch cannot think of being separated from Bombay city and being put under the rule of a dominant linguistic group. The problem ought to be settled with goodwill and peacefully. If no agreed solution can be arrived at, the decision should be left to our National leaders.

Shri C. E. Iyyanni (Trichur): I have no doubt that the S.R.C. report is a valuable and historic document in that it has redrawn the map of India with a view to satisfy the aspirations of the people and to allow their growth according to their genius and ability. The personnel of the Commission consisted of three eminent sons of India who are held in high esteem because of their great learning, ability and wide experience of men and things. They have done a good bit of a difficult job which is worthy of credit. Difference of opinion will not detract from the value of the recommendation made.

The case of the Kerala State regarding the territories to be included
534 LSD—8.

therein has been ably presented by some from these parts and I don't want to deal with it again. I have to emphasize the fact that ours is the smallest State in the Republic but with the highest percentage of population. Owing to the impossibility of finding employment and the lack of space for agricultural operations, the people of the T.C. State and Malabar have gone out to distant parts of Asia and Africa and are engaged in various avocations. Besides they are seen in every nook and corner of this our Republic. The problem of problems so far as Kerala State is concerned is how to find employment for its huge population. If as a result of the formation of States primarily based on language, a spirit of exclusiveness or unfriendliness is developed, symptoms of which are unhappily visible in the new State recently formed, we will be the worst sufferers. Our State, however much it is industrially advanced, I am afraid, can absorb only a comparatively small percentage of its huge possession and therefore we will have to go outside for work. Under the circumstances our salvation lies in the goodwill of the rest of India and we have to depend upon the fundamental rights vouchsafed to us in the Constitution. It is clear from the report that the Commission is aware of it and has suggested certain recommendations to combat it. Laws and rules regarding the domicile and permanent residence in certain States are framed in such a way that other citizens of India are prevented from getting employment or carrying on any business or avocation or acquisition of property which is both against the letter and spirit of the Constitution. The Commission recommends that laws and rules regarding the above should be passed by the Parliament in consonance with the Constitution with a view to uniformity and equality of opportunity being given to all citizens.

Great doubt is entertained regarding the financial viability of the new Kerala State. The Commission also

[Shri C. R. Iyyunni]

is somewhat conscious of it as is evident from the statement that the financial picture is not so gloomy as is believed to be. It concedes Malabar is a deficit area. The revenue of the T. C. State is a little over 17 crores and that of Malabar 3 crores. Out of this, diversion will have to be made towards the portion of the outgoing taluqs which will come to a crore roughly. With this amount the administration has to be carried on. I need not say that the Malabar District is very backward in the matter of education, roads, medical relief etc. To bring it on a level with the T.C. State a large capital outlay has to be made for the construction of schools, colleges, roads and hospitals etc. Besides there will be the recurring charges for running and maintaining them. Private enterprise is very scarce in the area. Unless the Centre comes to the aid of this small State, it will not be able to do it.

Besides this State has very little resources in the matter of minerals and very little space for agricultural or other expansions. It will be practically impossible for this small State to absorb an appreciable percentage of its unemployed population unless a few important industrial undertakings sponsored by the Central Government are located in this State. If the educated and uneducated in the land can't find work to earn a decent living, I feel that the State may become a hotbed of the discontented and the frustrated and a safe haunt of the subversive elements who may prove a menace to the unity and safety of glorious land which it is our desire to avoid. The Commission has contemplated such a contingency and has in general suggested appropriate remedies which, I hope, the Centre will bear in mind.

It is my fervent prayer that the Central Government and the Parliament will carefully watch whether as a result of the formation of linguistic States, the friendliness and goodwill that existed between the various parts of this country has been adversely

affected and if so, strong and remedial measures should be adopted to combat the evil which will go very much against the smaller States and be a source of weakness to the Republic. It will be a matter of great consolation to the smaller States if zonal advisory Councils are constituted as suggested by the Prime Minister with a view to bring together the neighbouring States and encouraging brotherliness and goodwill between them and to present their common needs and requirements in a consolidated form before the Central Government in an effective manner.

Shri Dabhi (Kaira North): Unlike some people—including some of the Hon'ble Members of the House—I do not doubt the integrity and the impartiality of the able and eminent members of the Commission. But it sometimes happens that even the most impartial persons unconsciously commit injustice. I submit that this has happened in the case of the recommendations of the Commission regarding the formation of the proposed bilingual Bombay State.

It will be seen from the trend of the S.R.C. Report that but for the controversial problem of Greater Bombay the Commission would not have recommended the formation of a bilingual Bombay State after the separation of Karnatak from the present Bombay State. Under these circumstances, it was expected of the so impartial a Commission as the S.R.C. that it would recommend such a bilingual State of Bombay in which neither the Gujarati-speaking areas nor the Marathi-speaking areas would be in a dominant position. And to do this was not only possible but was very easy. But instead of doing this, in their anxiety to placate our Maharashtrian brothers, the Commission has made such recommendations regarding the proposed bilingual Bombay State as would give an absolute majority to the Marathi-speaking people therein and thereby afford them the temptation to dominate non-Marathi-speaking people. The following figures will speak for themselves:—

Present position: The total population of the present Bombay State is 3,59,56,510. Out of this the population of the Marathi-speaking districts is 1,65,03,835 (45.09 p.c.). In Greater Bombay also Marathi-speaking people are 12,36,574, that is, 43.6 p.c. of the total population of Bombay city. So, at present, the Maharashtrians are in a minority in the present tri-lingual State of Bombay. But the recommendations of the S.R.C. make the Maharashtrians in an absolute majority in the proposed bi-lingual State, in which the population of the Marathi-speaking (including the Marathawada districts of Hyderabad) will be 2,13,17,985, that is, 53 p.c. of the total population. But then even without the addition of Marathawada Districts the population of the Marathi-speaking districts would have been 1,65,03,832, while the population of the Gujarati-speaking areas (including Saurashtra and Kutch) would be 1,60,62,947. Where was then the necessity of proposing the addition of Marathawada Districts to proposed Bombay State, especially when these districts are contiguous to the proposed Marathi-speaking Vidarbha State whose population is only 76 lakhs? In fact, it was very necessary that the Marathawada districts should have been proposed to be joined to the proposed Vidarbha State, so that the very tiny Vidarbha State might become at least a middle-sized State. But the commission wanted to give "a position of advantage" to the Maharashtrians in the proposed State. Hence it recommended a bi-lingual State in which the Maharashtrians would be in an absolute majority. Still the Gujaratis were prepared to accept the S.R.C. recommendations, placing them in a perpetual minority, in the interest of the unity and the welfare of the country. But now that all the Maharashtrian leaders have, without exception, rejected the recommendations of the S.R.C., the only alternative left is the acceptance of the three-State formula proposed by the Congress Working Committee and as stated by the Dhar Commission, in the J.V.P. Report, and by the S.R.C., Bombay City should, under no circum-

stances, be made a part of any unilingual State. I may also state that the Gujaratis are now not prepared to accept the bi-lingual Bombay State even without Vidarbha. With the addition of Vidarbha to the proposed bi-lingual State the Maharashtrians would get a majority of 67.5 p.c.

Lastly, the three-State formula of the Congress Working Committee should be final and the question of Bombay City should not be kept hanging on for five years but should be settled here and now and once and for all.

श्री रायचन्वभाई शाह (छिदवाड़ा) :

मैं राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग के प्रतिवेदन का हृदय से स्वागत करता हूँ। मेरी राय है कि प्रतिवेदन में जो सुझाव दिए गए हैं वे सब ही ज्यों के त्यों मान लेने चाहिए। यदि किसी सुझाव के बदले में सर्वसम्मत दूसरा सुझाव रखा जाये तो वह मान लेना चाहिए।

राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग द्वारा प्रस्तावित नये मध्य प्रदेश का जो कि भोजपुर मध्य प्रदेश के १४ हिन्दी जिले, भोपाल, बिन्ध्य प्रदेश, और मध्य भारत को मिलाकर बनेगा, मैं हृदय से स्वागत करता हूँ। इससे भारत के मध्य में एक विशाल और सुदृढ़ राज्य बनेगा जो भारत की एकता और सुरक्षा के लिए उपयुक्त होगा। आयोग ने इस राज्य की राजधानी जबलपुर रखने का जो सुझाव दिया है वह सभी दृष्टि से योग्य है और वह मान्य किया जाना चाहिए। परन्तु कांग्रेस हाई कमान्ड ने इस सुझाव को नहीं माना है और भोपाल को राजधानी बनाने का सुझाव दिया है, इससे महाकौशल के छत्तीसगढ़ के लोगों को काफी असुविधा होगी। महाकौशल हमेशा कांग्रेसवादी प्रदेश रहा है इससे हम सब कांग्रेस हाई कमान्ड के इस आदेश को बगैर किसी ही हल्का के मानने को तैयार हैं। परन्तु हम कांग्रेस हाई कमान्ड से यह प्रार्थना करेंगे कि वे भोपाल को इस प्रदेश की काम चलाऊ राजधानी बनावें और राजधानी के प्रश्न को हल करने के लिए एक उच्च

[श्री रायचन्द भाई शाह]

अधित्यक्त कमीशन नियुक्त करे जो प्रस्तावित मध्य प्रदेश का दौरा कर राजधानी के लायक उपयुक्त स्थान ढूँढ निकाले जहाँ पर नई राजधानी बनाई जाये क्योंकि भोपाल में भी राजधानी की पूरी आवश्यकता अनुसार मकानात नहीं हैं इसलिए जब नई इमारतें बनाना अनिवार्य होगा तो उसके लिए सही जगह का चुनाव हीकर फिर वहाँ पर राजधानी बनाई जावे इससे प्रांत के किसी भी भाग को कोई असंतोष नहीं रहेगा। भोपाल, जबलपुर, इंदौर, ग्वालियर रीवां आदि सभी शहरों की उन्नति की ओर भी पूरा ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिए।

हमारे महाराष्ट्र के भाई मध्य प्रदेश के १४ हिन्दी जिलों में से कुछ भाग पर अपना दावा करते हैं और उसे मांगते हैं। विशेषकर छिन्दवाग जिले की साँतर तहसील, बैतूल जिले की मुलनाई और भेंसदेही तहसील, खंडवा जिले की बुरहानपुर तहसील और बाल-घाट जिले की वारासिवनी तहसील, परन्तु इनमें से किसी भी तहसील में मराठी भाषियों का स्पष्ट बहुमत नहीं है। हमारे महाराष्ट्र के भाइयों ने इन तहसीलों की मांग आयोग के सामने भी रखी थी, परन्तु आयोग ने उस पर पूर्ण विचार कर उनकी इस मांग को अमान्य कर दिया है और जिले की इकाई को कायम रखने का सुझाव दिया है। मराठी भाषियों की यह मांग अनुचित है। मध्य प्रदेश के १४ हिन्दी जिलों को पूरे के पूरे ही प्रस्ताविक मध्य प्रदेश में मिलाना चाहिए।

मौजूदा मध्य प्रदेश के आठ जिलों को मिला कर विदर्भ बनाने की जो सिफारिश आयोग ने की है में उसका स्वागत करता हूँ। इससे विदर्भ की जनता की बहुत दिनों की मांग पूरी होती है और उन्हें अपना खुद का मराठी भाषी प्रांत मिलना है

बम्बई के बारे में आयोग ने जो द्विभाषी प्रांत बनाने का सुझाव दिया है मेरी राय में

वह सब से अच्छा सुझाव है और उसे मान्य करना चाहिए। यदि हमारे महाराष्ट्र के भाई उसे मानने को तैयार नहीं हैं तो फिर जो सुझाव कांग्रेस कार्य समिति ने दिया है तीन राज्यों का, उसे मान्य किया जाना चाहिए। उसके अनुसार महाराष्ट्र, गुजरात और बम्बई शहर इस तरह से तीन राज्य बनाने का सुझाव मान्य करना उचित होगा।

महाराष्ट्र प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी प्रस्तावित द्विभाषी बम्बई राज्य में यदि विदर्भ मिलाया जावे तो उसे मान्यता देने को तैयार है इससे मालूम होता है कि उसे द्विभाषी राज्य बनाने के सिद्धान्त से कोई विरोध नहीं है, परन्तु यह सुझाव गुजरात प्रदेश कांग्रेस को मंजूर नहीं है इसलिए में एक दूसरा सुझाव रखना चाहता हूँ। मौजूदा बम्बई राज्य में से कन्नड भाग निकल जाने के बाद जो हिस्सा बचता है उसका ही बम्बई राज्य बनाया जावे जिसका राजधानी बम्बई रहेगी। हैदराबाद के मराठवाड़ा के जिले प्रस्तावित विदर्भ में मिलाकर 'महाविदर्भ' बनाया जावे और सौराष्ट्र में कच्छ मिला दिया जावे। इस तरह से बम्बई का वाद-विवाद मिट जावेगा। भाषा के आधार पर राज्य मांगने वालों को मराठी भाषियों को महाविदर्भ और गुजरातियों को सौराष्ट्र मिलेगा। इस सुझाव से हम सब को संतोष दे सकते हैं।

पंजाब के बारे में आयोग का जो सुझाव है कि पंजाब, पेप्सू और हिमाचल प्रदेश मिला कर एक राज्य बनाया जावे, वह बहुत ही अच्छा सुझाव है और राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से उसे स्वीकार करना चाहिए।

Shri Bell Ram Das (Barneta): I support the recommendations of the States Re-organization Commission and offer my hearty congratulations to the distinguished members of the Commission. Undoubtedly a very difficult and arduous task was entrusted to the Commission. The re-organization of the States is a matter where usually two

are not likely to agree wherever there is demand and counter demand of territory or reluctance to part with territory. This is quite natural. It is impossible to find a solution which the contending parties are likely to accept. In such a matter the security and unity of India should be the main consideration. My humble submission is that where the contending parties cannot arrive at a compromise the matter may be left to our popular leader and the Prime Minister, Shri Nehruji.

So far as Assam is concerned, we welcome the recommendations, but I am sorry to point out that the Commission did not consider the case of inclusion of Cooch Behar in Assam on cultural and historical reasons. The language of Cooch Behar is not Bengalee as admitted by eminent Bengalee writers. It is a Rajbongshi language or Bahe language. At the time of Partition the Maharaja of Cooch Behar demanded the merger of Cooch Behar in Assam. An assurance of holding a plebiscite in this behalf was given by the Government at that time. But for reasons best known to the Government the district of Cooch Behar was suddenly included in West Bengal contrary to the wishes of the Maharaja and the indigenous inhabitants. Assam's history and culture is vitally connected with Cooch Behar. Our great Guru Sankar Deb wrote most of his valuable books in Cooch Behar in the local language which is Assamese and established large number of Satras and Namghars (Temples). His mortal remains are also at Madhupur in Cooch Behar. So Assam has a rightful claim over Cooch Behar.

Only a few Bengalee lawyers and businessmen of Dhubri Sub-division of the Goalpara district raised a false cry for merger of Goalpara with West Bengal. The S.R.C. in its wisdom has rightly rejected their unjust demand. Goalpara is an Assamese district with an Assamese population of 62 per cent. Some want to say that the 1951 census figure is incorrect and unacceptable. But the fact is that the earlier censuses were manipulated in favour of

Bengalee by the officers of both Government as well as of the Zamindars. One has only to go through the observations of the European Superintendents of earlier Census operations starting with 1891. The density of population is 441 per square mile leaving aside forest and forest inhabitants. This being the case the West Bengal cannot settle refugees in the Goalpara sub-division unless she wants to squeeze and push out the tribal and the Muslim population of Goalpara.

Sir, it is unfortunate that there is a cry for a Hill State by a section of the inhabitants of the Khasi and Jaintia Hills and the Garo Hills. But the great majority of the inhabitants do not want such a Hill State; they want more power for district councils. Similarly the inhabitants of Mikir Hills, North Cachar Hills and Mizo District do not want Hill State, but want more power and other concessions.

The Commission has rightly decided to do away with the Part C State. So Tripura must form part of the State of Assam at least on geographical reasons. On the same ground Manipur ought to have been merged in Assam. It will be dangerous to maintain a very small state in the Eastern Frontier. I plead for Central assistance for the development of the merged state for their all round developments.

General Ajit Singhji (Sirohli-Pali): My foremost feeling at the moment is one of sincere gratification to find that the S.R.C. should have been good enough to concede the claim of Rajasthan to Abu Road Taluka. Perhaps it would be more appropriate if I say that it is good of them to have conceded the wishes of the people of that Taluka. Indeed, my approach to the entire question is that we should give more weight to the wishes of the people concerned than to so-called claims or counterclaims. I shall not deal here with the unfortunate circumstances in which these people were separated from us as a result of an executive fiat about five years back. But they never reconciled themselves

[General Ajit Singhji]

to the separation, inspite of the allurements which the Bombay Government tried to offer, on the repression to which they resorted to coerce them into submission. It fell to me, as representative of Sirohi of which this Taluka formed a part, to espouse their cause and to submit memoranda, and to agitate on their behalf for their reunion with Rajasthan; and I am, therefore, naturally happy that the Commission should have recognised the justice of the case. I take this opportunity of expressing heartfelt gratitude on behalf of myself and the people of Sirohi as well as the people of Abu Road Taluka, to the distinguished members of the Commission, as also to the numerous friends, inside as well as outside Rajasthan, who were good enough to extend to me their valuable sympathy and support in my humble efforts.

As is perhaps implicit in what I have stated, it is not a correct approach to view the problem of the so-called reorganisation of the States as so many claims and counter claims. The efficiency of the administration and the well-being of the people are the only objectives to be fulfilled, and the wishes of the people concerned should be the final criterion in the matter of redrawing of boundaries. I venture to say that if we approach the problem in this spirit, the problem need not generate all the heat and controversy that it has, and should be capable of an easy solution.

From this point of view, it is not for me to find fault with the Commission if they have not seen their way to allow Danta and Palanpur to come to Rajasthan. All I would say is that I hope that they have taken care to ascertain the wishes of the people there. But there is one area, which at the moment forms part of Madhya Bharat, viz., the district of Mandsaur, which, I submit, needs the special attention of this House, because it seems to be now established, as some Hon'ble Members have already made out, that the people of that district are now cent percent in

favour of joining Rajasthan. When I say "now", I do not mean to say that they were against joining Rajasthan previously, though they did not openly agitate for such union. But then they did not anticipate the formation of Madhya Pradesh. The proposal about the formation of Madhya Pradesh has naturally set them at thinking, and given a fresh and irresistible impetus to their being placed in Rajasthan, so much so that, as I have said, they are now cent percent in favour of coming to Rajasthan; and I would respectfully, yet with emphasis, urge that their wishes should be conceded.

I come from Princely India, and it is my privilege to belong to the Royal family of Jodhpur. Rajasthan is often scoffed at as the home of feudalism. May I remind those friends who bear this outlook that at one time feudalism had its part to play in India. But the old order changes giving place to new, and God fulfils himself in many ways. So we have shaken off our feudalism, and our love for territory which went with it; and we are no longer sorry for it. As such I am not a little amused, and even pained, to find that those who scoffed at feudalism and at our lust of land, should now be quarreling, and quarreling in rather an undignified manner, over little bits of territory, as if each individual or group were carving a State of his or its own. We, of the Princely order, have surrendered our sovereignty, or such as we possessed, to share in a sovereignty which nobody can take away from us, the sovereignty that rests in the people, and it is now upto us to consider the whole of India as one home, wherein everybody of us has the right to go and reside and rise upto the fulness of stature, overriding all barriers of State or language or culture. I earnestly and humbly appeal to my Hon'ble friends in this House, and view this entire problem in this spirit and in this perspective.

Shri K. S. Gounder (Periyakulam):
The Report of the States Reorganisation Commission is generally welcome

but the recommendation to retain the Tamil taluks of Devikulam and Peermede with the Kerala State is regretted.

Unlike many other cases of disputed area, an opportunity for ascertaining the wishes of the people in T.C. States arose during the general election in 1954, which was necessitated by Travancore Tamil Nad Congress members seceding from the Congress Government Party, on the issue of merger with Tamil Nad. The elections were fought by T.N.C.C. and the Tamil area constituencies including Devikulam, Peermede, returned the T.N.C.C. candidates, placing beyond doubt the wishes of the people concerned.

Now let us examine whether this clear verdict of self-determination falls under the mischief of any of the limitations which the S.R.C. members had in mind. The Tamils in T.C. are not asking for a separate State, but only asking for merger with an existing State and the limitations which the S.R.C. members had in mind do not, therefore, apply to the demands of the Tamils in T.C.

The facts of the existing situation looked at particularly from the human angle of the people living in the area in question constitute the strongest argument for merger of the Tamil area with Tamil Nad.

All the Tamil areas in T.C. are contiguous to the Madras State and, therefore, satisfy fully this essential criterion. This area is very near and easily accessible through quite a number of highways and ways from Madras side. It is so near and accessible from Madras side that every day thousands of cattle from Cumbum valley go out to this area for grazing and return home in the evening. The ghats slope much more steeply on the T.C. side towards the sea, which is one reason why river waters empty themselves rapidly into the sea and thus go to waste.

Judged by any one of these objectives, the case is overwhelming for the merger of Devikulam and Peermede areas in T.C. with Madras. In fact, when food rationing was in force, Devikulam and Peermede Taluks,

which the S.R.C. members curiously enough wish to be retained in T.C., obtained their food supplies from Madurai and Coimbatore Districts in Madras.

It is clear that the S.R.C. members were themselves so impressed with the peculiarity and importance of this case, which as already seen satisfies all the criteria they had earlier laid down that they found it necessary to depart from their own principle of adjustments on a District Level (the reasons given for adopting this arbitrary unit are incidentally far from adequate or convincing). Having imported an important and additional consideration, viz., the political and administrative instability of this area consequent on the Tamil demands, it is somewhat inexplicable to find that the S.R.C. members should have decided that this evil can be warded off by transferring only four taluks to Madras State and retaining the rest in T.C. Is it the contention that the political and administrative instability which they dread will be completely wiped off by this partial transfer? Did the fact that, with the four (more populous) taluks out of the way, the Tamils in the remaining areas will be too few and, therefore, too impotent to cause any headaches to Malayalee politic, sub-consciously influence the Malayalee member of the S.R.C.? Incidentally, this member, unlike his colleague, the president of the S.R.C., who took the correct attitude in a parallel case, assumed the treble role of litigant advocate and Judge in respect of the decisions affecting his own State. While Tamils in T.C. in their present strength could not obviously be coerced into submission, as recent events have shown, it might not be so difficult to coerce, or drive away as refugees into the neighbouring State, the fewer and more scattered, and hence not so well organised Tamils of the remaining taluks. The arguments put forward by the S.R.C. for making this apparently invidious distinction are as interesting as they are unconvincing.

Here, as in the case of four southern taluks recommended for transfer to Madras, 'the wishes of the people have

[Shri K. S. Gounder]

been clearly expressed' and, as we have already seen, the conditions laid down by the S.R.C. itself for acceptance of the principle of self-determination are fully satisfied. And yet, they are introducing a new principle, viz., 'economic consideration'. In doing so, they completely disregarded what they themselves had said earlier on the subject.

We have a most curious situation here. The principle of self-determination, which the Commission recognise as worthy of the fullest consideration in a democracy, comes here into conflict with the idea of economic self-sufficiency which the Commission refuse to accept and yet, against their own clearly laid down dictum, the important principle is sacrificed for the unimportant. Is this confused thinking on the part of the Commission or the special pleading of the Malayalee member thereof?

The S.R.C. Report is a public document on which decisions of vital and far reaching importance to the country are to be taken and yet the Commission in a casual way mention and act on figures; without disclosing the source and the manner in which they were obtained. Labour population here, as in the rest of India, is no doubt mobile to some extent, and if the Tamil labour is migrant, the Malayalee labour is equally so in these areas. The Finance Minister of Madras has since clarified the whole issue and expressed the hollowness of the special pleading which the S.R.C. has resorted to in sponsoring the case of T.C. His remarks are worth quoting. 'Unfortunately, hav-

ing come to the conclusion and having made up their minds to integrate Devikulam and Peermede, they (Commission) have tried to find out various arguments, good, bad and indifferent, just like a lawyer trying to buttress his point of view'. If any independent person would go through their arguments, it would look as though there was 'confusion of thought and confusion of ideas' in the point of view put forward by the Commission.

On the basis of the 1951 census figures, which indicated that only 26 per cent. of the Tamilian population in Devikulam taluk represented persons who had been born within the T.C. State, and 14 per cent. in Peermede taluk, the Commission assumed that the rest of the large Tamil population in these taluks was part of the floating population. This assumption was unwarranted and incorrect. The Commission has not ascertained as to how many persons among those enumerated as born outside the T.C. State had in fact settled in this area and for how long they had been staying there continuously. When the Commission was dealing with the issue as to whether these taluks should go to Kerala State or to the New Madras State, it should have asked for and used only figures of persons born in these two taluks and should not have used figures of persons born anywhere inside the T.C. State and compared them with those born outside the State.

Quoting census figures of 1931, 1941, and 1951, the Minister said that the population for these years were:—

Taluk		1931 census	1941 census	1951 census
Devikulam	Tamilian population ..	51,730	53,394	62,130
	Malayalee population ..	3,894	8,282	16,050
Peermede	Tamilian population ..	24,776	31,911	42,570
	Malayalee population ..	19,284	31,748	50,440

The Commission, in its report, the Minister said, had adopted one formula for calculating the Tamil population and another formula for computing the Malayalam population. They had taken for granted that all persons of these taluks who were born outside the T.C. State were the only 'intruders' and

formed the only floating population. In these two predominantly Tamil areas, there had been infiltration by the Malayalam population and it had been admitted by Mr. Pattam Thanu Pillai in one of his statements.

The Commission had also overlooked the fact that even according to the

census figures supplied to it, the population of Tamilians in Devikulam taluk who were born within the T.C. State, were nearly 50 per cent. more than the number of Malayalees in the taluk who had been born in the State.

The Minister also pointed out that the Tamils owned nearly 90 per cent. of the cardamom estates in these areas, besides owning paddy areas.

There was positive proof that the Devikulam and Peermede areas were predominantly Tamil areas. The Commission had overlooked the fact that even in Peermede taluk permanently settled Tamilians were in a majority in every village except in the one village of Peruvanthanam. In Devikulam taluk, where there was a large permanently settled Tamilian majority, except in the only one village, namely, Pallivasal.

Even assuming for the sake of argument that some of the Tamil population had not permanently settled in this area, does the Commission seriously wish to introduce a new class of citizenship with limited rights for these so-called migrants? Apparently they are entitled to return representatives to the legislature but not entitled to any other rights of citizenship. What the constitution of India has given them, the Commission would unilaterally withdraw—a dangerous principle to introduce in our infant democracy.

In the first place, to lay stress on the percentage of the area of these taluks to that of the whole State, is deliberately misleading, as hill areas studded with forest, plantations, and catchment areas although relatively large in extent, will necessarily be sparsely populated in comparison with the plains and the scope for additional colonisation will necessarily be limited. Secondly, if the T.C. State needs outlets for its surplus population, so is Tamil Nad and with the increasing difficulties to which Tamil labour is subjected to in Ceylon, large numbers of them are likely to return to their homeland and must be accommodated. Thirdly, Tamil labour are better colo-

nisers, as the past history of not only of these taluks but also of overseas countries such as Burma, Ceylon, Malaya etc., has demonstrated. Lastly and this is most important—Colonising these areas with Malayalees, will, if it succeeds, mean the end of the Tamilians there, as they will have to either submit to the tyranny of the Malayalees or escape to Madras State as refugees.

The Madras Government have countered this through their representatives thus: 'The Madras Government had no major rivers with the exception of the Cauvery and the bulk of the State was at the mercy of the undependable north-east monsoon. It would greatly facilitate the State from the point of view of bringing additional areas under assured irrigation, if these two taluks were included in the Madras State and the utilisation by this State of the rivers in that area thereby facilitated. There was no scope for the development of major irrigation in this State except by harnessing the rivers in this area. The waters of the rivers in this area could not be used in T.C. State where land for irrigation from these areas was limited. There was a strong case for inclusion of this area in Madras State, in view of the attitude taken by the politicians of T.C. that they would not allow water to be delivered to the Madras State'.

Shri Bane (Bhusawal): I like to make certain observations on the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission and especially on the recommendation about the formation of the Bombay State and the Samyukta Maharashtra.

Before I go to the consideration of the actual recommendations, I want to say something in general on the question of redistribution of India on Linguistic basis. I am one of those who believed that the problem of Reorganisation of States on the basis of language was not a very urgent or pressing problem and it could have awaited for 10 years more. It did not deserve the priority at all. I do not agree with the view of the S.R.C. that

[Shri Rane]

It is the proper time now to reorganise States on the basis of language. I also do not share the view of the Hon. Member Shri Kakasahib Gadgil that the re-organisation of States on linguistic basis is as important as the Freedom movement of India. I am also unable to agree with many Hon. Members of this House who say that the culture of the people in India, who speak different language is different from that of others. According to them, the culture of Indian people varies from language to language. In my opinion, the culture of the Indian people is fundamentally one and the same. Customs, manners, dresses etc. may differ slightly here and there, but that does not mean that the culture is different. I am, in this respect, inclined towards the view of Acharya Kripalani. Hence there is no reason to redistribute India on linguistic basis on the ground of culture. The redistribution of States on linguistic basis at present will retard our Second Five Year Plan which is nearly double of the First Five Year Plan and for which India requires about Rs. 4,800 crores, i.e., forty-eight thousand millions of rupees. The main immediate problem of India today is how to reduce the poverty and squalor of our people and to raise their standard of life. The Reorganisation of States on linguistic basis will disturb our Development Plans and I have no doubt in my mind that it will retard the progress of India as a whole. But as the agitation for the division of India on linguistic basis is going for a long time in the country and as it was supported by the Congress, the question must be solved once for all though it has come as a boom-rung on the Congress now. I do not support the view that the Report of S.R.C. should be put in cold storage. This may prove disastrous in the end. In my opinion, this question should in no way be postponed and no opportunity for martyrdom be given to any body.

The Hon'ble Deputy Speaker has taken a pride that Andhra gave a lead in this fight. I admit that Andhra

gave a lead, but I submit most humbly, that Andhra gave a wrong lead. It was a wrong lead in many respects and especially in the use of bad means and ways utilised for the creation of separate Andhra State. In a way, Andhra is responsible for sowing the seeds of disharmony, bitterness and violence in the whole of India on this account. Whatever it is, the agitation has disturbed and threatened our internal peace. Therefore, I submit that this question of Reorganisation must be tackled immediately either to prevent the disturbance of internal peace or to restore the internal peace. The S.R.C. Report is there. The Government may either accept or modify the recommendations of the S.R.C. in solving this question once for all. The question is agitating the minds of the people throughout the length and breadth of India and it is no use retracing our steps now.

Before I consider the question of the Bombay State and Samyukta Maharashtra, I like to pay my tributes to the Commission for the disintegration of Hyderabad and abolition of the institution of Rajpramukhs and 'C' States.

The recommendations by S.R.C. to create the States of Vidarbha, Telangana and Kerala, in my opinion are not sound and wise. Such tiny States cannot be asset to the Indian Union. They cannot be good units of Welfare the Indian Union. Though they appear to be surplus today, they cannot remain so for ever. These tiny or small States will not be able to play their part in the Development Plans that may be ushered in near future. They cannot be good units of Welfare State. These small units cannot afford to spend more for the Welfare of the people, as envisaged by the Second Five Year Plan. All these States should be merged in bigger States.

As regards the formation of Bilingual State of Bombay as recommended by the S.R.C. the people of Maharashtra have resented it and want to reject it. I do not want to ascribe any malafides to the S.R.C. for this

recommendation of Bilingual State, as is done by some Hon'ble Members. But I want to impress upon this Hon. House that in view of the hatred and bitterness exhibited during the last few days, the Bilingual State as recommended by S.R.C. should not be imposed upon the Maharashtrian people. The Vidarbha people are not willing to join the bilingual State. The other solution for this problem is suggested by the Congress Working Committee and it is the three-State formula, viz., the creation of Maharashtra including Marathwada, Vidarbha; Gujerat; and the City State of Bombay. In my humble opinion, this is the next best solution, in case the Bombay City cannot be included in Maharashtra. This three-State formula is accepted by the leaders of Vidarbha and approved by the Madhya Pradesh State Assembly. It is not rejected by the Maharashtra P.C.C. On the other hand, it is welcomed by M.P.C.C. with a request to reconsider the case of Bombay City. Hence the three-State formula is a lesser evil and ultimately the Maharashtrians unwillingly may accept and work the three-State formula. Personally speaking for myself, any proposal out of the two is acceptable to me, as I am not a linguistic diehard. But this question is not a personal one, but a larger one as it affects millions of people. Hence in my opinion the people of Maharashtra should accept the three-State formula as the next best solution and try to win the people of Bombay within the coming 5 years for merger of Bombay city in Maharashtra.

If this is not accepted, I like to make one new suggestion. The Bombay city should be centrally administered as an Autonomous region with a Regional Council, elected on the basis of Adult suffrage on the model of Assam Tribal Territory as is prescribed in Articles 243, 244 and Schedule VI of the Indian Union. The above said provisions of the Indian Constitution can serve a best guide to administer Bombay City. I cannot expand here the idea for want of space.

In the end, I want to appeal to my Maharashtrian friends not to be led away by passions on this account. The incidents in the City of Bombay in the last month have prejudiced the case of Maharashtra to some extent and hence it is time for us to exercise self-restraint and patience. I also like to appeal to my non-Maharashtrian friends in the House and outside and especially in the City of Bombay not to have any apprehensions about the Maharashtrians, who have worked in collaborations with you for years together. Let all of us forget and forgive and march hand in hand to contribute our mite in building up our nation, though our States may be different if destiny wills it.

Shri Gadlingana Gowd (Kurnool): I have been elected to this House before the Andhra State came into existence. My constituency then consisted of Kurnool and Patikonda Taluks, purely Telugu-speaking Taluks Adoni and Alur Taluks which are bilingual Taluks where the people speak both the languages—Telugu and Kannada and Sirguppa Taluk, a purely Kannada-speaking area which has now gone to Mysore after the formation of Andhra State. People speaking Telugu in my constituency have been asking me to ask for Bellary. The Kannada-speaking people in bilingual Taluks have been asking me to represent to you for the appointment of Boundary Commission which was assured during the debates on Andhra State Bill with a view to go to Karnataka. The people in Sirguppa Taluk have been asking me to represent to you that they are not willing to merge in Andhra State as proposed by S.R.C. I am thus put in a very delicate position. Some of my Telugu-speaking friends and Kannada-speaking friends who are personally interested in me advised me not to speak on the subject as it is a very controversial matter and that it might affect my future. After matured consideration I did not like to keep quiet for my personal benefit of being re-elected and thus deceive people who elected me with great enthusiasm. I feel character is more important than the member-

[Shri Gadlingana Gowd]

ship of the Parliament. I have, therefore, decided to submit to you very frankly my views which I think according to my conscience are just most impartial. I will be very brief. Vishal Andhra has to be formed along with the other States by the 1st October, 1956 as programmed by the Government at present. The S.R.C. Report has made out a very good case for formation of Vishal Andhra but ultimately recommended the creation of Telangana with option to merge itself in Andhra after five years. You know that agitation for linguistic states has been going on for the last 40 years. Therefore, formation of linguistic States should be settled once for all. If the proposition of S.R.C. is accepted, it will give room for springing in of group politics in every party for and against merger of this State in Andhra. Thus all the leaders will divert their attention towards this group politics instead of developmental works of the State. It is, therefore, I say that Vishal Andhra should immediately be formed with all the Telegu speaking area wherever they are, taking into consideration only language and contiguity.

I have to say a few words about Kolar. The Kolar district in Mysore State has been proposed to be merged with Karnataka by S.R.C. and it has given two reasons for such a proposal. Reason No. (1) is: The Mysore Government has developed it. (2) Bellary is proposed to be given to Andhra as equity to Kolar.

The first reason will not hold good because Sir, as you are aware the Andhras also were mainly responsible for building up Madras. Historically Madras belongs to Andhras and was once called "Chennapattanamu" on the basis that Madras now contains the majority of Tamil-speaking people, the S.R.C. has recommended that it should be in Tamilnad and that Andhra should not reopen this question. I am not able to understand as to why S.R.C. does not apply the same principle to Kolar and Bellary. Second reason will also not hold good because

Kolar is a complete district and Bellary area proposed to be merged with Andhra is only 3½ Taluks. Kolar fetches an income of one crore of rupees to the State, while Bellary is a deficit area. It cannot therefore, be equated to Kolar. Therefore, I submit that Kolar should be included in Andhra and Bellary, Hospet, Sirguppa and Malappuram sub-Taluk should go to Karnataka.

In this connection I may say Sir, that the Communist Party in Andhra State Assembly has taken a right stand and moved an amendment to this effect. Secondly, I submit that the Government assured the Kannada people of Adoni and Alur Taluks that they would appoint a Boundary Commission. Though two years have passed since such assurance, the Government have not yet taken any action. I appeal to you, Sir, and to the Government through you to appoint Boundary Commission immediately to demarcate boundary between Karnataka and Andhra and to decide Kannada-speaking villages in Adoni, Alur and Raydurg Taluks for merger with Karnataka.

Lastly, I submit that there are bound to be linguistic minorities in unilingual States. Though the State Governments by conventions are expected to safeguard the interest of these minorities for giving education in their own mother tongue, to preserve their culture for reservation of appointments in services etc., the experience has shown that they have not only failed to do so but also suppressed them. I may here mention one or two instances:

"In a village called Hariwana in Adoni Taluk, there is 80 per cent of Kannada-speaking population. There are also Karnatak Sangha and Andhra Congress Committee. One of the members of the Executive Committee of the Karnatak Sangha who is a Kannadiga is the President of that village Panchayat. The Officers of the Planning Department suggested to him to construct a Reading-room-cum-Radio-room in the village under Local Assistance

Works. He agreed to do so. The Revenue authorities selected a Government site for the proposed building. The Andhra State Government sanctioned the Scheme which was estimated to cost about five thousand rupees. According to the scheme the Panchayat Board had to pay Rs. 1,250/-, the people of the village Rs. 1,250/- and 50 per cent by the Government. When the construction began the Andhra Congress Committee set up some persons to object for the construction of the building on some trivial grounds. The matter was scrutinised at every stage throughout from the Tehsildar right upto the Collector and the objection was over ruled and the construction was allowed to go on. At this stage, the Government intervened and stayed the orders of the Collector. This was brought to my notice. I immediately wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Planning Department under a copy to the Minister. I also saw the Minister and represented to him the case. He told me that it was usual to grant stays and that he could not avoid issue of stay as one M.L.A. Shri H. Ramlinga Reddi requested for the same. I may point out, Sir, that this M.L.A. does not represent that area and that the Minister also said the Government would not reverse the order of the Collector. The Collector appears to have strongly recommended in favour of construction. The Government which was bent to cancel the scheme on some ground or the other directed the Collector once again to inspect the place and re-submit his report. The Collector who is a very honest, straight forward I.A.S. officer wrote back to the Government that he does not think the inspection of the site was necessary as his P.A. had already inspected the site and that he could not change his opinion in the matter. In spite of the report being like this the Government cancelled the scheme on the flimsy ground that the site in question has not been alienated in favour of the Panchayat though this order is in contravention of another earlier order wherein it is said that the selection of site is enough to proceed with construction of building

under N.E.S. or Local Assistance Works as alienation proceedings will take time. I wanted this matter to be re-considered on the ground that their latest order will affect construction of all the buildings throughout the State. The Government now comes out in its true colours and says that the matter cannot be re-considered unless some other unobjectionable site is selected."

How do you expect these minority groups to have confidence in site Governments.

It appears in another case:

"A Textile Officer has told a Cloth Merchant that his licence would be cancelled if he does not replace his Kannada Name-board by a Telugu Name-board."

Thirdly, all the Kannada sections in all the schools in these bilingual areas have been closed. Would it be possible to expect justice in the hands of these people? I, therefore, urge the constitution of a Central Commission to protect the interest of linguistic minority groups such as Muslims etc. etc. in all the States. In conclusion I submit that Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay city and Punjab State with Punjabi-speaking areas should also be formed. Karnataka State should be called as Karnataka State alone and not as Mysore State as suggested by some Mysore legislators.

Shri Bhagabat Sahu (Balasore): Although the S.R.C. have recommended some revolutionary measures like abolition of Rajpramukhship and class 'B' and 'C' States, its recommendation with regard to reorganisation of States is full of illogicality and inconsistency, and also devoid of justice in many cases. Take the case of Singhbhum and Saraikella Subdivisions of Singhbhum district in Bihar, and Fuljhar, Bindra-Nuagarh and South Bastar in Madhya Pradesh, over all of whom the State of Orissa and the people of these areas laid claim for their inclusion in Orissa.

[Shri Bhagabat Sahu]

But to the utter disappointment, disgust and anger of Orissa Public the S.R.C. did not care to mention our claim over Singhbhum Sadar sub-division and in the case of other areas without going into the merits of these cases summarily rejected the claim of Orissa to these areas. Orissa public has been demanding inclusion of Singhbhum in Orissa since 1901. Even the O'Donnell Committee, whose report has been taken by the S.R.C. as the basis for their recommendation on the demands of Orissa, while rejecting the claims of Orissa to Singhbhum stated three grounds for such rejection in 1932:

- (1) Separation of Singhbhum from Orissa by a wide belt of feudatory States,
- (2) Geographical position and lines of communication favoured its retention in Bihar, and
- (3) The Hos opposed to such transfer.

Even if all these factors have completely changed in Orissa's favour and although Oriyas are next in predominance to Hos in the area, although the Hos in general and their representatives in particular have represented their case so ably before the Commission for their transfer to Orissa, it did not have the courtesy even to mention the claim over Singhbhum Sadar Sub-division by Orissa anywhere in the Report.

If one compares figures of Oriya population of 1951 census report with that of 1931 census report, one would find that within 20 years their percentage to the total population of Singhbhum have come down from 24 per cent. to 17 per cent. and that Oriya population along with its culture is dying not a slow death. This is one of the strong reasons why Oriyas of Singhbhum are so anxious to amalgamate Singhbhum with Orissa. What is the justification for Bihar to keep this area under its administration? 1951 Census report clearly shows

that permanent Hindi speakers in the Singhbhum district is only 2.5 per cent. Hos who are more than 50 per cent. in this area are, in the very nature of things, very anxious for transfer of this area to Orissa as in that case almost all Hos of India excepting 4½ thousands Hos inhabiting the whole of Ranchi Division will be under the administration of Orissa numbering about 5,93,000.

It is funny that Mr. Jaipal Singh the leader of so-called Jharkhand movement asserts that Hos along with other Adivasis of Chotanagpur want to remain in Bihar, as a proof of which he cites the success of Adivasi candidates in last general election from Singhbhum on his party ticket. Was it an issue in his party's election manifesto that in case Jharkhand was not materialising, Singhbhum would continue to remain under Bihar even if the whole of India would be reorganised on linguistic and other considerations. I can boldly say that he and his party in Bihar are not serious or sincere in their Jharkhand demand. Had they been so, they would have certainly demanded a division in Bihar Assembly while this report was under discussion, while 34 members of the Bihar Assembly belonging to so-called Jharkhand party of which Mr. J. P. Singh claims to be the leader in their memorandum to the S.R.C. demanding separate Jharkhand had stated that Hos area of Singhbhum had never belonged to Bihar and that Jharkhand area does not want to remain in Bihar. Why this sudden change?

Mr. Jaipal Singh who, under the cloak of Jharkhand is not only standing for Bihar, but also wants extension of Bihar to Adivasi areas of M.P. and U.P. is trying to befool the Adivasis of India by his cheap Jharkhand slogan. But he knows too well that Adivasis of Singhbhum who are so much inter mixed with Oriyas in culture and habit will not be deceived.

I do not understand how the S.R.C. could brush aside our Singhbhum and Saraikella demand so lightly. Their treatment towards Orissa is very much insulting. Is it true that because Orissa is poor and small, because it has no such high personality in the All-India level, our just and legitimate claim was summarily rejected? If that be the atmosphere, then no democracy which we all value so much, can grow and prosper in this vast land. It is amazing that the Chairman of the S.R.C. remained aloof from all consideration and decision over the boundary disputes between Bihar and the other States because of his long connection with Bihar. Had not the other two members similar long connections with their own States?

I would not have minded if our demands would have been rejected after proper examination.

Is it a fact that the nuisance value of an area weighed more with the S.R.C.? Is it that the S.R.C. was influenced by some extraordinary reasons and circumstances? Otherwise, I don't understand why the S.R.C. showed such judicial nervousness at the time of considering claims of Orissa against Bihar? Really it is funny that such a high power body like S.R.C. could advance such inconsistent and incorrect arguments to justify their stand to suit their pre-conceived rather pre-settled decisions. A prejudiced mind has produced a prejudiced judgment.

The people of Orissa indignant and unbalanced as they have been over the report of the S.R.C. are still looking to the Congress High Command and Government of India for undoing the mischief and wrong that have been brought about by the report of the S.R.C. Although Orissa is poor it has never lagged behind any other part of India in point of sacrifice at the time of movement for delivery of Mother India from foreign yoke. By way of digression may I be permitted to express my profound sorrow and astonishment at the mention of Andhra's claim to Parlakhemdi,

Brahampur and Koruput which are predominantly Oriya-speaking areas and where telugu population is meagre. It is most unfortunate that Mr. V. V. Giri who was speaking here on such a high level of internationalism could come down to lay such fantastic claims of Andhra over Orissa. He is, perhaps, suffering from the same weak disease of blood is thicker than water.

What I am saying here I am of course doing so with a heavy heart but I have no malice against Bihar or M.P. I am an Indian first and last. Provincialism as such does not possess me in the least.

My sole complaint is against the S.R.C. I am sure that our claim is just and sound. It can stand the test laid down by the Government of India or by any impartial tribunal.

Shri B. D. Pande (Almora Distt—North-East): Most of the informed peace-loving world is lauding India's Policy of cooperation and friendship. Ours is an affirmation of love which is all inclusive, in contrast to the exclusive pacts born of fears, suspicions and insecurities. Is it not an anomaly to have group and regional pacts when there is a United Nations Organisation as the integrating agency?

Mahatma Gandhi, the apostle of love and peace, steered our nation, through discipline and cooperation, to regain its liberty. He paved the ground for India to play a still more magnificent role in establishing international amity and cooperation. It was, therefore, natural that his foremost disciple should resurrect the long forgotten (over 2,000 years old) *Panch Shila* of Asoka, which represents the churned wisdom of human thought and practical morality. It represents the oneness of man and symbolises the innate unity of his aspirations. Jawaharlal invoked the *Panch Shila* to effect international comity because it advances the most cultivated and workable philosophy. It embraces such fundamentals as mutual respect, non-aggression,

[Shri B. D. Pande]

non-interference, equity and peaceful co-existence. *Panch Shila* is particularly pertinent in the *Atomic Age*, which leaves no other alternative between peaceful co-existence and violent co-extinction. The human doctrine of love, cooperation and peace is, therefore, bound to touch the sensitive cord of man at a time when disaster is about to overtake mankind. Reason and sanity must prevail. The desire for survival alone will not permit the forces of extinction to hold sway over humanity. Hence it is hoped that the precepts of *Panch Shila* may eventually be adopted with universal acclaim. Through its instrumentality our Prime Minister is striving to enlarge the sphere of cooperation and friendship to embrace the entire mankind. We are happy that India again is holding the beacon light for world peace.

With such an international setting it becomes all the more compelling that we ponder over and review our domestic scene. What do we find? The unity of India has been painfully impaired by provincialism, linguism and narrow group interests. National unity, cooperation and enlightenment, that had been so sedulously cultivated and nurtured, are fast losing ground while dissension, rivalry and parochialism are on the march. Even under foreign domination provincialism and linguism did not assume such frightening proportions as today. Our integrity then was intact because we recognised our basic unity in diversity—the oneness of India geographically, culturally and, yes, even linguistically! We then emphasised that our development and growth was of common origin and that we were children of the same Mother. Why then this doleful change? Are we not as a nation doomed to disaster if we permit destructive passions of linguism, provincialism and narrow vested interests to dominate our thoughts and to influence our actions?

The Government of India appointed the S.R.C. to strengthen our governmental machinery by further consolidation and integration of our loosely knit administrative units. Unfortunately for the nation, the divisive forces of dissension and unreason are clamouring for power and are nourishing a hydro-headed monster of provincialism, linguism, parochialism and jingoism. These forces are not directed by an alien power but are strictly of domestic origin. They are trying to destroy our precious heritage of tolerance of opposites and of unity in diversity—the oneness of the people of India culturally and linguistically. We cannot, therefore, afford the sinful luxury of tolerating them or permit them to misuse the S.R.C. recommendations for serving narrow interests. Through national solidarity we were able to terminate the domination of a powerful empire. Is it too much to expect that, through applying the precepts of *Panch Shila*, we can recapture our national integrity so that we may march forward in our domestic sphere as potently as we are doing in the international sphere?

In keeping with parliamentary propriety, I am constrained to make the following observations. All the members of the S.R.C. have laboured hard and rendered yeo man service to the nation. We express our cordial gratitude to them. However, it is natural that in the interest of candour exception be taken to some recommendations and observations. In his dissenting opinion Shri Pannikar, the able administrator and erudite historian, has advocated the vivisection of U.P., the only viable administrative unit that was unaffected by either linguism or by provincialism. It is shocking to have disintegration prescribed for U.P., no matter under what pretext. This historian also created sensational history by proclaiming the districts of Almora and Garhwal as being inhabited by nomadic tribes! Assuming for the sake of argument that his assertion is correct, since when is it a crime

to belong to a nomadic tribe? Was not the Mahatma the greatest of all nomads? His Odessy covering Gujrat, U. K., South Africa and the entire continent of India is a glowing record of his nomadism. The foremost living nomad is our Jawaharlal who has gone to the far corners of the earth in search of peace and in the interest of sanity. Finally, the Government of India has thought fit to place the portfolio of Law and Order (Home Ministry) on the broad shoulders of a genuine nomad from Almora, Pandit Pant.

These are days of test and trial in our national growth and India is passing through a trying transition. Every calamity, if wisely handled, can prove an opportunity in disguise. Let us therefore, face our tribulations with solidarity, courage and conviction—that we are Indians first, second and always. Let reason and sanity be our guide posts. Jawaharlal has given us a lead and we must give serious heed and study the proposal of the five regional administrative units namely Eastern, Western, Northern, Southern and Central. The geographical structure of India superbly facilitates such a regional division. Limited number of states will also reduce to a minimum the legislative, administrative, judiciary, Public Service Commissions and other allied State-bodies. It will also terminate the never ending squabbles and rivalries and jealousies that have been fanned by destructive forces. Panditji's sage counsel should be carefully considered and the principles of *Panch Shila* should be applied in this new concept of *Panch Khand* of India to re-establish national solidarity and peace. By the advocacy of *Panch Shila* India occupies an enviable position in International Councils. Can we possibly afford to ignore it in our domestic affairs? By implementing *Panch Shila*, in our national life we will be able to bring greater lustre to Mother India.

Shrimati Jayashri (Bombay Suburban): As representing the Bombay city, I am grateful to the members of

the S.R. Commission for the just and fair way they have dealt, with regard to the formation of the Bombay State, they have taken the view in a new light, while examining the problem, giving first consideration to the security, unity and economic prosperity of India, and have discouraged every separatist and disruptive tendency. Shri Ramanand Tirtha said that the fear in the minds of people "that the forming of linguistic Provinces is sinister" should be removed. But nobody has got this in mind—what one has to say is that, it is wrong to imagine that the States Reorganisation Commission had been appointed with the sole object of dividing the country on the language basis. The terms of reference of this Commission, and the Prime Minister's appeal to the nation seem to have been completely ignored. The Government statement appointing the Commission pointedly suggests:

"The first essential consideration in the matter of reorganisation of the States is the preservation and the 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 from the whole nation"

Three Commissions have examined the question of linguistic provinces. The Dar Commission in 1948, the J.V.P. Report in 1948-49 and Fazal AH Commission 1953-55. All Commissions have set their face against linguistic provinces. Unity, security and economic prosperity and the welfare of the country are the guiding factors. When three different Commissions during the last seven years have gone into the question of Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay as capital, and found that it is going against the larger interests of the nation, then there must be something wrong with the demand itself

There is no sacrosanctity about one State one language. Out of the 14

[Shrimati Jayashri]

languages, Gujarati, Urdu, Punjabi and Sanskrit will have no State under the S.R.C. Recommendations. Gujarati has at present a B State and a C State. They have been proposed to be merged with Bombay. Gujaratis though in minority have always kept friendly attitude towards their neighbours—and it is strange that the Maharashtrians, though in majority are stubborn in their demand for a separate State.

If the supporters of Samyukta Maharashtra still insist on separating, then in no case the city of Bombay be made to join an unilingual State. If the city of Bombay is made the capital of Maharashtra grave injustice would be done to the other component units. The 56 per cent. of the non-Maharashtrian population will be reduced to the status of secondary citizenship, and will be treated as aliens by the dominant group.

Bombay city is the meeting ground of all regional cultures. It is the nerve centre of India—we have a big South Indian population living in Matunga area, and a large number of Uttar Bharatiya population. Survey of linguistic composition of college students in the city reveals that 77 per cent. are non-Marathi speaking students. There are altogether 15 language groups in Bombay. Marathi speaking population is only 43 per cent.

The claim over the city is neither based on linguistic nor cultural grounds. Before the growth of the movement of Samyukta Maharashtra, the Maharashtrians claimed only Poona as their political, intellectual and cultural capital, as in fact it is. The Poona University was claimed by them on the ground that Poona is the home of Marathi language and culture. But the noteworthy fact about the majority of these Marathi speakers is that they form a population of a "shifting" or floating nature. They are the factory workers, who usually go back to their homes in Maharashtra during

the monsoon for cultivation and other occupations and however high the percentage of the Marathi-speakers in Bombay may be, larger numbers of them belong to this seasonal type of workers.

A novel 'argument' that is further advanced by the politicians of Samyukta Maharashtra about Bombay is that they say Bombay has been built by the labour of the working class of Maharashtra and therefore they should be the masters of the city. This type of proprietary right is not yet recognised by laws. The argument is therefore futile and invalid. Bombay has always been free from narrow sectarian and parochial point of view, and has stood for a broad national outlook, so essential for formulating policies affecting the country as a whole. At a time when the forces of linguism are asserting themselves, emphasising regional culture and regional outlook, it is all the more essential that a multi-lingual unit like Bombay be constituted into a separate entity as a bastion of national unity and solidarity.

The multi-lingual city of Bombay to whose growth every region in India has contributed, has developed a unique cosmopolitan life and high degree of culture. Bombay citizens are afraid this will suffer greatly if the city is annexed to any unilingual area. Resolutions passed by important organisations representing minorities in the city in support of the memorandum submitted by the Bombay Citizens Committee, strongly repudiate the claim advanced by Samyukta Maharashtra for making Bombay city its capital. The Sindhi Merchants' Association, the Uttar Bharatiya Sangh, the Parsi Federal Council, the South Indian Organisations in Bombay city and the Kannadiga Organisations in Bombay city have appealed to the Parliament and the Government that the city of Bombay with its environs should be given a separate status as a regional administrative unit by itself. The members of Bombay Pradesh Coo-

gress Committee have supported the S.R.C. Report, but failing that the three-State formula. Bombay is the only State which presents surplus Budget during the last four years. All the other States, U.P., Bihar, Bengal, Madras, Andhra, Orissa, Punjab, Madhya Pradesh had deficit budget. Is it with best interest of the nation to break up such a progressive State to satisfy a demand which has been found to be unsound. Bombay because of its cosmopolitan character subscribed liberally to the Central Government Loans. Last year Bombay city subscribed 97 crores out of 158 crores for the loan floated by Government. If the prominent position of Bombay as a financial and commercial centre is destroyed by making it a part of unilingual State it will prove a great loss to the nation. Whenever there was distress and calamity in any part of the country due to floods or famine, Bombay citizens have generously extended their hand of help to the distressed people. The prosperity of Bombay is shared by the whole nation and not a few citizens living in Bombay.

Lastly, I would appeal to all to consider this problem dispassionately and in a peaceful atmosphere. We talk of *Panch Shila*. Let us then not call the agitation as morcha which sounds like battlefield. Why create this hatred? Unfortunately the protagonists of Samyukta Maharashtra have generated an atmosphere where a small spark might set alight a conflagration. To call this "fight (morcha)" being "peaceful" and "democratic" is to make a mockery of both peace and democracy. The happenings in Bombay were a disgrace to a city which rightly prides itself on its high sense of civic consciousness and its spirit of good neighbourliness. I am sorry to say that during the tragic happenings in Bombay on the 21st of November, hands of hooligans I am ashamed to say that they were molested. Gandhi caps and national flags were thrown down and crushed. These incidents

have shaken the faith of the citizens of Bombay. The best fortune that we can see for the city of Bombay is that it should continue as it is today, the meeting place of all communities, their source of pride and affection and a convenient centre for their joint labour and enterprise. It will be incongruous to make this multilingual cosmopolitan city the capital of a unilingual province.

Shri S. V. L. Narasimham (Guntur): There can be no dispute that changes must be effected in the light of primacy of national unity. But, I wonder how formation of States on linguistic basis affects prejudicially unity of India. The idea of a national language is conceived to promote unity. Language plays the dominant role in democratic administration and considerations of contiguity, economic viability and commonness of culture will contribute to administrative convenience. Unity of India is promoted and preserved by fostering a sense of pride of citizenship of India and undivided loyalty to the country. Eloquent claims by individuals and certain tracts to have led India in the struggle for national independence will only rouse passions of others and other tracts and create hostile feelings.

I come from Andhra and Andhras have always demonstrated that they are Indians first and Andhras only next. The Simon Commission could and would have granted a separate state if only we would have welcomed them. We felt we ought to subordinate our desire for a separate state to the higher cause of national freedom and totally boycotted the Commission. It was only after the Congress came into power, we demanded the fulfilment of what was an article of faith with us and a realisation of a long cherished desire and formation of states on the basis of language will promote contentment of the Andhra State is a pledge given to us by the leaders. The

[Shri S. V. L. Narasimham]

ment and unity of the people. The Commission recognises the overwhelming opinion in favour of Vishalandhra and sets out clearly benefits that will accrue. But, it is suggested that the formation of Telugu state may be postponed for five years. There can be no opinion more influential than that of the people. If people's voice is supreme, the resolutions of all the political parties in the present Hyderabad State, prior to the appointment of the Commission and the views of members of Hyderabad State Assembly, emphatically demand the formation of Vishalandhra immediately. The Commission argues that Kolar and Tumkur must remain in Mysore. The reasoning is not right. Bellary town rightly must be included in Andhra. Kolar and Tumkur must be merged with Andhra. Hosur and Krishnagiri in Madras must be ceded to Andhra. Parlakimidi area now in Orissa state is a preponderantly Telugu area and the time for including the same in Andhra has arisen. The only ground on which this area was merged with Orissa was that the Maharaja of Parlakimidi wished it. Peoples' voice must prevail over the wishes of Maharaja. Batar and Chand in Madhya Pradesh must also come to Andhra. Vishalandhra will be an ideal state.

The Maharashtrians are rightly claiming Bombay. This city has developed on account of the resources that Nature endowed the tract. It will be idle to contend that this city will lose its importance if it will be the capital of an unilingual state. The Gujaratis have no objection to Bombay constituting a separate State. That itself suffices to explode the theory that Bombay shall not lose importance by being retained in a unilingual state.

Mr. Panikkar rightly suggested the reduction in size of the monster, Uttar Pradesh. Equality of States and equal representation are healthy checks over the tendency of large

states to dominate over the rest. Delhi can be made the capital of a Delhi State comprising the present Delhi State and a part of present Uttar Pradesh.

I hope and appeal that a decision will be taken on the lines indicated above.

श्री बी० पी० सिंह (मुंगेर सदर व जमुई) : सीमा पुनर्गठन की रिपोर्ट पर सभी सदस्यों को मत प्रकट करने का मौका दे कर आपने भारतीय संसद में एक नया कदम उठाया है आप के इस प्रयास की मैं प्रशंसा करता हूँ दुनिया की संसदीय जीवन में यह बात नई नहीं है। एक बार मैंने आप का ध्यान इस प्रथा की ओर आकर्षित किया था। परन्तु उस समय मुझे सफलता नहीं मिली थी मेरा आपसे आग्रह है कि आगे भी खास २ भवसरों पर आप इस प्रथा को जारी रखेंगे ऐसा मेरा विश्वास है।

मैं सीमा पुनर्गठन कमीशन के सदस्यों में पूर्ण विश्वास रखता हूँ और उन के प्रयास के लिये धन्यवाद देता हूँ। साथ ही उनके द्वारा निर्धारित नीति का पूर्ण समर्थन करता हूँ। परन्तु अपने द्वारा निर्धारित नीति का जहाँ उस ने अतिक्रमण किया है, उस के लिये खेद प्रकट करता हूँ। इस प्रकार का अतिक्रमण कर उस ने जनता को दुविधा में डाल दिया है पता नहीं किन कारणों से अपने द्वारा निर्धारित नीति का उस ने खंडन किया है। कारण जो भी हो परन्तु संसद् उन के द्वारा निर्धारित नीति का तो आदर करे ऐसा मेरा निवेदन है। मैं समझता हूँ माननीय सदस्यों के प्रति इस प्रकार हम आदर कर सकते हैं यदि उन की कोई भी सिफारिश उनकी नीति के प्रतिकूल है, उसे यह संसद अस्वीकार कर दे। उसी में माननीय सदस्यों की प्रतिष्ठा है।

एक समय था फोर्ट विलियम (कलकता) से ही सारे ब्रिटेन भारत का शासन होता था समय समय पर आवश्यकतानुसार उस सीमा में

कटीती होती नई और नये २ प्रान्तों का निर्माण हुआ। निकट भूत में भी बिहार—उड़ीसा और आसाम बंगाल के ही साथ था। देश का विभाजन होने पर पूर्वी बंगाल के अलग हो जाने से बंगाल का क्षेत्रफल छोटा हो गया। परन्तु उस से आर्थिक हानि की कोई बात नहीं उठती है।

देश का विभाजन हो जाने के कारण पूर्वी बंगाल से अधिक संख्या में विस्थापित लोग पश्चिमी बंगाल में आ रहे हैं। यह सत्य है। उन के बसाने की जिम्मेदारी भारत सरकार की है। यह भी निर्विवाद विषय है। इस के लिये भारत सरकार प्रयत्नशील है। यह समस्या बहुत दूर तक हल हो गई होती, यदि वे विस्थापित देश के दूसरे दूसरे भागों में भी बसाने का निश्चय करते। परन्तु विस्थापितों का बंगाल में तथा उस के पास वर्ती प्रान्तों में ही बसाने का हट युक्तिसंगत प्रतीत नहीं होता है। हो सकता है कि इस के पीछे, कोई जाहरा गहरा राजनैतिक कारण हो।

संसद के इसी अधिवेशन में श्री मेहर चन्द खन्ना और एक बार श्री अजित प्रसाद जैन ने संसद् में कहा था कि बंगाल के विस्थापित दूसरे प्रान्तों में बसाने के लिये राजी नहीं हैं। इस अवस्था में भारत सरकार विस्थापितों की समस्या हल करने में असमर्थ हो जाती है। उस के लिये यह हट करना कि उन को बिहार और आसाम में ही जगह मिलनी चाहिये और वह भी उन स्थानों को बंगाल प्रान्त में मिला कर ही। उस में कोई औचित्य नहीं मालूम पड़ता है। परन्तु एक गहरी राजनैतिक चाल की गन्ध आती है। और विस्थापितों के नाम पर बिहार में जगह की मांग बंगाभी मित्र करते हैं। मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि विस्थापितों का प्रश्न अखिल भारतीय प्रश्न है। इस नाते वह बिहार ही की समस्या है। और बिहार ने इस जवाबदेही को निबाहा है। और आगे भी निभाने को तैयार है। इस नाते

बंगाल बिहार की सीमा का मांग करे यह उचित नहीं है।

कमीशन ने केवल भाषा के आधार पर राज्य निर्माण की नीति को मान्य नहीं माना है। साथ ही भाषा का प्रश्न तभी विचारणीय होगा यदि आबादी का सत्तर प्रतिशत एक भाषाभाषी हो।

बिहार का किशनगंज जो महानन्दा नदी का पूर्वी भाग है वह केवल इस आधार पर पश्चिमी बंगाल में मिलाने की सिफारिश की गई है। वह भाग उत्तरी बंगाल और पश्चिमी बंगाल को मिलाने वाला होगा। उस भाग की आबादी अधिकतर मुसलमान है। जिन की भाषा तथा और किसी बात में समता नहीं है। उस की आबादी भी घनी है। कमीशन ने सिफारिश की है, उन की भाषा तथा संस्कृति की रक्षा की जाय साथ ही उस भाग में बंगाल सरकार विस्थापितों को बसाने की चेष्टा नहीं करे। उपरोक्त बातों से साफ जाहिर होता है कि किशनगंज को बंगाल में मिलाने का कोई भी दूसरा कारण नहीं है सिर्फ रास्ते के लिये। एक (National Highway) बंगाल के दोनों भागों को मिलाता है। यह बात समझ में नहीं आती है कि इतने लचर दलील के साथ एक राज्य की सीमा दूसरे राज्य से मिलाई जा सकती है। (National Highway) का व्यय केन्द्रीय सरकार वहन करती है। इस कारण उस के व्यवहार में कोई अन्तर नहीं आ सकता है इस सिफारिश के कारण वहां की जनता में घोर असन्तोष फैला हुआ है। सत्याग्रह कर सैकड़ों की संख्या में जेल जा रहे हैं। सरकार का कर्तव्य होना चाहिये जनमत के बिना एक राज्य की सीमा दूसरे राज्य से नहीं मिलाई जाय। कमीशन की यह सिफारिश उस के द्वारा निश्चित नीति के अनुकूल नहीं है। अतः यह सिफारिश का आधार ठोस

[श्री बी० पी० सिंह]

वहीं है। अतः वह सरकार को अमान्य होना चाहिये।

कमीशन की दूसरी सिफारिश पुरुलिया सब डिवीजन को चार चार घाना को छोड़ कर बंगाल में मिला देने की है। किशनगंज को मिलाने में यह दलील दी गई है कि वह भाग उत्तरी बंगाल और दक्षिणी बंगाल को मिलाने में सहायक होगा। परन्तु इस सिफारिश से धनबाद और रांची का रास्ता बन्द हो जाता है। धनबाद में कोयले की खान है रांची छोटा नागपुर कमिश्नरी का और बिहार का ग्रीष्मकालीन राजधानी है। साथ ही मुरी नामक नगर जो रांची जिला में है और उसका विकास हो रहा है वह इन स्थानों से तथा जमशेदपुर से अलग हो जाता है। धनबाद और जमशेदपुर का रास्ता भी बिहार ही कर नहीं पड़ता है। इस प्रकार सिफारिशों से विषमता का सिद्धान्त बरता गया है। जिस के समझने में बुद्धि काम नहीं दे रही है।

इस सिफारिश में भाषा का आधार भी कारण नहीं है। कारण मिलने वाले हिस्से में केवल ४२ प्रतिशत बंगला भाषी हैं। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने सिफारिश की है एक अनुष्य कम से कम दो तीन भाषाएं सीखें। पुर पलाम जिले में बंगालियों की आबादी पचीस हजार से अधिक नहीं है। जिन के नामों के पीछे बंगाली उपाधियां जैसे बनरजी, चटर्जी, दत्त, सरकार जुड़े हुए हैं। जो जिले की आबादी का १.८ प्रतिशत हैं।

कमीशन ने केवल इस आधार पर मान्यता के हिस्से को बंगाल में मिलाने की सिफारिश की है कि कसाह नदी पर बंगाल में एक डाम बनने वाला है। बिहार सरकार भी उस नदी पर एक डाम बनाने वाली है जिस की लागत साढ़े पांच करोड़ होगी साथ ही उस नदी का (catchment area) भी

बंगाल को देने की सिफारिश की गई है। प्रथम तो इस बुनियाद को ही में गलत मानता हूं, यदि इस आधार को मान लिया जाय, तब देश में और भी अशान्ति मच जायगी। कुछ दिनों के बाद बंगाल सरकार सुवर्ण रेखा का (catchment area) मांगेगी। इसी आधार पर बिहार सरकार उत्तर सरकार से गंडक का (catchment area) और मध्य प्रदेश की सरकार से सोने का (catchment area) मांगेगी। मुझ को यह जान कर आश्चर्य होता है कि इस प्रकार की लचर दलीलों पर कमीशन ने एक प्रान्त का हिस्सा दूसरे प्रान्तों में मिलाने की सिफारिश की है। इस प्रकार की सिफारिशों से कमीशन में हलकापन का बोध होता है। यदि (catchment area) ही आधार माना जाय तब भी १४०० (sq. mile) ही होता है। परन्तु सिफारिश ३००० (sq. mile) की है।

जिस प्रकार कमीशन ने एक नीति निश्चित कर ली है वह नीति हमारी कसौटी होती। उस कसौटी के आधार पर ही कमीशन की सिफारिशें होतीं। और वह सर्वमान्य होतीं। परन्तु जिस हलकापन से कमीशन ने सिफारिश की हैं वह सर्वथा अमान्य होनी चाहियें।

बिहार के सम्बन्ध में कमीशन ने अपने प्रतिपादित सिद्धान्तों की स्वयं अवहेलना की है। अतः मेरा निवेदन है कि भारत सरकार पूरी गहराई के साथ विचार कर निर्णय करे।

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि वह इस छोटी सी बात का कोई विशेष महत्व नहीं समझते हैं। मैंने माना कि उन के लिये यह विशेष महत्व की बात नहीं है। परन्तु उन को यह भी देखना है कि राज्य में एक छोटी सी बात भी किसी सिद्धान्त के आधार पर निश्चित की जाय। जिस से एक छोटी से छोटी इकाई के साथ भी पूरा पूरा न्याय हो

सके। जनता को सरकार की न्याय निष्ठा में पूर्ण विश्वास हो। बिहार की बातों के साथ कुछ भारतीय प्रश्नों पर भी अपना छोटा सा विचार व्यक्त करना चाहता हूँ।

प्राथमिक दृष्टिकोण से बड़ा से बड़ा राज्य निर्माण होना हितकर है। प्रस्तावित मध्य प्रदेश का मैं स्वागत करता हूँ।

कमीशन द्वारा प्रस्तावित बम्बई राज्य (महाराष्ट्र-गुजरात) का मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। साथ ही विदर्भ को भी बम्बई में सम्मिलित कर देना हितकर मानता हूँ। गुजरातियों के भय निवारणार्थ मध्य प्रदेश का कुछ भाग बम्बई में मिला देना श्रेयस्कर होगा।

केरल का मद्रास में मिला देना मैं आवश्यक समझता हूँ। कारण समुद्र के किनारे एक विशाल सुसंगठित राज्य का होना मैं आवश्यक समझता हूँ।

राज्यों का पुनर्गठन पूर्ण मतैक्य के साथ शान्तिपूर्वक हो, यह मेरी कामना है।

Shri Brohmo-Choudhury (Goalpara-Garo-Hills—Reserved — Sch. Castes): I welcome the recommendations of the States Re-organisation Commission in so far these relate to Assam. Assam occupies the most strategic position in the eastern part of India and is surrounded by the foreign countries on three sides. Assam is connected with the rest of India only by a narrow strip of land less than 40 miles.

So, if we consider about Assam, we must also consider about the security of India. Security of India needs that this Eastern Zone of India should be united and strengthened. The question of language is not the only factor to be considered in case of Assam, where the questions of national security and solidarity come first.

Assam is destined to remain a composite State. Peoples of the Hills

and Plains speaking different languages, having different customs and culture, live together in Assam and we must build together happy and prosperous Assam, not only for the sake of Assam, but for the security of India as well. That atmosphere should be brought in Assam.

Now I want to speak about Goalpara—In page 18 of the booklet regarding West Bengal Government's demand, Dr. B. C. Roy, Chief Minister of West Bengal, said: "that the district of Goalpara, as mentioned above, should be transferred to West Bengal, if the people in that area are willing to be so transferred".

Dr. B. C. Roy perfectly knows that Goalpara district is not a Bengali majority area and that is why he did not put his demands earlier. The very sentence "if the people in that area are willing to be so transferred" proves that he has no ground to his claim.

With regard to the slicing away the district of Goalpara from Assam, all the people of the district, including the two important minority communities—Tribals and Muslims, vehemently opposed, when the States Reorganisation Commission visited Dhubri and Goalpara. Historically, geographically, linguistically and culturally Goalpara is a part and parcel of Assam. All the members of the Assam Legislative Assembly elected from the district of Goalpara spoke in the Assam Legislative Assembly against the merger of Goalpara to West Bengal. The S.R.C. has rightly said about the West Bengal's claim on the district of Goalpara as unsound. No stronger term, I believe, can be used than these regarding the claim of West Bengal.

We must regard the opinion of the people as verdict. Any attempt to do against the opinion of the people will lead to serious troubles and disturbances.

Goalpara district is an integral part and parcel of Assam. Out of seven lakhs of Tribal People living in the Assam plain areas two lakhs of these

[Shri Brohmo-Choudhury]

people live there. If the district of Goalpara is separated from Assam, the interests of the Assam Tribes, and the economy of the whole of Assam will be dangerously affected. Moreover, both Goalpara and Garo Hills districts are so interdependent that one cannot be separated from the other.

Regarding the demand for Goalpara by West Bengal, Dr. B. C. Roy, the Chief Minister of West Bengal himself said in the West Bengal Legislative Council on 8th December, 1955—"Don't be deluded into thinking that getting Goalpara will be necessarily advantageous to us if the people don't like it. I doubt very much whether the people there are willing to come to Bengal. They have got more cultural affinity with the people of Kamrup area. Secondly, comes the communication. The communication is to be made through Cooch Behar. Due to this communication difficulty Cooch Behar is a problem to us on many counts. It will be still more difficult to have an area which we cannot develop properly."

As regards the Bengali population of Goalpara, I must speak a few words. When the British took over Assam, they brought English knowing Bengalis to Assam to help them in the administration. All the posts under the Government and Zamindars were occupied by the Bengalis. The people of Goalpara learnt Bengali and identified themselves as Bengali speakers in the Census of 1931 under the influence of the Bengalis. So the Census figures of Bengali speakers of 1931, include not only Bengalis but also Tribals and other local people. But the spread of education and due to the growth of self consciousness, the Tribals and other local people did not enter themselves as Bengali speakers in the Census of 1951.

Muslims migrated from East Bengal / adopted Assamese language, to have social connections with the Assamese

Muslims and to have association with the local people. They did so specially after the partition, when East Bengal became a foreign country. All the Muslim leaders of the district admitted the fact before the S.R.C. when it visited Goalpara and Dhubri. So we find the real Bengali speakers in 1951 Census as 1,93,000. These Bengali speakers are scattered all over the district. If Goalpara is to be separated, what will become of other 15 lakhs of Bengalis living in the other districts of Assam?

Assamese schools were introduced according to the demand of the people. It is impossible on the part of the popular Government to go against the wishes of the people. The question of suppression of the Bengali language does not arise at all.

As regards the land, there is a great scarcity in the district. The number of the landless cultivators of the district according to 1951 Census is 2,22,528. The density of population, after deducting the Government Reserve Forests and Zamindar's forests, comes to 441 per sq. mile.

The density of population of some other States are—Madhya Pradesh-163, Bombay-233, Orissa-244, Punjab-338 and Madras-441. So, no land is available for settlement with the displaced persons, as the density of population is very high.

As regards Tripura, I welcome an immediate merger of Tripura as recommended by the S.R.C. Tripura cannot remain separated and isolated for ever. I listened to the speeches of my Honourable friend Sri Dasaratha Deb from Tripura on the other day. He quoted from the memoranda submitted—"even a few decades ago upto 1947, the Tribal people of Tripura were in majority in the State contributing to the flourishing of Tripura's special social and cultural life". "Though Bengali was the Court language of the State for about a hundred years, it would be wrong to identify Tripura's culture and

tradition, completely with that of Bengal". He further said—"in Tripura, a section of the people, the Bengalis speak the Bengali language and the other section the Tribals have got their own different languages, which have nothing in common with the Tribal people of Assam."

I do not deny that Tripura has got separate culture and tradition. Tripura's culture and tradition are separate from that of Bengal. In fact, Tripura's culture and tradition are the culture and tradition of the Tribal people. The poor and illiterate Tribal people should be protected and should be allowed to develop in their own way. Our beloved Prime Minister and the President have declared many times that tribals should be allowed to develop themselves with their distinctive culture and languages. But it is wrong to say that the Tribals of Tripura have nothing in common with the Assam Tribes. Are Lushais not there? Are Kukis not there? Are the Tipperas quite different from the Bodos and Kocharis? In fact, the culture of Tripura is the culture of Tribes—to be more frank—is of Assam Tribes. Tribes of Tripura are kith and kins of Assam Tribes. We feel affinity with them. We the Tribal people of Assam want Tripura people to come under the administration of Assam, so that we may have a comfortable number and have a say in the administration.

I cannot find the reason why Tripura will not merge with Assam. While we consider about Tripura, we must not consider about Tripura alone. We should not forget, that Tripura is surrounded by foreign country on three sides. We must consider about the safety and security of Tripura, Assam and the whole of India. National security counts first.

We honestly feel that the question of merger of Manipur should not be delayed, because, we have many

things in common, historically and culturally with the people of Manipur. We respect each other and we never consider the people of Manipur to be a different people altogether. The people of Manipur are demanding a democratic set up of administration in Manipur for a long time. We have full sympathy for the people of Manipur and we want the Manipuris should not be denied democracy.

Manipur should also be merged with Assam to enjoy the democratic set up in the Assam administration. About a lakh of Manipuris living in the Cachar district have unanimously demanded for immediate merger of Manipur in Assam. We cannot understand why the Manipuris will not merge just now and share in the progress and administration of Assam immediately instead of merging after some years. We always heartily welcome the people of Manipur. The arguments put by the S.R.C. in case of Tripura for immediate merger with Assam apply to Manipur also for immediate merger.

If Assam is backward, if Assam has no Railway communication, if Assam is facing difficulties for want of roads and other facilities, not only Assam people, but the Central Government, is failing in its duty towards Assam. Central Government seems to be inviting troubles in future by neglecting the cause of Assam.

United we stand, divided we fall. Why then we not unite for the cause of Assam, Manipur and Tripura as well? It is very easy to create disunity and troubles, but it is very difficult to unite the people. We must not be guided by the sentiments only, but we must be guided by reasons.

There are other causes also. If a small State like Manipur is retained its separate existence, why Tripura will merge with Assam? This is why many people of Tripura who demanded for merger with Assam are

[Shri Brohmo-Choudhury]

now hesitating. The consequence will follow. If the small States like Manipur and Tripura are given separate existence, every Hill district will again demand for separate State. Many Hill people did not put their demands for Hill State for the reason that these two small States will be merged with Assam. But if these two small States are given separate existence why the other Hill districts will not put their demand for separate States? What will be the answer to this? You may create twenty States in Assam, but you will have to meet troubles and dangers hundred times. These dangers will be not only to Assam, but to the whole of India. We must not forget that Assam is surrounded by foreign countries almost on all sides. Therefore, the question of national safety and security must count.

Shri M. L. Agrawal (Pilibhit Dist. cum Bareilly Dist.—East): At the outset I desire to say that I fully agree with the Report of the S.R.C. as also with the views expressed thereon and the modifications proposed thereto by the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress. The Commission have based their recommendations on linguistic, cultural, economic, financial and administrative considerations. The paramount consideration, however, over-riding all others has been the unity, stability, safety and solidarity of the Union of India. The process of unification and integration began by the late Sardar Patel just after the attainment of Independence, has found its logical continuance and culmination in the proposals of the S.R.C. The extinction of C States, abolition of the distinction between A and B States and of the institution of Rajpramukhs which were adopted in the transitional set-up are some of the most welcome features of their recommendations. Viewed in this perspective of unity the note about U.P. of Shri K. M. Panikkar is disquieting and out of tune with the general tenor of the findings and

recommendations of the S.R.C. The contents of paragraph 5 of his note on page 245 of the Report, to say the least, are unfortunate for in the first place I deny, that there is any such feeling or occasion for such feeling outside U.P. and even if there were any in his opinion it behoved Shri Panikkar to remove such baseless feelings and misapprehensions and not to fan them up. Shri Panikkar has done a great disservice to the cause of the unity of India by which he swears by allowing himself to be made an instrument, however unwittingly, of propagating uncalled for bitterness and hatred against U.P. Taking their cue from Shri Panikkar several honourable speakers particularly from the South have thought it fit to cast flings and unmerited aspersions at U.P. for its size and taken up contradictory and mutually antagonistic stands on the subject. Some overzealous protagonists of reconstruction solely on the linguistic principle while advocating big linguistic States cavil at the Commission for having left U.P. undivided. These votaries of the linguistic principle forget that their extreme view would lead to the logical and the irresistible conclusion of forming a Hindi speaking State composed of the proposed M.P., Bihar, U.P., Punjab and Rajasthan. But logic and consistency are not their strong points. Reverting to his thesis we find that Shri Panikkar has opened his attack against U.P. in the following words in paragraph 1 on page 244 of the S.R.C. Report "In population U.P. is nearly equal to Andhra, Telengana, Karnatic and Kerala put together, larger than the combined population of the Punjab, Rajasthan and M.P." I am surprised that after recommending the formation of the giant States like, Bombay, M.P. and Rajasthan, each being larger in area than U.P. side by side with the pigmy States like Kerala and Vidarbha, he should have employed such specious arguments in support of his panacea of division of U.P. to cure the country's ailments of disunity. Is it not

a fact that the proposed Bombay State in area equals the States of Kerala, Andhra, Vidarbha and West Bengal put together and the proposed State of M.P. equals in extent the combined area of the proposed States of Vidarbha, Kerala, W. Bengal and Assam put together and the proposed State of Rajasthan equals in area the States of Kerala, Hyderabad, Vidarbha and W. Bengal put together? Is it not true that the population of the proposed Bombay State, namely 40.3 million exactly equals the combined population of Kerala, Hyderabad, Vidarbha and Assam and that the population of Bihar exceeds the population of the proposed State of Vidarbha and the other major States of Rajasthan and Orissa put together? And who would gainsay that a large area contributes to greater unwieldiness than a large population.

Shri Panikkar has dragged the federal principle as his principal argument for the vivisection of U.P. He has expounded that in a federal Constitution the Units should be fairly evenly balanced. He has cited the examples of the U.S.A., the Bismarkian Germany and the Soviet Union. It is true that in the U.S. Senate all the 48 States have 2 representatives each but both in the Reichsrat either of the Bismarkian Germany or under the Weimar Constitution, and in the Soviet of Nationalities there is no equal representation for all the States, though weightage is provided against the bigger States. Under the Weimar Constitution no State could be represented by more than 40 per cent. of the total strength of the Reichsrat. But Shri Panikkar has argued as if there is no weightage against U.P. in the Rajya Sabha. U.P. has less than 15 per cent as against 40 per cent in the German Reichsrat under the Weimar Constitution and has one representative for 2 millions whereas the smaller States have considerable weightage, the smallest having one representative for about half a million only. And when this weightage was enacted Shri Panikkar a distinguished

member of the Constituent Assembly was a consenting party to what now appears to him to be a constitutional monstrosity. Again Shri Panikkar has committed the mistake of comparing the Rajya Sabha with the American Senate, the German Reichsrat and the Russian Soviet of Nationalities. In Germany and Russia the Upper House has much larger powers than the respective lower House while in America where Constitution has laid down a Presidential system the Senate is much more powerful than the House of Representatives. Ours is a Parliamentary Constitution on the lines of the Federal Canada and the Unitary U.K. In Canada the Senate has no equal representation for all the States. Both the Canadian Senate and the House of Lords in U.K. like our Rajya Sabha have less powers than the respective popular House. Shri Panikkar has therefore compared the unlikes. In spite of the difference in the powers of the Upper House in the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. as compared with those of our Rajya Sabha, it is a matter for Shri Panikkar to note that U.P., one of the 16 States of India with an area of less than 9 per cent and a population less than 18 per cent of the entire country cannot be more dominant than the R.S.F.S.R. one of the 16 States of the Soviet Union with 76 per cent. area and 57 per cent. population of the entire U.S.S.R. In the matter of representation, Shri Panikkar has forgotten one more fact that whereas in most of the Federations in the world the units were independent sovereign States before they entered Federation in India they were integral parts of the country though they enjoyed autonomy in certain subjects. But in all the countries mentioned above, the lower House has been constituted strictly on population basis. Perhaps, Shri Panikkar is not satisfied even with this. But is it not true that on no occasion did the members whether in the Lok Sabha or the Rajya Sabha voted regionwise? They always voted according to Party affiliations. The idea of

[Shri M. L. Agrawal]

dominance has been haunting Shri Panikkar without any basis.

It would have been more intelligible if Shri Panikkar had illustrated his proposition that the present structure of Government has led to the dominance of U.P. in All-India matters. And what are these All-India matters? Is it not true that U.P., thanks to the apathy and neglect of the Centre, has so far been condemned almost exclusively to an Agricultural economy with no noteworthy industrial undertakings? Is it not true that the gigantic multiple river-valley projects like the Bhakra Nangal, Damodar Valley, Hirakud, Kosi and the latest Nagarjun-sagar are all outside U.P.? Is it not true that the Chitranjan Locomotive, Perambur Integral Coach, Sindri Fertilizers, Radio, Machines and Tools, Telephone, Aircraft Factories etc. are all outside U.P.? Is it not true that none of the big and important Railway workshops is situated in U.P.? Is it not a fact that both in the first and the second Five Year Plans U.P. has not been allotted contribution commensurate with its size and population? Is it not a fact that the First Finance Commission also treated U.P. shabbily and did not give its due?

Shri Panikkar after propounding his thesis for breaking up U.P. has tried to repel the arguments against division. By quoting figures mainly from the report of the Finance Commission of 1952 he has attempted to run down the economic, efficient and progressive administration of U.P. He says therefore that no harm would be caused in dismembering U. P. Even he does not suggest that the divided units would be better off in economy, efficiency or progress. Like a clever advocate he has stressed only one aspect of the figures. Appropriate percentages and other aspects thereof and the upto-date figures would show the other side of the picture which he did not care to expose. But being under restrictions I regret I cannot enter into these details.

The dissenting note of Shri Panikkar was wholly unwarranted and certainly not in the best interest of the unity and solidarity of India. Shri Panikkar failed to convince his colleagues. He will fail to convince the House.

Shri M. D. Joshi (Ratnagiri South): Never before have I felt such anxiety and a sense of depression while expressing my thoughts on a highly controversial subject. Because feelings have been running at a high level and tempers normally sober have shown embitterment. Yet we have to make an effort to solve this question having always before our minds the unity and solidarity of India.

It has been said that Maharashtrians asked for a Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay, and said that it was their moral stand; but, it is alleged, they gave up their moral stand when they proposed a bilingual State consisting of all the areas of Maharashtra (including Vidarbha), all the areas of Guzerat (including Saurashtra and Kutch) and the city of Bombay, that moral stand was given up. I maintain that we have not given up our moral stand. The proposal of a bilingual state made by the M.P.C.C. in its resolution of 21st October 1955, was a compromise formula, offered in response to the appeal made by our beloved leaders to the leaders of Maharashtra. When Mahatma Gandhi said he would be satisfied with "the Substance of Independence", it did not mean that he had given up his moral stand of Complete Independence for India, but it meant that he was prepared for a Compromise with the British Government. Offer of a compromise does not mean that one's moral stand is relinquished.

I wish to say a few words regarding the effect that would be produced in case Bombay city is separated from the areas of Maharashtra. In the first place, Bombay, which is the nerve-centre of the whole of Maharashtra, is practically the heart of

Maharashtra. The body cannot live without the heart; so Maharashtra will be paralysed without Bombay city, which forms an integral unit of Maharashtra's area. But the severance of Bombay from Maharashtra would spell certain disaster to the adjacent Konkan districts of thana, Kolaba and Ratnagiri. Especially, the whole economic life of my district, viz. Ratnagiri depends entirely on Bombay city. Practically every family has to depend on the earnings of one or two of its members serving in Bombay. About five or six lacs of people from my district, mostly very poor people, are serving as secondary or primary teachers, clerks, policemen, mill-hands, peons, labourers, and in all kinds of humble occupations in Bombay. Severance of Bombay city would therefore result in complete annihilation of the social, political and economic life of the poor people of my district, as also of the districts of Thana and Kolaba. People of these three districts would have to suffer the greatest hardship, if Bombay city is separated from Maharashtra region.

The unfortunate violent demonstrations in Bombay on 21st November have again and again used as an argument for the separation of Bombay. It gives me acute pain to notice that the argument comes from my Guzerati Comrades. Outbursts of violence are unfortunate exhibitions of the sour temper of the common mass of people, which must be endeavoured to be checked. Mahatma Gandhi several times expiated for violent outbursts on the part of Indians, by undertaking purificatory fasts. The British rulers used such violent outbursts as a stick to hit the Indian nationalist leaders, and condemn their agitation for Independence. I deeply regret to note that the same device is being employed to condemn Maharashtrians. But let our traducers and calumniators, high and low, whoever they may be, remember that it is very unwise to anger a 'virile and patriotic people',

to use the words of the S. R. Commission.

I have always believed that if ever there are two regional people who can merge easily, it is the Maharashtrians and Guzeratis. Guzerat has given the nation Mahatmaji and Sardarji. Maharashtra gave Lokmanya and Gokhale. I appeal to my Guzerati friends not to wound us by suspecting our *bona fides*. That attitude will merely result in more embitterment and even hatred.

I appeal to the House that Maharashtra asks for justice and nothing more than justice. The issue raised by the S.R.C. Report is not merely the issue of reassignment of a portion of land here or a portion there. The issue is much more grave. The question is: Can Indians do justice to each other? When the History of the present times comes to be written, let not posterity say, "Here is a case of justice demanded but denied. Our forbears were weighed in the balance and were found wanting!"

Shri Achuthan (Cranganur): After Independence, the first thing done was to bring the whole India under a constitution and a republic was formed. The next in order is the reorganisation of the component units. In para 85 of page 23 of the S.R.C. report the urgency is made mention of. The three members are all great patriots in their own line and their work was a very delicate and difficult one. The resolution of the same Ministry and the press note of the Commission found in pages 266 and 265 clearly state the objective of the Commission.

Even the biggest political party viz., the Indian National Congress, as regards 1920 accepted language as a basis for the unit in organisational purposes. But after Independence, when the actual situation was faced, the S. R. Commission was appointed and the Commission's conclusions are seen in para. 61 of page 15 of the S.R.C. Report.

[Shri Achuthan]

The J.V.P. report of the greatest leaders of the nation came to the conclusions that language cannot be the sole criterion and language can be the cementing as well as the separating force, and could not be adopted *in toto*.

The homeland theory and the linguistic fanaticism will not lead to the centripetal force which is essential for unity.

If each State demands any one language, what about the Centre and its activities. How are the Union subjects, which are very important for the existence and progress of the country to be deliberated in the Union language. Just like rivers join the ocean, so also the regional languages must form inseparable part of the Union language.

Now coming to the recommendations, it has recommended 16 States, some very big and some small. It would be better to keep the size and population of the States within closer margins as recommended. Just as big countries like China, Russia, U.S.A. and India, are given more importance in the assembly of nations, so also in India big States like U.P. may have greater pull and influence, which is bad for the proper growth.

Let us think ahead with vision and foresight and 'Bhasha Pranta' need not lead into 'bhasha bhrant' i.e. linguistic madness.

The recommendations of the commission for abolition of the three classes of states and the system of Rajyapramukhs deserve congratulations. Its proposals for minority safeguards, financial aid, Special Development Boards, Industrial location Plan and All India Services are really initial matters in aiding an All-India outlook and growth.

From the discussions all over India, I presume that we are passing the

language age just like Stone age, Iron age and Copper age etc. I will be extremely happy if this rising of this linguistic tide lasts not long and disappear in the ocean of the supreme national unity. For that definite steps must be taken to teach the national language on wider scale and especially in Universities, when the medium should be either Hindi or English.

Let me now come to the proposed Kerala State the smallest of the states. In carrying out states, the main factor of geographical contiguity economic stability, administrative convenience, and linguistic homogeneity cannot all be taken with an equal weight in its practical application and this is evident in the proposed Kerala State. Tamil and Malayalam are sister languages and Malayalam has its origin from Tamil. The word Malayalam is a Tamil word and each can understand each other. It will be foolish to assume that both are interim; impenetrable barriers. The area of Kerala is 14980 sq. miles for a population of 13.6 million while even West Bengal has 34590 sq. miles for a population of 26.5 million people.

Mr. Veeraswamy, hon. Member from South Travancore, in his speech said that Tamilians' fate in Travancore State was miserable and their demand to merge in Madras is a human problem. I need not trace the history of ITUC and the latest activities of theirs which led to the firing last year. Even the Prime Minister requested them not to launch Deliverance day and those communications of the Prime Minister will speak for themselves. The P.S.P. was in government then. In the public enquiry by a High Court judge the police action was justified.

The four taluks of South Travancore, now recommended to go to Madras shall not under any circumstances go to Madras. In para 291 of the Report it is stated, that if there is no distinct improvement, no area

can be tacked on to another state as in the case of Kolar Goldfields area. The Commission's plea is that the wish of the Tamil people who are in the majority have to be respected. In educational, irrigational, public health and transport point of view, the inhabitants are in a very advantageous position, if they remain within the Kerala State. In the last election only 1-5 lakhs of voters favoured merger with Madras while 1-2 lakhs did not favour it. If 70% is the criterion, to count the will, then there is no case for them. Geographical contiguity demands those four taluks in the Kerala and this will be an enclave if goes to Madras.

With regard to Shencottah, the enclave portion on the west of the Western Ghats must go to Kerala and I hope they will not have any serious objection to this.

In the matter of Devikulam and Peeremedi, the Commission has discussed it in detail and has recommended to retain them in Kerala. Even Shri Punnoose strongly supports that view. There the permanent Tamil settlers are not more than 20%.

I say that the problem of Kerala is a human problem and the density is more than 2000 per sq. mile. The proposed Kerala has not much further scope for agricultural expansion and this area is the vital part of Kerala.

In all respects, the taluk of Gudaloor in Nilgiri district must join with Kerala. The Commission did not advert to this and so this is an open question. The Malayalees from the single majority and all the Malabar land laws are applicable to Gudaloor. The Pykara hydro-electric works will not be affected if Gudaloor is taken to Kerala and the wish of the people are for this. It has got an area of 279 sq. miles and falls on the west of the Western Ghats. It was part of Malabar till 1877 and the voters list of 1961 was in Malayalam.

Coming to Thesevde, the commission recommended it to Kerala. Malayalees are 73% and the big Karnataka state can claim the north of Payaswini river only in the extreme average. I wondered why a great person like B. Siva Rao or Shri Nijalingappa lays his hand on this portion. Tulu dialect is far from Kannada.

They cannot have unilingual border areas and sufficient safeguards can be provided to strengthen the confidence. The goodwill of both sides is necessary and the small Kerala shall not be reduced still further. If linguism is extended to its farther ends, it will lead to stupidity which I hope, nobody can tolerate.

Mr. Meghnad Saha, the great scientist in his speech stated that full-fledged linguistic principle must be adopted in the formation of states and I believe that if this view is adopted, the process of disintegration will begin and it is highly probable that a small U.N. will take its shape in India.

Our beloved Prime Minister in his speech expressed his view of having five or six states instead of as at present proposed. But how far it can be worked out now is an impracticable one unless the whole nation agrees to it now. But his suggestions to have some Advisory Councils for a group of states is a commendable one and the Southern States richly deserve it.

Lastly, the problem of the Kerala state is a human problem, because the question is when to have living space in Kerala. All the sister states must keep a warm corner for us and must give us a helping hand. It must open its doors and must welcome us in terms of thousands but not mix it with the idea of charity or sacrifice. Treat us as your own kith and kin and let us be Indians first and last.

Shri S. L. Saksena (Gorakhpur Dist.—North): I offer my heartfelt

[Shri S. L. Saksena]

gratitude to the members of the States Reorganisation Commission on their most wonderful Report. They were dealing with the most difficult national problem of States reorganisation and yet they have produced a Report which has evoked admiration from all quarters for its impartiality and wisdom.

In the Constituent Assembly, when the Constitution of India was being framed, I fought hard for a unitary system of government in India. I had said that in the period of economic reconstruction, a backward undeveloped country could develop most quickly under a centralised, unitary system of government. The Soviet Union did not grant full autonomy to its numerous States until 1936 when 18 years of centralised, unitary government had enabled it to become one of the two mightiest nations of the world. The new Constitution, which the People's Government in New China has given to itself is a centralised, unitary constitution. But our Federal Constitution with Provincial Autonomy to the various State units has been responsible for our slow rate of progress. In the last five years since its liberation, China's national budgetary annual income has increased from 1,300 crores of rupees to 5,500 crores of rupees. The income of our central and states budgets was about Rs. 700 crores in 1948-49 and it is only about Rs. 1,000 crores in 1954-55. Similarly, China has spent 8,000 crores of rupees on its economic and social reconstruction in six years—1950 to 1955, since its liberation; India has spent only 2,500 crores of rupees on its reconstruction during the last eight years since its independence. The total outlay on the execution of China's First Five Year Plan from 1953 to 1957 will be 15,000 crores of rupees. The total expenditure on our First Five Year Plan ending in March 1956 has only been 2,000 crores of rupees and even the expenditure on the Second Five Year Plan ending in March 1961 is envisaged to be only Rs. 7,000 crores.

This unique rate of progress in China would have been impossible if they did not have a centralised, unitary system of government.

But, if we must still stick to our Federal System, then there could not be a better reorganisation of States than has been recommended by the Commission and I wholeheartedly support it. The majority recommendations must all be implemented. Only there are a few points on which I differ from it. One of these points is that the option to merge or not after five years given to some States such as Telengana is a dangerous principle. The reorganisation of States, if it has to be done, must be finalised now. I, therefore support the formation of Vishal Andhra here and now, and not after five years.

Another suggestion that I wish to make is the one for the appointment of a Boundary Commission which should finally adjust all boundaries. I particularly wish to draw attention to the boundary between Eastern U. P. and North Bihar. There are some portions of U. P. across the mighty Gandak, which are wholly unapproachable from the U.P. side for the major portion of the year. Similarly, there are some portions of Bihar like Chhitauni Ghat Railway Station which are across the Gandak from their side and are unapproachable from Bihar. These areas should be exchanged.

Along with these two suggestions, I support the Report wholeheartedly. I hope all people will accept these recommendations with goodwill in the larger interests of our national unity and will subordinate their own personal wishes at the altar of the unity and integrity of Mother India.

One thing I wish to point out. The Prime Minister has made a suggestion for the grouping of States into five larger units. I fear the result of such grouping might weaken the authority of the Centre and so the proposal should be more carefully examined before being adopted.

Shri V. P. Pawar (South Satara):
I am grateful to you for allowing me to place my views before the House on S.R.C. Report regarding the proposed Maharashtra State.

As a Member of the Legislative Assembly of Bombay, on the 23 February 1949, I had a privilege to move the resolution of formation of linguistic Provinces of Bombay *viz.* that the linguistic provinces of Maharashtra including the city of Bombay, Karnatak and Gujarat be formed without delay etc. and that the motion was carried almost unanimously.

At the outset I record my strong and unequivocal objection to the proposal of so-called bilingual balanced composite state of Bombay recommended by the S.R.C. The Commission has done a great injustice to Maharashtrians in brushing aside their genuine and proper claim of United Maharashtra. The Commission themselves have admitted that in the composite States a sense of loyalty to the State does not develop. I submit that in a bilingual State the real harmony of co-operative working will be difficult to be maintained and one of the two language groups of people who suffer remain indifferent and inactive in the work of national development. The bilingualism would not put confidence and enthuse all the people to willingly put in their efforts in the vast nation-building work which we have to do. We rejected it. I am thankful to the Congress Working Committee for not pressing it for our acceptance. Even the Chief-Minister of Bombay in his speech in G.P.C.C. is reported to have said that "Distrust amongst the different language groups has increased to such an extent that we cannot function together". Hence the bilingual composite State is now out of consideration. In response to our revered leaders' call for national spirit, we proposed that all Marathi speaking areas and Gujarati speaking areas be integrated together with Bombay city as capital. But it did not commend to the other concerned parties.

534 L.S.D.—10.

I am thankful to the Congress Working Committee for integrating all Marathi speaking areas into one single State of Maharashtra. We welcome it and appreciate the steps taken for inclusion of Vidarbha into united Maharashtra. I am deeply distressed at the proposal of formation of a separate city State of Bombay. I cannot conceive the idea of a Maharashtra State without the city of Bombay. I humbly and most respectfully request our leaders and the House to reconsider the proposal. The separation of the city of Bombay from its hinterland is neither in the interests of the city nor in the interest of the Maharashtrians. If there are any fears and apprehensions in the minds of a section of people of Bombay, there are ample safeguards in the Constitution. We the Maharashtrians are prepared to guarantee further legitimate safeguards not inconsistent with democracy and integrity of the State to satisfy the claims and interests of that section of Bombay city.

I reiterate my implicit faith in the formation of our unanimous demand of United Maharashtra with Bombay city as a Capital. I am thereby voicing the feelings not of intelligentsia only but of the peasantry, the masses and sons of the soil of Maharashtra of whom I have the honour to represent in the Parliament.

I submit that the contiguous Marathi speaking areas of the districts of Belgaum and Karwar ought to be included in the proposed state of Maharashtra. The Census Department has published Language Handbooks in which village-wise mother tongue figures are given with coloured maps indicating contiguous areas of different languages. The contiguous Marathi speaking areas can easily be determined with the help of those maps for the inclusion of these areas in Maharashtra. I therefore humbly pray that Belgaum city, Khanapur Taluka—Marathi speaking 180 villages, Belgaum Taluka—Marathi speaking 83 villages, Hukeri Taluka—Marathi speaking 22 villages, Chikodi Taluka—Marathi speaking 44 villages includ-

[Shri V. P. Pawar]

ing Nipani, Athani taluka—Marathi speaking 10 villages, the whole of Karwar Taluka, Hahyal Taluka and Supa Taluka etc. be included in the Maharashtra State in the interest of justice and fair play.

Lastly, I submit that I believe in the unity and solidarity of India. I assure that as a loyal Congressman I shall abide by the decisions of our beloved leaders and the House. I promise that the Marathas would shed their blood for the security and freedom of the motherland—India. I pray for justice and fair play to Maharashtra and the blessings to our Maharashtra State.

Shri R. K. Gupta (Mohindergarh): I welcome the report of States Reorganisation Commission due to following reasons:—

The number of the States has been reduced from 28 to 16.

The distinction between various types of State i.e. between "A", "B" and "C" has been removed.

The institution of Rajpramukhs which was against the basic principles of Democracy has been abolished.

Safeguards for linguistic minorities, backward and undeveloped areas have been suggested.

As regards the proposals of States Reorganization Commission for reorganization of States which are contained in para 3, I welcome them subject to minor changes and modification as mentioned below:—

- (i) I am of the opinion that Telangana should be merged with Andhra immediately. To keep this matter hanging for five years is dangerous.
- (ii) I am also against this view that Bombay should be formed as separate unit as its character is cosmopolitan. It will be a bad precedent in the history of India. The people of Calcutta, Hyderabad and Pondicherry will also

claim separate States of their Cities on the ground that the character of their city is cosmopolitan. A group of few capitalists of Parsis, Marwaris and Gujratis having vested interests are trying that Bombay should be formed as separate state. I do not go into the controversy whether Maharashtra or Gujrat are formed or not as separate States, but Bombay should not be kept as separate unit. In my humble submission if Vidarbha is merged with bilingual State of Bombay as proposed by S.R.C., the problem of Bombay will be solved.

- (iii) I am also of the view that Manipur should also be merged with Assam.

As regards Punjab, Pepsu and Himachal, the Commission has recommended that one bigger State should be formed by merging all these three States together. It is in the best interest of the people to have a bigger State as recommended by the Commission. From planning, economic and administrative point of view this will be an ideal State.

On the other hand, the setting of three small Units of Himachal, Punjab and Haryana will tantamount to a gruesome burden of the finances of the people which will be grown under heavy Administration of each State. In that case, each small Unit will require separate Administrative machinery, separate Assembly, separate Governor, separate cabinet, separate secretariat and separate High Court. This will be a great burden over the masses. Therefore, this will not be convenient and capable, from Administrative, economic as well as planning point of view. In other words the State so organised cannot prosper economically and planning as a whole will suffer. Our progress will be checked. The condition of the people

of Haryana and Himachal States will be more miserable as most of the areas of these two states is deficit, famine-stricken and unproductive. Now, let us see who will gain from this proposal. Only few persons who will be occupying the chair of the ministry in the new set-up. Please do not deceive people by raising slogans for your lust of great honour, dignity and money which is associated with ministerial posts.

From the point of view of defence, I also prefer bigger State to smaller one. Keeping this in view Pakistan created one strong Unit consisting of Punjab & N.W.F.P., Sind and Baluchistan despite stiff opposition.

I also submit that there is no fundamental difference between these three States from cultural and linguistic point of view. Our culture is one. Our language is one. Our religious and marriage ceremonies are same. Our mode of living and dressing are common. Our festivals are common and our problems are common. Therefore, fundamental and basic culture of these three areas remains the same and the people of all these three areas can understand the language of one another easily.

I also want to draw the attention of this august House that Hindi-speaking area specially District Mohindergarh to whom I represent is a backward and undeveloped area. This is because that we have suffered continuously for the last 100 years under the regime of erstwhile Rajas and Maharajas of Patiala, Nabha and Jind. Our fault was that our forefathers took part in the first War of Independence of 1857 under the Command of Nawab of Jhajjar. Nawab was arrested and executed in the Chandni Chowk Bazar of Delhi. Our area was also cut into pieces and was given to above Maharajas in awards. Since then we have been exploited by these Rajas. And this is the reason that we are poor and backward. Therefore, I suggest that a development Board for our area may please be appointed and special fund should

be reserved for the welfare of the people of this area. This is the only remedy. By separating our areas from Punjab, our problem and grievances will not be solved and removed. But on the other hand our difficulties will increase and people will suffer more.

I, therefore strongly urge that we are strongly in favour of S.R.C. report and our area should not be separated from the present Punjab at any cost.

Shri K. L. More (Kohlapur cum-Satara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity for making some observations on the report of the S.R.C. that is under discussion in this House. At the outset I must pay my high tribute to the Commission for their great work. They are eminent men with integrity, impartiality and competence to deal with the problem of such intricate nature.

But with due respect to the Commission, I submit that it is difficult to agree with some of their findings and proposals, particularly in respect of a proposal of a composite bilingual State of Bombay. I would like to make it clear that I whole-heartedly endorse the view of my great leader Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru when he said day before yesterday in this House that 'at no time can we afford to forget the basic fact that India is more than little corner of India that we represent'. Personally I attach highest consideration for the preservation and strengthening of unity and security of India. I have never allowed myself to be swayed by linguistic fanaticism.

The Commission have recommended the reorganisation of State called Bombay. The present State of Bombay is trilingual. It is proposed to be made bilingual by transfer to the proposed State of Karnatak, of the Kannada speaking Districts. To the State thus truncated are to be joined three new units Saurashtra, Kutch and the Marathwada Districts of Hyderabad. The Commission has argued that this is the present state of Bombay. The Commission is found to apply the

[Shri K. L. More]

attributes of progressiveness and well administration of the trilingual Bombay State, even to the proposed bilingual State. This position has led them to the erroneous conclusion that it should not be broken. The Commission, while discussing and praising the bilingual State, have contradicted themselves by their own findings when they in para 159 viz., 'Marathi and Gujrati feeling grew up side by side practically to the exclusion of any particular loyalty to the Province or State of Bombay'.

So the proposal for the continuation in a changed form as suggested by the Commission is not likely to guarantee any provision as an enduring political unit of a State and will not assuredly evoke loyalty to the Constitution. On the contrary, under the present atmosphere of surrounding unilingual States there will be a great scope for the disruptive sentiments such as linguistic fanaticism.

The laudable objective of the Commission as expressed in para 112, viz., "consistent with national solidarity, provision of full scope for the unhampered growth of the genius of each group of people" will be difficult to be achieved in a bilingual State. We get the impression from the Report that the Commission was not totally unmindful of the drawbacks of their proposals. It seems to me therefore that they were more inclined towards further disintegrating the Bombay State into unilingual Marathi and Gujarati States. The problem of Bombay City was a stumbling block in this direction. The Commission were convinced that the City of Bombay cannot be separated from Maharashtra. But they were unduly led away by the untenable, illegitimate and scanty evidence of the interested few people who expressed their apprehensions and fears regarding the future of Bombay. Their finding that "Its (Bombay city's) Integration in Samyukta Maharashtra will lead to a rapid decline in its importance" is unreasonable and inconsistent with

what they have said and complimented the Maharashtrians in para 433, viz. "The Maharashtrians are a virile and practical people with a past in which they take legitimate pride. Their achievements form an important chapter in the history of India". The finding that Bombay city cannot be made a separate State nor it can be separated from Maharashtra should have clearly and boldly led to the unmistakable conclusion of creating a State of all Marathi-speaking areas with Bombay city as their capital. Unfortunately this has not happened. It is a great fortunate event that the Congress Working Committee have reopened this vexed problem. I would like to assure this House on my part that I will respect every decision that is taken up by the Congress High Command and endorsed by this sovereign Parliament. I only appeal that the aspirations and strong feeling of the people of my area should be given due weight.

In the end I express my hearty thanks to the Congress Working Committee for ably going through the question of border areas especially the Marathi areas of Belgaum, Nipani and Karwar. I hope, a satisfactory solution that will please the Maharashtrians will be arrived at soon.

Shri P. R. Rao (Warangal): The problem of States reorganisation is a national problem which affects not only the present generation but also the future generations. Therefore it demands carefulness and responsibility on the part of the honourable members of this august House.

The Government while appointing the S.R.C. laid down certain principles. But the principles of viability and national unity have been stretched too far because of the undue pressure tactics brought about by few vested interests and power politicians. Therefore the recommendations of the Commission have been vitiated and influenced by the power politics. And as such some of the recommendations are not impartial and fair.

I sincerely believe the recommendations have to be modified so as to satisfy the wishes of the people and the interests of the nation as a whole.

In my opinion each language group is a nationality by itself. As the Constitution has recognised fourteen languages as the major regional languages, there are to be fourteen linguistic states. The Committee followed the principle of language in respect of Kerala, Tamilnad, Andhra, Karnataka, Orissa and Bengal etc. But they could not follow the same principle with regard to Samyukta Maharashtra and Punjabi-speaking States, because in the name of national unity they try to satisfy some of the power mongering groups of the ruling party. They recommended separate Telangana, Vidarbha, bilingual Bombay state and greater Punjab, and with regard to border issues they should have taken village as a unit instead of district or taluk. Coming to my own state Telangana, there is no truth in the arguments of those people who demand separate Telangana. It is only the vested interests and the power politicians that created the bogey of separate Telangana. But the general mass of the people are for Vishalandhra.

Therefore we, the representatives of the people should take correct decisions in favour of Vishalandhra and in the same way there should be Samyukta Maharashtra. Bombay City is the birth right of the Maharashtrians and therefore it should rightly be included in Samyukta Maharashtra. But if we decide it to keep as a separate City state just to satisfy the wishes of the vested interests we will be doing great injustice to the nation and creating a very bad precedent. Because as the country develops a number of cities become cosmopolitan like Bombay City.

The recommendations of the Commission with regard to greater Punjab is vitiated by the idea that the Sikhs would dominate the Hindu minority in the Punjabi-speaking State. Therefore, there should not be the reason for

denying a state for these Punjabi speaking people. It is unwise to club Himachal Pradesh and Haryana Prant with Punjabi state. Especially when the Punjabi speaking people are demanding a separate state and the Himachal Pradesh and Haryana people are not willing to join the Punjabi speaking state. The rest of the problem with regard to boundary adjustments is not a big problem. A number of boundary commissions should be appointed with instructions to draw the boundary line taking the village as a unit of course keeping the question of geographical contiguity. Then the whole problem can be satisfactorily decided according to the wishes of the various groups concerned.

Shri Abdus Sattar (Kalna—Katwa): Bengal was partitioned in 1905 to form with Assam a Province namely East Bengal and Assam and Bengal proper which include Western part of Bengal, Bihar and Chhota Nagpur. In 1912 Bihar was separated from Bengal. While creating a new province of Bihar some of the Bengali speaking Districts were given to Bihar with a view to reduce Bengal to a position where the Britishers could play the game of "divide and rule" successfully. The Bihar leaders published a letter in the Bengali on January 4, 1912, where they said:

"In accordance with the resolution of the last congress the sound principle would be that enunciated therein that all the Bengali speaking tracts should be brought under the Government of Bengal".

In the same letter the leaders said:

"Such tracts in Santhal parganas where the prevailing language is Bengali should go to Bengal and Hindi speaking tracts of the District remain in Bihar. As for Chhota Nagpur, the whole District of Manbhum and Pargana Dhalbhum of Singhbhum Districts are Bengali speaking and they should go to Bengal and the rest of the Division with Hindi speaking should remain with Bihar".

[Shri Abdus Sattar]

When the SRC was appointed, high hopes in the minds of Bengali speaking people in Bihar were raised that now their long-cherished desire will be fulfilled and they will be able to re-join their brothers in Bengal, but the Report of SRC has cast a gloom on the Bengali speaking people of Bihar, as the S.R.C. recommends only Purulia Sub-division minus Chas Thana in the District of Manbhum. Chas Thana has been excluded on the plea that it is contiguous to Dhanbad. This is a colossal mistake of facts. River Damodar divides Chas Thana and Dhanbad. In no way Chas Thana is contiguous to Dhanbad.

The Commission takes different views and principles when it comes to the question of Dhalbhum. The entire District of Singhbhum was never demanded by West Bengal. West Bengal demands the Subdivision of Dhalbhum where Bengali language is in predominance and the area is contiguous to Midnapore District of West Bengal. In custom, manners and habits the people of this Sub-division absolutely resemble those of Bengal. It was part and parcel of Bengal and for the sake of justice and fairplay and in deference to the popular will the area should go to West Bengal. In support of my contention, I would like to present some facts before you. The total number of documents registered in 1952 in Dhalbhum were 4,500. This was in 1952 when the campaign against Bengali language was rampant. Even then out of 4,500, 4,000 were executed in Bengali and the rest having been done in English. There was no trace of Hindi then. In 1955 the number of documents executed were 5,000, out of which 4,500 were in Bengali, 485 in English and 15 only in Hindi. Even in 1954, out of 4,500 documents, 4,000 were executed in Bengali, 350 in English and 150 in Hindi. In 1955 up to October number of registered documents were 4,000, out of which 3,200 were in Bengali, 300 in English and 500 in Hindi. It is to be remembered in this connection that the documents were

printed in Hindi and signatures there were in Bengali. This is quite clear that systematic attempts were made to get documents registered in Hindi. In spite of this the number of Hindi documents is very low in comparison to those executed in Bengali. These facts demonstrate clearly that the area is predominantly Bengali speaking. The Commission excludes Chas Thana from Purulia Sub-division on grounds that the majority of the people are Hindi speaking. With all humility I would like to ask why this same principle should not be applied to Dhalbhum and the Bengali speaking area should not be joined with West Bengal. This will be a sheer injustice and against the will of the people if the Bengali speaking area, Dhalbhum Sub-division is not rejoined with Bengal.

The SRC recommends the transfer of Purulia sub-division on the ground that this is a catchment area of river Kansavati. The river Ajoy inundates every year large tracts of land in the District of Burdwan and Birbhum. This river requires taming and controlling to mitigate the flood-havoc, and the catchment of the river lies in Santhal Pargana. Even on this ground the catchment area should go to West Bengal.

Portion of Kishengunj sub-division in Purnia District and portion of Gopalpur Revenue Thana has been recommended by the SRC for transfer to West Bengal on a different ground. On the ground of geographical integration and administrative convenience, now North Bengal has no link with the rest of West Bengal. According to SRC this is the only part 'A' State, where there is no geographical integration, but this transfer is opposed by Bihar friends on a very narrow ground which I feel pained to mention. I am more pained to find the old communalism has again appeared in Bihar Vidhan Sabha deliberations on SRC recommendations. The slogan 'Muslims will be in danger in West Bengal' has been

raised there. The West Bengal is a part of secular India. Is it not a slur on the Govt. of India to say that Muslims will be unsafe in West Bengal. Why this bogey has been raised? If they have got Urdu language, they will be allowed to continue it. I would like to point out that, in my District of Burdwan there is an Urdu High School, where Urdu speaking children get their education through the medium of Urdu. The West Bengal Government brings out an Urdu fortnightly 'MAGRABI BENGAL'. Besides this, some dailies are published from Calcutta in Urdu language. Instead of raising the communal bogey, I would request the Bihar leaders to remove the apprehensions in the minds of Muslims, if any, and tell the Muslims of Kishengunj that they will live with amity and happiness in West Bengal—where 50 lakhs of their co-religionists are living. As a testimony to this it should be boldly pointed out that most of the Muslims who had gone to Pakistan had come back to West Bengal. The Muslims would never come back to West Bengal, had they not felt themselves safe and secure in that part of India. To my mind this is sufficient to remove the apprehensions of the Muslims in Kishangunj.

I do not want to get back Bengali speaking areas in Bihar because Bengal has suffered and sacrificed in the cause of country's emancipation. I do not want to get them back, because West Bengal is over-populated. I want to get them back on the very principle the Congress has stood for since 1912.

I have the privilege and honour to be a member of All India Congress Committee since 1936 without any break. I have seen in the Congress Constitution that more than one Provincial Congress Committees formed in Madras, Bombay and other composite Provinces. The principles which Congress adopted in its Constitution before it came to power, for the sake of that very principle the

Bengali-speaking area in Bihar should go back to Bengal. Though the language was not the main criterion in reorganising the States, but it cannot be denied the language was the most important factor for recommending the States Karnatak, Kerala, Vidarbha and Madhya Pradesh. Bengali speaking area in Bihar contiguous to West Bengal should be joined in pursuance of the principle on which Andhra was created and on the background of which the SRC was appointed.

Shri Siddananjappa (Hassan-Chikmagalur): Broadly speaking, I wholeheartedly support the recommendations of the SRC. I am glad to note that the Commission have done away with the distinction between State and State, and have recommended only one class of States.

I am strongly of the view that if we want to build a strong, prosperous and united India, we should have only a small number—not exceeding six—of States for the whole country. Such States should be nearly equal in area, population and resources for economic and industrial development. In smaller States certain groups will occupy an advantageous position in order to maintain which they try to suppress the interests of the rest. But in larger States there will be scope for an equitable balance among various groups, and no one group will be in a position to dominate over others.

It is my firm belief that reorganisation of States will not brook any more delay. Any further delay will only tend to weaken the unity and security of the country and to hamper the economic progress of the people. Hence, I very much appreciate the anxiety on the part of the Government of India to take an early decision and implement it soon.

I like to draw the pointed attention of the Government of India and of this Hon'ble House to the necessity and desirability of providing adequate safeguards for protecting the interests of the minorities, for ensuring the development of backward

[Shri Siddananjappa]

areas and for the speedy execution and smooth working of Inter-State projects—on the lines recommended by the Commission.

It is also absolutely necessary to appoint an impartial and high power Boundary Commission or Commissions to settle justly and amicably boundaries between the new States to be formed.

I am happy that the Commission have recommended the formation of the States of Karnataka, Kerala, and Tamilnad (Madras) in the South. I wish they had likewise recommended the immediate formation of the States of Vishala Andhra and Samyukta Maharashtra. But it is still open to peoples of these areas to come together and form these two States. I hope they will do so.

I heartily welcome the recommendations for the formation of a Karnataka State. On behalf of Mysore State, I welcome all the Kannadigas into the proposed Karnataka State. Mysore is a very progressive State. She is ever willing to take in her neighbouring contiguous areas with their populations, irrespective of their language. Her Kannadiga neighbours are very dear to her. She has always looked upon them as her younger brothers, and is glad to take them back to her fold after several years of separation.

It is unfortunate that very recently there has been some opposition to this merger by a section of the people of Mysore State. The fears on which this opposition is based are baseless. This attitude is opposed to the progressive policies and views of Mysore State. I hope this opposing section will soon change their attitude, fall in time with the predominant, progressive and liberal views in the State of Mysore and heartily welcome all the Kannadigas into one fold.

It is heartening to note that most of the vast rich Malnad area is now coming under one administration,

thus affording unhampered scope for its rapid development. The Malnad area and the other areas proposed to be added to Mysore State are very rich in soil, and in agricultural, mineral and forest wealth. These rich abundant resources, if properly and adequately harnessed, will make the proposed Karnataka State one of the most prosperous and progressive States of India. I hope the Government of India will not hesitate to help with adequate finances the development of these rich areas.

The same Mysore being associated with a "model State" has acquired very wide recognition and respect. I suggest that the new Karnataka State to be formed should be called by the name "Mysore".

Under the British rule the Kannadigas suffered most. They were torn into several bits and thrown asunder into several States. This disruption took place on all sides of the territory which they once occupied under one Rule. Naturally, these bits of territory from all the sides should now come together to form the proposed Karnataka State. Hence the proposed Karnataka State has border area problems all along its boundary. I hope the Boundary Commission to be appointed will go into all these border area problems in detail and settle them justly. I also hope the new neighbouring States will generously cooperate in the settlement of these border area problems.

The Commission have done a very grievous wrong to the Mysore State as well as to the proposed Karnataka State by recommending the Taluks of Bellary, Hospet, and Siraguppa and the subtaluk of Mallapura of Bellary district, to be given back to Andhra State. The Commission seem to have accepted the representations of the Andhra Government *in toto* without verification, and to have rejected *in toto* all the representations on behalf of Mysore State. They do not seem to have carefully applied their mind to all the relevant facts and figures relating to this area. My hon. friends

Sri Sivamurthi Swami and Sri T. Subramanyam have placed before this House all the relevant data and shown clearly. That recommendation is absurd, illogical and unjust. So, I strongly urge upon the Government to see that this area is retained in the proposed Karnataka State.

Now the following are some of the other areas, which have Kannada-speaking majority and which are vitally connected with their neighbouring areas included in the proposed Karnataka State, which should legitimately and justly be merged in the proposed Karnataka State, namely, (1) the portion of Kasargod taluk in South Canara, lying to the north of the Chandragiri river, (2) the whole of Madakasira taluk of Andhra State,—this being an enclave in Mysore State territory, (3) the whole of Talwadi fika of Gopi taluk in Coimbatore district of Madras State, (4) the whole of Hosur taluk of Salem district in Madras State; (5) the whole of Akkalkote taluk of Sholapur district of Bombay State, (6) the Bidar, the Humnabad, the Shantpur and the Bhalki taluks of Bidar district in Hyderabad State, (7) the whole of the Nilagiri district in Madras State, (8) the Kannada-speaking areas, adjacent to the proposed Karnataka State, of Adoni, Allur and Raydurg taluks of Bellary district, and (9) South Sholapur taluk and Sholapur city in Bombay State. The people of these areas want to join the proposed Karnataka State. Besides language affinity there are other compelling reasons—like social, cultural and commercial contacts.

Shri A. K. Dutt (Calcutta South-West): The States Reorganisation Commission have not followed any definite well defined and fixed principle in suggesting the boundaries between various States and in forming new States. In some cases they have drawn the boundary line basing their decision on the linguistic basis. As for instance Karnataka, Visalandhra etc. In other cases they have not followed the same principle e.g. in the case of Bengal, Orissa etc.

In the case of Bengal, they have argued that they have not followed the linguistic basis because if Bengali speaking areas from Bihar are added to Bengal, that will cripple Bihar financially. That argument is also not sound. Dr. Roy, the Chief Minister of Bengal, has shown in his note that Bengal after partition is not also in a sound financial position. Bengal is already in debt to the extent of about Rs. 85 crores and there is deficit between expenditure and revenue and there is deficit every year to the extent of about Rs. 10 crores. These Bengali speaking areas have got mineral resources. If they are properly developed, Bengal can meet its deficit budget. Bihar has got various other mineral resources in various other parts of Bihar. If they develop the same they can meet their budget.

From the report it also further appears that in some cases a portion of land has been transferred from one province to another on Thana basis and others on Division of sub-division basis. This has created a great confusion. Under the circumstances the said report should be modified for the purpose of making the transfer of land on uniform basis.

West Bengal Government has sent some proposals suggesting some modification of the said Report. I support the said proposal of West Bengal Government.

Some of the members of this House, from Bihar have suggested that the said claim of West Bengal Government is a claim on the land of Bihar. It is not so. West Bengal Government does not want any land from Bihar to which Bihar is justly entitled. West Bengal Government claims only those lands which belonged to Bengal and which were transferred from Bengal to Bihar by British Government with a view that the Nationalistic movement which was agitating Bengal at that time may not spread in those places. Congress realised this position and the object of the British Government and assured through the accredited leaders of the Congress that this wrong will be righted after India gets independence and boundaries of the Provinces

[Shri A. K. Dutt]

will be again readjusted on linguistic basis after India gets *swaraj*. Even Mahatma Gandhi also gave a similar assurance to Bengalis who were agitating at that time for the purpose of joining with the parts of the Province which were cut off from it.

Moreover, Britishers never fixed the boundaries of the provinces on a fixed principle. They did it to suit their administrative convenience and political aims. Congress assured, after attainment of *Swaraj* the boundaries of the provinces should be fixed on linguistic basis, the people speaking the same language would be entitled to join together and thus will be able to act in a homogeneous manner to develop their own culture. Now, after giving these assurances year after year and making people believe that the Congress in proper time will carry out its assurances, it will not be fair to people concerned to deny their rights which they were assured they will get in proper time. That will frustrate those people and the unity of India will be at stake. I submit for the sake of unity and security of India, these assurances should be carried out and thus convince the people what Congress pledged. They are doing the same. If that is not done, the people will be prone to think that those assurances were mere bluffs and this will greatly shake the confidence of the people in Congress and Congress organisations and as the present Government is a Congress Government it will reflect on the Government itself. Under the circumstances I again reiterate for the sake of unity and security of India, that proposal of Government of West Bengal should be given effect to and the land to which the Government of West Bengal is justly entitled to should be given back to them and assurances of the leaders of the Congress should be carried out.

The case of Kishengunj sub-division stands on a different footing. When Bengal was truncated for the sake of national Independence of whole of India, Bengal was assured that Kishengunj sub-division should be

given to her and thus the communication system of the two parts of Bengal would be restored which has been shattered as a result of partition of Bengal. It is high time now that the said assurances be fulfilled. The S.R.C. Report admitted the said claim of Bengal but in giving effect to the same they have proceeded in a very halting manner. I submit the claim on Kishengunj sub-division of Government of West Bengal should be accepted and the Report modified accordingly.

In conclusion, I agree with the suggestion of our Prime Minister that there should be grouping of States into five zones. This will safeguard the interests of the minorities whether in language, religion, trade or commerce. These zones should be given sufficient authority to safeguard their interests. This will allay the fear—complex if there is any. The provinces working under each zone, acting together and co-operating with each other, shall understand each other's needs and difficulties and shall try to solve them. It may be hoped that working for some time under each zone, provinces working under it may merge into one another and become one whole, the ultimate object being of these five zones merging into one zone and becoming one really united India. This will be a real step towards unity and this will minimise dissipated tendency and provincial feeling.

श्री अमर सिंह डामर (झाबुआ—रक्षित—

अनुसूचित आदिम जातियां): राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में, प्रस्तावित मध्य प्रदेश में, वर्तमान मध्य भारत के विलय की चर्चा की है, इसका मैं हार्दिक अभिनन्दन करता हूँ, किन्तु मेरा यह भी नम्र निवेदन है कि भारत के भिन्न भिन्न भागों में बसने वाले दो करोड़ आदिवासियों का कहीं भी एक छोटा-बड़ा प्रान्त बनाया जाता तो कितना सुन्दर होता, किन्तु राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग ने

इसकी ओर तनिक भी ध्यान नहीं दिया, खैर यह तो सरकार के सोचने की बात है सरकार समर्थ है, इसलिए वह किसी भी समय, जो कुछ उचित समझती है कर सकती है।

राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग ने मध्य भारत के मध्य प्रदेश में विलय की जो दलीलें दी हैं वे निम्न हैं: पहिली दलील, मध्य भारत आत्मनिर्भर नहीं है; दूसरी दलील, मध्य भारत में डाकुओं का बोलबाला है; तीसरी दलील, मध्य भारत में सदैव ग्वालियर और इन्दौर की परम्परागत दुश्मनी रही है; चौथी दलील, प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना की रकम विकास कार्यों के लिए खर्च की गई है उसमें सबसे अधिक शहरों का ध्यान रखा है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मध्य भारत के लिए चारों तर्क युक्तियुक्त घटित होते हैं, इसमें कं सन्देह नहीं कि मध्य भारत एक पार्ट 'बी' स्टेट है, इसमें कोई ऐसे साधन नहीं हैं जिससे समूचे प्रान्त को आत्मनिर्भर होने में सहायक हों, यही कारण है कि मध्य भारत को सदैव केन्द्र की ओर मुंह ताकना पड़ता है दूसरा तर्क डाकुओं के लिए बोलबाले के रूप में किया गया है यह भी युक्तियुक्त है। जब से मध्य भारत राज्य का निर्माण हुआ प्रायः तभी से ही डाकुओं का प्रादुर्भाव हुआ, तभी से लगा कर आज तक मध्य भारत की डाकू समस्या हल नहीं हो पाई। केवल मानसिंह डाकू को मार देने से डाकुओं का उन्मूलन हो गया यह नहीं कहा जा सकता है क्योंकि डाकू मानसिंह के मारे जाने के पश्चात् भिण्ड और मुरैना में अन्य डाकुओं ने पचासों हत्याएं कर डाली हैं। राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग ने तीसरा तर्क ग्वालियर तथा इन्दौर की परम्परागत दुश्मनी का लगाया है—यह भी सर्वथा ठीक बैठता है। भूतपूर्व इन्दौर तथा ग्वालियर राज्य के इतिहास को देखा जाय तो पता चलेगा कि ग्रहिल्या बाई होमकर के समय तत्कालीन राधोबा ने सिन्धिया

की ओर से इन्दौर के ऊपर चढ़ाई की थी परन्तु ग्रहिल्याबाई होलकर के कुशल नेतृत्व के सामने राधोबा को हार माननी पड़ी और उसने ग्रहिल्याबाई होलकर से प्रत्यक्ष रूप में क्षमा मांगी थी और शरण में आ गया था। राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग के सदस्यों ने इतनी ज़ारीकी में पहुंच कर बहुत ही बुद्धिमानी की है। प्रायः तभी से इन्दौर तथा ग्वालियर की जनता में दुश्मनी की भावना पैदा हो गई थी, क्योंकि यदि कोई राष्ट्र दूसरे राष्ट्र पर तथा कोई राजा दूसरे राज्य पर चढ़ाई करता है तो उसमें जनता ही तो मारी जाती है, अन्य भी कई कारण हैं, कि जिनके कारण इन्दौर तथा ग्वालियर की जनता तथा नेताओं में भी अभी भी मेल नहीं हो पाया है।

एक ग्रामीण कहावत के अनुसार भूतपूर्व ग्वालियर राज्य की जनता जो शहरों में रहती है उसको छोड़ कर समूचे प्रान्त के लोग ग्वालियर के नाम मात्र से चिढ़ते हैं। वह कहावत इस प्रकार है—एक बार भूतपूर्व ग्वालियर राज्य के एक कस्बे में भ्रमण लग गई तो वहां से ग्वालियर तथा उज्जैन और इन्दौर तार बिये गये, इन्दौर तो एक अलग राज्य था परन्तु फिर भी भ्रमण बुझाने की सहायता वहां से प्राप्त ही गई परन्तु ग्वालियर तथा उज्जैन से किसी भी प्रकार की सहायता नहीं आई। होता क्या है कि उक्त घटना के छः सात मास पश्चात् ग्वालियर से उक्त गांव के तार से सम्बन्धित व्यक्ति को तार द्वारा सूचना दी गई कि भ्रमण बुझा दी जाय। वर्तमान मध्य भारत की ८० प्रतिशत जनता उक्त घटना को बहुत ही महत्व देती है। यही कारण है कि ग्वालियर के शासन के नाम से जनता अप्रसन्न है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, सबसे अधिक महत्वशाली तर्क जो राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग ने [उनकी रिपोर्ट में प्रस्तुत किया है, वास्तव में वह बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण है, निस्सन्देह प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना में मध्य भारत में शहरों की:

[श्री अमर सिंह डामर]

उन्नति का ६० प्रतिशत ध्यान दिया गया है और कस्बों तथा देहातों की पूर्ण रूपेण उपेक्षा की गई। प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना का करोड़ों रुपया ग्वालियर, उज्जैन तथा इन्दौर में बड़ी बड़ी भव्य इमारतें बनाने में खर्च किया गया है तथा शेष अधिकांश रकम देवास, रतलाम, मन्दसौर, गुना, शिवपुरी, भिन्ड तथा मुरैना में खर्च की गई, बाकी क्षेत्र में १० प्रतिशत रकम प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना की खर्च की गई। यहां तक कि प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना में पेटलावद तहसील जहां मैं आया हूं कोई भी ठोस योजना कार्यान्वि नहीं की गई और न की जा रही या की जाने वाली है, मध्य भारत में इसमें काफी पक्षपात किया जा रहा है।

मध्य भारत में राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग की, उन चर्चाओं के बारे में, जिन में यह बताया गया कि मध्य भारत स्वतन्त्र नहीं रह सकता बल्कि मध्य प्रदेश में मिलाया जाना चाहिए। इस सम्बन्ध में निम्न प्रतिक्रिया निम्न वर्गों में पाई गई।

मध्य भारत में तीन प्रकार के वर्गों ने अपने अपने दृष्टिकोणों से राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग की मध्य भारत के सम्बन्ध में की गई चर्चा को समझा है। प्रथम वह ग्राम वर्ग जिसने मध्य भारत का प्रारम्भ से ही मध्य प्रदेश में वलय का पुरजोर स्वागत किया है, दूसरा वह वर्ग जिसने राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग की मध्य भारत के विलय की चर्चा को असन्तोषप्रद बतलाया है, और तीसरी वह वर्ग जिसमें सामन्तशाही और राजप्रमुखी वर्ग आता है रिपोर्ट में अपने आपको समूल नष्टप्रायः पाया है, इस वर्ग में इस रिपोर्ट से बड़ी खलबली मच गई है, उपर्युक्त तीनों वर्गों ने जो दृष्टिकोण इस रिपोर्ट के बारे में अपनाया है, या अपने आप को जिन्होंने समझ पाया है

वह निम्नानुसार चौपाई से स्पष्ट हो जाता है :

कुसगुन लंक, अवध प्रति शोक ।
हर्ष विषाद विवश सुर लोक ॥

जहां तक मैं इस रिपोर्ट को समझ पाया हूं, मैं निम्न निर्णय या निष्कर्ष पर पहुंचा हूं। प्रस्तावित मध्य प्रदेश के बारे में तीन बड़े उच्चतम उदाहरण प्रस्तुत किए हैं, वे ये हैं, प्रथम उदाहरण यह है कि मध्य भारत, मध्य प्रदेश, विन्ध्य प्रदेश तथा भोपाल के आदिवासियों एवम् हरिजनों का एक ही प्रान्त की कड़ी में आबद्ध होना, आदिवासियों एवम् हरिजनों की जनसंख्या प्रस्तावित मध्य प्रदेश में सम्पूर्ण प्रान्त की एक तिहाई जनसंख्या से भी अधिक है, यह बड़े सौभाग्य की बात है, कि भारतवर्ष में इतनी बड़ी संख्या में प्रस्तावित मध्य प्रदेश में आदिवासियों एवम् हरिजनों का अनोखा मिलना दूसरा उदाहरण यह है कि—जैसा कि मैंने प्रारम्भ में ही कहा है कि इन्दौर तथा ग्वालियर के झगड़े का एकमात्र हल रिपोर्ट में सन्निहित है, इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं कि इस रिपोर्ट ने राजप्रमुख प्रथा को भारतवर्ष में सदा के लिए समाप्त कर दिया।

यह रिपोर्ट भारतवर्ष के इतिहास में इस बीसवीं सदी में एक बड़ा भारी क्रान्तिकारी कदम है, यह एक बड़े सौभाग्य की बात है कि छोटी छोटी रियासती इकाइयों को बड़ा रूप प्राप्त हो रहा है, मैं इसका पुरजोर हार्दिक अभिनन्दन करता हूं, जो कि निम्न दोहे से स्पष्ट होता है :

इक नदिया, इक नार कहावत मेळो नीर भरो ।
दोनों मिल जुल एक बरन भई सुरसरिनाम परो ॥

मैं शैली नीर शब्द को छिछला नीर संज्ञा से यहां पुकारूंगा याने वे छोटी छोटी इकाइयां—बड़ी इकाई में मिलने से एक सूसंगठित, सक्तिशाली तथा आत्म-

निर्भर ईकाई बन जाती है, फिर इतनी बड़ी ईकाई को सर्वथा छोटी छोटी बातों के लिए केन्द्र का मुंह ताकने की आवश्यकता प्रतीत नहीं होगी। मैं वर्तमान मध्य भारत की कुछ अन्य बातों को भी स्पष्ट कर देना यहां उपर्युक्त समझता हूँ—वे ये हैं :

कुछ मनचले लोग यह कहते हैं कि मध्य भारत की राजधानी ग्वालियर रखी जाय, क्योंकि यदि ग्वालियर को राजधानी नहीं बनाया गया तो—ग्वालियर का सर्वनाश हो जायगा ग्वालियर में बड़ी बड़ी भव्य इमारतें बनी हुई हैं वहां पर चील कोए उड़ेंगे। उनका यह सोचना सरासर गलत ही नहीं अपितु एक बकवास है क्योंकि यदि यह बात ग्वालियर के लिए ही सोची जाए तो अन्य शहर जैसे इन्दौर, धार, देवास तथा रतलाम ने क्या बिगाड़ा, जिनको रियासतों की राजधानी रहने का अवसर प्राप्त हुआ था, जिनमें से इन्दौर तो मध्य भारत की ग्रीष्मकालीन राजधानी भी रह चुकी है, जो कि मध्य भारत का सबसे बड़ा, सुन्दर, व्यापारिक, तथा शैक्षणिक दृष्टिकोण से बड़ा-चढ़ा शहर है, जिसमें भारतवर्ष में अहमदाबाद के बाद दूसरे नम्बर में मजदूरों के संगठन के लिए प्रसिद्ध है। ग्वालियर के बारे में मेरी निजी राय यह है कि—किसी शहर का महत्व किसी राजधानी के कार्यालय के रहने से न तो अधिक बढ़ता है और राजधानी के कार्यालय नहीं रहने से न कभी घटता है। किसी शहर का घटना तथा बढ़ना तो उसकी व्यापारिक तथा उद्योगिकता पर निर्भर रहता है। वैसे ग्वालियर में पहिले से ही बड़े बड़े दफ्तर हैं, सम्भव है अधिकांश वहीं रहें, जहां तक इमारतों का प्रश्न है ग्वालियर नरेश को चाहिये कि वह अपनी निजी प्रापर्टी की वे इमारतें जिनको उपयोग में व्यक्तिगत उपयोग में लाना कठिन है ऐसी इमारतों को सरकार के जिम्मे कर देना चाहिए फिर सरकार उनका चाहे कुछ भी उपयोग करे।

इसके बाद मैं मध्य भारत की ट्रान्सपोर्ट विभाग की रिश्ततखोरी पर अपने कुछ विचार व्यक्त करना चाहूंगा जो निम्न हैं : मैं समझता हूँ जब से मध्य भारत का निर्माण हुआ है तब से मध्य भारत के ट्रान्सपोर्ट विभाग में दिन प्रति दिन रिश्तत लेने वालों की संख्या बढ़ती ही जा रही है, रिश्तत लेने के रास्ते बहुत ही सरल हैं। मध्य भारत सरकार ने ट्रान्सपोर्ट विभाग को दो भागों में विभाजित किया है, एक भाग उत्तरी डिवीजन तथा दूसरा भाग दक्षिणी डिवीजन कहलाता है। दोनों डिवीजनों के लिए एक ट्रान्सपोर्ट आफिसर की नियुक्ति की गई है, अब मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि रिश्तत किस प्रकार ली जाती है।

जब भी कभी किसी व्यक्ति ने उसकी मोटर के लिए किसी भी प्रस्तावित लाइन के लिए प्रार्थना की—उससे ५०००, ८००० रुपये एक लाइन के लिए मांगे जाते हैं और गरजमन्द लोग रिश्तत दे देते हैं, ऐसे में सैकड़ों व्यक्तियों ने रिश्तत दे देकर मोटर की लाइनें ली हैं, ये ट्रान्सपोर्ट अधिकारी और उनके सहयोगी ट्रान्सपोर्ट कमेटी के सदस्य उनके एजेन्टों के द्वारा मोटर की लाइनें लेने वालों से रुपया प्राप्त करते हैं। यदि किसी व्यक्ति ने ईमानदारी पर रह कर रिश्तत नहीं दी तो उसको किसी भी सूरत में लाइन नहीं मिल पाती। इसकी शिकायत कई व्यक्तियों ने प्रान्तीय सरकार तथा केन्द्रीय सरकार को भी की है—लेकिन उनकी अभी तक सुनवाई नहीं की गई।

ठीक ऐसे ही हाल मध्य भारत में शिक्षा विभाग के हैं। सरकार आदिवासियों के लड़के तथा लड़कियों को मासिक छात्रवृत्ति देती है लेकिन बीच में जिले के शिक्षा विभाग के इंस्पेक्टर तथा स्कूल के मास्टर मिल कर, जिस देहात या कस्बे में आदिवासियों के बच्चे पढ़ते हैं, छात्रवृत्ति स्वयं खा जाते हैं। इसके लिए झाड़ुभा जिला जो कि आदिवासी जिला

[श्री अमर सिंह डामर]

हैं का इंस्पेक्टर खूब हाथ मारता है इसकी मैंने स्वयं भी शिकायत की किन्तु दक्षिण विभाग के उपसंचालक (Deputy Director) सभी प्रमाण हजम कर गया और जिला इंस्पेक्टर जामदार को वहीं रख छोड़ा, ऐसी प्रायः अधिकांश जिलों की शिकायतें हैं शहरों के हाई स्कूल, इन्टरमिडिएट कॉलेज, डिग्री कॉलेज बनाये जाते हैं परन्तु कस्बों में जहां गरीब लोग हैं और जहां कई मिडिल स्कूल हाई स्कूल बनने योग्य हैं वहां यह रोक लगा दी कि सरकार हाई स्कूल नहीं चलाना चाहती है। हां जनता जहां भ्राष्ट्र रुपया दे तो ही शासन मिडिल स्कूल को हाई स्कूल बनाने के पक्ष में है तो यह गरीबों के लिए यह बन्धन क्यों ; और भी कई शिकायतें हैं, मैं एक बार पुनः प्रस्तावित मध्य प्रदेश में मध्य भारत के विलय का हार्दिक अभिनन्दन करता हूं।

श्री बंजमिन हंसबा (पूर्निया व सन्थाल परगना—रक्षित—अनुसूचित आदिम जातियां): मैं आपको हार्दिक धन्यवाद देता हूं, कि आपने पूर्णिया तथा सन्थाल परगना के निर्वाचित क्षेत्र के एक आदिवासी (Scheduled Tribes) सदस्य को इस सदन में पुनर्संगठन आयोग पर अपना विचार प्रगट करने का मौका दिया। साथ साथ मैं आयोग के सदस्यों को भी धन्यवाद देता हूं कि उन्होंने अपनी कठिन परिश्रम उठा कर भारत के प्रत्येक हिस्से में पहुंच कर और भिन्न भिन्न संस्थाओं से मिलकर स्वाधीन भारत के भविष्य को दृढ़ बनाने के ख्याल से, जिन के ऊपर भारत सरकार ने यह भार आरोप किया, उसको पूरा करने में बाज नहीं आये।

मुझे पूर्ण विश्वास था कि आयोग अपने दौरा को समाप्त कर न्याय और विचार के साथ राज्यों का पुनर्संगठन करेगा। मुझे यह भी विश्वास था कि आयोग अपने साथ विचार

और न्याय को लिये दिल्ली से प्रस्थान कर रहे हैं यह विचार ये भिन्न भिन्न राज्यों में समान रूप से बटवारा करेंगे। महोदय मुझे दुःख है कि जब वे बिहार राज्य में पहुंचे तो उन्होंने न्याय और विचार को छोड़ डाला। आयोग के दो माननीय सदस्य जब पूर्णिया जिला पहुंचे तो वहां की जनता, बूढ़े, जवान, औरत, मर्द और बच्चों ने उनका स्वागत किया। लाखों की संख्या में उन्होंने अपनी राय जाहिर की। वहां की जनता ने "पश्चिम बंगाल" में सम्मिलित किये जाने का घोर विरोध किया। किसनगंज सब-डिवीजन जहां ८० प्रतिशत मुसलमान भाई हैं उन्होंने बंगाल में जाने से साफ इंकार कर दिया। वहां के सदस्यों ने आयोग के सामने उस अंचल के आर्थिक, सामाजिक, राजनैतिक, ऐतिहासिक तथा भूगोलिक दृष्टिकोणों को सामने रखते हुए इस का घोर विरोध किया। विशेषकर जनता की इच्छा को मद्देनजर रखने के लिये आयोग के सामने अपना दबाव सदस्यों ने रखा।

महोदय, जब आयोग दक्षिण बिहार के सकरीगली घाट पहुंचा तो वहां भी लाखों की संख्या में बच्चे, बूढ़े, औरत, मर्द और जवानों ने उनका स्वागत किया। वहां की गरीब जनता अपनी एक स्वर में अपनी इच्छा को प्रगट करते हुए आयोग के सामने "झारखण्ड अलग प्रान्त" का मांग पेश किया। आयोग के सामने सकरीगली घाट, सन्थाल परगना से केन्द्र दुमका तक १०० मील की लम्बी सड़क में लाखों की संख्या में आयोग के सामने झारखण्डी जनताओं ने "अलग प्रान्त" की मांग पेश की। आयोग, झारखण्ड प्रान्त के जिस किसी हिस्से में भी पहुंचा जैसे दुमका, बिस्तरंजन, धनवाद, पुर्लिया, रांची, जमशेदपुर तथा अन्य अन्य जगहों में भी वहां की जनता ने

अलग प्रान्त की मांग लाखों की संख्या में पेश की। दुमका में आठ, दस लाख जनता ने उनका स्वागत करते हुए झारखंड की मांग की।

महोदय, रिपोर्ट के पढ़ लेने पर मुझे कहने में कोई रूकावट नहीं है कि आयोग ने हम झारखण्ड जनताओं से अन्याय नहीं बल्कि अनर्थ किया। आयोग के दोनों सदस्यों ने संथाल परगना से गुजर जाने पर कहा था कि इन पीड़ित और दबाये गये झारखण्ड जनताओं की पुकार सदा हृदय और कानों में गूँज रही है। मुझे दुःख है कि रिपोर्ट की तैयारी करने के समय वे इस को भूल गये। गरीब जनताओं की पुकार को ठुकरा दिया। उन्होंने आयोग को पन्ना—६४ दफा २२८ में जनता की मांग को खुद मद्देनजर रखने के लिये लिखते हैं लेकिन खुद ही उसका उल्लंघन कर डाला। देखते हुए बिन देखे बन गये, जानते हुए अनजान बन गये और सुनते हुए—बहरे बन गये। न मालूम कितने दिन और ऐसे ही रहेंगे। हमने आयोग के सामने "झारखण्ड अलग प्रान्त" अर्थात् छोटा नागपुर कमिश्नरी, संथाल परगना जिला, मयूरभंज, कंबहर, सुन्दरगढ़ (उड़ीसा से), सुरगुजा और जासपुर (मध्य प्रदेश से) और उसके सरहद के इलाके जो आर्थिक, भूगोलिक, सांस्कृतिक तथा ऐतिहासिक दृष्टिकोण से सहज में मिला लिया जा सकता है मांग किया; जिसका क्षेत्रफल ६३,८५६ वर्ग मील, आबादी १६,३६७,१७७ और जिसकी वार्षिक आय २२ करोड़ के लगभग होता है। यह मांग कोई नयी चीज नहीं थी, यह पहाड़ी इलाका ऐतिहासिक काल से ही झारखण्ड के नाम से प्रसिद्ध है जहां भारत के १४ (एक चौथाई) आदिवासी एकत्रित विराजमान हैं। आयोग ने इन पर गौर नहीं किया न उनको समझने की ही कोशिश की। आयोग अपना हिसाब लगाने में गलती कर डाले। वे

Page--169, Para: 617 में यह

बयान देते हैं कि झारखण्ड पार्टी बहुमत में बिहार विधान सभा में नहीं है। आयोग को यह मालूम होना चाहिये कि झारखण्ड प्रान्त में पढ़ने वाली ८७ सीट में ५२ सीट, उत्तर बिहार से अलग चाहने वालों की है तो क्यों हम बहुमत में नहीं होते। गत आम चुनाव उत्तर बिहार से दक्षिण बिहार को पृथक करना ही मूल आधार था। इससे कोई इंकार नहीं कर सकता है। पुनर्गठन आयोग ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में यह भी लिखा कि यह केवल आदिवासियों की मांग है जो एक लघु संख्यक है। लेकिन मैं उन की रिपोर्ट को गलत साबित करता हूँ चूंकि यह चुनाव के फल से ही साफ जाहिर होता है कि यह मांग केवल आदिवासी नहीं लेकिन वहां के सारे जनताओं का भाग है। आयोग ने यह भी लिखा कि उत्तर बिहार को अलग कर देने पर उसे काफी क्षति होगी चूंकि उत्तर प्रान्त के लिये और दक्षिण द्रव्य के लिये प्रसिद्ध है। दक्षिण बिहार में कभी प्रान्त के लिये कमी नहीं हो सकती क्योंकि सन् १९४७ से १९५१ ई० तक जब बिहार अकाल पीड़ित राज्य घोषित होने पर Ranchi, Manbhum, Singhbhum और संथाल परगना बराबर प्रान्त के लिए Surplus Area घोषित रहा।

आयोग ने बयान करते हुए यह भी लिखा कि Bokaro Thermal Power झारखंड के अन्तर्गत पड़ता है इस तरह की महा उन्नत चीज को कोई राज्य नहीं खो सकता। मैं यह आयोग का लिखना भूल समझता हूँ चूंकि आज जितनी भी बड़े बड़े कारखाने जैसे Jamshedpur, Rourkela, Sindri, D. V. C. वगैरह बन रहे हैं। सारे भारत के नागरिकों की उन्नति की चीज और केन्द्र की अधिक की चीज है। इन सब चीजों से तो सारे भारत को लाभ होने

[श्री बंजमिन हंसदा]

बाला है न कि एक राज्य को ही। शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में मुझे यही कहना है कि पटना और बिहार University झारखण्ड के अलग या बाहर रहने से कोई नुकसान नहीं है क्योंकि हम एक जगह से दूसरी जगह विद्यार्थी भेज सकते हैं या झारखण्ड के अन्तर्गत भी Universities बना सकते हैं हमारे सदस्यों से यह बात छिपी नहीं है कि यह झारखण्ड इलाका जंगली देरा है। यहां के हर निवासी सीधे-साधे और भोले हैं। यह एक पहाड़ी मुल्क है जैसे हमारे साथी श्री Debi Ram हिमाचल प्रदेश वालों ने बयान करते हुए कहा वैसे ही हमें भी दबाया गया, लूटा गया, कंगाल बनाया गया। किस ने? समतल के शिक्षित रहने वालों ने। हमारे भोलेपन का नाजायज फायदा उठाया। यह मुल्क, यह प्रान्त स्वतन्त्र भारत का भविष्य भूषण है। मान्य सदस्यों से यह छिपी नहीं है कि सारे सांसार में मिलने वाले खनिज द्रव्य यहां पाय जाते हैं। गौरव की बात है कि वर्तमान युग की सर्वश्रेष्ठ द्रव्य जिस पर संसार निर्भर है—Uranium तक यहां मिल गया है। किन्तु मुझे दुख है कि यहां के निवासी जो मेहनती, हूष्ट-पुष्ट होते हैं उनको इस स्वाधीन भारत में, जनता राज म, किसी भी प्रकार का भारत की सेवा करने के लिये मौका नहीं दिया जाता है। खास कर यहां के आदिवासियों को। हमारे ऊपर सदा अन्याय किया गया। आदिवासियों में सदा असंतुष्टता फैली रही। इन के लिये Tribes Advisory Council बनी, Takkar Bappa's Tribal Committee बनी, लेकिन कोई कामयाब नहीं हो पाया। सरकार ने यहां तरह तरह के कानून लागू किये लेकिन निष्फल रही। यहां के गरीब आदिवासियों के असंतुष्टता के कारण जो सदा न्याय और हक को अपनाना चाहते थे उनको हक विचार के लिये १८५५-१८५७ ई० तक संथाल प्रान्दोलन

करना पड़ा। १८८० ई० से १८९० ई० तक Birsa प्रान्दोलन हुआ। फलस्वरूप Santal Parganas और Chotanagpur Tenancy Act बना जो आज तक लागू है।

∴ महोदय मैं आप को यह भी बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि कैसे वहां की गरीब आदिवासी जनता जो सदा बिहार के स्थित भाईयों के साथ रहना चाहती है Saraikela और Kharsawa जहां वह संख्यक में Tribes है Orissa में मिला देने पर Orissa सरकार के गोली के शिकार बने। वे चाहते थे झारखण्ड के आदिवासी के साथ रहें। दूसरी और जगहों, जैसे Bundu Shijkola वगैरह में आदिवासी, बिहार स्थित झारखण्ड आदिवासियों के साथ रहने की इच्छा प्रगट करने पर गोली के शिकार बनाये गये। D. V. C. में क्या हुआ गरीब संथालों की लाखों एकड़ जमीन ले ली गई। चितरंजन में क्या हुआ? संथालों की जमीन ले ली गई। आपने उन के लिये क्या किया? पश्चिम बंगाल संथाल परगना के पूर्वी अंशों की मांग कर रहे हैं जहां बंगला बोलने वाले ९/१० प्रतिशत हैं भाषा के आधार पर मांग करते। मानभूम भाषा के आधार पर मांग करते जहां कुरमाली बोलने वाले बहुसंख्या में हैं। भाषा के आधार पर मांग करने वाले पश्चिम बंगाल, उड़ीसा तथा मध्य प्रान्त के मांग का मैं घोर विरोध करता हूँ। महोदय साथ साथ में केन्द्रीय सरकार तथा हमारे प्रिय प्रधान मन्त्री तथा गृह मन्त्री से आज अर्ज करूंगा कि स्वतन्त्र भारत में आदिवासियों की समस्या को मद्दे नजर रखते हुए हमें टुकड़े टुकड़े और तितर बितर न करें। हमें एकत्रित रखने के लिये अपना सहयोग दान दें ताकि भविष्य में हम भी भारत के नागरिक बन सकें और सेवा कर सकें। महोदय, फिर भी मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि "झारखण्ड अलग प्रान्त" निर्माण के सम्बन्ध में यदि Kerala, Karnataka

और Vidarbha के अधिन पर विचार कमीशन को प्रगत की वह झारखण्ड प्रान्त में पूरा लागू है। चेयरमैन श्री Fazl Ali ने जो हिमाचल (Himachal) प्रदेश पर अपना राय जाहिर किया वह एक एक शब्द झारखण्ड पर लागू होता है, किन्तु दुःख है कि झारखण्ड प्रान्त की मांग को उन्होंने ठुकरा दिया। जनता की मांग को कुचल दिया। फिर भी झारखण्ड एक इंच जमीन भी बंगाल, उड़ीसा, मध्य प्रदेश में मिलाने के विरुद्ध है।

इन सारी बातों को विचार में रखते हुए सदन से मेरी प्रार्थना है कि झारखण्ड प्रान्त की मांग पर उचित विचार कर "झारखण्ड प्रान्त" निर्माण किया जाय। साथ साथ में माननीय प्रधान मन्त्री श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी का भी समर्थन करता हूँ और अनुरोध करता हूँ कि अगर अलग प्रान्त न बन सके तो भविष्य भारत की राजनैतिक, आर्थिक, और देश की जनता की उन्नति के लिये केन्द्रीय सरकार के अधीन भारत को चार भागों में बांट दें जैसे बुंदेलखण्ड, रोहिलखण्ड, बाघेलखण्ड और झारखण्ड। धन्यवाद।

श्री जी० एल० चौधरी (जिला शाहजहाँ-पुर-उत्तर-खेरी-पूर्व-रक्षित-अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : मैं राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग को बधाई देता हूँ कि आयोग ने अपने प्रतिवेदन में जो कुछ निर्णय किया वह बहुत सोच समझ कर किया है। ऐसे समय में इससे अच्छा कोई प्रतिवेदन नहीं हो सकता था, हाँ मैं यह मानता हूँ कि अब भी जो राज्य बनाये हैं चाहे वह भाषावार क्षेत्र पर माने जायँ चाहे सांस्कृतिक तौर पर माने जायँ पर राज्यों की संख्या अब भी अधिक है। मेरे विचार से देश में ५ राज्यों से अधिक राज्य नहीं होने चाहिए जैसा कि हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री ने ता० २१-१२-५५ को संसद में इजहार किया। मेरे विचार

छोटे छोटे राज्यों के रखने में देश का अधिक हित नहीं है। हमें आर्थिक दशा को सोच कर चलना है। हमारे सामने छोटे छोटे राज्यों का हजारों वर्षों से एक इतिहास रहा है जिससे हमें अनुभव है कि छोटे छोटे राज्य हमेशा आपस में लड़ते रहे हैं और उसका परिणाम देश को भुगतना पड़ा है। हमें प्रसन्नता है कि देश में जो ६०० छोटे छोटे राज्य थे वह समाप्त हो गये। अब फिर जो छोटे छोटे राज्य हैं वह बड़े कर दिये जायँ जिससे देश का काफी धन जो सरकारें चलाने में खर्च होता है, वह कम पड़ जाय जहाँ तक हमारे सूबे का सम्बन्ध है। प्रतिवेदन में दो विचार व्यक्त किये गये हैं एक तो विचार यह है कि सूबे को ज्यों का त्यों रखा जाय दूसरा विचार यह है कि सूबे का बंटवारा किया जाय। बंटवारे के लिए जो तर्क सरदार पणिकर साहब ने रखे हैं वह अधिक उपयुक्त नहीं हैं। सबसे बड़ा तर्क जो सरदार साहब ने दिया है वह यह है कि उत्तर प्रदेश एक बड़ा सूबा है और भारत सरकार पर हावी रहता है। वह तर्क उनका न्यायसंगत नहीं है जब सरदार जी ने अपनी कलम से मध्य प्रदेश इतना बड़ा सूबा बना दिया है। जहाँ तक भारत सरकार में अधिक प्रभुत्व की बात है, वहाँ में कह सकता हूँ कि अब तक जो जो योजनाएं बनी हैं, उनमें हमारे सूबे की अवहेलना की गयी है। फिर भी जब सरदार जी सूबे के बांटने का तर्क करते हैं उस समय यह भूल जाते हैं कि सूबों की दीवार बना कर यदि वह हम लोगों को अलग करना चाहें तो हम लोग अलग नहीं हो सकते। हम लोगों की एक संस्कृति है, एक खान पान है, एक भाषा है और एक पहनावा है। हम लोग सदैव एक हैं और एक रहेंगे। सरदार जी ने एकतरफा फैसला दिया है। सूबे के बंटवारे में उन्होंने दूसरा पहलू सोचा ही नहीं कि इससे और कितनी कठिनाइयाँ आ पड़ेंगी। सरदार साहब ने एक यह भी तर्क दिया है कि बड़े

[श्री जी० एल० चौधरी]

सूबों में सरकारी प्रबन्ध अच्छी तरह नहीं हो सकता, जब इस बात को ध्यान में रख कर हम भारत के चित्र का अध्ययन करते हैं उस समय हमें यह बात उल्टी सी लगती है क्योंकि देखा ऐसा गया है कि जो छोटे सूबे हैं, उनमें प्रबन्ध अच्छा नहीं है। मध्य भारत सूबा हमारे सामने है, जो उत्तर प्रदेश से काफी छोटा है, फिर भी वहां मनुष्य की रक्षा का कोई भरोसा नहीं है। ला एन्ड आर्डर की हालत बहुत शोचनीय है। दिन दहाड़े डाके पड़ते हैं चोरियां होती हैं। अन्त में मैं राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग को एक बार पुनः धन्यवाद देता हूँ और उसके प्रतिवेदन को ज्यों का त्यों मान लिया जाय इसकी मैं मांग करता हूँ। हा आवश्यकता पर थोड़ा बहुत हेर फेर किया जा सकता है।

Shri Lakshmidhar Jena (Jaipur-Keonjhar—Reserved—Sch. Castes): The report of the Commission is a document of immense importance to the country inasmuch as they have proposed very important and far reaching changes. They are men of integrity, honesty and are persons who could balance view on important issues.

You may see from the note of the Chairman, Shri Fazal Ali that he took no part in the question of the territorial disputes, as he calls them, between Bihar, Bengal & Orissa. Why it was so—is difficult to explain. Dr. Kunzru could discuss and give decisions on all questions regarding U.P. either to keep it divided or to keep the same as it is. Dr. Panikkar feels no compunction to discuss and give decisions regarding Kerala. He equally has no compunction to decide the fates of Rajpramukhs and wiping off of Ex-states even he was all along his life in the service of the Princes and the States. In any case Orissa and Bengal lose the sound and sober judgement with a balanced mind on so important issues as the territorial disputes between Bengal, Bihar and

Orissa. I, therefore, demand this one question, with all the relevant papers, be referred to a Tribunal. Let the Tribunal in this case be a man of the calibre of the retired Chief Justice Shri Varadachariar or Shri Patanjali Sastri or Shri Mahajan retired Chief Justices of the Supreme Court. It is then and then alone the decision will bind Orissa and Bengal. I fully associate myself with the demand of Shri Biswanath Das, the Orissa Congress Member, in his speech in Rajya Sabha. There is a deep feeling in Orissa that the just cause of Orissa is sidetracked always because of powerful influences. Decision of such eminent judges on an issue like this will restore confidence in the fairness of the decision.

We had absolutely no complaint about the decision of the two other members until we read paras 738, 744 and 747 at pages 200 and 201. These decisions made clear to us that those two eminent gentlemen have taken decisions without even looking at what is recorded in the O'Donnel Report commonly called the Orissa Committee Report of 1932. In para 745 the Commission speaks of "overwhelming public support for retention (of Phuljhar, Bindhra Nuagarah etc. areas) in the present Madhya Pradesh".

But the O'Donnel Report states that there is no public opinion in the District on this issue. Neither did the Committee believe the evidence of 15 leading persons of the area, some of whom as representatives of organisations and some on individual capacity demanded the inclusion of those areas in Orissa. On the other hand, the O'Donnel Report clearly stated how they accepted the statement of the Deputy Commissioner of Raipur regarding one area while that of a Tahsildar regarding another area and that of a Settlement Officer regarding a third area was accepted as true and correct. The opposition of a local zamindar and a Muslim Malguzar was enough for them to throw aside the claims of

Orissa. If the S.R.C. had referred to the census report of 1951, on which they profess to stand, they should have seen that Oriyas are in a majority in Phuljhar—an area of 850 sq. miles and other areas and which adjoins the Bargarh sub-division of Sambalpur District. It is inaccessible during the rainy season from Raipur. Nor are there any roads to Raipur. They are all connected only with Kalahande by roads. The postal and excise administration of these areas are connected only with and from Orissa. Under these circumstances there is neither logic nor reason to deny Orissa these areas.

Similarly they have rejected Orissa's claim to South Bastar which adjoins the Koraput District from Motu to Umerkote a distance of about 80 miles Bastar and Koraput people have all contact, communication and social intercourse and economic relations. Hats or market places are also common to both. Good road communications are available between Bastar and Koraput and with any other area so conveniently and well. The rivers Indravaty and Saberi rise from Orissa, water Bastar and fall in the Godavary. Bastar contains Adivasi population about 80 p.c. Of this Oriyas including Bhatrī—a dialect of Oriya—constitute 10 per cent. while Andhras, Marathi and Hindi constitute the rest. Halbi is practically Oriya, where it adjoins the Oriya areas while it reaches Maharashtri areas or Hindi on reaching Hindi areas. Under these circumstances the claims of Orissa are not only just and reasonable but demand attention.

Similarly the Commission have failed to consider the claims of Orissa with regard to Suddar sub-division of Singhbhum. It is an area 2700 sq. miles in extent. Regarding 590 sq. miles of area constituting the Seraikala—Kharswan sub-division, the Commission devotes paragraph 624 and 25 at P. 170 under Bihar merely to dispose off our claims to these two ex-state areas on the ground that this will convert Dhalbhum (which

Bihar should according to the S.R.C.) into an enclave. Not a word is mentioned about our claims on Suddar sub-division covering 2700 sq. miles. Ho representatives of Bihar Assembly, from Singhbhum, as also Scheduled Caste representatives and Sri Mihir Kabi from the general constituency of Singhbhum have been demanding inclusion of these two sub-divisions in Orissa. The Commission failed to see that 1955 is absolutely different from 1932 when the Hos were opposed the amalgamation of Singhbhum with Orissa. Merger of the adjoining find Orissa States has also transferred the opposition of Ho into one of active demand for their inclusion in Orissa. This is because their own kith and kin live in the adjoining States. Interest of the Hos therefore demand that they should join Orissa. It may be stated that there are merely 4,500 Hos in all the other districts of the Chotanagpur division out of a total of 5.99 lakh Hos in India. As against this there are over 5.8 lakhs in these adjoining 4 ex-state areas constituting the 3 Orissa districts and the two sub-divisions of Suddar and Seraikala leaving aside about 12,000 Hos in the Dhalbhum sub-division. All these are stated to be prone the injustice done both to the Hos and the people of Orissa.

No people suffered so badly under British heels as the people of Orissa. We were the people who fought on both side—with the Muslim Rulers of Bengal aided by the Great Moghul from the East and with the Bhamini's from the South. Orissa was last State in India to fall into Moghul hands. History of independence shows in each national fight, Orissa never lagged behind. From 1920, Orissa's contribution to the national struggle was only second to Gujarat and Bombay. Suffering has been the fate of Orissa since 1565 when she lost her independence. Let justice be assured to us, at least, under the National Government.

Dr. Gangadhar Siva (Chh'toor Reserved—Sch. Castes): I welcome the

[Dr. Gangadhar Siva]

immediate formation of Vishalandra. The principles, as to reorganisation of states have been formulated by the S.R.C. and they have considered the relative importance of the economic and administrative, historical, geographical, cultural and other factors in relation to the linguistic and have decided that the Bellary-Siruguppa and Hospet, three taluks be transferred to Andhra.

As the people of the 3 taluks are bilingual, the language factor is therefore not a very important factor. The commission has therefore approved large Telugu tracts and the Kolar District where the majority are Telugu, remaining in Mysore or Karnataka and the above 3 taluks going to Andhra.

The most important consideration is the importance of the Tungabhadra Project (Southern section) to the Rayalaseema Districts as necessary for eradication of famines, in the area. The economic well-being of the people of five districts must be preferred as opposed to the linguistic satisfaction derived by a section of the people of 3 taluks only.

The Kelkar award of 1921 is irrelevant. There has been a shifting of emphasis on the importance of linguistic factor as the sole basis of reorganisation of states after independence. The Dhar Committee, the J.V.P., the S.R.C. have substantially modified the importance of the linguistic *vis-a-vis* the economic, administrative and other factors.

The partition committee report of 1949 simply accepted the undisputed Andhra Area in Bellary as per J.V.P., and cannot operate as estoppel in view of the changed outlook. The Wanchoo Report did not go into the question of sub-division of Bellary District, on the other hand he held that it was unthinkable any portion of Bellary should be transferred to Mysore. (Page 2 Para 6).

The Mishra Report dealt only with the Bellary taluk, Government having taken an administrative decision

alloting 6 taluks to Mysore on linguistic consideration. The mistake was in alloting the Head-works of the Southern portion of the Thungabhadra Project to Mysore, a project intended solely for the benefit of Rayalaseema and designed to eradicate famines in the said areas. The project was delayed for 50 or 60 years for want of an agreement in regard to the sharing of waters, between Madras, Mysore and Hyderabad. Now that the project is complete it is unfortunate that the control of the portion of the Head-works which is intended for Rayalaseema should have gone into the hands of Mysore in 1953. Now under the proposed Karnataka the Hyderabad portion of the project is also passing into the hands of Mysore thus vesting a double veto in the hands of Governments which prevented the inauguration of the project for 50 or 60 years and Rayalaseema for whose development it was intended is placed entirely at the mercy of Karnataka.

It is no answer to say there are the River Board Bill and the Inter-state Water Disputes Bill 1955. The object of the said Bills is not to create an active and perpetual dispute by placing the Head-Work* of the project intended for the benefit of one state in the hands of a Government having adverse interests, but to solve disputes which may arise when a river flows through two or three states.

The trouble which have arisen between Andhra and Mysore during the last two years must have been brought to the notice of the Central Government. The Andhra Government has not been able to push through the High Level Scheme and the Hydro-Electric Project as the Mysore claims, on account of the merger of a small area, are directly antagonistic to the interests of Rayalaseema.

The S.R.C. taking these factors into consideration and having the welfare of the people of five districts

has rightly, ordered the transfer of three taluks to Andhra. The Mishra Report must therefore be taken to have been revised after careful consideration. There can therefore be no *resjudicata* in the matter.

The wishes of the people that must prevail in this context is therefore the wishes of the people of five Rayalaseema districts and not the wishes of a linguistically minded section of the people of two taluks.

The Project Ayacut figures quoted by my Karnatak friends are misleading and highly speculative. On careful verification I am convinced that the argument propounded by Karnataka friends that if the Richur side is joined to the three Bellary taluks and that if portions of Adoni Alur are also joined that the Ayacut in Karnataka is more than in Andhra is untenable. The Andhra Portion, both irrigational and Hydro-Electric, is greater whether the S.R.C. in regard to the re-transfer of the three taluks is given effect to or not.

The Northern and Southern Canal systems of the T.B. Project are completely independent of each other as regards alignment, administration and execution of canal systems.

In conclusion I appeal to the Honourable Members and the Government to uphold the recommendations of the S.R.C. in this respect, which are in the best interests not only of the people of the area concerned but in national interest and made by eminent persons of undisputed ability and integrity. Remembering the history of the delay in the execution of the project meant for eradication of famines in Rayalaseema area for 50 or 60 years which was due to the non-agreement of Mysore and Hyderabad with Madras, in regard to the sharing of water it would be unfortunate if the control of both the portions of the Head Works should go into the hands of Mysore and Hyderabad (now to be united Karnataka).

Shri Subodh Hasda (Midnapore-Jhargram—Reserved Sch. Tribes): I was very much glad, when the proposal for readjustment of boundaries on linguistic and cultural basis was taken up by Government. This S.R.C. was appointed to give impartial views with eminent persons. Everyone expected full justice from the Commission. But it failed to give justice, at least to the demands of West Bengal. I am sorry to say that this Commission had not gone deep and even it had not assessed the essential factors of language, cultural and administrative affinities. The demand for transfer of Dhalbhum sub-division, Manbhum, Santhal pargana's and Kishenganj sub-division to West Bengal from Bihar are nothing new. Linguistically, culturally, it has full affinities with West Bengal. Geographically these areas are also contiguous to West Bengal. So there cannot be any obstruction for transferring these areas to West Bengal.

It is more astonishing that the Dhalbhum sub-division has not been recommended for inclusion in West Bengal, though it is linguistically, culturally and geographically analogous to West Bengal.

It appears from 1931 Census that it is a predominantly Bengali speaking area. Fifty-seven point two per cent. people speak Bengali either as their mother tongue or as a subsidiary language.

Again, the Commission itself has admitted in para 667 of the S.R.C. Report that this Sub-division is the meeting place of Santhal, Oriya, Bengali and Hindi and according to the linguistic point of view, Bengali is the largest language group. The Santhals of this area have their own dialect but use Bengali as their subsidiary language.

A few years back Bengali was the medium of instruction in Middle and Primary Schools. In 1951 there were

[Shri Subodh Hasda]

154 Bengali Primary and Middle Schools out of 174 in this Sub-division as published by the District Board on the 30th November, 1951.

So there is no justification in saying that Bengali was not predominant there

A very important factor lies in this question. There are about 30 lakhs of Santhals in India scattering in three or four provinces. But nearly 15 lakhs reside in the districts of Purnea, Santhal Parganas, Manbhum and Dhalbhum sub-division of Bihar and seven lakhs reside in the contiguous districts of Midnapore, Bankura, Birbhum, Burdwan, Malda and Dinajpore of West Bengal. There are other tribes, who are also not negligible. These tribes use Bengali as their mother tongue except the Santhals who have their own dialect and use Bengali as subsidiary language. One more important feature of the Santhals is that their customs, language and culture are not different from each other though they are separated. The most important is about their safeguards. It has already been pointed out that the areas of Dhalbhum, Manbhum and Santhal Parganas of Bihar are geographically contiguous to West Bengal. If these areas be grouped together and transferred to West Bengal, then, 15 lakhs of Santhals will join the seven lakh Santhals of West Bengal, thus making a consolidation of about twenty two lakhs in a State. In this proposition a major tribal problem can be solved in a uniform way to achieve speedy progress as a combined force in one State. It is not only the problem that can be solved but they can develop their culture, customs and language in a uniform way. This is also a great factor as a justification of uniting Dhalbhum, Manbhum and Santhal parganas with West Bengal.

Again, the Santhal Pargana was an integral part of Birbhum District of

West Bengal before the Santhal rebellion in 60th year of the last century. But it was divided only to control the Santhals from further revolution against the British rulers. But it is a pity that this 'divide and rule' policy is still pursued.

So I must say about the interest of the Santhals and other tribes of those areas. Their interest should always be kept in view and they should be treated with love and sympathy. If these people be united together, they can fight for peace and prosperity of India.

Last of all, I would like to say, different education systems prevailed in different States among the tribal people. The tribals of Bengal had to learn Bengali, the tribals of Bihar had to learn Hindi and tribals of Orissa had to learn Oriya. This system of education is a great hindrance to develop their culture. So I want to submit that they should have a uniform system of education. But I have already said that the system of education in the Districts of Santhal Pargana, Manbhum and Dhalbhum Sub-division was through Bengali.

But the sudden imposition of Hindi has doomed the future of many tribal students in Bihar. I want to give an example from Dhalbhum Sub-division. Previous to this S.R.C. was set up, the medium of instruction was Bengali. In many schools still it is pursued, though it is banned by the Bihar Government. Thus the students had to face a lot of trouble and even many had to give up their studies. This sort of compulsion will surely darken the future of the tribals. It is not only the case of Dhalbhum Sub-division, Manbhum and Santhal Pargana faced the same trouble.

Under the circumstances if the Government want real development of the Adivasis why should Hindi be imposed upon them? Let them have education through Bengali which is easy and acceptable to them.

Taking into account these factors in the interest of these tribes I must say that the area of Dhalbhum Sub-division, Manbhum and Santhal Pargana should be transferred to West Bengal.

Shri B. C. Das (Ganjam—South): The main drawback of the S.R.C. recommendations is the absence of a common set of principles uniformly applied to every case. We find the self-same arguments advanced in support of some recommendations being posed as counter arguments to reject similar suggestion elsewhere. Absence of common norms has created widespread dissatisfaction and has led to unseemly wranglings.

People in high authority today frown upon the idea of linguistic States. They condemn it as linguism, detrimental to national unity and solidarity. But in the same breath they admit that pressure of public opinion has forced them to accept linguistic provinces in most cases. Are our people lacking in patriotism, in the urge for Indian unity when they claim linguistic provinces? It will be seen that linguistic groups which contributed the most to our national liberation movement are the foremost in the demand for linguistic provinces. Bengalis and Maharastrians who were pioneers in our national movement are the foremost protagonists of the idea of linguistic provinces. History of the recent past shows that when in 1920 Congress decided to become an organisation of mass-movement it had to accept the principle of linguistic provinces.

Truth has to be faced that in the past India did not develop into a nation like England, France or Germany. Its unique geographical position helped it to develop certain commonness of culture, certain common traits, peculiarly Indian. But this commonness could not develop into a monolithic nationalism. Absence of one common political centre and geographical barriers developed in different regions different national

groups, each inheriting certain common cementing traits helpful to development of Indian nationalism. It will be seen that most of the advanced language groups through evolution of history have developed into semi-national groups with their own history, tradition, literature and sculpture and other manifestations of a distinct culture from which they derive abundance of inspiration. Love for India springs from their love for their own national regions. One begins to love India by learning to love one's language, literature, history and culture, and the desire to refashion India after one's heart springs from the desire to develop the future of its own language group. To deny this reality is to strike at the root of Indian nationalism. During the British rule there has been great disparity and unevenness in the development of different national groups. There is great unevenness in the economic development also.

Here, I instance the case of Orissa which was the worst sufferer during the British rule. It got dismembered, and put in bits under different administrations, far away from the centre of administration in every case and a negligible entity. The Oriya people never experienced the direct impact of the British as they were administering them from a distance through intermediary Rules, who happened to be the upper strata of the majority language groups and who acquired vested interests in the Oriya regions and tried to keep the Oriya people perpetually backward to retain their position of superiority. This has resulted in the stunted growth of the Oriya people. Orissa's struggle for freedom started at first as a movement for amalgamation of all Oriya tracts under one administration. The Oriya national movement broke away from the Congress in 1902 under the leadership of the late M. S. Das, when Congress refused to espouse the cause of linguistic provinces. Only in 1920 when under Gandhi's leadership this principle became

[Shri B. C. Das]

banner of Congress policy, under the leadership of the late Gopabandhu Das the Oriya national organisation of the day—the Utkal Sammilani—decided to join the national Congress.

Any serious student of the recent history of the Oriya people will easily notice how as a separate language-group Oriya was almost at the point of effacement, how several areas which in 1901 were predominantly Oriya, today leave no trace of the existence of Oriyas there. After the formation of the Oriya province those Oriya tracts remaining outside the borders of Orissa found the Oriya majority considerably reduced to negligible minority. Communities patently Oriya are described as non-Oriya communities in the census reports.

The province of Orissa was formed in 1936, when Oriyas nowhere were in position of importance or influence, and the government of the provinces from which Oriya tracts were subtracted put up stubborn fight to give up as little as possible. The S.R.C. Committee has laid much stress on the O'Donnell Committee report, but ignores the limitations under which the report was written. There was at that time no Orissa Government to put up the case of Orissa. There were other provincial governments which put every spoke on the wheel to release as little of their territory as possible. The Congress was boycotting the committee and outside the Congress there were not many Oriya leaders of eminence to put up the Orissa case. The regions claimed by Oriyas were officered by non-Oriyas who came from the majority language groups which had acquired vested interests in the Oriya regions. In such circumstances all relevant facts could not be brought before the O'Donnell Committee, so whatever Orissa got was the minimum that could be spared to it.

The Oriyas have a feeling of neglect through centuries of alien rule that assigned them an inferior status. So

if their case is not examined thoroughly, and summarily rejected as 'unimportant', it will keep smouldering discontent for long.

I suggest a boundary commission to be set up to examine the following claims of the Oriya people.

(1) The case of Saraikella and Kharswan and the Sadar Sub-division of Singhbhum. I do not feel competent to pronounce any opinion on the desirability of forming a Jharkhand State, but as Jharkhand is not being formed, and as a large volume of conscious political opinion is that it is not the proper solution to the Adibasi problem, the 'Ho' people who were disrupted by the British should be brought under one administration. In view of the fact that 'Hos' live only in Singhbhum and the adjoining Orissa province and as through common association of centuries Oriyas and Hos have developed in villages a sort of common culture, the merger of Hos inhabited areas in the Orissa State is just and proper.

(2) The case of Phuljhar and other predominantly Oriya areas in Madhya Pradesh should be reopened and thoroughly examined.

(3) The unnatural and vexatious southern boundaries of Orissa should be put on some rational basis. Here I regret to mention that Sri Giri has made absurd claims on Berhampur and Koraput and quoted passages out of context in support of his claims for certain other portions of southern Orissa. The Oriyas claim that a part of Mandasa, Jalantara, Budharsing and Udyankhand are Oriya areas. They also allege that there is deliberate misrepresentation of the number of Oriyas in 1951 census report. There are claims and counter-claims by Oriyas and Andhras. All these require thorough examination and not merely legalistic approach, if this boundary problem is sought to be solved to the satisfaction of all concerned. What is most important is, if principles are clearly

enunciated and grievances are investigated into, no room will be left for bitterness or sense of frustration.

Because the S.R.C. failed to realise that in diversity Indian unity has developed and language should be taken as the primary factor in the organisation of States, so much controversy arises today.

Shri Amjad Ali (Goalpara—Garó Hills): N.E.F.A. is a part of Assam. It is governed at present by the President acting through the Governor of Assam. The S.R.C. has recommended that the present arrangement 'should continue' for some time to come under the plea that it has 'special features' of its own.

The Commission has been given a wrong impression that the people of this area are in any way to be differently governed from their brethren of other hill areas of the province. If the six districts of the hills now under Assam State administration, autonomous with safeguards under the Sixth Schedule of the Constitution, could continue as before, why could this area be not given to the province of Assam of which it is a part. Evidently, this suggestion, if given effect to, will encourage the separatist tendency. These hill brethren of ours will always consider themselves different from us and will always feel alien. If ultimately N.E.F.A. is to merge with Assam they should be allowed to share the developmental activities of their neighbours and grow under the fostering care of the Assam State Administration.

Tripura has been given to Assam to bring it "under one unified control". If by reasons of contiguity and nearness a 59 per cent. Bengal speaking area like Tripura could be given to Assam with all its border problems, why Manipur is left out for the present? The States Reorganisation Commission has opined that Assam is now burdened with "difficult economic and political problems of her own and the merger of Manipur

with Assam will add to Assam's burdens". To quote a well known Assamese proverb that the two horns of a buffalo do never appear heavy on the buffalo, I can say that if ultimately Assam should be given this burden to carry why defer the merger? Why is this distrust that the State of Assam will not allow Manipur to develop in its own genus and retain its "own special and cultural individuality"?

Manipur has long been agitating for a democratic form of Government. If they seek a democratic set-up they should be prepared to merge themselves in larger areas which can provide the full normal Legislative, and Administrative machinery of a State. It will be in their own interest that they should offer themselves to be merged with Assam.

Will of the people which is the largest common factor between the people of Goalpara and the rest of Assam *vis-a-vis* the State Government, has to be respected while looking upon Goalpara with regard to merger of a neighbour. For, it has been the unanimous desire of all that the Goalpara district in its entirety should continue as it is.

A case was tried to be made out that some lands were needed to settle displaced persons from East Bengal. This is an all-India question. To try to solve it by transfer of an area, which bristles with difficulties, to another is too much to look for. To illustrate it I may be allowed to state that there is great scarcity of land in the district of Goalpara. 1951 Census puts the density of the district at 360 after deducting the area under Government Reserve Forests. If the area under Zamindars' forests is deducted, the density comes up to 441 per sq. mile.

It may be noted that the density of Madhya Pradesh is 163, Bombay 237, Orissa 244, Punjab 338 and Madras 441 and these States are highly industrialised. There is no available

[Shri Amjad Ali]

wasteland for settlement with displaced persons.

My hon. friend Shri Datar, the Deputy Minister of Home Affairs, has rightly opined yesterday that the bordering areas of every State do know and learn the language of the neighbouring State.

You find that 1,93,000 Bengali-speaking people are scattered all over the district of Goalpara but the nine lakhs and odd thousands people of the district do not speak Bengali. How, in face of this also, can you think of transfer on linguistic grounds?

Kamrup has over 2,25,000 Bengalis and Nowgong has over 2,07,000 Bengalis. The official figure being 15 lakhs of Bengalis all over Assam. At best there is good ground for their seeking protection of their language for which there is ample provision in the Constitution. This is legitimate and constitutionally sound but not the transfer of any area, for that will create more difficulties and solve no problem.

Shri Y. M. Mukne (Thana—Reserve—Sch. Tribes): I record my strong and unequivocal objection to the proposed bilingual composite State of Bombay. This is rejected by the Maharashtrians.

I am thankful to the Congress Working Committee for accepting the principle of integrating all the Marathi-speaking areas into one single State of Maharashtra. I also welcome the efforts to include Vidarbha in the proposed Maharashtra State. I further pray that the question regarding the City of Bombay, be reconsidered by our revered leaders and the House and that the City of Bombay be included in Maharashtra. I reiterate my faith in the formation of united Maharashtra with Bombay as its capital.

The idea of the City State of Bombay is ruled out by the S.R.C. Report. It is neither in the interest of

Bombay nor in the interest of Maharashtra to have a separate City State of Bombay. The wishes of the people of Bombay are quite explicit from the verdict of the Bombay Municipal Corporation. The Constitution has provided adequate safeguards to the special interests in Bombay. Therefore, the Bombay City deserves to be integrated in the proposed Maharashtra State.

I request the contiguous areas of the Marathi speaking regions from the districts of Belgaum, Karwar and Surat be included in the proposed Maharashtra State.

I am for the unity and security of India. I pray for justice and blessings to our Maharashtra State.

Shri Ramananda Das (Barrackpore): I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to express my views on the Report of S.R.C. which was appointed by the Government of India to fix up the States on the lines indicated by the Government. The Commission submitted their report on consideration of language, administration, economic development and communications etc. They lessened the number of States to 16 from 22 and abolished many smaller States properly. The Commission followed different lines in respect to different States and in most of the cases they were guided by the main principles of language and culture but in some cases language question was not followed strictly as in the case of West Bengal. By partition Bengal was divided and truncated West Bengal was formed and North Bengal was totally separated from West Bengal and there is no link between these two parts of West Bengal. The Commission sincerely felt and admitted in para 651 that "partition of Kishanganj Sub-Division and the Gopalpur revenue thana be transferred to West Bengal. This will enable West Bengal to construct feeder roads connecting the national Highways to its

other territories and to control road traffic with Darjeeling and other parts of north by eliminating avoidable delays and inconvenient administrative arrangement and by liberalising, if necessary, the present practice relating to road transport. West Bengal also will require control of Indo-Pakistan Border in this region along its entire length. From administrative point of view this will be both convenient and desirable." But the Commission while giving their award did not recommend the whole of the Kishanganj Sub-Division. I, therefore, claim that the whole of the Purnea District to the east of the river Machi-cum-Mahananda above and of the river Mahananda below upto where it enters into Malda District should form Western Boundary of the corridor and should be transferred to West Bengal, as it is a Bengali-speaking area.

Manbhum District is contiguous to West Bengal and is predominantly a Bengali-speaking area, so the whole of the District minus Dhanbad should be transferred to West Bengal and not the Sadar Sub-Division minus Chas thana as recommended by the Commission.

Dhalbhum Sub-Division of Singhbhum District is also contiguous to West Bengal and is a Bengali-speaking area, so it should come in West Bengal and Serai Kela-Kharaswan being Oriya speaking area should go to Orissa.

I may mention here that Shri Bhajahari Mahata, the Member of Lok Sabha from Dhalbhum area fought last election on the question of Bengali language and he got returned to Parliament and supported the transfer of Dhalbhum area to West Bengal in his speech on the States Reorganisation Commission.

Shri Chaitan Majhi, the Member of Lok Sabha from Manbhum area being the elected representative of the Bengali-speaking population, in his speech on the States Reorganisation Commission, whole-heartedly supported the transfer of the Man-

bhum District to West Bengal, so West Bengal's claim of Manbhum District and Dhalbhum is fully justified. The cry of Muslims in danger in Kishanganj area by some so-called leader of Bihar is unjust and unfounded as Muslims numbering about 50 lakhs are living peacefully in West Bengal State which is as secular a State as any other part of India.

Andaman and Nicobar Islands nearest to West Bengal and being colonies of Bengali refugees should also come under West Bengal.

Apart from all other considerations, West Bengal has a special claim. Bengal and Punjab suffered worst by partition and independence. But Punjab recovered to some extent by exchange of population and lands. The case is different in West Bengal. Here 36 lakhs of refugees have already come from East Bengal and about 22 thousand have been coming every month and 80 lakhs of Hindus still remaining in East Pakistan will be coming slowly as they are not safe in East Pakistan. So the problem of the rehabilitation of 36 lakhs of refugees who have already come to West Bengal and who will be coming in future is the responsibility not of West Bengal but of the whole India. Most of these refugees are living in West Bengal in the open field for want of space for their dwelling houses and land for cultivation. So it is the duty and responsibility of the Government of India and this House to give them shelter as they have paid the heaviest penalty for the independence of the country. If Government do not come forward to give shelter and employment to these suffering humanity of West Bengal, the peace and tranquility, and I fear, the hard earned independence of India will be at stake and the country will be compelled to pay the heaviest penalty for the indifference shown to the millions and millions of suffering humanity uprooted from their hearth and homes for the good and independence of India.

[Shri Ramananda Das]

In this connection I would like to further point out that the P.C.C. of West Bengal, the Chief Minister of West Bengal Dr. B. C. Roy and the members of the West Bengal Legislature unanimously put forth the claim of West Bengal for the inclusion of the above mentioned areas to be transferred to West Bengal for the sake of language, culture, economic development, administrative facilities, river valley projects, communication and the rehabilitation of the millions and millions of refugees who have already come to this State without which the progress of this State will be jeopardized and the economic situation will come to a breaking point which will be dangerous not only for the State of West Bengal but for the whole of the Indian Union. I may point out here that yesterday Shri Atulya Ghosh, the President of the West Bengal Pradesh Congress Committee emphatically put forth the claim of West Bengal in a bold and efficient way and his stand is supported by the whole House as a genuine cause of the West Bengal and I also support his stand whole-heartedly.

In this connection I would like to mention here that I also appreciate the idea of the Prime Minister about the formation of 5 zonal regions of the country with federated States as its zonal union and this idea of the Prime Minister was unanimously supported by the whole House day before yesterday and if the zonal idea of the Prime Minister comes into force it will be a boon to the country and will set an example for the whole world.

I hope the whole House and the Government of India and the Congress High Command will give due consideration to the claim of West Bengal and will do justice to it by giving the territories claimed above.

Shri Shiva Dayal Upadhyay (Banda Distt. cum Fatehpur Distt.): The S.R.C. Report is a glowing tribute to the ability and impartiality of its authors. This, however, does not

mean that recommendations are perfect and deserve complete agreement. On the contrary, the principles which form the basis of reorganisation, by their very nature, cannot but leave much room for criticism. Much more so the application thereof.

Take for instance, the well recognised principle of language and culture. There is no doubt that the Congress leaders did stress the importance of division of the country on linguistic basis from time to time in the past. But it must be borne in mind that what was true in the time of British regime does not necessarily hold good after the attainment of independence. It is, therefore, no wonder that many of the Congress leaders of eminence have now modified their views on the importance of language.

As stated above, the main difficulty, however, lies in the application of these principles especially where there is conflict between one principle and another. In such cases we have to take a balanced view of various principles and make it a point to see that the security and unity of India is not jeopardised.

Indeed, many a time it so happens that the formation of States on the basis of language, engenders and fosters the feeling of narrow provincialism or sectionalism and instead of strengthening the country weakens it. As is well known, this spirit of separation has been the curse of the nation in the past and has brought about slavery and subjugation of the country.

Viewed in this light of security, it is incomprehensible how the formation of such States as Kerala, Karnatak can be justified situated as they are on the sea coast and thus open to easy aggression. Similarly one fails to appreciate the formation of Vidarbha as a separate unit.

This is the reason why I have all along been in favour of formation of

big States. My views have all the more been confirmed by the division of Pakistan into two units only.

The main question to my mind is how to reconcile the two opposing principles of language and security. This object can be achieved by combining two or three States into one with safeguards for the development of regional languages and cultures. In my opinion the development of language can be ensured by treating regional languages as transferred subject to be managed by the local bodies or regional Committees set up for this purpose under the State leaving rest of the administration in the hands of State Government. I have no doubt in my mind that hundred and one ways can be found to safeguard the interest of regional languages if we only are keen on the subject.

It is a happy augury that our leader while speaking in Lok Sabha the other day gave expression of his views in favour of forming five big zones, North, South, East West and Centre for the administration of the country. With due deference to my leader I would rather like to have four zones only instead of five so long as the Kashmir question is not settled formally. It is not yet too late in the day to combine (i) Punjab, Pepsu, Himachal, U.P. and Rajasthan in the Western Zone, (ii) Bengal, Assam, Bihar, in the Eastern Zone, (iii) South, whole of Deccan upto northern boundary of Hyderabad, and (iv) Bombay, Vidarbha, Saurashtra, Gujrat, Madhya Pradesh, Vindhya Pradesh and Orissa in the Central Zone.

This proposal, if carried into effect, will not only ensure the security and unity of the country but also give opportunity for the better development of various languages and cultures. For culture and language need nothing so much for their development as comprehensive and cosmopolitan outlook which can be generated more in the variety of surroundings consisting of various languages. Indeed culture is no culture at all if

it is confined to narrow and partisan ideas.

In the end, I fervently appeal to the House to beware of narrow regionalism and not allow, in the words of Rajaji, one mistake to lead to another but stop its march at once in the interest of the security and the unity of the country.

Shri Matthen: (Thiruvellah): Regarding the S.R.C. discussion, some newspapers have done a great disservice to me in having reported my friend Shri C. P. Mathew's speech supporting a Kerala State, as mine. It was in fact maligning me, though not deliberately. I who have been trying my best all these years against the formation of linguistic States generally, and Kerala in particular, feel really hurt by this wrong report, which I request ought to be corrected.

The agitation for linguistic States and the unfortunate recommendations of the S.R.C. regarding all of them except one, have been steadily building up bitterness and hatred all over the country that Members of this House — a large majority of them — were feeling so worried about its implications, its reactions on the national unity, integrity and prosperity of India when, all of a sudden our beloved leader held out the prospect of five Zonal Units for India, though only as an Advisory Body, to start with. It was not the satisfaction over this advisory capacity of these Units that was responsible for the continued applause, almost unprecedented, in this House, but it was that sudden escape from a national danger, which all feared there was no escape from. This welcome idea of Zonal Units with adequate representation from the Centre, if properly developed, will ultimately put an end to linguistic and communal hatred that was inevitable in uni-lingual States.

I am not saying in a spirit of vain-glory if I express some jubilation as Founder-Secretary of the National Unity Platform, over these Zonal

[Shri Matthen]

Units with effective representation from the Centre. This noble aim of N.U.P. stood vindicated after the Prime Minister's wonderful suggestion of Zonal Councils, one each for the Northern, Southern, Eastern, Western and Central areas of India. It was made very clear that these will not be created on linguistic principles. In all humility, I thank God for this answer to my prayer which I have been repeating every day these days—I am saying this in all earnestness, so that other hon. Members who believe in a God may repeat this prayer till we finally come out of this dangerous storm. The prayer is:

"Lighten our darkness, we beseech Thee Oh! Lord and by Thy great mercy defend us from the perils and dangers of this S.R.C. Report."

I speak as a Member from India as the Prime Minister advised us yesterday. If India's unity is weakened and its security endangered, what good a Kerala or Maratha or any other State can do. If the Union is strengthened and prosperous, it makes little difference whether I live in Kerala or in U.P. or anywhere else in the Indian Union. It is because of my conviction that the reorganisation of Indian States on linguistic basis only will divide one State from another, that I have been all these years trying to bring home the inevitable danger of such reorganisation; in spite of all my attempts and that of several others in this House and outside, the S.R.C. came out with a purely linguistic reorganisation, excepting in the case of Bombay. It is true that almost all the political leaders welcome such linguistic reorganisation. Political leaders in almost every State are a class by themselves. But do not identify them with the people of the States, the large majority of whom is not concerned with this linguistic reorganisation.

I can speak with intimate experience and knowledge of the people of my

State Travancore-Cochin. The people of our State, as you know, are literate, fairly well educated and intelligent, not like the common people described by Acharya Kripalani. I had occasion to discuss this question of Kerala State with hundreds of thousands of our people, with intellectuals, with businessmen, the common man in the street. Nobody wants a Kerala State, because they know it is suicidal to their best interests. The economy of our State depends more on the employment of Malayalese outside the State than inside the State. Except the political leaders, irrespective of ideology, the Congress, the Communists, the P.S.P., not one else had a kind word about this formation of a Kerala State. I do not want to say why these politicians are hankering after linguistic States. If provincial autonomy was brought down and Centre got more power over the various Departments in the States, I am sure this agitation would not have grown so strong.

Ever since the Travancore-Cochin State was formed, we never had a stable Government. Even today the Congress Government is carrying on with a slender majority and that with the help of the T.T.N.C. members, most of whom are not likely to continue, if and when the Kerala State is formed. The only other area that is added to it is the Malabar District of Madras, where again the Congress has little chances of getting a majority. I am not saying that the Congress is not likely to get the Government in the future Kerala State, but the proposed Kerala State in not likely to have a stable Government with any party getting a working majority. I am sorry to say that communalism has been a strong factor in my State all these years. The Ministries came and fell mainly on this plank. The three chief communities that pulled their weight in deciding the fate of Ministries were the Nair, the Ezhava and the Christian—almost equal in number.

With the addition of Malabar, Muslims also will come into the forefront. The 18 lakhs of Muslims of Muslim League Political Party in Malabar, added to 7 or 8 lakhs of Muslims in my State, can decide the shape and colour of any future Ministry in the proposed Kerala State. I believe the House is fully aware of the strategic position of Kerala, a sea coast State 2,000 miles away from Delhi. Our Western Ghats are so thickly protected by forests a few miles away from the Arabian sea that it can hide several things of which the Home or the Defence Ministry will come to know rather too late. We have no Navy worth mentioning. Can you offer to leave this strategic area under an unstable Ministry, if by any chance Geneva or Bandung spirit disappears. I wish I could be more outspoken. For obvious reasons I am not doing it. The only solution to this strategic danger is the creation of a large South Indian State which is bound to be stable. It is very essential for the security of India that South India must be under one Government.

When the Working Committee met early in November, I was here doing my lobbying for a South Indian State with the leading members of the Working Committee, all of whom responded very favourably to my suggestion of a South Indian State, consisting of Madras, Karnataka and T. C. I understand that Shri Kamraj Nadar, Chief Minister of Madras, was not very responsive to this suggestion when it was put up to him by the members of the Working Committee. The report is that this suggestion of a Dakshina Pradesh was again put up to him by the Home Minister and others two or three days ago when he came up for final talks. If my information is true, which I gather from some Madras Members who had occasion to discuss this subject after his meeting with the Central Ministers, their reaction was that Shri Kamaraj and his colleagues were less unfavourable. In the first place, he does not insist on Malabar being separated from Madras if they do not want to

go away. Even though he is not agreeable to a Southern State consisting of Madras and the proposed Kerala, he will have no objection to a large Dakshina Pradesh consisting of the proposed Karnataka also. I understand the nervousness of Madras in integrating my problem State with theirs, while the proposed Karnataka with Mysore as its nucleus, is bound to be a stable State. The defect of my State can be more than made up by the integration of Karnataka also to the Southern State, but Shri Kamaraj does not want to put up this proposal. He is prepared to consider it, I understand, if the High Command or Karnataka takes the initiative. I had occasion to discuss this subject with Shri Hanumanthaiah, Chief Minister of Mysore, whom I found more responsive. Even the other leaders of Karnataka I found not averse to this proposal. In the larger interests of India and South India in particular, I plead most earnestly to the High Command to do the needful. It is never too late to begin a good thing and to avoid a dangerous one. I appeal to the good sense, friendship and love of every Member of this House, and in particular to the Central Government and the Madras State to create a strong stable South Indian State, of course without prejudice to the proposed Zonal Reorganisation, where the South Indian State can co-operate with the Vishal Andhra.

Zonal Councils may ultimately develop one Unit State in each of the Centres.

श्री राम सरन (मुरादाबाद जिला-पच्छिम) : लोक-सभा में ८-९ दिन तक बहस सुनने और देश के वातावरण की उबल पुबल को देखने के बाद मैं यह सोचने लगता हूँ कि भ्रष्टा होता यदि राज्य पुनःसंगठन आयोजन की नियुक्ति न होती और यह सब समय तथा शक्ति देश के निर्माण कार्य में लगाई जाती। देखने में यह आ रहा है कि बहुत से राज्यों की विधान सभाओं और संसद् की दोनों सभाओं तक में छोटी छोटी बातों पर बड़ी गर्मी पैद

[श्री राम सरन]

हो रही है और उत्तेजना बढ़ रही है। नेताओं के मतभेद के कारण जनसाधारण में भ्रम सुलगने लगी है और कई जगह तो हिंसात्मक प्रदर्शन हुए हैं और उनके बढ़ने की धमकियाँ भी जा रही हैं। राज्य पुनःसंगठन आयोग और बड़े नेताओं के इस बात पर जोर देने पर कि हमें देश की एकता और मजबूती को ध्यान में रखते हुए राज्यों के पुनःसंगठन पर विचार करना चाहिये यह देखा जा रहा है कि एक राज्य के एक बहुत छोटे भाग को दूसरे राज्य में मिलाने के प्रस्ताव पर इन राज्यों के नेताओं की उत्तेजना का ठिकाना नहीं रहता। यह सब देख कर देश के कुछ हितेच्छु यह कहने लगे हैं कि रिपोर्ट पर अपना फ़ैसला कुछ वर्षों के लिये मुलतबी कर दिया जाये।

क्या यह उचित होगा ? इसका उत्तर सरलता पूर्वक 'हां' में देना आसान नहीं है। यह भली प्रकार विदित है कि अंग्रेजों के समय में राज्यों का संगठन शासन सम्बन्धी सुविधाओं और देश पर अपना राज्य कायम रखने की दृष्टि से हुआ था और स्वराज्य प्राप्ति के बाद स्वर्गीय सरदार पटेल की बुद्धिमत्ता और दूर-दर्शिता के कारण सैंकड़ों देशी राज्यों को जिनके शासनों में अनेक प्रकार के भेद और असमानताएं थीं उस समय भिन्न भिन्न प्रकार के राज्यों में संगठित कर दिया गया था। इसलिये इस बात की आवश्यकता अनुभव होती है कि राज्यों का संगठन बैज्ञानिक ढंग पर किया जाय। एक समय था जब प्रान्तों या राज्यों का संगठन भाषा और संस्कृति के आधार पर श्रेष्ठ समझा जाता था। समय के बदलने पर इस विचार में भी परिवर्तन हुआ अब यह अच्छा समझा जाता है कि राज्य के संगठन के आधार पर भाषा और संस्कृति के अलावा शासन की सुदृढ़ता, देश की एकता, असंप्रदायिकता की भावना, खर्च की पूर्ति, विकास की सुगमता आदि के आधार पर हो। कुछ

बड़े नेताओं की तो यह राय है कि भाषा के नाम पर या उसको आधार मान कर कोई भी राज्य न बनाया जाय। इस दृष्टि को सामने रखते हुए उनका विचार है कि देश में कम से कम राज्य बनाये जायें। किसी की राय से केवल पांच—उत्तरी, पूर्वी, मध्यवर्ती, दक्षिणी और पच्छिमी और दूसरी की राय में ८ या ९ राज्य बना दिये जायें तो अच्छा रहेगा। यह बहुत से विचारक मानने लगे हैं कि राज्य छोटे छोटे न हों बल्कि बड़े हों। तभी देश की मजबूती कायम रहेगी।

इसलिये राज्यों का पुनःसंगठन करना आवश्यक मालूम होता है और उसके लिये इस समय से अधिक उपयुक्त दूसरा समय मिलना कठिन है। इस समय हमारे देश में—केन्द्र और प्रान्तों में उन्हीं नेताओं के हाथ में शासन की बागडोर है जिन्होंने यातनाएं सह कर देश को आजाद करवाया और जो त्याग तथा देश प्रेम के लिये प्रसिद्ध हैं। सर्वोपरि श्री जवाहरलाल जी नेहरू हमारे बीच में मौजूद हैं। इसलिये यदि हमें राज्यों के पुनःसंगठन में अधिक हेर, फेर करना आवश्यक मालूम होता है तो यही उपयुक्त समय है।

गांधी जी के विचारों के अनुसार शासन की आदर्श प्रणाली विकेन्द्रीयकरण की है। इसी लिये हमने फिडरल प्रणाली को अपनाया है। पर उस आदर्श पर चलने से पहले हमें देश में शासन को दृढ़ बनाना है। उसका अर्थ है केन्द्र को दृढ़ बनाना। भारत का इतिहास बतलाता है कि जब जब केन्द्रीय सरकार कम-जोर हुई शासन अधिक समय तक न चल सका। इसलिये इस समय ऐसा कोई काम न करना है जिससे भारत के शासन की दृढ़ता पर बुरा असर पड़े। इसी दृष्टि को सामने रखते हुए राज्य पुनःसंगठन आयोग ने बड़े प्रान्त बनाने का प्रयत्न

किया है। पर उन्होंने भाषा पर अधिक जोर देते हुए कहीं कहीं बहुत छोटे राज्यों—जैसे केरल, विदर्भ आदि की भी सिफारिश की है। देर अवश्य हो गई है पर अब भी प्रयत्न इस बात का होना चाहिये कि बड़े राज्य बनें। इस दृष्टि से उत्तर प्रदेश को ऐसा ही रखने की सिफारिश उचित ही मालूम होती है। जैसा कि कई वक्ताओं ने कहा है कि यदि उत्तर प्रदेश को विन्ध्य प्रदेश का बुधेलखण्ड मिल जाय जिसे बन्धेलखंड वाले खुद चाहते हैं तो उत्तर प्रदेश की खनिज पदार्थों के मिलने से बड़ी कमी की पूर्ति होगी और जनसंख्या भी अधिक न बढ़ेगी। इसी प्रकार यदि प्रांथ में तेलंगाना को मिला दिया जाय तो तैलंग भाषियों का एक राज्य बन जायेगा। उसी प्रकार आयोग द्वारा नियोजित बम्बई प्रान्त में यदि विदर्भ मिला दिया जाय तो महाराष्ट्र का असंतोष समाप्त हो जायेगा। और एक बड़ा राज्य ४७० लाख की जनसंख्या का बन जायगा। केवल पंजाबी प्रान्त का झगडा रह जायेगा जिसे अलग बनाना देश की दृष्टि में कदापि हितकर न होगा। सरहद्दी राज्य होने के कारण पंजाब, पेप्सु और हिमाचल प्रदेश को मिलाना ही श्रेयस्कर होगा—सिखों के संतोष के लिये अल्प संख्यकों सम्बन्धी रियायतें उन्हें अवश्य मिलनी चाहियें। उस प्रान्त में पंजाबी और हिन्दी साथ साथ चलें और इस प्रकार सहयोग और सहचर्या की भावना पैदा हो।

इस प्रकार १४ राज्य रह जाते हैं जिनका कम करना समय की दृष्टि से उचित नहीं मालूम होता—साथ ही प्रधान मन्त्री जी के सुझाव के अनुसार देश के विकास और सुशासन की दृष्टि से देश को पांच क्षेत्रों में बांट कर उनमें सलाकार समितियां बना दी जायें जो आपसी झगडों को तय करें और सहयोग की भावना बढ़ायें। कुछ वर्षों के बाद बहुत सम्भव है कि हम देश में पांच बड़े राज्य स्थापित करने में सफल हो जायें। यह क्षेत्रों के इतरगत राज्यो

के सहयोग और सहचर्या पर निर्भर करता है। ऐसा होने पर हम संकुचित क्षेत्र से निकल कर बड़े क्षेत्रों में रहना पसंद करने लगेंगे। वह समय देश को बृद्ध बनाने और विकसित करने में बड़ा सहायक होगा।

Shri Mulchand Dube (Farukhabad Distt.—North): I have great respect for the distinguished members of the Commission and I have no doubt that they were inspired by the best of motives, but I beg to submit that they were swept off their feet, firstly by the resolution of the Congress in respect of linguistic States and secondly by the acrimonious and vociferous demands for linguistic States by various persons and groups who claimed to speak for the common people of the areas which they claimed to represent. In this clamour the Commission lost their moorings and forgot the terms of their reference. They have quoted paragraph 7 of the resolution—which reads as follows: I shall with your permission read to you the relevant portion of this paragraph:

“The Commission shall investigate the conditions of the problem, the historical background, the existing situation and the bearing of all important and relevant factors thereon.”

It will be noticed that language as a factor in the reorganisation of States in the Indian Union could be deemed to be included in the residuary clause namely “all important and relevant factors bearing thereon.” The resolution was deliberately framed in this manner so that the factor of language may be relegated to a secondary importance or, if I may say so, of no importance or significance. The Commission has however, not taken any account of the historical background of India, it has given some attention to the history of particular regions which they have proposed to reorganise on a linguistic basis. They have not given due importance to the lesson of history when during the last 1200 years, we have had to drink the

[Shri Mulchand Dube]

bitter cup of slavery to the dregs and what was the cause of it? Every person who has read the history of India even at school knows that whenever any foreign invader came even with a small army and succeeded in defeating a small potentate at the frontier, the rest of the country took no notice of it and remained unconcerned. A few years after the invader consolidated his forces, built up another army and conquered another slice of territory and thus by and by the entire country was enslaved, either by the invaders or by others who came after him but the method was the same. Now what is the present picture? The same tendencies have again begun to raise their heads. Now hon. Members who ought to know better have begun to declare that they cannot live with their brothers who speak a different language. The Maharastrians cannot live with Gujeratis with whom they have lived since the beginning of time. Language, while it has a unifying effect on those speaking the same language, has also the effect of separating them from people speaking a different languages from theirs. Now if water-tight compartments are formed in this way so that the Maharashtrians have nothing in common with the Gujeratis, the unity of India is endangered and in these circumstances no faith can be placed in their tall declarations that they would defend India if occasion arose as one man. I am, therefore, definitely of the opinion that only multilingual States should be framed and every child at school should learn two or three languages. I was reading an article on language written by an eminent man, whose name I forget and it was stated in it that children in Germany are taught Greek, Latin and Hebrew. In Holland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden, children are taught two languages English and German beside his own mother-tongue. The same is the case with Switzerland. The sub-revision is that everything including economic development, the establishment of a Welfare State and in fact anything should be sacrificed at the

altar of the unity and security of India for if this is lost everything is lost and if this is preserved, everything is preserved. There may be delay in achieving the objectives that we have set before us but the attainments of these objectives will be of no value if our freedom which has been won at great sacrifice is lost.

Shri Katham (North Bengal—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I like to make a statement on the Reorganisation of States. As to the present situation in Goalpara within Assam, the whole area is Bengali-speaking area. The whole of Manbhum district and part of Singhbhum and Kishanganj and Santal Paragana are all Bengali-speaking areas. So these areas should be an integral part of Bengal.

Dr. Natabar Pandey (Sambalpur): Spokesmen of Bihar have nowhere refuted Orissa's unassailable claim at Seraikella and Kharswan, on linguistic, cultural, administrative and economical considerations. They have not been able also to refute the fact that public opinion in Seraikela is to a man in favour of merger with Orissa. They have taken recourse to blatant misrepresentation, therefore, by saying that Sri Mihir Kabi, the Ganatantra Parishad candidate in Seraikela did not contest the last general election on the specific issue of transfer to Orissa. It is strange that no less a person than Shri Krishna Ballabh Sahaya, the Revenue Minister of Bihar, should have used the election manifesto to suit his own wrong arguments. In this connection I can do no better than refer to the Ganatantra Parishad election manifesto which will give a lie direct to the statement, of the Revenue Minister of Bihar. At page 15, under the heading "the special Problems of Orissa" in Section I, it has been clearly stated that, the Ganatantra Parishad will make special efforts "for restoring Seraikela and Kharswan". I submit that the last general election in which Sri Mihir Kabi was returned to the Bihar Legislative Assembly with overwhelming majority votes was in a way plebiscite in which the public opinion was

clearly expressed in favour of transfer to Orissa. Shri Ujendralal Ho, the Representative of Kharswan, has also represented before the Commission and the Union Government for transfer to Orissa. Under the circumstances, I submit that Government should modify the S.R.C.'s recommendations, so far as these areas are concerned.

Bastar being a no-man's land, linguistically, my claim is based not on linguistic considerations alone, but on administrative convenience and linguistic and cultural affinities etc. The S.R.C. has made no mention about Bhatri which is admittedly an Oriya dialect and Parijhi is also accepted as an Oriya dialect. My claim was particularly to the Jagdalpur and Kondegaon tehsils of Bastar district, which unfortunately, the S.R.C. has summarily rejected without examination. In the context of the recommendation for creation of a mammoth new State of Madhya Pradesh, there is therefore a case for the reconsideration in the light of the Memoranda submitted on this subject.

In conclusion, therefore, I submit that the Government of India should duly consider and restore Seraikella, Kharswan and sadar Sub-division of Singhbhum to Orissa from Bihar and Phuljhar. Bindra-Nawagarh areas, Shankara tract in the district of Sambalpur and four tehsils of Bastar as claimed by Orissa people.

Shri Girdhari Bhoj (Kalahandi—Bolangir—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I am both amazed and pained that a high-power-body like the S.R. Commission should have indulged in mis-statement of facts relating to Phuljhar and Bindra-Nawagarh areas in Madhya Pradesh.

The O'Donnel Committee never found "overwhelming public support for their retention in the present Madhya Pradesh." Regarding Phuljhar,

the O'Donnel Committee's findings were:

(a) The Zamindar of Phuljhar was against its inclusion in Orissa and alleged that the people were against merger with Orissa.

(b) "a Mohammadan Malguzar and a cultivator gave evidence to the same effect."

(c) fifteen witnesses supported the Oriya claim, but with two exceptions all these witnesses were Oriyas. "It was quite clear to us that there is no public opinion in Phuljhar. Save for a few individuals, the population is ignorant and indifferent".

(*Vide* Para 46 of O'Dannel Committee Report).

As regards Bindra-Nawagarh, the O'Donnell Committee in rejecting Orissa's claim observed "not a single witness was produced in support of the belated claim for the admission of this tract which we have no hesitation in rejecting."

(*Vide* para 49 of the O'Donnel Committee's Report).

From this it will be apparent that the O'Donnel Committee never found an overwhelming public support in Phuljhar for its retention in Madhya Pradesh as wrongly stated by the S.R.C. As regards Bindra—Nawagarh, Orissa's case was rejected on the grounds. (a) The claim was belated and (b) no witness was produced in its support. Therefore, it is clear that Orissa's case went by default and was not even examined by the O'Donnel Committee. This is quite a different thing from what the S.R.C. has attempted to establish.

The O'Donnel Committee was of the opinion that transfer of Phuljhar to Orissa will not affect it adversely either economically or administratively. On the other hand in as much as "communications with Bargarh are as good—indeed in the rains better—than with Raipur.", as observed by the O'Donnel Committee, we submit that administrative convenience will be better secured by its reinclusion in Sambalpur district of Orissa of which it formed a part till 1905.

[Shri Girdhari Bhoi]

It is absolutely wrong on the part of the S.R.C. to say that, "the Oriya-speaking population is not in a majority even in Mahasamund". According to the 1951 Census, the Oriyas formed the single majority in the tehsil.

Oriya	1,97,006.
Hindi	1,90,608
Chattisgarhi	1,47,920.

Taking the Chattisgarhi (Laria) speakers, with the Oriyas, with whom they have the maximum linguistic and cultural affinity in this tract, as revealed from the bilingual figures of the 1951 Census, and also the finding recorded in para 16, page 43 of Census of India, Paper No. 1 of 1954 (Languages), it can be incontrovertibly stated that the Oriya speaking population is in absolute majority in this tehsil. In Mahasamund tehsil Rural 'A' which includes Phuljhar (that is, Saraipali P.S. & Basna P.S.), the Oriyas are in absolute majority, that is, 53 per cent. being 1,46,081 in number.

Mahasamund Tahsil 'B' contains 5 Thanas, this is, Rajim P.S. and 4 P.S.'s. of former Bindra Nawagarh Zamindari that is, Gariaband, Chhura, Mainpur and Deobhog.

As regards Bindra-Nawagarh, our present claim was particularly in respect of the two Thanas of Deobhog and Mainpur of the ex-Bindra-Nawagarh Zamindari.

In 1931, Oriyas constituted 42 per cent. of the whole of Bindra-Nawagarh Zamindari. The Deputy Commissioner of Raipur had previously reported that there was a sprinkling of Oriya people in the South-East corner of Bindra-Nawagarh Zamindari and that "the people of the Zamindari have only a smattering of Oriya and really speak a patois which has in it more Laria (Chattisgarhi) than Oriya. When questioned, however, they would say that they speak Oriya."

(Vide para 47 of O'Donnel Committee's Report)

From this it is clear that the Oriya-speaking people are concentrated in the South of the two Thanas of Deobhog and Mainpur particularly claimed by us.

The portion of Bindra-Nawagarh Zamindari claimed in this memorandum to be integrated in Orissa comprise the area under Deobhog Police Station and Mainpur Police Station of Bindra Nawagarh under Mahasamund tehsil. This area protrudes like a peninsula into Orissa territory which surrounds this area on three sides. Mahasamund, the Sub-divisional Headquarters, is at a distance of 120 miles from Deobhog and 80 miles from Mainpur, whereas Dharamgarh a Sub-division Headquarters in Kalahandi District (Orissa), is at a distance of only six miles from Deobhog and forty-six miles from Mainpur. There is no road worth the name from Deobhog and Mainpur to Mahasamund.

The other facts and figures will be found from the various Memoranda submitted by the Government of Orissa and by the public of Orissa.

I, therefore, submit that in the context of the recommendation to create a mammoth new State of Madhya Pradesh with an area of 1,71,200 sq. miles, there is a clear case for reconsideration of our claim on the areas under reference.

Shri Dholakia (Kutch East): Let me express my gratefulness for giving me the opportunity of placing my views with regard to the S.R.C. Report in general and my State of Kutch as affected by it in particular.

The S.R.C. Report is generally a very balanced document, a result of careful study of all the relevant data on the problem of reorganisation of States. It is true that no report can satisfy all the claims and counter claims of various groups however it would be unfair and unjust to criticise the Commission as partial to a particular section or a group.

Kutch has never made a fetish of any political slogan and the only anxiety it entertained was to have full benefit of its development. Kutch will ever remain grateful to late Sardar Vallabh Bhai Patel, the Government of India and this House as a whole for the generous and sympathetic manner in which it has been looked after.

We Members of Parliament from Kutch met the S.R.C. twice and we made our position quite clear that so far as future of Kutch State was concerned, our prime anxiety was that the all round development of Kutch should not be disturbed in any event and for that we preferred to remain with the Centre for at least for the period of second Five Year Plan but in case it, being a Parsee State, was to be merged with any other State then our natural place is with Gujarat and Saurashtra but even in that case our proviso was that our development programme should be maintained and guaranteed and even when the possibility of formation of bilingual State of Bombay was suggested we readily agreed to it of course, insisting on the same proviso.

We are grateful to the S.R.C. that they have considered our position sympathetically. We had also emphasised the special feature of Kutch, particularly its economic backwardness, and that special consideration should be given with a view to facilitate its development in the future. I am glad to find that the Commission have given very careful consideration to the case of this Part C State and have made due provision for providing safeguards for the transitional phase. I particularly refer to the provision suggested in the Report in Chapter I of Part 3. It was quite legitimate for an economically backward Part C State to entertain fears regarding their development in the event of their merging with a more advanced adjoining State. It, therefore, naturally became the duty of the Centre, which looked after its economic development, to continue to accept the responsibility for their development

until a stage is reached when they could be left entirely to the care of the State Governments concerned.

The Commission have suggested some kind of supervisory body over the State Governments by the Central Government in respect of the development of economically backward areas in which Kutch is mentioned. Another important suggestion has been made in connection with special allotment to be made for the development of these areas. It is further suggested that the Government of India will exercise, under the proposed arrangements, control over the disbursement of these allotments for specified purposes. In this connection the suggestion made for constituting development boards consisting of officials and non-officials in consultation with the Government of the State, to look after the economic and social development of these areas, is a step in the right direction. I hope in the future set-up both these recommendations in terms of exercise of supervisory power over State Government and the constitution of Development Board will be implemented with a view to ensuring rapid economic development of Kutch. I, therefore, welcome these recommendations and urge that they be fully implemented. There is also the third suggestion in respect of the application of laws of the larger States to the merged Units. I submit that due regard will have to be given to the special need of the people and I urge that there should be no attempt at the wholesale application of new laws, particularly in the merged areas. The pace of application will have to be regulated and wherever sufficient grounds are advanced justifying some differentiation in law, the same will be duly considered.

Having referred to the special need and requirements of Kutch as a Part C State, I will now refer to the larger question of the bilingual State of Bombay. The S.R.C. Report recommended a bilingual State for the present Bombay State with additions of areas both to Gujarat and Maharashtra. We had agreed to these re-

[Shri Dholakia] commendations. Unfortunately, the Maharashtrian friends, in spite of the position of advantage given to them in the proposed State, did not see their way to accept the same and rejected it straightway. They have persisted in the formation of a linguistic State of **Samyukta Maharashtra** and advanced their untenable claim over the cosmopolitan and multilingual city of Bombay. It is significant to note that several impartial bodies have examined the question of the city of Bombay, such as Dar Commission and J.V.P. Committee and the S.R.C. have given their verdict and have expressed themselves in no uncertain terms that in view of national importance and cosmopolitan character, the city of Bombay can never become a part of any unilingual State. In any event, I feel, and when I say this I give expression to the sentiments of the entire Kutch public, that it will not be possible to agree to join a State in which after all that has happened, harmonious wrong is very doubtful and certainly will not be in the interest of a numerically and economically backward area such as Kutch is.

Lastly, I have heard the illuminating speech of the Prime Minister. It is not possible to delve much on many of the points made out by him, although they tend to clear the way to understanding and goodwill. I entirely agree with all of them but I cannot close this without enthusiastically commending his far sighted suggestion to have bigger units comprising of five zones of the country which will, I am sure, be in the best interest of unity and orderly development of the nation.

Shri Kottukappally (Meenachil): I wish to represent the case of Kerala. It delights my heart to watch and witness the birth of a new Kerala. I hail the dawn of the new era for the Malayalee race. I felicitate them in their securing a State which they can call their own and which they can model, mould and shape. A united Kerala embodies and personifies the hopes,

aspirations and ambitions of 15 million people for a long time.

But what we looked for, longed for and prayed for was an entire Kerala, full Kerala, an unbroken Kerala—not a maimed, mutilated Kerala, with no head and no feet. The birth of baby Kerala has not given rise to undeluded delight; it has caused us surprise and sorrow. The women of Kerala are wailing over the shape of the new baby and men are hanging their heads in shame and the children view it with disgust, dismay and disdain.

There is a Kerala which the Jews of the Old Testament knew; there is a Kerala to which early Christians and Arabs came from Syria and Western Asia; there is a Kerala over which the Perumal kings of old held sway; there is a Kerala of which Marco Polo the traveller wrote in praise and eulogy as the emporium of the East; there is a Kerala known to history, epic, legend and lore. It is for that Kerala that we look up to this Parliament as the arbiter of our destiny.

It has been featured by organs of public opinion in Kerala that it is a mystery of the ages how Sardar Panikkar came to agree to a Kerala which the SRC Report has given birth to. This mystery has been pictured as more profound than the inscrutable, impenetrable enigma that surrounds the Sphinx on the desert sands of Egypt. The Sardar is saturated with history, geography and the folk lore of Kerala, born and brought up as he is in that picturesque region of the earth. Knowing as I do my eminent, illustrious friend, I can only imagine that he agreed to a vivisection of Kerala on account of the fact that he wanted to be over-generous to our neighbours on the other side of the Ghats.

But I am sure the patriotic, devoted son of Kerala that he is, his pen might have trembled, his voice quired and wavered, as he wrote or dictated those lines that shattered the aspirations of the Malayalam speaking people.

The *Imperial Gazetteer* says: "identical in people, language, laws and customs, the whole of the ancient

Kerala is homogenous in every respect except for the accident of a divided political administration". The Dhar Committee put it in para. 38 of their report: "The Aikya Kerala movement undoubtedly represents the aspirations of a large number of Malayalee people and there can be no doubt that they would prosper and be able to manage their own affairs much better under their own Government nearer home, if such a Government were possible". The Linguistic Provinces Committee has also said the same thing.

There is a lore dear and sacred to every Hindu home on the West Coast: Parasurama the sixth avatar of Vishnu appeared at Gokarnam and raised Kerala from the depths of the sea. Parasurama's Kerala included Cape Comorin known as Kanyakumari. The creation of Kerala might be due to some special dispensation of the gods above. Survey the face of this earth from China to Peru and you cannot come across a region of greater scenic splendour—lakes, rivers, seas, mountains, green valleys, fair fields and stars twinkling and shining through all seasons—region of perpetual spring. I appeal to this paramount Parliament: Let no man separate what God has united.

The separation of the four taluks of Thovala, Agastheeswaram, Kalkulam and Vilavancode cuts at the root of the aspirations of the Malayalee race. Travancore territory which has formed the major portion of the new Kerala takes its name from a village called Thiruvancode in the Kalkulam taluk. The ancient home of the Maharajas of Travancore until about 1787 was at Kalkulam. In fact the old Travancore State extended from Cape Comorin in the south to Edava in Chrayankil and comprised all the four southern taluks now proposed to be separated. These taluks are sacred and hallowed to the memory of Raja Marthanda Varma, the architect of modern Travancore. These taluks are also hallowed by the memory of the heroic, valiant, Nayar warrior Velu Thampet Dalava who fought the British and lost his life. So much the British conquerors hated

him that they severed his head and paraded it on a pole at Kannamoolai in Trivandrum for days. His speeches and orations shall ever enliven the pages of the history of Indian nationalism. He spoke of a patriotism, a nationalism, a love of race and culture which it took decades for a Naoroji or a Banerjee or a Bal Gangadhar Tilak to echo. Raja Kesava Das who also hailed from this place was an administrator, statesman and diplomat. He happens to be the forerunner of a long line of illustrious Malayalee diplomats and statesman like Sir C. Sankaran Nair, Dr. John Mathai, Sardar Panikkar, K. P. S. Menon, V. P. Menon, P. P. Pillai, Raghavan, N. R. Pillai and above all that great statesman V. K. Krishna Menon, who has been to a large extent responsible in putting India on the international map. Our Prime Minister asked at Trivandrum the other day—do I know Malayalees? and answered—they are on my right, they are on my left and they are in my front and they are behind me. It shall pain, it shall distress, it shall wound the Malayalees if a sacred hallowed part of their land is cut out and joined with a region across the mountains. The genius of the Malayalee race is not gone; make them happy contended and they shall enrich in a variety of ways their motherland, that is India.

I plead just for a position of *status quo*. I plead for a position that had been there for ages. I plead for a position that existed before the Aryans from Central Asia entered the Ganges valley and started their settlement at Kurukshetra the primeval home of Hinduism. I do not plead for a poor man's bit of land. I plead that the poor Malayalee may keep the small bit of land he now possesses and not have it delivered to his rich neighbour.

If the SRC argument about the four southern taluks could hold good, one third of Switzerland north of the Brenner pass must belong to Italy and the area of Spain adjoining the Pyrennes must belong to France. I sat as a visitor in the Swiss Parliament at Berne and I found a third of the Swiss people were Italians speaking Italian.

[Shri Kottukappally]

The honest fact about the southern taluks is that the Malayalees are a generous and hospitable race. They gave home and shelter to the Jews before Jesus Christ was born at Bethlehem. They welcomed the early Christians to their shores. They received the Arabs. Even Vasco de Gama was swept by the sea to our shores. Even so in the South some of our brethren of the Tinnevely district came across the Aramboly gap and found a hospitable home amidst our homesteads. Most of the southern Travancoreans know Malayalam as much as Tamil. So have come to our centres of trade, Quilon, Alleppey, Cochin, Cannanore and Kasargode, the Konkani and the Gujerati. They were all welcomed and we all live together in peace, the Hindu, the Jew, the Christian, the Mussalman, and the Tamilian, the Konkani and the Gujerati, as brothers in a happy family sharing in common all that we have, partaking of our sorrows and our joys. The variety, the vigour and the richness of the Malayalee speaking people is the result of the combination, the absorption and the consolidation of the wealth of different cultures and the different racial experiences. Should we lose a part of our land, a part of our inheritance because we were good, generous and hospitable?

Look at the Atlas and you will find that geography, the lie of the mountains, the sea and the flow of the rivers, are the prime influence that carves a State and gives it special features and shape. The Himalayas in the north and the sea and the ocean in the west and in the east made India what it is. The Alps, the Mediterranean and the Adriatic made Italy what it is. The Pyrrannes, the Atlantic and the Mediterranean made Spain what it is, I would not multiply examples. The Western Ghats and the Arabian sea in spite of the Palghat, Aryankavu and the Aramboly gaps made Kerala what it is. Kerala should be one territory in between the Western Ghats,

the Arabeen sea, Cape Commorin and the Kasargode taluk.

The new claim for Devikulam and Peermede by Madras is unfortunate and unfair for the great Tamil race. It ill becomes a people, if they are serious, that produced a Kamban and a Thiruvalluvar and a modern Rajagopalachari and Kamaraj Nadar. It ill becomes a race that conceived and built the architectural marvels of Madura, Tanjore, Sreerangam and Ramaswaram. Thiruvallvar wrote in Kural, "There is no greater good than righteousness, nor no greater evil than the forgetting of it. Ask me not what will it profit a man if he is righteous. Look at the bearers of the palanuin and him that rideth on it". Devikulam and Peermede were mostly Reserve Forest regions until 60 years back and were not available to the Malayalee for Colonisation. Kanan Devan and the other English and Scottish Companies with their influence with the British Residents obtained substantial areas and opened them up for tea and rubber. The Tamil labour being readily available they employed them more than the Malayalees. If on this account Devikulam and Peermede should go to Madras, they should rather in greater fairness form part of Scottish Highlands. If this argument holds good, Tamilians can claim a part of Ceylon and the Malayalees a part of Malaya. If along the Himalayan slopes we have some Turkeystanis that is no reason why Naini Tal, Simla, Mussoori and Darjeeling should go to the Soviet Union on the other side of the mountains. Even the SRC Report has not taken away Devikulam and Peermede from us. The Census of India 1931, for Madras Pages 81 and 82 says about the labour force in Devikulam and Peermede. It is the rule for these workers to return to their villages for periods each year varying from 2 to 3 months, but generally 2...Tinnevely itself furnishes half Plantation labour in Travancore and with Madura and Ramnad over 3/4...The Madras born enumerated in Travancore. Tinnevely contributed over 6,000 Madura and Ramnad over 20,000.

The Malabar Collector wrote away Gudalur to Tamilnad a few years back. But the Census of India Report, page 290, states, Malayalam prevades Gudalur Taluk. Nobody disputes, it has Kerala Characteristics. Kasargode, few disputes, is part of Kerala. Census of India pages 290 and 299 say, Kerala really includes the Kasargod taluk of Kanara and Kanarese does not begin on the coast till Coondapour: In Kasargod taluk there is as genuine a piece of Kerala as exists anywhere on the West Coast.

The Kerala State for which I plead is geographically compact, administratively convenient and culturally homogenous with a separate, clear historical and traditional background.

I request this House to be just, generous and fair to Kerala. With only 15,000 sq. miles of land it will be the smallest State in the Indian Union. West Bengal will be twice as big and Madhya Pradesh 12 times bigger. The density of our population is something unknown in any other part of the globe. It is more than 3 times that of Italy, four times that of Switzerland, 20 times that of the United States and 300 times that of Canada. Comparing the density of population of Kerala with other States, according to the SRC Report it will be—

One and a half times that of Tamilnad,

Twice that of Uttar Pradesh, and

Six times that of Madhya Pradesh.

We shall be the baby State of the Republic. Our young men and women are asking the Indian Republic "Give us land to live, work and grow. You are the arbiter of our destiny. You make or mar us. We form an integral part of the nation. We have been in the Vanguard of the fight for freedom. We have been loyal and devoted to you. Allow us not to perish as a people".

Kerala is pictured as problem State. We have thousands of young men and women, intelligent, educated, enlightened, brave and heroic. But we have

little land. They have no work and do not know where to go to make both ends meet. They are filled with fear for the future and are in despair. They feel desperate due to frustration and a vacancy in life. Give them opportunities and they shall rise and serve and enrich the Republic. A people that produced a Sankaracharya as great as Aristotle or Aquinas, a Sankaracharya who replanted Hinduism from Camorin to Srinagar can be no small people. I appeal to this Parliament of the Republic to guard us, help us and treat us with equity and fairness. Do not leave before us a broken, belaboured, bleeding, baby Kerala. I fervently pray for your best wishes, your blessings and your benediction for my people.

श्री लीलाचर जोशी (शाजापुर-राजगढ़):

सबसे पहले तो मैं कमीशन के सदस्यों को धन्यवाद देता हूँ जिन्होंने यह रिपोर्ट अत्यन्त विद्वता पूर्ण तथा पक्षपातरहित हो कर दी है। किसी स्टेट या देश के किसी भाग के लोगों को हो सकता है कि रिपोर्ट का कुछ त्रिस्ता पसन्द न हो, लेकिन इसके लिए कमीशन को गलत कहना न्याय युक्त नहीं होगा। सब को प्रसन्न रखना बिल्कुल असम्भव है। विशेष तौर पर मध्य प्रदेश बनाने के लिए तो कमीशन के प्रति वहाँ की जनता सदैव के लिए कृतज्ञ होगी। इस प्रदेश के प्रस्ताव पर देश के प्रसिद्ध अर्थशास्त्री मि० राव ने जो देहली स्कूल ऑफ इकानामिक्स के डायरेक्टर हैं और जो प्लानिंग कमीशन के एडवाइजर भी हैं, दैनिक "स्टेट्समैन" ता० ४-११-५५ में और ता० १८-१२-५५ के दैनिक "हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स" में मनीष मध्य प्रदेश को सबसे अच्छा साधन सम्पन्न प्रदेश बतलाया है। अग्रिम, महोदय हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी पहले व पार्लियामेण्ट में अभी ता० २१-१२-५५ को इस प्रदेश के भविष्य के सम्बन्ध में बहुत अच्छे विचार व्यक्त किये हैं। इससे मनीष भाँति प्रकट होता है कि ये प्रान्त देश के मध्य में देश की सुरक्षा तथा एबना के लिए भी अत्यन्त

[श्री श्रीलाधर जोशी]

प्रावश्यक था। आज कोई भी स्टेट छोटे २ टुकड़ों में रह कर अपना विकास नहीं कर सकती। मध्य भारत लगभग २५ देशी राज्यों का एक समूह है जिसका स्वतन्त्रता के बाद हमारे देश के महान् पुरुष सरदार पटेल ने निर्माण किया। उस समय जैसे जैसे सम्भव हुआ देश की ६०० रियासतों के या तो यूनिन बना दिये गये अथवा उन्हें पड़ोसी प्रान्तों में मिला दिया गया। लेकिन इस तरक्की के युग में आर्थिक दृष्टि से ऐसे छोटे छोटे यूनिट्स न तो विकास कर सकते हैं, न स्थायी रह सकते हैं। ज्यादा अच्छा तो यही होता कि देश के ५ विभाग उत्तर, दक्षिण, पूर्व पश्चिम व मध्य के नाम से अभी कर दिये जाते, जैसा कि भविष्य के लिए हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी का विचार है। मध्य भारत में खनिज पदार्थों की कमी है, महाकौशल में कोयला, लोहा, मैंगनीज व अन्य खनिज पदार्थों की बहुतायत है, इसी तरह छत्तीसगढ़ व विन्ध्य में चावल है, मध्य भारत में कपास गेहूँ व ज्वार, चना, दालें व आइल सीड्स होता है। बम्बई राज्य के बाद टैक्सटाइल उद्योग में मध्य भारत का पहला नम्बर है। भोपाल व महाकौशल में कारेस्ट भी है। इस तरह यह नया प्रान्त कृषि व उद्योग दोनों पहलुओं से थोड़े ही समय में देश के दूसरे समृद्ध प्रान्तों की बराबरी करेगा— यह प्रदेश आदिवासी व शैड्यूलडकास्ट की जनसंख्या की दृष्टि से भी सबसे बड़ा प्रान्त होगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस राज्य की आबादी २६१ लाख होगी जो ज्यादा नहीं है। अगर इसमें से बघेलखण्ड या कोई और हिस्सा निकाला गया तो इसके प्रति बड़ा अन्याय होगा। यू० पी० के चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब ने बहां की प्रेसेम्बली में कहा है कि "रिहान्ड डैम के लिए ३० मील के विन्ध्य के रफे के लिए बदले में बिजली देने की बातचीत हुई है।" केवल वैसा करने में कोई हर्ज नहीं है, क्योंकि उत्तर प्रदेश के पास सारा हिमालय

पहाड़ संकड़ों मीलों तक खनिज पदार्थों से भरा पड़ा है। बहां का सर्वे कराना चाहिए। यू० पी० को बढ़ाने की बात कहना न्यायसंगत प्रतीत नहीं होती, मध्य भारत का कोई ऐसा छोटा हिस्सा जो किसी प्रान्त के बीच हो व उसका देना जरूरी हो तो वह दिया जा सकता है। इसी तरह इस प्रस्तावित मध्य प्रदेश के बीच में राजस्थान के प्रतापगढ़, कोटा व झालावाड़ के हिस्से आते हैं। यू० पी० का ललितपुर व झांसी डिवीजन का हिस्सा भी मिलना जरूरी है। यू० पी० या गुजरात में प्रस्तावित मध्य प्रदेश का कोई हिस्सा दिया जाना बिल्कुल अनुचित होगा। राजस्थान के कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने मध्य भारत के मंदसौर जिले को राजस्थान में मिलाने की मांग की है जो सर्वथा अनुचित है क्योंकि महाकवि कालिदास ने भी मेघदूत में मंदसौर को मालवे का भाग बतलाया है तथा मालवे के प्रसिद्ध वीर यशोधर्मन के कीर्ति स्तम्भ अभी तक मंदसौर में मौजूद हैं; न वहां की जनता ही राजस्थान में मिलना चाहती है। बस्तर के सम्बन्ध में जो मांग अन्य राज्यों ने की है वह भी वास्तविकता तथा तथ्यों के आधार पर सही नहीं है और कमीशन ने भी इसे प्रामाण्य किया है इस तरह इस नये प्रदेश का कोई भी भाग कम करना उसे कमजोर करना होगा क्योंकि एरिया की दृष्टि से इसकी आबादी बढ़ाने का प्लानिंग करना होगा, न कि कम करने का।

इस प्रस्तावित राज्य के बड़े होने की दलील भी युक्तिसंगत नहीं है क्योंकि यह युग साइन्स का है; रेल, तार, डाक, टेलीफोन, हवाई जहाज व वायरलस इत्यादि से शासन सुगमता से हो सकता है। यातायात के साधन भी थोड़े ही समय में सुलभ हो सकेंगे। यद्यपि कुछ राजनीतिज्ञों ने बुद्धि भ्रम फैलाने का यत्न किया है, परन्तु यह सही है कि मध्य भारत में ग्राम तौर पर लोकमत प्रस्तावित मध्य प्रदेश

के पक्ष में ही रहा है। राजधानी भोपाल हीने पर ग्वालियर के विकास का खास तौर पर ध्यान रखा जाना चाहिए। वहां की करोड़ों रुपयों के लागत की इमारतों का सदुपयोग होना अत्यन्त आवश्यक है। इसी तरह मन्च शहर जबलपुर, इन्दौर, उज्जैन, रीवां, रायपुर के विकास का भी पूर्ण ध्यान रखा जाना चाहिए।

मैं तेलंगाना को आन्ध्र में अभी मिलाने के पक्ष में हूँ। इसी तरह विदर्भ को भी कमीशन के प्रस्तावित बम्बई प्रदेश में शामिल करने की अपील करता हूँ क्योंकि विदर्भ को अलग रखना कैसे उचित कहा जा सकता है। हिमाचल प्रदेश की अपनी एक अलग भौगोलिक स्थिति है, उसको अभी अलगहदा रखना आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है।

अन्त में मैं आपके द्वारा इस हाउस का ध्यान देश में बढ़ती हुई जातीयता, प्रान्तीयता व साम्प्रदायिकता की ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ जिसकी झांकी कभी कभी इस भवन में भी सुन्नन को मिलती है। मिसाल के तौर पर मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि ता० २०-१२-५५ को इसी हाउस] के एक राजस्थान के सदस्य ने जो जनसंघ के एकमात्र प्रतिनिधि हैं, अपने भाषण में जातीयता की चर्चा की है जो बड़ी दुखद होने के अलावा इस सभा भवन की शान-बार परम्परा के भी अनुकूल नहीं है। देश में अब राजा-महाराजा, जमींदार-जागीरदार नहीं रहे। इस तरह सामन्त वाद तो चला गया। आर्थिक प्लानिंग द्वारा समाज वाद की दिशा में हम तेजी से जा रहे हैं। इस तरह पूंजीवाद भी आत्मे पर है। लेकिन राष्ट्रीयता के असल बुझमन यह जातीयवाद, प्रान्तीयतावाद तथा साम्प्रदायिकवाद है। देश को भागे बढ़ाने के लिए इनसे सावधान रहना बहुत आवश्यक है। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं रिपोर्ट का समर्थन करता हूँ।

Shri Neswi (Dharwar South): Things and events willed by God to happen

cannot be long postponed nor be resalted. This is evidenced in the formation of Andhra and by the feverish attempts now in full force to give speedy effect to S.R.C. proposals. The S.R.C. Members who are really eminent persons richly deserve to be congratulated for their valuable work which they have accomplished, even though there are lapses as is usual to man.

I now turn to the proposals relating to the proposed Karnatak. History as revealed by Dr. Krishna Shastri shows that Karnatak extended from Godavari in the North to the Kaveri in the South, bordered on the West by the Arabian Sea and in the East up to about 78° longitude.

In the linguistic survey of India, Kannada region is defined thus: "Kanarese is the principal language of Mysore and the adjoining parts of Coimbatore, Salem and Anantpur and Bellary. The frontier line thence goes northwards through the dominions of H.E.H. The Nizam as far as Bidar where it turns almost due West on to about 78° and further Southwards so as to include south-eastern portion of Jat and Daphalapur. Kanarese is also spoken in the extreme south-east of Satara in Tasgaon Taluka and further to the west in Kolhapur so far as west of the Town of Kolhapur..... Kanarese dialects are spoken in the Nilgiris and etc. etc."

According to census reports, Kannada is losing ten miles of area for every ten years. Predominantly Kannada talukas only 40 years ago are reduced to minority.

In view of the above facts, S.R.C. has failed to do adequate justice to Karnatak. Apart from proposing to add the talukas of Akalkot, South Sholapur, Alur, Adoni, Raidurg, Madakasira, Hosur and the district of Nilgiris the portions of Jat, Gadinglej and Kasargod taluka and the Talevadi Firka and the Sholapur city, they have at the same time snatched away the three taluks of Bellary, Sirguppa, Hospet and the sub-taluka of Mallapura on very flimsy

[Shri Néswi]

grounds, not minding the sanctity of Parliament where in 1953 an Act was passed on the consideration of the Report of Justice Misra, appointed for the very purpose. This is a bad precedent which must be set right by the unanimous verdict of the House.

The S.R.C. proposals to transfer the above-said areas in Bellary district on the poor plea of the headworks and the project dam being situated there are matters beyond my comprehension. None of the grounds put forth by the Commission can stand any sensible argument.

As regards the project, the proposed Karnatak State will really have a major and vital interest. Karnatak will have under low level canal 6,72,000 acres of irrigated area while Andhra will have 1,57,000 acres. Even if high level canal is to be taken up, Karnatak will have a major interest. If this principle is applied in all such cases then Pakistan must claim a vast area from our Indian territory.

Akkalkot and South Sholapur are analogous in many points. Even the Bombay Government and M.P.C.C. accept these areas as predominantly Kannada talukas. By population, trade relations, social and cultural affinity and people's wish these must be added to Karnatak. Scrutiny of the representations made in this behalf will justify the demand of Kannada people.

S.R.C. Report says in its para. 398 that the portions of Madakasira taluka being enclaves within the Mysore State were merged in Mysore in 1950. Kannada population is 64 per cent. and Telegu 22 per cent. It is 70 miles to Bangalore while Karnool and Hyderabad 160 and 360 miles respectively. Other points like administrative convenience, trade relation etc. will speak to the addition of this taluka to Karnatak.

The small area of Talavadi Firka is a part of Gopi taluka in Madras

State. It is distinct from the rest of the taluka and has a natural boundary. Kannada population is 90 per cent. Every one of the 80 villages have expressed their will to be included in Karnatak. All the 32 primary schools are Kannada schools. If viewed from administrative convenience only economical and other advantages, it must go to Karnatak.

Hosur taluka is contiguous to Mysore State and is 25 miles from Bangalore and 250 and 350 miles from Karnool and Hyderabad respectively. It deserves to be added to Karnatak.

The case of Kasargod taluka has been well explained on the floor of the House by the hon. Member Shri B. Shiva Rao, who represents the part. So I need not add any more.

The major portion of Jat taluka adjoining the Bijapur district is predominantly Kannada. The Collector of Bijapur was acting as a political agent for Jat before it was joined to Kolhapur residency. Jat is even now in Karnatak P.C.C.

The Nilgiris, Adoni, Alur and Rayadurg talukas, in fairness, must go to Karnatak. Claims put forth by the people of these areas and those of South Sholapur and Akalkot talukas and the city of Sholapur which were persistently made before the Congress High Commands for United Karnatak were postponed by saying that due consideration should be given while reforming the provinces. The city of Sholapur has been purposely included in the North Sholapur taluka with an intention to retain it in Maharashtra by dividing the Sholapur taluka into South and North Sholapur talukas after the submission of Dhar Commission Report. The City of Sholapur which has been built by the sweat of the Kannadigas must in all justice go to Karnatak.

Our Maharatta friends now claim the talukas of Belgaum, Khanapur and a portion of area roundabout Nippani in Belgaum district and those of Halial,

Supa and Karwar talukas in Karwar district on the ground that these are predominantly Marathi speaking areas. Karwar which is known as North Kanara itself shows that it is Kannada area. All the responsible persons the M.L.A.'s, M.L.C.'s and M.P. of this district and different institutions—strongly claim the retention of these areas in Karnatak. Considered from any point of view these places must be part and parcel of Karnatak. All the points that are applicable to these areas do apply to Belgaum and other places in Belgaum district.

The question of cities of Nippani, Belgaum and Karwar are to be given much thought before they are being considered for transformation. If they are transferred to Maharashtra they will be soon reduced to a position and status of ordinary towns as the result of losing all trade and economic relations established for long with Karnatak. The Nippani town which is the first tobacco trade centre in India will not only lose its importance but will soon begin to starve if it is joined to Maharashtra as its trade will surely be diverted to Karnatak, because the tobacco that is coming to Nippani market is mainly coming from the Kannada villages.

Breaking up of talukas without proper and compelling reasons is a dangerous process which will encourage fissiparous tendencies throughout India and thus impair the unity and solidarity of the country.

Breaking up of talukas should only be considered under special and exceptional conditions and with a real intention to make the people of the area concerned happier.

I should fail in my duty if along with other Kannadigas I do not express gratitude for the formation of the United Karnatak Province which has all along been doing its best for the national cause as a whole.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): I congratulate the Government for giving

earliest opportunity to Parliament to discuss the proposals of the States Reorganisation Commission. Our Home Minister, Pandit Govind Bhallabh Pant, deserves our thanks for his illuminating speech while inaugurating the debate.

States reorganisation is a long-felt need. There is no rational in the carving of states by the British. They never consulted the wishes of the people. In the process of their conquest and consolidation of India they arbitrarily divided certain areas to suit their administrative conveniences and went on adding to places as and when they came under their possession.

The partition of Bengal in 1905 had first focussed the attention of the nationalist forces on the necessity of carving out India into linguistic provinces. Congress had made it clear that in a free India linguistic division of the country would be the first item of reorganisation. And true to its professions and practice, Congress has made arrangements for redrawing the political map of India.

Political freedom is not an end in itself. It is the beginning for securing social justice and equality to all persons. Language plays a very important part in any democratic set up of government. Peoples language must be used both for legislatures and for administration. This is not possible if a state happens to be bilingual or multi-lingual. People cannot feel the pleasure of having their own government unless the business of the government is conducted in their own language. Hence the necessity of the States reorganisation.

The members of the Commission have acquitted themselves quite creditably in solving this knotty problem. They had formulated certain principles to guide them in this task and language was one of them. In any set up the security and unity of the country as a whole cannot be neglected. Further, financial viability

[Shri B. S. Murthy]

and administrative convenience are also quite essential. With these as their guiding principles, the Commission have accomplished their task in a manner worthy of the trust placed in them.

In the case of Andhras, the Commission have expressed their desire for Visalandhra. But to satisfy some elements in Hyderabad who desired for a separate Telangana, the Commission have proposed a period of five years for the full fruition of Visalandhra. But this should not prevent Andhras from achieving Visalandhra here and now. Visalandhra has been the dream of Andhras since 50 long years. It was with the immortal sacrifice of Amarajivi Potti Sreeramulu that the Andhra State came into existence on 1st October, 1953. His sacrifice is enough for creating Visalandhra. His soul will be in agony if Visalandhra is delayed because of the disunity of Andhra politicians. No Andhra can afford to such a thing. His memory is still green and it will do well for all shades of opinion amongst Andhras to rally round and make a unanimous demand for Visalandhra with the Andhra areas in the north, south and west.

Let me now briefly deal with the objections raised by the protagonists of separate Telangana. Their first point is that Telangana is financially viable where as Andhra is a deficit State. But this is not a permanent feature. Telangana's annual revenue will be Rs. 17 crores out of which Rs. 4 crores is the revenue from excise. It is an open secret now that the Central Government is bent upon introducing prohibition all over the country in accordance with the recommendations of the Prohibition Committee appointed by the Centre. This may perhaps be done in the ensuing year, and once it is introduced, Telangana will not be a viable state. Further, the land cess in Telangana is abnormal and amounts to rack-renting. This can be seen by noting that the wet rate in Telangana is from

Rs. 6 to Rs. 24 per acre whereas it is from Rs. 6 to Rs. 12 in the Andhra. This rack-renting should go and relief should be offered to the poor cultivator. If the land cess is scaled down, there will be a further fall in the revenues of Telangana. I do not wish to dilate upon this point any further except to sound a note of warning against the present complacency paraded by the protagonists of Telangana as to their financial viability. This is a fast vanishing feature and no reliance need be laid on that. The second point is that Telangana is rich in coal and other minerals whereas Andhra is merely an agricultural country. This again is not correct. We have in Andhra large deposits of mica, manganese, graphite, lime-stone, china clay, iron ore and other important minerals. We have a huge forest wealth. We have paper mills, jute mills, cement factories, cigarette factories, cloth mills and several other undertakings. Machkund, Tungabhadra and Nandikond will give sufficient electric energy at cheap rates to the rural areas for agricultural purposes. I need not say anything about the agricultural potentialities of Andhra as it is known as the "granary of India". The shipbuilding yard at Vizagapatam is a great asset.

The third point raised in certain quarters is that the Andhra people will dominate in Visalandhra and thus deprive the people of Telangana of their due share. This charge is untenable after seeing how the people of Rayalaseema are given the first preference in any nation building activity. Before the formation of Andhra state, the people of Rayalaseema entertained the same fears as are now being entertained by the Telangana people. Andhra is a happy family now and the addition of Telangana will make it happier and stronger.

Again the creation of Visalandhra is a historical necessity. In about 1560 A.D. the whole of Andhra was under the Golkonda rulers. The sultans of Golkonda built the city of Hyderabad and shifted their capital to it. It was

known as "Bhagyanagar" indicating the prosperity of the city. In 1765 A.D. the East India Company got the district of Ganjam, Vizagapatam, Godavary, Krishna and Guntur. These are known as northern circars and they were ceded to the British by Nizam Ali. After the fall of Tippu Sultan in 1799 A.D., the Nizam got the districts of Bellary, Kurnool, Anantapur and Guddappah as his share of the war booty. These districts were ceded by him to the English in 1800 A.D. That is why these districts are even now known as Ceded districts. The district of Nellore came into the hands of the Company in 1801 A.D. Chittoor district was formed in 1901 A.D. by the then Madras Government by bringing together all the Telugu speaking people from the surrounding districts. In the process of amalgamation and integration of Andhra areas, Telangana was left out because the Nizam was holding on to it and the British attitude towards the Princes is very well known. It is left to the people of India and to this August Parliament to re-unite Telangana with Andhra and thus putting an end to the remnants of the pernicious foreign rule and the reactionary rule or misrule of the feudal lords of native states.

I trust that the few people who are now wishing for a separate Telangana will give up their agitation and fall in line with the rest of the country in creating a strong, viable and progressive Visalandhra which will take full advantage of the Second Five Year Plan in developing its river valley projects and other projects relating to industrial and commercial advancement of the nation as a whole. I appeal to them to desist from further agitation lest the verdict of history should go against them as persons standing in the way of unification of all Telugu speaking areas into one state—Visalandhra—in the new set up of India.

A word more about the Telugu speaking areas in other adjoining states. While creating the new state of Orissa in 1936, vast areas inhabited

by Telugu-speaking people were added on to this State from the then existing Madras Province. This was wrong and Andhras being busy with the national movement never bothered to rectify it by appealing to the British. Further, the Congress assured them to do them justice after Independence. The whole of Koraput district, the Parlakimidi estate and the Parlakimidi Maliahs of Ganjam district and a portion of the Chatarpur and Berhampur taluks and the respective coastal belt should be added to Andhra. There is no justification to retain these areas in the Orissa state. Berhampur was built by Andhras but we are not asking for it. We are asking only for the contiguous areas consisting predominantly of Andhra people. I hope that the Orissa people will see to the justice of this transfer and would not impede the adding of these areas to the Andhra state.

There is a lot of unnecessary controversy about the transfer of Siriguppa, Bellary and Hospet taluks to Andhra. I wonder why Karnataka friends get agitated over this. Portions of Bellary district were transferred to Mysore state in 1953. Then Andhras did not get into a frenzy as they were sure that justice would be done when re-organisation of States in India is taken up. We patiently waited and the S.R.C. wisely recommended the transfer of these three taluks to Andhra bearing in mind the imperative need of having the headquarters of the Tungabhadra project in Andhra State. Tungabhadra project was at standstill ever since it went into the hands of Mysore state. Tungabhadra was originally intended for Rayalaseema which is often a victim of famines. After years of agitation this dream of the people of Rayalaseema was realised and when they are about to enjoy the blessings of Tungabhadra project it is unwise to snatch it away from them. Even if the plea that these taluks are predominantly Karnataka—which is not true—they are in a sort of exchange given the rich Kolar gold-fields where Telugu-speaking people are more than 52 per cent. It is unfortunate that our Karnataka friends

[Shri B. S. Murthy]

would not like to give us Kolar and Bellary as well. This cannot be done and I hope wiser counsels will prevail and they soon will realise the propriety of giving Bellary areas with grace to Andhras.

In conclusion, let me urge upon the government to lose no time in providing safeguards to the linguistic minorities. Whatever may be the future political map of India there still will remain certain linguistic minorities in almost all States. For these minorities there must be provision to educate their children in their mother-tongue and develop their culture unhampered by the major section living in the same State. Discrimination is often seen in the States dealing with minorities as far as State services are concerned. No doubt, the Constitution has given certain guarantees as far as Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are concerned. But these guarantees exist more in print than in practice. This is due to the lack of proper machinery to translate these guarantees into daily routine of states administration. This is rather depressing and calls for a bold and realistic approach to the problem. Therefore, I suggest that the Central Government may at an early date appoint a Committee of senior officers to study the problem and suggest as to what safeguards are necessary for the linguistic minorities—other minorities may be included in this category—and the machinery through which they may successfully be implemented.

Shri A. R. Siwal (Chamba-Sirmur):
Confining myself to the State of Himachal Pradesh, the demand of its people for a Pahari-speaking State is not only based on linguistic considerations but also on considerations of economy and administrative efficiency. This had actually been considered at the time of the formation of the State vide Ministry of States communication No. S.P. 39/29, dated 10th March, 1948:

"The ultimate objective is to enable this area to attain the position of an

autonomous Province of India. This objective would be attained in two stages.....In the final stage, after this area is sufficiently developed in its resources and administration, it is proposed that its constitution should be similar to that of any other Province". The Chairman of the Commission, too, (paras. 2 and 3 of the note of dissent) repudiating the other two Members has remarked, "This is clear from certain letters issued on behalf of the Ministry.....It is true that we are not bound by the opinion of the States Ministry, but I think that we should not completely disregard it."

It has been pointed out in the majority report that there is no reason to believe that "the interests of the hill people, on the one hand, and the interests of the people of the adjoining plains on the other, are mutually exclusive". However, the information supplied by the members from the backward and hilly areas at the time of the last Backward Classes Conference held in Delhi was enough to show how people of the hills suffered at the hands of the clever and more intelligent people of the contiguous plains. Even the Prime Minister was anxious that these people of the hills, i.e. Himachal, should have opportunities of advancement thrown out to them and that they should not be exploited by the so-called clever people coming from the plains.

The people of the hills have always looked upto the Himachal Pradesh for the protection of their rights and the fulfilment of their aspirations because, even if the contiguous hilly areas are not integrated with it, what happens in Hamachal does have wholesome reactions in those areas. Actually such a State on the borders of the country is necessary for more than one reason and, as pointed out by the Chairman of the Commission "Himachal Pradesh is a typical instance where the arguments in favour of small units outlined

in paragraph 212 of this report can be applied with advantage".

As regards "uneasiness about the merger of the State" being due to 'vested interests', para 4 of the Chairman's note conclusively repudiates it, stating among other things, that "early in 1950.....it seems to have been recognised that 'the sentiment of the hill people was opposed to the extension of the authority of any of the administrative organs of the East Punjab to Himachal'." And the reasoning applied for the integration of Himachal Pradesh with the Punjab in Article 560 is completely answered in para 10 of the Chairman's note. Moreover, as the Chairman has pointed out, "we have a special responsibility in keeping the people of the border areas like Chini and Pangri and also those of the rest of the Himachal Pradesh contented and happy and in guarding against any feeling being created in them that they are not so well looked after as the people across the border. With this special responsibility and with the imperative need for guarding the frontier exposed to infiltration, the national interests will, in my opinion, be best served by the Centre directly controlling the area".

Very aptly, the Chairman of the Commission has quoted with approval:

"The Punjab has two very great problems to solve (1) the communal problem and (2) the law and order problem. The deteriorating relations between the Hindus and Sikhs in the Punjab have caused concern not only to the Punjab Government but to the Government of India.....The disease runs very gravely (even) in the services....Himachal Pradesh, fortunately, is spared all this malady; for it is a State predominantly of the Hindus and no communal problem whatsoever exists here.....Any merger of the two would completely upset the present social order in the hills and is bound to result in a very strong reaction from the people".

The main reason for the abolition of Part 'C' States like Himachal Pradesh

is that "these units will still continue to be economically unbalanced, financially weak and administratively and politically unstable". But the natural resources—forests, minerals, herbs etc.—of Himachal Pradesh are undoubtedly capable of very considerable development about which the Chairman of the Commission is not unimpressed when he observes: "It may be that this is too optimistic a view, but, however that may be, it appears to me that any expenditure that may be incurred by the Central Government in developing this backward area and bringing the people living in it to the level of the more advanced sections to be found in the rest of the country will be fully justified in so far as it will serve the larger interests of the country".

Not the least important consideration involved is that the suppressed tenants have been given a very great benefit under the Himachal Pradesh Abolition of Big Landed Estates and Land Reforms Act, of which they will be deprived to their grave detriment under the Punjab Land Laws in the event of a merger. Thus, from whatever point of view the matter may be viewed, not only the retention of Himachal Pradesh as a separate unit but the transfer thereto of the enclaves of Kulu and Kandaghat in addition to Simla, Bakloh and Dalhousie appears absolutely necessary. Any merger of it will not be acceptable to the people. Of course, it may be forced on them against their wishes but "forcing of a permanent arrangement such as is envisaged in the merger proposal, on an unwilling and unequal party will be extremely unpopular and will not provide the mutual goodwill and co-operation so necessary for the successful functioning of democracy".

As far as the retention of Himachal Pradesh as a separate unit of the Indian Union is concerned, the Government and the people of Himachal Pradesh have fully associated themselves with the views expressed by the Chairman of the Commission. There is, however, a very strong feeling that the present status at the least should remain. Reversion to the

[Shri A. R. Sewal]

Chief Commissioner's regime would be as retrograde in the case of Himachal as made out by the Commission in the case of Bombay in Article 419. on page 116. Also, the enclaves mentioned above should be integrated and the people of other contiguous hilly areas concerned given an opportunity to join in if they so desire.

Finally, when circumstances permit, the people of Kashmir and Himachal Pradesh may like to join together thereby forming a new State of Kashmir and Himachal Pradesh which would, with the inclusion of Kangra therein, be equal to the proposed State of Vidharba in population. Due to international complications which such a union may involve, this may not be possible at this stage. However, the question of Kashmir being settled free of international complications in a not distant future cannot be ruled out, when it would be open for Himachal Pradesh to exercise its option of joining therewith. In that view, the right course left open for the Union Government is to let Himachal Pradesh continue as it is at present, with the integration therewith of the necessary contiguous areas, and not be a party to forcing a merger on the unwilling, humble people of the hills.

In a democracy, the willing co-operation of the people is the very basis on which it has to flourish and not coercion based on power authority. Sentiments affect and move vast multitudes and a lack of appreciation thereof has led to a lot of avoidable catastrophe in the past. Basing as we do our whole foreign policy on the principles of Panch Shila, it would be a sad commentary to ignore the same in the settlement of our internal matters and try to force any merger against any unwilling people or to deny the right of self-determination to large areas or a number of people.

Shri K. C. Jena (Balasore—Reserved—Sch. Castes): My friend Shri V. V. Giri after dwelling at great length on inter-nationalism and nationalism,

has come down to present the case of Andhra for its northern boundary which adjoins Orissa. He has specifically mentioned three areas which, according to him, should not be in Orissa on linguistic grounds and should have been in Andhra State. These three areas are: (1) Parlakemidi Taluk now in Orissa, (2) Berhampur town and coastal belt in the Berhampur and Chatarpur Taluks of Ganjam district, and (3) the Koraput district. He thinks that if the boundary of the Andhra State was also taken into consideration at the time the Orissa Province was formed or the Orissa Committee went into the question, these three so-called linguistically Telugu predominant areas would have been included in the Andhra State. As regards the Parlakemidi Taluk, he has said that the wishes of the Raja of Parlakemidi for including his Estate in the new Province of Orissa was given the weightage against linguistic figures. The majority of the O'Donnell Committee who went into the question of the Orissa boundaries favoured the inclusion of the whole Parlakemidi Estate as it then existed in Orissa. But the Chairman differed from this view and recommended that Parlakemidi should be excluded. What was ultimately done by the Secretary of State and the Government of India was that the Estate was divided and the area where the Oriyas predominate was given to Orissa and the areas where the Telugus predominate was retained in the then Madras Presidency. It was this desire of the Maharajah of Parlakemidi, namely, the division of the Parlakemidi Estate so as to include in Orissa the predominantly Oriya portion and to retain the predominantly Telugu portion in Madras, that the Secretary of State and the Government of India ultimately accepted. Thus Parlakemidi Estate which had an area of 618 sq. miles was divided and only 190 sq. miles consisting of Oriya predominant area was given to Orissa. Where then is the case for reconsideration of this matter? Moreover Parlakemidi town which itself has an Oriya majority is

the base from which administration of a large part of the Ganjam agency where Oriyas and Oriya assimilating Khonds live together is carried on and when the boundary line was demarcated, great care was taken to bifurcate the agency together with the Oriya predominating area from the remainder of the Parlakemidi Estate. On the other hand there are four Oriya predominant pockets close to the Parlakemidi Taluk now in Orissa which should come to Orissa on linguistic, cultural and economic grounds. My friend is obviously confusing the whole of the Parlakemidi Estate before 1936 and the present Parlakemidi Taluk of Orissa. In the former, Telugus were undoubtedly in the majority, but in the latter Oriyas dominate.

The population of Berhampur town when the O'Donnell Committee enquired into the Orissa boundaries was evenly balanced between the Oriyas and the Telugus. The present Oriya population of Berhampur town is about 36,000 and the Telugu population only 23,000 out of a total of about 62,000. Berhampur is surrounded by Oriya villages around and is the rail-head for its hinter-land which is a cent-per-cent. Oriya country.

The coastal belt which my friend has referred to was also taken into consideration by the Orissa Committee and they have said in para 65 of their report:

"It is unfortunate that this area includes a Telugu fringe; but the narrow coastal belt in which they predominate cannot be detached from the interior and the wishes of a small minority cannot be the determining factor."

Even if this coastal belt is examined linguistically it will be found that Telugu villages are not in a compact area close to the Andhra boundary so as to be transferred to Andhra. On the other hand, clusters of Oriya villages are found right along the coast line with only a few Telugu villages scattered here and there. The Gov-

ernment of Orissa submitted to the States Re-organisation Commission in great detail a supplementary memorandum with maps and statistics explaining this position.

My friend has also referred to the wishes of the Maharaja of Jeypore for remaining in Orissa which led to the inclusion of Koraput district in the Orissa province. But he does not perhaps remember that the late Maharaja Shri Vikram Deo Verma had himself written to the Secretary of State preferring to include his Estate in the new Orissa Province. Moreover, linguistically, Andhra has absolutely no case over Koraput district as Andhras are only 6 per cent. of the total population in the district. The S.R.C. has, therefore, rightly rejected the Andhra claim over Koraput.

It may also be recollected here that when the southern boundaries of Orissa as at present constituted were finally decided upon by the Secretary of State and the Government of India, the then Government of Madras were consulted and they had no objection to the present southern boundary of Orissa. It may also be made clear that in the Madras Government of those days, the Andhras were a dominant group whereas the Oriyas were altogether unrepresented in that Government. In face of the Madras Government's reply how is it my friend now comes forward against the existing southern boundary of Orissa from the Andhra point of view?

There are certain areas in the Andhra State now contiguous to the Ganjam district of Orissa which on the other hand ought to come to Orissa on linguistic and other grounds. They are Udyankhand, Budharsingh, Jalantara, Mandasa, Tarala and Tekilli. If the linguistic picture of these areas before the 1951 census is examined, it will be clear to any one that to the west of the Railway line extending downwards from Berhampur upto Tarala, the Oriyas are in a considerable majority over the Telugu population. The Oriyas living here have also social, cultural and economic relations with the Oriyas of Ganjam

[Shri K. C. Jena]

and Puri districts. In all fairness these areas lying to the west of the Railway line and comprising Jalantara, Mandasa, Budharsingh, Tekkali and Udyankhand should be transferred to Orissa.

We had no desire to raise the question of our southern boundaries as in our opinion this matter could be settled in discussion by both the State Governments concerned; but as my friend Shri Giri has thought it expedient to mention the Andhra claim, I am constrained to submit to the judgment of the house what I have stated above.

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes): The task of the States Re-organisation Commission was a very responsible one and the Commission have taken pains to go thoroughly into the question of re-organisation of the present States on the basis of language. Even though there are many defects in the Report, I welcome it and wish the Government a great success in reconstituting the States. I earnestly appeal to the Government to consider re-organisation of the States not merely on the basis of the recommendations but also considering in all sincerity the wishes and opinions of the people concerned.

I am very sorry to say, and it is my sincere opinion, that the S.R.C. has done injustice, though not very grave, to Madras State. When the language has been taken as the fundamental factor for the reorganisation of the States the Commission's recommendation to retain some Tamil areas in Travancore-Cochin State is repugnant to the spirit of the terms of reference and the main purpose for which the States are to be re-organised.

Language is the main force in the field of culture, and customs and manners, thoughts and feelings, the type of a particular civilization and way of every day life entirely depend upon the language the people speak. There may be some differences between one section and another of the people speaking the same language. But the

difference if closely observed will be insignificant. Therefore in the interest of the efficiency of administration, preservation and development of the language and culture of the people inhabiting the two Talukas of Devikulam and Peermede in Travancore-Cochin State should be included in Madras State as the people are predominantly Tamils. It is needless for me to give the details of the census enumeration of the Tamil and Malayalam speaking people in these Taluks. I draw the attention of the Government to the Census figures of these Taluks in 1951 Census Report.

The Commission have adopted a peculiar method to find out the real population figures of Tamils and Malayalies. It has resorted to enumeration and the result is decrease in the population of Tamils. These two Taluks are Plantation areas. If according to the Commission a portion of the Tamils is only a floating population are there not Malayali labourers as floating ones? The arguments are unacceptable to any one endowed with reasoning capacity. The Commission know what the Pattam Tham Pillai Ministry in Travancore-Cochin State did in Devikulam and Peermede Taluka when Tamilians conducted lawful agitation for the merger of Tamil areas in Madras State. Therefore I urge upon the Government to reconsider the recommendation and do justice to Madras.

It is a well known fact that there are Congress Committees for different linguistic areas as Tamil Nad Congress Committee, Kerala Congress Committee and so on. There has been sustained agitation in Madras State^m for changing the name into Tamil Nad. This genuine aspiration of the Tamils can be satisfied by the Government without prejudice to anybody and at no cost.

Am I to explain the reasons for the disunity between the North and South? Is it not anomalous developing between North India and South India? Are not the complaints by South Indians that the North has always been domi-

nating over the South and now after independence the domination of the North over the South is increasing not only politically but also culturally and linguistically justifiable? This view is fully representative in spirit of the views of crores of the people of South India. Therefore it is the primary duty of the Government to remove the apprehension of South India, otherwise known as Dravidam, which has been patriotically used in the song "Jan Gana....." which has become the National Anthem of our country. Therefore, the Dravidian languages should be taught in North Indian Schools. It is a great thing that the Deputy Home Minister declared in Parliament yesterday that chairs will be founded for Dravidian languages in North Indian Universities. But it is not enough. They should be taught in North Indian Schools as well. I will suggest a formula. Malayalam may be taught in Western India, Kannada in the Central India, Telugu in Eastern India and Tamil in Northern India.

I do not have any objection to the merger of Telengana in Andhra State and formation of Visalandhra. But to avoid any trouble I suggest that a cordial agreement should be effected between the leaders and people of Telengana and Andhra.

The attempt on the part of certain forces to form a separate Bombay City State is a very dangerous one and it will result in great chaos and turmoil. Such formation will be a bad precedent. Bombay naturally belongs to Maharashtra and to deny to Maharashtrians the right over Bombay is to snatch away from them their natural claim.

The last but not the least important question on which I want to express my dispassionate opinion is that relating to the sustained demand of the Punjabi speaking people of Punjab. Their demand for the formation of Punjabi speaking state as they call Punjabi Suba is quite justifiable and unchallengeable. To compel them to remain in a bilingual State is nothing but to compel them to ignore their

mother tongue, culture, etc., and live in a State of serfdom to Hindi. To keep in future India people of two major languages in one and the same State is like keeping snake and mongoose in the same cage.

Shri Bhatkar (Buldana-Akola—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I am in favour of Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay. I was surprised to read the chapter on Vidarbha in States Reorganisation Report. I have tried again and again to understand the reason behind the recommendation of the formation of Vidarbha, but I am sorry to say that I have failed to find any. I do not see any reason for the formation of Vidarbha except that the Commission did not want to give Bombay to Maharashtra.

I am of the firm opinion that the State of Vidarbha as it is proposed today cannot exist independently as far as the financial aspect is concerned. The States Reorganisation Commission Report says that the proposed Vidarbha will be surplus State by Rs. 1½ crores. But the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh says it is a deficit area at present, on which 7% more expenditure than its revenue has to be incurred. Shri Brijlal Biyani, Finance Minister of Madhya Pradesh and who is the leader of the Maha Vidarbha movement, says that this State will be surplus by Rs. 36 lakhs. These contradictory financial figures go to show that the proposed Vidarbha State will not be a surplus one but will become a deficit one.

The population of this State is 76 lakhs and the budget is of Rs. 9 crores. Such small state cannot make any progress and I am sure no development works can be undertaken in such a small State. Again, it is against the Commission's own recommendation of not keeping small States as they exist in the map of India at present.

A great majority of people in Vidarbha are in favour of Maharashtra, 95% of Janapad Sabhas in Vidarbha areas have passed resolutions in favour of Maharashtra and only a handful of people are in favour of separate Vidarbha. The Madhya Pradesh Assembly

[Shri Bhatkar]

has passed a resolution by a great majority in favour of Maharashtra in the last month.

It is therefore reasonable and necessary too, to merge Vidarbha area in the Maharashtra, so as to bring all the Marathi speaking people together. Of course the question of Bombay needs a satisfactory solution. I am of the opinion that Maharashtra has a rightful claim on Bombay City. Geographically, Bombay is situated in the land of Maharashtra and 44% of its population is Marathi speaking leaving Gujrathis at 15% as the second block. The Corporation of Bombay has passed by majority the resolution of Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay. The working Committee of the A.I.C.C., has proposed three state formula keeping Bombay as a separate unit. I welcome this resolution but I will pray that the working Committee should not keep Bombay a separate unit. I am also against the bilingual Bombay proposal of the States Reorganisation Commission. In any case it should not be forced on Maharashtra, as one and all in that area are against it.

Therefore, Sir, I pray to you, and through you to this House, to set aside the proposal of the States Reorganisation Commission in respect of Vidarbha and Bombay and form one Marathi Speaking State of Maharashtra.

Then, there is the question of certain border areas. Whole Taluqs and substantial areas in some districts are Marathi speaking. To state only the most unquestioned areas, I might mention Buranpur, Sansar and parts of the Districts situated along the Satpuras. All these in fairness to the people of those areas must be included in the Maharathi-speaking province. There is also the question of Bastar. Claims to areas in the former Indian State are made by Telangana, Orissa and others. There are also people speaking a language which is a dialect of Marathi. As is wellknown, the former Indian States had no logic

such as the one on which reorganisation is being based. There is a need to break up Bastar area in the same manner as Hyderabad area in the interest of equity and justice to the people of that area.

Shri B. B. Verma (Champanan North): Before I express my views on the recommendations of the S.R.C. for re-adjustment of boundaries between Bihar and West Bengal, I should like to offer a few general remarks on the report of the Commission as a whole. The first thing that strikes any impartial reader of the report is that there is utter lack of uniformity in the proposals formulated by the Commission in respect of different States of the Union. No principles have been uniformly followed for governing the proposed reorganisation of States in the entire country. As for example, the Commission have rejected the principle of "one language one State" and have also admitted that language should not be the sole or even the main basis of reorganisation of States. This view has also been warmly supported by our illustrious leader of this House. But, in several cases, it seems, the Commission have been mainly guided by linguistic considerations. Again, regarding the principle of wishes of the people, I much regret to have to say that while the wishes of the people concerned have weighed with the Commission in considering several proposals relating to Madras, Mysore, Hyderabad, Telangana, Andhra, Vidarbha, Saurashtra and Rajasthan, unfortunately, they have not considered it necessary to take note of the wishes of the people of Bihar or even of the portions of Bihar proposed to be transferred to West Bengal.

As to the grounds for the proposed transfer of certain portions of Bihar to West Bengal, I should like first to deal with the case of Kishanganj Sub-division of Purnea district of Bihar State. The S.R.C. have recommended that the portion of Kishanganj sub-division of the district of Purnea

which is to the east of the river Mahananda along with a portion of the Gopalpur revenue Thana contiguous to, the territory extending down to the national highway in this thana' should be transferred to West Bengal mainly 'in order to provide for geographical contiguity between two disconnected parts of West Bengal. In this connection, I should like to emphasise two points. Firstly, the necessity of provision of geographical contiguity is not so essential as to ignore the express wishes of the people of the area affected, who are pre-dominantly Muslims and are determined not to allow their homes and hearths to be transferred from Bihar. They have got old social and cultural associations with their kinsmen and friends residing in other parts of the district and of the State, and their associations should not be broken unless there is any 'compelling reason' for the same. Secondly, the two parts of West Bengal, viz., northern and southern, are already connected with each other through national highways and railways, which are controlled by the Government of India, and any resident of Bengal passing through Bihar has no reasonable difficulty or inconvenience, as Bihar is not a foreign territory. If, however, the West Bengal Government feel that they have any real difficulty in matters of transport and communication, necessary steps should certainly be taken by the Government of India to provide the people of West Bengal with adequate facilities for the same. The Leader of our House also supported this point of view, in the course of his inspiring speech, the other day, and, I think, we should abide by his wishes.

Regarding the proposed transfer of "the whole of the Sadar Sub-division of Manbhum district minus Chas revenue thana" to West Bengal, the S.R.C. have observed that all the arguments for or against the transfer "are either unimportant or are more or less balanced" except those based on West Bengal getting control over the catchment area of the Kasai river which

should be transferred to West Bengal. I am sorry to point out that the Commission have wrongly assumed that the Kasai river is 'of no real importance from the point of view of Bihar.' It is mainly due to this wrong assumption that they have recommended the transfer of the area to West Bengal. The State Government of Bihar have already finalised a scheme, as a part of their Second Five Year Plan, for constructing a reservoir, about 9 miles east of Purulia, on the Kasai river, at an estimated cost of Rs. 5½ crores, for irrigating about 3 lakh acres of land in Manbhum, while the West Bengal Government propose to utilise the river for the benefit of the people of other areas and not of Manbhum. No transfer of territory from Bihar to West Bengal is needed for this scheme. If, however, any portion of Bihar's territory is required for constructing the dam in question, Bihar should have no objection in lending necessary co-operation, as was done in the case of the D.V.C. Projects or the Mayurakshi Scheme.

Before concluding, I should like to point out that in both the cases, viz. Purnea and Manbhum, the S.R.C. have decided to break the unit of a district, without assigning any 'compelling reason', although they have accepted the principle of not doing so.

The West Bengal leaders are pressing their claims for other parts of Bihar as well, in spite of the fact that the Commission have clearly stated that such claims are altogether untenable. Without going into the details of these claims, I earnestly appeal to the Government of India not to entertain any of them, and to maintain the *Status Quo*, so far as the Bihar-West Bengal boundaries are concerned.

Shri Islamuddin (Purnea North-East): In discussing the S.R.C. report I draw your attention to para 653 of the report. Here the Commission with due enquiry and investigation held that the Kishanganj area is predominantly Muslim. Commission

[Shri Islamuddin]

have fully justified their fears regarding their language and culture and dislocation of their life. I come from Kishanganj area and I fully support the findings of the Commission which is nothing but truth. Not only I, but every individual of Kishanganj area has seen with his own eyes how the Muslims in Darjeeling, Jalpaiguri, Dinajpure and Malda and also in other parts of West Bengal were dislocated from their hearth and home in 1950. In the last Jamiat-al-ma Conference held this year in Calcutta, the President, Molana Hussain Ahmad Mudani, most emphatically declared that thousands and lakhs of Muslims of Calcutta and other parts of West Bengal who were dislocated in 1950 are still on the roads and the refugees from East Pakistan are occupying their houses and mosques and the Government of West Bengal took no steps for the resettlement of those Muslims in their homes and lands. Under these circumstances, and also when the problems of resettlement of refugees from East Bengal is continuing, will any man from Kishanganj area like to go over to West Bengal for a moment. Only some months back, about 4 lakhs of Muslims in Kishanganj expressed their uneasiness and danger in a Conference and gave their verdict that in no case they are prepared to go over to West Bengal. In case Kishanganj area is transferred to West Bengal there will be forced amalgamation, great uneasiness and new minority problem for West Bengal. The progress of the people of that area will be greatly retarded and there will be no functioning of successful democracy. These points have been rightly and forcefully maintained by the Chairman of the Commission in respect of Himachal Pradesh and these points are equally applicable in case of Kishanganj people. Their welfare will be at stake.

The resolution of Government of India under which the Commission was appointed says that the Commission will reorganise the States on the

following grounds namely, language and culture, unity and security of India, financial, economic and administrative consideration, and welfare of the people of each constituent unit and of the nation as a whole. There is no mention in the resolution of Government of India for the consideration of contiguity and corridor and therefore recommendation of Kishanganj area on this basis is beyond the scope of the resolution and cannot be accepted. This point was not mentioned in the resolution because in Indian Union the question of corridor and contiguity was unacceptable and anti-national.

From security point of view, it is almost necessary and desirable that Bihar as strong unit in regard to manpower and resources as compared to West Bengal should not be disturbed on the Indo-Pakistan border, as explained and held by the Commission in para 498 of the report. Regarding administrative consideration, the Chief Minister of Bihar has clearly indicated in his speech in Bihar Assembly the constitutional and administrative frame-work which has also been accepted by the Commission in Para 646 of the report. National highways have been constructed by the Central Government only to give all facilities to West Bengal for their movement to and from North and South Bengal. It is absolutely false that there is any separatist trend in North Bengal and, therefore, the question of contiguity does not arise. In spite of the fact that the Commission has directed West Bengal not to resettle any refugees in Kishanganj area, the Chief Minister Dr. B. C. Roy in his statement in West Bengal Assembly has said that he will resettle refugees in Kishanganj Linguistically the Commission has said that the language of Kishanganj area is Urdu in para 653. Therefore no case for West Bengal to have this area. Danger is great and I have fully explained and I appeal to our High Command and especially to our beloved Prime Minister not to accept

the recommendation of S.R.C. regarding the transfer of Kishanganj area and thus save about 4 lakhs of Muslims from being dislocated as the Commission have themselves pointed out very clearly in para 653.

Shri C. D. Gautam (Balaghat): The Members of the S.R.C. who are high personalities of wide reputation and vast experience, have studied problems from all points of view and have prepared their report after a careful study with an earnest hope that it would meet approbation of all States; but after publication of the report it was seen that great many controversies and strained feelings in various sections came into existence, creating such difficult problems in some States which the people of these States are themselves unable to solve at least at this stage.

Looking to the strained feelings and controversies prevailing in the country, it would have been desirable to retain *status quo* and to give up the idea of giving effect to the report of S.R.C. and of creating States recommended by S.R.C. Though this view is supported by some high personalities in the country, yet, as the matters have very much far advanced, it does not now appear possible to give effect to it. That being so, and now that the prospects of acceptance of the report of S.R.C. are unavoidable, if not fully at least substantially, I express the general view of the people of my Constituency on it. The District Congress Committee, Janpad Sabhas and other representative bodies of the District have also supported the report of the S.R.C. including its recommendation for making Jabalpur as the capital of proposed M.P.

I am of the view that the report of the S.R.C., so far as possible, be accepted by Parliament and the country, giving greatest importance to language where it does not come in conflict with the national unity or larger interests of the country.

So far as the formation of Madhya Pradesh as proposed by the S.R.C. is

concerned, we support it fully including the S.R.C.'s recommendation for making Jabalpur as its capital. There is no case in favour of any State to demand any portion from the proposed M. P. and the people, MLA's and representatives of local bodies and institutions have also with a forceful voice expressed themselves against such demands. Regarding Balaghat district in particular, the demand of certain Maharashtrians for inclusion of certain areas of Balaghat district in Maharashtra or Vidarbha is most unfounded and uncalled for. There are comparatively no Marathi-speaking people in the district worth the name—their proportion being very small—and there is not a single village in the district which is prepared to be included in Maharashtra or Vidarbha. In fact, according to the supplementary memorandum dated 28th September, 1953 submitted by Marathwada Regional Committee of the Samyukta Maharashtra Parishad to the S.R.C. the Maharashtrians have claimed only the eight districts of Vidarbha, namely, Nagpur, Wardha, Chanda, Bhardara, Amravati, Akola, Yeotmal and Buldana. They have claimed no area outside these districts. They have tried to say that Gonds in Balaghat District speak Marathi but it is not correct. Gonds either speak Gondi or Hindi and not Marathi. Also vide Page 69 of the Central Government publication "The Aboriginal problem in the Balaghat District" by Mr. M. V. Grigon, I.C.S. Aboriginal Tribes Enquiry Officer.

Jabalpur has been recommended by S.R.C. as capital of M.P., yet it appears that this place has not found favour with the High Command and probably Bhopal seems to be under their consideration as better place for capital. But the following facts are clearly more in favour of Jabalpur for making it as capital and they deserve consideration:—

(i) population of Jabalpur in 1951 was 256998 and now it is about 3 lakhs whereas that of Bhopal is only 102333;

[Shri C. D. Gautam]

(ii) Convenience of 60 per cent. of population who will be nearer to Jabalpur than to Bhopal including a very large number of Adibasis;

(iii) Better climate;

(iv) Historical and political associations;

(v) Natural surroundings and topography;

(vi) Availability of many buildings;

(vii) Facilities for trade;

(viii) Better communications and transport;

(ix) Better social welfare amenities including Power and Water supply;

(x) Education.

There are 18 colleges including technical ones. This will solve the problem of the Government Servants and others who will be posted or will go there in quite a big number, regarding education of their children. In case of Bhopal, they will be faced with great difficulty and hardship. "Memorandum on the location of the capital of the proposed Madhya Pradesh" by Shri R. S. Shukla submitted to Union Government will make everything clear.

A perusal of map will show that Lalitpur and Jhansi of Uttar Pradesh and Sunel of Rajasthan are enclaves and their inclusion in the proposed M.P. will be very much desirable from all important points of view.

Similarly, Gondia Tehsil of Bhandara District in proposed Vidarbha should be included in Madhya Pradesh as the majority of the people there are Hindi speaking; and the people of Kirnapur and Zanj Parganas of Balaghat district which is in Mahakoshal, have their daily dealings and business at Gondia. Further, the big bazars of Amgaon and Kati in

Gondia tehsil are prospering on account of these tracts of Balaghat district. Moreover, the people of Mahakoshal are required to pass from Balaghat district to Durg or other places of Chattisgarh, which is in Mahakoshal, through Gondia town by road or by rail. There may be different laws of Maharashtra about entry in that town, or in the Maharashtra or Vidarbha State, about import duties, taxes etc. causing further difficulties.

In fact, history tells that Nagpur, Chanda, Bhandara, Chattisgarh, Chhindwara, Gadhamandla etc. were under the rule of Gond Rajas and it will not be out of place to say that the four districts—Nagpur, Chanda, Bhandara and Wardha—which are sought to be included in Vidarbha be also included in Madhya Pradesh with Nagpur as its capital.

So far as Madhya Pradesh is concerned, I support the S.R.C. report including the formation of Jabalpur as its capital, with additions if possible, as proposed above so far as practicable.

श्री जेठन (पालामऊ व हजारीबाग व रांची—रक्षित—अनुसूचित आदिमजातियां) : मैं, बिहार राज्य के आदिवासियों की ओर से पश्चिम बंगाल और उड़ीसा के बिहार सम्बन्धी दावों के विषय में अपने विचार व्यक्त करना चाहता हूँ ।

यह बात सब लोगों को मालूम है कि बिहार-राज्य का दक्षिणी भाग प्रधानतः आदिवासी-क्षेत्र है। आदिवासियों की भाषा, संस्कृति और रहनसहन अन्य लोगों से भिन्न है। आदिवासी लोग देश के अन्य लोगों की अपेक्षा बहुत पिछड़े हुए हैं। वे यह कदापि नहीं चाहते कि उनके क्षेत्र को टुकड़े-टुकड़े किया जाये और अन्य राज्यों के विस्तार के निमित्त उनके सामाजिक एवं आर्थिक जीवन को खिलभिल किया जाये। इसलिए, पश्चिम बंगाल और

उड़ीसा की बिहार सम्बन्धी मांगों पर विचार करने के पूर्व आदिवासियों के दृष्टिकोण पर पूरा ध्यान देना आवश्यक है ।

बिहार में आदिवासी क्षेत्र बहुत विस्तृत है और उनकी संख्या भी लगभग ४० लाख है । बिहार सरकार ने उनकी सुविधा के लिए छोटा नागपुर तथा संताल परगना के क्षेत्रों में विशेष प्रकार के कानून लागू किए हैं जिनसे आदिवासियों को बहुत लाभ है । इस प्रकार के कानून पश्चिम बंगाल और उड़ीसा में प्रचलित नहीं हैं । इसी कारण, बिहार के आदिवासी किसी भी दशा में उन राज्यों में रहना पसन्द नहीं करेंगे । सच्ची बात तो यह है कि उड़ीसा और मध्य प्रदेश में जो देशी राज्य १९४८ ई० में विलीन किए गए, उनमें भी आदिवासियों की प्रधानता है और उन्हें भी बिहार में ही छोटा नागपुर और संताल परगना के साथ रखना चाहिए था । किन्तु खेद की बात है कि भारत-सरकार ने इस बात पर ध्यान न दिया और उक्त आदिवासी क्षेत्रों को विभिन्न राज्यों में विभक्त करना ही उचित समझा । किन्तु अब बिहार के आदिवासी क्षेत्र को खंडित करने की जो कुचेष्टा हो रही है, उसे कदापि प्रोत्साहित न करना चाहिए । उड़ीसा के मयूरभंज, क्योँझर और सुन्दरगढ़ तथा मध्य प्रदेश के जशपुर, गंगपुर, सुरगुजा आदि क्षेत्र न्यायतः बिहार में रहने चाहिए । उन्हें बिहार में न मिला कर, उलटे बिहार के मानभूमि और जिलों को खंडित करना घोर अन्याय होगा ।

सिंहभूमि जिले के सरायकेला और खरसावा क्षेत्र भी आदिवासी-प्रधान हैं । १९४८ ई० में, कुछ मास के लिए भारत सरकार ने उन्हें उड़ीसा सरकार के अधीन रखा था । वहाँ के आदिवासियों ने उक्त व्यवस्था का घोर विरोध किया और अपना विरोध प्रकट करने के लिए, १ जनवरी, १९४८ ई० को, खरसावा में जो बिराट प्रदर्शन किया उसके दमन के लिए उड़ीसा

सरकार ने क्रूरतापूर्वक गोली चलायी और हमारे सैकड़ों निर्दोष आदिवासी मीत के घाट उतारे गए और घायल हुए । इससे जनतन्त्र की घोर उपेक्षा हुई । सरदार पटेल को जब यह बात मालूम हुई, तो उनका दिल हिल गया । उन्होंने पूरी छानबीन की और उड़ीसा तथा बिहार के प्रतिनिधियों के विचारों को सुनकर यह अन्तिम निर्णय किया कि उक्त दोनों राज्य बिहार में ही मिलाए जायें । तदनुसार, मई, १९४८ ई० में उक्त दोनों राज्य बिहार-राज्य के सिंहभूमि जिले में मिला दिए गए । अब उस निर्णय को रद्द कराने की जो चेष्टा उड़ीसा की ओर से हो रही है वह अनुचित और अवांछनीय है । साथ ही, इससे पुनः विद्रोह होने की आशंका है ।

अन्त में, मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि "जनता की इच्छा" के सिद्धान्त के महत्त्व को भारत-सरकार ने तथा राज्य-पुनर्गठन-आयोग ने स्वीकार किया है । मद्रास, मैसूर, आन्ध्र, हैदराबाद, राजस्थान आदि क्षेत्रों के विषय में, अपने सुझाव देते समय आयोग ने स्थानीय जनता की इच्छाओं का ध्यान किया है और तदनुसार अपने सुझावों में हेरफेर किया है । किन्तु न जाने क्यों, बिहार के सम्बन्ध में विचार करते समय, आयोग ने इस महत्त्वपूर्ण सिद्धान्त की उपेक्षा की है । यह उचित नहीं है । मैं भारत-सरकार तथा इस सदन के माननीय सदस्यों से साग्रह अनुरोध करता हूँ कि बिहार के विषय में विचार करते समय स्थानीय जनता की इच्छा पर अवश्य ध्यान दें और विशेषकर बिहार के आदिवासियों के विचारों को ध्यान कर पश्चिम बंगाल और उड़ीसा की मांगों को अविलम्ब स्वीकार कर दें ।

श्रीमती अनुसूयाबाई बोरकर (भंडारा-रक्षित-अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग की रिपोर्ट का मैं स्वागत करती हूँ । इसमें जो सदस्य थे वे इस सदन की अनुमति ले

[श्रीमती प्रनूसूया बाई बोरकर]

ही चुने गये थे और वे बड़े विद्वान थे। इसके अलावा वे निष्पक्षपाती थे। उन्होंने बहुत से स्थानों का दौरा किया और जहां वे जा नहीं सके वहां से उन्होंने मेटिरियल मंगवाया और तब एक स्थान पर बैठ कर जनता की भावना और देश-हित का ख्याल कर उन्होंने अपना रिपोर्ट तैयार किया। जो हमारे सामने प्रस्तुत किया गया कि हम अपनी राय दें। जब से रिपोर्ट तैयार हुआ, तब से हमारे देश में एक प्रकार से गरम वातावरण उपस्थित हो गया जो देश हित में बाधक है।

दूसरे प्रान्तों के विषय में जितनी अच्छी तरह से उस प्रान्त के लोग बता सकेंगे उतना शायद मैं नहीं बता सकूंगी। मैं केवल विदर्भ पर ही बताऊंगी। रिपोर्ट में विदर्भ का स्वतंत्र प्रान्त बनाया जाना चाहिए ऐसा कहा गया है। हमारे महाराष्ट्र के भाइयों को ये मंजूर नहीं है और उन्होंने इसके ऊपर बहुत आन्दोलन किया, धमकियां दीं। तब उनको दिल्ली बुला कर ये कहा गया कि अगर रिपोर्ट मंजूर नहीं करते तो गुजरात, सौराष्ट्र और विदर्भ सहित त्रिभाषी बम्बई राज्य स्वीकार करो। इस पर उनकी एक बैठक हुई और प्रस्ताव मंजूर कर लिया गया। मगर गुजरात के भाइयों ने जब कहा कि ये विदर्भ की शक्ति लेकर हम पर शासन करेंगे, हम मिलना नहीं चाहते, तब जनमत का आदर कर उन्हें अलग कर दिया गया। फिर संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के भाई अपनी पहली मांग पर अड़ गये। वकिंग कमेटी या हार्ड कमाण्ड ने अब यह कहा कि विदर्भ को महाराष्ट्र में मिलाया जाये मगर वहां के लोगों की राय जान ली जाये तथा उनको महाराष्ट्र में आने के लिए निर्मजित किया जाये। इससे स्पष्ट ही पता चलता है कि वकिंग कमेटी तथा हार्ड कमाण्ड विदर्भ के स्वतंत्र अस्तित्व को मंजूर करते हैं मगर

महाराष्ट्र के उपद्रवों के कारण उन्होंने ऐसा निर्णय दिया। मैंने अपनी कन्स्टिट्यूएन्सी का दौरा किया तो मुझे पता चला कि सारा जनमत विदर्भ के पक्ष में है। भंडारा-नागपुर की सब जनता यही चाहती है। केवल बरार से दो-तिहाई लोग विदर्भ की मांग को पसन्द करते हैं। इसके सिवा मध्य प्रदेश असेम्बली में जो भाषण हुए उससे पता चलता है कि ८३ सदस्यों में से ५८ विदर्भ के पक्ष में हैं। जनमत के हिसाब से अगर देखा जाये तो जैसे बम्बई और गुजरात अलग किये गये वैसे ही विदर्भ भी अलग हो सकता है। प्रश्न ये है जब गुजरात बम्बई तथा विदर्भ कोई मिलना ही नहीं चाहता तब संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र बन कैसे सकता है। जबरदस्ती उनको मिलाना या हमारे में आकर मिल जाओ यह कहना जनता के दिल पर आक्रमण करने के समान है। बम्बई में हुए उपद्रवों से तो ऐसा लगता है कि जनमत संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र की मांग के साथ नहीं था तभी तो उन्होंने किकर्तव्यविमूढ़ होकर ऐसा कदम उठाया और सो भी ऐसे वक्त में जब सारा देश एक विदेशी मेहमान का स्वागत करने में लगा हुआ था। किसी को ये कल्पना भी नहीं थी कि इस प्रकार का उपद्रव कर भारत के उज्ज्वल कीर्ति पर कलंक लगाया जायेगा। हमारे लैडकर साहब ने यह कहा है कि मध्य प्रदेश के मुख्य मंत्री ने यह कहा है कि विदर्भ घाटे का प्रान्त है। मुख्य मंत्री ने मध्य भारत के मुख्य मंत्री श्री तस्तमल जैन को केवल आंकड़े पेश किये जिसे तोड़ मरोड़ कर ऐसा अर्थ निकाला गया। मुख्य मंत्री ने दूसरे दिन अपने बक्तव्य में स्पष्ट कहा कि मेरे शब्दों का ऐसा अर्थ निकालना गलत है विदर्भ घाटे का प्रान्त नहीं है। इसके सिवाय प्रान्त के वित्त मंत्री द्वारा अपने भाषण में स्पष्ट आंकड़े दिये गये हैं जो झूठे नहीं कहे जा सकते हैं क्योंकि सब बातों का उन्हें ख्या

हिसाब देना पड़ता है। मान लीजिए अगर विदर्भ घाटे का प्रान्त ही है तो क्यों उसे मिलाना चाहते हैं, मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। दूसरी बात जो खेडकर साहब ने कही वह यह कि रिपोर्ट में लिखा है कि विदर्भ का संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र में विलयन करने से विदर्भ में भी जातीयवाद फैल जावेगा। मैं आपको बता दूँ कि विदर्भ की मांग बहुजन समाज की मांग है, किसी एक जाति की मांग नहीं है। जब से रिपोर्ट प्रकाशित हुई तब से हमारे संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के एक भाई श्री खरे ने उपद्रव करने के साथ जनता पर यहां तक आरोप किया है कि जिनके पूर्वज यहां के रहने वाले नहीं हैं जो दूसरे प्रान्तों से आकर यहां बसे हैं और जिनकी मातृभाषा मराठी नहीं है तथा उनको क्या हक है कि मराठी भाषी जिलों की मांग करें। इससे पता चलता है कि जातीयवाद कहां है। विदर्भ छोटा है मगर एरिया में नवनिमित्त केरल और पश्चिमी बंगाल से बड़ा है। किसी प्रान्त का महत्व उसके छोटे-बड़े पर नहीं, उसकी समृद्धि और उन्नति पर होता है। पर जनता कैसे इन पर विश्वास करे? पहले एक भाषा और एक प्रान्त की मांग की गयी थी, फिर द्विभाषी बम्बई राज्य भी स्वीकार करने को प्रस्तुत हो गये। इससे पता चलता है कि अपनी खुद की मांग के साथ ही ये कैसा विश्वासघात करते हैं। अगर द्विभाषी बम्बई राज्य ही स्वीकार कर सकते हैं तो कमीशन के प्रस्तावित द्विभाषी राज्य को क्यों नहीं स्वीकार कर लेते। साथ ही अकोला पैक्ट भी किया गया था जिसमें दोनों को बराबरी का हक रहेगा। ऐसा संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र नहीं बन सका तो महाविदर्भ का स्वतंत्र प्रान्त बनाने में हम मदद करेंगे। इस चीज को तो आंखों के सामने से बिलकुल भुला दिया गया है। कोरे कागज पर सही करने को तैयार हैं। जब लिखे कागज की सही को महत्व नहीं दे सकते तब कोरे कागज की सही

को कितना महत्व दिया जायेगा। हमारे खेडकर साहब ने कहा कि हम भूखे रहेंगे मगर मिलकर रहेंगे। अगर ऐसा ही था तो नागपुर पैक्ट करने की आवश्यकता क्या थी, विदर्भ पर छींटें उड़ाने की क्या आवश्यकता थी। जनता को ठीक ये समझाया जाकर उन को मिलाया जा सकता था। अकोला करार रद्दी की टोकरी में डाला गया है तब इस नागपुर करार की कौन शाश्वती दे सकता है। नागपुर करार में कहा गया है कि यहां के लोगों को जनसंख्या के हिसाब से नौकरी में प्रतिनिधित्व देंगे। हाईकोर्ट की एक बेंच देंगे और एक सेशन भी यहां रखेंगे। हाई कोर्ट नागपुर में पूरा है। एक बेंच क्या करेंगे? जहां ३ सेशन होते हैं वहां एक ही सेशन कौन स्वीकार करेगा? जो नागपुर सारी हलचलों का केन्द्र रह चुका है और व्यापारिक तथा भौगोलिक और एतिहासिक दृष्टि से जिसका बहुत बड़ा महत्व है, बनी बनायी राजधानी है और राजधानी के अनुकूल वातावरण तथा सभी चीजें यहां हैं, उसका महत्व भी कम करना चाहते हैं। हमको दे क्या रहे हैं? सभी लेना चाहते हैं। मिलने के पहले बंटवारा भी कर चुके हैं। अब मिलना कैसा? दिल से तो नहीं मिल सकते हैं।

रिपोर्ट में कहे अनुसार विदर्भ भले ही छोटा होगा मगर उन्नतिशील होगा। इसको मिलाया न जावे तथा नागपुर राजधानी का महत्व किसी प्रकार कम न होने पाये। इतना स्थल हाईकमाण्ड रखे।

श्री बी० एन० मालवीय (शाजापुर-राजगढ़-रहित-अनुसूचित जातियां) : मुझे अत्यन्त हर्ष है कि सदन में राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग की रिपोर्ट पर चल रहे वाद-विवाद में भाग लेकर अपने विचार प्रकट करने का अवसर प्राप्त हुआ। पहले तो मैं आयोग द्वारा जो मध्य भारत, विन्ध्य प्रदेश, भोपाल त

[श्री बी० एन० मालवीय]

मध्य प्रदेश को मिला कर एक विशाल मध्य प्रदेश बनाने का दिया गया है उसमें मैं सहर्ष स्वागत करता हूँ क्योंकि अभी तक छोटी छोटी इकाइयों में ये प्रदेश छोटे टुकड़ों में बंट हुए थे जिससे प्रान्तीयता की भावना जागृत होती थी और इससे हरिजन तथा आदिवासियों की शक्ति पृथक-पृथक बिखरी हुई थी वही शक्ति इस प्रान्त निर्माण के पश्चात् केन्द्रित होकर हरिजन आदिवासियों का पूर्ण रूप से प्रतिनिधित्व उनके विकास कार्य हेतु होता रहेगा। इस प्रान्त पुनर्निर्माण से मध्य भारत के हरिजन आदिवासी पूर्ण रूप से प्रसन्न हैं और वे इस बात के लिए अति प्रसन्न हैं कि हमारे लिए वह स्वर्ण अवसर अब निकट आ गया है कि हम भूखे, गरीब, दीन-हीन बेध बार तथा बेरोजगार हरिजन आदिवासियों को जो अधिकार हमारी सरकार देती है, वे अब साकार रूप में प्रत्यक्ष देखे सकेंगे और हमारे हक जैसे शिक्षा, सरविस, भूमिहीनों को भूमि तथा सामाजिक समान अधिकार मन्दिर प्रवेश आदि मिलने में आगामी नव निर्मित मध्य प्रदेश सफल सिद्ध होगा और, ज्यादा से ज्यादा हरिजनों को सुविधा देकर उन्हें सन्तोष मिलेगा।

वर्तमान मध्य भारत में रहते हुए हमें ६ वर्षों के करीब हो गये हैं किन्तु कोई भी विकास तथा उनके जीवन में परिवर्तन नहीं हो पाया। गांव गांव में असन्तोष की आवाज सुनायी दे रही है और वे अपने जीवन से निराश हैं क्योंकि उन्हें देहाती इलाके में साम्प्रदायिक भृत्ति के सवर्ण कहलाने वाले कुलमी, राजपूत, सैंधों, घाकड़, गलोद, जाट, काती आदि जाति के लोग बुरी तरह से सताते हैं, मारते-पीटते हैं, जबर्नू बेगार लेते हैं और बेगार के नाम से जो जमीन है उसे भी छीन रहे हैं। मध्य भारत सरकार ने जो गत समय में आकरामा कानून पास किया है न उसे लागू

होने देते हैं। कई गांवों में हरिजन को कपड़े व जेवर नहीं पहनने देते हैं। हरिजन डूल्हा को घोड़े पर चढ़ने नहीं देते। आज भी कस्बों के होटलों पर हरिजन को चाय नहीं मिलती है। हरिजनों का बहिष्कार करते हैं जिससे हरिजनों में त्राहि त्राहि फैली हुई है, और उनकी कोई फरियाद नहीं सुनता है। बड़े राज्य के निर्माण से संकुचित व साम्प्रदायिक भावनाएं निश्चित तौर पर दूर हो जायेंगी। प्रान्त के नव निर्माण से हरिजन बहुत ही खुश हैं, यह मैं सदन को बताना चाहता हूँ और मैं आगामी नये मध्य प्रदेश के प्रति आशा करता हूँ कि हरिजन आदिवासियों को ज्यादा से ज्यादा हरिजन सुधार कार्य पर ध्यान देते हुए उनके हक दिलाने में अग्रसर होगा। यह ही मेरे सुझाव हैं। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं मध्य-प्रदेश का हार्दिक स्वागत करता हूँ।

श्री पी० एल० बाबुलाल (गंगानगर—
ईशानू—रक्षित—अनुसूचित जातियां) : राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग ने जो सुझाव हमारी सरकार को प्रान्तों के पुनर्निर्माण के लिए दिया है मैं उसकी सराहना करता हूँ। इस विषय पर सात दिन से लगातार चर्चा चल रही है। इस पर बोलने वाले हर सदस्य ने अपने अपने ढंग से राज्यों के पुनर्गठन के विषय में चर्चा की। और इस बीच मैं जब मैंने कई लोगों की संकुचित भावना को देखकर बड़ा ही आश्चर्य हुआ। हमें पता लग गया कि जो लोग अपने आपको उदार कहते थे तथा अपने आपको त्यागी और दानी कहते थे उन देशभक्तों का पता लग गया कि वे कितनी दृढ़ तक देशभक्त तथा त्यागी हैं। आज जब मैं देखता हूँ कि एक एक गांव के लिए यहां संसद् में बुद्धि-युद्ध हो रहा है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब हम यह मानते हैं कि सारा भारतवर्ष हमारा है तो हम सबको यह मानकर चलना चाहिए कि हम एक जिले व गांवों की छोटी छोटी बातों

को लेकर ऐसी कटुता पैदा न करें जिससे कि हमारे देश में साम्प्रदायिकता और जातीयता और प्रान्तीयता की भावना न उभरे। राज्य पुनर्गठन के विषय में मैं अपना सुझाव आपके द्वारा हमारी सरकार एवं संसद के सामने प्रकट करना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि जब हम भारत में राज्यों का पुनर्निर्माण करने जा रहे हैं तो हमें सारे भारत के नक्शे को एक उदार हृदय से बदलना पड़ेगा। इसमें हमें यह नहीं देखना है कि किस प्रान्त का हिस्सा किस प्रान्त में मिलाया जा रहा है, क्योंकि सारा भारत हमारा है और जो कुछ हम कर रहे हैं वह देश को सुदृढ़ बनाने के लिए कर रहे हैं और किसी प्रान्त के हिस्से को किसी अन्य प्रान्त में देश की भलाई के लिए मिलाया जा रहा है और उसके लिए अगर कोई अपने निजी स्वार्थ के लिए शोर मचाते हैं तो उनको मचाने दो, क्योंकि वह हिस्सा कोई पाकिस्तान में थोड़ा ही मिलाया जा रहा है। मेरा तो यह बड़ा विश्वास है और मान्यता है कि अगर देश को आर्थिक, सामाजिक और राजनैतिक दृष्टि से मजबूत बनाना है तो प्रान्तों का विशाल होना अनिवार्य है। अगर हम सब लोग साथ मिल कर रहेंगे तो उससे हम लोग एक दूसरे से कुछ सीखेंगे और हमारे अन्दर बन्धुत्व की भावना बढ़ेगी और आज जो लोग भाषा के नाम से जो प्रान्तों की बातें करते हैं, उसके अन्दर साम्प्रदायिकता, प्रान्तीयता एवं जातीयता नजर आती है। जब अन्य राष्ट्रों के बड़े बड़े विद्वान आज विश्व-सरकार बनाने की योजना बनाने जा रहे हैं और सौभाग्य से इस सिद्धान्त को सारे राष्ट्र मान लेंगे, तो उस समय सारे भारत को हमें एक ही प्रान्त का रूप देना पड़ेगा। तो अगर भाषा के आधार पर आप प्रान्तों के पुनर्निर्माण को प्रमुखता देते हैं तो मैं यह कहे बिना नहीं रह सकता कि मध्य भारत को जो मध्य प्रदेश में मिलाया है तो उसका उत्तरी-पश्चिमी हिस्सा राजस्थान में मिलाना

चाहिए क्योंकि हमारी और उनकी संस्कृति वंशभूषा और भाषा व रहन-सहन एक है। इतना ही नहीं, जो मध्य भारत से चंबल नदी राजस्थान में प्रवेश कर रही है तो इसलिए वह हिस्सा उसमें मिला दिया जाये तो प्रसार की दृष्टि से उस पर एक ही सरकार के अन्तर्गत काफी अच्छी व्यवस्था की जा सकती है। सिर्फ इसी तरह पंजाब की सब-तहसील लोहारू तथा पेप्पू राज्य का जिला महेन्द्रगढ़ भी राजस्थान में मिलाना चाहिए, क्योंकि उनका रहन-सहन, खान-पान वंशभूषा और संस्कृति राजस्थान के साथ मिलती जुलती है पंजाब से नहीं। सरसा और भाबोर तो बिलकुल ही राजस्थान के जैसा एक भ्रंग है।

अजमेर और भाबू की पुनः राजस्थान में मिलाने की जो आयोग ने सिफारिश की है, इसको मैं विशेष महत्व नहीं देता क्योंकि अजमेर राजस्थान का हृदय है और वह उसके बिना शून्य था। भाबू भी राजस्थान का अभिन्न भ्रंग था इसके लिए तो मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि जैसे संत कबीर ने कहा है :

मेरा मुझ को कुछ नहीं, जो कुछ है सो तोई ।
तेरा तुझ को सौंपते, क्या लागत है मोई ॥

अब मैं हिमाचल प्रदेश के विषय में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ कि १९५४ में मैंने हिमाचल प्रदेश का दौरा किया था। वहाँ मैं विशुद्ध हृदय पहाड़ी लोगों से मिला। मुझे महसूस हुआ कि यहाँ के लोग कितने खल-कपट रहित व सरल स्वभाव व ईमानदार हैं। अगर ऐसे लोगों को पंजाब के इलाके में मिला दिया जाय तो उनकी बही हालत होगी जैसा कि कल हरियाना के सदस्य ने बताया। ऐसे पिछड़े हुए इलाकों का उत्थान ही करना है तो उत्तर प्रदेश का जो पहाड़ी इलाका जो हिमाचल प्रदेश के साथ लगता है, उसको हिमाचल प्रदेश में मिला कर क्यों न प्रगतिशील बनाव जाय ?

[श्री पी० एल० बाबूपाल]

राज्य पुनर्गठन का विषय कोई छोटा नहीं है। यह विषय भारत की महानतम समस्याओं में से एक महत्वपूर्ण समस्या है। इसको सुलझाने में हमें पूर्ण विवेक और शान्तिमय तरीकों को काम में लेना चाहिए चाहे इसमें देर बेसक लग जाये।

Shri Lakshmayya (Anantpur): While supporting the proposals of the States Reorganisation Commission, I would like to make a few observations. At the very outset, let me pay my humble tribute to the members of the Commission for having produced such a historic document. The Andhra State has made several claims over some portions of adjoining States, namely, claim over Hosur in Salem District and Parlakamedi and Koraput in Ganjam District and the District of Kolar and some portions in Tumkur and Chitaldrug districts. But unfortunately, all our claims were overlooked by the Commission on some principle or the other. I am happy that they have recommended at least two proposals—one in regard to the transfer of Bellary, Hospet, Siriguppa and Mallapuram Sub-taluk where the Tungabhadra Project and its head-works are situated and, second, the formation of 'Vishal Andhra'. We are thankful to the decision taken by the Working Committee and the statement made by our beloved Prime Minister in the House in regard to the formation of Vishal Andhra. Andhras as a whole would rejoice and in particular, the people of the Ceded Districts who were ceded by the Nizam of Hyderabad in the year 1801, I am sure, would feel very happy for joining the Telugus of Telangana. Joining after long separation is really a pleasant and happy thing. In respect of the second proposal with regard to Bellary, Siriguppa and other areas, there is a lot of controversy. My hon'ble friend Shri Nijalingappa for whom I have great regard as the architect of Samyukta Karnatak has said in the course of his speech that it was a *gala* day for all the Kannadigas when Bellary and six taluks were merged with

Mysore State in October, 1953. But I tell you that it was a most unhappy occasion for the people of Rayalaseema. The other day when the SRC report was announced in the papers, Andhras in general and the people of Rayalaseema in particular celebrated a grand festival, a festival of 'Vijaya Dashami' like Ramleela for getting back a precious jewel which is nearest and dearest to their heart, namely, the Tungabhadra Project and Bellary.

My hon. friend from Mysore constituency has spoken in the course of the debate that Bellary is a girl tied with Mysore two years back and she cannot be returned. I want to tell my friend that Bellary being the elder sister does not want to separate the other sisters, namely, Anantapur, Cud-dapah Kurnool and Chittoor and she has come back. Temporarily she was kidnapped. Luckily she was recovered. The epic-famed Sita or Janaki was brought back after one year, but here Bellary after two years. That is the only difference.

Shri Nijalingappa in the course of his speech referring to the waters of 'Tungabhadra' and their interest in the Ayacut in the Tungabhadra Project quoted some figures which are misleading and compared it to the 'tail wagging the dog'. That is why we are urging that tail must be converted into a head, that is to say, that we should have full control on the southern side canals under the Tungabhadra project. To use the same phrase of my hon'ble friend I may quote one instance. In the District of Kolar, if District is taken as a unit, the Telugu speaking population is admittedly 54 percent while the Kannadigas form only 24 percent. If the taluks are taken as units Telugu population is 69 percent whereas Kannadigas form only 17 percent. Is not the tail wagging the dog there, I ask my hon. friend? We can cite several of such instances, but on the principle of administrative convenience and economic links Kolar district has been recommended to be annexed with Mysore State.

My hon. friend Shri Subramaniam argued the case of Bellary very ably and efficiently. He is a good lawyer no doubt, but I am sorry to state that all the points raised by him are not fresh. They have been pressed before the Commission, and the Commission, whose members are widely reputed for their impartiality and integrity have decided the case on merits. I may submit to the House one instance. Supposing a case was decided by the District Court in favour of 'A'. That decision was upheld by the High Court. Further, appeal was preferred and in the appeal a single judge of the Supreme Court upheld the decision of the lower court. Supposing on a point of law if the full Bench of the Supreme Court sits over the judgment and decides reversing it, is not the decision valid, I ask? In the case of Bellary also the three members have entered into the merits of the case and taking into account several facts, have made this proposal. How can we say that those proposals cannot be accepted? The terms of reference are wider for the States Reorganisation Commission. The principle of language alone was not considered and several factors like administrative convenience and economic links and the importance of Tungabhadra project were taken into consideration and they have decided in favour of Andhra State. My hon. friends from Karnataka are very clever and intelligent. Wherever Kannada population is in majority, they urge the language test to suit their case, but for those parts where Kannada population is in minority they speak about the wish of the people. How can you blow hot and cold in the same breath? Wherever the proposals of the S.R.C. are in their favour they appreciate the decision of the S.R.C. and at the same time if the proposals of S.R.C. are not in their favour they criticise. I ask my friends in view of the amendment moved by Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy in the Mysore Legislative Assembly in the course of the debate on the S.R.C. that the Telugu portions in Mysore State should be merged with Andhra

534 L.S.D.—14.

State, "Is not the wish of the people prevalent there?" Perhaps they think, the wish of the Kannadigas alone is the wish of the people. Further, I may tell the House that one M.L.A. from Mysore has written to me that the fate of the Telugus would be miserable if at all those Telugu portions are merged with Mysore State. What more do we require to assess the wish of the people in Mysore State. I request the members of the House to look into the para 231 of the S.R.C. report where it is said that "after very serious consideration we have decided to recommend the exclusion of the portion of Bellary District along the course of the Tungabhadra from Karnataka and its transfer to the Andhra State...". It is only after giving due weight to the important pronouncement made by the Government and careful examination of the merits and demerits of the different proposals that they have come to the conclusion that the changed proposal is desirable.

Bellary is the premier town of Rayalaseema. A sudden snatching of old association has resulted in a great deal of hardship to the people of this town. Therefore, in the interests of this prosperous town, it should be transferred to Andhra State.

In regard to the Tungabhadra Project, this is a life-line of Rayalaseema. We are not for territorial aggrandisement or expansion. We want this project for the sake of food and drinking water for the people of Rayalaseema. Rayalaseema is subjected to periodic famines. The devastating effects of famine in 1951-52 are still fresh in the minds of this House. It is not that, that land in Rayalaseema is not fertile. It is fertile, the Ryots are very hard-working and industrious, but our agriculture is a gamble in rains. We have to depend upon precarious monsoon which always fails and rarely favours. On account of that the Rayalaseema Development Board thought of this Tungabhadra Project to eradicate famine in Raya-

[Shri Lakshmayya]

laseema by providing irrigation facilities and to give facilities of drinking water to a number of villages in this unfortunate area of Rayalaseema. It is an irony of fate that the Project at the time of its completion passed into the hands of the Mysore State by the transfer of Bellary and other taluks in the year 1953. Mysore Government all along prevented the inauguration of Tungabhadra project for over forty years and placed a number of obstacles in the way of construction. Luckily, it was inaugurated in the year 1944, but after it went to the hands of Mysore State. Andhra Government has been experiencing considerable difficulties in pushing through the scheme. This is the only main supply of water and power to Rayalaseema. Rayalaseema is badly in need of hydro-electric power for industrial development and agricultural purposes. You are aware, Sir, the Mysore Government has surplus power and they are selling it to Bombay, Madras and Andhra. Therefore, they have no interest in pushing through the hydro-electric scheme. Their share in this project is only 20 percent and the interest of Andhra State in hydro-electric power is 80 percent. Therefore, we are more particular about its completion.

Next, coming to the interests in water, we the people of Rayalaseema want that the water in Tungabhadra project should be rationed in four famine districts of Rayalaseema. Therefore, we want complete control over the two canals, that is, low and high level canals on the southern side. It does not mean that they are completely denied. They have got half share in the water. They will have full control over the canal on the northern side, that is, Hyderabad side, which would irrigate 4½ lakhs of acres in Raichur district which was recommended to be annexed to Karnatak. If Andhra gets Alampur and Gadwal, an area of one lakh of acres would come to Andhra. Andhra Government will not interfere with their control over the northern side of the

canal but what we want is the full control over the high level and the low level canals on the southern side. If this is denied, Rayalaseema has no salvation. The three members of the Commission, like the Gods of Trinity—*Brahma, Vishnu, Mahesh*—have given this rice bowl to the famished people. It is said by the hon. Members that the River Board Bill and Inter-State Water Dispute Bill would facilitate to settle the disputes in river waters and its localisation of the schemes; but I may ask the House, is it desirable to invite the disease and make one suffer in view of the contemplation of the best medicine under preparation. Prevention is better than cure. The Commission has rightly said in regard to the difficulties of the working of the Tungabhadra Project Board that the chances of friction with regard to the Tungabhadra project will be minimised if it is transferred to the Andhra State. Lastly, with malice towards none and charity for all and firmness in right of existence, I make an appeal to the Government and to this august House to accept the proposal of the S.R.C. I request my Kannadiga friends to be charitable, liberal and noble. Ours is a cry for bare existence. After all what is it they are losing? Only two lakhs of Kannadigas in the bilingual area of Bellary, Hospet, and Singuppa who have been all along with us; and who are cordial with us will be left to the Andhra State. I may tell the House that 5 million people of Rayalaseema would be brought to ruin for the sake of the two lakhs of Kannadigas living in that area. When we are leaving the fate of 20 lakhs of Andhras who live in Mysore State on the border districts in their hands, cannot they leave two lakhs of their Kannadiga friends to the Andhra State? I appeal to the Government and this August House not to snatch away the rice bowl or morsel of food namely the Tungabhadra project and head-works from the hands of the poor and famished people of Rayalaseema which has been graciously gifted by the S.R.C. I request the Government to accept this proposal in toto.

Dr. Amin (Baroda West): The States Reorganisation Commission's Report is a historic document which should command respect and study. After all, we have to broaden our outlook and mental frontiers. But, unfortunately, this Report has aroused much passion and controversy all over the country. In all our actions the unity of the country and the dignity of the nation should be the main consideration. The interests of one section or group should not be allowed to over-ride the interest of the nation as a whole. We must think of India as a whole and not India in terms of Maharashtra, Gujarat, Punjab and the rest of it.

The Commission recommended the creation of a bilingual state of Bombay. But this is not acceptable to our Maharashtrian friends. So the only alternative, as suggested by the Congress Working Committee, is the formation of three States namely Maharashtra, Gujarat and Bombay City. To my mind this is the only just and practical approach to the whole question regarding Bombay State and this should be acceptable to all concerned.

Following the Congress Working Committee's resolution, suggesting the formation of three states, certain events took place in Bombay city. Demonstrations were staged, inflammatory speeches were made by certain irresponsible politicians and public feelings were aroused with the result that the normal life of this peace-loving city was paralysed and considerable damage was caused to public property. We cannot achieve anything by threats or demonstrations. To achieve anything one must have a just and proper case because only unjust, improper and wrong cases required the help of demonstrations and threats. The only result that these demonstrations and threats produced was to strengthen the feeling of suspicion and distrust amongst the other language groups of Bombay State about the good intentions of Maharashtra and they now feel that

they will not receive fair and impartial treatment in a Bilingual State of Bombay. So the only alternative is to divide the state into three separate states of Gujarat, Maharashtra and Bombay City. This solution is the best solution under the present circumstances and has received the greatest measure of support. The Congress Working Committee deserves to be congratulated for suggesting a just and practical solution for a difficult problem.

Some sections in Maharashtra are opposed to the formation of a separate State of Bombay City and passionately plead for its inclusion in Maharashtra. According to the 1951 census the Maharashtrians are still in a minority being only 43.6 per cent. of the population. It is unwise to include a multilingual cosmopolitan city into an unilingual State. Besides, it is for the people of Bombay to decide whether they should join Maharashtra or remain as an independent unit. The problem of the city of Bombay is not an issue between Maharashtra and Gujarat. It is a matter of national importance and national interest. The States Reorganisation Commission has rightly stated:

"After taking into account the mixed population of the city, the fact that its future development depends on the co-operation of different language groups and the view and apprehensions of the minor language groups even though these may appear to be exaggerated, we have come to the conclusion that its special position should be recognised".

The Commission further observes:

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

These weighty arguments of the Commission in regard to the special

[Dr. Amin]

position of Bombay city cannot be overlooked. The Dar Commission has rightly observed:

"The best fortune that we can see for the city of Bombay is that it should continue, as it is to-day, the meeting place of all communities, their source of pride and affection and a convenient centre for joint labour and enterprise. It will be incongruous to make this multi-lingual cosmopolitan city the capital of a uni-lingual province".

The J.V.P. Committee has also observed:

"We feel that it should be stated clearly and emphatically that Greater Bombay will not become just a part of a purely linguistic province and that if such linguistic provinces are formed out of the present Bombay Province, the area of Greater Bombay will have to be constituted as a separate unit."

The 56 per cent. non-Maharashtrians of Bombay do not wish to join with Maharashtra and there is no special reason why the wishes of the majority of the population should not be respected.

I, therefore, favour the three States formula as suggested by the Congress Working Committee regarding Bombay State and strongly advocate the formation of a separate State of Gujarat with Baroda as its capital. Baroda city was the capital of the former Baroda State which was the most resourceful and progressive State. It is a centre of art, education, culture, literature etc. and represents the great traditions of Gujarat. Its vast office buildings which were previously used by the Government of the former Baroda State could be utilised by the Government of Gujarat State at no extra cost. Its geographical situation and the climatic conditions also justify the selection of Baroda as the capital of the proposed Gujarat State. After thorough and careful consideration of the question regarding capital of Gujarat State I feel convinced that Baroda fulfils all the conditions for being the capital of the proposed Gujarat State and the Government will

give just and proper consideration to Baroda's claim for being the capital of the proposed Gujarat State.

Shri Wodeyar (Shimoga): I am glad I have an opportunity to express myself and submit my views to this House. I am one of those who have been since my early age thinking in terms of having a Karnataka State. Even as a student, I went upto Mysore for my studies and remained outside for quite a few years. This enabled me to study the various regions in India and after having my experience outside, it is my confirmed conviction that people cannot progress unless they have their own democratic linguistic set up. I do not mean thereby that there should be any sort of animosity or adverse feeling towards our neighbours. If democracy has to serve really the interest of the people and if the voice of the representatives can be really heard, it could be only done in the mother-tongue.

Kannadigas in India having been dispersed in various Governments had no opportunity to think, act and to organise together. This has resulted in a sort of lop-sided development in the various areas whereas Mysore in spite of its comparatively poorer soil and unsatisfactory economic conditions resulting there from has made considerable head-way in the matter of utilising even lesser resources of the State for industrial development, whereas outside Mysore, in spite of definitely better industrial resources, very few industries have been developed. I had also an opportunity to study in some detail the economic and other aspects when as a Member of a Sub-Committee appointed by the Mysore State Congress. We toured the entire Karnataka parts outside Mysore. Of that Committee, Shri Channiah, the present President of the Pradesh Congress Committee was one. We made a unanimous decision after our tour and a fairly good study of the areas outside, that it would be to the interest of all Kannadigas or Kannada-speaking people to have one administration. I am very happy that the time has

now come for the realisation of that ideal for which every Kannadiga both inside Mysore and outside has been yearning for. The greatest problem now is the question of fixing up of our boundaries. It is a historic fact that after the down-fall of Tippu, Kannada areas were scattered about and were distributed in the various Governments. In the northern part of Karnataka, during the rule of the Peshwas, a number of small principalities were established which resulted in Kannada people having about 19 very small administrations. The Rulers were all Maharashtrians who insisted on their own language becoming the State language; so much so, in the present Districts of Dharwar, Belgaum and Bijapur and areas in the north, the influence of Maharashtra made itself felt in various ways. It would be interesting to note that during the last 50 years and more, when we have got the Census recorded, we find that during every Census the Maharashtrian language has been making in-roads and encroaches on Kannada area by at least 5 to 10 miles every year. It is thus that you find that in the present Sholapur, Kolhapur Districts and round about, people, though they speak Kannada at home, are being educated in Marathi, so much so, their development has considerably suffered and percentage of literacy has not increased at all. Similar factors have also existed in the East and North East in our relations with the Andhra people. There also the Andhra influence has been responsible for the encroachment of Telugu language on Kannada areas. It is significant also that in these areas the officials also were Maharashtrians and Andhras respectively. Similar considerations also prevail with regard to South where the Tamilians both on account of their influence and official position encroached upon the Kannada area. On account of this shrinkage as it were, people are often astonished when we make claims to areas which though in fact are our own have come under these various influences and where the Kannada language has been relegated to the secondary posi-

tion and only remains to be spoken at home in the family. This unfortunate position has not only dwindled the Karnataka area but also its influence. It is against this encroachment and repression of the Kannada language that we have during the last 40 years been fighting for the establishment of a Karnataka State wherein all Kannadigas can come together and develop themselves. Let me make it quite plain that while I am urging for the formation of the Karnataka State, I am doing so not in any parochial or narrow spirit. I am doing so, as I am convinced that each State can develop to its fullest stature only if it can democratically function and it can be so done only through the mother-tongue.

As the Constitution stands, it is impossible for any State to break away or to become in any manner independent. Every Indian feels that he is an Indian first and they only think in terms of his own either Karnataka, Andhra, Tamil or any other State. I am convinced that it would lead to a better integration than by having multi-lingual State where each linguistic group fights against others thereby leads to dis-harmony and non-development.

Having said so, I would like to mention that this House should very carefully go into the question of our borders. Apart from the areas which have been recommended to be included by the S.R.C. in Karnataka, I would urge the following to be included in Karnataka State.

First and foremost among those areas is the area including Bellary, Sirguppa and Hospet Taluk and the Mallapuram sub-Taluk which have been recommended to be given over to Andhra. By no standards is this recommendation just and equitable, with those against the basic principles of language, with those against history, against traditions and above all against the definite and unequivocal expression of public opinion of these areas. The case for Andhra has absolutely no

[Shri. Wodeyar]

legs to stand upon except possibly wire-pulling. Non-inclusion of these areas in Karnataka and forcing it to go into Andhra would lead to a repercussion which would yield to most unfortunate results. This should be avoided and these areas should be continued in the Karnataka State.

Arguments in this favour have been advanced by all the speakers who have spoken on behalf of Karnataka and even the Andhra speakers have been unable to make out a proper case for themselves.

Next in importance is the Nilgris District which if the opinion of the real people of the soil is taken into account should result in its being included in Karnataka. Similarly Madaksira Taluk is a Kannada-speaking area and is an enclave and should be included in Karnataka. Hossur Taluk, in view of the universal desire of the people of that area should also be in Karnataka. The Northern part of Kasargod Taluk and the small portion in the western part of Gopichetty Palayam viz. Talvadi Firka should also form part of Karnataka. Though I would not like the dis-integration of a Taluk, these two areas are such as can be easily separated in view of their geographical convenience of separation. It is my view that where it is possible to make such a separation without in any way affecting either the economy or the linguistic set up of the adjacent bigger State, it should be so done. Similar areas I would like to be included in Karnataka are the Taluks of Akalkot and South Sholapur in Bombay State. They are definitely Kannada area and their separation and addition to Karnataka will not upset the rest of the Districts from which they will be taken out.

As one coming from Malnad area, wherein I was born, I want to say a few words. This area is one of the most neglected and when one considers the vast and variegated resources of this Malnad area, one is inclined to think that a political and economic sin has been committed that in the

State and the Central Government have not taken due notice of that area and considered ways and means for the development of its undeniable and well-known resources in plantations, Ports, Forests, Minerals and rivers. Lack of transport either by way of Railways or Roads and bridges, is its greatest draw-back. I am happy that most of these areas are in Karnataka. I would urge in this respect that apart from the question of pure language and even in spite of it, all the areas should be included in Karnataka. From this aspect, language apart, any part of Kharwar or Belgaum District should not be taken out of it. I, therefore, welcome the formation of the Karnataka State and let me assure the House that if the State is formed so as to include the areas I have noted above and if the Malnad is entirely included in Karnataka, the Karnataka State will be one of the best of the 16 States that are going to be formed in our Union.

Shri R. D. Misra (Bulandshahr Dist.): I would at the very outset like to pay compliments to the very arduous and creditable work that the members of the State Reorganisation Commission have done. We may or may not agree with the recommendations of the Commission but I must say that they have looked at the question from a broad angle, in an unbiased manner and in the interest of the people of the country as a whole. It would be unrealistic to disregard the obvious fact that there are in India district units differing from each other in food and clothing, customs and manners and in language. These units were dis-integrated by the imperialist forces and they were aspiring for their unification. It cannot be denied that the people speaking a particular language and living in a well defined area consider that area as their homeland. For example, a Bengali, an Oriya, a Telugu, a Tamilian, a Malayali, a Cannad, a Gujrati, and a Hindi speaking person, wherever he might be settled in India, considers Bengal, Orissa, Andhra, Madras, Kerala, Karnataka, Gujrat, Bihar, Uttar

Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Punjab as his homeland and feels homely. Therefore, it is necessary to keep in mind the linguistic principle in any scheme of reorganisation of the States. Further, linguistic distribution of provinces has been an integral part of the Indian national movement which achieved independence. It was only when the Congress was organised on the basis of language units that it was able to develop a national movement. The urge for the unification of separate areas, has gone deep down into the minds of the masses and a refusal to unite them at this stage would lead to a wide-spread sense of frustration which might have very grave consequences. All the disintegrated linguistic groups should be brought together; but it does not mean that States should be reorganised on the basis of linguistic principle only. In the reorganisation of States other factors should be taken into consideration.

The first essential objective of reorganisation must be the unity and security of India. Then, a border state should be well administered and stable and should be a resourceful unit capable of meeting the emergent problems arising out of military exigencies. It would be safer to have on our borders relatively larger and resourceful states rather than small and less resilient units. Then, financial and economic considerations must be kept in mind. This would mean that a state should have adequate financial resources to maintain itself and to develop its economy. A state should be so constituted that, as far as possible, it should be self-supporting and it should have an incentive to raise, and should be able to raise, on its own initiative, at least a part of the resources needed for its development. Financial aid from the centre should normally be utilized for development purposes and not for meeting the ordinary obligations of a State on revenue account. If a federal system of Indian Union is to continue, the

reorganised States must have financial resources under their own control reasonably adequate to meet their responsibilities. If small States on the linguistic principle are reorganised, the burden of extra non-development expenditure, that is to say, on Governors, Legislatures, secretariat staff etc., is bound to be very heavy. Therefore, small States should not be formed. The creation of large units will lead to appreciable economy in the unproductive expenditure on administration which the country cannot afford at present.

For the purpose of reorganisation of States, India should be divided into seven zones, as was done in the census operations of 1951.

North-India Zone with an area of 137012 sq. miles and population of 68790432 persons, consisting of Uttar Pradesh and Vindhya Pradesh should be created. Uttar Pradesh is a densely populated State. It cannot make progress and feed its people without industrialization. It is poor in mineral resources while its adjoining small State of Vindhya Pradesh is rich in minerals but is thinly populated with a density of only 151 persons per square mile. There are crores of hungry people in the State of Uttar Pradesh with no mineral resources for their economic development and Vindhya Pradesh there is a vast empty land, rich in mineral resources, with a very meagre population, unable to exploit them in their own interest or in the interest of the country. The States should not be organised in such a way that on one side of a border of a State there be people without land, rich in mineral resources, and there be empty land, rich in mineral resources, on the other side. It is therefore essential that the State of Vindhya Pradesh should be merged in the State of Uttar Pradesh. Moreover, there is a cultural affinity between the people of Vindhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh. The elected representatives of Vindhya Pradesh desire to have their own State but if it is not possible they

[Shri R. D. Misra]
say that their State should be merged with Uttar Pradesh.

East India Zone composed of Bihar, Orissa, West Bengal, Assam and Manipur should be created.

It would be safer to have on our borders of East Pakistan a big and resourceful and well administered State.

South Indian Zone, consisting of Madras State, Karnatak State, Kerala State, Andhra and Hyderabad States proposed by the S.R. Commission, should be created.

West Indian Zone consisting of Bombay State and Vidarbha State proposed by the S.R. Commission should be created.

North Western Indian Zone consisting of Rajasthan and Punjab proposed by the S.R. Commission should be created.

Central India Zone consisting of Madhya Pradesh should be constituted.

Kashmir State.

In these zonal States; people speaking different languages should be reorganised in cultural zones and cultural councils for each cultural zone should be created to look after educational and other cultural matters of that area. In these areas the work of the State should be carried on in the language of that region and the children should be given education up to higher secondary stage in their mother tongue. It should also be the duty of these cultural councils to see that children speaking a language other than that of the region get their education in their mother tongue, and, if their number is adequate, provision for their education in their mother tongue should be made in the schools for them.

If the States of the Indian federation are to enjoy a uniform Status, it is essential that each State should be inherently capable of survival as a viable administrative unit. It should have ample resources—financial, administrative and technical—to maintain itself as a modern State. Any

movement which may tend to impair the unity of India must not be encouraged. In a vast country like ours, on account of its topography centrifugal forces are not an unnatural phenomena, but these forces must not be allowed to impede the achievement of our national unity. The disruptive achievements such as provincialism and linguistic fanaticism should be firmly discouraged but at the same time full scope for the unhampered growth of genius of each linguistic group of people should be provided in the scheme of reorganisation of States.

But if the Government considers that the recommendations of the Commission should be accepted with minor amendments as proposed by the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress, I suggest that the territories, from one State to the other, should be transferred on the basis of village unit. Every village contiguous to the territory of a State should form part of the State in which the language of the majority of the people of the village is spoken.

In the end, I appeal to my countrymen through you and through this hon. House not to forget the unity of India and not to let separatist tendencies develop in the country which divided and weakened India in the past and made her a subject country.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan (Krishnagiri): At the outset I feel that time is not yet sufficiently ripe for taking up this complicated matter. We could have waited a little longer. I do not blame the S.R.C. for raising this controversy. I draw the attention of the House to Paragraphs 77 and 78 of S.R.C. Report on page 21. Paragraphs 80 and 82 are also worthy of consideration. The Dar Commission and the J. V. P. Committee did not consider the time opportune for reorganisation because it was likely to divert attention from more vital matters, retard the process of consolidation of the nation's gains, dislocate the administrative, economic and financial structure of the country and seriously interfere with the progressive solution of our economic

and political difficulties. It will let loose, while we are still in the formative stage, forces of disruption and disintegration. Things have not improved to such an extent as to justify a change from that cautious approach. Mutual ill-feeling has grown amongst the peoples of India since the publication of the report. Instead of allaying fears and doubts, a fresh lease of life has been given to them. I am very unhappy about this.

As for the report itself, it is surprising that the Commission has recommended the co-existence of giant states and dwarf states. Giants and dwarfs may be quite interesting in fairy tales. They do not fit in democratic and socialistic pattern of society.

The Commission's terms of reference entitled them to recommend a postponement of the entire question. They chose differently. The Prime Minister's wise suggestion about zonal councils could also have been put before them under the terms of reference.

In my humble opinion the zonal councils can be appointed under Article 263 of the Constitution.

As for safeguards mentioned in the report, I think that it is better to incorporate them in the form of an additional Chapter of Directive Principles of State Policy. Any other step by way of mandatory provisions will interfere with development of democratic traditions. The former should not be there at the expense of the latter. In this connection I wish to draw the attention of everybody to Paras. 842 and 843 of the report under the heading, 'Industrial Location Plan'. It is the important question of equitable distribution of Central Government expenditure. Some of us from the extreme south have much misgivings in this regard. No heavy industry worthy of mention has been started in the south.

No clear ideas have been given by the Commission as to which laws will operate in the proposed States created after dismembering the various existing States. Only administrative matters have been examined in detail.

Finally, I am very sorry to state that in my opinion the Commission has forgotten the objects of its constitution, namely, reorganisation and consolidation. It has allowed itself to degenerate into a sort of an All India Boundary Commission, dealing with districts and tahsils.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Distt.—South): It is a fundamental principle of biology applicable to the plants as well as to human beings and animals that in order to survive, one must adopt himself to environments. I hope a large number of speakers dealing with various problems did piece meal. They lost sight of the fact that India at the centre has only 7/10 of the revenue of New York city. The age of an Indian is 31 years and the cloth he can have to cover his body is only 14 yards, the food he eats is only 12 hundred calories. The house provided for the common man is not fit even for a dog or other pet of the fortunate gentleman of an advanced country.

The butterfly has beautiful colours and so have the flowers in the garden but these beauties of nature have little meaning for the struggling man who has not yet got the minimum necessities of life. What is true of an individual is equally true of the community. Life has something beautiful about it and all things beautiful are things difficult. The art and beauty of life, whether of individual or of community, are to come into being only if life has grown strong enough to sustain and protect itself. The farmer grows grain and has little interest in flowers. The life in its early growth develops its organs to sustain and protect itself and it is given to it after its fullest

[Pandit K. C. Sharma]

growth for the purposes of the continuance thereof that it can develop in the realms of variety, beauty or charm.

The problem before any young democratic set-up as we have got in India to-day is the problem of security and unity. Its security also lies in its unity and also in its economic development as well as in a pure administration. The problem therefore resolves into a sense of unity or coherence.

It is important in the case of India much more than any other democracies. The long history of India points to this fundamental lack of sense of unity as a cause of its defeat and enslavement. For the first time in its history an opportunity has arisen that India can feel United.

What are the factors that help the creation of sense of unity and what are the things that go against it? My humble submission is that bigger the areas, lesser there would be a sectarian loyalty or communal pride and other factors that have worked out a situation in the old history of India against its unity and oneness. Therefore, many communities and languages as well as castes and creeds in one large region will not have separate little loyalties but will have only one loyalty that is the loyalty to the land of the birth. It is, therefore, to the advantage of the country that it should not be divided into small areas of less than 3 crores of people in a State or less than 50 crores of its revenue. There should be large regions with a view to have a larger outlook on life.

The state, a welfare state as ours claims to be, must raise the standard of life of its people. What is the life worth for, if one has to go naked or has only one meal a day? I have said that a State must have 50 crores at its disposal for the development of its area. Small States cannot develop and cannot undertake necessary schemes for ameliorative purposes. Nor can they take up the

social measures for the good of the common man. There the vested interest will stand in the way. For instance, it is U.P. that led the way in the attainment of social objectives.

What the common man asks for is abolition of Zamindari, elimination of usury and pure administration. The State of U.P. undertook the first reform at the earliest opportunity and has succeeded wonderfully. The small States have not, many of them, undertaken the necessary measures. It is again the State of Uttar Pradesh which was first to eliminate usury. Its administration, too, is free from caste prejudices or communal bias. In the small areas, vested interests, communal feelings or sectarian prejudices work against the interest of the common man which they cannot afford to do in large areas of large populations.

The history of great revolutions reveals that the first igniting cause has been the corrupt administration of the time. Corrupt administration does not mean simply taking bribes or illegal gratification. These are minor defects that can be cured by good administrator. The question in India is of an administration which enjoys the confidence of the people, that is, which is free from all communal influence, sectarian leanings or class or caste prejudices. This is possible only in large areas and not in small States where the caste or creed is likely to emerge into power and terrorize over the common people. The history of riots of 1947 is an ample proof that the demoralization of the administration under the stress and strain of time can fall to the lowest degradation. It is good to learn from experience and I hope our leadership has enough of receptivity to learn the necessary lesson.

The question is will the people of India with all the cries of language and culture accept this view of things?

I beg to submit that language has two functions: one, as means of com-

munication and helpful in the ordinary day to day needs of life; second, it creates a thinking capacity and is a vehicle of thought and as such a means of culture and mental and moral development. I may say with all respect to my friends that different languages good in themselves, so much talked about, have served only the first purpose and it is not a purpose which can be the basis of carving out a separate state. The creation of thought and development of culture has had its source in the great literature of the ancient language of Sanskrit. India has only an all India culture which has been derived, nourished and developed by the great words in Sanskrit. The great men of India, the great teachers and philosophers were all-India figures and gave away their best to the whole of country and through it to the humanity at large. They did not belong to this area or that area. Therefore, the problem of language and culture as understood in European countries does not exist in India. It cannot be a basis of a separate state. I do not mean to say that language, a regional language, should not be developed. What I mean to say is give all the facilities and encouragement for the development of all different languages of India. The central fact is that India must have a national language and must develop it to the fullest stature so that all may have a sense of unity through their common language.

Another question is whether it would be possible to get such a scheme accepted in view of the existence of large number of States at present.

I may enlighten the House that there was such a scheme of regional division of India proposed by the late Sir Secunder Hyat Khan of the Punjab. It envisaged a division of India into seven large regions. The scheme was not accepted for various reasons but its soundness was never questioned. It was a case of pre-

partition India and there were many problems that had different aspects and had to be viewed from various angles. Again, in May, 1946, Cabinet Mission Scheme of dividing India into three regions was accepted by all political parties concerned. It did not work due to some political developments but in its essence it was a sound proposition.

We may not pass over the case of Pakistan of having only two regions. If the West Pakistan with all the different races, languages and ways of life could form into one region, there is no reason why India cannot have large regions of multiple language characters.

Coming to the question of U.P., I beg to say that it is a good State in size, population and revenue. It has justified its existence by its record of welfare measures and development schemes. It is said of it that it will have a dominating voice in the councils of the administration. I may point out that the experience does not prove the charge. On the other hand this great State has been the bulwark of the country.

It should also not be ignored that we have got Indian citizenship and our structure is different from the structure of States quoted by Mr. Pannikar. Nor do the facts in other states mentioned by Mr. Pannikar prove his contention.

Again, U.P. has had a long history and has enjoyed a sense of unity and coherence which cannot be broken so easily.

The principle for separation of State in particular instances apart from the general proposition above are, firstly a definite popular demand for a State; secondly, language, culture, way of living and history of the area; and thirdly, financial, economic and administrative considerations. None of these essentials exist in the case of U.P. for its division in two States. Therefore U.P. as it

[Pandit K. C. Sharma]

is a good State and needs no change whatsoever.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury (Ghatal): Going through the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission, I find that the Commission did not follow any consistent principles for the delimitation of the boundaries of the proposed States. The terms of reference were rather wide, but one can hardly fail to recall the circumstances in which the Commission was appointed. In July 1952, that is, soon after the meeting of the new Parliament, Shri Tushar Chatterjee, a Communist Member of Lok Sabha, moved a non-official Resolution demanding the linguistic redistribution of the States of India. This gave an added momentum to the popular movements which were assuming great proportions in the Southern India where the language problem had become acute. Their Assemblies demonstrated a babel of tongues. When they realised that in spite of past resolutions of the Congress, the formation of Congress Provinces on the basis of language, the JVP Report etc., the Congress Government was delaying the matter on some plea or other, they started their struggle for the realisation of their demands. This led to the formation of the Andhra State and later the appointment of the Commission. So, whatever may be the other considerations, it is clear that the greatest factor relating to the appointment of the Commission is the demand for linguistic States. Viewed in this way, while other points such as the question of national unity, culture, economic viability, and so on and so forth have to be considered in their proper perspective, the importance of the main point namely, language cannot be minimised in any way.

Starting with this premise I find that the Commission has emphasized one principle in respect of one area and another in respect of another area. It has not followed any uniform criteria. This has happened because the Commission does not

seem to have had due regard to the basic issues involved. According to me the difficulty has become aggravated, because of their inability to suggest a solution according to which the tendency of group domination or parochial bias would be eliminated. It is therefore necessary that the recommendations of the Commission should not be considered sacrosanct and proper changes should be made conceding certain just claims, but opposing the unjust and chauvinistic claims of certain people. Viewed in this way, I would suggest reconsideration of the case for Samyukta Maharashtra and also the case for a proper Punjabi-speaking State.

Now coming to my own state, West Bengal, I am surprised to find that the just demands of West Bengal have been turned down. Quoting the language of the Commission, "The readjustment of West Bengal's border has now become a major problem." It can be said justly that justice has not been done to her. While I do not make any chauvinistic claim as some others have done, I do not find any reason why the Commission could not have considered the claim for certain adjoining Bengali speaking areas. Our demand is on the basis of a principle. Take the village as a unit, consider the question of contiguity, consider the question of language of the people, and you can also consider the wishes of the people there. If you do that you cannot exclude Chas Thana of Purulia. You cannot but concede parts of Dhalbhum in Bihar. You cannot exclude certain portions of the Goalpara district.

Now, in this connection, I must mention something about my district. Certain chauvinistic claims were made about some portion of the district of Midnapore. There were counter claims about a certain portion of Orissa also. This led to some sort of agitation on either side but ultimately, I am glad to say, reason prevailed and there is no agitation now on this score.

Then, there is one thing which relates to a matter of vital importance for the area from which I come and therefore, I would like to refer to it. According to the Commission, "the transfer of Purulia can be justified on the ground that it will facilitate the implementation of a flood control-cum-irrigation project which has recently been taken up in West Bengal. The Kangsabati (Kasai) River which rises in Purulia is of no real importance from the point of view of Bihar, but West Bengal has already utilised it to some extent in its lower reaches and now proposes to build a dam on this river near the Bihar border. If flood control and irrigation in the Burdwan Division are to be efficiently carried out in future, it will be desirable to transfer to West Bengal a major portion of the catchment area because this will facilitate soil conservation measures and also provide perhaps a more appropriate dam site. The importance of Kasai to West Bengal will be apparent from the fact that it is supposed to derive its name of the 'The Butcher' from the annual devastation which its flood waters cause in and round Midnapore."

This is what the Commission itself has said. I have raised the question of flood protection, irrigation facilities and power generation, so far as this river is concerned, in this House a number of times. Coming as I do from a chronic flood affected area, I am keenly aware of the urgency of the problem of developing this area. So, naturally, I am glad to find that it has not escaped the notice of the Commission. But I must make it clear that I do not think that the flood protection or developmental work in the region is being hindered simply because a certain area falls within the jurisdiction of a different State. If it is so, then many other difficulties will continue to exist even after the States had been reorganised on a satisfactory basis. I wonder that those who speak about the unity

of India so frequently failed to solve such a problem. Recently, we have got the report of the River Board Bill and the Inter-State Water Disputes Bill which have been passed by the Rajya Sabha. The legislation that is in the offing may be of use in certain circumstances, but generally our attitude should be to look after the welfare of the entire people and help in the process of rapid development without creating any obstacles. So, while mentioning the just claims on certain parts of Bihar or Assam for inclusion within West Bengal, I want them to be transferred to the administration of that State without any bad blood being created between

a Bihari and a Bengali or a Bengali and an Assamese.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): In reorganising the boundaries of the different Constituent States, the main determining factors would be the linguistic principles. It is true that there is commonness and unity in the culture and tradition in India yet different parts of India and its people have diverse habits, social customs and manners and partially different cultural outlook. It is well known that language is the most important factor in the expression of one's mind and development of culture. In our country, the different peoples of our country developed in somewhat different way than the others. It is true the religion played a very important unifying force. Yet our country being vast and the communication being bad in olden times the peoples of the different states of India had not the same sense of unity or oneness as a nation. During the British Rule, in spite of our differences the whole of India forgetting their culture or other differences united to a man to fight the common enemy, the British Ruler. However, every state or linguistic group tried to preserve their individual unity though they were then on fighting the British for the liberation. The British divided

[Shri K. K. Basu]

India into provinces and princely states according to their own colonial consideration and based on the theory of 'Divide and Rule'. Often it was to their advantage to keep different types or linguistic group under their one administration so that they can play each other. It is well known that language is the most important for the flowering of ones own culture and social progress. To make democracy real it is necessary that people must be able to express their own mind in their own way and in the language they understand most. It helps to understand each other. It was, therefore, necessary to bring the peoples speaking the same language together as far as possible for their full and all round growth. Our culture is unity in diversity. Therefore Indian National Congress as the platform and forum of expression of national aspiration and struggle agreed to the principle of reorganisation of provinces as it was unknown as the linguistic principles. The anti-partition movement of Bengal in 1906 which gave birth to the Indian nationalism was criticised as the people were hurt because of the Bengali speaking people were divided into two parts. Since that time Congress was committed to the distribution of State Boundaries on the linguistic principles. The Congress revived their position several times and as a practical expression of that organised the different Congress Committees of the different Provinces based on linguistic principles. Therefore it was natural and fair that after the country became free the States should be reorganised on the principle of linguistic group living in a contiguous territory. It would have been a fair expression of the desires of the people. I feel that villages should be taken as the basic unit which can assume the linguistic composition and adjusted with the adjoining area for the formation of the States or alteration of its boundaries.

The peoples of India expected that the Congress will fulfil its pledge after they have come to power. The

Congress did not reorganise the States on some plea or other. The people were on their march. After several years through heroic struggle the people of Andhra got their Andhradesa in 1953. It gave the movement for linguistic distribution of the States a further fillip which forced the Government to appoint the States Reorganisation Commission whose report we are discussing. The S.R.C. rejected the emphasis on linguistic principles yet it formed several linguistic States in the South like Kerala and Karnataka and marathi speaking States which we generally welcome. In the case of adjustment of boundaries in the northern States it discarded these principles and tried to suggest the solution on other principles. It is I think an opportunistic and bureaucratic approach. They raised the bogey of administrative convenience and economic viability. If one part of a district or whole is taken away from one district and added to another how much administrative problem can it make? Have not our administration faced much more complicated problem than this? I am inclined to believe that this betrayed a very much bureaucratic mind but much less dispassionate for reasons best known to themselves. They wanted to work on the logic of checks and balances as can be seen more blatantly in the case of suggestion for the formation of bilingual Bombay States which can only serve their vested interest.

The problem of economic viability has been raised. In India most of the States are backward being under the foreign domination. There are huge potentialities tapped and untapped. Moreover the centre is spending enormous amount for the development of different States. These are planned out on the basis of national importance and not on the basis of population of the States and the *per capita* tax they pay. It is found to be for some time that there will be uneven development. It is the duty of the most advanced parts to help the less backward parts. In Yugoslavia the advance Republic pay more for the backward Republic.

Moreover a State which may have some arid zone may become a land of good production and fertility. If some project is established. The case of Sind in the British days is a glaring example. In Rajputana desert if oil is found in commercial scale in Jaisalmer the whole economic outlook of the place may change. Moreover most of the important sources of revenue are with the Centre. The Centre can help a State to build up a sound economy within a short period. Therefore economic viability cannot be such an important determining factor. Moreover it is much cheaper and economic to administer an area through one language. We are all expecting that all States should use their mother tongue of its own inhabitants in its administration and also education in States. If we allow a big linguistic minority in a State it will be much expensive to run an administration, courts and educational institution in two languages specially when such institutions have to be founded in the villages. Democracy can be real only when the administration, executive and judiciary is carried on in the language of the people. In the case of education nobody can even suggest that the best method of imparting and expanding learning is to use the mother tongue as the vehicle and medium of instruction. Therefore, for all round development of an area and its people it is necessary to keep close and under one administration one linguistic group if the test of contiguity is satisfied; other factors should come as a secondary consideration.

Based on the above principles boundaries of the States should be readjusted as far as possible amicably and if necessary through the boundary Commission.

I, therefore, feel that these cases of boundary disputes among Orissa, Bihar, West Bengal and Assam will have to be settled amicably and if necessary through a boundary commission.

It is good that S.R.C. has conceded Purulia sub-division minus Chas P.S. to West Bengal. The exclusion of Chas P.S. seems to have no foundation of logic. Apart from linguistic consideration it should not have cut off from Purulia as it is part of the same administration and on the same side of the river Damodar which cuts across the district of Manbhum on which the S.R.C. has laid much stress on other occasion when it suited them.

In the case of Kisanganj portion if there is dispute as to linguistic composition it can be enquired into. No people should be asked to join with another unit against his wish similarly, I find that entire Dhalbhum should go to West Bengal. It is a predominantly Bengali speaking area which even the Santalis have adopted in many cases because of historical and other reasons. Jamshedpur should normally remain with Dhalbhum as it is the nerve centre of the sub-division and Bengali being the largest percentage of speakers and at least much more than Bihari with whom it is suggested to remain. Moreover, Bihar does not stand to loose much financially over which S.R.C. has laid much stress. Apart from some unemployment which will always remain all the main income from the factory are recovered by the Centre.

In the case of Dhanbad and also Goalpara District of Assam it is quite possible to add certain contiguous Thanas to West Bengal. There may be same room for disputes regarding the transfer of the whole district but there is no case why the border areas which speak undisputably Bengali should not be transferred to West Bengal.

In the case of Santal Paraganas I feel that its future is to be determined keeping in mind the tribal interest. It is always desirable to keep the same tribes under one administration and as far as possible in a contiguous and so that they can be given same autonomous rights and special rights other than the reservation of seats to develop themselves. I, therefore, feel

[Shri K. K. Basu]

that Santal Parganas should be kept in tact as far as possible. If it is found that it is advantageous to him tribal people to come to West Bengal as they would form a big chunk the Santal Parganas should come as a whole or nearly so, otherwise it will have to remain where they are with Bihar. In that case those Santals who adopted Bengali script should be allowed to continue there being of other tribal language through the Bengal script. However, this question of preservation of tribal interests should be thoroughly given into and decision will have to be taken coolly and dispassionately.

On the same ground I urge that Singhbhum Sadar and Kharsowar and Seraikeata should be given to Orissa. Singhbhum is a predominantly Oriya speaking area. In Seraikeata and Kharsowar tribe known as Ho is most predominant and they also form a big chunk of tribal population of Orissa. The same tribe should be brought under the same administration and made to live in a contiguous territory.

I hope and trust that map of India should be redrawn finally on a sound and healthy principle keeping in view the interest of the people.

It must be remembered that discontented people are a grave danger to the unity of India. Union of free and happy people would strengthen our great Indian Nation and its unity.

श्री चांडक (बेतूल) राज्य पुनर्रचना आयोग के सामने एक महत्वपूर्ण और पचीदा विषय था । इस विषय से सम्बन्ध रखने वाले लगभग दो हजार से अधिक लम्बे लम्बे मेमोरेन्डा, डेढ़ लाख से अधिक पत्र उनके पास आये, उन सब की छान बीन कर गहराई से विचार करना तथा उसके बाद अपनी सिफारिशें करनी थी । इसके लिये उन्होंने देश भर का दौरा किया, हजारों व्यक्तियों के विचार जाने इस तरह डेढ़ साल तक कठिन परिश्रम

उठाकर उन्होंने अपनी सिफारिशों की । उन पर जो गंभीर जिम्मेदारी डाली गई थी उस राष्ट्रीय समस्या को सुलझाने का उन्होंने अपनी धीर से भरसक प्रयत्न किया अतः उन्हें हार्दिक धन्यवाद देना में अपना कर्तव्य समझता हूं ।

आयोग की सिफारिशें शायद सब को प्रसन्न न कर सकी हों, अथवा उन सिफारिशों से मतभेद भी हो सकता है लेकिन जिस निष्पक्षता और राष्ट्रीय भावना से उन्होंने काम किया है उसकी कद्र न कर उनके इरादों पर आघात करना हर्षिज उचित नहीं कहा जा सकता । इस सदन के कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने इस प्रकार आघात किया है यह देखकर दुःख होता है ।

राज्य पुनर्रचना आयोग ने राज्यों की पुनर्रचना किस आधार पर हो इसके लिये जो तत्व निश्चित किये हैं, तथा सीमा निर्धारण के सम्बन्ध में जो नियम कायम किये हैं, तथा जो संरक्षण सुझाये हैं, वे सर्वथा उचित, विचारणीय, तथा स्वागताई हैं ।

राज्य पुनर्रचना आयोग की रिपोर्ट पर सदन में अत्यन्त गंभीरतापूर्वक, तथा शान्त दिल से विचार होना चाहिये कारण इस हाऊस के निर्णयों पर इस विशाल भारत का सदियों का भविष्य निर्भर करता है ।

पुरानी देशी रियासतों के कारण 'ख' और 'ग' राज्यों का निर्माण हुआ । कुछ 'ख' और 'ग' राज्य वर्तमान समय की शासन प्रणाली में आत्मनिर्भर न हो सकने के कारण उनका संलग्न राज्यों में मिलाना उनकी और देश की भलाई के लिये अत्यावश्यक था और यह समस्या आसानी से सुलझायी जा सकती थी । इसके लिये देशव्यापी कमिश्न की आवश्यकता न थी । इस प्रकार जो राज

बनते उन्हें 'क' वर्ग में लाकर राज्यों का एक स्तर भी कायम किया जा सकता था। "राज्यों की पुनर्रचना" इस व्यापक अर्थ को लेकर कमिशन की नियुक्ति ने देश भर में एक अजीब उलझन का वातावरण पैदा कर दिया।

अंग्रेजी सल्तनत से जब आजादी की लड़ाई चल रही थी उस समय की परिस्थिति में कांग्रेस ने भाषावार प्रान्त रचना के तत्व को मान्यता दी, लेकिन केवल भाषा के आधार पर ही प्रान्त रचना हो इस बात पर कभी जोर नहीं दिया। फिर तब की और आज की परिस्थिति में महान अन्तर पड़ चुका है। इसको मद्देनजर रखकर ही जे० बी० पी० कमेटी ने सन् १९४८ के अन्त में अपनी रिपोर्ट में अत्यन्त सावधानी की सूचना भी की है जिसका उद्धरण ऐस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट के पैरा ६२ में दिया गया है। में उसकी ओर आपका तथा आपके द्वारा इस सदन का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। जे० बी० पी० रिपोर्ट की इस सिफारिश से स्पष्ट संकेत मिलता है कि, देश की सुरक्षा, एकता, तथा आर्थिक विकास को प्रथम स्थान, तथा भाषा आदि को बाद स्थान दिया जाय। उससे भी हर चीज को अलग अलग कसोटी पर कसकर सावधानी बरतने की चेतावनी दी है। लेकिन ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि देश के इन महान नेता और कर्णधारों की गंभीर चेतावनी की ओर विशेष ध्यान नहीं दिया जा रहा है।

आन्ध्र का निर्माण भाषा के आधार पर हुआ लेकिन इस प्रदेश के निर्माण के समय दक्षिण में जो तंग वातावरण पैदा हुआ तथा अनिष्ट घटनायें घटीं वह देश के लिये एक गंभीर चेतावनी थीं। आन्ध्र निर्माण के लिये आन्ध्र के एक महान नेता का अन्तर्दान कर आत्म बलिदान करना और आन्ध्र का निर्माण होना एक संयोग की घटना थी किन्तु उस परिस्थिति ने देशभर में भाषा और संस्कृति

की आड़ में अलगाव की मनोवृत्ति पैदा की और उसने काफी जोर पकड़ा। ऐस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट प्रकाशित होने के बाद भी बम्बई आदि स्थानों में जो घटनाएँ घटीं वह भी एक स्तर की सूचक थीं।

सप्ताह भर से चल रही चर्चा के दौरान में अनेक प्रकार की विचारधाराएँ हमको सुनने को मिलीं। भाषा और संस्कृति पर काफी जोर दिया जा रहा है, कहा जाता है कि एक भाषा बोलने वालों का एक ही प्रान्त बने, यदि द्विभाषी प्रान्त बनाना ही हो तो उसमें प्रधान भाषा का प्रचंड बहुमत रहे। यह प्रगट किया जा रहा है कि मानो भाषा के साथ संस्कृति भी बदल जाती है। और यह भी प्रगट किया जा रहा है कि एक भाषा वाले दूसरी भाषा वालों के साथ सहानुभूति, सहकार्य, और प्रेम के साथ नहीं रह सकते। इन विचारों को सुनकर ऐसा मालूम होता है कि मानो भाषा और संस्कृति के नाम पर नये साम्राज्य पैदा किये जा रहे हैं।

में बड़ी नम्रतापूर्वक कहना चाहता हूँ कि में इस विचार-धारा से सहमत नहीं हो सकता। मेरी नम्र राय में भाषा का एक स्थान है। हमारे संविधान में जिन चौदह भाषाओं को स्वीकृति दी गई है वे सभी हमारी राष्ट्र-भाषाएँ हैं। उन सबको मिल जुल कर तथा परस्पर सहकार्य से देश की एकता कायम रखनी है, न कि प्रत्येक का अपना अलग अलग स्थान निर्माण कर आपस में एक दूसरी के लिये दीवारें खड़ी करनी है। भाषा विचारों को प्रदर्शित करने का एक साधन है न कि साध्य। भाषा की एकता से विचार सरलता से प्रगट किये जा सकते हैं तथा समझे जा सकते हैं और शासन में सुविधा हो सकती है, इसलिये भाषा का एक महत्वपूर्ण स्थान है, लेकिन वह सर्वोपरि नहीं है। भाषा में आत्मीयता है

[श्री चांडक]

लेकिन सदियों के सम्बन्धों में अधिक आत्मीयता है। फिर देश की एकता, सुरक्षा, आर्थिक और सामाजिक विकास इन्हें आज के युग में प्रथम स्थान है। केवल भाषा के आधार पर प्रदेश का निर्माण और वह भी एक भाषा का एक प्रदेश यह प्राचीन युग की संकुचित राष्ट्रवाद की कल्पना ही कही जा सकती है। देश के एक महान नेता, धुरंधर विद्वान और दूरदर्शी राजनीतिज्ञ देशरत्न चक्रवर्ती राजगोपालाचार्य जी ने इन्हीं शब्दों में इस कल्पना का वर्णन किया है।

आज महाराष्ट्र महाराष्ट्रियनों के लिये, पंजाब पंजाबियों के लिये, बंगाल बंगालियों के लिये, बिहार बिहारियों के लिये, और इसी प्रकार की आवाजें सब ओर से आ रही हैं। फिर 'भारत' किस के लिये यह कुछ समझ में नहीं आता। हम ने भारत का शानदार संविधान बनाकर दुनिया के सामने एक आदर्श रखा। विश्व शान्ति के लिये 'पंचशील' का संदेश दुनिया को दिया। वही हमने यदि अपने आपको संकुचित राष्ट्रवाद के दायरे में बन्द कर लिया तो महान तपस्वियाँ और परिश्रम के बाद स्थापित की गई एक राष्ट्रीयता का महल केवल कागज के महल की तरह रह जावेगा और फिर अखिल भारतीय नेता कहां से पैदा हो सकेगा? और क्या इस संकुचित राष्ट्रीयता से आगे चलकर बहु-राष्ट्रवाद की कल्पना का उदय न होगा? अतः इस विषय में गंभीरतापूर्वक, सोच समझ कर और सावधानी के साथ कदम उठाना चाहिये।

फिर भाषा के साथ संस्कृति भी जोड़ दी जाती है यह देखकर विशेष दुःख होता है। संस्कृति का अस्यन्त संकुचित अर्थ लगाया जाता है। मामूली रीति रिवाजों को संस्कृति कहा जाता है। और उसके आधार पर अलग अलग काल्पनिक महल खड़े किये जाते हैं।

यों तो हमारा मुल्क अनेक जातियाँ, उपजातियाँ, साम्प्रदाय और बोलियों का है, लेकिन मानव-जीवन के मूलभूत तत्वों को लेकर भारत की संस्कृति और परम्परा सदा से एक रही है। डॉ० राधाकुमुद ने "Fundamental-unity of India" में, योशी अरविन्द ने "रेनासेंस इन इन्डिया" में और विद्वद्रत्न बिपिनचन्द्र पाल ने "दी सोल ग्रॉफ इन्डिया" में भारत की सांस्कृतिक एकता की पुष्टि की है। शान्त दर्शी कवि-रवि ठाकुर ने "भेई भारतेर महामानवेर सागर तीरे" कह कर अपने काव्यों में विशाल भारत का आदर्श सामने रखा है। क्या भगवान बुद्ध से स्वामी दयानन्द तक सब को काशी नहीं जाना पड़ा? बद्दीनाथ—पशुपति नाथ से कन्याकुमारी तक और त्रिवेन्द्रम से पद्मानन्द तक गंगा और यमुना को पवित्र नदियाँ ही नहीं देवी नहीं माना जाता? और भव्य भूषर नगाधिराब हिमालय की पृथ्वी का मानदंड ही नहीं देवतात्मा नहीं माना जाता? और सब जगह शादी-बिवाह-उपनयन, तथा अन्य संस्कारों के समय एक ही मन्त्रों का उच्चारण नहीं किया जाता? अर्थात् भारत की संस्कृति प्राचीनकाल से एक रही है और आज भी है। मामूली रीति रिवाजों को संस्कृति कहना उसका मजाक उड़ाना है।

अब मैं राज्य पुनर्रचना आयोग की सिफारिशों के सम्बन्ध में भी कुछ कहना चाहूंगा, और खास कर मध्य प्रदेश के सम्बन्ध में, क्योंकि मैं मध्य प्रदेश के मराठी विभाग से आता हूँ। मेरे पूर्वज लगभग १७५ वर्षों पूर्व राजस्थान से वहाँ जाकर बसे और वहीं के हो गये। मेरा जन्म वहीं हुआ, मेरी शिक्षा-दीक्षा सब मराठी के द्वारा हुई, मेरा गत ३५ साल का सतत सार्वजनिक और राजनैतिक जीवब मराठी विभाग से ही संलग्न रहा। मुझे

मराठी भाषा से विशेष रूचि और प्रेम । यही नहीं, मैं सब से अधिक आसानी से अपने विचार मराठी में ही प्रगट कर सकता हूँ । चाहे मेरी मातृभाषा मराठी समझी जावे या नहीं ।

नये मध्य प्रदेश के सुझाव का तो मैं हार्दिक स्वागत करता हूँ । किन्तु यह नहीं समझ पाता कि मध्य प्रदेश के चार जिले नागपुर, भंडारा, चांदा, और वर्धा, मध्य प्रदेश से क्यों और किस आधार पर अलग कर दिये ? यह चार जिले सदियों से मध्य प्रदेश के अंग रहे यद्यपि इन जिलों में प्रधानतः मराठी भाषा बोली जाती है तथा सदियों साथ रहने के कारण मराठी और हिन्दी वालों के सम्बन्ध सदा मधुर और सहानुभूतिपूर्ण रहे हैं । भाषा के नाम पर कभी अलगवाव की भावना नहीं रही । शिक्षा, शासन, और सार्वजनिक जीवन में मराठी और हिन्दी को समान स्थान रहा है । और आज तो दोनों का जीवन इतना घुल मिल गया है कि एक दूसरों से अलग करना उचित नहीं कहा जा सकता । दोनों ने मिल कर सुख और दुःख साथ सहे हैं, आजादी की लड़ाई साथ लड़ी है । गत एक सौ वर्षों से याने १८९१ से आज तक जमीन के तथा सारे कानून एक रहे हैं । बरार के चार जिले—अमरावती, अकोला, बुलढाना और यवतमाल, इनका सदियों से नागपुर प्रदेश के इन मराठी चार जिलों से कभी सम्बन्ध नहीं रहा । बरार के यह चार जिले सन् १९०३ में मध्य प्रदेश में लीज पर मिलाये गये । इसके पहिले लगभग चार सौ साल तक यह जिले निजाम के मातहत हैदराबाद में रहे, तथा इसके पहिले का इन जिलों का इतिहास भी अलग ही रहा है । आयोग ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में "विदग्ध" पर जो अध्याय लिखा है उसके द्वारा भी इस बात की पुष्टि होती है ।

सन् १९३८ के प्रसिद्ध "खरे" काण्ड के पश्चात् ही विदग्ध को अलग मांग खास तौर से पैदा हुई । और वह बरार के नेताओं द्वारा ही खास तौर पर हुई । इस मांग के पीछे भी राजनैतिक स्पर्धा ही प्रमुखता से थी । अन्य कोई प्रबल कारण न था । बरार के इन चार जिलों ने कभी मध्य प्रदेश को अपना नहीं समझा । और न उसके साथ उनकी आत्मीयता रही, क्योंकि इन जिलों का अस्तित्व ही मध्य प्रदेश में अलग का सा रहा ।

कमिशन ने 'विदग्ध' को अलग बनाने का सुझाव देते समय उस पर जो अध्याय लिखा है उस पैरा ४४६ में मध्य प्रदेश के इन चार जिलों नागपुर, भंडारा, चांदा, वर्धा, पर अलग से विचार करने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं समझी । कलम की एक फटकारे से इन चार जिलों को मध्य प्रदेश से अलग कर दिया गया । यह चार जिले गोंडवाना प्रदेश का हिस्सा रहे, यहां सदियों गोंड राजाओं का राज्य रहा, बाद में भोसलों का राज्य रहा, और उसके बाद १८६१ से मध्य प्रदेश का हिस्सा आज तक रहे । नागपुर ही गोंड, भोंसला, अंग्रेजी राज्य, और उसके बाद आज तक इस सूबे की राजधानी रही । गत पांच शताब्दियों से यह चार जिले साथ साथ और एक सूबे में रहे । इतने दीर्घकालीन सम्बन्ध और उससे पैदा हुई आत्मीयता के बन्धन, भाषा, लिपि, संस्कृति, विचार, व्यवहार, कानून आदि, किसी बात की कोई संशय नहीं, फिर भी केवल भाषा के नाम पर इन चार जिलों को मध्य प्रदेश से अलग कर देना न न्यायोचित है और न आवश्यक ही है ।

वास्तव में तो आज के वर्तमान मध्य प्रदेश को बने रहने देना ही अधिक उत्तम था । भाषा के कोई वास्तविक झगड़े नहीं, स्वयंपूर्ण और आत्मनिर्भर प्रान्त, हिन्दी मराठी को

[श्री बांडक]

सब जगह समान स्थान, फिर इतने अच्छे बने बनाये प्रान्त को तोड़ देना उचित न था। तथापि यदि विदर्भ के चार जिले यदि महाराष्ट्र में जाना ही चाहें तो उन्हें उनकी इच्छा से महाराष्ट्र में भ्रवश्य जाने देना चाहिये। लेकिन मध्य प्रदेश के नागपुर विभाग के चार मराठी जिलों को भेड़ बकरी की तरह कान पकड़ कर उनकी इच्छा के विरुद्ध केवल मराठी बहुमत की मांग पर और भाषा के एकमात्र आधार पर महाराष्ट्र में जोड़ देना हर्षित उचित न होगा। मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा तथा बाहर नागपुर के इन मराठी चार जिलों के जो मत व्यक्त हुए हैं उसमें प्रचंड बहुमत महाराष्ट्र में शामिल होने के खिलाफ है। नागपुर प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी ने भी महाराष्ट्र में शामिल होने की इच्छा व्यक्त नहीं की है। अर्थात् कांग्रेस बकिंग कमेटी की आज्ञा को सभी एक बैनिक की तरह मानेंगे यह निर्विवाद है। लेकिन नागपुर प्रदेश के चार जिले स्वयं इच्छा से महाराष्ट्र में नहीं मिलना चाहते वह भी उतना ही सत्य है। अतः उचित तो वही है कि मराठी भाषी बहुमत की इच्छा इन चार जिलों के ३८ लाख लोगों पर मजबूरन न लादी जाय। नेताओं से, कांग्रेस हाई कमांड से, तथा इस हाऊस से मेरी यह सविनय अपील है कि नागपुर प्रदेश के चार जिले नागपुर, अंडारा, चांदा, और बर्धा, मध्य प्रदेश से अलग न किये जाय। अन्य सुझावों के सम्बन्ध में मेरा यह क्याल है कि विवाद के प्रश्न आपस में बैठकर शांत दिल से विचार कर निपटा लिये जाय। जहां यह संभव न हो वह प्रश्न हमारे सर्वश्रेष्ठ नेता और प्रधान मंत्री पं० जवाहरलाल जी पर छोड़ दिये जायें और उनका निर्णय मान्य कर लिया जाय। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि इस नाजुक और गंभीर खाल को भी हमारा देश और हमारे नेतागण कुशलता से निपटा लेंगे। तथा सब और से

वही प्रयत्न होगा कि हमारी एक राष्ट्रीयता मजबूत हो और हमारा यह कार्यक्रम भी देश की समृद्धि बढ़ाने में सहायक हो।

Shri Shankargauda Patil (Belgaum South): Before giving my views on the proposed Karnatak State and its boundaries, I feel it my duty to express my feelings of gratitude firstly, to the S.R. Commission and secondly, to the Congress High Command for taking the wise and necessary step of forming the Karnatak State which was the long cherished desire of the Kannad people. After a period of hundreds of years the Kannada speaking people who had been distributed under different administrations will form into one culturally homogenous and geographically contiguous administrative unit and are provided with an opportunity to shape their future according to their culture and genius. It will be a well-balanced and viable unit with the industries of Mysore, the raw materials, the mineral and forest wealth of Kanara, and the rich and fertile lands of Northern Karnataka. This State will be a healthy and progressive unit of the Indian Union.

I want now to refer to the plea made by some Maharashtra friends for making a change in the S.R.C. recommendations, by joining some parts of the Belgaum district like Belgaum city, to Maharashtra, Nipani city, some villages in the western part of Belgaum taluka and Khanapur Taluka and the talukas of Haliyal, Supa and Karwar in the North Kanara District. The proposal involving as it does the splitting up of villages on language basis is *prima facie* untenable and feasible. The terms of reference to the Commission, and the recommendations of the latter clearly indicate that this theory has not found favour either with the Government or with the Commission and rightly so. We are not here for creating linguistic states but rational administrative units. If we make an attempt in the former direction, it

will create a number of new problems which may require a score of years to complete the task and in the end we may find the benefits derived from such a course being outweighed by the resultant inconveniences and disadvantages. We have got to make a broad and realistic approach to this problem. One must realize that however just the realignment of State boundaries, substantial linguistic minorities will always have to co-exist with a linguistic majority. I think *Panch-Shila* which we are invoking to resolve the international conflicts has as much relevance in the field of domestic controversies and *Panch-Shila* must begin at home in solving these domestic controversies.

It is worthwhile to mention in this context, that the substantial portions of South Sholapur Taluka, Akalkot Taluka, in Sholapur District, Jath Taluka in South Satara and God-Inglaji in Kolhapur District consisting of Kannad speaking villages are included in Maharashtra by S.R.C. The population figures of Kannad speaking people going to Maharashtra and those of the Marathi speaking people going to Karnatak are as under:—

District	Marathi Population
1. Karwar District	36,330
2. Belgaum excluding Chandgad Mahal	385,032
Total	421,362
Total Kannad population in Marathi Districts.	
1. Sholapur.	188,658
2. South Satara.	101,586
3. Kolhapur.	115,161
Total	405,405

These figures are exclusive of the Kannad population of the Marathawara District where separate figures are not available.

The Maharashtrians being fully conscious of the weakness of their case in this regard want to utilize this factor as a bargaining counter by making an offer to transfer the Kannad speaking areas to Karnatak in exchange for the re-transfer of Marathi speaking areas to Maharashtra. I submit that we cannot be bailed into accepting such an offer in view of the unlimited risks involved in carrying the language factor too far. It is not the extent of the area and the bulk of the population that have got so much to do with the formation of States as the other considerations namely, whether a State unit or District or Taluk could be viable, well balanced in view of its future prospects of growth, not ignoring the links between cities and towns and the surrounding rural areas.

Now I want to touch on some important points of detail as regards the disputed parts of Belgaum and North Kanara Districts. The towns of Belgaum and Nippani happen to be the most important commercial centres which the District cannot afford to lose in the interests of its economic well-being. They are the marketing and transit centres not only for the Belgaum District, but to Karnatak as well. They have no special economic affiliations so as to transfer them to Maharashtra. Nippani being one of the biggest tobacco centres in India, if separated from the Kannad speaking tracts in Karnatak will be deprived of its tobacco growing centres resulting in the total collapse of its trade and prosperity. Belgaum in addition to its being a District Headquarters is also constituted as the Headquarters of the Karnatak Division containing the regional offices of the Revenue, Police, Forests, P.W.D. and Income-tax Departments of State and Central Governments. It forms also the cultural and educational centre of the present Bombay Karnatak. The Karnatak Law Society, the Karnatak Liberal Education Society and the Kannad training colleges, have started their institutions there involving

[Shri Shankargauda Patil]

lakhs of rupees. There are about 94 Government and Semi-Public Buildings worth 2 crores of rupees. Historically, Belgaum always formed part of Karnatak and never of Maharashtra and it has been recognised as such by the All India Congress Committee. It formerly formed part of Bellary District, later of Dharwar District and lastly was made the District place, when Belgaum was formed into a separate District. In 1920 the A.I.C.C. included Belgaum in K.P.C.C. and in 1924, the A.I.C.C. chose it as the venue for its Karnatak session. In 1929, when the Kannadigas took exception to the Marathi Literary Conference being held there, eminent Maharashtrian leaders like Shri N. C. Kelkar, P. V. Kane and D. B. Potdar and others admitted that Belgaum formed an integral part of Karnatak. One of the factors relied upon by the Maharashtrians is the Marathi language majority to be found in Belgaum Taluka and Khanapur Taluk. It is a bare majority of 50 per cent. which was due to the merger of surrounding native States areas like Sangli and Kurandawad. The stress of this argument is negated by the insistent desire of all the other language groups in those areas to join Karnatak.

The case of North Kanara cannot be considered as divorced from the South and Belgaum Districts. The so called Malanad tract commencing from Khanapur in Belgaum District passing through North and South Kanara Districts extending upto Shimogga in Mysore forms one contiguous Belt involving common problems of development which have been delayed due to the absence of one common administration. Hence the S.R.C. has included the whole of this area in the proposed State. The North and South Kanara Districts being integral parts of one unit have been rightly linked once again by the S.R.C., thus affording the opportunity to the Konkani speaking people to have their own integrated unit as the other language and cultural groups of India. The claim of the Maharashtrians over some parts

of North Kanara only on the basis that Konkani is akin to Marathi is rendered fallacious by their self-denying attitude towards South Kanara and other parts of North Kanara where the Konkani population is equally concentrated. It is submitted that Konkani is an independent language and all Konkani people in Kanara have adopted Kannad as their written language. To separate Karwar town from Karnatak would amount to deprive it of its hinterland (Karnatak) and to deny it its strategic position as a district place thus reducing it to a fishing village.

The transfer of Bellary and surrounding Taluks to Andhra is an injustice which is keenly felt by the Kannadigas. The fact that a chance for broader re-adjustment of State boundaries presented itself to the commission did not change the merits and demerits of the case. The reasons given by the Commission far from being convincing are felt not adequate to reverse the well-considered verdict of two eminent judges and the decisions of the previous committees appointed by the Government. If the judicial decisions have to be of any respect, if the declarations of the Government have to have any finality, if the wishes of the people are entitled to have any recognition in Democracy those areas of Bellary should go to Karnatak.

In areas like, Akkalkot, Jath and Gadinglaz, which were tacked on to Maharashtra in 1949 only as an ad hoc arrangement, the wishes of the people should prevail in deciding the matters. It may also be noted that the former too have all along been in the jurisdiction of the K.P.C.C.

Lastly, the new state, as recommended by the S.R.C. should go by the name of Karnatak. To call it Mysore State would be a retrograde step.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj (Sholapur—Reserved—Sch. Castes): The problem of re-organisation of the States is of vital importance to the people. After

the achievement of freedom we are striving on the one hand for the development of our economic life and on the other for bringing up social equality in the country. The re-organisation of States will expedite the achievement of both these objectives.

However, it is not advisable to bring in heat on this issue. The reorganisation of States on linguistic basis will certainly help the people to organise their lives in a better way and to participate in the functioning of the administration. But this reorganisation has to be done after taking into consideration many other factors such as development of India as a whole. If reorganisation of certain States on linguistic basis would affect the implementation of our Second Five Year Plan, then it is better to go cautiously. It is not advisable for political leaders to excite the feelings of the people because certain States may not be organised simply on linguistic basis. If people's minds are excited on this issue, it may affect the security and the well-being of the country as a whole.

If looked at in this perspective, the problems arising out of the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission would not seem insurmountable. The S.R.C. has done a good job in solving the most intricate and difficult problems. It is harmful to cast aspersions on the members of the Commission or to doubt their bonafides. The recommendations may not be totally acceptable to all the Provinces but the fact remains that they tried to do their best under the existing circumstances.

The problem of Samyukt Maharashtra is one of those very complicated problems. The demand of Maharashtra people has been consistently that of having a Samyukt Maharashtra with Bombay as its capital. It is not only a natural demand but a just demand also. The majority of people in Bombay are Maharashtrians and it is they who have brought up and culti-

vated Bombay through their sweat and labour. The Maharashtra community is by itself very tolerant and all through the hundred years it has given every opportunity to all kinds of people to help bringing up the city of Bombay economically and industrially. Maharashtra owes a debt of gratitude to all those communities coming from all over India who have developed Bombay as the best Port and almost the industrial capital of India. Our slogan is "allow people to live" and our request to them is "allow us to have our own living". What we expect of them is to recognise our right over Bombay which is not only our own home but also the only place for our people to eke out a living existence.

Maharashtra has a tradition of service and sacrifice. It does not seek power. The record of Maharashtrian leaders before the achievement of freedom and after that is indeed a record of almost complete effacement. It was in 1937 that a great and noble Maharashtrian leader, Shri B. G. Kher, who became the Chief Minister of Bombay took up only the portfolio of education to himself while giving important portfolios to his colleagues, the Gujerati brethren. Even during the last election when Shri Murarji Desai was defeated it was Shri Hiray who implored him to accept the leadership of Bombay Assembly Congress Party and to take up the responsibility of becoming the Chief Minister of Bombay. Many more instances could be quoted to show that Maharashtra has always been prepared to sacrifice itself in order that the nation could go forward. Whatever has happened during the last few months, the Gujerati brethren should remember the tradition of Maharashtra and should cast out all suspicions about their Maharashtrian brethren. If they satisfy the just claim of Maharashtra they will find out that Maharashtra would be willing to give them whatever they need, particularly would be willing to give any kind of safeguards that they desire. It is time the Congress High Command realises the force of the

[Shri P. N. Rajabhoj]

sentiments of the Maharashtrian people and bring about a just solution of the problem of Maharashtra.

The most important part of the S.R.C. Report from the point of view of the untouchables and other backward communities is relating to the safeguards which they propose for the minority communities. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in his speech in Parliament has said that the Hindu community owes a debt to other minority communities who are economically and socially backward. I completely endorse the views of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. The minority communities have to be safeguarded not only in their interest but also in the interest of the society as a whole. If one limb of the body becomes weak the whole body is bound to suffer thereby. So if the other religions besides the Hindu religion such as Christians, Muslims and others remain suppressed or backward the whole Indian society will to that extent suffer.

Regarding the untouchables and other backward classes, the responsibility of the Indian Society is still bigger. The Constitution of India has given reservation in services and in Legislatures to the untouchables and the Scheduled Tribes for a limited time. It is only 6/7 years left for the untouchables and the Scheduled Tribes to enjoy this reservation. These communities, however, still remain socially and economically backward as before and when this reservation is taken away from them they will be unable to compete with other advanced elements. So it is necessary to assure the backward classes that even after the reservation meant for them is discontinued the society will look after their needs with the same consideration as it is doing at present.

Particularly in the Provinces, the untouchables and other backward classes may suffer at the hands of an intolerant administration. Untouchability has been banned by law but it remains in practice. Untouchables

living in the villages particularly need the protection of the administration. It is precisely realising that necessity that the S. R. Commission has stressed the problem of giving safeguards to the minority communities. Let the advanced classes bear in mind these provisions and try to implement them in practice.

The problem of boundaries is also equally important. It is a tragedy for Maharashtra that the areas of Belgaum, Karwar and certain other areas have been taken away from the proposed Maharashtra Province. These areas are predominantly Maharashtrian to the extent that 80 per cent. of the population in those areas speak the Marathi language and their cultural affinity is more with Maharashtra than with any other language group. The Commission seems to have been under a misapprehension that Konkani dialect which is being used in certain parts of Karwar, Supa, Halyal and other areas is distinct from Marathi language. They have been led to believe that Konkani is a separate language by itself. That is a wrong interpretation and the commendation to include these parts in Karnatak is an unjust step. It is necessary that this wrong should be set right immediately and 4 or 5 lacs of these people should be restored to the province to which they belong.

However, whatever the problems, it should be remembered that they must be solved through understanding and mutual co-operation. No separatist tendencies should be entertained or encouraged. There are people who would like India to be cut into several smaller States. They raise the cry of protection of minorities particularly the untouchables and other backward classes. Their fears are really unfounded in view of the assurance given by the Prime Minister again in the Lok Sabha. The nation has complete faith in Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the untouchable particularly regard him as their real saviour. It is the duty of every Indian to strengthen his hands at this critical juncture in

the history of the nation. The finest emotions he cherishes for all people including the untouchables and every single minority community would enable him to achieve the only objective of his life namely the achievement of the good of the people. With him India will come up and in India's glory his name will for ever shine.

Shri Madiah Gowda (Bangalore South): I fully endorse the views expressed by my hon. friend Shri M. K. Sivananjappa on the floor of the House on 21st December 1955.

The idea of forming the Kannada-speaking areas into a separate State was first formed without reference to either Mysore or the Kannada parts of Hyderabad. It is not, therefore, correct to say that the conception of a United Karnataka was there from the beginning. Even the J.V.P. report in 1949 refers to the proposal of having a Karnatak State with or without Mysore.

It is wholly incorrect to say that there is anything more in common between North Karnataka and Mysore than there is between, say Salem or Coimbatore, or Chittoor of Madras State. In fact, there is some distinctiveness of Mysore which can be easily seen by any one.

North Karnatak with the addition of two districts of Hyderabad and possibly Bellary of former Madras which has always gone with Karnatak Pradesh Congress Committee until merger with Mysore, will be as big as Mysore and equally viable. What is more, if it is formed into a separate State, not only will the tension of an unwarranted merger be obviated, but with its own capital nearby and a Cabinet of its own will receive greater attention and develop more rapidly.

It is wrong to think that the cost of administration will be higher if two States are formed. In any case, the number of Ministers will be less in each of the two States than in a

United State. The real savings will be in travelling and other allowances of Members of the Legislature, the Heads of the Departments and other officers and officials and of the Ministers who have all to cover long distances in the bigger State. All these expenses will be considerably minimised if there are two States.

Mysore has been able to develop because of the reasonable scales of salary both of the Gazetted and non-Gazetted public servants which are considerably lower than the adjoining ones in Bombay and Hyderabad. The S.R.C. has not taken note of this fact in regard to Mysore, where the net result of infiltration (which as observed by the S.R.C. usually means upgrading of lower scales), will be to virtually double the total administrative targets resulting in a deficit of rupees five to six crores at least for Mysore Services. For instance, the cost per student in Bombay is Rs. 51/8/- and in Mysore Rs. 37/8/-. For the ten lakhs of students in Mysore, the rise in cost will be merely 130 lakhs. That will only illustrate the financial chaos we are in for by merger.

There is no need to refer to other problems regarding administration such as equation of posts, integration of laws and taxes.

I submit very humbly that having two States instead of one will not in the least endanger the strength or unity of the country.

No question of the biggest State helping a more rapid economic development arises because either as one or two, the State has to depend largely on Central Aid.

Mysore is viable and so should the other part equal in area and population be. They will be free to develop as they choose with a coast line.

Mysore prefers either to remain as it is or because of geographical and economic consideration, South Kanara of Madras and Killegal and Coorg can be added to it, which will mean two

[Shri Madiah Gowda]

clearly demarcated areas—one State in the North called Karnatak and the South called Mysore.

The wishes of the people are as stated in S.R.C. an important factor and judged from the time Mysore has to remain as it is, separate with slight additions. I humbly submit that the view obtained virtually by the employment of a gagging order both in Congress legislators and Congress Members of the P.C.C. of Mysore cannot be the voice of Mysore.

It seems to me that neither the S.R.C. nor the rest of India have fully assessed the love and reverence in which the Raj Pramukh is held. If a vote were to be taken today, I am sure ninety-nine point nine per cent. will vote for the retention of Raj Pramukh.

I feel that the interests, the desires and wishes of the people in the villages are lost in this controversy. What the villager needs is ready redress of grievances and ready provision of amenities both of which are most easily obtained in a smaller State.

If democratic principles are to have their proper play and if the new-found freedom were put a little heart into the masses and mean anything to him, it can only be where he feels there is a Government of his own and that is obviously possible in a sizeable and not a sprawling big State.

I, therefore, very strongly urge that two States may be formed—one Mysore with South Kanara and Coorg if need be, and the other North Karnatak with Bellary. This is the best solution and no one should object to it. In that case, the Raj Pramukh can continue without inconveniencing any one and there will be least dislocation and unsettling.

Shri R. C. Majhi (Mayurbhanj—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): The demand of the Adibasis and non-Adibasis of the Chotanagpur plateau and surrounding areas has been for a separate State of Jharkhand. I fail to understand why the S.R.C. did not accede

to this humble and legitimate demand. I take this opportunity to give the House an approximate picture of Jharkhand.

The proposed Jharkhand State comprises of seven districts of South Bihar namely, Ranchi, Hazaribagh, Palamau, Dhanbad, Santal Parganas, Singhbhum, Manbhum, three northern districts of Orissa namely, Mayurbhanj, Kunjhar and Sundargarh, two districts of Madhya Pradesh namely, Jashpur and Surguja and parts of Midnapur, Bankura and Birbhum districts of West Bengal. The mountainous area together with surrounding plains was full of dense forest. This area was known as Jharkhand even during the Mughal period.

The first settlers of this virgin forest of Jharkhand were the Adibasis now known by the different tribes of Santhal, Mundas, Urang, Ho, Mahale, Bathudi, Gond etc. In course of time Hindus, Muslims and foreigners infiltrated this area and today the total population of Jharkhand is over 16,367,177 and the area is over 63,859 sq. miles, which is larger than Andhra, Assam and Orissa Provinces. Its revenue resources at conservative estimate are enough to make itself sufficient.

In this Jharkhand area gigantic modern industries of iron, copper, aluminium, fertiliser, cement have been set up all over and is full of collieries, minerals to feed these factories and some economists have suggested in early forties for the construction of an Industrial Province for expansion of industries in a national scale.

The President's Constitution Order has declared the following as Scheduled areas—namely Mayurbhanj, Sundargarh in Orissa, Singhbhum, Ranchi, Palamau, Santal Parganas of Bihar, Jashpur and Surguja districts of Madhya Pradesh, that means incidentally majority of the scheduled areas come within the fold of Jharkhand. Now if we further examine we shall find that these scheduled

areas are contiguous but unfortunately they are under three Provincial Governments. Naturally the same type of tribal people are receiving different treatment.

When there is cry for spreading *Rashtrabhasa*, Oriyas abolish Hindi School of Adibasis area, Bengalis give more preference to Bengali Schools than to Hindi Schools in Adibasis area. As a result of linguistic campaign Adibasis are suffering and remaining backward.

As the Adibasis of Jharkhand area are divided in more than three Provinces; they have to learn Hindi, Bengali and Oriya and their mother tongue,—four languages and three scripts. This is the same with non-Adibasis also. Take the case of Santhals and Kurmis. Three adjoining districts of Midnapur, Singhbhum and Mayurbhanj in West Bengal, Bihar and Orissa respectively.

They can talk among themselves in their own mother tongue but they cannot have correspondence unless they learn each of the three scripts. Why should Santhals and Kurmis, Adibasis and non-Adibasis be obliged to learn more than two languages and scripts? If Jharkhand State is constituted Adibasis and non-Adibasis all will have to learn *Rashtrabhasa* as second language and their mother tongue as the first language.

With the growth of big industrial cities and towns some of the best institutions and hospitals are established there and there are communications to these cities from all around these scheduled areas. Provincial boundary limits more than often can halt passenger traffic, tourist traffic, ambulance vehicles even when a patient is dying as automobile cannot ply and cannot pay taxes for so many Provinces. As commercial centres are also associated with these industrial centres, *Kisans* and common men have been very often finding it difficult to market their agricultural produce and other commodities due to various provincial restrictions. Even

due to these restrictions of cattle movement from Province to Province, Adibasis and non-Adibasis *Kisans* find it difficult to carry on agricultural operations. So the best solution is a separate State of Jharkhand.

Bengal-Bihar-Orissa controversy on linguistic grounds has been worsened to bitterness for slicing away parts from Jharkhand area. This has made the Adibasis insecure, for the Provinces have now started setting Adibasis against Adibasis. We have been divided into four Provinces and now sub-divided within the respective Provinces, in the mad race of these language fanatics. The only way to end this controversy—to my mind—is to constitute the Jharkhand State for the integrated administration of these Adibasis and the scheduled areas.

We Adibasis realise that we have no equity and justice to share with the fellow citizens of India. A few weeks back four Adibasi M.L.As. wanted to participate in the debate on the S.R.C. Report. They were refused the right to do so. They submitted an amendment which was in order and in time. The amendment was received, typed, signed and cyclostyled—ready for circulation. But it was declared as “unreceived” by the Speaker in the Orissa Assembly. I want you to refer to proceedings of Orissa Assembly. Is this the way we all share pains and pleasures in common with others in the free spirit of preamble of our Constitution? We have got material evidence.

I submit all these facts in the large interest of the Adibasis of Jharkhand area. This is also in the large interest and prestige of the nation. India cannot allow any sections of its nation to remain weak and disrupted. I appeal to the House to concede to the joint demand of Adibasis and non-Adibasis, for a separate Jharkhand State as soon as possible.

Sardar Akarpuri (Gurdaspur): The S.R.C. has done a very good job by submitting excellent report which

[Sardar Akarpuri]

solves many problems concerning re-organisation of States. It deserves our appreciation on the whole. However, there are certain problems which, in my opinion, have not been appreciated correctly, particularly the cases of the Punjab, Vishal Andhra and Maharashtra. I am mainly concerned with the Punjab problem. This requires a clear and dispassionate consideration as, unfortunately, the S.R.C. has not correctly appreciated the Punjab problem. The arguments put forward by the commission are not logical and consistent, their proposal led to no proper solution. The unsatisfactory nature of the S.R.C. proposals is shown by the fact that the Chairman of the Commission did not agree with the proposals concerning Punjab. An overwhelming majority of people in the proposed Punjab are against the recommendations of the S.R.C.

The Punjab problem has been made complicated because of the presence of two communities—the Hindus and the Sikhs. The Sikhs are not only an important minority in Punjab; they constitute an energetic and vigorous community which has played a great role in the History of India. They are bound to play a great role in the construction and defence of India as a whole and the Punjab in particular. A solution must be evolved of the Punjab problem which should be fair and just to the Punjabis as a whole, and must satisfy the sikh minority who at present have got their misgivings about their elder brother, the Hindu community in Punjab. I am convinced that the Sikhs have not been treated fairly in the past by the majority community as evidenced by the non-implementation of the Sachar Formula mutually agreed to in 1950 by the Hindu and Sikh leadership, which recognised Gurmukhi as the correct script for Punjabi language.

It is gratifying that the Punjab problem has been taken up by the High Power Committee and I hope that they will find out a suitable solution. In my opinion this problem can only be solved if an attempt is made

to solve it on the basis of the principle applied to the reorganization of other States in India. All the proposed States, other than Punjab, are on the basis of universally accepted principle of unilingual States. If this fair and just principle is applied to the Punjab problem, it will readily lend itself to an easy solution. The Punjabi language is an immensely important part of Punjabi culture. The growth of the Punjabi language is imperative for the growth and synthesis of Punjabi culture which is essential for the elimination of communal tension and creating perfect harmony in Punjab. For the growth of the Punjabi language and common culture it is essential that Punjabi in Gurmukhi script be recognised as the official language of the Unit. This can be implemented by constituting two zones, one the Punjabi speaking and the other Hindi speaking (Haryana Prant and Himachal Pradesh) with separate legislatures but with a common Governor and High Court. In case the above proposal cannot be accepted, unilingual State, whatever the boundaries, with Punjabi in Gurmukhi script as the official language, be constituted. The question of fixing boundaries of this unilingual State should be left to the High Power Committee for a decision. I am sure that either of the above two proposals will solve the Punjab problem and that a decision given by our great leader Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru on the above basis will be accepted by all concerned.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi (Yadgir): I welcome the recommendations of States Reorganisation Commission in general and the recommendation for Karnataka State in particular. Karnataka has a glorious past. It had once established Vijayanagar Empire in the South. Its arts, literature and culture, have largely contributed to the cultural wealth of India. I am sure that Karnataka will contribute to the all-round development of India when the new States come into existence. The Commission have rightly recommended that in the provincial distribu-

tion under the British the Kannadigas suffered most. Today Kannadigas are split up into five units namely in Mysore, in Madras, in Bombay, in Hyderabad and in Coorg. New Karnataka State will have an area of about 85 thousand square miles with a population of about 2 crores and 20 lakhs.

Now, some people oppose the formation of linguistic States. Others say that this formation may be postponed for another 15 or 20 years. I fail to understand them. There are some others who want to have two Karnatakas. I should like to quote a few lines from the Address delivered by the late Vallabh Bhai Patel, while inaugurating the 10th Karnataka Unification Conference: "It is generally admitted that the present distribution of Provinces in India has no rational basis. It is admitted by all that there must be a redistribution of provinces. Again if India is to achieve rapid progress, the linguistic areas must be reorganised into provincial units."

Regarding Karnataka the late Sardar said: "Karnataka has a glorious past. From the sixth century, Karnataka had brilliant historic record till the sixteenth century. Today, the Kannada speaking people are one in language and culture. They have been struggling to achieve administrative unity since 1907. Your case is strong. The British Karnatak area in population and size is larger than Mysore State. A large part of Mysore and Hyderabad is inhabited by Kannada speaking people. If we take these areas, the Kannada-speaking units would be a formidable linguistic unit in India."

Karnataka took a leading part in the country's struggle for freedom. India is marching fast towards independence. It will not be long before it occupies its proper place along with other free nations of the world. I assure you will not have to wait long to see a united Karnataka rising out of the scattered Karnataka speaking areas with a provincial Government and proud provincial life of its own.

A small section in Mysore wants to have two Karnatakas. They say Mysore for Mysorians. It is not only against the will of the people but against various resolutions adopted in the past. Let me assure my Mysore friends that their interest in greater Karnataka State will not suffer. If they are advanced let other Karnataka brethren be benefited by their progress.

District Bellary is a part of Karnataka. Andhras cannot claim it. As a matter of fact Adoni, Alur and Raidurg Taluqs should be included in Karnataka. It is necessary in the interest of administration. So whole of Bellary district should be kept in Karnataka. Raichur and Gulberga districts and four taluqs of Bidar of Hyderabad State are going to be added to Karnataka. The area of Hyderabad Karnataka is about 18,537 sq. miles; the population about 30 lacs. The revenue is Rs. 3,31,65,856. The surplus Revenue over expenditure is about 111 lacs. If all the Karnataka area is united, Karnataka State will be a viable State.

I am glad Hyderabad is disintegrated and Marathi speaking areas and Kannada speaking areas are merged with Samyukta Maharashtra and Samyukta Karnataka respectively. It is the will of the people that Telangana should be added to Andhra, thereby making Vishalandhra. For the last 25 years, people of Hyderabad were agitating for the disintegration of Hyderabad and passed a number of resolutions that Karnataka, Andhra and Maharashtra should be merged with contiguous areas. Demand for Telangana is a recent one. It is in the interest of the people to form Vishalandhra immediately.

I am happy that the institution of Rajpramukh is abolished. This necessitates suitable amendment of the Constitution. I am also happy that distinction between Part A and Part B is abolished, giving equal status to all States.

[Shri Krishnacharya Joshi]

India after the Reorganisation of States will be a stronger nation. With certain modifications, I support the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission.

श्री जीगडे (बिलासपुर—रक्षित—अनुसूचित जातियाँ): मध्य प्रदेश के मराठी भाषी लोगों की भाषा, भूमि और स्वत्व को हर तरह से शासन ने बढ़ाया पर उनका अलग अलग होना हमें खलता है। वर्तमान मध्य प्रदेश का रहना अच्छा था। आयोजित मध्य प्रदेश में छत्तीसगढ़ के लोगों पर न तो आयोग ने ध्यान दिया और न इस सदन ने कोई ध्यान दिया। इसीलिए वहां के प्रतिनिधियों को बोलने का मौका नहीं मिला। छत्तीसगढ़ की जनसंख्या ८० लाख है, क्षेत्रफल ५४,००० वर्ग मील है। वहां के रहने वाले लोगों का न तो निजी खंघा है न व्यापार है और न राजनीति में उनका प्रभुत्व है। और वहां के किसी भी छोटे-बड़े शहर में स्थानीय लोगों का अस्तित्व नहीं। उस भूभाग को मध्य प्रदेश की राजधानी भोपाल बनाने से विशेष धक्का पहुंचेगा। लोगों को ५०० मील से ७०० मील का चक्कर काटना पड़ेगा। यह भाग पर्वतों और प्राकृतिक दुर्गमताओं से अलग हो जाता है और न भोपाल के लिए कोई सीधा रास्ता है। जबलपुर को प्रदेश के भिन्न स्थानों से रेल या पक्की सड़कों से जोड़ा गया है केवल कुछ सीधी एक्सप्रेस ट्रेनें चलने की देर है। प्रान्त के किसी कोने से जबलपुर ३५० या ४०० मील से दूर नहीं पड़ेगा। ऐसी हालत में जबलपुर हर स्थिति में राजधानी बनना चाहिए क्योंकि यह प्रदेश के सब लोगों को सुविधा दे सकेगा और वहां सब साधन उपलब्ध हो सकेंगे। चाहे भोपाल या जबलपुर राजधानी बने, राजधानी के लिए ८-१० करोड़ रुपये तो खर्च करने पड़ेंगे और यही प्रदेश ऐसा होगा जहां राजधानी बनाना समस्या होगी और जिसके लिए केन्द्र को विशेष खर्च करना पड़ेगा। ऐसी हालत में क्यों न

जबलपुर को राजधानी बनाया जावे और हाई कोर्ट भी जबलपुर में रहे।

छत्तीसगढ़ के दूरस्थ लोगों के लिए एक विश्वविद्यालय और हाईकोर्ट का डिवीजन बेंच रखना लाजमी होगा। हमारे नये प्रदेश में ६ नयी कमिश्नरियां बनें जिन्हें प्रशासन की अधिकतम शक्तियां दी जायें ताकि लोगों को सेंकड़ों मील पार कर राजधानी न जाना पड़े। छत्तीसगढ़ की दो कमिश्नरियां, विन्ध्य-प्रदेश, इन्दौर, ग्वालियर और जबलपुर वे ६ कमिश्नरियां बनायीं जावें। प्रशासन के कई विभागों को भी हमें इन्दौर, ग्वालियर, रीवां, रायपुर, बिलासपुर आदि शहरों में स्थापित करना चाहिए।

इस नये प्रदेश को यदि राजनैतिक स्वायत्त देना हो तो यह अत्यधिक जरूरी है कि इस प्रदेश में बिसदन प्रथा चालू हो अर्थात् विधान सभा के सिवा विधान परिषद् की स्थापना हो।

हम महाकौशल वालों का यह कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि हम उदार बनें, अपने नये क्षेत्र के भाइयों को पहले सम्पन्न सुखी समृद्धिशाली बनायें, बाद में हम अपनी ओर देखें। इन भाइयों को आभास तक न हो कि वे दूसरों से मिलने जा रहे हैं या उन पर दूसरों का प्रभुत्व हो रहा है बल्कि यह अनुभव करने लमें कि वे अधिक सुखी हो रहे हैं। पुरानी स्थानीयता की भावनाओं को त्याग हमारी समग्रता की ओर झुकना ही प्रदेश को गौरवशील भाग बना सकेगा।

इस प्रदेश की आगामी २० वर्षों तक क्षेत्र की व्यापकता और पिछड़ेपन को देखकर उद्योग-स्थापना, यातायात, रेल के निर्माण तथा आर्थिक सहायता में विशेष अधिक धन की मदद देना केन्द्रीय शासन का कर्तव्य होता है तभी देश की सर्वांगीण उन्नति में हम दूसरे राज्यों की बराबरी पर पहुंच सकते हैं और

स्थानीय लोगों को कुशल, सम्य और समृद्धि-शापी बना सकते हैं, नहीं तो यह प्रदेश शोषित-पीडित बना रहेगा ।

भारत देश के राज्यों के पुनर्गठन पर लोक सभा में सभी राजनैतिक दलों के लोगों द्वारा बल के बन्धनों को तोड़कर बिना रोक टोक गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार किया जा रहा है । हमारे भविष्य के नक्शे बढलेंगे और एकाग्र नटित सघन प्रान्त बन कर देश में स्थायित्व लायेंगे । स्वतन्त्रता के पश्चात् हम यह बूसरी बार नक्शा बदल रहे हैं ।

यद्यपि राज्यों के पुनर्निर्माण में भाषा, संस्कृति, भौगोलिक एकाग्रता, इतिहास, आर्थिक सम्पन्नता, शासन का आर्थिक और राजनैतिक स्थायित्व, सुरक्षा, राष्ट्रीय एकता आदि के आधारों पर ध्यान देना आवश्यक समझा गया है पर न जाने क्यों, केवल भाषा को ही एक और अन्तिम आधार मानकर राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग ने फैसला दिया और बहुतेरे सदस्य इसी आधार पर ही तुले हुए हैं । जब सब राज्य भाषाओं को पूरी तरह पनपने देने को साधन दिये जा रहे हैं, तो क्या कारण है कि हम द्विभाषी बड़े-बड़े राज्य जहाँ पर बनाये जा सकते हैं, न बनावें और एक दूसरे को समझने की कोशिश करें ।

राष्ट्रीय उन्नति के लिए यह भी आवश्यक है कि देश में प्रति वर्ग मील के अत्यधिक जनसंख्या के बंगाल और केरल को राष्ट्रीय गम्भीर समस्याएं समझी जावें और उनके साथ स्थान देने और घन और उद्योग की सहायता में विशेष बजन दिया जाये । उसी प्रकार आसाम, राजस्थान, हिमाचल प्रदेश, कश्मीर, मध्य प्रदेश और विशाल आन्ध्र जहाँ भूमि अधिक है, लोग गरीब हैं और जहाँ शोषण का जोर है, पर आगामी

२० वर्षों तक विशेष आर्थिक सहायता, जनसंख्या के आधार पर नहीं, वरन् उनके पिछड़े-पन, आदिवासी हरिजनों को हालतों और विशाल क्षेत्रों को देखते हुए दो जावे ।

अब ऐसा समय आ चुका है कि दिल्ली, हिमाचल प्रदेश और मनीपुर राज्यों को अलग राज्य नहीं रहने दिया जावे क्योंकि ऊपरी बजनदार शासन देश और स्थानीय लोगों को धक्का पहुंचाता है । बम्बई जैसे नगर राज्य की स्थापना खतरे से खाली नहीं है । इससे पूंजीवाद, विदेशी गुप्तचरों, शत्रुओं, पूंजीपति, भ्रम विषमता और हिंसात्मक साम्यवादी तरीकों को बल मिलेगा ।

बस्तर के कुछ हिस्सों का अन्य राज्यों का भांगना न्यायसंगत नहीं है । बस्तर का यातायात और खनिज पदार्थ की उन्नति भिलाई इस्पात कारखाना से अटूट सम्बन्ध रखती है उन्हें बिलराया नहीं जा सकता । सारा बस्तर मध्य प्रदेश में ही रहेगा ।

Shri B. K. Das (Contal): During the discussion of the S.R.C. report for these nine days many important points regarding the readjustment of West Bengal's borders which in the opinion of the commission has assumed the shape of a major problem have been brought forward by several hon. members. As I feel that West Bengal's claim to some areas of the Santhal Parganas has not been adequately dealt with I desire to place some facts regarding this matter before the House in the form of a statement.

The States Reorganisation Commission have observed in para. 655 of the Report that Bengali influence in the entire Santhal Pargana district is very slight. But a reference to the following documents and papers will show that Bengali influence is preponderating in Santhal Parganas particularly in Jamtara, Pakur, Dumka and Rajmahal Sub divisions.

(a) Gantzer's Report (1922 to 35) prescribing Bengali as the language

[Shri B. K. Das]

for writing up records in Jamtara, Pakur, parts of Dumka and Rajmahal Sub-divisions.

(b) Circular No. 2 of 1949 (*vide* General Clauses and Circulars of Patna High Court) prescribing Bengali as an optional court language in Jamtara, Pakur, Dumka and Rajmahal Sub-divisions.

(c) Land Revenue and Land Tenure (*vide* Facts and Figures about Bihar, 1955, page 71) showing prevalence of Bengali Year in the entire Santhal Parganas except Godda and Damin-i-Koh.

(d) Linguistic Survey by Dr. Grierson showing Jamtara, Pakur, Dumka, Rajmahal inside Bengali influence.

(e) Appendix (3) to Bihar Electoral Rules, 1936 (*vide* Bihar Election Manual 1938, page 112) prescribing Bengali as the language for writing Electoral Rolls in Jamtara, Pakur, part of Dumka and Rajmahal Sub-divisions.

The Commission have observed, in para. 654, that the claim of West Bengal, that the Revenue History of this District indicates its administrative links with Birbhum and Murshidabad, is not convincing. A reference to Schedule 1 to Act XXXVII of 1855 constituting the district of Santhal Parganas will show that Taluks Kundahit, Kraya, Pabia, Sarat, Darin Mauleswar, (Jamtara Sub-division, parts of Dumka and Deogarh Sub-divisions) formed part of Birbhum district of West Bengal. Land Revenue and Land Tenure (*vide* Facts and Figures about Bihar, 1955, page 71) already referred to establishes beyond and shadow of doubt that the revenue history of this district is indissolubly inter-linked with that of West Bengal.

The Commission have also observed that affinities of Santhals with West Bengal are also not convincing. There is over-whelming evidence that Bengali is more commonly used and understood by Santhals than Hindi. The observations made by Hoernely,

Deputy Commissioner of Santhal Pargana in 1927 that Hindi must not be forced down the throats of Santhals eloquently testifies to the affinity of Santhals with the Bengalis. Recognition of Bengali as an optional Court Language in four sub-divisions of Santhal Parganas is an additional proof of affinities of Santhals with the Bengalis. Moreover, there is also a substantial number of Santhals on the other side of the border in Birbhum. If the areas under reference are integrated with West Bengal tribal unity, instead of being disrupted, will be strengthened. Preceding census reports also show that a large section of Santhals use Bengali as subsidiary language.

Although the Commission have observed in para. 9 that they have mainly relied on statistical figures as given in different censuses in reaching their conclusions, strangely enough, in the case of Santhal Parganas, they have relied on manipulated census figures of 1951. That the census figures of 1951 are manipulated will be evident from a reference to the previous census figures particularly of Jamtara and Pakur. For instance, in Jamtara according to 1911 census the number of Bengali speakers was 69,979, which rose to 73,091 in 1931 and abruptly came down to 15,877 in 1951. Is it not a biological absurdity? How is it that in the two bordering sub divisions of Jamtara and Pakur, Bengali speakers have abnormally decreased whereas in the other Sub-divisions away from Bengal they have increased? According to 1951 census, percentage of scheduled tribes population is about 30 in Jamtara Sub-division, but the percentage of speakers of Tribal languages has been shown as 56. How is this possible? According to Appendix (II) Bihar and Orissa Census Report part 1 of 1931, in Jamtara Sub-divisions 41 per cent. speak tribal languages of whom 32 per cent. speak Bengali as subsidiary language, 30 per cent. Bengali and 29 per cent. Hindustani of whom 20 per cent. speak Bengali as subsidiary language.

The Commission have rejected the claim for Ajoy Catchment on the ground that there are no balancing factors although Jamtara Sub-division in which portion of Ajoy Catchment lies is predominantly Bengali speaking. In this connection it may be pointed out that the Commission have conceded claims for Tungabhadra Project (para. 336), Bhakra Project (para. 560), and Kasai Project (para. 665) in accordance with the principles enunciated in para. 203 that it will be a clear advantage to give access to Head-works if territorial adjustments do not come into conflict with other important considerations. There are no important considerations which can stand in the way of ceding Ajoy Catchment to West Bengal.

Thus it will be seen that historically, geographically, linguistically, portions of Santhal Parganas particularly Jamtara, Pakur, parts of Dumka and Rajmahal Sub-divisions form part of West Bengal. The final report on Revision Survey and Settlement Operations in the district of Santhal Pargana 1922-35 by J. F. Gantzer, M.B.E., Settlement Officer also supports my contention.

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay City—North): We all know that in the discussions that are now going on with regard to Bombay State, the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission have now receded to the background. It is the 3-State proposal of the Congress Working Committee that holds the field. I represent the city of Bombay in this House and am going to confine my observations to the future of the city alone. The Congress Working Committee's 3-State formula involves the separation of Bombay city from Maharashtra and from Gujarat and its formation into a City State. It should be obvious that such a City State would be a small State. In view of many of us such an arrangement would not be in the best interests of the parties concerned and certainly not in the interests of the city itself. Personally,

I am sceptical of any good coming out of a separate City State for Bombay. It will amount to a needless amputation of a healthy limb.

All of us agree that the Report of S.R.C. is a great document and in whatever this Parliament may ultimately decide to do in the matter of Reorganisation of States, their recommendations should receive due weight. These are recommendations which are far-sighted and based on wisdom and courage. The Home Minister in his speech has rightly said that S.R.C.'s recommendations should not be lightly tampered with.

And yet the proposal to constitute Bombay City into a small City State runs counter to the whole argument of the S.R.C. Report. One of the chief contributions of the S.R.C. Report has been that it has argued powerfully against the continuation of the existing small States. There is therefore no question of its approving the creation of a new small State such as the separated Bombay city is going to be. The reasons given in the Report are weighty indeed. Take for instance the fact that in a small State there won't be available that "impersonal administration" which is vital for the working of democratic institutions. The Report goes on to say "the Governments of smaller areas, not having enough work in the field of 'policy-making' tend to undertake detailed and direct administration". Personal ambitions and jealousies receive greater prominence in a small State because of the fact that "the smaller the forum for political activity the greater the inter-play of personal ambitions and jealousies".

We are all aware of the usual argument and it is a sound argument that the burden of unproductive expenditure which a small State has to bear is far out of proportion to any good that the State may receive in return for that expenditure. In fact the Report has emphasised the fact that "some of the larger States have proved to be the best administered".

[Shri V. B. Gandhi]

In other words the Report points out how the whole trend of modern States is towards bigger units. "With the expansion of the requirements of organised social communities, modern States inevitably tend to become bigger and it is difficult to reverse the process". And in proposing to create a new State in Bombay city, what are we trying to do except to reverse this process, this whole historical trend towards bigger States. These are weighty reasons and deserve more serious consideration.

Now let us see what S.R.C. Report has to say about the future of Bombay city in particular. The whole chapter on Bombay State in this Report is a forceful argument against separating greater Bombay and constituting it into a City State. For instance, the Report says "having regard to the population and the size of the area as well as the fact that it is primarily a city unit, it will not in our opinion, be entitled to be treated as a full State of the Union". We should remember here that the whole scheme of reorganisation as recommended by the Commission is based on State units possessing certain necessary attributes and it is obvious that in the opinion of the Commission, Greater Bombay will not be possessing these necessary attributes to be entitled to the status of a full State in the Union. In proposing therefore the creation of a city State for Bombay, we shall be taking upon ourselves a great responsibility in as much as our proposal will be a proposal which runs counter to the principles evolved by the Commission on which to base our new States.

Then there are other arguments such as that the City has its "natural links" with its hinterland in Maharashtra and that both the Marathi and Gujarati speaking regions continue to depend on the financial surplus of greater Bombay. It is not necessary to go into the details of this financial aspect, though it is an important aspect. It should be sufficient

to quote the view of the Commission on this point.

"On financial grounds alone, we would view with concern the separation of Greater Bombay from the other two regions of the State".

These in short are some of the grounds on which S.R.C. has clearly opposed the idea of separating Bombay city and constituting it into a State. It is not suggested here that a City State in Bombay will not be a viable one. We are confident that the City State will possess adequate financial, administrative and technical resources for its development and growth. The city has a hard-working population and there is in its life enough vitality to promise a reasonable level of well-being for its people. There is no reason to fear that as a result of separation the city will suffer and languish. And yet, we should not ignore the fact that the city will still be a small State and may not escape the consequences of being a small State.

In the last few years, many Commissions and Committees have considered this question of reorganisation of States and none of them has proposed the creation of a City State for Bombay, as its first choice. Every time the suggestion has come, it has come as an alternative to something else. For instance, the Dar Commission, the J.V.P. Committee, the Congress Working Committee, the Bombay Pradesh Congress Committee and even Shri S. K. Patil in his speech the other day in the House—they all have put forward the suggestion for a separate Bombay State only as an alternative to something else which evidently in their opinion would be a better solution. In view of this overwhelming opinion our course plainly should be to seek a solution which would avoid the separation of Bombay city and its formation into a City State.

What does it then lead us to? Probably, the S.R.C. formula! But we

know that the Maharashtrians have rejected it. It would also lead probably to the M.P.C.C.'s formula. Here, we know that the Gujaratis have rejected it. But this should not deter us from pursuing our search for a formula which will not involve the separation of Bombay city. I have faith enough in the wisdom of the leaders of Maharashtra and Gujarat and of the city of Bombay and I am sure they will not be found wanting in resourcefulness and in a sense of patriotism. In the face of such tremendous issues, no one should stand on prestige. The issue are worthy of reconsideration. The responsibility is on all of us to persist until a right solution is found. Let it not be said by posterity that the men, whether in Maharashtra, or in Gujerat, or in Bombay city who are now deciding the issues were not big enough for the tasks to which they are called.

We are in this country fortunate in having amongst us leaders who have great influence, whose views receive consideration and whose decisions are accepted by reasonable men in all parties. No reorganisation of States can be complete without satisfactorily solving the problem of the city of Bombay. I am of the opinion that in an issue of this importance, it would be quite proper for the Congress Working Committee to take the initiative in its own hands, bring the leaders of the parties concerned together and give them a mandate to seek a solution which will avoid the separation of Bombay city.

A solution of this kind will save the city and save the other regions in the Bombay State which in many ways are dependent on the city. It will be relevant here to say that the claim that Bombay belongs to Maharashtra is in a sense implicit in the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission. It was conceded more explicitly by Shri Dhebar, the Congress President when recently he agreed to the City's going over to Maharashtra after five years in the

event of the City's Legislature deciding by a two-thirds majority in favour of such a course.

I have tried here to focus attention on the risks to which the city would be exposed if separated. It will be seen that more than the future of the city is involved in this. The future of democracy in these regions is involved. I have no doubt the people of the city, of Maharashtra, and of Gujarat will be disposed to accept an agreed solution of this kind which has the blessings of the Congress Working Committee. It will secure the loyal support of Congressmen. Its passage through this Parliament will be made easier. A permanent solution of the Bombay problem has to be a solution that makes democracy workable in this region. Such a solution lies only along the lines that have been indicated.

Shri Kajrolkar (Bombay City—North—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Much is being said about the future of Bombay vis-a-vis the formation of Samyukta Maharashtra. I take the opportunity of clarifying the view point of the constituency I represent. Majority of my voters are Maharashtrians, hailing particularly from the Coastal Districts like Ratnagiri-Kolaba and Thana. They have been in Bombay for generations now and if at all anybody could claim to have a rightful share in the building of this city, it is my people and particularly the people of the Konkan.

Circumstances in Konkan have never been very affable for any type of living. A very large number of the inhabitants of Konkan had to migrate to the city of Bombay for earning their livelihood. This migration still continues and will continue as the city of Bombay alone affords these people their 'living'. I particularly point these facts to the minds of all those who think in terms of keeping Bombay 'separate'. If Bombay is kept 'separate', Konkan Districts will nearly be driven to 'economic starvation'. I, therefore, humbly appeal to those concerned not even to think of any

[Shri Kajrolkar]

kind of a 'separate unit' for the city of Bombay, the manpower of which hails predominantly from Konkan and other districts of the Marathi speaking areas, particularly Satara.

I quite realise the tempo of controversy that has raged round the city of Bombay, but I venture to point out that the city with its geographic position, its cultural background and particularly thought of in the context of 'manpower' can be claimed by the Maharashtrians and Maharashtrians alone. I do admit that Bombay city is a cosmopolitan one but the Maharashtrians are the largest single unit there.

Our Constitution guarantees all safeguards to all minorities and as such no individual or groups need harbour any fears of injustice.

I have been a Congressman all my life and as a soldier I shall always go by the mandates of the Supreme body. Whatever decision is taken by the Government on the recommendations of S.R.C. has to be accepted and each one of us must play his or her part in its implementation. However, as a representative of the people of my constituency I feel it my duty to voice their feelings.

I take this opportunity to make an humble appeal to our beloved leader—our Prime Minister. He has raised the status of our country in 'international arena'. He has been responsible for giving all solutions for maintenance of 'world peace'. In doing so, he has always felt the pulse of the people and I am sure he will not ignore the people and their will in deciding this issue as well.

I support the creation of Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay city as the best solution of the problem falling which a bilingual state as proposed by the States Reorganisation Commission may be considered.

May I appeal to my Gujrati friends to take a practical view of the proposals put forth by me and to answer the

call of the occasion and the situation. Let them show large-heartedness and brotherliness towards Maharashtrians as they have always done.

In the end, I may make an appeal to the heroic leader of the Bombay Pradesh Congress Committee, Shri S. K. Patil also to give consideration to the proposals put forward by me above and find out solutions of the problem in such a way that the largest number of people of Bombay may be satisfied and the glory of Bombay remains undiminished for ever.

Shri Bogawat (Ahmednagar South):
When we are carving the political map of India, we must be very careful to see that unity, security and solidarity of India is maintained.

Father of the Nation, Mahatma Gandhi made India free through the ideals of non-violence and truth. His right hand, great Sardarji liquidated the States and freed the States people from the tyranny of the feudal-lords. His political heir the great Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlalji has undertaken the most difficult task of carving the political map of India so that there should be social and economic development of the people of each State. We are marching towards a Welfare State, our goal being a socialistic pattern of society. Independence of India will last long if there is no exploitation, if there is co-operation, good-will and friendship among the people of several States. In the international sphere Panditji is trying to establish peace, cooperation and goodwill and he would not fail to do so in our country also.

I have respect for the integrity, honesty and talents of the S.R.C., but if I criticise their reports it should not be taken as disrespect to them. In my opinion this great task would have better been solved by persons who identified themselves with people's movement. The British wanted to divide and rule and exploited the country for 150 years. States were

formed in such a way so that they may be able to rule. When there was an attempt of "Wangbhag" the people were as if *up in arms* in 1905, and the movement of linguistic States began to grow. Here we must keep in mind how Muslim League was thrown out in the last elections in East Bengal. Congress passed resolutions on several occasions to form linguistic States and election manifestos also mentioned the same story. Dar and J.V.P. Commissions were appointed. They made recommendations. My grievance is that S.R.C. has not given more attention as to how this national movement was taking roots. Time and circumstances had changed and some recommendations were things of the past. S.R.C. ought to have given more thoughts to the people's movement for Vishal Andhra, Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay, State for Punjabi language just as they have given their thought to Samukta Karnataka. In my humble opinion the recommendations of S.R.C. as to keeping (a) Telangana and Vidarbha as separate States is wrong (b) Bilingual Bombay and Punjab are not justifiable (c) Boundary questions are unsatisfactory. I am of the view that there should be Vishal Andhra, Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay as its capital, a State for Punjabi language, Himachal should be kept separate for the present.

The Boundary questions should be solved as contiguous village-wise, and mother-tongue figure-wise as shown in the census handbook. Contiguous unilingual areas can be very easily determined with the help of the maps. Composition of districts and talukas have always been changed, whenever administrative convenience required it. Let the border people not feel that their future growth of education, social and economic life is hampered. I press for villages in "contiguous" area in Bidar, Adilabad, Belgaum and Karwar districts and the town of Barhampur to be included in Samyukta Maharashtra. I may add that Konkani is nothing but a dialect of Marathi. This view is supported by eminent scholars.

Having said this I shall put my reasons for Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay as its Capital. S.R.C. has recommended bilingual State for Bombay. In doing so they have created a small State of Vidarbha and many a Marathi-speaking area was kept out which cannot be liked by the Marathi speaking people. If a bilingual State was to be created, S.R.C. ought to have created a State for all speaking Marathi and Gujerathi languages. In a balanced State there always is a question of majority and minority to run democracy properly. Further S.R.C. ought to have inquired if there were differences which increased later on. They ought to have inquired if there was cooperation, friendship and goodwill without which such a decision can't be enforced, otherwise it is impossible to have unity and solidarity of the State. It appears they have not given their thoughts to these most essential things. They have not given their thoughts to how the movement for Samyukta Maharashtra had spread. They are swayed it appears from the representation of the Citizens Committee and the reasons given by S.R.C. are just similar. Charges of communalism, suspicions, fears, apprehensions, mistrust and misgivings are made, which are most humiliating and so the movement has taken a serious turn. The Working Committee of the Congress has recommended three States, but I humbly request the leaders, and especially Panditji that if a City State of Bombay is created it would be a most retrograde step. This should not be in the interest of the great city. It will be a 10th rate State as admitted by Shri S. K. Patil. It will go red. It will be a worst step and a bad precedent as capitalists would try to escape from the socialistic pattern of country side. Nobody is afraid except a few capitalists and industrialists. The Marwari industrialists are not against. There are 26 textile mills of Marwaris and only 15 belonging to Gujerathis. I am a Marwari elected from Maharashtra and other Marwaris are also elected from Maharashtra. The best economists, the advocates, the doctors, many Telugus, Tamils and people from

[Shri Bogawat]

Upper India like Bombay to be included in Samyukta Maharashtra.

Maharashtrians are great patriots, Maharashtrians are good friends, who protect the weak if you are friends to them. They would protect the weak just as was done by great Shivaji, Chimnaji Appa and others who drove away foreigners and Portuguese. The Maharashtrians sacrificed in the Freedom movement. Lokmanya was from Maharashtra. Vinobhaji comes from Maharashtra. Maharashtrians are not short-sighted. They will always help industries so that the industries would grow. They want the expansion of industries for the development of Maharashtra for solving the problem of unemployment, and the capitalists should not have any fear. I say the fear, the apprehension and the mistrust is unreal. Shri S. K. Patil has given a challenge for plebiscite but I think he will have to take back his words if Bombay Corporation elections are held soon. The Corporation has passed a Resolution for Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay as Capital. Heaven will not fall if Bombay is allowed to remain in Samyukta Maharashtra. I appeal to this House, the Working Committee, the leaders of Government and all the saner elements in the country to respect the people's decision.

बाबू राम नारायण सिंह (हजारी बाग—पश्चिम) : राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग के प्रतिवेदन पर लोक-सभा में बहुत लम्बी चौड़ी बहस हुई। सारे देश में इस सम्बन्ध में यथेष्ट हलचल है। विषय भी बहुत ही गम्भीर है। देश को विभिन्न प्रान्तों में बांटना है। अंगरेजों के बनाये प्रान्त ठीक नहीं हैं। वे देश में ज्यों २ फैलते गये, त्यों त्यों अपने शासन में सुविधा के मुताबिक प्रान्त बनाते गये। उन्होंने यह विचार नहीं किया था कि एक प्रान्त का टुकड़ा दूसरे प्रान्त में रख देने से वहाँ के लोगों को रहन सहन में बहुत बृहत् बाधाएँ होंगी। इसलिये अखिल भारतीय

राष्ट्र महासभा (कांग्रेस) ने यह विचार मान लिया था कि स्वतन्त्रता के बाद सारे देश को भाषावार प्रान्तों में फिर से बांट दिया जायेगा। तदनुसार यह आयोग बनाया गया और अब उनका निर्णय देश के सामने है।

यहाँ पर यह स्मरण रखना चाहिये कि देश और दुनिया में प्रायः सभी झगड़े, आन्दोलन और युद्ध भी जनता की राय से नहीं होते। नेता वा सरकार ही इन बातों के लिये उत्तरदायी होती है। स्वतन्त्रता के साथ साथ भारत के दो टुकड़े हो गये—एक हिन्दुस्तान और दूसरा पाकिस्तान। यदि जनता की राय ली जाती तो यह निश्चित है कि यह घटना नहीं होने पाती। जो हों इस बंटवारे के अनुसार हिन्दुस्तान, हिन्दुओं अथवा हिन्दू नेताओं को मिला और पाकिस्तान मुसलमान नेताओं को मिला। ८ वर्ष बीत गये, पाकिस्तान में अब तक शासन संविधान भी नहीं बना। हिन्दू नेता लोगों ने संविधान बनाया, जिसके अनुसार सारे देश में एक भारी चुनाव कराया और उसके बाद केन्द्र तथा प्रान्तों में सरकारें बनीं। लेकिन ये सारी बातें इसी तरीके से की गईं ताकि देश में उन्हीं नेताओं का राज्य हो और मूक जनता उनकी सेवा करे। मेरे कहने का अभिप्राय यह है कि अभी देश में आयोग के प्रतिवेदन पर भी जो झगड़े और आन्दोलन हो रहे हैं, नेताओं के स्वार्थपूर्ण कार्यों के कारण ही हो रहे हैं। गरीब जनता का इसमें कोई हाथ नहीं है। दुःख तो यह है कि इस पर भी निर्णय तो नेता ही करेंगे।

जो हो जमीन बांट ली जाय पर आदमियों को बांटने की चेष्टा न की जाय। कोई जमीन, कितनी भी जमीन कोई भी बड़ा से बड़ा इलाका किसी प्रान्त से लेकर किसी दूसरे प्रान्त को दे दिये जायें पर किसी मनुष्य को, उसकी इच्छा के प्रतिकूल इधर से उधर न किया जाय। यह भी स्मरण रहे कि ऐसा जो भी कार्य होगा, वह अन्याय होगा। किसी सरकार का, इस

संसद का भी कोई हक नहीं है कि किसी मनुष्य को व मनुष्य समूह को इच्छा के प्रतिकूल एक प्रान्त से उठाकर दूसरे प्रान्त में रख दिया जाय। यदि ऐसा हुआ तो यह घोर अनर्थ होगा।

इस तरह का झगड़ा हमारे बिहार प्रांत और बंगाल के बीच बहुत दिनों से चला आ रहा है। इसको भ्रवश्य तय करना चाहिये। लेकिन इसमें न जबर्दस्ती और न जल्दबाजी करनी चाहिये। जो भी व्यक्ति या समाज या इलाका बंगाल में जाना चाहे, उसको वैसी ही सुविधा मिलनी चाहिये लेकिन जो बिहार में रहना चाहे, उसको भी वैसा ही सुविधा मिले लेकिन ये सारे कार्य सलाह और पंचायत से ही सम्भव हैं। कोई निर्णय किसी पर जबरन लादना नहीं चाहिये। यदि ऐसा हुआ तो बहुत बुरा होगा। इसका फल अच्छा कभी नहीं हो सकता है केन्द्रीय सरकार को चाहिये कि कुछ बिहारी और बंगाली सज्जनों की एक पंचायत बनावें जिसमें कुछ केन्द्रीय सरकार के भी प्राधमी रहें। वह पंचायत पुरलिया और पूणिया जाये। पूरा समय देकर, पूरी मुस्तैदी के साथ और सभी की सलाह से सभी के सुख और सन्तोष के लिये, यह पंचायत ऐसा निर्णय करे कि भावी में भी बिहारी और बंगाली भाई और मित्र बन कर रहें। कटु स्मरण भी न रहे। इस सम्बन्ध में समय देकर शान्ति से कार्य करना होगा। शीघ्रता करने से काम बिगड़ेगा। यह देश के लिये बुरा होगा। देश की उन्नति के लिये देशवासियों में प्रेम की परभावश्यकता है। इसी तरह बम्बई, पंजाब, मध्य भारत तथा तैलंगाना आदि जगहों का भी सलाह से ही सभी प्रश्न हल करना चाहिये। इसी में सबका कल्याण है।

यहां पर इतना कह देना उचित है कि जिस समाज से या इलाके से कोई हटना चाहता है, तो उस इलाके के अधिकारी वर्ग के लिये

लज्जा की बात है। पुरलिया इलाके के सभी या कुछ भी लोग बिहार से हटना चाहते हैं, तो यह बिहारियों के लिये, बास कर बिहार सरकार के लिये बड़ी ही लज्जा की बात है। कोई हमसे क्यों भ्रलग हो ? यदि इतने दिनों में बिहार सरकार पुरलिया के लोगों को प्रेम में नहीं बांध सकी तो उन की बंगाल में जाने की इच्छा को क्यों बुरा मानती है। मैं स्वयं जानता हूं कि बिहार सरकार ने बहुत बहुत अनुचित और अन्यायपूर्ण काम करके वहां के बहुत लोगों को अपने पुराने प्रेमी साथियों को भी बहुत दुखित कर दिया है। बिहार की जनता इस बात को जाने और समझे कि इस समय बिहार की जो कुछ भी हानि या बुराई होगी, उसके लिये उनकी अयोग्य सरकार उत्तरदायी है।

मैं एक बिहारी हूं, झारखंडी भी हूं। मैं चाहता था और अभी भी चाहता हूं कि झारखंड बिहार से भ्रलग हो। सभी आदिवासी झारखंड में ही रहते हैं। हम लोग भ्रायं जाति के लोग भी वहां यथेष्ट संख्या में रहते हैं।

आयोग के दो सदस्यों ने अपनी धांकों जो महान् परिदर्शन, रांची आदि झारखंड के प्रधान स्थानों में देखा है, उनको भ्रवश्य ही पता लगा होगा और विश्वास भी हुआ होगा कि आदिवासी बिहार में नहीं रहना चाहते। सभी गैर आदिवासी खुले तौर पर ऐसा नहीं चाहते, यह ठीक है। उसका कारण है बिहार सरकार के लोग आदिवासी लोगों का यह कह कर डराते रहते हैं कि यदि झारखंड बना तो आदिवासी लोग गैर आदिवासियों को या तो मार देंगे या वहां से भगा देंगे। यदि गैरआदिवासी लोग निडर हो जायें और इस सरकारी कथन को झूठ मान लें तो यह कहना कठिन होगा कि झारखंड का कौन गैर आदिवासी भी बिहार में रहना चाहता है। कारण है कि बिहार सरकार झारखंड जाने छोटा नागपुर और संताल परगना को और वहां के

[बाबू रामनारायण सिंह]

रहने वाले सभी आदिवासी और गैरआदिवासी लोगों को अपनी सम्पत्ति समझती है और तदनुकूल व्यवहार करती है। यह तो किसी मनुष्य के लिये असत्य है। आयुक्तों ने किसी अंश में इसको माना भी है। लेकिन उनका कहना है कि झारखंड के बनने से बिहार की माली हालत बिगड़ जायेगी। बिहार की माली हालत ठीक बनी रहे इसलिये झारखंडी गुलाम बने रहें। बाहरी न्याय बुद्धि। आयोग के सदस्य लोग देश के इन्ने गिने लोगों में हैं। कोई शक नहीं कि वे हर तरह से योग्य और विश्वासपात्र सज्जन हैं। उनके सम्बन्ध में उनकी नियत के सम्बन्ध में तनिक भी छीटा कसी करना अन्याय है। वे हमारे पूज्य हैं। लेकिन लोगों ने भारी भूलें की हैं। यह कहना अत्युक्ति नहीं होगी कि भारी मूर्खता की है। झारखंड एक राज्य न बने, एक बम्बई नगर का एक राज्य हो सकता है। पढ़े लिखे लोगों के लिये किसी विषय के पक्ष या विपक्ष में बहस कर देनी कोई कठिन बात नहीं है। अक्षी से अक्षी चीजों में बुराई दिखलाई जा सकती है। बात भी है कि संसार में ऐसी कोई चीज नहीं है जो केवल भली है और उसमें कोई बुराई नहीं है। अन्त में मेरा निवेदन है सकल समाज से कि जो करो, सलाह से करो। देर भाये दुस्त भाये। जो जहां रहे, सुख से रहे, सब से मिल कर रहे, और सब के लिये रहे। पूरे पवित्र और सच्चे लोगों की सरकार बने जो सबके साथ समान बर्ताव करे।

Shri Subramania Chettiar (Dharmapuri): I have been listening to the heated controversies which are coming from all corners of this House regarding S.R.C. Report. I have seen in newspapers several agitations and disturbances, shooting and deaths in some parts of this country. I regret very much for this situation which is created at present. This linguistic redistribution should not have been brought within this short period after

our Independence. Now our Government itself has created the linguistic feelings in the minds of people.

However, I appreciate the attitude of our Government at present for the importance shown to the Provinces provincial culture and their languages. Now according to this report it is clear all the people living in all parts of our country are our nationals. The culture of the different provinces are all our Indian culture and the languages spoken in all the Provinces of our country are said to be our Indian national languages. Almost all the States are now formed on lingual basis.

So when all the languages spoken in our country are said to be, treated to be our Indian national languages, it is not proper on the part of our Government to thrust Hindi on the non-Hindi speaking areas in the name of official language and in the name of Constitution.

Even though the Constitution has accepted Hindi as our official and national language, now we find all the languages our own Indian languages. I request our Government to come forward boldly to amend the Constitution to treat all our Indian languages as our national languages and official languages in their respective Provinces. For the control of the Central Government let us have English as medium. This method of giving importance to our languages is impartial and will be unanimously accepted by all the people living in all corners of this country.

Regarding the redistribution of areas in Madras State, the Hosur taluk is claimed by the Andhra, but it is a multi-lingual State. So in ascertaining this area a referendum may be held. It is not proper to say that Devikolam and Peeramade would go to Kerala as the atmosphere is favourable to the Malayalees. These places are predominantly Tamil speaking areas, which has been under the control of Tamilnad for a long time. In Malabar also many areas are predominantly Tamil

speaking. In such a way here are many areas under dispute in the borders of Madras State. Therefore instead of deciding these areas by the Commission or by Government a referendum should be held for ascertaining these areas to a particular State.

I would like to say about Andaman and Nicobar Islands which are near to Tamilnad and which have also been under the control of Tamilnad. These islands should also be included in Tamilnad and it is our earnest request and our desire to call the Madras State as Tamilnad. As there is much dispute over one District with another District, I am afraid the irrigation facilities may be disturbed due to inter-State river disputes. So I suggest that all the natural resources should be brought under the direct control of the Central Government and should be utilised wherever possible without a discrimination.

In the end we welcome the suggestion made by our Prime Minister regarding the creation of five zones for the East, West, North, South and the Centre. I think the zonal language should be given importance for all the administrative purposes by which we can improve the unity and cooperation of our country.

श्री बबूनाथ सिंह (सरगूजा-रायगढ़-रक्षित—अनुसूचित आदिम जातियाँ) : मैं राज्य पुनर रचना आयोग की रिपोर्ट के सम्बन्ध में अपने विचार बताना चाहता हूँ। मध्य प्रदेश में आदिवासियों की सुविधा के लिये कई योजनाएँ बनाई गई हैं किन्तु अच्छी देख भाल न होने के कारण आदिवासी उत्थान का काम बहुत ही धीरे हो रहा है। और अब जो नया मध्य प्रदेश भोपाल विन्ध्य प्रदेश व मध्य भारत को मिला कर बनाया जा रहा है उस लम्बे चौड़े राज्य में आदिवासियों का उत्थान कार्य किस तरह हो सकेगा आदिवासी जनता बहुत गरीब है तथा अशिक्षित व भोली है इसका सबूत यह है कि हमारे लाखों भाई बहिन हर साल ईसाई बनाये जाते हैं। आदि-

वासियों की गरीबी किसी से छिपी नहीं है तो अब हमें इस सम्बन्ध में सोचना है कि राजधानी कायम करने में राजनैतिक विचारों का ख्याल न करके राज्य की जनता को भी खास कर पिछड़ी हुई आदिवासी जनता के सुभीतों का ख्याल करके ही राजधानी कायम करना उचित होगा।

नये मध्य प्रदेश में लगभग साठ लाख आदिवासी होते हैं वो राज्य के तीन हिस्सों में बसे हैं जैसे मध्य भारत में ग्यारह लाख भूपाल में एक लाख विन्ध्य प्रदेश में छः लाख तथा मध्य प्रदेश के चौदह हिन्दी जिलों में चालीस लाख हैं अगर भूपाल राजधानी होगी तो सिर्फ मध्य भारत और भूपाल के बारह लाख आदिवासियों को सुभीता होगा किन्तु मध्य प्रदेश व विन्ध्य प्रदेश के छयालीस लाख आदिवासियों को ५०० से लेकर ७५० मील तक लम्बा सफर राजधानी जाने के लिये करना होगा ऐसी हालत में मध्य प्रदेश की राजधानी भूपाल न कायम करके जबलपुर राजधानी कायम करने से नये मध्य प्रदेश के तीन हिस्सों में बंटे हुए साठ लाख आदिवासियों के बीचोंबीच राजधानी होगी और सब आदिवासियों को सुविधा होगी।

मध्य प्रदेश के जो चौदह हिन्दी जिले नये मध्य प्रदेश में मिलाये जा रहे हैं उनमें से किसी भी भूभाग को सरहदी प्रान्तों में जैसे बिहार, उड़ीसा, आन्ध्र या विदर्भ इन किसी में भी भाषा के आधार पर न मिलाया जाय। क्योंकि वर्तमान मध्य प्रदेश की सरहदी हिन्दी जिलों में आदिवासी लोगों की संख्या अधिक है और वो आदिवासी भाषा और हिन्दी भाषा के अलावा सरहदी प्रान्तों की भाषा भी बोलते हैं जैसे उड़िया, तेलगू, मराठा आदि किन्तु मध्य प्रदेश के हिन्दी जिलों के आदिवासियों के रहन सहन, आचार विचार, पूजा आरथा सब एक सी हैं इतना ही नहीं, हमारे आधिक

[श्री बाबूनाथ सिंह]

सम्बन्ध और जमीन के कायदे, कर्ज के कायदे तथा शिक्षण के सुभीते और नौकरियों में सुरक्षित स्थान जो हैं वैसे दूसरे सरहद्दी प्रान्तों में न होने से अगर हमें दूसरे सरहद्दी प्रान्तों में जोड़ दिया जायेगा तो हमारी सामाजिक आर्थिक, सैक्षणिक और राजनैतिक नुकसान होगी इसलिये मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वर्तमान मध्य प्रदेश के चौदह हिन्दी जिलों को जैसे के वैसे ही नये मध्य प्रदेश में मिलाया जाय और जहां तक हो सके हमारी गरीबी को देखकर राजधानी जबलपुर में ही कायम की जाय ताकि सब मध्य प्रदेश के आदिवासियों के बीचों-बीच हो।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, हम नया मध्य प्रदेश के निर्माण के अवसर पर हर्षित भी हैं और दुःखी भी, दुःखी इसलिये कि हम विदर्भ भाइयों से बिछड़ रहे हैं और हर्ष इसलिये कि हम भूपाल, विन्ध्य प्रदेश और मध्य भारत के भाइयों से मिलने जा रहे हैं। हमारा सिर्फ इतना ही कहना है कि हम घनाड़ी आप के पड़ोसी हैं आप घनवान हो हम आपके गरीब भाई हैं। आप हमारा भी ध्यान रखियेगा। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

Shri C. Bhatt (Broach): The commission appointed by the consent of the Sovereign body of Parliament was the best solution for this problem. The personnel were not only best available but also efficient and impartial. I would like to pay them my best compliments.

The recommendations submitted by them are best in the circumstances and I would like to agree with them that India is such a vast country which required not to be divided in small parts but necessarily required to be in big States. Therefore when they have tried to suggest that there should be big zones, I readily agree to the suggestions. From that point of view I would like to suggest that

there can be Western zone which should include Gujarat, Saurashtra, Kutch and the whole of Rajasthan. Thus there should be Eastern, Western, Southern, Northern and Central and some other zones, as required.

From only linguistic point of view the formation of State will not do. There should be unity of India first before the mind of all of us.

As far as Bombay is concerned S. R. C. recommendation are the best; but M. P. C. C. has rejected them out right, theirs' is a queer logic and imperialistic designs in this negation. The Maharashtrian friends still have not forgotten the old days of Peshwas. They should now put their feet on earth and think of the new world. The Maharashtrian friends were quite passionate about Poona before but Professor Gadgil played a villain of the peace, part and got into the heads of Maharashtrian brothers that without Bombay there should not be a Maharashtra or a Samyukta Maharashtra.

The last small session of Bombay Assembly, the demonstrations made by hooligans, the fruitless and feeble efforts of Maharashtra leaders all go to show that the problem has slipped out of their hands and gone into the hands of the hooligans.

Therefore I suggest and am anxious that Gujarat, Maharashtra and Bombay should all be separated in three States.

Bombay itself will be a City State. Gujarat, Saurashtra and Kutch will be one State and Maharashtra will be a third State. It is no use after so much of bickerings to remain together. Let us be separate and let think and try for stronger United India.

Shri S. C. Deb (Cachar-Lushal Hills): I like to express my opinion in the debates on S. R. C. Report representing as I am, Cachar and Lushal Hills, bordering Pakistan. First of all I must pay my tributes and high appreciation of the work of the three distinguished personalities who took

upon themselves the arduous task in reshaping the map of India and I generally approve their well-balanced recommendation so far as the North-Eastern zone is concerned. I also approve the assertion made by our Chief Minister of Assam Shri Bishnu Ram Medhi, in his inaugural speech in Assam Assembly on the 16th November 1955 to the effect that "from the point of national security and unity of India—the entire region to the North-East of Pakistan needs an integrated administrative, homogenous unit so that it can be developed as a self-sufficient economic zone under a plan". Straightaway I like to say that both Tripura and Manipur State should be merged with Assam from that point of view.

The recommendations that have been made in the S. R. C. Report for merger of Tripura in Assam are equally applicable in the case of Manipur as well. Those hon. Members who took part in the present debates from Tripura and Manipur emphasised the need of democratic set up in these places and expressed a sense of apprehension if these two States merge with Assam. That purpose will be completely served if these two States immediately merge with Assam. I hail the people of Tripura and Manipur for that aspiration of theirs. I welcome them in the State of Assam on behalf of the people of Assam.

Shri Dasarath Deb, M.P. says that if Tripura is merged with Assam there will be conflicts between Bengali and Assamese languages and education facilities, will be disturbed. I like to refute that thing. I am a Bengali and the district Cachar comprises 70 per cent. Bengali-speaking population of the total population. We are all safe there. Our representatives are there in the State Assembly and two Ministers are there in the State Cabinet. We are living there all in equal footing like all good friends sharing our happiness and sorrow on the same way. We believe on our strength and peaceful development. Another fact that Shri Deb complains

is of a serious character. That is subvention granted by Central Government under Art. 275 of the Constitution for development of Tribal areas is partly diverted for that of the plain area. I emphatically protest that charge. In this connection I like to draw the attention of the House to the relevant matter from the speech of our Chief Minister made in his inaugural speech on the 16th November, 1955. I refer to pages 9 and 10 of the speech where he deals in a whole para how State Government every year is contributing nearly equal amount over and above the grant of the Central Government on various items viz., education, medicine veterinary etc., and also to the development of road communications. Our friend Shri Jogeswar Singh, M.P. from Manipur raises a question of infiltration of anti-social elements from foreign lands. That is a dangerous thing. It should be at once stopped and it requires a continued and joint efforts of us all and the Governments to stop that infiltration.

Our Assam State is a composite State so far as language is concerned. We are all trying to develop a common homogeneity of purpose to develop our State for peaceful habitation.

So far as safeguards for minorities are concerned S. R. C. report in the fourth para deals with them effectively.

With regard to different matters safeguards the Home Minister in his inaugural speech of the debates gave special importance to that. I may add also that our Chief Minister specially dealt with that subject and approved and guaranteed on behalf of the Government of Assam all those recommendations regarding minorities and tribal people in case of merger of Tripura and Manipur with Assam. My constituency has close cultural and social ties with Tripura and Manipur. It may be some fissiparous tendencies here and there exist. But now the question is we have many common problems to solve and develop this zone in a well-knit administrative unit. I ask my colleagues

[Shri S. C. Deb]

gues from Manipur and Tripura and all the people to shake off their doubts and fears and take an objective view of the whole position in a constructive way. Let us work together hand in hand and face the problems squarely and do our utmost to reconcile our points. So that this new State of ours may be developed in its full aspect. So that posterity lives in peace and harmony.

I entirely agree with the recommendations of S. R. C. in para. 897 regarding Indian Service of Engineers. All the State Governments should approve that solution and agree to work for that technical efficiency.

Ch. Raghubir Singh (Agra Distt.—East): The House has been discussing the question of the Reorganisation of States for a number of days. Some hon. Members spoke about Uttar Pradesh to which I happen to belong.

Discussions on the division of the States started since the setting up of the States Reorganisation Commission. Divergent opinions on the subject were expressed.

As the matter is thoroughly thrashed out here as well as in the Vidhan Sabha of U. P., I need not say much about it. I may submit three or four most important points in this connection.

When we take up any question regarding India, the vital and most important consideration is the preservation and strengthening of unity and security of India, although the economic, financial and cultural considerations are equally important.

As our province is entered upon the task of reorganising and reconstructing we need solidarity in our thoughts and actions and must be free from all other considerations. The Chief aim before us is how to improve our economic considerations.

I have often heard people saying that U.P. is a big province but have they ever thought that U.P. has always been calm and quite and one of the best provinces in administration. Their argument does not carry much weight.

I may submit, that things done without thinking of far reaching consequences, are most painful and troublesome, therefore the question of the division of U.P. is not at all desirable.

The third most important thing is that the portion of a State would involve a huge expenditure in making provision for an additional Legislature and additional set up of administration which will be detrimental to the development of that part of province. The division of a State or a country into small units is not a way or process for the progress and development of a State or a country but there are other sectors, such as social and economic conditions and political consciousness and traditions of the people which play a very important role in the development of a country.

In the last I may urge my friends in Parliament that Gawalior, Morena Bhind district of Madhya Bharat and Vindhya Pradesh be joined to U. P. There are very sound reasons for the above fact if I mention here. One thing to note in this connection is that this area mentioned above is infested with dacoits and the public is put to great hardships. If this area comes under one provincial unit, it will be easier to control the affairs and thus relieve the people from harassment.

I therefore conclude my speech by urging upon the Government and hon. Members of Parliament that the above parts be added to U. P.

Shri Bheekha Bhai (Banswara-Dungarpur—Reserved—Sch. Tribes) : I was opposed to any reorganisation of States at this juncture when we have not been able to sentimentally integrate the whole of our country. We have often to face disruptive forces and sometimes, we find some disturbances in the name of provincialism, casteism and linguism. Secondly, when the Second Five Year Plan is under preparation and the schemes are to be formulated by the State Governments, this is not a proper occasion for reorganisation of States.

But now we have reached such a stage that we cannot go back, hence

we should accept the S. R. C. report as it is with certain minor boundary settlements here and there.

The best course for the Government ought to have been the reorganisation of States on a zonal basis. As an Adivasi, I would always welcome the zonal formula put forward by some of our eminent politicians, as it solves the problems of Adivasies.

There have been conflicting claims on Adivasies areas and more so, on backward areas, as their representatives are feeble and less vocal, less vociferous.

Take the case of Manbhum, Sinbhum, Bastar, Dangs, Dalbhum, Raigarh, Puljhir, Dungarpur, Banswara and other areas, these areas have become the bone of contention between the adjoining States, this is politicians' game. I may be pardoned for my frank and bitter expression. Why Gujrat should claim Dungarpur-Banswara, when they have not been able to set the things in merged areas of Bombay State. Why should they have claimed the said areas on the basis of river Mahi flowing through Gujrat. A river may have its course through different States and no State should treat it as their exclusive property. Historically Vagad area (literally meaning border) was part and parcel of Mewar, the Sisodia clan ruled over all these petty States of Dungarpur, Banswara and Partapgarh. They had been ruling since the twelfth century. All these small States are historically, culturally and geographically linked with Rajasthan State. The areas are predominantly inhabited by the Bhils and Minas and as their elected representative I may inform the Government that they are true sons of the soil and who valiantly fought against the Moghuls along with Rana Pratap. They are the real saviours of Hinduism and the Gaddi of Maharana. History bears out the fact that Bhils of Rajasthan were always with the Ranas of Mewar.

I welcome the recommendations of S. R. C. report relating to Rajasthan. The recommendations have been received in every quarter of Rajasthan as impartial, unbiassed and genuine. I

join in the people of Rajasthan in voicing my feelings by welcoming the S.R.C. report.

A word, about Himachal Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh is most backward State and its inhabitants widely differ in their living from the plain people and special measures for development are needed, hence it should be treated as a separate entity for at least coming ten years. I have seen the whole of Himachal Pradesh and from my experience I say so, without dilating on points for want of space and thereafter it should be formed into one hill State joining adjoining areas.

Lastly I submit, through you, to the Government that backward areas or border areas, which are inhabited by the majority of Adivasies, should not be integrated with other States unless the Adivasies representative are consulted and for those areas, a special committee of the Planning Commission be set up in order to go into the causes of discontent and neglect so that special schemes be formulated and included in the Second Five Year Plan. The frame of the Plan should be revised in the light of discussions of S.R.C. report which will give an idea to the Government where the shoe pinches.

For the special development of backward areas of Dungarpur and Banswara, more emphasis should be laid on the development of cottage industries and a bench of the High Court and a branch office of the Revenue Board be set up at Udaipur where the tribals may get speedy justice.

श्री अल्लू राय शास्त्री (जिला आजमगढ़—पूर्व व जिला बलिया—पश्चिम) : भारत के नवीन चित्र को निर्मित करने के लिए जो सुमाव प्रदेश सीमा आयोग ने दिये हैं, उनके लिए उनको धन्यवाद है।

प्रदेशों का आकार सर्वत्र बृहत् करने का सुमाव है। तब किसी प्रदेश को बांट कर छोटा करने की मांग क्यों? आन्ध्र व मराठस आज भी मिल जायं और अपना प्रभाव संसद् में बढ़ा लें तो हम उत्तर प्रदेश वालों को क्या

[श्र अलगू राय शास्त्री]

भाषण हो सकता है ? मुझे बांटना हो तो उत्तर, दक्षिण, पूर्व, पश्चिम तथा मध्य एवं प्रवशिष्ट में से ६ भागों में शासन की सुविधा के लिए भारत के प्रविभाग में करता । रेलवे तथा सेना के क्षेत्रीय विभाग की तरह पूरी रेलें केन्द्र की हैं—पूरी सेना केन्द्र की । प्रबन्ध व्यवस्था के लिए क्षेत्र व क्षेत्रों में उनका विभाजन है न कि कोई स्थायी राज्यों की तरह वह सर्वथा स्वतन्त्र क्षेत्र हैं । स्वतन्त्र राज्य अपनी सुविधा के अनुसार परस्पर समझौते से सम्बन्धित होकर एक संघ भी बना लेते हैं—राष्ट्र संघ की तरह । वैसे स्वतन्त्रता यहां के नामधारी राज्यों को नहीं है । यह सब एक ही खेत की प्रविभक्त क्यारियां हैं । भारत की यह एकता सामने रहे तब भाषा, संस्कृति तथा अन्य संकुचित भेद हमारे मार्ग में खड़े नहीं हो सकते । तब क्षेत्रों का अन्योन्य प्रवेश तथा प्रदेशों का अनेक भाषी रूप खटक नहीं सकता ।

भाषा का संस्कृति से बड़ा प्रगाढ़ सम्बन्ध है—सम्यता का एकाधिकारी जन्तु मनुष्य ही है । वह भाषा का भी स्वामी है । सम्यता वाला जीव ही मनुष्य है । सभास्थली सम्य—सम्य ही की सम्यता । एकाकी जीवन में सम्यता का स्थान क्या ? सभा केवल एक की नहीं होती । सभा में केवल एक ही भाषा नहीं होती । अनेक भाषा वाले बैठ कर जहां अनेक प्रश्नों पर एक दूसरे की भावना का आदर करते, विचार करते हैं, वही सभा है । एक ही भाषा विश्व की भाषा हो नहीं सकती । सितार, सारंगी, तबला, मुदंग, शहनाई, बांसुरी सब के स्तर अपने अपने स्थान पर अधुर और महत्व वाले होते हैं । कोयल, काक, तोता, मैना, मयूर सब के शब्द, स्वर लहरी अपनी विभिन्नता वाले होते हैं । वैसे ही ग्रीक, लैटिन, संस्कृत आदि मूल भाषा में अपने अपने महत्व की हैं । इन भाषाओं की उपभाषाएं, बटे बेटियां अपने अपने लालित्य से सुसज्जित हैं । सब रहे, सब का परस्पर मान रहे, सब

हिलमिल कर बैठें, बोलें, एक दूसरे से प्रिय वाक्य बोलें तब वह स्थान सभा स्थान होगा । तब वहां बैठने वाले सम्य कहलायेंगे और उन्हीं की देन सम्यता होगी । भाषाओं का परस्पर अन्योन्य प्रवेश की सम्यता का मूलाधार है । ऐकान्तिक एकाकी जीवन सम्यता का बाधक है ।

यहां मलयालम के शब्दों का शुद्ध पुरातन संस्कृत शब्दों से भेद करना कठिन हो जाता है । “इन्द्रीवरश्यामराम” जैसी ललित पदाबलियों के पाठ सुनकर मलयालम के ग्रन्थों में “कादम्बरी” का लालित्य सुलभ होता है ।

जिस भारत देश को वैदिक, ब्राह्मण, औपनिषदिक, गाथा ग्रंथीय, लोक साहित्य मय, पौराणिक, स्मृति रूप संस्कृत भाषा की निधि प्राप्त है, उस सम्पूर्ण देश की प्रविभक्त देश वा क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं के आधार पर प्रविभक्त संस्कृति का देश मानना कैसे उचित होगा, में आज तक नहीं समझ पाया ।

(१) राम सों कर प्रीत रे मन राम सों कर प्रीत
काल सों तां काल डोले मुख पसारे भीत ॥

आजकल पुनि तोहि डसिहै समुझ

राखो चीत ।

कहत नानक राम भज ले जात अबर

बीत ॥२॥ रे मन

(२) नानक नन्हें हो रहो जैसी नन्हें दूब ।

और घास सब चर गयी दूब खूब की खब ॥

के पदों की भाषा क्या कोई ऐसी भाषा है जो संस्कृत मूलक हिन्दी भाषा से भिन्न है ?

शासन की सुविधा के लिए मुझे तो एक ही केन्द्रीय शासन के अधीन देश भर में डिविजनल शासक समितियों के द्वारा जनपदीय शासन के विभाग से शासन की पद्धति ठीक लगती । कमिश्नरों की शासक समितियों वर्तमान विधान सभा के सदस्यों से निर्मित होती जो उस कमिश्नरी में पड़ते हैं । जिले या जनपद जिला बोर्डों से शासित

होते तो राष्ट्र में बड़ी दृढ़ता रहती। यह भाषा और संस्कृति के झगड़े ये छोटे छोटे राज्य जो प्रदेश और स्टेट्स के रूप में मांगे जा रहे हैं, सामने न आते।

केवल एक संसद् केन्द्र में ७५० सदस्यों की होती उसके भीतर ५०० की लोक-सभा तथा २५० सदस्यों की एक विशिष्ट सभा बना दी जाती—७५ मंत्री, उपमंत्री आदि केन्द्र में होते जिससे प्रत्येक १० सदस्य पर एक व्यक्ति सरकार का शासन सूत्र हाथ में पा जाता—पूरे देश को इस प्रकार अच्छा प्रति-निधित्व मिलता—देश की उन्नति और विकास में सब को समान भाग प्राप्त होता, परन्तु यह मेरी योजना छोटे मुंह बड़ी बात लगेगी, मैं इस कारण इसके विस्तार में इस समय नहीं जाना चाहता।

इस समय मैं इतना ही कहूंगा कि सरकार जो विधेयक सामने लावे उसमें वह आयोग के सुझावों को पूरा महत्व दे, हां टेढ़ी पूथिवी पर सरल रेखाएं ही नहीं होंगी, उच्च सिद्धांतों पर भी आबाद होते हैं। फलतः आयोग के सुझावों के ऊपर कांग्रेस की कार्य समिति ने जो संशोधन सुझाये हैं उन पर ध्यान देना चाहिए। भारत की भौगोलिक सीमा में शीशे का गिलास है। आयोग के सुझाव उसकी चहार दीवारी हैं। कांग्रेस कार्य समिति के सुझाव उस भीतरी चहार दीवारी की बाहरी मेखला हैं। सुझावों की चहार दीवारी पर बाहरी मेखला संरक्षण का कार्य कर रही है। यदि उसकी उपेक्षा कर दी जाय तो भीतरी चहार दीवारी कुछ चपेटों से छिन्न भिन्न हो जायेगी। यदि कांग्रेस कार्य समिति के सुझाव स्वीकार करके तदनुसार आयोग के सुझावों को संशोधित, परिमार्जित कर दिया जाय तो देश में दृढ़ता, स्थिरता और शाश्वत मधुरता आवेगी, विकास में सहायता मिलेगी।

मैं सदा स्वतन्त्रता की प्राप्ति के पश्चात् इस पक्ष का रहा हूँ कि देश में अब स्वदेशीय

सरकार हो, दलगत सरकार नहीं। समाज-वादी ढाँचे में दलबन्दी को स्थान कहाँ? मैं भाल पार्टीज्ज क्रान्फरेन्स बुला कर विकास कार्यों की सहलता के लिए प्रयत्न किये जायं, यह मांग कांग्रेस के अधिवेशनों में करता रहा हूँ। ग्रहमदाबाद ए० आई० सी० सी० तथा कलकत्ते की ए० आई० सी० सी० में क्रमशः श्री राजर्षि पुरुषोत्तमदास जी एवं श्री जबा-हरलाल नेहरू की अध्यक्षता में जो बैठकें हुईं उनमें यह प्रस्ताव मैंने रखे थे श्री आचार्य कृपलानी जी ने अपने भाषण में उस दिन कहा था कि नेता लोग ऊपर की लड़ाई छोड़ें, तब मेल हो। मैं उनके वाक्यों का स्वागत कर उनसे इस सम्बन्ध में पथ-प्रदर्शन की मांग करता हूँ।

श्रीमन्, विस्तार से तभी कहा जायगा जब सरकार भारत का नया चित्र सामने लावेगी। इस समय देश का कल्याण इसी में है कि वह आयोग के सुझाव को कांग्रेस कार्य समिति द्वारा संशोधित रूप में स्वीकार कर भागे बढ़ें।

अल्प संख्यकों को संरक्षण दीजिये किन्तु पानी जैसे नमक को अपना लेता है, वैसे परस्पर मिलन की भावना हो। शीशे के गिलास में भरे पानी के भीतर खड़खड़ाते लड़ते झगड़ते पत्थर कंकड़ की तरह भिन्नता की भावना को प्रभ्रम न मिलने पावे। मिक्स्चर में सब दबाएं घुल मिल जाती हैं। वही मिक्स्चर हैं। हरदी जर्दी को तजे तजे सफेदी चून—चूना सफेदी त्यागता है। हर्दी जर्दी—पीलापन त्यागती है, मिलकर रोटी का सुन्दर जाज्वल्यमान रूप प्रगट होता है। अल्पसंख्यक संरक्षण वैसा ही हो।

अखिल भारतीय दृष्टिकोण वाली शिक्षा, वैसी ही सरकारी सेवाओं का संगठन वैसा ही उनका चुनाव यह भारत की एकता तथा दृढ़ता के लिए अनिवार्य है।

Shri P. Ramaswamy (Mahabubnagar—Reserved—Sch. Castes): At the outset I wish to congratulate the Government, for appointing the S.R. Commission consisting of some of the eminent men of our country, who made impartial recommendations on this all important matter. I am satisfied that they have examined this matter in great detail and it is only after taking all factors into consideration they have come to the conclusion that it will be in the interest of Andhra as well as Telangana, if, for the present, the Telangana area is constituted into a separate State, known as residuary Hyderabad State up to 1961. They have also laid emphasis on the point that even after 1961, it is primarily for the people of Telangana to take a decision about their future i.e. they may either decide amalgamation with Andhra State or continue as a separate State. In this context, it is upto us, a true patriot, not only to honour their impartial recommendations, but to prevail upon the Government to accept them unconditionally. As the Andhras are not willing to wait up to 1961, and as they want a decision here and now, we are quite prepared, if the Government arranges, a referendum with a view to obtaining and recording peoples' verdict, so that there may not be any doubt in any quarter, in respect of the wishes of the people, which is the main point for determining issues of this kind.

On any subject, it is usually possible to argue on both sides. I have heard with great interest the speeches made by several of my colleagues on both sides of the problem. While I agree with the commencing analysis provided by my esteemed colleague Shri H. C. Heda in favour of Telangana, I cannot but disagree with the reasoning of my equally esteemed colleague Shri Raghuramaiah who feels that if Vishal Andhra is not formed now with Hyderabad city as its capital, it is a bus which Telangana people will miss for ever. In this connection, I am afraid I have to say that it is too much of an empty threat. He will

please note that the people of Telangana are not fools to get into buses which will take them to unwanted places. He also said that his brothers in Telangana today are afraid that the coastal districts are richer, prosperous, more educated and more vocal and that they would swallow up the Telangana people. I think it is a wrong conception. The people of Telangana are conscious of their greatness in many ways, and are quite capable of rising to occasions. We do not want to draw comparisons with others. All that I can say, is however much they may try and for any length of time, it is certainly not an easy matter for the Andhra to swallow us. In respect of one more point viz. the culture of people turning on both sides of the Krishna and Godavary rivers is exactly identical, I beg to disagree, because it is certainly not correct. We all know that culture covers language, habits, ideas, beliefs and even vocational pattern of society. On this basis, with the exception of language, the Hyderabadis are completely dis-similar to the Andhras. And even on the basis of language, which is common, the accent is dis-similar. In my opinion Hyderabad State presents a definitely mixed culture of various types. This is historical fact and therefore an inrefutable one. In fact, Hyderabad is a miniature India, which accommodates and adjusts with all kinds of people living in this great country.

Our State has no rivalry with any other State. It can hereafter be an ideal State for the practice and preservation of the *Pancha Shila*, so much needed not only in our country but all other countries of the world to avoid war.

I am glad that Shri Raghuramaiah admits at one place that no group of people should be coerced, as this is certainly a fundamental concept which we should all accept. This is exactly what is desirable.

I now wish to deal with what my most esteemed friend and the Dy.

Speaker of this House had said in this connection. He has come to the conclusion, by advancing certain reasons, that from any point of view, there is no justification for keeping Telangana separate. He also considers the argument for separate State of Telangana as untenable. In the later case by disagreeing with the arguments of the protagonists of Telangana he automatically disagrees with the recommendations made by the S.R.C., as well. While it may be said that such of those like me, who are in favour of Telangana may not understand and appreciate the need to join Vishal Andhra and may even be supposed to be hand in glove with the Razakars who had lost a battle of their own and are now merged in the rest of India and who according to Shri Ayyangar are "behind the scene" in the Telangana agitation with the intention of creating "a Second Pakistan", what has he to say for the recommendation made by S.R.C., comprising of men of the highest order in respect of patriotism, integrity, attainments, sense of justice and above all fairness. Mr. Ayyangar knows that this High Power Commission enjoys the confidence of the Central Government. He also knows that the people of Hyderabad State have not begged S. R. C. to give them a State whether there was justification or not. Nobody can say that the S.R.C. recommended a separate state to us, as a result of influence from the hidden hand of others, whose only object in life is to create a danger spot in Telangana.

Regarding the introduction of prohibition, this does not upset us. The earnings, ruins expenditure, on this account may only have a small difference in deficit. That deficit can be substantially met from the earnings of Sales Tax Department and we can also expect a share of money from Rs. 45 crores specially reserved by the Government of India for assistance to States, after the introduction of prohibition. We are therefore not much worried on this account, although it may appear to many of us as a great source of income for us.

534 L.S.D.—17.

We have every right and with justifiable pride to lay a claim, for separate Telangana State, to fight for it and take it, if we could convince this hon. House and our leaders at the helm of affairs by furnishing enough justification for our independent existence.

Before I conclude, I wish to tell a few words in connection with the much needed land reforms in this country. The story of Andhra Governments' decision to get rid of the land revenue for a category falling within Rs. 10 is a recent one. The implied impracticabilities were realised in the later stages and finally resulted in complete abandonment of the scheme. In other words, they have not been able to introduce any land reforms so far. Whereas, the land reforms in Hyderabad have been enacted and are in the process of implementation. On this portion last measure of our great advancement, we are proud because even our great Prime Minister spoke highly of the achievement of ours sometimes before in this very House. The pace of progress has to be kept up and its implementation has to be expedited. Thus, you will all find that if we are allowed our way, and if the encouragement due to us is given now, we shall show that we are as good as our other brethren in other States of this great country.

Shri Jwala Prashad (Ajmer North): I rise to welcome the S.R.C. Report in recommending the merger of Ajmer with Rajasthan. What is more important to note is that Rajasthan gets Ajmer and Abu, not because, they are part of Rajasthan, but because Rajasthan is inconceivable without them in free India. In addition to what has been submitted by my colleague Pt. Mukat Bihari Bhargava as regards the importance and greatness of Ajmer, I have further to point out that we must not forget that Rajasthan today is composed of various States, whose rulers have agreed to unite their respective territory for a common administration with a nominated Rajpramukh. It still retains its feudal character and medieval outlook. Regional and group jealousies and local loyalties do not

[Shri Jwala Prashad]

permit suitable atmosphere for democracy. And to consolidate unity it is imperative that their influence must be minimised in the interest of the country and good administration, in the State concerned. This is why, Ajmer with no Rajas for more than a century, alone, is suitable for the seat of its government, and hence Ajmer will be best suited for the Capital of Rajasthan, which has lived in a feudal tradition for centuries. Apart from this, there are obvious advantages in choosing Ajmer as the capital of Greater Rajasthan, which no other State town, in that State can claim. Ajmer is situated in a charming valley and has a healthy climate in all seasons. It is in the centre of Rajasthan, and every one of divisional headquarter is almost equi-distant from it. A night's journey from Ajmer will take you to any part of Rajasthan however distant. The most unfortunate aspect of the question is that at the time of integration of Rajasthan Ajmer people with one voice demanded unconditional merger with it,—so that, Ajmer may get its due place and importance in the picture of new-born State. At that time the good wishes of all the leaders and people of Rajasthan were with Ajmer people, because all the leaders of Rajasthan who fought with the Rajas to emancipate the people of Rajputana States always made Ajmer, their base, of political operations, being in the centre and seat of Rajasthan Provincial Congress Committee. I refute the false and misleading statement of Shri Kasliwal in the House with all the emphasis at my command that Ajmer people opposed merger at that time. In support I invite the attention of the House to the speech delivered by Shri M. B. L. Bhargava who was, then, the sole representative of Ajmer, from the floor of the Provisional Parliament on 17th March 1949 and also the remarks of revered Sardar Patel—the then Home Minister made in reply to it, the same day. Shri Kasliwal has raised a bogey of scarcity of water in Ajmer, which has got no foundation whatso-

ever. The Central Government has in addition extended the previous water-works at a cost of nearly 40 lakhs of rupees by digging wells in the bed of river Sarswati near holy Pushkar Lake. Hence there is no scarcity of water. The claim of Ajmer as Capital of United States of Rajasthan rests on stronger grounds of its central geographical position and on well-known historical and cultural grounds to which detailed reference has already been made by my colleague—Pt. Bhargava.

The position remains that the Rajputana Congress Committee itself in April or May 1949 on the eve of formation of Rajasthan by an overwhelming majority demanded the simultaneous integration of Ajmer, with Ajmer as its capital, bears an eloquent testimony as to the claims and suitability of Ajmer as a place, eminently, capable of being chosen as the capital of Rajasthan. I will also like to refer to the statement of Shri Sukhadia, Chief Minister of Rajasthan made in the Rajasthan Assembly while discussing S.R.C. in which he has admitted that he was also of the opinion that Ajmer should be made the capital of Rajasthan. In spite of resolutions passed by Rajasthan and Ajmer Provincial Congress the merger of Ajmer could not take place and Ajmer missed in becoming the capital of Rajasthan. But expediency on the part of Government allowed Jaipur as Capital—a Jaipurian as the Chief Minister and the Jaipur Maharaja as its Raj Pramukh. After 5 years comes the S.R.C. Report for merger. Now it is not moral responsibility of Central Government and hon. Home Minister that justice is done to Ajmer by putting Ajmer in the final map of Rajasthan as capital at its due important place, as if, it was merged while United State of Rajasthan was taking shape? We believe that the revered Home Minister will take stock of all these factors, now. We will not be allowed to suffer for our helplessness or on any other account. Lastly I emphasise that after merger of Ajmer, Rajasthan

should be called "ARAVALI PRADESH" or like in order to forget feudal affinity with Rajas.

Shri M. R. Krishna (Karimnagar—Reserved-Sch. Castes): Out of the existing 27 States nearly 23 are linguistic in character and barely 4 States are multi-lingual. There is not going to be any great change in their economic or educational or political conditions. After all people in these 4 States are also Indians, faithful to Indian Constitution and they have all to learn Hindi which is their national language. It would be a very wise step if Hindi is developed in all States and after 5 years only 4 States are formed like the four commands of the army.

Switzerland is a country which in most respects like our country. It has a multi-lingual population. In Cantons there are three language groups, German, Italian and French. They carry on their trade administration as smoothly as any other country. All these persons owe allegiance to the Swiss Constitution. When it is so in Switzerland, I see no reason why our country cannot do the same. One may say that in Switzerland linguism is not loaded with communalism whereas in our country communalism enters not only in temples and houses but in almost everything. Then it is up to our leaders to crush this spirit of communalism.

Secondly, we have seen that to some extent reorganisation of states in Europe took place. In Europe there were a number of small states in the middle zone. There was constant trouble in this middle zone because the adjoining big powers were always suspicious about one or more states in this zone. It was virtually a breeding field for all Great Wars. Therefore, every State in that zone knew her disadvantages and weaknesses and because of the frequent damages due to bloody wars, were even voluntarily agreed to annex their territories to big areas. There was definite feeling amongst many small states that it was foolish to remain aloof, some had

merged and many had friendly alliances for the sake of Defence. Here such necessity did not arise. The Plan-Period is not yet over. It is not a partial Plan that the Government had launched. All round development plans are under operation, there are no fears of Tamil Nad conquering Malabar or Andhra invading Hyderabad.

Honestly speaking the people are not happy about wasting our time on matters of this kind which spreads a feeling of contempt and hatred for each other. The people want more community projects, more National Extension Blocks, more houses to live in and cheap transport facilities. Let the State guarantee all these and after fulfilling their wants, think of other things. I think it is Pope who said "For forms of Government let fools contest. What is best administered is best".

If the Government desired to curtail the existing 27 States to 16 not because of security reasons as in Europe but purely on economic reasons, for, culture alone cannot form the basis for these reorganization. Then instead of setting up a commission to recommend the re-grouping of States and publishing its report, a Finance Committee should have been constituted. This Finance Committee should have gone into all financial aspects of the States that the Re-organization Commission has recommended. And they should have given the income of the proposed State, the specific schemes that will be taken up, the actual amount that will be spent in each place. The special consideration that a particular area will get and reasons for it. This would have made the Members to have altogether different view about the proposed States than what we feel now without such recommendations. This finding of the Commission and the decisions taken in this House will not only serve as concessions or assurances but will give a correct picture to every person in a district to know whether the merger of that area is going to be beneficial or not. If the

[Shri M. R. Krishna]

Commission felt that a particular portion in Hyderabad is going to get a certain benefit after say 5 or 10 years, still there will be a larger section to favour that decision.

Because such convincing factors are not there, it becomes very difficult for one to decide whether Vishal Andhra is going to be beneficial or not. Assurances are always there and I know they all depend upon the person who is in charge of that Department. We Harijans are to-day existing on assurances and safeguards and we are happy because our leaders who rule us are men with sympathy for Harijans.

We have to take lessons from the past history. Our Prime Minister has rightly said that things should not be forced on the people. And I believe the Commission must also have felt in the same way to recommend a separate Telangana.

The Union of Czeck & Slova which were identical in almost every respect were to be united. Guarantees more than wanted were given to the Slovakia. The Parliament of Czechoslovakia was opened in January 1939 and Dr. Martin Soveol, the President of the Parliament declared "that the period of the Slovaks struggle for freedom has ended. Now begins the freedom of National Rebuilt". And the Slovaks said that they would never more feel animosity towards the Czecks again and both would remain faithful to the whole State of Czechoslovakia.

But hardly a month after this declaration the Slovaks became thoroughly dis-satisfied with the affairs. Revolted against their brethren and finally Hitler had to come on the scene and there was much trouble for both the sides.

Such things may not happen here but troubles are bound to come in big scale, even such things should not be allowed to happen and so the wishes

of the people should be taken in whatever manner we can.

The apprehensions which my friends in Hyderabad have in order to make up their minds to the merger in Andhra are because of two important factors. You will remember, the days when late Mohmmad Ali Jinnah visited Hyderabad before the days of Independence. He made very eloquent speeches in favour of the Muslim Home Land for the muslims of Hyderabad and to others in India. The need for me to mention about Mr. Jinnah's speech was the Hyderabad Muslims and other Muslims have been promised a very comfortable living in Pakistan. Many left Hyderabad to Pakistan thinking they would be treated very well. But in spite of the fact that one of the Hyderabad Ministers was the Governor General of Pakistan, the Hyderabad and Indian Muslims have been treated badly the result was many had to return to India.

There is bound to be difficulties because there is not proper economic development promised to the Telengana in a Vishal Andhra. There is another factor which makes one to feel that the areas of Telengana will not be improved in Vishal Andhra.

In the composite Madras State the Andhras were in the Government, as Chief Ministers and Ministers of Development and with other important portfolios. They were even more than 70 to 80 % in District Boards—with all these the Andhra areas were not developed and they have been said to be neglected. There could be only one reason for this backwardness. That the majority of the people of composite Madras State did not allow the Andhras to develop. Then this can very well apply to us in Telangana. It should not be felt that people of Telengana are in any way inferior to Andhras and in India of to-day there cannot be any feeling of hatred and enmity.

It was my duty to express the genuine feeling of the people but we will

not fail to accept the orders of our leaders in the Centre who take the fullest responsibilities of all the shortcomings due to the changes they propose to bring about. We are just disciplined soldiers under an able experienced and honest Commander, Shri Nehru.

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): The S.R.C. has rightly adopted the principle of not carving a state solely on the basis of any language, though, naturally the language mainly should come into the picture as a matter of administrative convenience. They have also rightly laid emphasis on the economic progress and the future successful working of the plans leading to the welfare of the people as well as the administrative convenience of a particular area or State.

People with a theoretical approach mostly influenced by a local language not only lose sight of the correct perspective mentioned above but are even prepared to find fault with the decisions arrived at after just appreciation of all relevant facts. The reorganised States are to permanently function hereafter it is essential that their boundaries are fixed up after careful consideration of the language complex and homogeneity of a particular area. Much of the dissatisfaction and criticism of the present proposals of the S.R.C. relate to this aspect. I wish the following broad principles had been accepted and also uniformly applied in determining the boundaries of proposed States (1) contiguous unilingual areas i.e. where at least 70% of the people speak a particular language—should constitute a particular State. (2) Contiguous bilingual or multilingual areas i.e. where below 70% of the population speak a particular language—should be added on to the unilingual area unless economic and administrative consideration come in the way of it particularly because in the border strips of about 15 to 20 miles people usually understand both the languages and their non-inclusion one way

or the other is not very harmful from language point of view (3) The unit should have been a taluk or tehsil or even a part of it if it is contiguous and also unilingual in the above sense. (4) The wishes of the people of any such area when divided should not be very material in a basic scheme of linguistic reorganisation unless these wishes accord with the other considerations of economic progress and administrative convenience.

I plead that even now these principles might be uniformly applied to the border areas by one or more boundary commissions to be appointed. This would greatly satisfy and settle many boundary disputes and even create an amount of goodwill and restore a very helpful climate. In that case a particular area is an enclave in another language area so should be merged with it, automatically disappear.

Madakasira is a part of my constituency and it is my responsibility to point out the real situation and feelings there. Western portion of the taluk contain a majority of Kanada speaking population while the eastern portions including Madakasira Town has a majority of Telugu speaking population. This language belt is also across contiguous adjoining Pavagada Taluk in Mysore State.

The agitation for merger into Kanada area is not shared by the whole population. There is at least as much of it, if not even greater, that the Taluk should continue as it is seeing that it is so existing for many years. The greater part of the trade and economic relations are with the neighbouring big Hindupur market in Andhra area. Unless this taluk and the adjoining Pavagada taluk are together bifurcated to be joined with the corresponding contiguous linguistic zones, S.R.C. recommendation might be accepted otherwise painstaking border adjustments are not worthwhile.

[Shri Raghavachari]

I would now pass on to the recommendation of S.R.C. relating to a few taluks of Bellary District to be re-transferred to Andhra. I am in favour of this finding as it is arrived at after very careful and serious consideration of all aspects of the case urged both by the Karnataka and Andhra people as also on the principles adopted by S. R. C. in general. This recommendation is to prevail according to the oft enunciated principle observed in accepting the decisions of the S.R.C. unless the people mutually agree on an alternative solution to replace it.

The Commission was certainly entitled to review the entire position concerning all States in the Indian Union and recommended any readjustment. They were free to consider any proposal as is definitely stated in their terms of reference. Many of their proposals require even the amendment of the Constitution. So this argument advanced that this offends Andhra Act 1953 has no force.

The attachment of portion of Bellary District to Mysore even before the constitution of Karnataka solely on the marginal majority of Kanada population without a serious examination of all other relevant factors cannot stand in the way of a re-examination of the whole question now in the context of a new set up. Nor can the Prime Minister's then statement that Bellary question is finally decided come in the way as the Prime Minister himself stated in the course of this debate that there can be no absolute finality in these matters.

Kelkar award which was concerned with demarcation of areas for Congress Party propaganda organisation purposes cannot also come in the way of its being considered now—especially when the public outside the particular political group had no say in that award or before it was given the Dar Commission and the J.V.P. Report only pronounced the District as a bilingual one.

The exclusion of these particular taluks from the Andhra University jurisdiction was not confined to this area only but intended even to the other parts of Bellary already included in Andhra as also to the other three districts of Rayalaseema now in Andhra.

The exclusion of this area from the Partition Committee proposals regarding Andhra the proposed area was conceived with a desire to include into Andhra undisputed Telugu areas. This was the result of the anxiety of the Andhras for an immediate formation of an Andhra State. It did not admit it was to go to Karnataka at all.

Even the Misra's report is largely influenced by the marginal linguistic gravity of Bellary Taluk as S.R.C. have rightly noticed. One has only to read the report to arrive at this conclusion. Though he was asked to consider administration and other factors he appears to have taken into consideration only the conveniences necessary for Karnataka and not at all consideration in favour of Andhra territory.

In regard to re-transfer of the Tunga Bhadra Zone the following consideration that concern the economic and future well being of the greater part of the frequently famine affected zones of Rayalaseema deserve serious mention.

This Tunga Bhadra project was the dream of the age long agitation of the Rayalaseema people. It was meant to afford irrigational facilities through high and low level channels as also supply of power requirements of the four Districts. This area is to be agriculturally developed and is to afford facilities for settling the neighbouring Telugu people drawn from the famine affected areas. This would not be easy if this area is to be excluded from the Andhra territory.

By excluding this area from Karnataka and attaching it to Andhra would

relieve the Andhras a little from the trouble born out of the obstructive attitude of Mysore at least on the right bank portion of the project. Here the argument that Kanadas would still have a joint interest in the Project, at least on the left bank is immaterial as it is confined to an area where the Andhras are not at all concerned or interested.

The obstructive management of the last few years compelled a reconstitution of the T.B. Board by the centre to complete the progress of construction over and above all these things the recent *satyagraha* movement started by the new parties into Karnataka namely Karnataka Action Committee must necessarily fill all Andhras with fear. This agitation was forcefully to take the water of the project to non-localised areas as against the distant localised areas.

If this is a force taste of things to come how can one expect Andhra to be satisfied with the Centre's power of relieving them against such things under the new proposed River Board Bill—which is more advisory in nature. Even the process of having to carry quarrels for their final decision should be very unpleasant. Government activity at State level affects virtually many spheres of life. It is bound to make the lot of Andhra unenviable specially with regard to a vital irrigation project.

I appeal to Kanada friends to allow us to have the proposed retransfer. Their own language and education can easily be safeguarded under the general recommendations of the S.R.C.

Shri Boovaraghasamy (Perambalur): I have been listening to the heated controversies which are coming from all corners of this House regarding S.R.C. Report. I have had seen in newspapers several agitations and disturbances, shooting and deaths in some parts of this country. I regret very much for this situation which is created at present. This linguistic redistribution should not have been

brought within this short period after our Independence. Now our Government itself has created the linguistic feelings in the minds of people.

However I appreciate the attitude of our Government at present for the importance shown to the Provinces, provincial culture and their languages. Now according to this report it is clear all the people living in all parts of our country are our nationals. The culture of the different provinces are all our Indian culture and the languages spoken in all the Provinces of our country are said to be our Indian national languages; almost all the States are now formed on lingual basis.

So when all the languages spoken in our country are said to be, treated to be our Indian (national) languages, it is not proper on the part of our Government to thrust Hindi on the non-Hindi speaking areas in the name of official language and in the name of Constitution.

Even though the Constitution has accepted Hindi as our official and national language, now we find all the languages our own Indian languages. I request our Government to come forward boldly to amend the Constitution to treat all our Indian languages as our national languages and official languages in their respective Provinces. For the control of the Central Government let us have English as medium. This method of giving importance to our languages is impartial and will be unanimously accepted by all the people living in all corners of this country.

Regarding the redistribution of areas in Madras State, the Hour taluk is claimed by the Andhra, but it is a multi-lingual State. So in ascertaining this area a referendum may be held. It is not proper to say that Devikolam and Peeramade would go to Kerala as the atmosphere is favourable to the Malayalees. These places are predominantly Tamil speaking areas, which has been under

[Shri Boovaraghasamy]

the control of Tamilnad for a long time. In Malabar also many areas are predominantly Tamil speaking. In such a way there are many areas under dispute in the borders of Madras State. Therefore instead of deciding these areas by the Commission or by Government a referendum should be held for ascertaining these areas to a particular State.

I would like to say about Andaman and Nicobar Islands which are nearer to Tamilnad and which have also been under the control of Tamilnad. These islands should also be included in the Tamilnad and it is our earnest request and our desire to call the Madras State as Tamilnad. As there is much dispute over one district with another district, I am afraid the irrigation facilities may be disturbed due to inter-state river disputes. So I suggest that all the natural resources should be brought under the direct control of the Central Government and should be utilised wherever possible without a discrimination.

In the end we welcome the suggestions made by our Prime Minister regarding the creation of five zones for the East, West, North, South and the Centre. I think the zonal languages should be given importance for all the administrative purposes by which we can improve the unity and cooperation of our country.

Shri Ibrahim (Ranchi North East): It is known to everybody that Muslims of Darjeeling, Jalpaiguri, Dinajpur, Malda, Calcutta and other districts of West Bengal were dislocated from their hearth and homes in West Bengal in 1950. In the last Jamiat Ulema Conference held in Calcutta this year, the President of the Conference emphatically declared that thousands and lakhs of Muslims are still displaced persons and strangers in their own State of West Bengal. They have been subjected to great hardships due to the step-motherly treatment of West Bengal Government. This had naturally direct bearing on the people of Kishenganj, the major-

ity of whom are Muslims. National highways and railways have been constructed by the Central Government to give equal facilities to the Governments of Bengal and Bihar and more to Bengal to and from North and South Bengal and therefore there is no question of territorial link between the North and the South Bengal. The social and other customs of the people of Kishenganj are more akin to Bihar than Bengal. People of Kishenganj sub-division will feel extremely unhappy if they are forced to go to West Bengal. It will be undesirable and against national interest to keep disgruntled population in the border area.

I want to say a few words in regard to Purulia sub-division. The majority of the people of that area belong to backward classes who speak Hindi and their mother tongues i.e. Kurmali, Adibasi's language and there are less than half who speak both Bengali and Adibasi and Kurmali languages. These people have been wrongly recorded in census as Bengali speaking. Real Bengali speaking population is very small who are out and out Bengali. One *thana* of Purulia sub-division falls in my new constituency and I know that majority of the people of Purulia sub-division are unwilling to go to Bengal. I would strongly urge that the wishes of the people should be ascertained before transferring the areas to Bengal. Besides, transfer of Purulia sub-division will create a great problem of communication between Ranchi and Dhanbad and also between Jamshedpur and Ranchi and so forth. Thousands of people have launched *Satyagraha* as a protest against the transfer of Kishenganj as well as Purulia to West Bengal in their respective areas. I strongly feel that the wishes of the people of the areas should get a fair deal and must not be ignored under the circumstances.

Shri Pocker Saheb (Malappuram): Our Prime Minister's suggestion of the creation of Zonal Advisory Councils is a very valuable and excellent

idea. One could go further and even suggest Zonal States. But such ideas ought to have come before the formation of Andhra State. The immediate cause of the formation of Andhra was the sacrifice of the life of one patriot, the emotion generated by it and the violence that followed it. The Government submitted to this violence and the Andhra State was the result. This is at least the reading of the situation by the public. The agitation for linguistic States became, after this event, accentuated and acute in other parts of the country. The Government appointed the States Reorganisation Commission which has submitted its report and has mainly adopted linguistic considerations in one way or the other in their recommendations. This has aroused the expectations of the people and it is impossible, at this stage, to give a quietus to the demand for linguistic States. But the reorganisation must be carried out in such a fair and just manner as not to leave any room for future bitterness and conflict.

I will only touch upon questions relating to my own area and that too in the briefest manner leaving out even some of the important details. In the first place, I strongly and earnestly support the recommendation of S.R.C. for the formation of Kerala State, but with certain important and fully justified modifications. Vast bulk of the people of the area demanded and are pressing for a Kerala State including Malabar in it. The Congress Pradesh Committees of the Travancore Cochin State and Malabar, the Muslim League and various other parties have all pressed forward the claim for setting up a Kerala State by amalgamating the T.C. State, Malabar and the Kasargode Taluk of South Kanara. The intensity of the demand has been heightened by certain recent events. The people of Malabar were already aggrieved at the step-motherly treatment given to their district in the First Five Year Plan. They were keenly disappointed at, and resented the non-inclusion in the present Madras Cabinet of a member from the Malayalam speaking area of the existing Madras State.

On top of this came the utter neglect shown to Malabar in the Second Five Year Plan which brought about the massive walk-out of Malabar Members from a meeting of the Madras Legislature. As if all these were not enough the speech of the Madras Finance Minister in the Madras Assembly over S.R.C. Report improperly advocating only the cause of Tamilnad to the utter disregard of the interests of Malabar and of Kerala aggravated the already lacerated feelings of Malabar and further intensified and galvanised their demand for the immediate formation of a Kerala State. In the face of all these glaring and blazing facts, I wonder how such responsible and important leaders like Sri Rajagopalachari and Sri Kripalani brought themselves to make, and made themselves responsible to, the amazing statement that the people of Malabar wanted to continue, as at present, in the existing Madras State. This statement has no foundation in facts. No self-respecting Malayalee will agree to hang on a Tamil Government. All sections of the people of Malabar are, as I have indicated above, unequivocally and strongly for the setting up of the Kerala State with Malabar as a part of it.

Now, coming to the recommendations of S.R.C. in connection with the proposed Kerala, I am sorry to have to state that they are not justified in proposing to exclude from the new State of Kerala the five Southern Taluks of the T.C. State and in not including the Gudalur Taluk of Nilgris District in the State.

Neither is the demand of the Tallians to Devikulam, Peermedu and Chittoor Taluks justifiable on any ground. In Devikulam, leaving the floating population of labourers the population is predominantly Malayalam speaking. In Gudalur Taluk not only the language, but the land and customs of the people are same. Language spoken by a predominant section is Malayalam; admittedly the Tamil speaking people are very much less than the Malayalam speaking population.

[Shri Pocker Saheb]

As regards Kasagod it is obvious that even in the north of the Chandragiri river more than 50 per cent. of the people speak Malayalam. As the space allotted to me for this memorandum is limited I can only endorse the reasons mentioned in the speeches delivered by my hon. colleagues Shri A. M. Thomas and Shri Damodara Menon.

It is surprising that the Working Committee of the Congress has suggested exclusion of Laccadives and Ammenidivi from Kerala. For the reasons mentioned in the memorandum submitted by Jamiatul-Jazera and Islanders' Welfare Association, the recommendations of S.R.C. should be implemented in this respect.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh (Amravati West): Vidarbha has been created a separate State in the map of future India out of 8 Maharathi Districts of M. P. I have gone through the chapter of S.R.C. Report on Vidarbha again and again but I have failed to understand the reasoning behind this case. Sir, I do not challenge the integrity of the able persons in S.R.C. But I have every reason to say that the S.R.C. has not made the right approach to the case of Vidarbha. Rather I should say, though they have concealed this fact, that the creation of Vidarbha is not by itself but due to the complicated question of Bombay city.

In my opinion the creation of Vidarbha is to keep up "Balance Bilingual Theory" of Shri S. K. Patil.

Now I will come to show how the case of Vidarbha is weak in every respect. The Commission in its report on page 124, para. 45 have given the reasons of creating Vidarbha. To sum up, the main reasons are:—

- (i) It is surplus by Rs. 1½ crores;
- (ii) the importance of Nagpur city would be lost;
- (iii) land tenancy laws are different from Maharashtra;
- (iv) important section of Vidarbha is against joining with Maharashtra.

Let us examine all these points on the basis of facts. It is said by the Commission that Vidarbha will be surplus by Rs. 1½ crores. I wonder how the Commission has come to this conclusion. The House will be interested to know some of the facts of the budgetary position of Vidarbha. In one of his press interviews the Chief Minister of M.P. said that the income from Vidarbha is 42 per cent. of the total revenue of the State while the expenditure that the State has to incur on Vidarbha is 49 per cent. The Chief Minister is a third party man and authorised too, and he is to be believed.

It will be again interesting to know what Finance Minister of M.P. said in this respect. He is not only the Finance Minister but also the leader of Maha Vidarbha movement, who calls himself "विदर्भे पिता" or "Father of Vidarbha".

In his book "Financial Viability of the proposed Vidarbha", published by this so-called Father of Vidarbha, he has quoted some budgetary figures of proposed Vidarbha. It has been said on page 10 of this book that Vidarbha would be surplus by 36 lakhs only. If we go thoroughly through this pamphlet more interesting facts come out.

Instead of going into details I may quote para. No. 2 from the speech of Shri P. K. Deshmukh, Minister of Local-Self Government of M. P. in the Assembly debate on S.R.C. on page 38. It is seen from this para. that the surplus of 36 lakhs, that is shown by the Finance Minister relates to only the year 1952-53. The rest of the years 1953-54, 1954-55 and 1955-56 are all of big deficit.

We are puzzled to know, Sir, to whom we should believe, to the Commission Report of one and half crores surplus or to the Chief Minister of the State or to the Finance Minister who is a contesting party in this case?

It will be interesting to know what the per capita income of the Maharashtra and Vidarbha respectively is. In Vidarbha as stated by Shri Bhanu in the pamphlet, "Demand for Vidar-

bha" per capita income given is Rs. 12.3 while in Maharashtra as stated by the eminent economist Shri D. R. Gadgil in his memorandum to S.R.C., it is Rs. 13.1 and Rs. 13.2 in Marathwada of Hyderabad. The per capita expenditure in Bombay as stated by S.R.C. is Rs. 6/- while in Madhya Pradesh it is Rs. 3.5 only.

Budgetary deficit and surplus can be judged from the per capita income and expenditure of the state. Suppose Maharashtra spends Rs. 3 per head rather than Rs. 6 at present it will save Rs. 4.5 crores and if Vidarbha spends Rs. 6/- per head as Maharashtra does, it will have to spend Rs. 2 crores more which means it will have to suffer the deficit of 1/2 crore. So in every respect the financial position of Vidarbha is not sound and it cannot stand by itself.

It is stated in the report of S.R.C. on page 124 that the important section of Vidarbha is against joining with Maharashtra. I would have not mentioned the names of the leaders of Vidarbha movement, but for this remark of S.R.C. In order that this House be aware of this important section I will like to give the names of the important leaders in favour of Vidarbha and Maharashtra. The sponsors of the Maharashtra are—Shri Waman Rao Joshi, Dr. Gopal Rao Khedkar, Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh, Union Minister, Barrister R. M. Deshmukh, While the names of the leaders of Vidarbha are—Shri Brij Lal Biyani, M. Sambashiva Kannamwar, M. D. Tumpalliwar, Dina Dayal Gupta, Dr. M. S. Aney.

The sponsors of Maharashtra are veteran men of 30 to 40 years of political standing in Vidarbha and are the sons of soil having Maharathi as their mother tongue. But in the list of the leaders of Vidarbha none except Dr. Aney, who has retired from the politics long ago, has Maharathi as his mother tongue. And yet the Commission is pleased to hold these persons as important section while deciding the fate of Maharathi speaking people in Vidarbha, completely

brushing aside the views of veteran Maharathi speaking leaders in Vidarbha, whom I have mentioned above.

There are some Maharathi speaking areas at the border of Vidarbha and Madhya Pradesh like Burhanapur, Sansar Taluks and home portion of Bhaidehi and Adilabad Taluks, which should be included in Maharashtra.

Therefore, I think that the case of Vidarbha seen from any point of view is not a case which is based on reasons.

I will appeal in the name of all Maharathi speaking people that the whole Maharathi speaking area including Vidarbha be formed into one state as Maharashtra. There is absolutely no difficulty in doing so. Of course the question of Bombay city is the real battle. It has been repeatedly argued in this House that Bombay belongs to Maharashtra and I am of the same opinion. It is not in the interest of the Bombay city itself to keep it away from its hinter-land, Maharashtra. But the Congress High Command has suggested, in its resolution, three states formula as Maharashtra, Gujarat and Bombay to form three separate states. I would welcome this formula as far as it has consolidated all Maharathi speaking area except Bombay, brushing aside the recommendation of superfluous state of Vidarbha. I will urge upon the Working Committee to go a step further and find out some solution for the city of Bombay, so as to stop the battle over it.

Lastly sometimes it is heard from responsible persons that the bilingual Bombay State is the solution to the question of Bombay city. I would say it is not at all the solution, but it will add fuel to the fire. The bilingual theory of S.R.C. for Bombay State is now dead and gone and I hope, Sir, in no case it should be made to appear again.

श्रीमती निमीमाता (बिलासपुर-दुर्ग—
रायपुर-रक्षित-अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : राज्य
पुनर्गठन आयोग की अधिकतम सिफारिशों के

[श्रीमती मिनीमाता]

में सहमत हूँ। परन्तु भाषावार प्रान्त के निर्माण से मेरे विचार में पिछड़े वर्ग के लोगों को कष्ट मालूम होता है। खास कर मैं छत्तीसगढ़ से चुनकर आई हूँ वहाँ पर करीब १४ लाख हरिजनों की जनसंख्या है।

आज भी आप देखेंगे हमारी सरकार यथाशक्ति पिछड़े वर्ग को हर प्रकार से सुख सुविधा दे रही है फिर भी मैं नहीं कह सकती कि कब हरिजन आर्थिक एवं सामाजिक रूप से सवर्ण के समकक्ष में आ सकेंगे।

इसलिए मेरी प्रार्थना है कि जहाँ तक पिछड़े हुए वर्ग हैं सरकारी कार्य के लिए उन्हें दूर न जाना पड़े। इसलिए पास पास में कार्यालय स्थापित करने की कृपा करें। मैं छत्तीसगढ़ के लिए एक उदाहरण के लिए बताना चाहती हूँ। जब नागपुर राजधानी थी तब तो छत्तीसगढ़ को जितना उत्थान प्राप्त होना था नहीं हो सक जरा विचार कीजिये कि बरार में ८ लाख हरिजन की जनसंख्या है। वहाँ तो २२ हरिजन छात्रालय हैं और छत्तीसगढ़ में १४ लाख जनसंख्या हरिजनों के होते हुए भी सिर्फ रायपुर जिले में एक हरिजन छात्रालय है और यह भी दुस्सावस्था में है। आप समझ सकते हैं कि हमारे छत्तीसगढ़ अधिक्षित होने से उनको मिलने वाली सुविधाओं के कोटा को दूसरे एरिया चाट जाते हैं और छत्तीसगढ़ की कितनी उपेक्षा की जा रही है। और शायद बर्तमान राज्य विभाजन के बाद भी ऐसी की जावेगी।

अब रही राजधानी की बात। जब नागपुर में ३०० मील के भीतर राजधानी और हाईकोर्ट थे तब लोग अधिक्षित होने के कारण अपने पूर्ण अधिकार को प्राप्त न कर सके अब ७०० मील दूर भोपाल में राजधानी बनने जा रही है। तो आप विचार कर सकते हैं कि कोई कार्यबश छत्तीसगढ़ या भोपाल आते हैं तो कितना खर्च बैठता

है। हमारे अविकसित और पिछड़े एरिया को दृष्टिगोचर करते हुए और मेरे सुझाव पर ध्यान देते हुए चार जिलों को नया मध्य प्रदेश में मिला दिया जाय। नागपुर भण्डारा, वर्धा, चान्दा इससे विशाल मध्य प्रदेश बन सकता है और नागपुर का महत्व ज्यों का त्यों बना रहेगा क्योंकि नागपुर प्राचीन काल से सांस्कृतिक महत्व को रखता आया है। दूसरी बात हमारे विदर्भ वाले भाई जो हमारे साथ कई वर्षों से एक साथ रह रहे हैं। अब यह लोग डांवाडोल हो रहे हैं। विदर्भ संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र में मिलना नहीं चाहते और महाराष्ट्र विदर्भ को मिलाना चाहते हैं। इसलिए जन कल्याण को ध्यान में रखते हुए चार जिला को महाराष्ट्र में और चार जिला मध्य प्रदेश में मिला दिये जायें।

छत्तीसगढ़ के पिछड़े हुए इलाके को प्रशासनिक सुविधाएँ देने के हेतु यदि राजधानी भोपाल बनाई जाती है तो मेरा यह भी सुझाव स्वीकार किया जाय। सारा मध्य प्रदेश पांच कमिश्नरियों में विभाजित किया जाय और हर कमिश्नरी को पूर्ण अधिकार दिये जायें और जनता को भाने जाने के खर्च से तंग न होना पड़े और सस्ता एवं सुगम न्याय मिल सके।

छत्तीसगढ़ के पिछड़े प्रदेश एवं छत्तीसगढ़ के पूर्वी रियासतों के पिछड़े लोगों के लिए मेरा यह भी सुझाव है कि रायपुर में हाईकोर्ट के बैंच एवं रेवेन्यू के कार्यालय रखे जायें ताकि छत्तीसगढ़ी जनता को विशेष कर वस्तर के पिछड़े प्रदेश को जहाँ पर यातायात के संबंधा अभाव है, जहाँ के आदिवासी भ्रजाना-धकार में हैं ये लोग रायपुर तक पहुंच कर न्याय के भागी बन सकें।

Shri Barrow (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Underlying the Fundamental Rights, as enunciated in the Constitution of India, is the principle of

equality of opportunity for the individual citizen.

The recommendations of S.R.C. can only be effective if they sustain and inspire the spirit of this principle and enshrine with sanctity the cultural and educational rights of minorities.

Of all linguistic minorities the Anglo-Indian community occupies a unique position. It is a minority found in every State, yet without effective numerical strength in any single area to safeguard its culture. Culture here is taken to cover the social inheritance of beliefs, habits, moral and aesthetic standards, manners, institutions, vocations and the whole complex web of a community's inner and outer life. That culture is based primarily on language and religion is universally recognised. It is, therefore, necessary to provide special safeguards for the mother-tongue of this minority.

English is the recognised mother-tongue of the Anglo-Indian community, and the fact that it is an Indian language should receive official recognition. It is also the *de facto* mother-tongue of hundreds of thousands of persons who have been culturally nurtured on English.

English should, therefore, be included in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution because it is an important Indian language which can enrich the national language, Hindi, this being the purpose of languages included in the Eighth Schedule.

Article 29(1) gives minorities the right to conserve their language, script, culture etc., and Article 30(1) the right to establish and administer educational institutions of their choice.

These provisions are insufficient in themselves to safeguard the educational rights of minorities and require to be effectively supplemented.

There should be a constitutional obligation to provide public examinations in languages used in minority institutions.

A large number of candidates throughout the country desire instruction in the medium of English and because it may not be feasible for all State Governments to provide examinations in English at the Secondary stage, it is, therefore, urged that an All-India Secondary Examination in English be instituted.

Provision for examinations in English at the University stage will also be necessary and for this purpose affiliation of Colleges, using the English medium, to a Central University must be permitted.

The languages used for recruitment should not only depend on the numerical strength of the minorities but also on the intrinsic worth of the language. Administrative efficiency depends on personal qualities plus attainment and potentiality. An administrator whose mother-tongue is sufficiently developed for scientific and technological purposes, can advance in his particular field and it is therefore, essential that the languages selected should be sufficiently developed. English as such should continue to be permitted for recruitment examinations, provided that the candidate has also a sufficient knowledge of the regional language in which he will be called upon to work.

All safeguards for linguistic minorities must be included in the Constitution and made justiciable.

Residual measures to secure the interests of minorities should be the responsibility of a Statutory Commission for Minority Affairs.

Any substitute for such a Commission will be ineffective.

Provincial Governors will not be able to ensure that the dominant language group will adopt the necessary measures for protecting minorities.

Shri Laskar (Cachar—Lushai Hills—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Language and wishes of the people are no doubt important factors but the principle of

[Shri Laskar]

national unity and security should be the first and foremost considerations in the formation of States. Coming to my State of Assam, I like to say that from the point of national security and unity of India and also due to peculiar geographical and strategic position the North East Zone of Indian Republic should form one homogeneous administrative unit that means Assam plus Tripura plus Manipur. This is the proposal of the Assam Chief Minister, Assam Congress, all M.L.As., all M.Ps., of Assam. It is not correct that Assam Government and Assam Congress are not keen to take Tripura and Manipur. This is not my own proposal. The Chief Minister of Assam in his statement in Assam Assembly said on 18th November, 1955. "From the point of national security and unity of India it will appear clearly that the entire region to the North East of Pakistan needs an integrated administration from various points of view and should form one administrative homogeneous unit so that it can be developed as a self sufficient economic zone under a plan", and this statement was supported by Assam P.C.C., M.L.As., M.Ps. of Assam. S.R.C. supported the principles. The Commission has recommended merger of Tripura in Assam and Manipur as a centrally administered territory for the time being and its ultimate merger with Assam should be kept in view. My point is that why this should be ultimate and not immediate. If Manipur's merger with Assam would have been recommended by S.R.C. the hon. Members from Tripura would not have come for Tripura's separate existence. We, Assam people welcome the merger of Tripura. We are glad that West Bengal Government and West Bengal Congress have supported this merger, but they have given another suggestion that with the merger of Tripura, Assam should be declared a bilingual State, which seems to be unreasonable and untimely. Assam is a multi-lingual State. Assamese is not yet the State language of Assam. There are so many minority linguistic groups who are keeping in fact their

own language and culture in Assam. I am a Bengali. My district Cachar is a Bengali speaking area. In all institutions in my district whether primary or secondary, Bengali is the medium of language. This bilingual theory will create suspicion and fear in the minds of Tripuris, Manipuris and other linguistic groups in Assam and on the other hand it will not do any good to Bengalees in Assam. Bengalees in Assam have got courage enough to protect their language and culture. Language will take its own course. I request my friends from West Bengal not to bother about that. I like to draw the attention of hon. Members from Manipur and Tripura to the true facts regarding language. I do not find any relevancy or substance in the speech of Mr. D. Deb, from Tripura. In opposing merger of Tripura with Assam he brought some wild allegations against Assam Government which are baseless and without any foundation, and collected some wrong information about Assam. These are no doubt good for false propaganda purposes. He at one place of his speech condemned Chief Commissioner's rule and in another place admired Tripura's economic progress during this bad administration. I request him to change his mind. Let Assam and Tripura unite as friends and both will be benefited by this. All safeguards are recommended for Tripura by S.R.C. The Chief Minister of Assam has accepted all these as recommended by S.R.C. The Chief Minister of Assam is keen to take Tripura and is inviting their willingness for which he in his statement in the Assembly explained the policy of Assam Government towards Tripura after merger. I think there should not be any misgivings in the minds of Tripura people after that. Geographical, strategic position and other factors being almost similar, S.R.C. has recommended Manipur's existence on two considerations. The first consideration is that it is not desirable to impose another burden on Assam for administering the border area of Manipur. It seems that S.R.C. is too much sym-

pathetic towards Assam. I do not find any force in the arguments. In case of Tripura it is said that it is desirable to bring Indo-Pakistan borders under one control, why the same recommendation has not been made in the case of Manipur? Indo-Pakistan and Indo-Burma borders of the Mizo Hill Districts are under the control of Assam Government. While Assam Government is capable of administering so many border Districts in Assam State, it will not hesitate to shoulder the responsibility of Manipur for sake of national unity and national security.

The second consideration is that whereas Tripura's merger in Assam is natural but Manipur has no linguistic affinity with Assam. With due respect to the members of S.R.C. for their ability, wisdom, impartiality I must say that due to ignorance of facts they have come to this conclusion. Manipur has got cultural, linguistic, social affinity with Assam. The total population of Manipur is 5,88,000. Manipuris 3,50,000 others are Nagas, Mizos etc. Nagas have linguistic affinity with Nagas of Naga Hill District which is contiguous to Manipur. Mizos have linguistic affinity with Mizos of Mizo Hills District which is also contiguous to Manipur. Many Manipuris are also living in Assam. In my District Cachar Manipuri population is a little more or a little less than a lakh. In Tripura also about $\frac{1}{2}$ lakh. Manipuris are scattered in other Districts of Assam. These Manipuris left Manipur due to constant attack from Burma and settled in Assam and have been retaining their language and culture there. As for an instance—Manipuri dance is known to everybody. Who have brought it to prominence? First they are the Manipuris of Tripura and Cachar. Serari Singh, Raj Kumar of Cachar District and Kamini Singh of Tripura were brought as instructors in Santineketan even 25 years back. Now all over India Cachar Manipuris are serving as instructors for Manipuri dance. In Cachar District the General Secretary Nanda Kishore Singh,

M.L.A. is a Manipuri. The home of the priest of Maharaja of Manipur is in Cachar District. There are so many other proofs also. Therefore the merger of Manipur with Assam will be natural like Tripura. It is said that the people are not willing to come to Assam. The ordinary people are very simple, they do not know any thing about politics. It is very easy in a small State to rouse their feelings by parochial slogans. This is not the proof of their unwillingness. Here the M. Ps., are opposing merger because Manipur or Tripura cannot claim two seats in the Parliament and advisers will be dislodged and artificial leadership cannot find place in case of merger. Therefore the leaders naturally may not support merger. How can you judge the wishes of the people then? Language and wishes of the people are no doubt important factors, but these are not end in themselves. Other factors are to be taken into consideration. By keeping Manipur as a centrally administered area, other dangers are invited. Fissiparous tendencies and disruptive forces are tempted to grow in border areas in Assam. Therefore I request you not to make a precedent by keeping Manipur as a centrally administered area. Regarding administration, economic condition and financial position, Manipur's M.P. Mr. Keishing has given us a picture. Therefore even out of grace do not give Manipur to my Socialist friend Mr. Keishing and Tripura to my Communist friend Mr. Dasarath Deb. A few disappointed and frustrated back date Bengali leaders demanded Purbachal Province with some motive behind it. S.R.C. rightly rejected it, with giving reasons in para 730 in the Report. The Cachar people, all Congress Committees, M.L.As., M.Ps., protested against this proposal. Manipur and Tripura people legitimately and rightly demand for representative Government at the State level. For having the democratic right and responsible Government the only solution is the merger of Tripura and Manipur with Assam which is the clear verdict of S.R.C. stated in para 732 of the Report.

Dr. J. N. Parekh (Zalawad): At the outset, I feel linguistic approach to a problem, and giving of exaggerated importance to the same is not in time with one world concept of the modern age. When the world is becoming small, and when science and technological advances play an important part in our everyday life, our approach to these matters must be in a broader perspective. When economic factors play very important part in shaping the destiny of a nation, and when the humanity is in the grip of 'haves' and 'have nots' fight, mixing up of 'Linguism'—changes the very basis of conception in certain aspects.

Therefore I feel linguistic division of the country, in the present time is most inopportune, from national point of view. No doubt it was Congress, in the times of British regime that had advocated the linguistic approach, things have considerably changed after independence, and a bold policy decision by the Congress would have gone a great way in stabilizing matters. I think if the whole matter was deferred for a few years and priority to other items given such as, Five Year Plan, stabilization of our economy etc., it would have been much better.

I personally feel, the controversy that has arisen after the publication of the report should have set our leaders thinking, and a bold decision to show the report would have been ideal one. It appears things now have gone too far.

Coming to the report itself, one feels there are no set principles on which a consistent line is taken. I feel, economic aspect has not been given due weight and consideration but political feelings and other factors perhaps have played an important part. One is therefore surprised to see many and varied approaches leading to the impression that an *ad hoc* decision was first made and then the efforts made to justify the same by advances of various and different reasons.

While no doubt the task was an onerous one the Commission has tried in its way to give a best solution of a very vexed problem.

The report has caused excitement, irritation and heart burning in some parts while some areas have welcomed it. In an overall picture one finds many areas like Mysore, Andhra, Bihar, Bengal, Orissa, Madhya Bharat etc. have one thing or the other to say. While areas like Punjab, Pepsu, Maharashtra, Bombay are almost in turmoil. It is very essential that a very cautious and calm approach is warranted. Sometimes we create problems and then say country is faced with grave problems. It is but natural areas which have historical backgrounds century old ties, pattern and custom find it difficult to adjoin and hence if and when Constitutional means or methods are denied or not taken advantage of, it results in fury being let loose. In a democracy, particularly when it is growing, calm and peaceful discussion of controversial matters should not be muffled and it should be the duty of our leadership to canalize public opinion on right directions.

Recent announcement of the Prime Minister in Lok Sabha about his idea of dividing the country in five big zones viz. East, West, North, South and Central Zones is very very laudable one, it deserves to be worked out in greater details. One can say a lot on this but there is hardly any space or time for the same.

The chapters about administrative set up and minority safeguards are very important ones. But in my view most important aspect is the creation of an atmosphere of mutual trust and goodwill. In certain areas and certain matters a narrow and parochial approach is prevailing and that is the starting point of many troubles.

Coming to the most controversial question of Bombay State, I feel inflicting a solution will not take us anywhere—it will only be a beginning of a

trouble. Both sides Maharashtrians and non-Maharashtrians should sit together and solve the problem. I had my definite views about Saurashtra which I had given to our leaders but as things stand problem of Saurashtra has become very small looking to other vast issues at stake. It has been alleged that mercantile community and industrialists are seized with fears wrongly. I feel that is not correct. Businessmen and industrialists have occupied a particular position by the dint of their intelligence, ability and efficiency in any town, city or country. Here somehow the question of Bombay is linked up as to that of between Gujeratis and Maharashtrians while really it is not so because in Bombay there are many others who have an interest. The problem is very tricky one and full of dangerous potentialities if not properly tackled. I feel the bold, truthful and correct approach will certainly reduce the area of disagreement and bring the concerned to an agreed solution which is essential for the developing economy and stability of the country.

Unless the fissiparous tendencies are checked the whole country may be in turmoil for nothing.

For the sake of national security and unity a calm and calculated approach is necessary and with Panditji at the helm of our affairs I do not think the same is impossible.

Shri L. N. Mishra (Darbhanga cum Bhagalpur): I Welcome this Report more because of its observations made under the heads—safeguards for linguistic groups, integration of services, and unity of India. To my mind the Commission has done a great service to the country by pointing out these important questions. Nothing can be more important than unity of India.

All attempts must be made to bring North and South more closer. Commission's recommendations regarding teaching of South Indian language in Northern part of India and North Indian language in South must be implemented without any delay. I also welcome establishment of some Universities on the line.

Of great importance is the recommendations about creation of some more All India Services. I may mention the need of having All India Service of Engineers in particular. Execution of river-valley and other projects demand that there must be free-flow of engineers from one project to another, from one State to another. It will ensure good working and better results. I was surprised to learn that some of the Chief Ministers are opposed to it. Why should they be so sensitive about their powers and rights? Moreover the Coordination Board of Ministers in its last meeting has already accepted the idea of having an All India Service of Irrigation and Power Engineers. It is something funny to see Chief Ministers opposing an idea which a colleague of theirs has already accepted on behalf of the respective States. Creation of an All-India Cadre of Engineers will go a long way in meeting the present shortage of technical personnel experienced by various States. We must have it.

Next I come to the case of my State—Bihar. The Commission has recommended the transfer of the portion of the Kishangunj Sub-division and the entire Sadar Sub-division of Manbhum minus Chas Thana to West Bengal. Kishangunj is proposed to be transferred to West Bengal in order to provide link between North and South Bengal. The National Highways connect South Bengal with North Bengal. They are under the control of the Central Government and no State Government can interfere with the movements of goods and traffic on them. Then again, the corridor theory is repugnant to Indian Nationalism. On the ground of language and culture, this area cannot be transferred to West Bengal. About 90 per cent. of the population in Kishangunj are Hindi or Urdu speaking and only 3 per cent are Bengali speaking. People of this Sub-division have social, economic and cultural ties with the people of the rest of Purnea and Bihar. The entire population is bitterly opposed to the proposed transfer. The Panchayats of the area have registered

[Shri L. N. Mishra]

their protest against the proposed transfer. Over thousand persons have already courted arrest and imprisonment on this issue.

So far as the transfer of the Sadar Sub-division of Manbhum to West Bengal is concerned, there is absolutely no case in its favour. According to the Commission itself an area where the speakers of one language do not constitute 70 per cent. or more of the population, should not be disturbed on the basis of language. In the District as a whole, Bengali speaking population is only 43.5 per cent. whereas Hindi speaking population is 43 per cent, and the rest are the speakers of the aboriginal languages. Dhanbad Sub-Division is predominantly Hindi speaking. In Manbhum Sadar Sub-division, Bengali speaking population is only 52 per cent. Therefore, neither in the District as a whole nor in the Purulia Sub-division, Bengali speaking population is in considerable majority. So on the ground of language, this area cannot be transferred to West Bengal. The transfer of some area on the basis of catchment of some particular river is something funny. Gandak has its catchment area in Uttar Pradesh, Sone in Madhya Pradesh and Kosi in Nepal. Shall we claim these areas for amalgamation with Bihar? Two Bills, the River Board Bill, and the Inter-State Water Disputes Bill, are already before the House. These two Bills ensure enough of safeguards of inter-State water disputes if there be any.

It is wrong to say that Bihar is not interested in Kosi river. We have a project costing Rs. 5½ crores for constructing a Dam on the Kosi for the irrigation of about three lakh acres of land in the Sadar Sub-Division of Manbhum. Both Bihar and Bengal Projects can be executed on this river simultaneously. Bihar Project will help the Bengal Project because the Project in Bihar will moderate the flood in West Bengal.

By the proposed transfer of Purulia Sub-division to West Bengal, communi-

cations between Dhanbad and Jamshedpur and between Dhanbad and Ranchi and between Muri and Jamshedpur will be completely disorganised. It is really funny to find that the Commission creates the same problem in Manbhum which it tries to solve by giving a link through Kishanganj between North and South Bengal.

By the proposed transfer, Dimna Nala in Sadar Sub-division of Manbhum which is at present a source of water supply to Jamshedpur will fall in West Bengal. The Suvarnarekha will also fall in West Bengal. Bihar has a scheme of constructing a dam on the Suvarnarekha in Chandial Police Station for additional water supply to Jamshedpur which is necessary for the expanded Steel Factory and also for irrigation of large areas of land of Singhbhum. By the proposed transfer, Chandial will also go to West Bengal. The economy of Bihar will, thus, be violently disturbed.

Shri Thimmaiah (Kolar—Reserved-Scheduled Castes): I welcome this Report. It fulfills the legitimate aspirations of the people. The people of this country agitated even before independence for the linguistic States. Though the Commission has not taken the language as the sole basis for the reorganisation of the states, the Report by and large has envisaged the linguistic states subject to administrative viability and the unity and security of the nation.

Having said this I come to the united Karnataka with the Mysore State which I represent. The agitation for the united Karnataka is as old as the National Congress. The people of Mysore have committed to this long back and they cannot escape from it. They have to welcome this unification whatever may be the honest difference of opinion among certain leaders of Mysore State. In this connection I have to say something about the Scheduled Caste people of Mysore State as I am the representative of the Scheduled Caste people. The Scheduled Caste people of Mysore welcome

the united Karnataka. There is no doubt about it. We support this because we sincerely feel that our position is same wherever we go and wherever we stay. One word about my Constituency i.e. Kolar District which Andhras claim under the plea that majority of the people speak Teiugu. My Andhra friends are under the illusion. They do not know much about Kolar. Kolar is the crown of Mysore. The people of Kolar never feel like Telugu people. They are more than Kannadigas because of their long standing ties and relations with Mysorians. They have contributed a lot to make Mysore State, a model State. They are very happy with Mysore. Nobody wants to go to Andhra. It is not fair to equate Kolar with Bellary. The question of Bellary must be decided on its own merit.

Shri U. C. Patnaik (Ghumsur): It is unfortunate that when we are thinking in terms of the Five Year Plans for socio-economic progress, our national energies should have been diverted to linguistic and other differences. Instead of one mighty nation putting its shoulder to the wheels to create happy and prosperous India of tomorrow, forces of disintegration are setting up their ugly heads to divide the nation. While S.R.C. Report has accentuated these differences, one cannot help feeling that our First Five Year Plan has not succeeded in canalising our national energies to the development programme. Had the present or future plan caught the imagination of the people and enlisted their wholehearted co-operation, there might have been less scope for the inter-provincial mistrust and jealousies that are now growing. This I feel, calls for a revision of our plans so as to sublimate our abundant energies into constructive channels instead of dissipating the same in internecine squabbles.

I had not intended speaking on this Report, but for the speech of the hon. Member from Pathapatnam Shri V. V. Giri on the floor of Lok Sabha yesterday. We both belong to the

same town, we are neighbours and friends for some decades. He has always been known for his cosmopolitan views. Yesterday, while speaking on generalities, he was soaring in ethereal regions with his exhortation on national unity and international amity. Perhaps he was right in claiming that "great minds think alike" and that he could think years ahead of the Prime Minister, on this aspect of the matter. But when, towards the close of his speech, he came down nearer home and spoke about the boundary disputes between Andhra and its neighbouring States, there was a marked contrast between his generalisations and his views on specific matters, quite contrary to those profession. This is an example of how the most broadminded political thinkers err, when they come down to personal or parochial levels. I was amazed to hear the hon. Member from Pathapatnam that Berhampur was lost to Orissa in 1936. May I be permitted to point out that the predominantly Oriya speaking areas of Ganjam and Koraput were lost to Madras for a long time and were partially restored to Orissa in 1936, with the full concurrence of the Madras Government and Madras Legislature? Orissa had then no Government of its own; these divisions and demarcations of boundaries were made by the Central Government in consultation with Government of Madras. The then Delhi-Madras confidential correspondence would reveal how Madras fought for every inch of land before conceding the areas to be finally merged in Orissa in 1936.

The Oriya population of Berhampur is definitely far greater than that of Andhras, according to official census. If the economic interests of the Andhras then (in 1936) predominated in the town, it was due to the special privileges they secured at the cost of the bulk of the population. As regards Parlakimedi the zamindari was divided into two parts, Oriya-predominating-areas going to Orissa and the rest remaining in Madras. Out of 618 sq. miles of Parlakimedi Estate, only 190 sq. miles has come to Orissa and the

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

rest continues to remain in Andhra. The population of the area transferred to Orissa was about 64,000 of which 50 per cent. were Oriyas, 37 per cent. Andhras and the rest, tribal population; including the doubtfuls, the Oriyas were 63 per cent.

In Jeypore Estate, the population of Andhras is only 6 per cent. It is inconceivable how my hon. friend draws an analogy from Hyderabad.

On the other hand, Budarsingi with 80 per cent. Oriyas, Jalantara, Tarla, part of Mandasa and other areas contiguous to Orissa with predominantly Oriya majority, are still in Andhra.

These facts and figures illustrate my contention that the differences in language, rouse narrow parochial feelings, bring down personalities from Himalayan heights to the extent of pressing for false claims and tend to distract us from our national goal of unity and progress.

I reiterate my suggestions made on numerous occasions on the floor of Lok Sabha, that Government should try to canalise our national enthusiasm, sublimate our national energies for purposes of development and defence instead of allowing the same to be diverted into parochial squabbles.

श्री आर० सी० शर्मा (मुरैना-भिड़) :

राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग के प्रतिवेदन पर चर्चा होते हुए भिन्न भिन्न प्रकार के दृष्टिकोण सभा सदन में प्रकट किये गये हैं। आयोग ने छोटे, बड़े एकभाषी और द्विभाषी प्रान्तों को रूप रेखा दी है और राज्यों का वर्गीकरण समाप्त किया है। बहुत कुछ सराहनीय कार्य किया है जिससे कहीं सन्तोष है तो कहीं असन्तोष भी है। चर्चा के मध्य में सदन के नेता प्रधान मंत्री जी ने एक नया दृष्टिकोण देश के समझ उपस्थित किया है, वह है बहुत बड़े बड़े राज्यों के निर्माण का निस्सन्देह यदि संकीर्ण विचार दूर हो जावे एकता और न्याय की ओर ही सब का झुकाव हो जावे तो बड़े बड़े राज्य निर्माण में

कोई कठिनाई नहीं होगी। परन्तु वस्तुस्थिति कुछ और ही है अतः अभी बड़े बड़े राज्यों की रचना करना उचित प्रतीत नहीं होता है। जनतन्त्र के विकास के वास्ते भी बहुत बड़ी बड़ी इकाई श्रेयस्कर नहीं होगी अभी हमारे देश की शासन व्यवस्था चलाने वाली नौकरशाही की नियत और रुचि पूर्णतः जनतन्त्र के अनुकूल नहीं हो पायी है। बड़े बड़े राज्यों में बहुत कुछ नौकरशाही पर ही निर्भर रहता है। स्वयं के अनुभव से यह कह सकता हूँ कि विशाल उत्तर प्रदेश की अपेक्षा छोटे से मध्य भारत में भ्रष्टाचार कम है जनसाधारण की सुनवाई आपेक्षिक दृष्टि से मध्य भारत में सीधे और ठीक होती है शान्ति और व्यवस्था के प्रश्न पर भी मध्य भारत उत्तर प्रदेश की अपेक्षा अधिक सतर्क और सफल रहा है। अतः मेरा यह मत है कि मध्य भारत में विन्ध्य प्रदेश का वह भाग जो उत्तर प्रदेश में नहीं जाना चाहता है उसको तथा भोपाल को और राजस्थान के झालावाड़ और कोटा को मिला कर एक सुदृढ़ प्रान्त बनाया जावे जिसकी जनसंख्या १२५ लाख के लगभग हो।

मध्यभारत के मध्य प्रदेश में विलीन किये जाने के सम्बन्ध में मुख्य कारण जो बतलाये हैं वे हैं (१) माताटीला बांध मध्य प्रदेश के निर्माण से एक से अधिक राज्यों के अधिकार में नहीं रहेगा (२) चम्बल के दक्षिण में शान्ति व्यवस्था एक शासन के हाथ में आ जावेगी (३) ग्वालियर और इन्दौर का झगड़ा समाप्त हो जायगा (४) मध्य भारत का सम्बन्ध महाकौशल से है (५) भविष्य उज्ज्वल होगा।

उपरोक्त कोई भी कारण मध्य भारत के विलीन करने के वास्ते न तो पर्याप्त है और न वह सही है। माताटीला बांध फिर भी उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार के हाथ में रहेगा, शान्ति और

व्यवस्था उत्तर प्रदेश का भी सिरदर्द है वह मध्य भारत के विलीन होने पर भी रहेगी। मध्य भारत का सम्बन्ध महाकौशल से तो रहा नहीं, उत्तर प्रदेश से प्रवश्य रहा है, दक्षिण मध्य भारत का बम्बई से रहा है, राजस्थान से रहा है। ग्वालियर इन्दौर के जैसे झगड़े रहे हैं वे तो दोनों के एकीकरण के साथ उत्पन्न हुए थे वह अब समाप्त ही हो रहे थे। ऐसे झगड़े सर्वत्र रहे हैं। विदर्भ और महाकौशल के झगड़े आयोग ने माने हैं भविष्य तो अब सारे देश का एक साथ है।

इसके विरुद्ध मध्य भारत को कुछ बढ़ा कर एक इकाई रखने के सम्बन्ध में प्रान्तीय कांग्रेस ने भारी बहुमत से निश्चय किया और विधान सभा के अधिकांश सदस्यों ने भी मध्य भारत के समर्थन में भाषण दिये हैं। आयोग ने स्वयं बड़े बड़े प्रान्तों की रचना पर बल नहीं दिया है यह प्रान्त विदर्भ से तो अब भी बड़ा है। उड़ीसा, आसाम, केरल से कहीं अच्छा प्रान्त रह सकता है। आयोग ने प्रतिवेदन के पृष्ठ २६, चरण १०६ में यह माना है।

"No change should be made unless it is a distinct improvement in the existing position."

ऐसी दशा में मध्य भारत की विलीन करने का कोई अवसर नहीं है। कुछ ही वर्ष पूर्व २२ राज्यों को मिला कर मध्य भारत की रचना हुई इसके भविष्य उज्ज्वल होने के सम्बन्ध में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी और उस समय के गृह मंत्री सरदार पटेल ने आशीर्वाद दिये उन पर से अनेकों समस्याओं को लेकर दिल और दिमाग को मिलाकर कार्य किया उसमें बहुत कुछ सफलता मिली। जमींदारी और जागीरदारी बहुत जल्दी समाप्त की। किसानों की प्रगति का एक अच्छा विधान बनाया जैसा किसी भी प्रान्त में नहीं है। अब पुनः विलीनीकरण और एकीकरण का चक्र इस प्रान्त की जनता के वास्ते कठोर परीक्षण का समय होगा।

राजधानी का प्रश्न विवादास्पद बन चुका है जबलपुर, भोपाल और ग्वालियर सामने हैं जिस स्थान पर अधिक से अधिक साधन राजधानी के हों उसको छोड़ कर अन्यत्र चित्त दौड़ाना कहां तक उपयोगी होगा। आज किसी भी प्रदेश की राजधानी उसके मध्य में नहीं है तो फिर प्रस्तावित मध्य प्रदेश की राजधानी ग्वालियर में रखने में ही क्यों आपत्ति है? महाकौशल में भी भोपाल राजधानी से सन्तोष नहीं है।

प्रस्तावित मध्य प्रदेश में यातायात के साधनों का भारी अभाव है। १७१ हजार वर्ग मील का प्रान्त जिसमें सड़कें न हों, रेल न हों, वहां लोग किस प्रकार सुखी रह सकते हैं, मिल सकते हैं, समझना कठिन है। अविकसित प्रान्त बड़ा बनाना केवल कठिनाइयों को आमंत्रण देना है।

मुझे विश्वास है हमारे नेतागण पुनः विचार करके वास्तविक कठिनाइयों का निराकरण करेंगे और जनसाधारण को सन्तोष प्रदान करेंगे।

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury (Nabadwip): S.R.C. Report, whatever divergence of opinion it may have created, is certainly to be welcomed from the point of view of ocean, coastal and internal shipping of India. The country stands to gain, because, by hemming in of the princely States, so that they had no easy access to the coast, a policy of the British Government has been corrected. In the heated interest over controversial issues, one is apt to lose sight of this. The 15 natural regions based on the form of land, type of soil, climate, mineral resources etc. all form a pattern that is intimately connected with access to the coast, and the Commission has solved this well, for the recommendations have been based with a view to a certain extent to the economic and political considerations that flow from the geography of a

[Shrimati Ila Palchoudhry]

country. It has given us more maritime States than we have at present. Most States will be opened out to a major port and a number of minor ones. In some cases, some exist and some are likely to be developed.

Gujarat will be served by Kandla, as also the hinterlands of Rajasthan and Punjab; Maharashtra by Bombay; Karnataka by Mangalore or Matpe; Kerala by Cochin; Bengal, Assam, Bihar, U.P. by Calcutta; through riverine transport to the sea; Andhra by Vishakhapatnam; Orissa by Paradweep, which is contemplated to be developed into a big port, and so on. There will remain some parts, owing to the vastness of India, that will only be able to establish contact to the sea, through Railways, but the overall picture is better than it was.

In this achievement, looking to the development of India, there is much to congratulate S.R.C. on, for it will enable India to foster her international contacts more effectively, her merchandise will cross the high seas and trade and communication will come to her shores. In this context, future historians and India will remember S.R.C. and the people who worked for this report, with pride.

In view of what the Prime Minister said, Zones, if they are created may be a good solution, but as that is nebulous, I shall confine myself to S.R.C. Report. Zones, good as they might be, always seem rather cold, because the name of a place is connected with tradition and background—and it is a pity to ruthlessly change names. Mysore which takes its name, from the incident of the Goddess Chamundeswari who killed Mahishashura—if the name is changed—loses colour and individuality. Bellary, which is normally part of that State, should be allowed to remain in Mysore. Bhopal, being decided as the capital of the State is a happy recommendation for it has all the qualifications of being a capital.

Certain controversies regarding internal adjustment of boundaries arise inevitably in a programme like this. I submit with all the emphasis at my command that just demands should have the scope of being looked into before finalising the recommendations, and the wishes of the people should have fair survey. West Bengal paid the price of the freedom movement, more than any other State, she also paid the price of freedom—more dearly than most other States. The British divided her, and the result of freedom still further division!

The Indian National Congress in 1911 urged Government to transfer the Bengalee speaking areas from Bihar to Bengal. The admired leaders of Bihar, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Deep Narayan Singh, Sachidanand Sinha, Nand Kishore Lal, Parameshwar Lal, all supported this suggestion. They were men of Bihar—but leaders of India, their vision was wide, fair and just, they had no narrowness and spoke in a clarion voice.

There is no room for recrimination or heated feeling, for India must help to solve the problem of Bengal. Language is a very important consideration and S.R.C. has considered language. On this basis and of contiguity and administration the parts of Manbhum with Bhas thana, Dhalbhum the parts of Purnea with the Mechi as the Western boundary, the Santhal Parganas in which lie the catchment areas of the river Ajoy and Goalpara, if people in that area are willing to be transferred, should be included in Bengal.

The corridor to connect North and South Bengal, is an absolute administrative necessity. I will not go into figures because figures have been supplied fully, pressing the preponderance of Bengalee speaking population. The towns of Jamshepur and Dhanbad also have a Bengali majority if the fleeting population is discounted. The total demand of Bengal from Bihar will be 11,000 sq. miles, population approximately 50 lakhs.

from Assam 3,987 sq. miles, population a little over 11 lakhs. This makes Bengal a State of forty to forty four thousand sq. miles with a population of little over 3 crores. Bihar has 60,000 sq. miles and population 3 crores 20 lakhs. What great disruption of economy to Bihar can this cause? To stabilize economy of Bengal, Dhanbad and Jamshedpur should be included in Bengal.

The rehabilitation of refugees is a vital consideration for Bengal. They are sent to Hyderabad, Bangalore, Mysore, Andamans. Why? The little faith and hope in life that they can yet save, could only be given to them in Bengal, where they can at least be amongst people who speak their language. The non-inclusion of Kishanganj area, because it has a Muslim population holds no water. There are over 50 lakh muslims in West Bengal living in absolute amity and equality, also assurances have been given that they will not be disturbed for refugee rehabilitations. Bengal has never tried to suppress any cultures. Muslim culture has flourished on the soil of Bengal. The Muslim poet Kazi Nazrul Islam is acclaimed loved and quoted as Bengal's own poet. Ill and aged as he is, he is looked after, by the kind help of the Prime Minister, and also to a great extent by his admirers, irrespective of religion or caste. A 76-year old man to be dragged in an open truck at the risk of his life in Winter from Puralia to Hazaribagh Jail, because he sponsored Bengali songs, would not be thought of in Bengal. That his health was affected was inevitable, that he did not die was a miracle.

Bengal wants no favour. Only justice and fair-play. I want, that the question of Bengal be considered *de novo* and her just demands conceded. We seek the cooperation of Bihar and Assam, of all India to solve our problems for are we not also your brothers? What room is there for anger or recrimination! We want to grow so that we can serve the whole of India and play our full part. We give a

great deal of revenue to the Centre, we have our cultural contributions to make to that whole concept of India that we hold in our hearts, India whose shores are washed by the seas, India that is crowned with the glittering snows.

If politics is the art of the possible, then it is incumbent to know what is possible, and if administration is the machinery that applies that which is possible, it must also find a formula that will be acceptable to the greatest number.

Pandit B. Shukla (Durg—Bastar): I happen to represent a peculiar constituency and probably a very interesting one too. I have the largest number of a aboriginals as my voters, although I represent a general seat.

The aboriginals of Bastar were made aboriginals, not by any statutory act but by the fact that perhaps they are the original inhabitants of this vast and rich land.

They have been preserved by nature. Their habitation is named the "Aboojh Mad" i.e. the unknown land of the Marious. It was through Mr. Grigson an ex I.C.S. that their existence was made known to the outer world. He was probably the first outsider who was allowed to penetrate a little into this unknown land so strongly fortified by nature. That was also because, as they say, he himself had a strain of Adivasi blood in him. Later on Father Elwin also wrote about these fine tribes.

I am only trying to give in a nutshell what the people are about whom I am conveying to this august House, their needs and demands.

They are there and have been there and if the creator wishes they will be there till eternity. They have a peculiar mode of living which suits the conditions under which they live and whatever is done or wherever they are attached to, they will like to be spared from the fouling influence of the so called present day civilization.

[Pandit B. Shukla]

I can say this with authority because I have gone to them, met them and thereby to some extent known what they want and what they need.

From the outside, they only require a little sympathetic attitude and a little medical help. They only need an authority which can keep order and do justice quick and precise.

They may or may not get all this but I can say with confidence that they will remain Indians. This I am saying in augmentation and I am glad to completely endorse the views of Shri Jaipal Singh, the hon. Member from Ranchi.

I do not want at the present juncture to stress anything more about these people except this that they should be allowed and assured the same freedom and protection as they wrested from the foreign rulers. The foreigners even went to the extent of trying to prove that these people are cannibals, which allegation is completely false. All the same, they had to concede these people a proper status and proper protection. This is a question which needs to be properly looked into.

S.R.C. Report is a subject which requires diligent study. I have been feeling and visualising the very many problems that it had to report on. There is no doubt that it was a stupendous job and they have tried to tackle it marvelously well. The amount of labour and research that they have put into their work is voluminous but when we think that the problem is the future set up of more than three hundred million people, their efforts will seem only the beginning of a good task.

Personally, in my province, I would have preferred *status quo*. I can give very good and cogent reasons for this. I think the present new arrangement is fairly good.

I am in favour of either adopting the report *in toto* with a few minor

alterations here and there or we have to begin the whole job anew.

When we are laying the foundations of the edifice of free India we have to do it with sure and steady hands. History repeats itself and it is not for nothing that we are having sixteen States when the Great Ashokan Empire was also divided in sixteen States.

I can say with confidence that whatever I have heard and talked during the days of this debate, I have come to know that provided certain conditions are fulfilled, the Report can be passed and carried out with perfect unanimity.

For some time I felt that many of us are groping in darkness but the leader of the House showed us the ray of light which I hope will become the beacon and guiding star in times to come.

In the end I only want to say with all emphasis at my command

सत्यमेव जयते

श्री सूर्य प्रसाद (मुरैना—भिड़—रहित—
अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : मैंने एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट का अवलोकन किया। मध्य भारत राज्य के विलय सम्बन्धी अध्याय को पढ़कर बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ। कमीशन ने इस स्टेट को विलय करने के कोई ठोस कारण नहीं बताये, केवल ग्वालियर-इन्दौर की खींचतान बताकर इस उन्नतशील राज्य का विलय कर देना न्यायसंगत नहीं कहा जा सकता। हाँ तक राजधानी के झगड़े का सवाल है ऐसे झगड़े प्रत्येक राज्य में होते आये हैं, धीरे होते रहते हैं। देश के अनेक प्रांतों की राजधानियाँ दो स्थानों पर रही हैं। राजधानी के सम्बन्ध में खींचतान मिल मालिक एवं कुछ पूंजीपतियों के निजी स्वार्थ के लिये अवश्य रही हो। लेकिन जनसाधारण ने इस विवाद पर कभी ध्यान नहीं दिया। कमीशन ने भाषा के आधार पर

कुछ राज्य बनाये परन्तु यह नीति बम्बई पर लागू नहीं की गई, यह बात जचती नहीं है। विदर्भ, केरल, कर्नाटक, आंध्र और हैदराबाद सरीखे छोटे राज्य बनाकर मध्य भारत को छोटा राज्य बता कर समाप्त कर देना ठीक नहीं। कमीशन ने आधे में होली आधे में दीवाली वाली कहावत चरितार्थ की है। प्रस्तावित मध्य प्रदेश को हिन्दी भाषा भाषी बताकर कमीशन ने अपनी गल्ती को छुपाने की कोशिश की है। जहां तक मध्य प्रदेश की भाषा का सवाल है भिन्न भिन्न क्षेत्रों में भिन्न भिन्न भाषायें बोली जाती हैं, प्रत्येक क्षेत्र के रीति-रिवाज रहन-सहन, वेशभूषा, अलग अलग हैं। यदि कमीशन को ऐसा ही करना था तो सम्पूर्ण मध्य प्रदेश, उत्तर प्रदेश, राजस्थान, दिल्ली आदि को मिला कर एक विशाल हिन्दी भाषा-भाषी प्रान्त बनाने की सिफारिश करनी चाहिये थी। कुछ लोगों का मत है कि बड़े राज्यों में शासन संचालन व्यवस्था ठीक होती है, मैं इस बात से सहमत नहीं हूँ। जितने बड़े राज्य हैं उनकी शासन संचालन व्यवस्था में खोखलापन देखने में आया है। शासक थोड़े से समय में जनसाधारण से नहीं मिल सकते, जनता के जीवन की देख रेख नौकरशाही की दया पर निर्भर रहती है। राज्य संचालन के दृष्टिकोण से छोटे संघठित, सुदृढ़ राज्यों की जिसमें जनसाधारण अपने जनप्रिय शासकों से मिल कर अपने कष्टों का निराकरण शीघ्र करा सकें रहना अत्यावश्यक है। इस प्राण-विक युग में बड़े राज्य देश की सुरक्षा के लिए रहे यह कहना उचित प्रतीत नहीं होता। कमीशन ने उत्तरी मध्य भारत के ४ जिलों का आर्थिक व शासकीय सम्बन्ध महाकौशल से बताया है। यह जानकारी सही नहीं है। सैकड़ों मील स्थित महाकौशल का सम्बन्ध इन ४ जिलों से हो ही नहीं सकता। शायद कमीशन मालवा के कुछ जिलों को बताना भूल कर इन जिलों का जिक्र कर बैठा। इन ४ जिलों की

भाषा, वेशभूषा, रहन-सहन, आर्थिक एवं रीति-रिवाजों का सम्बन्ध तो उत्तर-प्रदेश के आगरा, इटावा, झांसी और कानपुर से रहा है। कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि दुनियां इतनी नज़दीक होती जा रही है कि चंद घंटों में कहीं से कहीं पहुंचा जा सकता है। यह मोटर और हवाई जहाज वालों की बात है, उनके लिए सब-शेज पास हैं। आप प्रत्येक व्यक्ति के लिए मोटर और हवाई जहाज नहीं जुटा सकते। आपको करोड़ों गरीब वस्त्रविहीन पैदल चलने वालों का जिनके पास रेल का किराया तक नहीं है की सुविधा का ध्यान रखना पड़ेगा। वे कैसे बड़े और विशाल राज्य होने पर आप तक अपनी दुःख-भरी फरियाद लेकर आ सकेंगे। आप सोचिये तो सही कि किस तरह एक जनता द्वारा चुना हुआ मंत्री चम्बल नदी से लेकर आंध्र राज्य की सीमा तक जहां से समुद्र तट पास रह जाता है दौरा कर अपनी भूखी प्यासी जनता जनार्दन की वास्तविक दशा का अवलोकन कर सकेगा। जहां तक मध्य भारत के शासन-संचालन का सवाल है, इस स्टेट ने काफी तरक्की की है इसकी आर्थिक दशा की प्रशंसा तो कमीशन ने स्वयं की है। साथ ही साथ हरिजन, आदिवासी एवं अन्य पिछड़े हुये वर्गों के उत्थान कार्य में तो शायद सारे देश के प्रांतों में आगे रहा है। मध्य भारत कांग्रेस ने इन बातों की ध्यान में रख कर एकमत से मध्य भारत राज्य जैसा है वैसा रखने सम्बन्धी राय केन्द्र को भेजी है। इसी तरह मध्य भारत की धारा-सभा के मेम्बरों ने भी जो प्रस्ताव पेश किए हैं मध्य भारत को अलग राज्य रखने की बात कही है। कुछ नेतामित्री की खींचतान में लगे लोगों के अलावा समस्त जनसाधारण मध्य भारत राज्य बने रहने के पक्ष में हैं। २२ राज्यों की सेवाओं का एकीकरण मध्य भारत अभी तक पूर्ण नहीं कर पाया। राज्य के विलय होने पर फिर पन्द्रह वर्ष में एकीकरण होने की सम्भावना है। राज्य के विलय होने के फैसले से जनसाधारण हैं

[श्री सूर्य प्रसाद]

काफी शोभ है वे पुनः उन परेशानियों में नहीं पड़ना चाहते जिनको उन्होंने ७ साल में पार किया है। जब विदर्भ, केरल, आंध्र, कर्नाटक, क्षीरसे छोटे राज्य रह सकते हैं तो मध्य भारत को वहाँ की जनता की इच्छानुसार रखना ठीक है। मुझे यह ज्ञात है कि कांग्रेस उच्च सत्ता ने मध्य भारत को विलय करने का निश्चय कर लिया है फिर भी जनसाधारण की भावनाएं उनका नुमायन्दा होने के नाते प्रदर्शन करना मैं अपना कर्तव्य समझता हूँ। अन्त में मैं अपने देश के कर्णधारों से विनती करूंगा कि अन्य विवाद-ग्रस्त राज्यों की भांति मध्य भारत के विलय सम्बन्धी निर्णय पर पुनः विचार करें।

श्री भोला राजत (सारन व चम्पारन—रक्षित—अनसूचित जातियाँ) : पश्चिम बंगाल में बिहार के कुछ सीमावर्ती क्षेत्रों पर जो दावे किए हैं, उनके विषय में हमारे बहुत से भाई अपने विचार व्यक्त कर चुके हैं। मैं केवल उड़ीसा के दावे के सम्बन्ध में अपने विचार व्यक्त करना चाहता हूँ।

यह बात सर्वविदित है कि १९११ तक बिहार, उड़ीसा और आसाम बंगाल प्रान्त के ही अन्तर्गत थे। १९१२ में बिहार और उड़ीसा का एक अलग प्रान्त बनाया गया। १९१२ से १९३५ तक उड़ीसा बिहार के साथ रहा। १९३६ में उड़ीसा का स्वतन्त्र प्रान्त बना, बिहार की जनता तथा वहाँ के नेताओं ने उड़ीसा प्रान्त के निर्माण में सब प्रकार से सहयोग प्रदान किया। १९३६ से १९४८ तक बिहार और उड़ीसा के दोनों प्रान्त अलग-अलग रहे। किन्तु, उनके बीच कोई संघर्ष नहीं हुआ, १९४८ में, जब सरदार वल्लभ भाई पटेल के नेतृत्व में, भारत के प्रायः ६०० छोटे-बड़े देशी राज्यों का विलियन हुआ, तो उड़ीसा प्रान्त में उस क्षेत्र के प्रायः दो दर्जन देशी राज्य विलीन कर दिए गए, उस समय,

बिहार में केवल दो देशी राज्य—सरायकेला और खरसावा—मिलाए गए। किन्तु उड़ीसा वालों ने यह मांग की कि उक्त दोनों देशी राज्य भी उड़ीसा में ही मिलाए जायें, १९४८ के प्रारम्भ में, कुछ मास तक, उक्त दोनों देशी राज्य उड़ीसा-सरकार के अधीन थे, किन्तु, स्थानीय जनता ने यह प्रबल मांग की कि वे बिहार में ही मिलाए जायें। बिहार-सरकार ने भी भारत-सरकार से यह अनुरोध किया कि उक्त दोनों राज्यों को बिहार-प्रान्त के सिंहभूमि जिले में ही विलीन करना चाहिए। सरदार पटेल ने सोच-विचार कर मई, १९४८ में यह अन्तिम निर्णय किया कि सरायकेला और खरसावा के देशी राज्य बिहार प्रान्त के सिंहभूमि जिले में ही विलीन किए जायें। यद्यपि उस समय उड़ीसा वालों ने सरदार पटेल के निर्णय को स्वीकार कर लिया था तथापि किसी न किसी रूप में उसी समय वे बिहार और उड़ीसा के बीच संघर्ष होता रहा है। १९५३ में राज्य पुनर्संघठन आयोग की स्थापना होने पर, आयोग के समक्ष जो स्मृति-पत्र उड़ीसा की ओर से प्रस्तुत किए गए, उनमें तो सरायकेला और खरसावा के क्षेत्रों के लिए ही नहीं, बल्कि सम्पूर्ण सिंहभूमि जिले के लिए मांग की गयी।

महोदय, इस प्रसंग में यह बता देना उचित होगा कि सिंहभूमि की स्थिति बड़ी विचित्र और दयनीय है। एक ओर, उड़ीसा ने तो उस पर दावा किया ही है, साथ ही, दूसरी ओर, पश्चिम बंगाल ने भी सिंहभूमि जिले के धालभूमि सबडिवीजन पर दावा किया है। धालभूमि सबडिवीजन में बंगला भाषियों की संख्या कुल जनसंख्या के अनुपात में केवल ३० प्रतिशत है। इन में भी अधिकांश लोग ऐसे हैं जो अपनी अपनी बोली के साथ साथ बंगला भाषा भी बोलत हैं, यह स्पष्ट है कि इन अल्प-संख्यक बंगला भाषियों के आधार पर धालभूमि

का क्षेत्र पश्चिम बंगाल में नहीं मिलाया जा सकता।

उड़ीसा की मांग के सम्बन्ध में, यह ध्यान देने की बात है कि १९३६ में उड़ीसा के प्रलय प्रान्त की स्थापना के पूर्व, भारत सरकार ने प्रस्तावित उड़ीसा प्रान्त की सीमा निर्धारित करने के लिए एक कमेटी बनाई थी : उसे 'मो डोनेल कमेटी' कहते हैं। उस कमेटी ने पूरी छानबीन के बाद यह निर्णय किया था कि सिंहभूमि जिला को बिहार में ही रखना चाहिए। राज्य पुनर्संगठन आयोग ने भी उड़ीसा की उक्त मांग पर प्रच्छेदी तरह विचार कर 'मो डोनेल कमेटी' की राय की ही पुष्टि की है, और यह सुझाव दिया है कि उड़ीसा की मांग को अस्वीकृत कर देना चाहिए, फिर भी, उड़ीसा वाले हो हल्का मचा रहे हैं, यह बड़े श्लेद का विषय है।

यदि हम भाषा की स्थिति पर विचार करें, तो यह स्पष्ट हो जायगा कि १९५१ की जनगणना के अनुसार, सिंहभूमि जिले में उड़िया भाषियों की संख्या कुल जनसंख्या के अनुपात में केवल २० प्रतिशत है, सरायकेला — खरसावा सबडिवीजन में उड़ियाभाषियों का अनुपात लगभग २५ प्रतिशत है और सिंहभूमि सदर सबडिवीजन में केवल १७ प्रतिशत है। इससे यह स्पष्ट है कि भाषा के आधार पर सिंहभूमि का कोई भी भाग उड़ीसा में कदापि नहीं मिलाया जा सकता, अतएव मैं इस सदन के माननीय सदस्यों से अपील करता हूँ कि उड़ीसा की मांग के विषय में राज्य पुनर्संगठन आयोग की राय को मान लें और उड़ीसा की मांग को रद्द कर दें।

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta—South—East): The Report of the States Re-organisation Commission has been largely welcomed in the country because in spite of its reactionary attitude to the question of linguistic States, it has had to accept by and

large the principle of reorganisation of states on a linguistic basis. In spite of its allergy to language as a factor determining the reorganisation of States, it has, except in two cases, namely, those of Punjab and Bombay, been forced on the whole to accept language as the primary basis of re-organisation.

However, by not accepting language as the most important and the decisive factor in constituting a State and by introducing instead or in addition so called considerations of economic development, administrative convenience etc; the Commission has not only done great injustice but has actually opened the door to senseless claims and counter claims leading to strike between different sections of the people in India. The Commission has failed to realise that given goodwill on all sides, problems of economic development or of administration, or for the matter of that any other problem, can be solved by mutual co-operation and adjustment between neighbouring States and through the good offices of the Centre, if necessary. A neighbouring State is not a foreign country and it should not be difficult, given goodwill on both sides to pass through it or otherwise to obtain its assistance for tackling problems like those of administration of a detached area or the economic development of the State. For this reason it is incomprehensible how the Commission could recommend the inclusion of certain areas in certain States, not on the ground of linguistic affinity but on the ground that such areas contain the catchment areas of rivers which have to be dammed or other similar considerations. I am of the definite view that if any area cannot be claimed on the ground of language, no claim to it should be entertained on any other ground and problems such as those mentioned above should be tackled by adjustment with the State to which that area linguistically belongs.

It is sheer absurdity to characterize the demand for re-organisation of

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

States on a linguistic basis as a fissiparous tendency. The claim for a linguistic State is not a claim for a separate existence outside India but one for a State in which the people speaking a particular language will have the opportunity of carrying on the work of administration in their own language and to receive education upto the highest stage through the medium of that language. This can never happen unless States are constituted on a linguistic basis.

Accepting these principles, the recommendations of the Commission regarding the Punjab and Bombay are utterly indefensible.

The people of the Hindi speaking areas of PEPSU as well as the people of the Hariana areas of the Punjab do not wish to remain in PEPSU or the Punjab and wish to join the adjoining Hindi speaking people in a common State. Therefore, there is no other alternative left than to reorganize the Punjab and PEPSU by merging them on a linguistic basis. The fact that a section of the people of the Punjab does not wish such a reorganisation cannot justify any compulsion on the people of the Hariana area and of the Hindi speaking areas of PEPSU to remain with the Punjab. It is not possible to deal with this matter at greater length in view of the brevity to which this memorandum is limited.

I am firmly convinced that the demand for Samyukta Maharashtra is a just one and there can be no rational ground for not conceding the same. Further the arguments for the exclusion of the city of Bombay from that State are absolutely reactionary and irrational. The proportion of the population of Bombay is of no consequence where the land around it is undoubtedly the part of Maharashtra. To argue that the cosmopolitan character of Bombay would be endangered if it forms part of Maharashtra is dangerous and, if I may say so, anti-national. Therefore, there is

no argument for constituting Bombay into a separate city State.

In conclusion, I must refer to the boundary dispute between West Bengal and Bihar and between West Bengal and Assam. Here again, the Commission has complicated matters by deviating from the linguistic principle. The claim of land from other States for rehabilitation of refugees is not only unjust but a disgrace on the great and progressive traditions which Bengal has always stood for and I am sure that no honest and patriotic Bengali will ever countenance any claim to any piece of land on that ground unless such land rightfully belongs to Bengal by reason of being inhabited by Bengalees.

The demarcation of boundaries between Bengal and Bihar and between Bengal and Assam must, therefore, be made strictly on a linguistic basis and all questions of administrative convenience, economic development and inter-communication between areas should be settled by mutual agreement in so far as they are not settled by linguistic redistribution.

In this case as well as in all other cases, the demarcation of the boundaries should be based on language and contiguity with a village as a unit.

Where the border region consists of tribal areas, the following principle should be adopted for demarcating boundaries and reorganising the State.

The tribal areas, wherein a particular distinctive tribe lives, should be attached to one linguistic State or the other, as per their cultural and linguistic affinity with that of the neighbouring State, as well as on the basis as to which State their economic development is more closely linked and likely to be more naturally developed. Where a tribe is inter-spersed by the migration of neighbouring linguistic

populations, then the different compact areas wherein the tribe lives will have to be put in those States with which its economic life is united or is likely to be more naturally developed.

These tribal areas included in one linguistic State or the other must be so administratively divided into tehsils, districts or regional units, as the case may be, so that their local or regional autonomy can be exercised.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara). I want to refer to proposals affecting my constituency of North Kanara and Belgaum districts. Maharashtra has claimed Belgaum, Kharapur, Haliyal, Supa and Karwar. Facts and figures placed before the Commission render the claim untenable. The proposals of the S.R.C. to retain these areas in the proposed Karnatak State are correct and just, natural and rational. True there are Maharashtrian residents in Belgaum and Kharapur, counting in thousands; but the claim for Belgaum and Kharapur is a recent one, Mahatma Gandhi when he first touched the question of linguistic provinces, definitely placed Belgaum in the proposed Karnatak—linguistic area. The late Shri N. C. Kelkar, a most respected leader of Karnatak and who was Member of the Congress Working Committee in the early twenties wholeheartedly concurred with this arrangement. Belgaum can never be sliced off from Karnatak; it is a corner-store of the future Karnatak State. Kharapur cannot in that case be separated; though the Maharashtrian population will feel sore about it.

Haliyal, Supa and Karwar talukas have a portion of the population, which is Marathi. This however, cannot justify their exclusion from the Karnatak State of the future. If Maharashtra claims the Karwar Taluka just to strengthen its claim over Goa, then it is far fetched indeed.

It must be remembered that North and South Kanara constituted one continuous district and the nineteenth

century, which the British cut into two parts. The mere presence of a small section of the Marathi population cannot take this taluka away from North Kanara district, which is being rightly included in the future Karnatak. The overwhelming part of the combined population of North and South Kanara are indeed happy that they will henceforward come under one administration. One cannot take off one part and attach it elsewhere. Every guarantee shall be tendered to the Marathi population and nothing should be done by word or deed for them to feel not at home in the future Karnatak State. They should never have anxiety in regard to just and well merited appointments in services. Thus Maharashtrians and Kannadigas should live in utmost fraternity as Gujaratis and Maharashtrais should live elsewhere—Bombay, under the powerful canopy of our hoary motherland.

We should not indulge in aggressive linguistic warfare; otherwise we are doomed. The menace of linguistic aggression spells disaster to the future of our motherland. Neighbours should know neighbours' language as language is the key to a man's or woman's heart. The heroism of the Maharashtrians, the culture of Kannadigas and the spirit of sacrifice of Gujaratis should be blended all together in such a way that we produce a most homogeneous tract of land on this side—just as Hindi and Bengali, Tamil and Telugu and Malayalam and Urdu and all the known and unknown languages of India, under the imperishable influence of Sanskrit, will all make their mighty contribution towards the stream of culture of this ancient land that is Hindusthan.

Shri Bansilal (Jaipur): The recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission regarding the State of Rajasthan are satisfactory and have been generally welcomed. During the course of the discussion on the S.R.C. report in the House a

[Shri Banalal]

few points were raised which I would like to deal with. The most important recommendation so far as Rajasthan State is concerned, is regarding the merger of Ajmer in it. Apart from the fact that it is a tiny 'C' class State having less than a population of one million, its geographical position is such that its remaining separate from all round surrounding areas was well nigh impossible and its merger in Rajasthan was regarded since long a certainty. While speaking about this State, one of its representatives, Pandit Mukut Behari Lal Bhargava laid much stress on the fact that if Ajmer was to be merged in Rajasthan, in that case, Ajmer city should be made the capital of it. In my opinion Pandit Bhargava's claim is untenable. It is a well known fact that Ajmer can stand no comparison to the city of Jaipur. So far as the facilities for becoming a capital are concerned. Besides, the question of capital after so many years should be treated as a closed chapter and raising of this issue at this stage will neither do good to Ajmer nor Rajasthan. Let Ajmer come with a grace to us—if I may be allowed to say so—Come like a new daughter-in-law in a big family. No body can deny the fact that though small in size, this territory in the heart of Rajasthan, has played a tremendous role in the political emancipation of our country and also has been a source of inspiration to the people of Rajasthan in their sublime fight against the feudal order. But in the context of to-day and in the circumstances as we are, no useful purpose will be served by diverting our attention to small things when it is expected that coming of Ajmer will infuse new life in the State and the people will achieve the happiness and prosperity which unfortunately they have been denied so far. It will suffice to say that Pandit Bhargava and the people of Ajmer should harbour no fears and have reliance on us. Ajmer should have and will has its position in the body politic of Rajasthan. Let there be full faith and trust on both

sides so that it may be an example of good merger for the rest of the country.

Another important recommendation of the S.R.C. is about the Abu Road Taluk now in Bombay State. The whole country knows in what circumstances this part of Rajasthan was separated—rather snatched from it and joined to Bombay. It was a glaring injustice done to us. But the people of Rajasthan hoped, not in vain, that one day or the other this grievous wrong and wound caused would be rectified and healed. The people of Rajasthan are jubilant that their cause has been supported by the Commission. We take it as a sheer justice. It was surprising that even against this background, Shri Tulsidass and others from Bombay State have again raised their voice for retaining Abu Road taluk in Bombay. I think this demand having no moral backing will go in wilderness. All considerations and factors namely wishes of the people, language of proximity are in favour of Rajasthan and the claim of Bombay State on Abu is declaimed by one voice in Rajasthan.

By another recommendation the Commission has proposed that from every point of view Loharu sub-tehsil should belong to Rajasthan. This position taken by the Commission has been challenged by Pandit Thakurdass Bhargava. He wants this sub-tehsil to be a part of Punjab. His claim is based on the wishes of the people which in fact, have never been ascertained. Besides, has this formula been applied any where? It is strange enough that he himself was not prepared to apply this formula in the case of Himachal Pradesh when he advocated the merger of this hilly State in the Punjab. Does he not know that the people of Himachal Pradesh are against the merger of their State in the Punjab? As in the case of Pandit Bhargava, it was noticed with interest during the course of debate on this subject

that most of the hon. Members started with the loud slogans of unity of India and the sacrifices to be made for the motherland, but dealing with their own States they showed the lust for territory and went astray. Pandit Bhargava's claim for Loharu sub-tehsil showed the same mentality. There seems to be no ground or reasoning for any change in the Commission's recommendations regarding Loharu.

While welcoming the recommendations of the S.R.C. on almost all counts, I would like to draw attention to the case of Mandasaur district in Madhya Bharat. Let it be frankly admitted at the very outset that in the case of Madhya Bharat remaining a separate State, Rajasthan would have been contended with the present position, but in the case when Madhya Bharat is proposed to be merged in the new State of Madhya Pradesh, there is little justification for joining this district in the new State. The people of the area want that they should be merged with Rajasthan. This case should be duly considered.

Before closing I would like to add that the suggestion made the other day by our beloved leader and Prime Minister regarding the regrouping of the various States in the country in four or five zones is hailed everywhere in the country and should be given effect to as soon as possible. This will be in the best interest of the people of the new States that are being carved out.

Shri Rajagopala Rao (Srikakulam): India's youngest State, Andhra, owes its formation to the large-heartedness and far sight of the Prime Minister who had, more than anyone else, realised that the desire on the part of the Andhras for separation from multi-lingual Madras was deep-seated. Notwithstanding the manifold problems requiring his attention, he gave thought to the Andhra question and showed personal interest in the matter by deciding that the Andhra claim for

separation from Madras should be conceded there and then.

Thus, we revere the memory of Sri Potti Sriramulu, we, Andhras, know in our heart of hearts that but for the sympathetic approach of the Prime Minister even the supreme sacrifice of Sri Potti Sriramulu would have been in vain and that Andhra State would not have been a reality today.

Again, when the States Reorganisation Commission, while recommending the disintegration of Hyderabad, suggested a five-year time-lag for the merger of the Telugu districts of Hyderabad with Andhra to form a State of Visal Andhra, it was the Prime Minister and the Congress Working Committee who decided in favour of immediate formation of Visal Andhra. It will mean the fulfilment of a desire which three crores of Telugu-speaking people had been cherishing since the dawn of this century. Our faith in the national leadership of the Congress and Shri Jawaharlalji has been fully justified and rewarded. Unlike others, we did not bargain with the British Government for a separate Andhra State. We did not also want an Andhra State while India was unfree. We wanted an Andhra State in an independent India.

The saying that there is many a slip between the cup and the lips is more true in the case of political matters than in life generally. Some friends in Telengana are suspicious or are labouring under misapprehensions. But very soon they will be dispelled, like mist in the morning sun. We are confident that just as the infant Andhra State had tided over countless difficulties in the first year of its birth to become what it is today, we will get over these problems of misunderstanding and mistrust, and given the blessings of leaders like Shri Jawaharlalji and Pandit Pant and goodwill of friends in the rest of the country, Visal Andhra will be a reality before long.

While we are grateful to the Union Government and the Congress High

[Shri Rajagopala Rao]

Command for the happy prospect ahead, we cannot but vent our soreness about the haphazard way the northern boundary of Andhra has been fixed. The Prime Minister's pronouncement on the formation of Andhra State with the undisputed Telugu areas of Madras, minus the city of Madras, also contained an assurance that a boundary commission or committee would be set up later on to fix the boundaries of the new State finally. While negotiations are taking place between the Andhra and Madras Governments to settle the southern boundary of Andhra, the finalisation of the northern boundary engaged the attention of the States Reorganisation Commission.

But instead of bestowing on the matter the mature consideration they had given to other problems, the Fazal Ali Commission seemed to deal with the Andhra-Orissa border in the most haphazard and peremptory fashion. The Commission declared:

"The Andhra claim to Koraput rests on a number of arguments, the most important and relevant of which at the present time is that the trading affiliations of the district with Parvatipuram and the rest of Srikakulam district as well as with Vishakapatnam district are fairly close. The basis of the demand for the other territories which have been claimed is mainly linguistic, Parlakimedi Estate and Berhampur Town in particular being claimed as outlying Telugu pockets in Orissa."

Again the report said:

"The Parlakimedi pocket was considered together with the Parlakimedi hill areas at the time that portion was transferred to Orissa; and although the main ground for this transfer was that the preference of the Raja of Parlakimedi for Orissa deserved to be considered with sympathy, the transfer was also justified on linguistic grounds. The Berhampur tract was likewise established at that time to be clearly within the area of Oriya influence. There is little reason to upset these decisions now."

But facts and figures present a different picture. Taking Parlakimedi Taluk alone into consideration, of the total population of 1,03,529, Telugus accounted for 63,015 or 60.9 per cent. The Oriyas, on the other hand, are no more than 33,607 or 32.5 per cent. whereas the tribal population of Savaras numbers 6,907 or 6.6 per cent.

Over 50 per cent. of the inhabited villages of Parlakimedi Taluk are Telugu-speaking. The following figures are revealing:

Total No. of villages	253
Telugu-speaking	120
Oriya-speaking	51
Savara-speaking	38
Uninhabited villages	44

There is in addition a mass of historical material to show that the area is part of Andhra. The Orissa State was formed in 1936 by the merger of areas from Bengal, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh then C. P. and Madras. If there had been an Andhra State in existence then the disputed territory could never have gone to Orissa. The well-known English historian, Mr. Hunter, in his *Orissa History* said:

"The mountain spurs which run down to the sea on the south of the Chilaka Lake formed a well-defined natural boundary between Orissa and Ganjam."

There was evidence that in Puri Jagannath temple, Oriyas were collecting tax from non-Oriyas, that is, Telugus of Koraput and Ganjam. When the Statutory Commission came to India, the then Government of India gave a memorandum "that the Ganjam district did not form part of Orissa State in the last four centuries". Again in 1925, in the Philip and Duff Enquiry Report they said:

"Although therefore it cannot be denied that the majority of the population of the Parlakimedi Estate is Telugu we felt that the Raja's opinion must carry great weight and we considered it incumbent on us to make a more detailed investigation in Parlakimedi then perhaps the percentage

of Oriya-speaking population justified."

Later O'Donnel Committee was appointed and two members of that Committee, excluding the President, said:

"That it would be very unfortunate if Parlakimedi was left out on account of a majority of its population being Telugus, while other influential Oriya zamindars are transferred to the new Province."

The Chairman, Mr. O'Donnel, differed with that view and said:

"Language and race are abiding facts and ultimately of far greater importance than the reactions of zamindars. More than half the total population is Telugu by race, and Telugu is the mother-tongue of nearly two-thirds and the subsidiary language for 45,000 persons."

Still Parlakimedi was given to Orissa.

Again the Joint Select Committee of the British Parliament considered this question. Then Major Attlee said in the proceedings:

"We have great sympathy with the desire of the Raja of Parlakimedi for the inclusion of his Estate in the new Province, but in view of the racial and linguistic composition of the population therein contained, we are unable to recommend that his desire should be acceded to."

The same is the case with Koraput. Mainly with a view to acceding to the wishes of the then zamindar of Jeypore, it was joined to Orissa. Even today if one has to go to Berhampur from Koraput one has to cross Andhra territory. According to the Commissioner of Census himself, if the 1931 census had given a faithful picture of the Andhra population it would have been more than 85 per cent. The people living in the Agency area, who constitute 85 per cent. of the population of the district, have the same customs and habits as Telugus. The women among them, like Telugu women, wear *mangalasutram*—a symbol of marriage—to their necks. They also have inter-

marriages with the Telugus living in the plains. Therefore, it is just that the five taluks of Koraput should go to Andhra.

It is regrettable that the S.R.C., which studied the Bellary problem piecemeal considering population figures taluk-wise failed to pay similar attention to this question. Population figures for the entire district were taken into account and the issue decided summarily. Even the fact that the Orissa Government, as evident from the resolution adopted on the subject by the Orissa Legislature, would stand in the way of execution of the Vamsadhara Project, so vital for the development of Srikakulam area, did not impress the Commission, though the self-same members rightly decided that Bellary should revert to Andhra as much in the interests of the smooth execution of the Tungabhadra Project as on linguistic grounds.

Finally, about linguistic safeguards, the need for which has been underwritten by the Commission itself and forcefully upheld by the Prime Minister, very little is done for the Telugu-speaking population of these areas. In Koraput and Parlakimedi area, hundreds of Telugus, poor, illiterate peasants, have been held in connection with last year's Andhra-Oriya disturbances. In spite of repeated requests, the Orissa Government has not appointed a Special Judge to try the cases, with the result that hundreds of poor cultivators have to go all the way to Cuttack for the trial. Without in any way meaning to prejudge the issue before the court, I wish to say that there has been a deliberate attempt to strike terror into the hearts of Andhras living in the area and that in the process a large number of innocent persons are being harassed.

In the circumstances, it is necessary that the Union Government should move in the matter and see that the Telugu areas of Parlakimedi and Koraput are restored to Andhra.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned sine die.