

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

2837

LOK SABHA

Friday, 16th December, 1955

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the
Clock

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

2-07 P.M.

MESSAGES FROM RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following two messages received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:

(1) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 125 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 14th December, 1955, agreed without any amendment to the Citizenship Bill, 1955, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 8th December, 1955."

(2) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 125 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 15th December, 1955 passed, in accordance with the provisions of article 368 of the Constitution of 493 L.S.D—1.

2838

India, without any amendment, the Constitution (Fifth Amendment) Bill, 1955, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 13th December, 1955."

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

STATEMENT *re* ACTION BY GOVERNMENTS
ON I.L.O. RECOMMENDATION

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): I beg to lay on the table a copy of the statement on action taken or proposed to be taken by the Government of India on the Recommendation adopted by the I. L. O. Conference at its Thirty-seventh Session held in June, 1954. [See Appendix V, annexure No. 59]

COMMITTEE ON ABSENCE OF MEMBERS FROM SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

TWELFTH REPORT

Shri Altekar (North Satara): I beg to present the Twelfth Report of the Committee on Absence of Members from the sittings of the House.

I also lay a list showing names of Members who were continuously absent from the sittings of the House for 15 days or more during the Tenth Session, 1955.

MOTION *re* REPORT OF STATES REORGANISATION COMMISSION

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration

[Mr. Speaker]

of the following motion moved by Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant on the 14th December, 1955:

"That the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission be taken into consideration."

Mr. Gadgil.

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey): May I make one submission? The speeches that are being made have been very instructive, but too long. The result would be that many of us who want to take part in the debate may not have the opportunity. I do not want the time to be shortened especially with regard to speakers like Mr. Gadgil, but there must be a time-limit fixed. Secondly, this is a subject on which divergent views have to be put forth, and many parties have been cut across. But certain parties which have not been cut across should not be penalised. There are many of us here who are not Members coming from the Punjab or U. P. and we have got definite views for the good of the country also. Therefore, this group should not be completely overlooked. For the whole of yesterday, none of us were called.

Mr. Speaker: The Business advisory Committee, in view of the considerations mentioned by the hon. Member, has allotted a sufficiently long time of 54 hours. The hon. Member was not present in the House when I made two statements on two different occasions and that is why he has raised these points. I did put a time-limit, or suggested a time-limit of 30 minutes; but, I had also stated that representative speakers will have to be given more time. If I may say so, in those areas where there is a keener contest, those areas will have to be given some more time. I hope that by the time these 54 hours are finished, every one will get a chance. I also agree with his suggestion that every speaker who gets up should bear this in mind that

others should have a chance rather than ask the Chair to enforce a time limit. I shall, if need be, enforce a time limit if the House wishes me to do so. But, it is better that the whole ground is cleared and some representative speeches are allowed a longer time

I also said the other day as to how we should conduct the debate and the lines on which we should proceed. I had indicated some lines. Thereafter, it is felt not only by me but also by my colleagues on the panel of Chairmen that it is better that the case for each province or each State is first stated. It is not a regular hard and fast rule. It is not possible to complete the case of each area. Let there be some speeches and let us thus finish one round for all the areas in the Union. I believe the hon. Member comes from Travancore-Cochin.

Shri Punnoose: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: I am keeping a watch on the thing. I may inform him,...

Shri M. A. Ayyangar (Tirupati): Three Members have spoken from Travancore-Cochin.

Mr. Speaker: To be very accurate, I am verifying. Two Members from Travancore-Cochin have spoken till now. On the analysis that I have, two from Bihar, one from Madras, one from Madhya Pradesh,—I am referring to the existing States and not the States as recommended by the S.R.C.—

Pandit D. N. Tiwary (Saran South): One from Bihar.

Mr. Speaker: I am speaking from records and not from impression only.

An Hon. Member: Nobody has spoken from Madras.

Mr. Speaker: That is also a wrong statement. Hon. Members will bear with me and hear me. One from Madras, one from Madhya Pradesh...

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar (Tiruppur): If I may point out...

Mr. Speaker: Let him not interfere. Two from Andhra, two from Bombay, two from Hyderabad, two from Travancore-Cochin, one from West Bengal one from Mysore, two from the Punjab have spoken. It is also the desire of the Chair to allow further speakers. But, let us travel through the other provinces and concentrate, as I said, on the most contentious problems in the S. R. C. Report. All people will, I hope get a chance. I may make here the position clear that I do wish to give a chance to the Centrally Administered areas, particularly Tripura, Manipur and other areas, as also to certain Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes where the problems are of a different character. But, it is not possible to have all this within the short space of a day or two. They have to wait; not only to wait, but keep present also in the House so that whenever they are called upon, they will be ready to deliver their speeches or give their views. That is what I propose to do. But, then, it is not possible to do it immediately at the beginning or in one or two days. Let them wait and have patience.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): I appreciate the wishes of this hon. House expressed yesterday that I should immediately follow my esteemed friend Shri S. K. Patil. I know that the Members of this House are very anxious to know fully and frankly the case for Samyukta Maharashtra and that is the reason why they desired me to speak. There may be a man here and there who perhaps may be thinking that this will be a forum in which two gladiators from Maharashtra will exchange blows. I assure

him that he will be thoroughly disappointed.

I appreciate what Pandit G. B. Pant has said in one of his best speeches that I have ever heard that this question should be solved in a calm and in a dignified atmosphere. I have had the privilege of working with him for nearly 3 years and the first lessons in parliamentary life that I learnt were at his feet. We were then only 45 in this House. But, we were a number to be counted in a House of 145. He led us in battle and now he is leading us in the consolidation process of our country. I endorse his appeal for unity, for compromise and I feel greatly obliged to him when he said that all endeavours would be made to arrive at a solution acceptable to all concerned.

I also appreciate what my hon. friend Shri S. K. Patil has said about compromise, co-operation, this, that and the other. I assure him that, being a disciple of Mahatma Gandhi, to as much an extent as possible, I will go to the farthest length to have an acceptable solution. But, there is a limit. That limit is, nobody can compromise one's self respect, no woman can compromise her chastity and no country its freedom. What I am afraid of is that what the Commission has said about the Maharashtrian race has constituted an insult which, in the course of our history during the last 600 years, has never been paralleled. We know how to answer such an insult. But, those methods are not valid today and are not relevant and are certainly not democratic, to the principles of which I and all of us are pledged.

My hon. friend Shri S. K. Patil said that this was not the time to consider the question of reorganisation of States and in the memorandum submitted on behalf of the Bombay Provincial Congress Committee, this is what one finds:

[Shri Gadgil]

"One must not be deceived by the vociferous propaganda carried on by some of our political leaders for immediate linguistic division of the country. They have perfected their propaganda machine and everything is being said and done in the name of poor ignorant masses who know nothing about it, nor are concerned about it."

What happened on the 18th of November, what happened on the 21st of November, constitute an eloquent testimony to the feelings of the Maharashtra masses in Bombay. There are people with whom it is a commercial proposition to misrepresent matters. I am not dilating on this because I do not want to create any bitterness. But, I would urge with all the humility at my command that the Government do institute an enquiry and find for themselves who fired, where the firing took place and how the whole thing was tactlessly handled. If the poor people are ignorant and are not interested in it, I am receiving dozens of letters, I am getting newspaper reports where meetings and meetings are held where it is stated that anything short of Samyukta Maharashtra with the city of Bombay as capital will not be acceptable. And I am glad to find in today's papers that the chairman of the Standing Committee of the Bombay Corporation has come out openly and has said that he stands for two States, one Gujerat and the other Maharashtra with Bombay city as its Capital. That is a very good thing that I have noticed while entering the House today.

If the people are nobody, is that a democratic approach?

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh West): No.

Shri Gadgil: Further, I find that one of the persons who had been advocating cosmopolitan life in Bombay has said as follows:

"There is a strong view held by those who have still retained their

faculty of thinking independently that the political leaders of the present generation are unfit to consider the linguistic problem in an impartial, unbiased and objective manner."

I do not know who that gentleman is. One can easily imagine who he can possibly be. This is an insult to my great leader Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and his colleagues. If our leadership has been known for anything, it has been known for solving the most difficult problems in the most amicable, peaceful and tactful manner. When our great leader is good enough to solve the problems of world politics, when our leaders are good enough to solve the problems of planning and the future economic affairs of this country, and when they are good enough to rule this country, it is said that they are not good enough to solve the problem of reorganisation of States.

The problem of reorganisation of States is as important as the problem of achieving freedom. After all, reorganisation of States is organisation of freedom. Freedom was won; and I am very glad to say that we have been very fortunate in having substantially the same leadership to continue during the process of consolidation. History tells us that the leaders of revolution are its first victims. This happened in France; this happened in many European countries. But in our country, the leadership that led us to freedom continues to guide our destinies, and it is because of this that we can talk on a level and in an atmosphere which is full of friendliness, understanding, and the spirit of give-and-take.

What is this problem of reorganisation of States? We adopted a Constitution in which we said that the State will be federal. If the State is federal, there must be some principles on which the constituent States must be delimited. If it is a question of building only a godown, there is no difficulty; you can just have four walls, a few doors and the roof.

But if it is a question of building a good bungalow, then you must determine the size of the rooms, the size of the doors, ventilators, this, that and the other. It is because we have adopted a federal Constitution, that we must lay down certain principles on which we can delimit the States.

In order to organise our freedom, our first attempt has been to have a Constitution. We had it, and we accepted what was there because it is not possible to write in politics on a clean slate. It is just like correcting the proof, you correct the proof and while correcting you commit more mistakes. This process goes on. So, when we adopted a Constitution, we accepted what was there, and said that a further discussion of this will be undertaken later on. And before actually the Constitution was adopted, two attempts were made, one by the Dar Commission, and the other by the JVP Committee. But the JVP Report was never put before the Constituent Assembly; it was never put before the Congress. It was just considered. I cannot disclose anything further, but it was not finally adopted by anybody.

Now, the problem is this. How are we to delimit the States? And what are the principles we should follow? In this, we have the guidance of history, and we have our own experience. Part of it was detailed by Pandit G. B. Pant when he traced the history of this question.

May I go a little earlier and say that Mr. Elphinstone, the first Governor of Bombay, was once camping nearabout Poona? A director of the East India Company saw him, and when he saw on his table a number of Marathi books, he said 'What nonsense is this?' Why have you encouraged translation of English books into Marathi? His reply was historic. He said: "Our aim is to see that the meanest man in the land understands what our Government is." Secondly, he said: These books constitute a highway back to England". That traveller has taken the highway and has

gone back. But the problem for us is still there, namely how to bring what the Government does and what the Government plans to the meanest man, to the poorest cottage in the village. That is possible only when we properly reorganise our States.

There are people who think that there cannot be any other principle substantially than that of language. And that has been accepted by us before, in the course of the last thirty years. We know what sort of agitation the Bihari people carried on in 1911. And they got the Bihar State. Then, the Orissa people got the Orissa State, and the Sind people got the Sind State. And even after Independence, the Andhra State came into existence. The entire trend of our politics has been that there should be delimitation substantially on the basis of language. And the other trend is that the smaller States should not exist; the trend is from the small to the big. These two tendencies are there.

May, I here also quote the views of Sardar Patel? In 1946, in the month of May, a deputation of Kannada people waited on him, and this is what he replied. He said that the first act of free India would be to bring together all Kannada-speaking people under one State. Then, in Rajkot, when he inaugurated the Saurashtra State,—in the bringing about of which I too had some humble part—he said: "One dream of Saurashtra is realised; the greater dream of Maha Gujarat will soon be realised." These are the assurances. These have been the trends. They have entered into the political life of our country. And if anybody at this moment says that we must reverse the process, all I can say is that it is a mad man's attempt. There are people who want to denounce this as linguism. Any virtue carried to its extreme can be denounced. Nobody has asked that anyone who speaks this language should go there or anyone who speaks the other language should come here. But by and large, this principle and the territorial integrity of the

[Shri Gadgil]

State or territory in which that language is spoken must be maintained, because it is consistent with justice and consistent with fair-play. In the process of integration of States, in which I too had some humble part to play, we integrated the States keeping this as the principle; and we brought into existence Madhya Bharat, Rajasthan, PEPSU and so on and so forth.

When this process was going on, the Government of India decided not a moment too early, as has been well said by Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, that a Commission should be appointed to go into this question. Now, the function of the Commission should not be misunderstood. If I want to build a house, I engage an architect, whether an individual or a firm. But his decisions are not binding on me, because he does not know exactly what conveniences I want, and what sentiments I have to respect. Therefore, he has to prepare only a plan taking into consideration as much as possible all these matters. But the final voice very rightly depends upon the people and their representatives in the highest tribunal in this land, namely this Parliament.

Then the Commission was appointed. I do not want to say anything about the personnel; they are all good people. But, with the best of intentions, what they have produce has created trouble in all the States except Uttar Pradesh. Commissions may come and Commissions may go, but Uttar Pradesh continues. I do not envy; I admire.

An Hon. Member: Admire the solidarity.

Shri Gadgil: The point is that this Commission was asked to present an interim report. That is clear from the Government resolution appointing it. If the Commission had done that, many of the troubles and tribulations would have been spared. If they had propounded in their interim report, 'Well, we want a bi-lingual State!' that matter would have been con-

sidered at that stage. But they did not do it, and, I am sorry to say, that was a grievous mistake on their part. If they had decided the principles, the principles on which the delimitation of States was to be achieved, this House would have had sufficient time to discuss the principles, and the principles having been accepted, implementation would have followed. They have not done that. What they have done is to present a final picture in which everything is on an *ad hoc* basis.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

If anybody could tell me that what they have said in this has not been departed from, although I am a poor man, I am prepared to give Rs. 5 by way of prize. Every principle, whether for delimiting the borders or constituting this State or that State has been departed from and there have been *ad hoc* solutions. I say, where you want to bring into existence an enduring entity—this is not a sort of current repair as they say in P.W.D., but this is structural repair—there must be some philosophy behind the structure of the State. Let us have the first principles of that philosophy, let us have the broad picture of that philosophy before we agree to it.

Now, as I said, the preliminary report or interim report was not submitted. What did they say about language? The present position, whatever be our views—the views of the advanced few like my hon. friend, Shri S. K. Patil—is this:

"It has to be remembered that linguistic and other group loyalties have deep roots in the soil and history of India. The culture—based regionalism, centring round the idea of linguistic homogeneity, represents to the average Indian values easily intelligible to him. Indian nationalism, on the other hand, has still to develop into a positive concept".

That is the broad fact today. Having accepted that to be a broad fact, they say also after two or three

paragraphs, about the composite State idea:

"On the other hand, such loyalties as did develop within the area were based on languages. The same holds true about Bombay and Madhya Pradesh. Marathi and Gujarati feeling grew up side by side, practically to the exclusion of any particular loyalty to the province or State of Bombay".

This is the position. And they summarised that, having taken into consideration everything, language is not the only principle on which it should be done, but there are other considerations, administrative, economic, this, that and the other. I am not concerned with what they have said, but with what they have done. In all the 16 States, except three—to which I shall come—language has been the only principle which has guided them in disintegrating and integrating. Whether it is a small taluk or whether it is a sub-division or whether it is a district, whatever they have done to take from one State and give to another is done entirely with a view to bring about greater linguistic homogeneity. Now, the three States, to which I referred, are Punjab, Assam and Bombay. While laying down the principle, they have been very careful to make some remarks so vague that anything that they wanted to do with respect to Bombay State could be interpreted in the context of that vagueness. Now, Kutch is brought, Marathwada is any stretch of imagination, cannot be a uni-lingual State, because of its geographic position and because of the political consequences following partition. It is impossible—it cannot be a uni-lingual State. Therefore, to say that they have made an exception in the case of Assam is not relevant for this purpose. Then take the case of Punjab. I must talk with great restraint so far as Punjab is concerned.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Even otherwise.

Shri Gadgil: That I always do—when you are in the Chair.

Two things they have said in the Report. One is that the Punjabi language and the western Hindi are practically the same. I am not a linguist or philologist; so I do not want to say anything on it. But this is what they have said. Secondly, the majority of Punjabi-speaking people themselves are opposed to it.

Now, take the case of Bombay. So far as Bombay is concerned, their first plea is that we are continuing the old State. I am surprised. Of the old State, Karnataka is gone, Kutch is brought, Marathwada is brought in—and then you tell us that it is the same State, having the same progressive administration, this, that and the other! We did not represent our grievances—may I point out with great humility—in our memorandum. Not that we had no grievances. We have suffered in the course of the last three years; the Gujaratis have not suffered. If they point out one single administrative discriminatory act against the Congress Government before 1952, I shall withdraw my statement. But I do not want to increase bitterness. I would only ask the House, if the House wants to know how we have suffered, to refer to the proceedings of the Bombay Legislative Assembly between 18th November and 22nd November. We did not mention this because we are brothers, good brothers. Although there was no common loyalty, our relations are excellent. So far as I personally am concerned, my best friends are in Gujarat. I was partly educated at the Baroda College. I have nothing but love for them—I tell you this is my innermost feeling.

An Hon. Member: *Bhai, bhai.*

Shri Gadgil: We did not represent these because when two brothers are partitioning, what is the good of one brother telling the other, 'When your eldest daughter was married, you bought so many saris. Now, you have not purchased any'. Will you kindly take all these things into consideration. No. Let us close the old

[Shri Gadgil]

chapter and open a new chapter. I have always said, we do not want to be in this political partnership any longer; we will be very good neighbours; our relations will improve from every point of view. I have said that to them; I say that again today.

So this continuation of the same State is not a fact. It is just like saying: 'It is the old coat.' when only the inside collar, which can be changed, is there; the rest is absolutely new. That is how the thing actually looks. Then they have put us together, having given a finding here, that there is no common loyalty as such grown. I can speak also about the class B States, to go into the financial affairs of which, a committee was appointed, and I was its Chairman. I went to several places, to Saurashtra, to Madhya Bharat, to PEPUSU and Rajasthan. It was only in Saurashtra that I found, with great pleasure, that some sort of common loyalty was growing, and I congratulated the Chief Minister there. But elsewhere, the loyalty was to Jodhpur or Indore or Gwalior, to this, that and the other. Therefore, knowing our own people as we do, the politician has to deal with facts, and that man can work it out successfully who sees what is possible, when and how. That is in a sense the definition of politics. That there was no state loyalty was their finding. Knowing this, they have done us a wrong. Why? It is because they say their finding is that Bombay cannot be a separate State; if it is a separate State, it will be a retrograde State and if you give it any constitutional status and make it a different administrative unit, it will not be consistent with the general constitutional pattern of our country. Therefore, having come to that conclusion and having come to the conclusion that it is geographically in Maharashtra, they did not have the courage in the end to say that it should go to Maharashtra. I have good reasons to believe that they changed their views. Everybody changes his view. Not that I do not change my view. Even Mr

Patil has changed his opinion he held in 1946 when he was the chairman of the Reception Committee of the Samyukta Maharashtra Sammelan held in Blavatsky Lodge. Of course, he has every right to change his opinion. He changed it. I do not quarrel about it.

Shri S. K. Patil (Bombay City—South): I was one of the Speakers.

Shri Gadgil: Whatever it is, the information published in papers is that he was the Chairman of the Reception Committee. However, I am prepared to accept for the time being his explanation. That is not much in it. The point is that the Commission changed their views. I do not refer to what forecasts were put in the various papers. They were not contradicted. I may say how this formula came into existence. In the month of May a high Congress authority toured my province and tried to persuade me to accept a State of this character and I plainly told him that this would not be possible because things have moved and people were in no mood and we wanted to solve the problem not for the time being but finally. Ours is the best principle as you will have Maha Gujarat for which Munshi has been trying. I am not even a member of the Samyukta Maharashtra Parishad. When reorganisation is to come it should be final and no interim solutions should be there. I shall refer to what I said before the Dar Commission. I stated that I do not want samyukta Maharashtra here and now; I do not want it till the first elections are held; but it should not be denied before the next election. This is exactly the time now so that the problem may be finally solved. We wanted time to consolidate the 590 States which we integrated and brought into our bigger polity. This progress of consolidation must work and a due sense of responsibility must grow. Then we can have these delimitations. That was my position.

I trace what happened now. In June a meeting was held at the place of the Chief Minister of Bombay attended by the top-most Gujerati leaders

and thereafter this bilingual thing started—that this is going to come—to which there was no reference in any papers uptill then. You will find it from the Report itself. They say 'we have rejected totally the claim of Maha Gujarat but we are assured by the Gujarat Provincial Congress Committee that important elements in Gujarat will accept this proposal. Did they ask the leaders of the Samyukta Maharashtra Parishad or the President of the M.P.C.C. "What have you to say about this formula?" No. Any way one finds lack of procedural propriety and correctitude if nothing else. If they had told then how their mind was working I would have given them the formula which we gave before the High Command and later on which we adopted in our M.P.C.C. meeting of having all the Gujarati people and all the Maharashtrian people in one State with Bombay city as capital. I would have done this if there had been an interim report. If they had only said that they wanted a bilingual State because multi-lingual State develops a higher sort of nationalism and if they had convinced me, I would have certainly accepted it. But that was not done. Now this formula comes and this formula is being sold to us by no other salesman than Mr. Patil. He is much more enthusiastic and much more clever than the S. R. Commission itself. He is assertive, while commission is appologetic. During his formative years and subsequently he has been living in the commercial and cosmopolitan Bombay and, therefore, he is a good salesman. But having been by temperament and training and also brought up in rural atmosphere, I am a somewhat cautious buyer and if I distrust intellectual brilliance it is not that I have no respect for them but because of the fear where my destiny ultimately will lead me to if I accept it. Now let me analyse the formula as it is. It is said that it will give us some advantage. What is that advantage? It is that Maharashtrian area will be able to have 13 to 15 members more.

People who do not know the working of the Congress and other political parties in India in Maharashtra will naturally say "what is wrong in it"? I will tell you what is wrong. The wrong is that in Maharashtra the political consciousness is very great. You go to any village. You will find that they have knowledge of up to date things. When I toured during the last elections, in one Dhangar village a villager asked me "what is this business of recall which is being preached by the Socialist Partv". I said "look here, it is very simple. In the good old days when the Moghuls were ruling an officer was appointed and he used to ride the horse with his face towards the tail of the horse. Somebody asked him why he is sitting so and he replied that nobody knew when the other order of dismissal would come hinting that there was no security. That is recall". He understood it all right. The point is we have a higher political consciousness and the result is in all the elections—take the figures from 1921 up to date—the proportion of non-Congressmen elected on other party tickets is considerable in relation to many other States except Travancore. Take the present figures. Out of 152 which are the Maharashtrian seats, 114 are elected on Congress tickets and in Gujerat out of 98, 88 are on Congress tickets. Now supposing the Congress party is in the majority in the House, but in the Congress party itself the Maharashtrians will not be in the majority and this Constitutional mechanism will be used, I do not say normally, but not unlikely, to our detriment and we therefore, do not want it in the light of our experience and in the light of Commissions finding about loyalty. We only say that we will remain good neighbours. We do not want to be enemies. We will go still farther and Co-operate in many things. But this is the position. Apart from this, in the number of members elected for Bombay Assembly from Maharashtra we have about 8 non-Maharashtrians. I want to know how many non-Gujeratis have

[Shri Gadgil]

been elected from the Gujarati area. I will be surprised to know if there are any. There is no advantage. We do not want this partnership. Suppose now I were to accept the interpretation of my friend Mr. Patil, who says that your formula of having Vidarbha in the proposed bilingual state is no formula, because a bilingual State is a balanced State. This is a new contribution to political science. What is this balanced State? How it will function? If it is merely bilingual and if bilingualism is Amrit, let us have the Vidarbha variety also. But if it is a balanced State that is proposed and that is what we suspected and I am glad an authoritative interpretation of Commission's mind has been given by no less a personality than Mr. Patil. It is because they wanted a balanced State that they made Vidarbha a separate State although bigger States have been merged like Madhya Bharat. Why was Vidarbha kept separate? It was done to ensure a balance in the proposed State of Bombay. That is the reason why Marathi speaking areas of Belgaum and Karwar were not included in the proposed State of Bombay. Give me what is mine. I will accept with good grace and take from me what is not justly mine I will part with it with blessing. I assure you. Do lay down certain principles. Do not say we cannot break a district here and do break it elsewhere. You have broken Talukas, transferred Sub-Talukas like Loharu. You have taken villages as units in Andhra. Please for God's sake observe some decency, some consistency and do not look upon consistency as entirely the virtue of fools. Anyway this will not go down the throats of hon. Members of this House.

How will this balanced State formula work? Just consider that in the context of the circumstances which we have inherited. If the elections go against any particular group or any administrative act is unpalatable to it, they will always lay it down to the factor

that it is because other community people are there, just as I have found many a student complaining to me that he has not been selected because he is a Brahmin or that he is not selected because he is a Maharashtrian. I have asked them, 'Have you ever considered that there may be a possibly good explanation for it?' But Communalism will increase. That will be the first result; I have no doubt about it. Communalism of the bitterest type will be there. The Gujaratis, by and large, are traders, rich people and we have nothing to lose except our poverty. Now, you can just imagine the moral relationship that will exist between a community which is substantially rich, a fact admitted very graciously by the President of the Congress, and us, poor people. However high a character we may have, there will be a few people who will be succumbing to temptation and the whole thing will be not a well-governed, well administered State but a municipality in which people change sides according to self-interest. That is what will happen. (*Interruptions*). Will the State be steady? In the reorganisation of States what are we after? We want that there should be enduring peace and that the conditions for further progress, economic, moral and social, of the community should be assured. But those conditions will fast disappear. It is for these reasons that we oppose the S.R.C. formula. We are appealed to in the name of the country again and again, we are asked to take into consideration the unity, this and that. If it is a special appeal to us I must enter an humble protest

Take the history of 150 years. Immediately we lost our power we started public life. In Bombay, Bal Shastri, Jambekar and others led the intellectual movement before the University days. After University, the prince of graduates, namely Justice Ranade—who looked like Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant as I said in one of my books—Justice Telang—and other people led the movement. Who were the founders of the Indian

National Congress? The Maharattas. Who were the pioneers in violent action? Chapekar, Kanare, Phadke and later on Bapat and Savarkar. You may condemn them. In the re-orientation of the Congress policy when the liberals sat tight over it, who was it that brought in new life? Who propounded the new tenets and new philosophy. It was Lokamanya Tilak. In the Home Rule Movement he led and in the 1920 movement we were behind none and ahead of many provinces. How are we? I will merely quote the certificate given to us by no less a person than Mahatma Gandhi that Maharashtra is the beehive of workers. We are specially told that we should work for the unity, and safety and good of the country. We have done nothing else. Given now Vinobaji is carrying the flag of Gandhian philosophy and spreading his message from place to place. To ask us to serve the nation is to ask *chandan* to be fragrant.

I want to assure you that what we are fighting for is justice. In all the 16 States you have accepted the linguistic principle. You may say that you have not done that, but that is what you have done. What crime have we committed that you have singled us out for a special treatment as if we are members of a criminal tribe. If Bombay is included in Maharashtra certain people would not like it. I want to know what for? Again and again we made efforts to approach those who were against us through the good offices of Shri V. L. Metha, a Godly and God-fearing man. He is for us; he concedes our claim. Our claim is conceded by Shri Narayan, son of Mahadevji Desai and he has written an excellent article in a recent issue of *Bhoomi Putra* in which he has said, 'Why are you after the money in Bombay? Gandhiji considered goodwill to be of much more value than all the gold in the world. The roots of capitalism are loosened and tomorrow they will dry. The poisonous tree will fall and all the powdered face attraction will disappear. Whom are you supporting? We do not want it because we know

that it is not going to be a stable State. This balanced State is a dangerous State. It will be a state of unbalanced politics. This bilingual State is a dangerous State. You accept the principle of language everywhere but you are denying it to us. Why is it?

Under the new Working Committee formula the suggestion is that all the Marathi-speaking areas from Madhya Bharat, Marathi areas of Hyderabad and main Maharashtra will be under one State but Bombay city will be a separate state. I appreciate what they have done. I also welcome their assurance that they will persuade the Vidarbha people to come. I go a little further and request please, reconsider that part of your resolution in which you have created Bombay as a separate State. Throughout his one hour speech—out of which I was present for nearly 45 minutes—what Shri S. K. Patil said, as I could gather, was that he was not for the city State but he wanted this S.R.C. scheme and as regards the other he said if there had been no agitation, things would have been different. Why should the agitation, this and that affect you in coming to a right solution? May I in all humility say that what happened in Bombay would not have happened if, in the words of Shri Narayan some *sanyam* had been shown? The Chief Minister of Bombay—he is a friend of mine for the last 40 years, said:

काँग्रेस जीवंत असेपर्यंत मुंबई महाराष्ट्रा
मिलणार नाही

It means, so long as Congress is alive Maharastrians will not get Bombay. And Shri Patil followed said, 'For 5,000 years you will not get it'.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Is he going to live so long?

Shri Gadgil: I wish him to live long enough.

The point is, I told one of my friends who came here, and complained this is what Shri Patil said. I said, 'Don't get excited; the three zeros are absolutely useless and so far as 5 is concerned there is no

[Shri Gadgil]

sanctity about it.' The formula of the Working Committee is Bombay City State and after 5 years you will have it. May I ask them in all humility just to visualise the picture of Bombay during these 5 years? what forces will consolidate there? The first thing that will happen; the first casualty will be prohibition—prohibition will be completely wiped out for aught I know. I know the real public opinion in Bombay of the middle classes and other people. They will be the first to scrap our great experiment of prohibition.

An Hon. Member: Is it because of Gujaratis?

Shri Gadgil: There are other things. Some of the people are obviously for that. But, even now, under the present arrangement, if you are medically certified, we will give you.

We have been told by the S.R.C. that, Bombay is geographically in Maharashtra and many other things. But certain interests will not like it. Who are those interests? Again and again we tried to understand who they are; but, we failed. You ask us to compromise. A request has been made. I am quite willing.

! P.M.

But they do not come and discuss. They know they have got something and if you throw the responsibility on us to come to a compromise that will be the British method. This is not the method of my leader and, therefore, he has said very clearly that he will try to bring about an acceptable solution. But if it is left to the parties, what will happen. Just as it happened in the case of the Macdonald Award. The issue will be taken away from the hands of the leaders and organised parties, and the people will decide it in the streets of Bombay, and that is just the thing that I wish to avoid.

We are told that Bombay was built by Gujaratis and therefore they have a right. This is the extra-territoriality which we heard in the case of China,

Egypt and other places. Are they so much afraid of us? They have investments in South Africa, Uganda and other places? Have they not invested everywhere. They are 17 per cent in Cochin Town but they are not asking for special treatment. Why are they asking of us then? Do my friend from Gujarat realise what an insult is implied in this? They may not mean it, they may not be even conscious of it, but the fact is and the consequence is that this has offended the entire Maharashtrian community. Think for God's sake, what is it and what they want. They are the traders for the whole of Maharashtra. In every rural area that you go, the trade and commerce is in the hands of Marwaris and Gujaratis in certain places, exclusively Marwaris in certain places and exclusively Gujaratis in certain places. My forefathers invited them to Poona and settled them in Gujru, Sarafa and other places. They were *nagarseths* and were taken in procession and even now our relations with them are excellent. The Gujaratis in Maharashtra and Poona have been provided with Gujarati schools and Poona has taken the lead in this respect. I have something to do with the Poona Municipality and so I know it. We made special provision for Gujarati teaching. Till then the local people did not know what Gujarati language was because they were so much assimilated with us.

Shri Patil said something about the composition of the people, that we are only 48 per cent. Take the figures from 1881 and our majority which was 54 per cent was brought down gradually and now it is 48, including Konkini. Konkini Structurally is Marathi and there is no difference in it and Marathi, it is a dialect. I want to understand the position. In Bangalore, the Kannada-speaking persons are 24 per cent, and Tamil speaking persons 31 per cent. Take the case of Jamshepur; the Bengali-speaking population is 54,000 and the Hindi speaking population 44,000 out of 158,000. In Hyderabad, the Urdu-speaking population is 49 per cent

and the Telugu-speaking population is 40 per cent. And yet these towns and cities are all allowed to be in the states and not made separate states. The consideration of population of any particular city is irrelevant because in the large area, it is just a pocket. Do you give self-government to Badr in Ahmedabad because it is predominantly Maharashtrian? Will you give the same privilege to certain areas of Baroda where the Marathas are large in numbers? Is it local option? Take the city of Bombay and draw a circle with a radius of 75 miles and at the northern point of the circle, about 80 miles away, the Gujarat border steps in. Draw another circle of 250 miles radius and in that circle, the Gujaratis are one-eighth and seven-eighths are Maharashtrians. The nearest Andhra border is 32 miles from Madras and yet it is put in Tamil Nad. Why do you apply one law to one person and apply another law to another person?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Madras was wrongly put in there.

Shri Gadgil: I thought that some such intervention would come but not from the Chair because the Chair is to be impartial. But here it comes from the Chair.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): Charity begins at home.

Shri Gadgil: The point is that if Bombay City is made a separate State, immediately the claim of Madras will grow up, immediately the claim of Calcutta will grow up. Why are you going to let loose these forces? Are you going to yield to the capitalists as a preliminary for inaugurating the socialistic pattern of society? For whom are you keeping Bombay as a separate state? The traders, they are everywhere; the whole trade and commerce and economy in Maharashtra is dominated by Gujaratis and Marwaris and they have not asked for any protection there. What will happen if

Bombay city is included in Maharashtra state? May I quote from Shri Baruchua's speech which he delivered in the Bombay Legislative Assembly? He says: "Geography of the Port of Bombay will not change. Communications will remain safe. Facilities for trade and commerce money market transport will be used by all Communities. I refuse to believe that a single minority group is going to wind its business because the city goes to Maharashtra. There is no evidence to show that city's importance will dwindle." When you say that some damage will result have you got any proof or are they only vague allegations, allegations made in our absence? At least for courtesy, the Members of the Commission should ask us, "Here are the accusations; what is your stand? what is your written statement? do you want to cross-examine?" Even the ordinary cannons of fairplay and justice have been disregarded. Therefore, the insult is all the more intense. We are told "You are only 48 per cent." But the argument seems to be that even if we were 70 per cent, Bombay will remain apart from Maharashtra, because of the extraneous consideration that certain capitalists want that to be so whatever be the population of Maharashtrians. The House may have some idea, at least the Minister of Transport has some idea, as to how many people come to work in Bombay city every day. From Poona, there were 2,000 season ticket holders coming every day to Bombay, during war time. People come from Virar, Agasi and Bhinder and from Karjat and Kalyan to Bombay; they are really citizens of Bombay and most of them are Maharashtrians; they cannot recide there because the great Bombay Corporation and the greater Bombay Government have done nothing by way of housing programme. You go in the evening after dusk as I have done so often and you will see that on the pavements people are sleeping, the slums are there and so on. The Jail Manual of Bombay Government lays

[Shri Gadgil]

down that 96 square feet is the minimum—you will appreciate this as we were kept many times in jail—but here it works out to less than 40 square feet. The Rent Enquiry Committee has made a thorough enquiry and it says “the city has a sub-stratum of original inhabitants, but it is largely a city of immigrants. A portion has made Bombay a place of its residence, but to a large portion it is only a place of work to be left when it becomes unsuitable”. And even those who stay for some years go away because they are not of the population. The sub-stratum of the population to whom Bombay belongs is Maharashtrian, and the greatest proof of that is this. We have the latest budget of the Bombay Corporation, in which out of 4,860 primary teachers, 3,000 are Marathi, that is 62 per cent:— People who are permanent residents have their children with them. They are the stable population. That is the test. Though I do not say that it is the only test, this is a test which you cannot lightly brush aside.

Take the situation of Bombay. The entire road system and the railway system converge on Bombay. The two main lines south-east and north are there; the two national highways, Bombay-Agra Road and Bombay-Bangalore road, converge there and all our activities centre there. The people from Ratnagiri, Colaba and Thana depend mainly on this city of Bombay; similarly people from Satara, Sholapur and Poona also depend on this city. If you ask any Marathi boy as to what he will do, he will tell you “I will go to Bombay”. This is the natural aspiration of every Maharashtrian boy. That will show what place Bombay holds in the economic life of our people but you are taking it away. My humble submission is this. The SRC has come to the conclusion that Bombay should not be a separate State and that it is part of Maharashtra geographically. Just because certain people expressed certain vague fears, they should not have allowed their

judgment to be coloured and should have given us Bombay as it justly belongs to us.

I am very sorry that the injustice done to us is not fully realised by many of our friends and critics. What loss of Bombay means to us economically and socially, apart from prestige is not fully realised. A question is asked who built it? Mr. Barucha, a Parsi M.L.A., said “every industrial city is built by all—not by this community or that but if proportion has to be taken into consideration then the biggest proportion goes to the Maharashtra people who gave their labours.”

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): Not Parsis?

Shri Gadgil: Yes, Gujaratis also. The capital that is invested in Bombay is not exclusively the capital of a few Gujaratis. There are shareholders of concerns which are functioning in Bombay, from all over the country. Very recently, America and Britain opened two refineries of which the investment comes to about Rs. 110 crores. Have they asked for any safeguard? There is foreign capital to the extent of Rs. 800 crores. Have they asked for any safeguard? You Gujaratis are controlling our rural economy; you are our *sowcar*; we have elected many of you as Presidents of our Congress Committees, municipalities and everywhere we have treated you fairly; we have never given them anything but just and affectionate treatment. And in utter disregard of this, you insist on Bombay city being made a separate State,—just consider what it means? In Rangoon the capital of Burma Indians were in the majority and yet Indians did not claim it as their own. If the city state logic were accepted serious political consequences will follow. When the entire surrounding country is speaking a particular language, a

pocket cannot be taken out; that must be part of it. Bombay is our biggest city. The population of Bombay is 28 lakhs. According to the 1951 Census, thirteen and odd lakhs or nearly fourteen lakhs speak Marathi. There is no other province whose biggest city is outside its territory. Take Ahmedabad. The Gujarati population in Bombay city is five lakhs. The population of Ahmedabad is much more. Shri Patil said that Northern-Indians are five lakhs in Bombay. The Hindustani-speaking people are two lakhs. Another lakh and eighty thousand say that their language is Urdu but all of them are not from Northern India. Shri Patil knows and the Census Commission has also stated that the Deccan Musalman—the Konkani Musalman—has given Urdu as his mother tongue. Also in the Census Report, you will find people with Marathi as their subsidiary language in the city are considerable. The number of Marathi speaking people is the highest from every point of view—from the point of view of people who have written Marathi as their mother tongue, people who come to work there and the other general considerations. All these lead to only one conclusion and no other. Why are you telling us that Bombay city should be a separate State?

What kind of politics will operate there. Take the occupational position. 54,000 are the employers and nearly eleven lakhs are the employees—mostly proletariat, and white-collar. What the white-collars feel about this problem you know. You could have seen on the 21st, they had opened their chests and said 'fire', we stand for Samyukta Maharashtra. In the city of Bombay, the economic disparity is so pronounced. Here are Malabar Hill residences and the slums of Matunga, side by side. People will say: we have got Bombay now and we will liquidate this disparity much sooner; than can be good enough for the capitalists. Liquidation of in-

equality is the Congress programme also. Probably my friend here quoted me as saying: "Mr. Gadgil wants to liquidate rich people." I said: we want to liquidate rich people as a class and that is the programme of the Congress if I understand the Congress programme and if it is sincerely preached, it will be done but it has to be done in an orderly manner. If Bombay city becomes a State, it will be done much quicker than can be digested. From that point of view, I would urge my capitalist friends to consider this problem. Whether it is economic or social life or this that or the other, everybody has played a part. Because there are 12 languages or four religions, should Bombay be a State by itself? I do not agree. Those things are concomitants in every modern city whether it is Calcutta, Jamshedpur or Bangalore or Kanpur. If you concede Bombay today, you will have to concede Kanpur and Calcutta tomorrow. As regards Madras, we have already some evidence of it.

In the end I humbly want to put this proposition before this House. I do not consider that this House is not fit enough to decide this question. If this House does not decide, who will decide? Some solution has been pointed out by Shri Asoka Mehta. Shri Patil claimed that he was the originator of it but now obviously he wants to disown it. I and other leaders have put it before our great leader, the Prime Minister. We said to him "accept in principle that Bombay city and Maharashtra should be one State"? We then sign on a blank paper. You fill in any safeguards you like, any adjustments you like. You are pressing for adjustment; you are pressing for safeguards for the brave Sikh community. If they are good enough for 40 lakhs, are they not good for these forty men who constitute the Citizens Committee of Bombay. Dr. John Mathai who was my colleague and an eminent public man has warned us as to what

[Shri Gadgil]

would happen if Bombay become a State. You are creating Bombay City State in spite of the advice of the SRC, in spite of the advice of all people whose words count. There is Mr. Ambekar, President of the INTUC who said "you make Bombay City a separate State, public life will be impossible; the life of public worker will not be safe." Great administrators who have grown grey in administration, have advised so. If in spite of all this, you follow the course hinted, it means you do not care for the people and that you care for the interest of the few, who are the owners of the property which they earned during the British regime. How it was earned during the British regime—let me not analyse it because the beginning of life and property are always enclosed in darkness.

It is a straight question. Do you want to usher in the socialist regime? Here is the demand for Samyukta Maharashtra. I assure the Prime Minister that we shall see that Samyukta Maharashtra becomes a socialist State of his liking much sooner than it can happen in any part of India and we are going out of our way to give safeguards although it means some sort of an insult to us. But we want to be very practical. We want to get over the immediate difficulty. I again repeat what I said to Pantji "Make Bombay City and Maharashtra one State and whatever safeguards or whatever arrangements of any type are considered necessary will be accepted. Any legislation which deals with Bombay city's problems should be reserved for Central consideration if the majority of the members from Bombay city is one. The only condition we insist is that it must be consistent with the integrity of the State and with democratic principles. These are the words used by the MPCC in its resolution.

I have taken considerable time of this hon. House. But I want to appeal to you: give me something to tell my people that reason succeeds and argu-

ment prevails. After all, reason is supreme, argument is powerful. If you do not create that atmosphere and that faith in a democracy then there is the end of democracy. You can certainly put down the throat of Maharashtrians anything you like, but it will not last long. For what I know of my people and my race they are best friends, but once they take into their head that injustice is being done to them they will stake everything but will never put up with it. Do not drive our people to a mood of that kind, I very humbly and respectfully request the hon. Home Minister and his colleague, our beloved leader. We have gone to the utmost limit and nobody can accuse us of being unreasonable. The hon. Members of this House will also consider our offer. But, if at the end of 40 years of public life I am driven to a course which is not palatable to me. I will only end by saying, give me that blessing which Kunti gave to Karna. On the morning of the Karna Parva's beginning day Kunti went to Karna and she said: "Look here; you are my son". Then Karna said: "Oh, you are my mother: you are telling me. Uptill now you have forsaken me, disregarded me. That does not matter. But, give me this blessing. I am not asking for any big thing. Give me this blessing that my life will not be mean and my death will be noble." मेरु जीवन प्राकृत न हो मेरी मृत्यु बीरोचित हो

Shri Debeswar Sarmah (Golaghat-Jorhat) rose.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri C. C. Shah—who will dispose of Bombay first.

Shri C. C. Shah (Gohilwad-Sorath): This great debate. (Interruption).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. You will now hear from Gujarat State.

[SRI BARMAN in the Chair]

Shri C. C. Shah: Mr. Chairman, this great debate until yesterday was running its calm and even course in a dignified and smooth manner.

An Hon. Member: What happened today?

Shri C. C. Shah: The temper has changed today, but it would be my endeavour to place before you, Sir, calmly and as objectively and in a dispassionate manner as I can the views which I hold on this subject. I consider it a great privilege to have an occasion, to have an opportunity to participate in this debate because the decisions which we will take will affect the course of the history of this country for years to come and it will affect our national unity, its security and its prosperity. Therefore, while it is our great privilege to have an occasion to make these decisions it is also our responsibility to make those decisions in a calm and dispassionate manner.

The problem of reorganisation of States is most complicated and delicate and it is none too easy to find solutions which will satisfy all. For that purpose we appointed a Commission and that Commission consisted of persons in whom the whole country declared its full confidence, in their integrity, in their ability and in their competence. It will be an evil day for us, I submit, if any one challenges the *bona fides* of a Commission of this nature. There may be honest differences of opinion; it may be that some of the conclusions which they have arrived at may not be acceptable to some, but to challenge the *bona fides* of this Commission is wrong for anyone to do, I submit. It is the considered opinion of this House and of the country that the Commission approached its subject in an objective and in a dispassionate manner, and while one may differ with their conclusions here and there by far and large the conclusions which they have given to the country have been acceptable in a large majority of the cases. I submit that when we appoint a Commission of this nature, while we have the sovereign authority to come to final decisions, we cannot

lightly tamper with the conclusions arrived at by men who have dispassionately examined this subject, and unless we find an agreed alternative, or unless there are compelling reasons which make any of the recommendations of the Commission difficult or impossible of implementation, we should not change their decisions.

I submit that, now that this problem is before us we must solve this problem once and for all and finally. I do not believe either in shelving that problem or in postponing it. We have solved much greater problems and we can solve this problem with the same faith and hope as we have solved other problems. Therefore, I am of the view that, now that we have been seized of this matter and it has come before us, we must decide it finally and should not leave anything for posterity or generations to come to quarrel about or to bicker about.

The Commission has carefully examined the factors which weighed with it in the reorganisation of the States and in doing so the Commission has laid emphasis—as it was its duty and of every one of us to do so—on the prime necessity of national unity, security and prosperity. Our national unity is a tender sapling which needs to be nurtured carefully and while we say much about it there is unfortunately something in our blood which makes it easy for us to divide but very difficult to unite. Hundreds and thousands of castes in the country and our history would show that it has been very difficult for us to unite, and while we had cultural unity all throughout the ages, after centuries we have gained a political unity, which, in spite of the division of the country, makes India one and indivisible and in a manner in which it never was before. I would therefore submit that reorganisation being only a means to an end, the end being national unity and security, we should not look upon this problem as something which should in any manner interfere with the final objective which we have set before ourselves.

[Shri C. C. Shah]

The two great unifying forces in the country today are the Congress and the personality of the Prime Minister. And, the Constitution is there which makes for unity, but the Constitution can work only when there is unity of heart amongst the people. The Congress and the personality of the Prime Minister are the two great forces in the country today which make for our unity. There are any number of fissiparous tendencies amongst us, and while we have these two great forces amongst us it is time to consolidate that unity rather than stress those forces which make for division amongst us.

Language undoubtedly, is an important factor, but I do not believe—I do not want to argue or take the time of the House—that it is the sole or the only factor on which any redistribution of the country can take place. Undoubtedly, we spoke of the linguistic divisions of the country and the linguistic reorganisation. The Congress did speak about it. But, after independence new problems arose for us, a new situation arose for us and in the light of that new situation the J.V.P. Committee reminded us, that at the time when the Congress spoke of the linguistic principle, it was not faced with the practical application of this principle and hence it did not consider all the implications and consequences that arose from that practical application. Now, in the light of the present circumstances, it is for us to consider whether language will be one of the important factors or the sole factor as some want it. It shall not be the sole factor because language is a thing which unites as well as divides. It probably unites those who speak the same language but divides them from those who speak a different language. Therefore, I submit that the Commission was perfectly right, and took a proper approach when it said that language shall not be and should not be the only factor for the reorganisation of States.

The Commission has also said that even though there may be linguistic unity, there need not be one State for one language. The principle of one State for one language is impossible of application. It was in the light of these considerations that we in Gujarat have approached this problem. We did not ask for any separate State of Gujarat on a linguistic basis. In our memorandum we have made it clear that we do not ask for a separate State of Gujarat. Shri Gadgil referred to a speech of Sardar at Rajkot, and he seemed to imply that Sardar wanted a separate linguistic State of Gujarat. He also referred to Shri Munshi and said that Shri Munshi asked for a separate State of Gujarat on a linguistic basis. Both statements are entirely incorrect. Shri Munshi never asked for a separate State of Gujarat on a linguistic basis. All that we asked for, if it was possible, was to bring all the Gujarati-speaking areas into one administrative unit. It may be a bi-lingual State; it can be a bi-lingual State. In the memorandum of the Gujarat Pradesh Congress Samiti we have submitted that the present composite State of Bombay should continue. It has worked harmoniously. It has worked in a spirit of goodwill and we were willing to see that it should continue to exist as it has been existing thus far. We saw no reason why a State which had existed for more than a century and had achieved a sort of organic unity for itself should be disrupted. We therefore submitted that the present State of Bombay, with all the affinities which it had created for over a century should continue. But we also submitted that if the Commission, on account of claims made by others found it necessary to divide the State of Bombay on a linguistic or any other basis, then it should be more or less on the basis on which the Congress provinces were re-constituted under the Congress Constitution, namely, into the four component units of the present Bombay State. Those are: Karnataka, Gujarat, Maharashtra and Bombay Pradesh. Those were the

provinces which the Congress Constitution had created in 1921 and those are the provinces which should be created under the new reorganisation if the Commission thought it necessary to redistribute or reorganise the State of Bombay.

So far as Saurashtra is concerned, it made no claim and no demand. In respect of Saurashtra, the Government memorandum said that the Government of Saurashtra and the people of Saurashtra will agree to any decision which the Commission came to in the national interests. If the Commission decided that it was in the national interests to merge Saurashtra in the composite State of Bombay, the Government and the people of Saurashtra would accept that position. If the Commission decided that a separate State of Gujarat was to be formed and then Saurashtra was to be merged in that separate State of Gujarat, Saurashtra would accept it. If, for any other reason, the Commission decided that Saurashtra should remain as a separate State, even then we said that we shall accept it. We left it entirely to the Commission to decide, in the national interests, what should be the future of Saurashtra, having full faith that the Commission will come to a just and fair decision both in the interests of the people of Saurashtra and in the interests of the country as a whole. It is wrong to suggest that Saurashtra made any demand for a linguistic State and my friend Shri Bhawanji, who is the President of the District Congress Committee of Kutch will also explain to you that that was the same stand that Kutch took. Neither Saurashtra nor Kutch nor Gujarat asked for a linguistic State. We feel that when we have worked in a composite State for over a century and we have worked arm in arm and we have worked with goodwill there is no reason why we cannot continue to work together. We on our part at least find no reason to separate. But if others compel us to divide, if others create a situa-

tion in which it would become necessary that the State of Bombay should be reorganised and redistributed, then we demanded that the city of Bombay should be a separate unit. I shall explain the reasons why we made that demand. But, before doing so, I would like to say this:—I am sorry Shri Gadgil is not here—in the existing composite State of Bombay, the people of Maharashtra are in a majority. In the bilingual State, as suggested by the States Reorganisation Commission, they will be in a majority. A grievance has been made that the entire Gujarati-speaking area has been brought into this bi-lingual State and that the entire Marathi-speaking area has not been brought into this State. But the position is this. The whole of Marathwada which has a population of 47 lakhs has been put into the bilingual State. As against that, the population of Saurashtra and Kutch is 47 lakhs. So, while 47 lakhs are added from one side, another 47 lakhs are added from the other side. So, the majority which the people of Maharashtra have in the composite State of Bombay will still continue to be so in the proposed bilingual State of Bombay. In fact, it will now be somewhat greater majority.

Shri Gadgil presented charge-sheets against many people. He was here to present charge-sheet against the Commission; he presented a charge-sheet against the Government of Bombay; he presented a charge-sheet against the Chief Minister of Bombay and he had a grievance against everybody who did not agree with him. But that is a different matter. A State or an area or a group generally asks for a separate State of its own when it suffers under a sense of grievance. Probably, it suffers under a sense of grievance when its development has not taken place in the manner it should. It may suffer a sense of grievance when it has been discriminated against in the services, and therefore, not receiving a fair deal in a large State or a composite State.

[Shri C. C. Shah]

Can Maharashtra have any such grievance? In their memorandum, either before the Dar Commission or before the States Reorganisation Commission, not a word is said about any grievance of Maharashtra, either on developmental expenditure or on services or in any other manner. And yet, Shri Gadgil was here to say that the Maharashtrais have their grievance. But what are the facts? I will only give you what the facts are as given in B.P.C.C. memorandum. In Maharashtra, 10·225 lakhs of acres are being irrigated. In Gujarat only 3·846 lakhs of acres have been brought under irrigation. In Konkan, it is 21,000 acres. In Karnataka it is 3·32 lakhs of acres. In terms of money, out of the capital expenditure of Rs. 12 crores up to 1946-47, Rs. 10·75 crores have been spent on major irrigation works in Maharashtra. Arising out of the Ramamurthi Committee's recommendations, the Government of India have given the Bombay Government loans to the tune of Rs. 6·8 crores for expenditure on minor and medium-scale irrigation works in Maharashtra compared to only Rs. 80 lakhs in Gujarat. Road communications in Maharashtra are much better than in Gujarat or Karnataka. The majority of the districts in Maharashtra are well-served by road communications while the districts in Gujarat are deficit to the extent of 75 to 95 per cent.

An Hon. Member: What about the railways?

Shri C. C. Shah: Now, take the question of services. If you examine the services in the Bombay State, the Maharashtrais are in a preponderant majority. But in spite of that, if they want a separate State, none can prevent it. It is impossible to compel them to live together, if they do not wish to. Mr. Gadgil said that they would not be partners; they could be only good neighbours. If they do not want to be partners and if they want a separate State, they can have a separate State, but not on their own terms.

They cannot dictate that "these are the terms on which we shall have a separate State". They can separate only on the terms which the Commission has recommended or which previous Commissions have recommended, which have been known to be fair and good. What were the principles which we adopted in the redistribution of States? Take Andhra, for instance. The one principle we adopted was that in the case of Andhra, only the undisputed areas, areas about which there was no dispute or controversy, would be given to them. We said, Andhra must give up its claim for the Madras city, if a separate State was to be formed. They gave up the claim. Now, the S.R.C. has recommended a solution which in the opinion of all, except probably friends from Maharashtra, is the best one. This is the best solution of this difficult and delicate problem. It is the opinion of almost a large majority of this House; it is the opinion of the majority of the people of this country; it is the opinion of the Government as the hon. Home Minister has stated; it is the opinion of the B.P.C.C. as well as the G.P.C.C. And yet, my friends from Maharashtra do not want to accept the solution which is considered to be the best in the interests of all. Can they by rejecting it have the best out of the bargain? Can they by rejecting it get something to which they are not entitled? Take the Dar Commission the J.V.P. Committee or the S.R.C. Every Commission has un-animously and successively held that whatever might be the redistribution of the States, Bombay city must retain its cosmopolitan and multi-lingual character. In national interests, Bombay city cannot be part of any unilingual area. That is the unanimous decision of both the Congress and every other Commission appointed to examine this problem dispassionately and impartially. By rejecting the best solution and by pointing out what may be the difficulties in the formation of a City State for Bombay, would they like us to agree to a thing to which they are not entitled? It will be putting a premium on unreasonable-

ness if we submit to such a demand. Here is the S.R.C. recommendation which is considered to be the best solution. If they do not want to accept it, let them accept the solution which has been recommended by any other Commission. Even now, the unanimous decision of the Working Committee is this. Is it suggested that every Commission has been unfair to Maharashtra? Is it suggested that everyone has been unjust to Maharashtra? Is it suggested that men who had nothing to do with this problem and who examined it in the national interests and nothing else, have been unjust to Maharashtra? Is it suggested that consistently all of them have been unjust? Will friends from Maharashtra pause to think why it is that every Commission and every Committee and even the Congress in 1920 decided like this? That decision was taken by Shri N. C. Kelkar himself. Why was it so?

Shri M. D. Joshi (Ratnagiri South): Kelkar's decision was as regards the formation of the Congress Committee and not as regards the formation of the State.

Shri G. H. Deshpande (Nasik Central): Has my friend read the Samyukta Maharashtra Committee's report?

Shri C. C. Shah: Interruptions will not provoke me; you can take it from me. You can say whatever you want when your turn comes.

Shri S. K. Patil: That decision was that the city of Bombay cannot be included in the Provincial Congress Committee of Maharashtra.

Shri C. C. Shah: It will be necessary for me to place before the House the reasons for this conclusion. Take for instance the Dar Commission. This is what they have said:

"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 multi-lingual, cosmopolitan city the capital of a unilingual province."

That is the unanimous decision of the Dar Commission.

The J.V.P. Committee have said as follows:

"The question of the City of Bombay has not only risen but has been fiercely debated. And yet, in our opinion, there can be little room for argument about this great city."

They say, there cannot even be any argument about this. The case is so clear and complete that there cannot be argument about it. Who said it? It was said by the President of the Congress, the Prime Minister of India, men who have devoted their whole life to the cause of this nation. Are we to believe that they were unjust to Maharashtra? Are we to believe that they did something which was not in the national interests? The J.V.P. Committee went on to say:

"It is not only one of the greatest cities of India but is essentially a cosmopolitan multi-lingual city; the nerve-centre of our trade and commerce, and our biggest window to the outside world. It is quite impossible for us to entertain any idea or any proposal which might injure the many-sided life and activity of this great city, which has been built up by the labour of all kinds of people and communities. We cannot consider it as belonging to any one linguistic group and attach it to a purely linguistic province. That would undoubtedly mean its rapid deterioration from its present commanding position."

So, the S.R.C. came to the same conclusion. The S.R.C.'s conclusion was that Bombay cannot be made a part of any uni-lingual area. Both the people of Maharashtra and the people of Gujarat, Saurashtra and Kutch and as a matter of fact, the people of the whole country are attached to this city for reasons which

[Shri C. C. Shah]

are well-known. The best future which can lie for this city is that it should remain the capital of a bi-lingual State. Therefore, the S.R.C. recommended it. In doing so, they relied upon the traditions of tolerance, and the spirit of mutual understanding and goodwill which had prevailed in the city of Bombay amongst various communities. It expected that this recommendation which was the best under the circumstances would be accepted in that spirit by the people of Gujarat, Saurashtra and Kutch and also by the people of Maharashtra, because it would be in the wider national interests. When it raised that expectation, it did not reckon with the attitude of the people of Maharashtra. They rejected it. Gujarati people, in spite of their being a minority—only 35 per cent. as against more than 48.5 per cent. of Maharashtra—accepted it. But the Maharashtra people rejected it. The offer they make is a bi-lingual State with Vidarbha and they say we are unreasonably rejecting their offer. For a minute consider this. Do they believe in a bi-lingual State? Every word of Mr. Gadgil's speech was an impeachment against a bi-lingual State. In every word of his speech he meant to say, "we cannot live with any other community; we want to live by ourselves. We believe in linguism; we believe only in a unilingual State." Was this offer of a bilingual State with Vidarbha made in a fair manner with the intention to work it?

Shri M. D. Joshi: Well.

Shri C. C. Shah: You can say so certainly. But, the facts are obvious. It was made with a view to gain a crushing majority and nothing else. It was made only with a view to gain a crushing majority as Shri S. K. Patil rightly observed.

Swami Ramanand Tirtha (Gulberga): I humbly submit, that is unfair.

Shri C. C. Shah: It may appear unfair to you. What did they say? Having made this bi-lingual State with Vidar-

bha, after 5 years, Gujarat can go out, of course leaving Bombay to Maharashtra! Is there any doubt that they would have seen to it that Gujarat goes out? That is all that I can say about this.

A bi-lingual State is a State, as Shri S. K. Patil rightly and correctly said, in which the two communities must be more or less evenly placed. Where one community has a crushing majority, the other community does not feel a sense of confidence that it can get justice or fairplay. The other community has no confidence that it can make itself effective in a State of that character. All that can happen is that it will be a unilingual State to which something else is attached to remain in an inferior position for ever. That is not a bi-lingual State. That cannot be accepted. I say, the Commission very rightly suggested two States, one which was an exclusively Maharashtra State, one in which they had a preponderating majority.

There is something more in this. How did this offer of a bi-lingual State with Vidarbha come about? That is very interesting. One Maharashtra Minister of the Bombay State has thrown very revealing light on the manner in which this offer came about. The Congress High Command called the three deputations of Gujarat, Bombay and Maharashtra here to negotiate and try its best to find an agreed solution. This hon. Minister in a public interview to the Press tells us that suddenly on the last day of these interviews, the leader of the delegation Shri Shankar Rao Deo passed to him a chit that we may offer to the High Command as an alternative a bi-lingual State with Vidarbha. Shri Chavan tells us that he was greatly shocked at this proposal. He considered it impracticable. He was not prepared even to give this as a proposal because he thought that it cannot be made either *bona fide* or in a practical spirit. Then, he was told, if you do not accompany us to make this proposal,—it is a public interview

given by Shri Chavan; I am not saying anything secret—our unity will be endangered and so keep up that unity. In the executive committee of the M.P.C.C., he told them openly, this is not an offer which can be acceptable to Gujarat or anybody, this is not an offer that we can make. He rightly said so. That was not an offer which may be accepted by anybody with self-respect. As I said, that offer was not made in the spirit that that should be worked. If it had been made in that spirit and in other circumstances, things would have been different. That is a different matter. It is a fundamental principle of their creed that they believe only in a linguistic State. Why then this sudden volte face? Why this sudden jump to a bi-lingual State with Vidarbha? If they believed in a moral principle that they should have a redistribution of States only on a unilingual basis, that moral principle is suddenly given a go-by and that moral principle does not come in the way of suggestion a bi-lingual State in which they have a majority of 66 per cent. and Gujarat has only 28 per cent.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): Moral principle is majority.

Shri C. C. Shah: Yes, moral principle is majority.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: And a good one too.

Shri C. C. Shah: Then they say, all the Gujarat speaking areas have been brought in, why not all the Marathi-speaking areas? The argument is very plausible, very catchy. But take Saurashtra and Kutch. They are small petty States, B and C States. By any standard they cannot exist and they have got to be merged with another State. If they have got to be merged, they cannot be taken to Rajputana or Madhya Pradesh. If they have to be merged, they can be merged only in Bombay: nowhere else. Saurashtra and Kutch did not make any condition. They said, we are even prepared to go to a bi-lingual State even

though others may have a majority. Unconditionally they made the offer, whatever the Commission decides, we shall accept. There cannot be a more fair offer than that. I say—of course, I don't say that because it is my State—Saurashtra is the only State which, having existed for 8 years as an independent State has voluntarily agreed to merge itself with another State and accepts any decision which the Commission gives. To cast aspersions on such people who have acted in such a straightforward and honest manner is, I submit, not fair.

The Gujarat Provincial Congress Committee having considered the situation and the resolution of the M.P.C.C., passed a resolution. They said, having considered all that and having stated that for the reasons mentioned therein that a bi-lingual State with Vidarbha is unacceptable,

“This Committee was and is prepared to accept the recommendation of the Commission as a permanent solution of this delicate problem in the larger interests of the country, if the Maharashtrian leaders are willing to accept it in its entirety in the spirit in which the Commission has made it. If the Maharashtrian leaders are not willing to accept it, then, this Committee is of opinion that in the interests of all concerned, the Bombay State should be divided into three States.”

The Gujarat Provincial Congress Committee, even on 25-10-55, in spite of the hatred and bitterness which has been spread by the protagonists of Samyukta Maharashtra, was prepared to accept a bi-lingual State as recommended by the S.R.C. What was the response? They rejected it. If they rejected an offer which is considered to be best in the national interests, somebody has got to come to some conclusion. That decision has got to be taken. That decision was taken by the Working Committee after careful consideration, after all the efforts to bring about an agreed solution failed, after all the negotiations

[Shri C. C. Shah]

failed, after everything that could possibly be done to persuade the friends from Maharashtra to agree to a reasonable solution failed. The Working Committee has come to a decision. That decision, as Shri S. K. Patil told us, was arrived at with the consent of Shri Deogirikar and at his request because it was said that rather than a bi-lingual State as suggested by the S.R.C., the three State formula would be more acceptable to Maharashtra. The Working Committee,—I do not want to take the time of the House—resolution has said that because of the opinion expressed by the M.P.C.C. and because of the attitude taken by the M.P.C.C., it has come to this conclusion as the largest and greatest common measure of agreement between the parties and in the national interests. That decision, I say, is consistent with the stand that the Congress has taken since 1920. That decision is consistent with the unanimous conclusion of the Dar Commission, the J.V.P. report and the S.R.C. report, because the S.R.C. report never recommended that Bombay can be part of a unilingual area. Therefore, I submit that that decision is the right decision. The decision of the Working Committee was an unanimous decision. Even Shri Deogirikar did not object, did not oppose it, though I am told that he did not vote for it. Is it suggested, I ask once again, that the entire Working Committee was out to do injustice to Maharashtra? Will friends from Maharashtra ever pause to consider this? Of course, they have worked themselves up in a frenzy; they have worked themselves up in a great fury. I know it. They are victims of their own slogans; and others are made victims of violence. I request them to pause and consider why it is that while they feel so strongly in one way, the whole nation feels so strongly to the contrary. It is not a question of Gujarat alone. Leave aside Gujarat. It is a national problem. Gujarat is vitally interested in it. Bombay is an asset for the entire nation. That is why the Prime Minister says, and that

is why the Congress has always said that it cannot be a part of any unilingual area. Will friends from Maharashtra ever pause to consider the feelings of others? Men like the Prime Minister, Pandit G. B. Pant, and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad were sitting there in the Congress Working Committee. Was everyone of them unfair to Maharashtra? Why is it that they came to this decision?

2 P.M.

All these arguments of territory, language etc. were advanced before them; in fact, they have been advanced since 1948, before the Dar Commission, before the J.V.P. Committee, and also before the S.R.C. Everywhere, these arguments have been advanced, and they have been considered fully times out of number, and yet this is the only conclusion that could be reached.

I want to submit one other matter. When did this demand for Bombay come up? It is an interesting story. The demand for Samyukta Maharashtra is comparatively a recent one. Compared with the demand for Karnataka, or Andhra or even Vidarbha, it is a recent one. Only in 1946, at Belgaum, the Literary Parishad of Maharashtra said that for cultural and literary reasons, it was better if all the Marathi-speaking people were brought together; the political leaders took this up and developed it. Of course, now it is the most clamorous and the loudest demand. If it is a demand and they want it, we must meet it. But then it should be met on terms which are in the national interest and not in the interest of any particular section.

Before the Dar Commission was appointed, this question of linguistic redistribution was being considered in the Constituent Assembly. All the PCC chiefs, particularly those in the south, where the problem of linguistic redistribution was most urgent, met in a meeting under the presidentship of Dr. Rajendra Prasad. I shall read the minutes of that meeting, and it will be interesting to you to listen to

that. Now, who were all present at that meeting? Shri Shankar Rao Deo, Shri Nijalingappa, Shri Keshav Rao Jedhe, and all others from the south, and also the president of the GPCC. The question arose as to what should be the redistribution of the States for the purposes of our Constitution. And they wanted to find an agreed solution. And what did they do?

"The following representatives of provinces interested in the formation of linguistic provinces met at the residence of Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Congress President, on 24th February 1948, at 9 p.m. Dr. Rajendra Prasad was good enough to attend the meeting. The following formula which was circulated to the representatives was discussed."

And what was the formula? It was that

"Aspiring provinces should agree to start with the provincial boundaries as laid down by the Congress in 1920."

At that time, Maharashtra did not say that Bombay should be a part of Maharashtra or Samyukta Maharashtra.

Shri H. G. Vaishnav (Ambad): It was there already. So, where was the necessity to say that?

Shri C. C. Shah: Then came the Dar Commission. For the first time, before the Dar Commission, this claim was made, namely Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay.

As I have said already, this is a national problem. No doubt, Gujarat, Saurashtra and Kutch are vitally interested in its future. But, it is not a matter entirely between Gujarat and Maharashtra. And yet, I must tell you why Gujarat is so greatly attached to Bombay. It is amazing to find that Bombay which was a neglected island had coastal relations with Gujarat, Saurashtra and Kutch for centuries before it had any connection with Maharashtra, because between Bombay and Maharashtra are the impenetrable ghats which made

coming over to this area almost impossible. It was because of the coastal trade that the connections of Gujarat, Saurashtra and Kutch with Bombay have been there since times immemorial. I say this not as an argument for any claim by Gujarat, but I say it because it is a fact.

Those who are lawyer Members will find that all over the West, the Hindu law of succession applied is mitakshara. But in Gujarat, the law of succession that is applied is Mayukh. This was so because the social customs in Gujarat, Saurashtra and Kutch were somewhat different from those in the rest of the area where mitakshara was applied. And what is the branch of the law which applies to Bombay? It is not mitakshara but Mayukh. In the whole of Maharashtra, on the other side of the ghats, mitakshara is applied but in Bombay, North Konkan, Gujarat, Saurashtra and Kutch, it is Mayukh that is applied. And why was the Mayukh law applied there?

In a very learned historic judgement given in 1879, at a time when there was no controversy whatsoever, Chief Justice Westropp of the Bombay High Court....

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: It is a foreign authority.

Shri C. C. Shah: It is not a foreign authority; it is a historical fact.

Chief Justice Westropp said:

"The island of Bombay and North Konkan including the island of Karanja formed part of the Kingdom of Gujarat."

Then, he proceeds to trace the entire historical connection between Gujarat and Bombay. Until the 16th century it was the rulers of Gujarat who ruled over this area, and from the rulers of Gujarat, it went to the Portuguese and from the Portuguese it went to the British. It has never been part of any Maharatta rule.

Shri M. D. Joshi: May I know who the kings of Gujarat were?

Shri C. C. Shah: They were the Sultans of Gujarat.

Chief Justice Westropp further came to the conclusion that North Konkan and the Island of Karanja in which the property in dispute lay were a part of Gujarat for a long time and as such:

"We should scarcely expect to find a Hindu law of succession prevailing at one side of Bombay harbour different from that existing in the Island of Bombay and in Gujarat."

It is not only that. Nearly five lakhs of people from Gujarat, Saurashtra and Kutch are in Bombay. There is not a single village or town in Gujarat, Saurashtra and Kutch whose people are not in Bombay. The prosperity of Gujarat, Saurashtra and Kutch depends upon the prosperity of Bombay. Further, it is the literary and cultural centre for Gujarat. The first newspaper in Gujarati was started in Bombay. The best Gujarati newspapers, are published from Bombay, such as the *Janmabhoomi* and the *Bombay Samachar*. The head office of the Gujarati Sahitya Parishad, of which I am the secretary, is in Bombay. (Interruptions).

So, the position about Bombay is that it was an area in what you call North Konkan. It was an area which was always divided and separated from Maharashtra. Men like R. G. Bhandarkar, the great Sanskrit and Maharashtrian scholar, have said:

"It (i.e. *Dakshinapatha*) is thus almost identical with the country called Maharashtra or region in which the Marathi language is spoken the narrow strip of land between the Western Ghats and the sea being excluded."

By narrow strip, he means North Konkan. Again, Mahamahopadhyay Shri P. V. Kane, another Maharashtrian scholar observes:

"...the foregoing discussion gives a pretty clear idea as to the extent of Maharashtra. The Konkan was generally not included therein."

And in conclusion, he states:

"that from the most ancient times the Konkan was looked upon as a unit by itself and is distinguished from Maharashtra by physical and topographical peculiarities."

The whole of Bombay City is inhabited by people who are all immigrants, be they Mahashtrians, be they Gujaratis, be they from any other part of India. It is a city of immigrants, as Dr. Gadgil himself, spokesman of Maharashtra, has said. All have an equal claim upon the city of Bombay. They have come; others have come; the whole of India has come. The influx of Maharashtrian population into this area of Bombay started only after the Bhor Ghat was constructed and the GIP Railway was constructed. Right up to 1872, the Maharashtrian population in that area was hardly 22 per cent, and then it began to increase. With the industrial development of Bombay, labour from the adjoining areas began to come in. They have come. They are welcome, as everybody else is welcome in the city of Bombay. But it would be impossible for the people of Gujarat even to conceive that the city of Bombay which has been built up by the labours of everybody—in which they have contributed, others have contributed and we have contributed in our own humble way with our talent, in a small measure it may be, but it shall not be acceptable to Gujarat—it is inconceivable to us that the city, with which we have been associated for centuries, should become part of a unilingual area.

And what is this argument about 'our territory.' This territorial argument is nothing but the 'homeland' idea. To what lengths it can go, I would take the House for a few minutes to show. I shall read one of the passages from the writings of their principal spokesman.

Shri Neswi (Dharwar South): Does the hon. Member know that the first

inhabitants of Bombay were the Kanarese, and the first address to the Governor General was presented in Kanarese?

Shri C. C. Shah: Perfectly right. The memorandum to the Governor of Bombay was in Kanarese language, not in Marathi language.

At the time of the Dar Commission, a suggestion was made that this question should be postponed for a period of ten years, and in opposing that postponement, this is what Dr. D. R. Gadgil, the principal spokesman, said:

"Within a period of ten years of such postponement, the financial resources of the opponents of United Maharashtra, the large number of refugees seeking settlement, the negligence, connivance or complicity of the provincial Ministry may combine to render the Marathas strangers over large stretches of their own homeland".

We were told that there is no homeland theory. This is in their words. And that homeland goes to what length? If you separate the city of Bombay from Maharashtra, what is it that he will do? The non-Marathas, the non-Marathi-speaking people, though in a majority of 56 per cent. in the city of Bombay, are foreigners! They are strangers. Then what will he do?

"The insistence of the non-Maratha writers that even though they live on Maratha territory, they must be separated from the State of Maharashtra raises many speculations regarding the future working of the Indian Union. One analogy to that insistence and one corollary of it may, however, be pointed out. The Muslims detested the idea of living under the rule of the Hindu majority, challenged the concept of the integrity of India and insisted on separation from it. When the Hindus were forced by circumstances to agree to partition they, in their turn,

challenged the concept of the integrity of the Punjab and Bengal and fought for the territory inch by inch. If the non-Marathas of Bombay do not want to live in the State of Maharashtra and for getting their purpose challenge the integrity of the territory of Maharashtra and insist on the separation of Bombay from it, the Marathas will, of course, oppose to the full extent of their capacity such a procedure. If, however, circumstances force its acceptance, they will in their turn challenge the concept of the integrity of Bombay City. Large portions of the City of Bombay are inhabited by a majority of the speakers of Marathi and most of these are contiguous to the territory of Maharashtra outside city limits. Why should Marathas living in these parts be supposed to welcome non-Maratha rule? If it is to be a partition why not a partition of Bombay City territory as well?"

They would have division of Bombay City, road by road, street by street! That is the homeland theory. That is the territorial theory. And that is the reason why the SRC was at pains to point out that they reject the homeland theory completely; in India it is Indian territory, and every citizen of India has a common citizenship and is free to go wherever he likes and live wherever he likes. But that is not the approach of friends from Maharashtra. However, now after speaking of this territorial inviolability, they say, why are you afraid of us, what apprehensions have you? They want that 56 per cent. of the people of Bombay should be subjected to the rule of 44 per cent. and ask the question, why are you afraid, what apprehensions have you? Those apprehensions have been registered by every Committee, by every Commission. To say that they were imaginary, that the Commission imagined, some apprehensions which were not there, that the Committee imagined

[Shri C. C. Shah]

some apprehensions which were not there, is, of course, no argument. Every non-Maharashtrian element has this apprehension. I will take the SRC Report:

"During the course of our inquiry, a vast majority of persons who appeared before us and did not belong to either of the contending language groups, expressed themselves strongly in favour of placing Bombay City under a separate administration."

This is the view of people who had nothing to do with the contending groups, the large majority of them.

"We also noticed serious misgivings in the minds of large sections of the inhabitants of Bombay as well as persons outside about the future of the city if it formed part of a unilingual State."

And more than that. What did the Prime Minister note, when he framed the JVP Report?

"There have been proposals for a Greater Bombay, but they have apparently been held up because of the argument about the future of Bombay that has been going on for some time. These apprehensions retarded the industrial development of Bombay. We think in any event this scheme for Greater Bombay should be given effect to. We understand that owing to the arguments about linguistic provinces and the splitting up of Bombay province, there has been considerable apprehension in the minds of many people in Bombay."

Not merely Gujaratis—

"and it has suffered in consequence. We feel, therefore, 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."

That was the assurance given by the President of the Congress, Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya and by the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister of India.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has already taken 50 minutes. There is no further need to read literature, because literature can be quoted both for and against. So I would request him to round up his speech.

Shri C. C. Shah: Yes. After this assurance by the highest body of the Congress, the industrial development of Bombay proceeded and that industrial development has been phenomenal during the last 7 or 8 years. Two refineries—the largest in Asia—have been put up. But for this assurance, the industrial development of Bombay would have suffered. It is for this House to redeem that pledge given by the highest body of the Congress.

I will not take more of your time, but I would only say this. What is the future which they, the protagonists of Samyukta Maharashtra, envisage for Bombay City if it becomes part of Maharashtra?

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Good-neighbourliness.

Mr. Chairman: Please do not interrupt. That will only take more time for him to reply.

Shri C. C. Shah: Dr. Gadgil, the principal spokesman has this to say:

The main stages by which the problem of Bombay has to be solved appear to be as follows:—

- (1) A ban on the establishment of new or expansion of old industrial undertakings within a distance by road or rail of 50 miles of the Fort area.
- (2) The preparation of a plan of industrial

vocation for Bombay and the whole of its hinterland. (3) A detailed programme which should indicate the stages by which the transfer of population and industry from greater Bombay and the movement of dispersal from the most congested areas of the Bombay city will take place."

So, not only they do not envisage any further development of Bombay, but they want the industry and the population of Bombay to be transferred to the hinterland which to them is Maharashtra.

Shri S. S. More: What is wrong in it? It is decentralisation.

Shri C. C. Shah: Of course, it is decentralisation. You can decentralise the whole of Bombay. I don't mind it. You can decentralise the whole of Bombay and not only a part of it. **Shri Gadgil** further says, "The future of Bombay State, is in the long run bound up almost exclusively with Maharashtra."

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Shri C. C. Shah: **Shri Gadgil** proceeds: "This will reduce the industrial importance of Bombay for those parts and also stop the flow of industrial labour from distant regions. Bombay's all-India importance for certain specialised agencies may remain; but it will exist chiefly as the port and the economic centre of Maharashtra which is the role indicated by its geographical location." Thus, they want not only that the industries of Bombay should be disbursed but the national importance of Bombay should be reduced and it should remain, principally, as a port for Maharashtra.

Now, if that is the future; what is the position of Bombay today? Bombay contributes 40 per cent. of the total customs revenue of the whole of India. It is a national port and our gateway to the world. Bombay contributes 31 per cent. of the total income-tax of the whole of India. Bombay handles

55 per cent. of its total import trade and 40 per cent. of its total export. All that they want to go.

Shri S. S. More: How? The customs and income-tax are Central subjects.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Everybody knows it. Only the hon. Member gives it in detail.

Shri S. S. More: He is making a wrong distortion.

Mr. Chairman: He is entitled to have his own views.

Shri C. C. Shah: My submission is this. 56 per cent. of people living in this area, to whom it is the homeland as to anybody else in this country, cannot be left to be ruled by a linguistic minority. The expansionist urges of aggressive linguism may try to annex the territories round about it. But it is for us, sitting in this House, to decide whether such expansionist urge will be encouraged. It is not for Gujarat that I am speaking. Not at all. It is for the nation, it is for the country that I am speaking.

Now you will find that before the Dar Commission and before the S. R. C. the entire non-Maharashtrian element, the 56 per cent. of it in Bombay, have demanded that Bombay should not become part of a unilingual area. Those are the resolutions passed by the Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee. The Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee has unanimously resolved that in the event of the State of Bombay being redistributed, the Bombay city should become a separate unit because Karnataka has equally vital interest in the future of the city of Bombay. The Bombay Citizens Committee has demanded it. The Sindhi Association in Bombay has demanded it. The Kerala Association in Bombay has demanded it. The Uttar Bharatiya Association in Bombay has demanded it. Everyone of them has demanded it. You will be surprised to know that there are five lakhs of people from

[Shri C. C. Shah]

North India in Bombay, principally in labour population. What do Maharashtrian friends want? They say that labour from outside should not come to Bombay. Bombay is the largest employment centre. Bombay is the place where every man can earn his living. They do not want that anyone should come to Bombay from outside Maharashtra. My submission, therefore, is that this territorial argument smacks of homeland, and partition. In our Constitution we have deliberately provided that the adjustment of areas, boundaries etc. is the sole concern of the Parliament and no group of people has a right to say that a particular territory belongs exclusively to any linguist group, no matter who are the people living in that area whether they are 56 per cent. or not, that these 2-3 million people are strangers, that they are immigrants who can stay on sufferance. We have to resist the aggressive linguism which always finds a place in every nook and corner. I do not want in any manner to say that the people of Gujarat make any claim to Bombay. We are greatly attached to Bombay as much as any other community, because five lakhs of our people are there. We believe firmly that Bombay should not be a part of any unilingual area. We want it to remain as it is, a cosmopolitan and multilingual city of this great country.

Finally I would like to say this. Bombay, as the Home Minister with that felicity of expression, for which he is so unrivalled, told us is the cradle of our nationalism. It was the birthplace of the Indian National Congress. Come to Bombay and see the spirit of freedom which it breathes and the sense of equality which it feels; the spirit of tolerance which you will find in Bombay, you will find nowhere else in any other city in India. It is the same with the national outlook in Bombay. Bombay has given a lead in national struggle. Bombay has given a lead in every movement. Bombay has been a friend in adversity to the whole of this

country. If anything happens either in Bihar or Bengal or Assam or any other part of this country, Bombay will give in millions to help them. What happens in Bombay today will happen in the whole of India tomorrow. I say that city, which is our pride, should not be tossed in the vortex of Maharashtra politics. Three different units—Marathawada, Maharashtra and Vidarbha for the first time are coming together. We do not know what it is elsewhere. That may be will be. Shri Kaka Saheb Gadgil told us that there is very great political consciousness in Maharashtra. Because of that political consciousness probably he finds that loyalty to the Congress is less in Maharashtra than what the shape of Maharashtra politics so.

An Hon. Member: It is not like that.

Shri C. C. Shah: That is what is implied. I hope it is not. To men like Kaka Saheb Gadgil, Bombay is only a waiting room. To us it is the flower of Indian culture. I, therefore, humbly beg to submit that the decision which has been taken by every committee and commission is the only right and correct decision. I would appeal to my friends from Maharashtra; I have lived in Bombay all my life and I have been brought up in Bombay. I have been in Bombay for all the 55 years of my life and I know what Bombay is. The protagonists of Samyukta Maharashtra—most of them—have not lived in Bombay and they do not know what Bombay is. Shri Patil has got a right to say what Bombay is because he has lived all his life in Bombay. The Bombay Pradesh Congress Committee has got a right to say what Bombay is; the legislators elected from the Bombay city have a right to say what Bombay is.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): Does it not belong to the whole nation; does it belong only to the Congress?

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur): Try to understand it.

Shri C. C. Shah: Therefore, I would appeal to my friends from Maharash-

tra to accept with good grace what the nation has decided, what the country has decided ever since 1920. We wish them well; may their State of Maharashtra prosper and progress well. But, let them not create bitterness and insist on a demand which demand is untenable and unreasonable.

श्रीमती कमलेंदु मति शाह (जिला गढ़वाल पश्चिम व जिला टिहरी गढ़वाल व जिला बिजनौर उत्तर) : राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग पर मुझे यह कहना है कि मेरे विचार से उत्तरप्रदेश का विभाजन उचित नहीं है। अन्य प्रान्तों के लोग तो विभाजन की मांग इस कारण से करते हैं कि इससे उन लोगों के हाथ में शासन सत्ता आकर उन्हें अपना प्रभुत्व जमाने की आशा होगी। परन्तु उत्तरप्रदेश के विभाजन की मांग तो मुख्यतया इस प्रान्त के प्रदशों में अधिकारियों की शासन शिथिलता के कारण है जो जिलों की स्वाभाविक प्रगति में बाधक है। इस प्रकार की शासन शिथिलता में जागृति लाने का एक उच्च साधन तो विभाजन हो सकता है, परन्तु क्या विभाजन की मांग करने वाले यह जिम्मेदारी ले सकते हैं कि इस उच्च साधन द्वारा जो पीछे बदलना भी मुश्किल होगा, उनके जिलों की कठिनाइयों का अन्त अवश्य हो जायेगा।

Mr. Chairman: Order: order. It is not right in this way to talk inside the House so that the hon. Member who is speaking now is not being heard. If any hon. Member wants to talk, I would request him to go the lobby and have a talk. Every hon. Member in this House has a right to be heard while he or she is speaking about his or her State and it is only right that other hon. Members should give him or her his ear. That is my humble suggestion. *

Shrimati Kamlendu Mati Shah: I am talking of U.P. because I know of it. I do not want to talk about Bombay or any other place because I do not know much of it. I think it would be very kind of my brothers, if they would not want to listen, at least allow me to speak. If they do not

want to listen they may go out of the House. They may not like Hindi and they may like me to speak in English. I know English but I would rather speak in Hindi than in English, because that is the national language.

मेरा प्रस्ताव तो श्रीमान्, यह है कि प्रान्तों के डिभिजन करके उनकी शासन सत्ता वृहत् स्तरीय कमिश्नर के हाथ में दी जाए जिससे जिला अधिकारी जागरूक होकर अपने कार्य का उचित रूप से संचालन करें। वर्तमान समय में तो ये जिलाधीश जो सरकार के विश्वासी प्रतिनिधि (conscience keepers) समझे जाते हैं अपने जिलों पर निर्बिघ्न शासन करते हैं और सरकार उत्तरप्रदेश के लखनऊ जैसे एक कौने में होने से यदि कर्तव्यपरायण जिलाधीश न हो तो उसे मनमानी करने का अवसर मिल जाता है। अतः मितव्यय इत्यादि बातों को ध्यान में रखते हुए मेरे विचार से तो यह उत्तम होगा कि जिलों के समुदाय बना कर उनके लिए बंध प्रविष्टिदित समिति (Statutory Standing Committee) क्षेत्र स्तरीय कमिश्नर के नीचे रखी जाय। इसके लिए आवश्यकता पढ़ने पर सरकार को संविधान में भी संशोधन करना चाहिए।

अब प्रत्येक क्षेत्र को उच्च स्तर पर उठाने का प्रश्न है, उसके लिए जब प्रान्त प्रदशों के समुदायों में बिभक्त होकर क्षेत्र स्तरीय कमिश्नरों के शासन में आजायेंगे तब वह कमिश्नर इन प्रदशों के टुकड़ों को इनकी आवश्यक उन्नीच के लिए यथाचित मात्रा में धन बाँटेंगा। मेरे विचार से इस प्रकार के कार्य संचालन से अवश्य लाभ होगा क्योंकि केवल प्रान्त के टुकड़े करने से जनता के असन्तोष का कारण कदापि नहीं हटाया जा सकता।

ब्राज हमारी सबसे बड़ी निर्बलता-पदलांतुपता है, जिससे हम केवल इसी बात पर ध्यान दे पाते हैं कि किस प्रकार हमारे वर्तमान पद स्थिर रहें और आगे हमें उच्च से उच्च पद मिलें। राज्य पुनर्गठन कार्य में केवल इसी कारण से हमें कठिनाई का सामना करना

[Shrimati Kamlendu Mati Shah]

बंद रहा है। यदि हम अपनी यह कमजोरी हटा कर मन में यह दृढ़ व्रत ले पायें कि सम्पूर्ण भारत हमारा एक प्रान्त है और हमें किसी भी प्रकार केवल उस प्रान्त के कल्याण को अपना ध्येय बनाना है, तभी हमारा भी कल्याण हो सकता है।

मैं तो इसी में विश्वास करती हूँ कि जितने ही कम प्रान्त होंगे उतनी ही हमारी एकता बढ़ेगी और हम एक कटुम्ब की तरह रह सकेंगे, किन्तु जनता और राज्य शासकों का पारस्परिक सम्बन्ध और सहयोग बनाये रखने के लिये कमिश्नर के लेवल में बंध प्रतिपादित समितियाँ अर्थात् (Statutory Standing Committees) बनाई जानी परम आवश्यक हैं। क्योंकि जो वर्तमान डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड हैं हमारे जिलों में, उनके क्षेत्र तथा साधन अपूर्ण हैं और सर्वद्वय अपूर्ण रहेंगे, न उन्हें इतने अधिकार ही दिये जा सकते हैं, न उनके पास हैं ही, कि जनता उन्हें विश्वास या महत्व की दृष्टि से दें। इस सम्बन्ध में भी आवश्यकता पढ़ने पर एक बार फिर संविधान का संशोधन करने में आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिए। १९ दफा हम अपने संविधान में संशोधन कर चुके हैं और बारहवीं का आवश्यकता पढ़ने पर उसमें संशोधन करने में आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिए।

उत्तरप्रदेश का विभाजन मांगने वालों के सामने प्रश्न यह नहीं है कि उत्तरप्रदेश बहुत बड़ा होने से उसका विभाजन हो। अपितु प्रश्न यह है कि राज्य के शासन में जो बुराइयाँ वास्तव में पाई जाती हैं उनको दूर किया जाय। अनुमानतः विभाजन से यह बुराइयाँ दूर हो भी सकती हैं किन्तु हमें यह भी नहीं भूलना चाहिए कि यह केवल मात्र कतिपय व्यक्तियों का अनुमान ही है। मुझे केवल इतना ही कहना है कि हमें मेल से रहना है और अपने देश को एक करके जिस तरीके से भी हो उसकी भलाई का ख्याल करना है। राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग ने सरकार को जो अपनी रिपोर्ट ली है वह मेरे

ख्याल से अच्छी है और उसी के मुआफिक हमें चलना चाहिए।

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: May I make a submission? If the debate is regulated, I would submit that it may be regulated in an understandable way. The hon. Speaker was pleased to make certain observations in the matter of the regulation of the debate. Then the hon. Deputy-Speaker made some suggestions. When I stood up to catch the eye of the Deputy-Speaker, he said, 'Let Bombay be finished first'. After hon. Member, Shri Shah, spoke in respect of Bombay, U.P. has been called. I know that I have to catch the eye of the Chair; but I also have a right to participate in the debate, subject to my ability to catch the eye of the Chair. But, to catch the eye of the Chair only to be turned down is a procedure which is not understandable.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. I do not accept the last part of the observation of the hon. Member to be a right one. After all, only one Member can catch the eye of the Chair, not two at a time, not to speak of too many. So many hon. Members are eager to speak and the Chair has got to exercise its own discretion. It cannot be dictated to by each and every hon. Member of this House. The hon. Member has just pointed out that the Deputy-Speaker had stated that Bombay State would be taken first and the other States after that. U.P. was allowed to intervene because of the fact that that particular Member wanted to go away and requested the Deputy-Speaker to be allowed only five minutes. That was a very pertinent and reasonable request and she was allowed to intervene between the speakers of Samyukta Maharashtra and Bombay. That view of the Deputy-Speaker is being followed even now with the exception which I have just mentioned, and there has, therefore, been no deviation from what he expressed.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: What about Assam? From that State no one has

been allowed to make any submission. Where do those Members stand?

Mr. Chairman: I shall forward that demand to the Deputy-Speaker.

[**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER** in the Chair]

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: May I make a submission?

Shri R. S. Diwan (Osmanabad): He has already made his submission.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: But I have a right to make my submission to the Deputy-Speaker.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I understand it. The hon. Member wants to have a chance for Assam. But hon. Members will bear with me that there must be some scheme and that I am proceeding with it now. We have heard from Shri Gadgil about Maharashtra, from Shri Patil about Bombay City, from Shri Shah about Gujarat, and now I shall dispose of Vidarbha. Yesterday we heard from somebody about a different Punjab and also an opposition to it from Shri Tek Chand. If there is one more from Punjab, I would like to give a chance to that Member.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: What about Shri Chatterjee? How was he given a chance?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Assam has not got so much of trouble as others have. Next I want to come to Madhya Pradesh which has swallowed up four big territories, Madhya Bharat, Madhya Pradesh, Bhopal and Vindhya Pradesh; they must be heard. Seth Govind Das spoke for Jubbulpore in the dispute about the capital—Bhopal or Jubbulpore. Hon. Members must read the whole report to know the points of dispute and where they are. Of course, U.P. and Rajasthan are practically untouched. I have no quarrel with U.P., but all that U.P.

“सर्वजनाः सुखिना भवन्तु”

Let me also continue in position.” Therefore, it is not as great a problem as Bombay or Punjab or Madhya Bharat or even Karnataka, which has rolled into one several areas.

Then we have Vishalandhra, where one section does not want to join another section. In Travancore, one section wants to go away from another section. These are all the categories into which I have put them. Next I will come to border disputes, Bengal and Bihar, Assam and Bengal, Assam independently, Orissa, etc. Then the Class C States and after that the minorities will come. Then again the turn will come. Now I call Shri Khedkar, and next I am going to call Shri Chettiar.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: But yesterday you allowed Shri Chatterjee to speak about Assam.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Chatterjee was called upon as a leader of a group and incidentally....

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: May I know what group that is?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If I give up even the power of deciding whether I ought to call X, Y or Z as a representative of a group. I need not sit here. I have got that right. Does the hon. Member think that he is the head of a group as much as Shri Chatterjee is, to whatever party he may belong? Shri Chatterjee incidentally brought in the question of border disputes in his speech. Immediately shall I rush into the border and say “When there is a main project of river, it should not go into a canal? My hon. friend, Shri Sarmah, was himself a Speaker of an Assembly and I am sure he would have pulled up a number of members. I am not competent to pull him up; he is a big man

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: You are dealing with Bombay now; we have got certain disputes with Bombay on behalf of Karnataka.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Karnataka has disputes all round.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: It would be better if you give a chance to our group....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I called Shri Nijalingappa yesterday.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: What about our group?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Am I to divide Karnataka into P.S.P. group and other groups? I will call each group. The first person that was called was the leader of the P.S.P. group. I am really surprised when the hon. Member says "If the leader of my group is called, why should I also not be called?"

श्री जी० बी० खेडकर (बुलढाना अकोला) : विदर्भ की जनता की मांग मध्य प्रदेश में जो हिन्दी का विभाग है उस से अलग होने की थी। २० वर्ष से विदर्भ के अन्दर हिन्दी विभाग से अलग होने की कोशिश जारी है। १९२८ में वहाँ की विधान सभा में भाषा का एक प्रस्ताव पास भी हुआ था। दार कमिशन के सामने जो डेपुटेशन गया था और उसने जो मेमोरैण्डम पेश किया था, उस में भी विदर्भ को हिन्दी विभाग से अलग करने की मांग की गई थी। एस० आर० सी० कमिशन के सामने भी यह मांग की गई है। विदर्भ प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी ने ऐसा प्रस्ताव पास किया है कि संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र बम्बई समेत मिलना चाहिए। इतना ही नहीं, वहाँ के बहुत से एम० एल० एज०, बहुत से एम० पी० और बहुत सी लोकल बाडीज के मेमोरैण्डम में भी विदर्भ को हिन्दी विभाग से अलग कर के महाराष्ट्र में मिलाने की मांग की गई थी। मैं एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट का स्वागत करता हूँ कि उस में मराठी भाषा बोलने वालों को हिन्दी विभाग से अलग किया गया है। लेकिन आठ जिलों का प्रान्त बनाने की बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती। एक ओर तो ५० पी० है जिस में ५२ डिस्ट्रिक्ट्स हैं और दूसरी ओर ८ जिलों का एक छोटा सा प्रान्त बनाया जाता है जिस में सिर्फ ७६ लाख की आबादी है। विदर्भ प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी के जरिये से संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र की मांग की गई थी। इतना ही नहीं, लोकल बाडीज ने जो डेपुटेशन भेजे थे उन में भी संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र की मांग की थी। जो लोकल बाडीज जनपद सभा के नाम से वहाँ पर काम करती हैं उन में भी संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के

प्रस्ताव बहुत बड़ी संख्या में पास हुए हैं। इतना ही नहीं, बहुत बड़े बहुमत से म्युनिसिपल कमेटीज में प्रस्ताव पास किये गये थे। फिर भी यह कारण मैं नहीं समझ पाता कि क्यों ऐसा किया गया कि आठ जिलों का प्रान्त बनाया जाय। आठ जिलों का प्रान्त अलग बना कर वहाँ की जनता की जो संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र में शामिल होने की मांग थी उस को पूरा नहीं किया गया। एस० आर० सी० कमिशन ने आठ जिलों का प्रान्त बनाने के जो कारण बतलाये हैं उन में से एक कारण तो डेढ़ करोड़ रुपये के सर्प्लस का भी है। एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है :

"The size of this surplus in future will depend on a variety of factors but so far as it can be estimated, it may be a crore and a half of rupees or possibly more. In view of the satisfactory financial position of Vidarbha and since Maharashtra without Greater Bombay is likely to be a deficit area on revenue account to a very much greater extent, there is some reluctance in this area to join Maharashtra."

ऐसी बात इस रिपोर्ट में लिखी गई है। मध्य प्रदेश के मुख्य मंत्री ने पिछले साल एक प्रेस कान्फ्रेंस में कहा था कि विदर्भ की इन्कम ४२ परसेंट हुई और विदर्भ के ऊपर ४७ परसेंट खर्चा होगा। ऐसा मध्य प्रदेश के चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा था अभी हाल ही में जो वहाँ के अर्थ मंत्री हैं उन्होंने ने इस कमिशन की रिपोर्ट प्रकाशित होने के बाद एक पुस्तिका छपी है जिस में कहा गया है कि विदर्भ का सरपलस २६ लाख का रहेगा। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि एस० आर० सी० ने जो एक करोड़ ५० लाख रुपये का सरपलस बतलाया है यह फिर उसने कहाँ से ली है। जो मध्य प्रदेश के चीफ मिनिस्टर हैं वह सरपलस नहीं बतलाते हैं और जो फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर हैं वह २६ लाख का सरपलस बताते हैं लेकिन कमिशन एक करोड़ ५० लाख का सरपलस बताता है। यह जो फिर बतलाये गये हैं इनके बारे में पहले तो यह बात दिमाग में ली गई

होगी कि यदि ऐसा नहीं बतलाया गया तो ठीक नहीं दिखेगा और प्रान्त तो बनाना ही है। इस वास्तु उन्होंने इसको एक सरपलस प्रान्त बता दिया। कमिशन ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में जो विदर्भ बनाने का कारण बताया है उसमें एक कारण यह भी है कि—

The position will, of course, be different if Greater Bombay forms part of Maharashtra.

यह कहा है कि यदि संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र होगा और उसका कॅपिटल यदि बम्बई बन गया तो नागपुर का महत्व चला जायेगा। मैं इस हाउस के सामने कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो कमिशन ने नागपुर का महत्व दिखाया है तो उसने ग्वालीयर और इन्दौर का महत्व क्यों नहीं दिखाया है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जनता के वास्तु कॅपिटल रहती है, कॅपिटल के वास्तु कोई जनता नहीं रहती है। इसके साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि कमिशन के सामने, इस रिपोर्ट के लिखने के वक्त नागपुर में जो महाराष्ट्र विदर्भ और मराठवाड़ा के नेताओं ने जो एक एग्जीमेंट किया था और जिस चीज को उन्होंने अपनी रिपोर्ट में लिखा है, नागपुर के महत्व को किसी भी तरह से कम न किया जायेगा, इतनी साफ बात एग्जीमेंट में लिखी हुई होने के बाद अब यह कहा जाना कि यदि एक महाराष्ट्र बन गया तो नागपुर का महत्व कम हो जाएगा, ठीक नहीं है। मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि मैं बिल्कुल ही नागपुर के महत्व को कम होने देने के पक्ष में नहीं हूँ।

एक और बात भी बड़ अजीब ढंग से लिखी गई है। वह कहते हैं—

Communalism, it has been stated, may also be introduced into the political life of Vidarbha if it joins Maharashtra.

मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि यह इस तरह से लिख कर कमिशन ने क्या पाया। इस तरह से लिखना महाराष्ट्रीय जनता का अपमान है। इस रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है कि यदि

विदर्भ की जनता महाराष्ट्र के साथ जोड़ी गई तो महाराष्ट्र में जो जातिवाद है वह विदर्भ में भी आ जायेगा। इस किस्म का डर कमिशन को दिखाई देता है। मैं साफ तौर से यह कह देना चाहता हूँ कि आज महाराष्ट्र में जातिवाद नहीं है, आज विदर्भ में जातिवाद नहीं है। लेकिन अगर कोई पिछड़े हुए लोग ऊपर उठने की कोशिश करते हैं तो उसको जातिवाद कहा जाता है। आज जो पिछड़े हुए लोग हैं जो एजुकेशनली, सांशली या पॉलिटिकली ऊपर उठने के स्वाहिशमन्द हैं और कोशिश करते हैं तो इसको जातिवाद का नाम दे दिया जाता है। आपको तो मालूम ही है कि स्वयं भारत सरकार हरिजन समाज के विद्यार्थियों को कालिज में शिक्षा देना चाहती है, शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स के विद्यार्थियों को स्कूलों में शिक्षा देना चाहती है, जो नागा जाति हैं और जो पिछड़ी हुई हैं उसको ऊपर उठाना चाहती है, उनके बच्चों को शिक्षित बनाना चाहती है और इन कामों और दूसरे कामों के लिए भारत सरकार डेढ़ करोड़ रुपया भी स्कालरशिप इत्यादि के रूप में विद्यार्थियों को दे रही है तो आप ही बताइये कि क्या यह जातिवाद है। यदि कोई ऊपर उठने की कोशिश करता है तो क्या यह हमारे लिए ठीक है कि हम इसको जातिवाद कहें। मैं तो बड़े अदब से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यदि महाराष्ट्र में इस ढंग का जातिवाद है, तो विदर्भ में भी इस ढंग का जातिवाद जरूर है मैं तो इसको जातिवाद नहीं मानता हूँ। ऐसा भी कहा गया कि

Land and tenancy laws in this area will have to be modelled on those of Bombay State.

यदि हम लोग महाराष्ट्र के साथ गये तो वहाँ का आज जो टर्नेसी एक्ट है वह अलग है और जो विदर्भ का टर्नेसी एक्ट है वह अलग है। हो सकता है कि जो क्रान्तिकारी कानून आज बम्बई में होंगे वही क्रान्तिकारी कानून विदर्भ के वास्तु लागू करने होंगे। इस किस्म का डर भी इसमें बताया गया है। मैं

[श्री जी० बी० खंडकर]

अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज बम्बई के अन्दर जो रैयतवारी सिस्टम है वही रैयतवारी सिस्टम विदर्भ के अन्दर ४० बरस से चालू है और आज जो टर्नेंसी एक्ट बम्बई में पास हुआ है वैसे ही टर्नेंसी एक्ट विदर्भ में भी पास हुआ है। आज यदि आप मध्य प्रदेश में मध्य भारत को शामिल करते हैं तो वहाँ का टर्नेंसी एक्ट क्या अलग नहीं है। आज जब कुछ प्रदेशों को मिलाकर एक प्रान्त आप बनायेंगे तो आपको एक ही कानून भी बनाना होगा। आज विदर्भ के अन्दर या मध्य प्रदेश के अन्दर हम हाते हुए भी विदर्भ के वास्ते, उसके चार जिलों के वास्ते एक अलग बरार लैंड रवेन्यू कोड मध्य प्रदेश सरकार ने पास कर दिया था। लेकिन धीरे धीरे मध्य प्रदेश के अन्दर भी यह स्थिति आई कि इसी बरार लैंड रवेन्यू कोड के आधार पर एक ऐसा ही कोड वहाँ बनाया जाये और बनाया गया है जो कि सारे मध्य प्रदेश में लागू किया गया है। तो यह जो कानूनों के बारे में डर की बात कही गई है यह मेरी समझ में कोई वाजिब नहीं है। यदि आप समाजवादी समाज व्यवस्था करना चाहते हैं तो आपको सब प्रान्तों में एक से कानून बनाने होंगे और क्रान्तिकारी बनाने होंगे। जो हमारी मांग थी वह यह थी कि सारी मराठी भाषी जनता एक साथ एक प्रान्त में होनी चाहिये जिस को कि संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र का नाम दिया गया था। इस मांग के होने के बावजूद आज आठ जिलों का एक छोटा सा प्रान्त बना दिया गया है जो फाइनेंशियली सैल्फ सपोर्टिंग नहीं रह सकेगा, यह हम लोग जो वहाँ रहते हैं, जानते हैं। साथ ही साथ यह भी कहा गया है कि बम्बई को एक द्विभाषी प्रान्त बना दिया जाए। स्टैंडर्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन कमिशन ने मराठी भाषा भाषी जनता की मांग को ठुकरा दिया है लेकिन जो कांग्रेस वकिंग कमेटी ने इसके बारे में कहा है और जो पर्याय निकाला है, मैंने उसका स्वागत किया है। आज मुझे इस बात से भी संतोष है कि मध्य प्रदेश

की विधान सभा में जिस की बैठक अभी हाल ही में हुई है इसी आशय का एक प्रस्ताव वहाँ पर पेश किया गया था जो इस प्रकार है :

A New State of Maharashtra comprising the Marathi speaking areas of the Bombay State excluding Greater Bombay, and the Muruthwada district of Hyderabad and the Marathi-speaking areas of Madhya Pradesh be formed.

यह प्रस्ताव मध्य प्रदेश असेम्बली के सामने रखा गया था और उस पर अलग अलग विचार प्रकट किए गए। मुझे संतोष है कि आखिर में वह प्रस्ताव प्रचंड बहुमत से पास हो गया प्रस्ताव में कहा गया है :

"Vidarbha, that is the Marathi-speaking area of the present Madhya Pradesh, should be invited to join the new Maharashtra State and the wishes of the people there should be ascertained."

3 P. M.

जहाँ तक विशज आफ दि पीपल का सम्बन्ध है, मैं बड़े अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि मध्य प्रदेश असेम्बली ने प्रचंड बहुमत से एक प्रस्ताव पास कर के प्रकट कर दिया है कि लोगों की इच्छा क्या है अर्थात् वहाँ का बहुमत संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र की फेवर में है। और विदर्भ के एम० पी० भी बहु संख्या में संयुक्त महाराष्ट्रवादी हैं ऐसी स्थिति में मेरी यह हर दम प्रार्थना रहेगी कि कोई ऐसी उम्दा व्यवस्था की जाय कि सब मराठी विभागों को एक साथ कर दिया जाय, सब गुजराती विभागों को एक साथ कर दिया जाय और सब तेलगु विभागों को भी एक साथ कर दिया जाय, जिससे वहाँ का एडमिनीस्ट्रेशन अच्छे से अच्छा हो सके। वकिंग कमेटी ने इस बारे में जो पर्याय निकाला है, वह जनता के सामने है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि कुछ जिलों का जो विदर्भ प्रान्त बनाने का सुझाव रखा गया है, वह किसी भी स्थिति में प्रगति नहीं कर सकेगा। गत कई वर्षों से हम मराठी भाषा

बोलने वाले तीन विभागों में विभाजित रहे हैं। आज उनकी सन्धि हो रही है—उन विभागों को एक साथ करने का पर्याय लाया गया है। मैं उस का स्वागत करता हूँ। इस निर्मित से तीन कॉपी लोग एक साथ हो जायेंगे और उनकी उन्नति होगी।

रिपोर्ट में यह भी कहा गया है कि यदि विदर्भ संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र में शामिल किया गया और बम्बई न किया गया, तो महाराष्ट्र नक्सान का प्रान्त रहेगा। बरार के कुछ लोगों ने यह डर भी प्रकट किया है कि फिर हमारा एकस्प्लायटेशन होगा। मैं एक बात साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ कि भले ही हम भूल रहे हैं, भले ही महाराष्ट्र ब्रुटि का प्रान्त रहे, लेकिन हमारी इच्छा एक साथ काम करने की है—हम आर्थ पेट रहेंगे, लेकिन हमारी इच्छा एक साथ रहने की है। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि मराठी भाषी जनता की यह मांग पूरी होगी।

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, before I start my speech I would like to say one word about something which came from your mouth...

Mulla Abdullabhai (Chanda): Sir, the previous speaker has spoken against Vidarbha and so I would like to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Afterwards.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: When Shri Gadgil was making his speech, Sir, you interposed that it was by a mistake that Madras was given to Tamil Nad. I know that you speak Tamil and therefore you would not have meant it seriously, but I would only like to say that people in position and power should be rather careful before they make such remarks. Such remarks do pain some people and are the cause of some misunderstanding.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is not the subject matter of this Report.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: Whatever you say becomes a subject matter of this discussion.

Now, I would like to tell this House that the members of the Madras State met a few days back to discuss the

recommendations of this Report and they had occasion to express their opinions. As far as Madras is concerned I shall have the honour to put forth my point of view before you here. As you know and as the House knows Madras is not affected in any major measure by this Report. The recommendations made at the meeting of the Tamil Nad M.P.s are these: (1) that southern taluqs in T.C. State recommended by the Report to be added to Madras may be accepted, (2) Peermede and Devikulam in T.C. State where majority are Tamils should also be added to Madras.....

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): No.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: (3) rest of the recommendations relating to Madras to say, and now I come to the fourth and the most important one. The Members who are here are not only Members representing the States from which they come but they represent the whole of India. So, they have advisedly said that safeguards to minorities should be provided as laid down in the Constitution. Whatever may be the division that we make there is no division which can be made by which all the people belonging to a particular language can be brought together. It is found in borders and even in places other than borders that there are people belonging to other languages and the majority may belong to a different language. So, if you are to preserve the unity of this country, and our hard earned freedom, we must have the safeguards provided. I am one of those who believe that to every man in India belongs India. We are free to settle wherever we like; we are free to set up any trade we like; we are free to do any work we like; we can claim every part of this great country as our own and serve it unto the end of our life. Therefore, it is very necessary that these safeguards which have been mentioned in this Report should be implemented. There may be still further safeguards which may occur to us at the time of amending the Constitution, and they all should be stressed. The feeling that we belong to this or that region is

[Shri T. S. A. Chettiar]

bound to be there. After all we have feelings of States, Districts and so on and we must have the feeling of language also. Beyond all that we must also have the feeling that we belong to a great country to which all the languages belong and to which all the States belong.

In the recommendation about Madras there has been only one matter about which there is quarrel and that is the matter of Devikulam and Peermede. This question has been a matter of quarrel between the people of Travancore-Cochin State and the people representing Madras State. This case has been put very clearly in this 'Analytical Summary and Comments' which has been issued by the Lok Sabha Secretariat. In a very few lines they have put this case very effectively. It says:

"In the Devikulam and Peermede taluqs, the Tamil-speaking population is 72 and 44 per cent. respectively, out of which 46 and 30 per cent. are a floating corps of labourers' [migrant from adjacent Tamil districts] leaving thus only 26 and 14 per cent. as the non-floating Tamil-speaking population."

I do not know wherefrom the authors of the Report have got that statistics. I will have occasion to examine them in a moment, but before doing so let me raise the other points which they have mentioned in their Report as to why Devikulam and Peermede should continue to be in Travancore-Cochin State. It goes on to say:

"It is contended on the other hand that the Tamil population in this area might 'have been originally migrant' and that it now constitutes a majority. Devikulam and Peermede taluqs are hilly areas with several natural advantages, and being the sources of forests and some rivers vital to the economy of Travancore-Cochin, the State cannot be deprived of this area and even the other claimants recognise this fact and are

prepared to exclude certain portions of these taluqs from being included in Madras. But linguistic principle should not be considered 'the sole criterion particularly in areas where the majority of a language group is only marginal'. Moreover these two taluqs form 12 per cent. of the whole area of Travancore-Cochin and being thinly populated, may be utilised for relieving the congestion, in other areas of Travancore-Cochin, which is a very thickly populated State."

Now, let us consider the points which have been raised by the authors of this Report. Let me first come to the population problem. I am absolutely unable to understand how these figures of population have been given. Now, I am going to read from speech which has been compiled with proper reference to statistics and census figures. I am reading from the speech of the Minister for Education and Finance who piloted the motion on the Report of the SRC in the Madras Assembly. This conclusively proves that what has been said in the Report with regard to population figures is wrong and is not based on facts. The actual figures are given in this speech. There it is said:

"There are, however, sufficient indications to show clearly that this has been all along a predominantly Tamil area."

The following figures taken from the Census Reports for 1931, 1941 and 1951 are relevant in this connection. The Malayalee population of Devikulam in 1931 was only 3,894 while the Tamilian population there was 51,730. In 1941, the Tamilian population became 53,394 while the Malayalee population became 8,282. In 1951 census, the Tamilian population is 62,130 and the Malayalee population has become 16,050. In Peermede, the Tamilian population in 1931, 1941 and 1951 is 24,776, 31,911 and 42,570 respectively, whereas the Malayalee population for the corresponding census period is 19,284, 31,784 and 50,440. I do not

want to add to what the Minister there has said. He further went on to say:

"I will take up the figures for the Devikulam taluk first. I do not think the Malayalee population could have increased from 3,894 in 1931 to 8,282 in 1941, however fertile certain sections of the population may be."

This increase in population cannot be merely due to natural causes. He further says:

"Again, the strength of the Malayalee population has nearly doubled in 1951 to what it was in 1941. Therefore, there has been an infiltration of Malayalee population into an area which has been Tamilian throughout".

I know that efforts have been made from time to time by Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai and his successors to see that people from Malabar and other areas migrate there and settle there, but unfortunately those people could not settle there and went back, with the result that the population what it is today.

Let me quote further:

"Whether the Tamilian population whose strength has been steadily increasing on the Malayalee population whose strength has been suddenly jumping up is the floating population is the question that will have to be considered. All these have been ignored completely and the Commission say that it has been represented before them that most of the Tamilian population was floating population".

I say that this representation is a gross misrepresentation of facts.

Shri Punnoose: Does the hon. Member know that this was an area which was kept away from the intrusion of the peasantry for the development of plantations and that therefore there was no chance of the Malayalee population getting into those areas and that

the Tamilian workers came from Madura and Tirunelveli districts of the Madras State?

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: I speak from the Census Reports and the Census Reports speak their own tale. I do not want to say anything more about it.

Now, I come to the question of water resources. An argument has been advanced that these two taluks contain some of the water resources of the people of Travancore-Cochin. Is it new that in this great country, the water resources may be in one place and the irrigation projects which are fed on those waters may be in another place? In fact, what Malabar and Travancore-Cochin need is dewatering. It is no argument that because they have got those water resources, those areas must be added on to that State.

The third reason that has been advanced for the retention of these two taluks in the Travancore-Cochin State is this: it is a new economic theory! It is said that if these two taluks are taken away, the income of the Travancore-Cochin State will be less. Here, I quote from the Report of the Commission where they say:

".....whenever new States have been created or when accommodation is needed for any other reason, to grant ways and means advances to the States which may require them in order to help them to tide over their difficulties."

Again, they have said:

"Pending a comprehensive review, we would suggest that grants-in-aid on revenue or capital accounts as well as long-term loans should be available to the new States as nearly as may be on the existing basis."

So, for economic reasons, if they want such an assistance, it is for the Government of India to come to their assistance. We will all certainly be here to fight for them to get that assistance. But that is no reason to say that Peermede and Devikulam can

[Shri T. S. A. Chettiar]

and should go to the Travancore-Cochin State. The Commission have also said that the wishes of the people must be ascertained in such cases. The wishes of the people have already been ascertained in these cases. During the last general election, what happened? A candidate belonging to the Travancore-Cochin State Congress was set up in those taluks, and even the President of the Tamilnad Congress went there to do propoganda for that person. But the Travancore Tamilnad Congress set up two candidates and they not only won with a thumping majority but—if my information is correct—the other candidates lost their deposits also. So, the wishes of the people have been ascertained. There is nothing more to be done and it has been completely proved.

Now, I do not want to attach any motives to the States Reorganisation Commission, but this much I must say: they were not in possession of correct facts when they made this recommendation.

I come now to the next question. Arguments were put forward after the speech of Shri C. C. Shah ended that those Members living in Bombay only should speak about Bombay. I have got a right to touch upon other aspects of the States Reorganisation Commission's report though not belonging to Bombay. As a Member of this Parliament, I have that right and in this Parliament I hope every Member has a right to touch on all aspects of this Report irrespective of the party or community to which he may belong. Now, I would like to touch upon one important aspect of the Report. The SRC Report has laid proper emphasis upon the primacy of India, that is, we must make arrangements for the continuous flow of feeling that we are all Indians first. In this matter, language plays a very important role. Religion and language, if not used properly, may prove to be the dividing line between State and State. We want a national language undoubtedly through which we can converse, through which

we can read, through which we can write and carry on the administration. But there is one other aspect which I would like to place before you. A national language, when it grows in its natural formation, helps the nation, but when a national language is forced upon the people and is speeded up to an extent that it cannot be followed by the people, then it may create certain feelings which go against nationalism. English, during the past 150 years, has had a growth, an easy growth. It might have had a slow growth and it is true that it paved the way for the unity of India in a large measure. We were able to understand each other, we were able to converse with each other and convey our ideas to each other and were able to fight with the British Government because English was known to us and it made us understand each other throughout the country. We could therefore understand each other and make common programmes for each other. But that really took 150 years. Now, we are emphasising on a national language. Our Prime Minister has also said that all the languages of India are our national languages. Now, there are attempts made to give an additional emphasis to the official language,—more than it can grow. In South India, for example, the present generation cannot learn Hindi as they have learnt English today. If we say that in the course of the next five or ten years, everybody must learn Hindi or at least a large number or younger people must learn Hindi, it is bound to create a sense of frustration, and that in its course is bound to create an element of disunity in the country. So, I would like to say this: let us not hurry up in the matter of Hindi. Let us by all means make it an official language, but you can never force a language on a people. We know the result of elections in East Bengal. What happened? The great reverse of the Muslim League in East Bengal was mainly due to the fact that they failed to recognise the Bengali language. Of course, today we have not committed such a mistake. But if we try to force the pace of Hindi,

It may create a dividing line between us rather than uniting influence. I would like to recall to you what a prominent politician in Madras said when it was announced that Hindi has been made the official language of India and that the correspondence between the Centre and the States will be in Hindi. He said that unemployment for the northerners—the Hindi-speaking people—has been solved. He said so because all the official records and correspondence will have to be translated into English and so they will send people from the north to the southern States to carry out the translation work. That will mean unemployment to a large number of people in South India because of their replacement by the Hindi-speaking people. That is not the idea which we would like to give to our people. The Hindi which is being contemplated in article 351 of the Constitution is not the Hindi which is spoken today. The Hindi spoken today is the regional language. Article 351 says:

"It shall be the duty of the Union to promote the spread of the Hindi language, to develop it so that it may serve as a medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India and the secure its enrichment by assimilating without interfering with its genius, the forms, style and expressions used in Hindustani and in the other languages of India specified in the Eighth Schedule, and by drawing wherever necessary or desirable, for its vocabulary, primarily on Sanskrit and secondarily on other languages."

Today Hindi continues to be a regional language. It may become the national language in many years; it must assimilate from the other languages in twenty or thirty years; but today it does not have that assimilation which is necessary. I would like that a large number of Tamil, Telugu and Kannada words come into the Hindi language. I would like that the Hindi spoken here should be such that even if a man does not know

Hindi, he will be able to understand a few words. That will be the official language. The official language of India will certainly contain elements of culture from all the languages. That process, Sir, cannot be hurried up. I shall make this request to the men in power. Please let us accept the objective; but, let us not hurry up. Let us accept that Hindi will be the official language; but let us have the courage and the strength to give time for it to grow. I think it will take at least a generation for the people in my part of the country to catch up with the people who are in the Hindi-speaking areas. Unity must come from both sides. Even for shaking hands, two hands are necessary. Similarly, real unity will come only if a large number of people in the North learn some of our South Indian languages. Our President Dr. Rajendra Prasad when he addressed the Kasnbar festival in Madras made one excellent suggestion. He said that it was necessary to make a provision in North Indian schools and colleges for the study of a South Indian language.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up. I will give him five more minutes.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: All other speakers have been given more than one hour. I want at least 15 minutes more. Precedents are there.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may kindly resume his seat. He has spoken at length so far as the particular items of difference between Madras and Travancore-Cochin are concerned. He has also spoken on the general matters. He has taken half an hour.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: You will be invidious if you cut short my time, when you have given more than one hour to other speakers. I am speaking on very important matters.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member can go on; let us see.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: In all the South Indian States, Mysore, Travancore-Cochin, Madras and Andhra, we have made the study of Hindi

[Shri T. S. A. Chettiar] compulsory in the secondary schools. But not even in one State provision has been made for the study of any South Indian language in schools and colleges in North India. I say that unity can come only by one approach from two people and not from one. Study of any language cannot be enforced simply because it is necessary to get a job in the Government. To inspire people it must come out of affection. North India must make up its mind to study some South Indian language. Mere speeches or declarations in this House or elsewhere that we also want South Indian culture to grow will not do. Our respect for South Indian culture must be shown by the way in which we make a provision for the study of South Indian languages in the North Indian schools and colleges. These are the ways in which unity of India can be brought about.

Before I conclude, I would like to refer to a few other matters contained in the recommendations of the S.R.C. Report about States other than Madras. I come to Andhra. They are a good and frank people and surely they deserve better. I accept there will not be two States—Telengana and Andhra—but there will be only one Visalandhra. It will be to the credit of all the Andhras. Coming to U.P. this is a matter to which much attention has not been paid. It is such a huge State and the S.R.C. has not touched it at all. I do not see why. Mr. K. M. Panikkar has put in a note of dissent and I say that all the reasons given by Mr. Panikkar must be accepted by this House. They say that there are 52 districts in U.P. One of the Central Ministers told me that some Ministers of U.P. do not know even the names of all the districts. It is just like the case of a man having too many children whose names he does not know.

An Hon. Member: Grand-children also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member seems to know the names of all the school children there!

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: It has been said that to have a large state is economical but it is said in page 247 of the S.R.C. Report that there are several States in India where the percentage of expenditure on administrative services is less than in the U.P. The percentage is 24.6 in U.P. whereas it is 13.1 in Mysore, and 11.4 in Travancore-Cochin. Another reason has been given:

“The test of economical and efficient administration is obviously whether a State is or has been in a position to increase the expenditure on nation-building services. It does not appear that the Uttar Pradesh can claim any particular advantage or achievements in this matter.....The *per capita* expenditure on social services in Uttar Pradesh in 1950-51 was Rs. 2.4 against Rs. 3.1 for Assam, Rs. 3.3 for Madras.....”

I come to another important matter, namely, literacy. This is what Mr. Panikkar has said:

“Further, I find no evidence to justify the claim that the Uttar Pradesh Government because of the size of the State has been a particularly efficient one. Uttar Pradesh has the lowest literacy of all the Part A States in India including Orissa.....”

The percentage of literacy in U.P. is only 10.8 as against 21.8 in Madras etc. For all these reasons, I say in the interests of the people of that State such a huge set-up is not conducive to efficiency. I would like to state that the views expressed by Mr. Panikkar must be accepted in this matter.

I have only one more point to make. Bombay is a city of national importance; it is not merely of capital importance. There are other capitals of other States which are important only because they are capitals. But Bombay and Calcutta are of national importance. Therefore, Bombay is certainly entitled to a very careful consideration of this House. Some people have said, “I have a right to speak about Bombay, because I have lived

in Bombay." I have not lived in Bombay for any length of time, but as a Member of this House who is interested in this country, I have a right to speak on Bombay. Mr. Gadgil made a very good speech, but at the end the idea I had was, "Don't make Bombay a separate State; if you do it we will make such a row as will make life impossible for you. You will see what happens to the Gujaratis and Marwadis in the various parts of Saurashtra," and so on. This is not the way to support the claim that Bombay should be given to Maharashtra. I do not know how many of you know that out of the 30 lakhs of people in the Bombay city, 4½ lakhs are South Indians. So, Bombay is not a place which can be one linguistic unit alone.

Shri Punnoose: What about Madras? There are plenty of Andhras, Malayalees there.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: I include you. It is the popular expression Madrassi, which includes all South Indians.

I think that if they are not able to agree to the solution recommended by this Commission, the solution of the Working Committee that Bombay should become a separate State may be accepted. There are good grounds for that proposal and I would like to add my voice in its support. I do not want to take more of the time of the House. I would like only to add this. In matters like this we can never come to a conclusion which is satisfactory to every one. In any conclusion, there will be some people who will accept and some will reject it. By and large, we will have to determine what is in the best interests of the country and what are the best wishes of the people. In doing so, we are in duty bound to give all safeguards, as I said in the beginning, to all minorities wherever they may be, about their safe existence so that they may not be harassed. District is not the unit that I would like to be taken. There may be areas, there may be villages with a large population speaking a certain language and the

district may have a different language. In such places, the villages may be considered as the unit and the demarcation made accordingly.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up other business. Before I proceed to that, I would like to correct an impression that has gone round by my statement when Shri Gadgil was speaking here. Shri Gadgil was referring and giving points as to why Bombay ought not to be kept as a separate State. When the suggestion was made, he referred to Madras City. I only wanted to say just by way of interruption. It is not as if it forms part of the S. R. C. report and no contention was raised. There is no fear at all that it will go back or that it will be divided. There is no such question. I just intervened to say, some people might say that the case of Madras is not clear. That is all. Not that I wanted to create any trouble. It is only a private interruption just for the purpose of removing the tension that was going on. Nothing more. No hon. Members from Madras need be under the impression that I am creating something that was not there. Therefore, that kind of argument on the remark that I made casually to remove the tension in the House need not be taken seriously and then set into a fear that there is a possibility of such a decision.

Shri Achuthan (Cranganur): We did not take it like that.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): Your remark was in jest and not in earnest.

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): May I make a submission, Sir? I would only invite your recollection to the definite statement that you made when you participated in the debate on the Andhra Bill that Madras must not be a part of Tamil Nad.

Shri Kamath: As a Member; not as Chairman.