

PETITIONS ON REPORT OF
STATES REORGANISATION COM-
MISSION

Shri Sivamurthi Swami (Kushta-
gi): I beg to present a petition relat-
ing to the Report of the States Re-
organisation Commission.

Shri Madhao Reddi (Adilabad): I
beg to present six petitions relating to
the Report of the States Reorganisa-
tion Commission.

MOTION RE REPORT OF STATE
REORGANISATION COMMISSION

Mr. Speaker: The House will now
proceed with the further considera-
tion of the following motion:

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

Shri M. A. Ayyangar (Tirupati): I
take this opportunity to remember
and pay our deep debt of gratitude to
the Father of the Nation, Mahatma
Ghandhi without whom we would not
have won freedom for this country.
The first hurdle was over. The
Britishers were ruling this country
not directly, except at the top. There
were about 360 districts in undivided
India, and each district had not more
than ten Europeans, all of them put
together; that is, the District Collector,
the Sub-Divisional Magistrates, the
District Educational Officer, the
Superintendent of Police and so on.
In all, there were 3,600 Europeans on
the whole civil side, ranging from
nineteen or twenty-one years of age
up to sixty years, ruling this country
of 36,00 lakhs of Indians, at the rate
of one European for a lakh of our
population. It was a disgusting affair.
We were putting up with this.
Mahatma Gandhi led us. He started
the non-violent non-co-operation
movement when he was fifty and won
freedom for this country when he
was about seventy-five or so. He
never dreamt that during his lifetime
he would see that freedom of the
country achieved. He lost his wife
when he was in jail. Shri Rama-
chandra for whom we have built

temples and temples, killed Ravanesh-
wara and got back Sita and then ruled
for 10,000 long years over this land.
But this man of peace—Gandhiji—who
suffered but who did not inflict suffer-
ing on the enemy, ennobled us, and
brought a new era of life in
human existence. When human
relations were decided by war,
he started a new era of suffer-
ing instead of inflicting suffering on
others. This is a unique experiment in
world's history. We are too near it to
appreciate its full significance. It is
a miracle that has been achieved by
us through him. Lord Buddha preach-
ed non-violence. Jesus Christ follow-
ed him. Asoka adopted non-violence
after he killed thousands in Kalinga.
But it was left to Gandhiji in this age
to fight without arms and win free-
dom by fighting one of the mightiest
empires in the world:

*Harischandro Nalo Raja Purukutsah
Pururuvah.*

*Sagarah Karthaviryascha, Shadaite
Chakravarthinah.*

There were also emperors in our
country. The emperors held sway not
over one single plot but over two or
three countries or two or three States
together. But we won freedom from
one of the mightiest empires of the
world over which the sun is supposed
to have never set on account of fear
or on account of love. Between these
two bloody wars, we defeated the
might of Germany—between 1914-
1918 and 1939-1945—with all the wea-
pons of destruction that science has
discovered so far, in the air, on the
land and over the sea. England
defeated Germany. Gandhiji defeated
England. Gandhiji defeated both
England and Germany, together. In
this bloodless war of ours both the
vanquished and the victors have been
ennobled. The other day, for Queen
Elizabeth's Coronation, Panditji was
invited. In my own humble way, I
went there as an appendage to our
Speaker. All of us were invited.
Somebody there put the question:
“How can we come when we belong
to a Republic?” We said that in our

Republic we never killed anybody, but we suffered, and therefore we are in the best of terms with everybody. This is the message we were able to give, to the rest of the world—the message of peace. The British Raj was removed from this country without the atom or the hydrogen bomb being used and they left neither on account of love nor on account of fear, and thus we have endeared ourselves to others.

Now, when we have won our freedom, it has made it necessary for various countries in the world to seek our hand of fellowship. We are stretching out our hand of fellowship, not by helping them with atom or hydrogen bombs, but with our five fingers—the Panch Shila. Look at the miracle that has been won. Formally it was left to persons to carry on the message of Buddha to the north, south, east and west of India. Today, the prince of peace is carrying that message—the message of Panch Shila—for deciding the destinies of whole nations. It is our good fortune to be guided by that prince of peace.

Freedom was won. We must also pay our humble tribute to Sardar Patel, who, following the winning of freedom, got real freedom for the people throughout India. The British divided India into British India and the native States. It was those in British India who won freedom first. Though we were not British, we were not born in the British soil, we all belonged to British India and some of us belonged to the native States. With the achievement of freedom for British India, Sardar Patel worked to achieve freedom for the 565 odd native States. When we in British India were fighting for freedom, the people in the native States were afraid of opening their lips, because the Rajas and Maharajas shut us out and were inviting the British with garlands. But the urge for freedom spread and the people of the native States joined the fight and another miracle was achieved in less than four months since August, 1947. All the princely States were

liquidated and the people in those States have been made the Rajas and Maharajas. Today, who is the king of this country? There cannot be a Prime Minister without a king. Here is the Prime Minister whom we all love, but who is the king of this land? All our adults are our kings; their wives and children are our queens and princes and princesses.

Let us take the next step. The next step naturally follows. Reorganisation is necessary. India was split up into so many conglomerate groups. I can only speak of Madras. When freedom was won and reforms were introduced, it was all a babel in the Madras Legislative Assembly. There were the Malayalam-speaking people; the Kannada-speaking people; the Telugu-speaking people and the Tamilians. Though all of them belonged to the same Dravidian stock, not one of them could understand the other, and all of them had to converse in a common language. Today, after we have won freedom, we have to distribute this freedom to every one. Even there, we have achieved something which other countries have not achieved. We have not, as other countries have done, appropriated everything to one party. It is the Congress Party that won freedom of this country with the aid of the people of course, but it was not left to the Congress Party to say that "we alone will enjoy the fruits thereof". We have distributed them to everybody. When our leader stood for election, he was opposed by Brahmachari who carried Ganga water on his head. So, every man and woman in this country, merely by the age of 21 years has become the real ruler of this country. Therefore, when a resolution was sought to be introduced in this House that some qualifications ought to be imposed either by way of education or otherwise, it was stoutly opposed by this House. Therefore, qualification was also removed so as to enable all sections of the people to take part in the governance of this country in their own tongue. Now, should we not re-

[Shri M. A. Ayyangar]

organise this country on that basis? It is wrong for any person to say that this reorganisation is a wrong step. I think that if one says so, he must go back or at any rate, he cannot rewrite history. This reorganisation of course may lead to fissiparous tendencies, but we cannot be eternally afraid of this. Yet; it has got another phase. This reorganisation on a linguistic basis brings all those people who speak one language, together. To say that all of us can live together and speak different languages, that we have got a Centre to look after things, that you can divide a particular State and separate one person from the other, though they speak the same language, is not proper. Is it for this that Poti Sriramulu died? For forty years and more the cry was there and since his death, the Andhra State was formed in South India. But you remember the Andhras were the rulers in Pataliputra and from there they were gradually shunted back to South India. Today they have come to their own. But they have come back to serve and not to rule. It is in that spirit that we want to reorganise, to serve the rest of the country. Now, this hotchpotch has to be removed. It has been said that the present position of the Maharashtrians, the Telugus and the Kannadigas was the result of the imposition of foreign rule. The Maharashtrians want a Vrihat Maharashtra. The Kannadigas want their status to grow from prosperity to prosperity. That is exactly what the Andhras wanted in South India. The Andhras led the fight and they got the State with the help of the Prime Minister. Now, the Kannada-speaking people are distributed among five States: some in Bombay, some in Hyderabad, some in Mysore and some in Coorg, and some also in Madras. Look at Coorg. It has a population of one lakh only. There is a Chief Minister for Coorg. There is a Chief Minister, Shri Sampurnanand, who is the Chief Minister of a State which has six crores of population. Therefore, small and big—chota and bada—States—all of them want

to be independent! We do not ask the Chief Minister of Coorg whether he would agree to the will of the people. The Chief Minister himself says, the will ought to be this. You will surely remember, Sir, with what great difficulty the Hyderabad question was solved. Who fought for Hyderabad? Those outside fought for Hyderabad; those inside could not fight. Today the Telengana people say, "we are different and we want a separate State." At that time they fled to Bezwada; the Maharashtrians fled to Bombay and the Kannada people fled to Mysore. Today these people say that "instead of the Nawab ruling, we want to rule." That is exactly what is going on in Telengana. What else is the agitation? Please look at the territory. In the Report, they have taken into consideration the physical and geographical features. They say, the Maharashtrian portion of Hyderabad is absolutely different from the Telengana portion. Do they not dress alike? Do they not talk alike? You cannot distinguish one from the other, except that in the Telengana area there is a greater admixture of Urdu. It is not *pucca* Telugu, but 65 per cent. Telugu and the rest Urdu. Today, after freedom was won, the movement for Telangana State has started. When did this movement start? It was only after independence. Before that period, was there any difference between the people of Telangana and the people of Andhra? I presided over a number of meetings at that time; the people fled away from Hyderabad to Madras. I addressed meetings. I was a member of the Executive Council of the Congress Party; at that time Sardar Patel also was there and our great leader was presiding over the deliberations. We asked, "when are you going to take steps regarding Hyderabad?". It is not as if Telangana could be left to itself. It is not even in the interests of Hyderabad. Hyderabad city was the capital of 16 districts. Today, if Telangana alone is there, it will be the capital of 8 districts. That means, you will have to cut off all the Mahals by 50 per cent. What do we

say now? We say, we read Telangana literature. Telangana literature is our literature. Warrangal is one of the important cities in Telangana and it was there that Bhagvad was written and we read it. On the other side, they read Mahabharata and Ramayana. The argument advanced for keeping Telangana separate is this. They say, "We are very low in education; therefore, if we join those people who are more educated, we may not get into the services." If a person gets cipher marks in the examination, can you put him in the I.A.S.? How are you to be educated? It is only along with the others. We are educated and we are interested in our brothers also; we want to see that the whole family is educated. Another argument they advance is this. In the Circars, people are so strong and educated that in politics they will over-ride us. We have the Circars and the ceded districts. Both of them are prepared to take Hyderabad as capital. Enjoy it as much as you like. The Telangana people are the head; we are only the limbs. If guarantee is necessary, I can give this assurance. What does the word "ceded" mean? The districts were ceded by the Nizam of Hyderabad to the Circars. Circars were originally British districts. There were two portions—Circar portion consisting of 5 districts and the ceded districts including Chittoor—which were under the Nizam. Andhra was so divided; the Britishers took a portion and the rest was taken by the Nizam. The Nizam ceded 5 districts; we only want the other districts also to be ceded. Is it wrong? Rather, we want to cede ourselves to them. So, history also is in favour of us. The ceded districts form part of Hyderabad. You say, the people of Hyderabad are not up to the level of the Circars. Rayalaseema also is backward. Both of us are backward and if we join together, we will pull down the advanced districts of the Circars. I can give this guarantee that you and I will both be depressed and depress the Circars also permanently. Are the Telangana people satisfied? So far as Rayalaseema is concerned, it is backward in water and we have

famine conditions almost every second year. We go with outstretched hands for having gruel centres. Even for that, my friend Mr. Nijalingappa says he will stop even that much of water; I will come to that later on. If Telangana is backward, you have got another friend in Rayalaseema which is also backward. The two together will drown the Circars. So far as backwardness is concerned, it is common. I can assure you that we were also a friend of the ceded districts. We entered into a pact called the Sri Baug Pact and we said that the High Court or capital must be in Rayalaseema; we must have a guarantee then 60 per cent of the posts in the offices should be given to our people, and so on and so forth. Now we find that no such guarantee is necessary. We are equal to the task. Therefore, we expect that Telangana also will come up. Telangana's argument is, "we are now a viable State, and if we join the deficit State, Andhra, we will also become deficit." I want to refute this argument. Where does the money come from? If a person is diseased, on account of the disease, water enters into the body and the body gets fat. That is a diseased body. Rs. 5 crores or Rs. 6 crores of Telangana come from drinking. You want to continue to drown those poor fellows in drink and then say, "I have grown fat in Hyderabad." That is absolutely wrong. Hyderabad was a feudal State; there were sub-feudal tenures and there were the zamindars under them. We have abolished the zamindari system in Andhra and the amount of land tax is not more than Rs 10 per acre. In Hyderabad it is Rs. 18.

An Hon. Member: It is Rs. 24.

Shri M. A. Ayyangar: We abolished the zamindari system and reduced the tax to Rs. 10. A few rich men in Hyderabad want to exploit the people by pouring not alcohol, but toddy into their mouths. The poorer people are the tillers of the soil and at their expense, the rich men are growing fatter. They collect Rs. 18 or Rs. 24 and say, "No, no; Telangana must be

[Shri M. A. Ayyangar]

a separate State only." They say, that Nawab must go and Reddi must come. I only ask them, why should we disintegrate? Why should we be a party to disintegration? Is it for the perpetuation of the feudal landlordism for ever in that State? It is wrong. I ask hon. Members who have spoken in this House over this matter, what is the difference between the Telangana people and ourselves? Is the language different? Are the customs and manners different? Are they, in order to satisfy some of our people in the North, going to say, "We are going to have a university for Urdu"? I am also for the development of Hindi. I am going to preside over a conference here tonight. I am also a Member of the Hindi Commission. Certainly, I am cent. per cent. for Hindi being the official language of the Union, so that gradually it may become the national language for the whole of India. What is this argument that this can be converted into a Hindi University. Who stands against it? I am quite willing. It is not as if every man there knows Hindi. If it is so, it is easier. They are so educationally backward. I assure them, if they know Hindi and Urdu well, within 10 or 5 years English will disappear and they will have an advantage over the people of South India, because they know Hindi and Urdu.

From the financial point of view, it is an absolutely deficit State. Introduce prohibition which we have accepted or will accept on an all-India basis. Reduce the land tax from Rs. 24 and Rs. 18 to the normal level. I assure you, it will be a useless State and it will begin to borrow.

The authors of this report have said that the granary of South India is the Krishna-Godavari valley. If you only go to those places which were occupied by my communist friends, Nalagonda—I am not referring to them—I only say that when persons want to hide themselves during wartime or otherwise, they go to a place which is not near any sea coast or railway station, which is a hill or jungle and live little better than the man there

or the wolves and tigers. Tour that territory from end to end. I have travelled the whole of Hyderabad. I came and reported to our hon. Minister of Railways and requested him to open up a railway there, for Heaven's sake. They do not produce anything except castor oil: not for digesting but for purging. They have no food to eat. The report says:

"The demographic features are also so different that a casual observer proceeding from Aurangabad to Warangal may see the differences between the people not merely in their language, but also in their clothing, special customs, manners, etc. The geopolitical argument and the consequent claim to unity will, therefore, be seen to have no substance."

Telangana State has no foodgrains. They have to be supplied from the Circars. After having won freedom, to satisfy a few people, are we to allow a separate Telangana? If Visal Andhra is formed, you cannot have two Chief Ministers. There will be only one. You cannot have all the Ministers. To pamper a few persons who are holding certain interests, you want to keep the large population in a pit. What is this argument? So far as finance is concerned, the State is useless. We must introduce prohibition there. We must reduce land revenue. No human being can tolerate this, no civilised Government can tolerate this cancer in the heart of India. If the excise revenue goes and if the land revenue is reduced, it will sink into poverty. Even foodgrains are not grown there; the big brother in the Circars has to help. If the elder brother says, I have fought for you, I have released you from the ancient feudal system, got all the three of you divided, come back, one man says, no, no, I will stand by myself now that we are separated. Live in a separate house and maintain yourself. I know what will happen. You cannot maintain yourself for 5 years. The S.R.C. report allows five years. For what? In the meanwhile you break your heads. Nothing more than that.

Now, what is the opinion? Why should you care for the opinion there? Today, the opinion of the legislature is clear and they have unequivocally passed a resolution. It may be said that the Karnatakas and Marathi-speaking people have also joined in this. Even if we leave them alone, the majority are in favour. Are we to go to the polls again on this issue? Some people will stand for Telangana. The ordinary people will be terribly afraid. There is a propaganda going on that they will be swamped by the Circars. I say, there is no question of swamping. Some Members have raised the objection that U.P. is big and so, it should be cut up. If some one is a little fat, would you try to cut him with a knife? There is no harm. If the U.P. is too big, one day they will say, we are too big, so let us divide. Bigger Germany wanted to have a population of 9 crores. That was a unitary State: not a federal state. Visal Andhra will be next biggest State, or as big as some other States, if not equal to the U.P. That would add to our pull at the Centre. Do these *chota* States, Part C States have any pull?

An. Hon. Member: What about Kerala?

Shri M. A. Ayyangar: Unless it is inevitable, why do you divide Telangana from the Andhras? If necessary, we will also call ourselves Telangana. Let us all have Telangana. From any point of view, there is no justification. It must be only cutting Hyderabad to three pieces for the purpose of not allowing water to mix up with water, not for the purpose of stagnating somewhere. That would be the case of Telangana. From coast to coast, it is the Circars. They are prepared to share that with Telangana as they are sharing it with the ceded districts people. If Telangana wants a balancing force, we will give it. In case there is any pressure, let them be certain that we, who are similarly situated, will not allow the Circars to ride roughshod over us. If we give Hyderabad as capital, their capital is our capital. It is not as if we are asking them to give us anything. The

tall is not wagging the head. The reverse is the case. We have given the capital. It is not necessary to labour this position.

When Panditji went there, they spent Rs. 30,000 or 40,000. When people from other countries who have not made any sacrifice, go, crores of rupees are spent. If one or two individuals spend, it is only an investment. Where do they get all the money from? There are persons who fought against Hyderabad joining with the rest of India. There was the Razakar movement. They wanted to make a second Pakistan in Hyderabad. They were defeated. They handed over all their weapons to the communists. That trouble is over. I do not say the communists; they are good; they have come here; they were never there. Today you will see the hidden hand of those persons. They do not want Hyderabad to be divided. They did not want to join the Indian Union. Today they are putting this third hurdle. They are behind the scene. From village to village they are carrying on propaganda saying, we are your friends, Visal Andhra will create trouble for you. Do not create a third Pakistan here, because I am afraid it will be a danger spot in India. It ought not to be left to them. Who are they? Did they want freedom? Gandhiji was there; Sardar Patel was there. Here is our Panditji. It is left to Pandit G. B. Pant to reorganise the States. We got freedom; we got the princely states removed. Today, we are reorganising the States. Reorganise on a linguistic basis, without which it will be difficult to have peace in this country.

Yesterday, when Shri Gadgil was speaking, I went a little out of the way. He said that this matter will be decided in the streets of Bombay. I am a man of peace. This will never be decided in the streets of Bombay. Here is our friend, Pandit G. B. Pant in whom we all have confidence. He, along with the Prime Minister will decide this. Telangana is naturally a part of Andhra. Just as water that flows from Hyderabad flows into the

[Shri M. A. Ayyangar]

sea, let us join it with the Circars and the ceded districts.

Just one word about Bellary. I am not prepared to enter into a controversy. All honour to my hon. friend Shri Nijalingappa and I wish he becomes the Chief Minister of the new Karnataka State. The point is this. I am not trying to get Bellary. In that district, there are 3 taluks already given. We want six taluks. For 160 years, this area had been part of Andhra. Even on linguistic considerations also, these 3 taluks should come to us. We admit that in the two taluks of Hospet and Siruguppa, there is a majority of Kannadigas, and naturally they should go to Karnataka. In the remaining three taluks, they are not absolutely Kannadigas or absolutely Telugus. I am fighting for a linguistic reorganisation of the States. That is the primary consideration. Of course, that is not the exclusive consideration; other considerations also have to be taken into account. We have two parts in Andhra. There are the Kolar gold fields. People may not have gone to Kolar, the gold producing country, in Mysore, where the Andhras live in a majority. I am not trying to walk away with this gold. You can have all the gold for yourself. If you want to give, it is your business. But all that we want is that you should give us some water. So far as the ceded districts are concerned, I ask any hon. Member here.....

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): Nobody prevents you from having water.

Mr. Speaker: Let there be no interruptions. Otherwise, the argument will go on for a longer time.

Shri M. A. Ayyangar: I am finishing in a few minutes.

Formerly, it is true that we did not claim that portion of Bellary where the Tungabhadra project is lying. We were satisfied with Alur and the other place. In that sense, this is no doubt a new claim that we are putting forward. So far as Bellary town and taluk are concerned, the Andhras have

been claiming them for a long time. So far as Hospet, and Siruguppa are concerned, they must naturally go to the Karnataka. I have talked to my friends here on this matter, and I have told them, let us have no quarrel with Karnataka over this matter. All that we want is that we should be able to get rid of famine from the ceded districts. It is for that purpose that the Tungabhadra project has been put up. It is not materially so important for the Karnataka State as for the Andhra State on this side. We have got a low level sluice there, and the waters through it are being used to irrigate about 70,000 to 90,000 acres of land in Bellary, and about 2½ lakhs of acres in the Andhra area. All that we want is that those portions of the project area, which lie up to a distance of two miles on either side should be handed over to us, for this reason, namely, that we want to develop power also along with irrigation.

It is true that a Board has been constituted for administering this project, by the Central Government. And on this Board are members nominated by the Mysore State as well as the Andhra State. But the Mysore engineer resigned or was transferred about three or four months ago. And even to this day, no engineer from Mysore has been appointed in his place. So far as Mysore is concerned, they have got surplus electric power and they are exporting it also. So they are not worried very much over the Tungabhadra project. It is surplus for them. But so far as I am concerned, it is life for me. Let us even assume that an engineer is appointed in his place today. Just the day after tomorrow, he may take leave and go away. Though the Centre is represented on the Board, yet we cannot insist on them anything. This is the trouble that we are having constantly.

Therefore, I am beseeching all hon. Members to consider this matter calmly. It is not as a matter of right that I am asking you. After all, we have to live as brothers. This Tungabhadra project was meant for us primarily.

We were not overflowing with milk and honey. We were starving all the time. And every second year, we had to stretch out our hands for gruel. Possibly, some of you may not know what gruel is. Gruel is nothing but some rice put into water. There is a greater quantity of water than rice in it. So, when we take gruel, we take three-fourths of water and only one-fourth of rice, with a pinch of salt. This has been our lot every second year. Even tomorrow, this may be our lot. Under these circumstances, am I asking too much from my Karnataka friends? I am one of them. I shall celebrate the formation of their State. When Sriramulu died, he died not merely for the cause of Andhra, but he gave a fillip to the Karnataka movement. I am very happy therefore that Karnataka is coming into existence. But I am asking only for a small concession from them. So far as I am concerned, I am prepared, and I say, the Andhras also are prepared to lie in their management. But I only want that they should give us some water. I would like to tell them, "You are so over-fat and so rich. Mysore is flowing with milk and honey. You have got so much of power and water already. Therefore, this Tungabhadra project is only a second-rate project for you. It is not so important to you as it is for us. Therefore, give us some portion of this area." I would appeal to my hon. friends here and also to my leader and to Pandit G. B. Pant to consider this request with sympathy.

We are not anxious that we should impose our language upon the Kannadigas. We say that you can take away the territory of Hospet and Siruguppa, if necessary. We do not insist on having them at all. All that we want is that head-stream and the corridor.

An. Hon. Member: Corridor also?

Shri M. A. Ayyangar: What is wrong with my asking for a corridor? After all, we are all living in the same country, and we are living like brothers. We are not asking for a corridor as if we were belligerents like

Germany and Russia. I am sorry to find that there is no feeling of sympathy at all in regard to this matter. And my hon. friend is trying to out-Herod Herod. I would appeal to my friends, in the name of humanity, and in the name of India as a whole, and they would give it, not my hon. friend Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy. I would appeal to the people, and they will give it. Let my hon. friend take the credit for it and give it to me. I have no objection.

Then, there are problems relating to the boundary disputes. We have no intentions that a Tamil village should be kept in a Telugu area or that a Telugu village should be kept in a Tamil area. I am sure that a boundary commission will be set up to solve all these minor problems relating to boundaries. The boundary problem is there in the case of Orissa also. I do not know much about it, and possibly my hon. friends from Orissa will speak about it.

The question of minorities is also there. Unfortunately, we find that a person's loyalty to his language is so infinitely deep that sometimes he goes to the extent of imposing his language on every other man in his area and thus trying to convert him. I am not able to understand this at all. After all, why should there be this kind of conflict, if a good number of persons in a particular area speak a particular language? If there is a good number of Telugu-speaking boys in a Tamil area, why should you not provide them with Telugu schools? Similarly, if there is a good number of Tamil-speaking boys in a Telugu area, why should you not provide them with Tamil schools? I am not able to understand why you should object to giving them such facilities at all. I have been touring round recently in connection with the Language Commission. And I have found everywhere that this is the fear that people have. In every State, they impose their own regional language upon the boys studying in the I, II and III forms, and the result is that the boys whose mother-tongue is not that

[Shri M. A. Ayyangar]

regional language, find it very difficult. They want to study in their mother-tongue so that they may go back to their own area.

I would urge the Central Government that the Constitution should be so amended that the linguistic minorities will be in the charge of the Central Government. Or, they must be within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Governor. A Governor has got what is called his individual judgment and also what is called discretion. You can call it what you will; we can find suitable expressions for the purpose. So, the Governor of the State or the Centre must be directly in charge of the linguistic minorities in that State.

In conclusion, I would say that boundary commissions may be appointed all over the country to settle all boundary disputes. So far as Bellary is concerned, I would request my Karnataka friends—I am not trying to enforce it as a matter of right—to calmly consider this matter. So far as Vishalandhra is concerned, I would appeal to my friends from Telangana to come together, so that we may grow in size and in strength and be one of the mightiest States in India.

Mr. Speaker: Now, Sardar Hukam Singh.

Shri Sivamurthi Swami (Kushtagi): If you could give me a chance to speak for a few minutes now, I shall be able to answer the points raised by Shri M. A. Ayyangar.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will get his chance in due course. As I said earlier, I am going by States.

Shri Punnose (Alleppey): Could we have some idea about the arrangement as to which States you are taking up first, so that we could get ready accordingly?

Mr. Speaker: It is difficult for me to give an absolutely rigid programme, for I may have to change it. I am thinking today of having PEPSU and Punjab, where there are many controversial points, Orissa, Hima-

chal Pradesh, Centrally administered Delhi, and then....

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: When will Karnataka come?

Mr. Speaker: Karnataka will come, but not today; it may, but I cannot say. Then, I am thinking of having Manipur and Assam. That is my idea. Let us proceed and see as to how we go on.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): What about Madhya Bharat?

Mr. Speaker: It will come later.

I have an idea to give every present State a chance. But it will be seen that if very long speeches take place, I must take them as representative speeches, and cut off the other speeches in respect of the very same States. That is how the position is developing. I have to state to my Bombay friends that it will not be possible for me to accommodate them today, in view of the fact that a long time has been taken already for the discussion of Bombay city's future, yesterday as well as the day before.

Mulla Abdullabhai (Chanda): What about Vidarbha?

Mr. Speaker: Every State will get a chance. There are still five more days. Let us not spend time over embroidering arguments. If only the arguments and facts are placed before the House, I think we shall be able to cover much more solid ground in a much shorter time, and everybody will be satisfied also. This is what is passing in my mind.

Shri G. H. Deshpande (Nasik Central): Excuse me for disturbing you. I am sorry for disturbing you. I have received an urgent call from my constituency.....

Mr. Speaker: I understand that the hon. Member has to go to his constituency. I understand the importance of it.

Shri G. H. Deshpande: I would not take much time.

Mr. Speaker: We have heard the pros and cons in respect of the city

of Bombay and the case of Samyukta Maharashtra for a sufficiently long time. I cannot allot more time to that matter today. I would request the hon. Member to look to the whole picture and be liberal enough to give more time to States which have not yet had a hearing.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore): On a point of clarification. You have mentioned a number of States which will be represented today. I want to know whether only one Member from each State would have opportunity to speak, or more Members will have opportunities.

Mr. Speaker: The point, as I said, when I first made my announcement was that I had imagined that there should be one representative speaker who would place the entire case and then there would be differences which would be expressed by other speakers; they need not cover the same ground again, unless they wanted to contest it. But, unfortunately, I find that there is a tendency to repeat the same thing. For example, the general aspects of the Report need not be discussed by them now, or even the old history as to how linguistic provinces came in. It is not, to my mind, necessary to repeat that now—I am giving, my own opinion; people may differ—and time can be saved by only stating the particular case which they want to bring out. So I cannot say whether one speaker will get a chance or two speakers will get a chance; it all depends upon what time speakers take and how they place their case.

Shri Bogawat (Ahmednagar South): May I make a request? In the deliberations of the last three days so much time has been given and so few Members could speak, we are afraid that many Members will not be able to get a chance. So my request is that the time for speeches may be curtailed.

Mr. Speaker: They need not be afraid Bombay has got sufficient time.

Shri Bogawat: Only two hours.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the controversial nature of the problems in Bombay, I intentionally gave more time to the speakers who, I believe, were represented to me to be representative speakers. It is not that the Chair must call every Member, but the Chair is keen to call every view to be brought before the House. It is not that every Member should get a chance; every view should get a chance. Members will therefore be liberal enough to see that the case of other provinces and other people should also be put before this House.

Several Hon. Members rose:

Mr. Speaker: Nothing further; I do not propose to answer any questions. Sardar Hukam Singh.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala -Bhatinda): I realise that I have a very delicate duty to discharge. I am conscious that my task is a difficult one. I feel that I have got a very sound case.

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

But I also know that there is much of misunderstanding and, in some quarters, some bias as well against my case. I will try to overcome these difficulties. But I only ask the indulgence of the House to hear patiently what I have to say.

Shri Gadgil yesterday told us that the net result—and even Swarni Ramananda Tirtha was of the same view—whether any importance was attached to language as one of the factors or not, whether it was predominant factor or only a small factor, has been that most of the States have been formed on the language basis. Shri Gadgil referred to other States as well. He rushed on simply by uttering two words about our States that there were certain differences between the Punjabi-speaking people themselves, and therefore, he thought that he was the only Member or he represented the only State which had not got that treatment which had been given to other States. But my case is quite a different one altogether. While our countrymen had

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

asked that States should be reorganised on predominantly language basis—and we also did that—all languages except one have got at least one State to themselves. The net result is that we have got a great controversy over Bombay State. Maharashtrians do complain. They have my full sympathy. But at least their language has got one State, as we see the recommendations, whatever might come out afterwards—that is a different thing. Previously that had been the attitude of our leaders as well. It had been authoritatively stated that a State should not have more than one language, though one language may have more than one State. I also went to this Reorganisation Commission on the basis of that and asked that my language also should have a State to flourish and develop therein. What has been the result? While others have got States for their languages, I have lost even my language. There is a story told in our parts that a lady went to a fakir for blessings for the prosperity of her family, and the fakir, instead of giving her blessings, stripped her of her clothes and she came back without the clothes, what to say of getting those blessings that she wanted. So that is what our fate has been. We had gone there with the representation that a State should be formed on the basis of the Punjabi language as well. But what the recommendations show, if we read them carefully, is that even the language should go. That has been my fate. Therefore, my case is quite distinct and different from those of others that have been put before you in this House.

There is a bias, as I said, and that had its effect even on the recommendations of this Commission. We have been accused of fissiparous inclinations, we have been charged with having 'Muslim League' tendencies, we have been told that we want further division of the country. It is also said that we have the 'home' concept—I was feeling nervous when it was

other reference. Even in this Report, it has been stated that the memorandum of the Akali Dal was mainly based on grounds that are usually put in the case of linguistic provinces. I say that that also is a wrong statement. I have got that memorandum with me and I am prepared to place it on the Table of the House—anybody can see it. It is entirely based on grounds on which other States have been based. There is nothing in it of that 'home' concept or anything that might injure the interest of the country or might contain something that might be peculiar to this State. There is one sentence at the end and if that offends, I am sorry for it. That memorandum related to all other things, that it would be a homogeneous State, it would eliminate causes of unrest, it would remove language controversy, it would help education to be imparted in the child's mother tongue, it would strengthen border defence, it would be surplus in food, rich in resources with enormous potentialities for development, the proposed State would be a model for others to emulate much in advance of other States in everything, in education and in health. And then the last sentence is this:

"We hope that India wants such a State and the country needs a contented Sikh community, if incidentally, that is also achieved".

12 Noon.

If this sentence that we have put is the one that is objected to, namely, that incidentally the Sikh community would also become contented, then, I am very sorry. If that be not the object that is required to be achieved. Otherwise, there is nothing that can be taken exception to.

My complaint is that our case has never been considered on merits. There was always that lurking suspicion in the minds of our leaders and, consequently, in the minds of our countrymen also that, perhaps we are not loyal to this country; we have evil

designs and we have some truck with some foreign power; we have been doing this and we have been doing that. This has been propagated throughout the country in the Press and on the platform and, naturally, even when lies are told and repeated so frequently, they do have some effect. I here want to declare it in the strongest terms possible that this is all malicious propaganda and is always resorted to, to create an atmosphere in which our case may not be considered on merits, so that the sympathy that we might get, that our case might evoke in the hearts of our countrymen on merits alone—I repeat that—might not be available to us. And, this is what has happened when this Commission was considering this point.

My complaint is that it is an old legacy. The first Commission appointed was the Dar Commission. Our case was not referred to it. They had no need to mention that. But, in rejecting the demand for linguistic provinces they referred to our case also unnecessarily. Then said, "if we concede the formation of linguistic provinces, then the Sikhs are also demanding a State and that demand might intensify." This was also one of the grounds on which they rejected the plea of all the other States.

Then the case came to the JVP Committee. They had no cognizance of our case because they were taking only those cases which had been discussed and dealt with by the Dar Commission. But, I do not know, why they in conclusion put down a sentence—

"We are clearly of opinion that no kind of rectification of boundaries in the provinces of North India should be raised at the present moment, whatever the merit of such a proposal might be."

The merits are to be ruled out. Whatever the merits might be, no such question should be raised at this moment. This is not all. They had to admit here, in this Report, that even then they decided that they

should go into it. They said: "even apart from our view of this reference to us, we are firmly of opinion that no such question should be raised at the present moment. This does not necessarily mean that the demand for the adjustment of provincial boundaries is unjustified or without merit". They had to admit that this had merits in itself, but this should not be raised. Those merits should not be considered. That has been the fate, I should say, even in the discussion of this report as well. I declare it here that all this suspicion is unfounded. The Sikhs are Indians first and Indians last. They have never done anything that may arouse any suspicion in the mind of anybody. I put that question straight to our Prime Minister in 1952 on the 7th of July when the non-official resolution of my hon. friend Shri Tushar Chatterjea was being discussed and our Prime Minister referred to this fact that the Sikhs wanted a separate State and he was not conceding it. I stood up and put this question straight to him—it is put down in the Debates—Who has asked for that State? And, the historic reply by Panditji was, 'I welcome the statement. I concede that no responsible leader has ever asked for it.' That is recorded in the Debates. When Master Tara Singh was welcoming our Prime Minister recently at Amritsar, standing just underneath that highest authority of our Gurus, the Akal Takht, within the holiest precincts of Shri Darbar Sahib, Golden Temple, he declared unequivocally that he wished he could rip open his heart to show to his countrymen that the Sikhs were Indians first and Indians last.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): Which countryman suspects this?

Sardar Hukam Singh: That is my complaint. Even this Commission suspects it; even the Dar Commission suspected it and the JVP Report suspected it. I am coming to that. I have the good fortune of standing by the

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

side of my own friend and of my own friend has patience I will be coming to that also.

Master Tara Singh declared it very unequivocally in the holy precincts of the Darbar Sahib that he wished he could rip open his heart there to show his countrymen that Sikhs are Indians first and Indians last; that they had never any truck with any foreign power. I wrote a letter to the Prime Minister that these charges are being levelled against us, that propaganda is going on in the Press and on the platform and I requested the Prime Minister to institute an enquiry into that. I said that if there is even a reasonable suspicion in that respect that we have ever betrayed this country or that we have any truck with any foreign country, we deserve to be shot in front of the cannon, what to say of giving us a Punjabi Suba. If really that be not a fact and if it is only a propaganda to malign us in the eyes of our countrymen, then, it is the duty of this Government to clear this position and tell our friends in this country that this is not a fact. If this impression goes round, then, certainly, life for the Sikhs in this country will be intolerable and will not be worth living. It may not be possible for any minority to live in this country if this idea is infused in the minds of our countrymen that we are not faithful to this country.

I have just submitted that the SRC had to concede that our case was also based on the usual grounds that are advanced in the case of a demand for a linguistic State. But, then, what do we find in the conclusion? Have they adhered to those principles and merits which they have laid down? Have they acted on those principles which they have laid down for the guidance of themselves? My complaint is that not one of those principles was adhered to. They completely forgot the merits in our case. Not only that; they have gone much further and advised us—of course, we feel that it is an insult to our intellect as well—that

instead of having an uncertain majority in a small State, it is better that the Sikhs should be in a sizable minority in a bigger State. If on linguistic considerations, financial, economic and defence and all considerations, the Sikhs can certainly get a majority, then the advice of the Commission is that instead of having in a Punjabi State a majority, it is advisable for them to have a sizable minority of one-third in a bigger State. Why does that come in? Were they giving us a sovereign State so that we were being cut off from the rest of India? Did we ask for the division of the country? Was it in our mind that we wanted to separate or is it in their conclusions that their brains are being influenced by that impression that perhaps it would be a separate State. I feel that that misapprehension and the effect of that mischievous propaganda were influencing the decisions of these eminent men when they gave their verdict and insulted us as well.

We have heard the debate for the last three days; we have heard many good arguments of those whose aspirations have been fulfilled, of those whose desires have been met. Now they are full of praise for this Commission and their Report and they have very sound counsels and advices to give to others. They come out with the statement that the national security shall be the primary aim, that it is the unity of India that should be seen first of all, that we should look to the country as a whole. They perhaps mean to say that those others who are still asking, who have not got what they want, are perhaps traitors, are not looking to the unity of India. I want to ask this question: Where does the question of security and unity of India come in so far as internal re-adjustment of boundaries between the States is concerned? I challenge anybody who imputes this to those who desire the re-distribution. I want them to prove in whatever way they can that those who ask for this linguistic re-distribution of India are less patriotic or that they have less consideration for the unity and

security of India. Unity and security of India is dear to us, if not more, at least equally with those that have got those ideas in their minds. We yield to none in this declaration that we are as patriotic and as loyal and as faithful to this country as anybody else who can claim that. Here our great Acharyaji—he is not here today—came out with some fresh concepts and interesting ideas. He said that our leaders, our heroes and our saints belong to the whole country. Could any province claim them exclusively to itself? Was not the culture that they gave common to the whole of India? And he named our Ramachander, Krishna, Guru Nanak and other nobilities and high persons, heroes and saints. That is quite welcome. We do not dispute those abstract counsels and abstract truths. They would remain true as long as we are here. Who doubts them? But even our Home Minister—I thank him for that—gave us this counsel that we should discuss it calmly and coolly taking into consideration the country as a whole. May I remind the Acharyaji and our revered Home Minister that when he was the Chief Minister he did say that he would not permit the land of Rama and Krishna to be divided into two? Did he not say that?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: He did say that; it was reported so in the papers.

Sardar Hukam Singh: My friend says he did say that.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It was reported so in the papers.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Even our Home Minister had to say that he would not permit the land of Rama and Krishna to be divided into two provinces. That should at least be considered by Acharya Kripalani and I would request the hon. Home Minister to realise and appreciate our aspirations as well. As I said just now, in asking for a re-distribution of the country, we are not splitting it up into independent States. The reasons are given here that the States should be bigger.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Distt.

—South): He wanted unity and he is giving you unity.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I thank the hon. Member for that and also thank the members of the Commission. Then he claimed that the land of Rama and Krishna must belong to his own province and not to any other province.

Shri B. D. Pande (Almora Distt.—North East): It is not a statement of facts. What he said was that the land of Rama and Krishna should not be divided.

Sardar Hukam Singh: If I have not expressed in suitable terms, I thank my friend for having done so. He said that the land of Rama and Krishna should not be divided. If I have committed any wrong or mistake, I am sorry, and I shall take his words. I would request the hon. Home Minister to appreciate the feelings of others as well in the same concept and in the same understanding as he had himself when he was there. We are told not to think in these terms. We are told by Acharya Kripalani that the culture is one. But is there an Indian culture distinct from the cultures of the provinces that compose it? As Swamiji said day before yesterday, it is only a synthesis of the cultures of the provinces and there is no separate culture of India except that it is a blending together of the cultures of all provinces. If those units progress, if the cultures of those units develop, it is the development of the culture of India and of no other country. It is also said that it would be better for a brave community, for an enterprising community like the Sikhs to have a larger unit instead of shutting themselves up into a smaller unit. We have got these words of praise very often and we are thankful to those who uttered them. If we realise that, then we find that the members of the Commission had that notion in their minds that if a Punjabi Suba is conceded or carved out, then all other provinces should be shut to the Sikhs. Is that the idea? As Indians, should not the Sikhs have the same opportunity in other provinces as anybody else has got? I admire that even when

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

a section of the Muslims wanted a separate State, they have got it and they have gone. But our State is giving every facility to other Muslims to stay in any of the places that they want. We have been trying to accommodate even those who want to come here. I endorse that policy. I am happy over it. But would it be that Sikhs, if only a linguistic redistribution is made, would have access only to that small pond and would not be able to move about and shall not have facilities in other provinces? I request the hon. Members to appreciate the feelings that are working behind. As I said in the beginning, there is a lurking suspicion and mistrust that has gone all round. If the country believes that if our leaders also believe that we are traitors, let us be told that we are not to be trusted. First satisfy yourself that we are true and loyal and faithful as anybody else. When that satisfaction is come and we arrive at the conclusion that there is nothing wrong so far as our fidelity and loyalty is concerned, are not we entitled to the same privileges and the same conveniences as anyone else has got?

Not only this. We have been told that if we get the Punjabi Suba, then every Sikh from every other province shall have to come here; that will be their fate. This is not only by irresponsible persons or Press but even by responsible leaders; they talk like that sometimes and I can quote instances. We have been told that we are wrong in demanding this. If we ask for a Punjabi Suba and that is given to us, then all those Sikhs who are living outside and flourishing in their business and enterprises—those Sikhs whose home is outside Punjab and PEPSU should all migrate from that place. This, I cannot understand. Many responsible men have said that.

An Hon. Member: I do not believe.

Sardar Hukam Singh: If you can believe that I am speaking in your presence, then you can believe that. What is it that is in their minds then? What is it that is working there?—The same suspicion, as I said.

When that is removed, I am sure I will have all those concessions or all those privileges which any Indian has got. I want nothing more; I should make it clear. I am not asking for any special concessions. I have not asked for any weightage or anything like that for the Sikhs. Never was that done. There is a misapprehension in that respect as well. I have never asked for any rights particularly for the Sikhs. What we say is that we shall have the same rights as any other Indian. We should be treated on the same level as any other Indian. We heard here in very fine words from our friend that Sikhs are their kith and kin; there is no difference absolutely between a Sikh and a Hindu. We are all one but these Akalis are creating these differences.

I am also of that opinion; I endorse that view though not with the same vehemence as those words implied. They are one. I am also of the same opinion. I have declared it once before. My elder brother was Sodagar Ram. I have four sisters. One is married to a Sikh and three to Hindus. My wife comes from a Hindu family, which even smokes. Can we imagine that I will have prejudices against Hindus? Those who have seen my house in Kapurthala were amazed to find *hukas* lying there. Could I ask my wife's brother not to indulge in what he wanted to?

What have we been asking? We should be taken into the fold of Hinduism. We have been deploring that the President's Scheduled Castes Order was absolutely wrong. Who created that cleavage? Was it not created by the President's Order of 1950 that only those Scheduled Castes shall have those rights except the four Sikh classes in Punjab and PEPSU, who professed Hindu religion? Was that order not the starting point of that cleavage that is complained about so often? Was it not the beginning of the difference that was created? Are we asking for anything separate?

When the Hindu Code Bill was introduced in this august House in

regard to clause 2(2), Dr. Ambedkar stood up and said that this included Hindus and Sikhs. I moved an amendment that Sikhs should be excluded; I did it purposely. When I had the chance to speak, I told him: if you want to take me into the Hindu fold, I am prepared to come but do it wholeheartedly and completely. First remove that clause where you have separated me and go the whole hog. How are you going to take away the customs? Sikhs and Hindus are one. But when there are certain privileges, you say: you are out of my fold; and stand at a respectable distance and would not allow me to come near you.

My friend here by my side has taken note of it; he would say that it was out of a compromise. I anticipate that. Can you imagine the fate of those persons who were in such a plight that they were forced to agree: this much and no further. You can very well see and appreciate the difficulties of those people:

जादे चोर १ पगड़ी ही सही

It means: the thief is running away but he leaves behind his turban. All right; I have to be content with it.

We are denounced as separatists. I shall come to this in a minute. We have a distinct religion; that we have always claimed but we had always said that we were included in the Hindu fold; we had been told that for the last hundred years, Dr. Ambedkar had told me, that in the High Courts and elsewhere, Sikhs were included in the Hindu fold so far as social legislations are concerned and we were glad of that. Then the President's Order threw us out of that fold. That is one thing.

Then we said that we had the same language. There are some safeguards for the linguistic minorities; they had been dinned into our ears. The safeguards are there; we have paid full attention to them. We were a religious minority first. By denying or the disavowal of that language, we are being made a linguistic minority as well. A very prominent member, one office-holder of the Hindu Mahasabha said

—there was a report in the papers and I cannot vouchsafe it further—that he had an objection to his children being taught in the Gurmukhi script because that would have the imprint of Sikh culture on their children and on their future generations. That was the report. You cannot say: "We are in the same fold," and immediately tell us "No, go away." It was said that there was the same language. Now they say it is a Sikh language. Then about culture, it is reported that this person said that there would be an imprint of Sikh culture.

Now, I am reminded of Jinnah who in his Resolution of 1940 said: "Muslims have got a separate language, separate religion and separate culture. All these are distinct and therefore, they are a separate nation." We say, we belong to the Hindu-fold; they say 'no'. We say we have the same language but they say 'no'; this is Sikh language. We say, we have the same culture; they say: No, get away. Are we the separatists, Sir? Are we advocating anything that smacks of parochialism or separatism? I leave it to hon. Members to judge to what end we have been driven to by our brothers and what is going to be the ultimate end of it. I appeal to the hon. Members to go through this question very calmly, and particularly my Home Minister to look into the disease itself and then try to apply the remedy that might be most suitable to it.

Language, Sir, we are told has been a problem long ago; it is not a fresh problem. The Report says that the Hindus have been denying it. May I ask when this denial came up? It was for the first time in 1931 at the time of census that certain Hindus denied that language because there was competition between Urdu and Hindi. The Muslims wanted that Urdu should be the *lingua franca*, the language of the whole country and the Hindus desired, quite rightly, that it should not be Urdu and it should be Hindi. Both of them denied their mother tongue and it is in the record of the Census Report that both have spoken falsehoods.

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

It is only the Sikhs that have stuck to it. The Census Commissioner has reproduced the following in his Report:

"Census operation have begun

Question	You should answer
Religion	Vedic Dharam
Sect	Arya Samajist
Caste	Nil
Race	Aryam
Language	Arya Bhasha (Hindi)
The Census Committee, Arya Samaj, Wachhowali, Lahore."	

I read something in the language papers here with regard to the census. They propagated that a question was put to the Editor, one paper said, by a Hindu of Jullundur Division as to what he should return as his mother tongue and that he had told that man that it is the Hindi language. That man was living in Jullundur Division. 98 per cent. of the people of Jullundur Division are Punjabi-speaking. An ex-Chief Minister of a native state gloated over the fact that Hindus have declared to a single man that they are against Punjabi and that it is not their language. Now, we know that some murders also were committed. The 1941 census could not incorporate the returns of language. In 1951 also this attempt had to be abandoned. But, the Commission says that there is no language problem here. They say there is no language problem at all. Then, what is the problem? They say it is the communal problem; it is not the language problem. They also say that the Hindus have always disowned this language.

Sir, I have read of the case of Central Europe where because of the adjustment of foreign territories and nations certain minorities have been left in other States who had a different language. But, here in India where we are told that we are one; we have been living here, if the Hindus have a different language, Punjabi is not their mother tongue and it is

the mother tongue of the Sikhs alone, then either the Sikhs have come out of some foreign countries or those Hindus, who deny that Punjabi is their mother tongue, are foreigners; they are not sons of this soil.

Shri C. D. Pande (Nainital Distt. cum Almora Distt.—South West cum Bareilly Distt.—North): They are.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I am only putting the alternatives. You may choose any. If it suits you I will accept that. If they are then do you say that the Sikhs are not?

Shri C. D. Pande: Both are the same.

Sardar Hukam Singh: If both are the same and our Hindu brethren deny their mother tongue does it not require the careful attention of the leaders to analyse what the causes are? Several friends have enquired from me many a time as to what is the cause that these Hindus of Jullundur Division deny their mother tongue. I have no answer to it. Sometimes I have said: "I have none. You must ask them." I can only say that it is communalism, but if they can give you any answer it would be for them to make.

In the last census before the last general election—I am bringing to the notice of the Home Minister what our fate is—when there was a mention of delimitation of constituencies—one instance will tell you our line of feeling—the Punjab Government Election Commissioner recommended by some scheme that such and such a constituency should be formed. The Chief Election Commissioner also supported that and the constituencies were formed. There was a Member from Jullundur and he did not find his constituency to be of his own taste. He went round to every Member of the Parliament here. One hon. Member who is a Parliamentary Secretary now in this Government came to me and asked: "What is the position?" I said that so and so has been coming round and canvassing us that we should support him. He is saying

that with the scheme that is brought up by the Election Commissioner in regard to constituencies the Sikhs shall have a majority, they will separate from India and Punjab would be lost to India. They would join Pakistan." I was amazed to hear that if one constituency is not made the Sikhs would join Pakistan. Then, what were the headlines in the newspapers? It is this:

इलकशन कमिश्नर ने सिक्ख राज्य की बुनियाद कायम कर दी ।

They said that the foundation was laid for the Sikh Raj because one constituency was not formed according to the liking of one hon. Member. A deputation was led to our worthy President and they put the same thing. The next day I saw a report about the interview in the papers. I also approached the President and asked: "What is happening there?" Anyhow then there was discussion in the Parliament and that constituency was certainly readjusted. Then I declared standing up here that I am glad that now the Sikhs would not join Pakistan because one constituency has at least been remodelled.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur): Old history.

Sardar Hukam Singh: My friend says "it is old history" but the fresh one is worse than that.

Sir, I appeal to hon. friends here to realise what the position is. I am asked: "Why should I cry for language?" Are Hindus not also the sons of that soil? Do they not have the same language? Is it not their mother tongue? If the Sikhs were to sit silent perhaps the Hindus would not oppose it. I only tell them that they are two sons of the same mother. The elder one gets annoyed perhaps on account of certain faults of the younger one. The younger one might have committed certain mistakes or on account of his own ignorance, prejudice or communalism the elder one runs at the mother with a dagger in

his hand and wants to kill the mother. He says: "I must stab her." The younger one runs to the rescue of the mother saying: "Let her be saved. I will sacrifice myself. Whatever the case I will suffer the consequences. If the mother survives she will tend both, she will love both and then the elder brother would realise that he had made a mistake." That is my lot, Sir. The language is the mother as is generally called. I am the younger brother. Even if on account of my mistakes this elder brother is out to kill her I do not want to permit him to do not.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Certainly not.

Sardar Hukam Singh: It is not the words that would count; it is the action that is required. That has been the trouble always. It is in the records, even in the Report of the Commission, that the Hindus do not own that. What further proof am I required to give to this House. I am told that this is not their language. How sad? And why did they do it? Now the Report has stated that if a Punjabi Suba is formed, that would not solve any problem. Quite right. Why? Because the Hindus do not own it. And what would be the condition? It was the easiest thing in this case for the Reorganisation Commission to have come to a conclusion. As I said in the beginning, I went to the Commission to get a State for my language. And what have they given? Like that lady who came away without her garment even instead of giving me that State, they have taken away and scrapped away even the language. They have cast aspersions that this is not a distinct language. They have stated that their script Devanagari is more suited to the expression of this language. Let it not be understood that I am against Hindi. I am certainly for Hindi and it is not possible for any Indian to ignore or set it aside. If anybody does it, it would be at his own cost. He will suffer himself if he ignores that. But my position is that Punjabi, regional language, should not be sacrificed. Let Hindi have its pedestal by all

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

means, even a little more. But let it not be done at the sacrifice of the regional language. Let that also remain. It should be given the same status as any regional language has got in any other State. We are told that it will not solve any problem. And what would be the result? As I was saying it was the easiest thing to do with such a formula. That is the best of all things. One of my friends was saying that Bombay is a bilingual State. Quite right. Because, people have gone from outside. Some are Gujaratis and some are Maharashtrians. They are not living in separate zones as this is Gujarati and that is Maharashtrian. But in Punjab State the case is quite distinct. There are two distinct zones—Punjabi and Hindi. Similarly, in PEPSU there are Punjabi and Hindi zones. The Punjabi zone of Punjab is contiguous to Punjabi zone of PEPSU. Both are contiguous. Sachar formula has declared that this is the Punjabi zone. The PEPSU Government has declared that this is the Punjabi zone. There are no disputes about boundaries. Only a declaration is required that the two are united. They would form one compact, homogeneous area, rich in financial resources and other potentialities. But the SRC Report has departed from that ground. Let not anybody be under the impression that there is a great difficulty so far as economic and financial resources are concerned. It would be much richer than the present Punjab and PEPSU States.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the population?

Sardar Hukam Singh: If only these two are united, then the population would be 93 lakhs.

An Hon. Member: What about revenue?

Sardar Hukam Singh: Now you have drawn my attention to that I will take it. If these areas are united—they are officially recognized and

regularly demarcated by the Government themselves—then the population would be 93 lakhs and the proportion of the Sikhs would be 56 per cent.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Do all the non-Sikhs also wish for that?

Sardar Hukam Singh: Yes, Sir. I do not stand in their way if you make it by persuasion; but not by the present order of giving them economic concessions. Mind that. The Sikhs would be 56 per cent. If these two zones are united they would be 93 lakhs and 56 per cent.

An Hon. Member: If PEPSU and Punjab are united?

Sardar Hukam Singh: If PEPSU and Punjabi zones of Punjab are United we will be in a majority. We had that apprehension when we put up the memorandum. Certainly we anticipated we will be confronted with this. Why should a majority be converted into a minority? If the Sikhs are in a minority at this moment, why should they be made a majority by the adjustment? Of course, that question struck us and faced us. If there had been no suspicion and if we are as good as brothers then there should not have been any question of this proposal of making one party into a majority or the other. We were conscious that we would be confronted with that. Therefore, we But facing the facts as they were, we included certain other tracts which were bilingual and in the memorandum that we submitted it became 47.5 per cent. If this is formed then the language is Punjabi and there would be no trouble at all because those who oppose now and disown it, they will have no ground at all if this regional language is declared for administration and for educational purposes. Then every man who lives there shall find it to his own advantage to read it. The present friction would disappear. Would you believe me when I say that when I went before the

Commission and I was cross-examined there a member of the Commission put me this question: "how have you included this part of Ganganagar and part of Karnal in that State?" I think I said "if they are not, let them be excluded". Then he said "Oh, then you would become 51 per cent." I say, then something in the Constitution might be provided that I should always remain in a minority. If I ask for a Punjabi speaking State, purely of the Punjabi-speaking areas, I cannot be given because I become a majority. If I include other regions, bilingual as well, then I am confronted with "these are not Punjabi-speaking areas so you cannot get that". What is the remedy then? Where should I go? If I am refused this Punjabi-speaking zone because I become a majority, then do something else, and keep me in a minority. I purposely put that when I said that I should remain 47 per cent. We are told that Sikhs would be driving out Hindus. They would go out and they would not like to remain here. Why? That means, if they form 70 per cent. then alone they are prepared to stay here. If they become 55 per cent, they are not prepared to stay. Pressed further, it means that they want a majority and a stranglehold of 70 per cent. and not less than that. This is their condition for staying. Otherwise they would walk away. They do not want to live there if the Sikhs form 47 per cent.

Very peculiar arguments have been advanced and statements given. Recently there was a statement that there should be a comparison between the population of the Sikhs in the towns and the villages with those in the jails. They say they are the criminals and they are not prepared to mix with them. This is also the argument that has been advanced. I do not want to reply to that argument. There is no need to do so. But what I want to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister is, this is what is happening there and he has to redress it. *He should not think that simply safeguards would suffice.*

There is a mentality and psychology of 70 per cent. and 30 per cent. There is a superiority complex that they are the rulers and others are the ruled. There is an inferiority complex that we have to depend upon and be at their sufferance. It is not a question, as my friend said of such persons becoming Hindus or Sikhs by conversion. Let them, by their own free will, take to any religion which they may like. This is a secular State, and nobody can object to that. We are not asking for that, but as far as we are here, we should have equal treatment at least.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You have taken nearly an hour. How long would you like to take further?

Sardar Hukam Singh: I have much more to say, but I can say them only if I am allowed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have allowed an hour. I am only leaving it to the hon. Member to say how much time he wants from now?

Sardar Hukam Singh: I shall condense my further points as much as I can. In paragraph 93, the Commission has laid down the principles, to which I referred earlier. They are: "preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India; linguistic and cultural homogeneity financial, economic and administrative considerations; and successful working of the national plan." So far as these four principles are concerned, if we look to the chapter in which this case is rejected, we will find that there is not a word mentioned as regards the successful working of the national plan. Though it has been said elsewhere that the catchment area is there, they said that it would not help the linguistic and cultural homogeneity. I will take that aspect now. At present we have got 126 lakhs in the present State, out of which 76 lakhs are in the Punjabi-speaking zone and 50 lakhs in the Hindi-speaking area. Out of 76 lakhs they are equally divided between the Hindus and the Sikhs—38 lakhs Sikhs and roughly 38 lakhs Hindus. It is

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

wrong to say that all the Hindus are against a Punjabi-speaking area. There were deputations that were led before the Commission by certain hon. Members of the Hindu community who supported this idea. Chowdhuri Hari Chand of Hoshiarpur and Chowdhuri Kartar Singh, M.L.C. were there. Also another Hindu gentleman—Shri Om Prakash Kohol, has written a book on Hindus and the Punjabi-speaking State and he has strongly supported it. It is wrong to say that all Hindus are opposed to it. I can say that the Maha Punjab Samithi—and we put it to the Commission as well—does not contain even one member from the rural areas. They represent only urban interests and have something vested in the present position. They are certainly most vocal. They are in the Government. They have the press at their command; they have trade and everything and all the equipment that go to form modern machinery. So, it is wrong to say that all Hindus are opposed to the Punjabi-speaking State. Even assuming that roughly the Sikhs are on the one side and the Hindus are on the other side—the argument of the Commission—we find that in the present Punjab, there are 38 lakhs of Sikhs, 38 lakhs of Hindus in the Punjabi-speaking zone and 50 lakhs of Hindi-speaking people, that is, the Hariana people. I am leaving out Kangra for the present, and though there was a resolution, my friend objected to it. If he says that it is a Punjabi-speaking area, let it remain so. I do not object to it.

Shri Anand Chand (Bilaspur): Do you accept that resolution?

Sardar Hukam Singh: I have said that the opinion of Grierson that Kangra was a Punjabi-speaking area.

Shri Anand Chand: What about Kangra?

Sardar Hukam Singh: I said that there was a resolution passed by the District Board of Kangra that it should be tagged on to the hilly areas, but the other day my friend

objected to it, and therefore, I accept the position.

Shri Hem Raj (Kangra): I enquired from the District Board and the District Board said that there was no such resolution.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I have got the records here. I am not anyway pursuing it. Let it be forgotten that they passed a resolution. At least there are 50 lakhs of Hariana people who want that they should have a separate State. I shall now read a few lines only indicating what the views of the three Legislative Assemblies—Punjab, PEPSU and Himachal Pradesh—were, so far as the redistribution is concerned. I think this should be of some interest to my hon. friends. Out of the total of 138 members who took part in the discussion of the SRC Report, 59 were from Punjab Legislative Assembly, 51 from PEPSU Legislative Assembly and 28 from Himachal Pradesh Legislative Assembly. 30 members have supported the Commission's proposal for merger of Punjab, PEPSU and Himachal Pradesh into one unit out of the 138. 91 members have demanded the formation of three linguistic States,—Punjabi-speaking State, Hariana State and Himachal Pradesh. Six members—five from PEPSU and one from Punjab—were opposed to the inclusion of Himachal Pradesh in the future Punjab. They favour the merger of PEPSU with Punjab but the question of demarcation of suitable boundaries was left to the Congress High Command sub-committee. Four members have left the whole question of the future boundaries of Punjab State to the Congress High Command. Two members from PEPSU advocated the retention of PEPSU. One from PEPSU suggested the merger of Mohindergarh district with Rajasthan. Four members, all from Punjab, have not expressed any opinion for or against the SRC Report. Though in the Himachal Pradesh Assembly, 28 members participated in the discussion, at the time of voting, 38 members took part. Four

of them voted for the Commission's report and 34 voted against. This is the view of the Assémbly members. I was just giving out the figures, because the Commission has given the impression that the majority of the people were opposed to the formation of a Punjabi-speaking State, and that therefore it falls through. Apart from the 50 lakhs Hindus, I have given the indication from the debate of the Legislative Assémbly that 38 lakhs Sikhs also have favoured it. Nobody has said that there are any Sikhs who opposed it. 88 lakhs were there in all. Of course, there might be one or two here or three or four on the other side, but roughly, 88 lakhs favoured it and 38 lakhs opposed the formation of a Punjabi Suba and Hariana. Can it be said that the majority of the people were opposed to it? If they want to say that this majority included Hariana people, and say that 70 per cent. are opposed to it, I do not understand why Hariana people should be included in it, because they do not speak Punjabi. Why should you include them in the number of Punjabi-speaking people when it is not their language? To include them and say that the majority are opposed to it is wrong. There are 88 lakhs who are in favour of the redistribution of the State, as far as Punjabi-speaking area is concerned.

Similar is the case in regard to PEPSU Punjabi zone. There are 17 lakhs of Sikhs and 12 lakhs of Hindus there. They have no objection to read Punjabi. There is no problem at all. The Commission has created a fresh problem. PEPSU was going on peacefully. The language policy is not objected to by anybody. Certainly that question involved complications similar to those that are appearing here in the Punjab. If we calculate the number of people in the Punjabi-speaking area that was proposed to be made, there would have been 55 lakhs of Sikhs and 50 lakhs Hindus. In that respect, we can say that, if all are Indians and no premium is to be placed because a certain person belongs to

this community or that community, certainly the majority was in favour of a Punjabi-speaking State. It is simple arithmetic and nothing more than that. But, we have been told that the majority is opposed to it. The wishes of the people are to be ascertained from the debates in the Assémbly and it is said that the requisite minimum measure of agreement must come. I want to ask, whether the proposal of the Commission in respect of a Punjabi-speaking State was ever considered in the light of this test. There at least one-third were opposed to it and two-thirds were in favour of a Punjabi Suba. Here one-fourth are in favour of the proposal of the Commission and three-fourths are opposed to it.

1 P.M.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena (Lucknow Distt. cum Bara Banki Distt.): You mean one-fourth were in favour of it and three-fourths against.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Out of 1,76,00,000 people, 55 lakhs of Sikhs at least are opposed to it; 50 lakhs of Harijanis do not want it and at least 10 lakhs of people from Himachal Pradesh are opposed to it. This is simple arithmetic and the percentage can be calculated. I only want to ask whether that test was to be applied only for the rejection of a Punjabi-speaking State and not for forming the new proposed State. Does that test lose its force and efficacy because other proposals are being made now? Why is that test not applied here? It is said that the Akali Dal Memorandum put it that there are deficit areas. We did put it. We were deficit when the country was divided. But now the Punjabis have made it a surplus State. Other areas are being added on to this, so that the headache of the centre may be shifted to Punjab, and Punjab might have to bear that deficit. Punjab must be put in charge of these deficit areas and be responsible for them. Are these people only cattle to be huddled together in any enclosure that the administration wants? Are

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

they human beings or are they to be considered only as livestock that is to be put in a box and despatched to any place that is desired? Should you deliver them only on the sweet will of the consignor or has the consignee also any say in that matter? Another reason is given. The catchment area is there in the Himachal Pradesh and therefore it should be part of the same State. We are asked to consider the whole country as one unit. So far as the proposal of the Commission is concerned, there is a minority report that it should be a centrally administered area. Does the Centre intend to stop giving the water to the areas because the head-works are there? Bhakra Dam is there and lands in Rajasthan and other areas are to be irrigated by its waters. For that reason, can all those areas be put in one State? I want to submit one more thing. There is a minority report that Himachal Pradesh should be kept apart. Sufficient reasons have been given, namely that it is an undeveloped and backward area requiring special attention, and the wishes of the people are also there. All these are mentioned in the note of the Chairman. The other two members have recommended the merger. But, one of those two Members, dealing with U.P. has said that U.P. should be divided. He has said that the areas of Kumaon and other hilly tracks are backward and they need to be developed. He has said that they cannot develop in that bigger State and therefore the State should be divided. When he says that these areas are undeveloped, the people of the hill areas are backward and their problems are distinct and separate, and when he appends that note for the dismemberment of U.P., he takes up the case of these hill tracks and uses them exactly on the lines in which the Chairman of the SRC has done when he appended the minority report that so far as the Himachal Pradesh was concerned, it should be kept separate. I have to submit that there are two Members of the Com-

mission who are in favour of Himachal Pradesh being separate. Though not in the Report, there are two Members who support the separate existence of Himachal Pradesh, for they have given the same reasons on two different occasions. If that argument is accepted, there is only one Member—a minority—who wants the merger of Himachal Pradesh. The Chairman of this Commission was very discreet when he said that he would not participate in it so far the question of Bihar was concerned, because he had spent many years of his life in that Province. I believe that he lived in U.P. also. I am sorry the Chairman originally belonged to Uttar Pradesh. If he did apply that principle in the case of Bihar, why did he not apply it in the case of U.P.?

Pandit K. C. Sharma: He had little interest in it.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Why was that test not applied in the case of Uttar Pradesh, when another Member has given a note pleading for the dismemberment of U.P.? I do not say that it must be dismembered. I am taking up the argument. Let it remain as it is; let it swell; I have no objection. Let it be made greater; I have nothing against it. I am coming to my argument, how can these proposals of the Commission convince anybody here.

As you say that I should finish. I close my case now. They have united together unnatural zones which have nothing in common between them. Therefore, the whole trouble arises. Unless the solution that has been made applicable in the other States is applied in this zone also, there would not be contentment and permanent peace. The people would not be able to live in amity. They have raised the question of national security and unity. If it is made, as has been tried to be made, that it would be optional for anybody to read any language. The report says that the Hindus are averse to

Punjabi, and even those who are brought from the PEPSU, though they have no objection now, will have objection when they unite. What would be the fate ultimately of Punjabi? We are told that it will not suffer. The Sikhs are not going to leave their mother tongue. Let it be assured. They won't leave it, though they will have Hindi as the Kashtrabhasha. The Hindus have been encouraged here that they have a different language. When this State is made, it would not be a Punjabi State. It is wrong to assume that Punjabi language can flourish. When 117 lakhs are opposed to it, 55 lakhs would not be able to continue it. It would suffer and in the end it will be wiped out though as yet it stands in the Constitution. So, this proposal would not solve that problem, but will create many more, to the detriment of our unity and national security. Now, there are two zones separate and distinct. What would happen in the future? Every hamlet, every cottage will be a bilingual cottage, bilingual hamlet. This will go to the farthest ends of the border where there is no trouble at all. There is no mixture of population as Punjabi-speaking or Hindi-speaking in the border. But, if it is said that Hindus have their language, and that Punjabi is not their language, this would permeate even to the remotest corner. Is it in the interests of national security to have two cultures? Surely language is culture and forms part of a pattern of life and has certain values in life. You say Punjabi is not the language of a Hindu sitting in the remotest corner at the border which is vulnerable. We have to guard against it. You would be allowing two languages, two cultures to remain there which will separate permanently the Hindus and the Sikhs. Those who say that there is no difference between the Hindus and the Sikhs are trying to apply a formula by which they are creating that difference, where none exists at present. That, I say, would not add to the security of the State,

and it would be detrimental to the country as a whole.

श्री अजित सिंह (कप्रथता-भटिंडा-रक्षित-अनुसूचित जातिवां) : मैं आपका शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ कि आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया। मुझे सिर्फ दो तीन प्वाइंट आपके सामने रखने हैं। बहुत कुछ तो सरदार हुकम सिंह जी ने लॉगवेज के मुताबिक कह दिया है। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि हम न सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान में ही लिंग्विस्टिक स्टेट्स बनाने के लिए उतावले हो रहे हैं बल्कि बाहर के मुल्कों में भी लिंग्विस्टिक स्टेट्स बनी हैं। रूस में भी और यू० एस० ए० में भी लिंग्विस्टिक स्टेट्स बनी हैं। हमारे यहां बेशक बहुत सी जबानें बोली जाती हैं। हमारे देश में तकरीबन २०० से ज्यादा जबानें बोली जाती हैं। लेकिन हमारे कांस्टीट्यूशन में सिर्फ १४ जबानें मानी गयी हैं। जो इन जबानों के आधार पर सूबे बनाये गये हैं उसके लिए मैं कमीशन को धन्यवाद देता हूँ। मगर जब मैं देखता हूँ कि हमारे पंजाब को जबान के आधार पर नहीं बांटा गया है, तो मुझे अफसोस होता है और दुःख होता है, और इस मामले में जो मेरे शक थे, और जिनके बारे में मैं ने दो तीन साल पहले लिखा भी था, वे आज पूरे हो रहे हैं। मैं ने आज से दो साल पहले डा० काटजू साहब को एक चिट्ठी लिखी थी, जिसमें मैं ने अपने ये शक जाहिर किये थे। मैं ने उस में लिखा था कि मुझे शक है कि जब पंजाब का सवाल बोली के आधार पर लिया जायेगा तो उसको इग्नोर कर दिया जायेगा। तो डाक्टर साहब ने मुझे यह जवाब दिया था कि

“I do not know how any question of discrimination arises in this particular matter,”

यह डाक्टर साहब का दिसम्बर ७, १९५२ का पत्र है। इसमें उन्होंने मुझे बताया था कि आपके साथ कोई डिस्क्रिमिनेशन नहीं होगा। और जिस तरह जबान के लिहाज से दूसरे सूबे बनेंगे उसी तरह आपके साथ भी सलूक किया जायेगा। लेकिन आज यह मेरे शक मेरे सामने आ

[सरदार अजीत सिंह]

रहे हैं और हम इंतते हैं कि कमिशन ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में हमको बिल्कुल इगनोर कर दिया है।

अगर आप इजाजत दें तो जवान के बार् में में कुछ बड़े आदिमियों की रायें आपके सामने पेश करूँ :

"Resolutions and remarkable speeches of the authorities and the leaders of the nation in support of the redistribution of areas on linguistic and cultural basis.

Resolution of Ministry of Education, New Delhi.

The Ministry of Education, New Delhi, passed a resolution on the 10th August 1948, on the subject of medium of instructions in educational institutions. The resolution has been published in the Gazette of India, August 14, 1948 at page 1000, part I, section 1.

It says, the principle that a child should be instructed in the early stages of his education through the medium of mother tongue has been accepted by the Government.

All educationists agree that any departure from this principle is bound to be harmful to the child and therefore to the interests of the society."

इसी तरह से नेहरू कमिटी की रिपोर्ट में लिखा है :

"The Committee examined the principles of redistribution and came to the conclusion:

"If a province has to educate itself and do its daily work through the medium of its own language, it must necessarily be a linguistic area. If it happens to be a polyglot area, difficulties will continuously arise and the media of instructions and work will be in two or even more languages. Hence it becomes more desirable for provinces to be regrouped on linguistic basis.

Language, as a rule, corresponds with a special variety of culture, of tradition and literature. In a linguistic area all these factors will help in the general progress of the provinces'."

इसी तरह इंडियन नेशनल कांग्रेस के सन् ४५ और ४६ के मनीफेस्टों में यह लिखा हुआ है :

"They assured the people of this vast sub-continent that the culture, language and script of the different linguistic areas in India shall be protected and guaranteed the freedom of different territorial areas within the nation to develop their own life and culture within the larger framework and declared for this purpose that such territorial areas and provinces should be constituted as far as possible on linguistic and cultural bases."

इसी तरह हमारे पंजाब के लीडर डा० गोपी चन्द्र भार्गव ने एक दफा कहा था :

"Dr. Gopichand Bhargava, former Chief Minister of East Punjab said at Jullundur on 1st June 1948 that Punjabi was undoubtedly the mother-tongue of the people in the East Punjab. The announcement of the East Punjab Government declaring both Hindi and Punjabi to be the media of instruction in primary schools has, however, rudely shaken all Punjabis, except those who wish to sacrifice their mother-tongue at the altar of communalism."

यह है जनाब उन बड़े आदिमियों की रिपोर्ट्स जिन्होंने कि पंजाबी बोली के हक में कहा है और आज हमें अफसांस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि कमिशन के मंत्र साहबान ने बड़ी मेहरबानी की, बहुत तकलीफ उठाई इस काम को करने के लिए मगर हमारी पंजाबी बोली को इगनोर कर दिया गया है। आज मैं यह कहने पर मजबूर हूँ कि हर एक बोली की अपनी अपनी लिपि है। कोई भी भाषा हो उसकी अपनी लिपि है। पंजाब में जैसे पंजाबी बोली है

उसकी अपनी लिपि गुरुमुखी भी हैं और जैसे अगर एक दुबले पतले आदमी को किसी बड़े मोटे आदमी का कोट पहना दिया जाय तो वह कभी फिट नहीं आता, लज दीखता है और वह जोकर सा मालूम पड़ता है और मेरा कहना है कि जो कोट फिट है उस कोट को ही उसे क्यों न पहनाया जाय, उसी तरह मेरी अर्ज है कि पंजाबी की जो अपनी लिपि गुरुमुखी हैं उसे ही क्यों न अपनाया जाय। श्री टंक चन्द ने ठीक ही कहा है कि पंजाब में भगड़ा सिर्फ लिपि का है बोली का नहीं है। उन्होंने यह सही फरमाया है और आपसे मेरी दरखास्त है कि आप इस लिपि का जो भगड़ा है इसको भी निबटाने की कोशिश करें नहीं तो यह मालूम होता है कि वह भगड़ा कभी खत्म नहीं होगा। अभी जैसा सरदार हुकम सिंह ने वार्डें तौर पर बतलाया है कि न यह हिन्दुओं और सिक्खों का भगड़ा है और न ही यह सिक्ख स्टेट का भगड़ा है बल्कि भगड़ा बोली का है, स्क्रिप्ट का है। अगर बोली के आधार पर एक सिक्ख स्टेट बना भी ली जाती है और उसमें सिक्खों की ५५, ५६ फीसदी आबादी हो भी जाय तो भी कोई डर की बात नहीं है क्योंकि उस आबादी में से करीब एक चौथाई आबादी शंभुल्ल कास्ट सिक्खों की है और इस तरह हम देखेंगे कि उनकी आबादी कभी भी बहुत ज्यादा नहीं हो सकती क्योंकि शंभुल्ल कास्ट के जो लोग हैं वे कांग्रस के साथ हैं और वे कांग्रस का ही साथ दते हैं और इसलिए मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि उसमें कोई मैजिस्ट्रेट या माइनिस्ट्री का सवाल पैदा नहीं होना चाहिए। बात तो सिर्फ उसूल की है और उसूल को मानना चाहिए।

अभी मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि जो नया पंजाब बने उसमें पंजाबी डिपार्टमेंट जैसा हमारे पेंप्स में पंजाबी डिपार्टमेंट काम कर रहा है पंजाबी जवान को जिन्दा रखने के लिए, हम चाहते हैं कि वही पंजाबी डिपार्टमेंट नये पंजाब में भी बनाया जाय और उसके वही फंक्शंस हों जैसे कि वह पेंप्स में फंक्शन कर रहा है।

जब रहा माइनिस्ट्री संफगाहर्स का सवाल। वरना मेरे दोस्त बहादुर सिंह साहब ने उस पर

बड़ा जोर दिया और कहा कि जो लोग बड़े स्टरडी होते हैं और जो बड़ी माइनिस्ट्री में हैं उनको इग्नोर किया जाता है और उनको सर्विस में तरजीह नहीं दी जाती और उनके साथ अच्छा सलूक नहीं किया जाता और उसके जवाब में मेरे भाई श्री टंक चन्द ने बड़े सुन्दर तरीके से परसेंटेंज निकाल कर साबित करने की कोशिश की कि उनका यह इल्लजाम दुरुस्त नहीं है। लेकिन जनाबवाला, मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि जो लोग वाकई माइनिस्ट्री में हैं वे तो रोते नहीं हैं, जिनके साथ असल में डिस्क्रिमिनेशन किया जाता है और जो आजकल कुचले मार और दबाये जा रहे हैं, वे तो रोते नहीं हैं क्योंकि उनको रोना आता ही नहीं है और अगर रोयें भी तो कोई उनकी सुनता नहीं। उन लोगों का दुःख तो आपके सामने कोई पेश नहीं कर रहा है। उनको देखिये कि वे कितनी माइनिस्ट्री में हैं और सर्विस में उनकी क्या हालत है? जब उनके बारे में सवाल किया जाता है तो आंकड़ें दे कर बतला दिया जाता है कि इतने गूंडे धर और फोर्ध में भर्ती किये गये और इतने चपड़ासी या पेंटी क्लर्क्स की तौर पर लिये गये लेकिन जो हमारे आला तालीम पाठे हुए भाई हैं ग्रेजुएट और एम० ए० वर्ग के उनको अच्छी पोस्ट्स नहीं मिलती हैं और वे इधर से उधर बेकार स्टूडेंट पोस्ट्स की तलाश में मार फिरते हैं और इसलिए मेरी गुजारिश है कि जो असल में डिस्क्रिमिनेशन के शिकार हो रहे हैं उनकी तरफ तबज्जह दी जाय और उनकी हालत सुधारने की कोशिश की जाय। न कि किसी एक संकशन से डर कर उनकी तरफ ज्यादा तबज्जह दी जाय। मेरा मतलब किसी संकशन को पिच करने से नहीं है। मैं तो सिर्फ यह चाहता हूँ कि शंभुल्ल कास्ट लोगों की तरफ अच्छी तरह से ध्यान दिया जाय और जैसा कि अभी सरदार हुकम सिंह ने सन् ५० के प्रेसीडेंट के आर्डर का जिक्र किया है, वह वाकई डिफैक्टिव है और उसमें शंभुल्ल कास्ट सिक्खों के साथ जैसा सलूक नहीं हो रहा है जैसा हिन्दू शंभुल्ल कास्ट वाले भाइयों के साथ हो रहा है। और उल्लेख इस बात की है कि प्रेसीडेंट का जो

[सा हर जीवत सिंह]

शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट सम्बन्धी आर्डर हैं उसको अमेंड किया जाय और उसमें इक्वैल ट्रीटमेंट होना चाहिए। शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट हिन्दूज और शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट सिक्ख्स के साथ एक सा वर्ताव किया जाय। अगर एक शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट का सिक्ख फीरोजपुर में नौकरी कर रहा हैं तो उसको वही बेनिफिट्स दिये जाने चाहियें जो कि एक हिन्दू बेनिफिट्स दिये जाने चाहियें जो कि एक हिन्दू के शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट भाई को दस्तयाब हैं। सिक्खाओं में शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट की चार जातियां हैं। मजहबी, रामदासिये, कबीरपंथी और सिक्लीगर। अगर वह आदमी पंजाब से निकाल कर पूना में भेज दिया जाता हैं उसका ट्रान्सफर कर दिया जाता हैं तो इसमें उसका तो कोई कसर नहीं हैं और मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि पंजाब में जो उसको बेनिफिट्स मिल रहे थे और उसके बच्चों को वजीफा वर्गों में मिल रहा था और उसके बच्चों को नौकरी मिल रही थी, पूना में उसको यह तमाम बेनिफिट्स नहीं मिल रहे हैं। पूरा दर्श हमारा हैं और यह मुनासिब नहीं जान पड़ता कि उनको बेनिफिट्स देना सिर्फ पंजाब और पेंप्स तक क्यों लिमिटेड कर दिया जाय। पेंप्स के बार् में मुझे यह कहना हैं कि कमिशन ने भी यह सिफारिश की हैं कि पेंप्स को उसका पूरा स्टेटस दिया जाय। और उन्होंने उसके बार् में इस तरह कहा हैं :

"By way of caution, however, and as a concession to the sentiment in Patiala, we would recommend that the special position of the city of Patiala might be recognised and that some important offices of the Punjab Government might be located there. This would involve no departure from the general principle which is referred to elsewhere in this report, namely that administrative convenience must be the main consideration to be taken into account in deciding the location of government offices. The claims of Patiala can be supported on the ground that Chandigarh has still to develop and that the location of some offices in Patiala

which is situated at a short distance from Chandigarh, will be both popular and convenient."

कमिशन ने भी हमारे साथ बड़ी मेहरबानी की हैं कि पटियाला को एक अच्छी पोजीशन नये बनने वाले पंजाब राज्य में देने की सिफारिश की हैं। पटियाला एक अच्छा इंडस्ट्रियल सिटी बन सकता हैं और इसके डेवलपमेंट पर काफी रुपया खर्च किया गया हैं। यह चारों तरफ रेल से और रोड से कनेक्टड हैं और अगर हम इसको कैपिटल मान लें तो इसमें हम लोगों का और सरकार का दोनों का भला हैं। सर्विसज के इंटेंग्रेशन के बार् में मुझे यह कहना हैं कि जब पहले सर्विसज का इंटेंग्रेशन हुआ था तो कुछ सर्विसज को बुरी तरह से कुचला गया था और उन लोगों का promotion का नम्बर ही नहीं आता था। पटियाला जो पंजाब से मर्जर होने के लिए तैयार हैं, उसका मर्जर में वेलकम करता हूं साथ ही साथ मैं यह अर्ज करूंगा कि सर्विसज में प्रमोशन लेंथ आफ सर्विस पर हो न कि उनके पेमेंट पर उनका कोई प्रमोशन हो। पंजाब में सर्विसज में लोगों को तीन तीन हजार और साई तीन तीन हजार रुपये तक तनखावें मिलती हैं जब कि हमारे पेंप्स वालों की दो हजार से कम ही पर रुक जाती हैं। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि पेंप्स और पंजाब की सर्विसज का जो इंटेंग्रेशन हो वह लेंथ आफ सर्विस पर किया जाय न कि उनका पे स्कैल देख कर किया जाय।

पेंप्स के बार् में एक चीज और कक्षा चाहता हूं। पेंप्स का कुछ रुपया रिजर्व में हैं। मैं चाहता हूं कि वह रुपया पंजाब के यूनाइटेड फंड में न डाल दिया जाय। वह पेंप्स के लिये ही खर्च किया जाय तो मैं आप को इस के लिये धन्यवाद दूंगा।

[SHRI BARMAN in the Chair]

आखीर में मुझे यह कहना हैं कि हो सकता हैं कि हम पेंशनटली सोचते हों, या बातों की रों में बह जा सकते हैं। जो हमारे लीडर पीडित जी और पंत जी बैठे हुए हैं वह हमारे कल्याण की बात शायद ज्यादा बेहतर सोच सकते हैं। आर्किटेक्ट ने मकान बना दिया, उस में रहना

हम लोगों को हैं। हमें देखना है कि हम कैसे आराम से रह सकते हैं। कहां खिड़की और बारी अच्छी होगी, कहां गुसलखाना अच्छा होगा, कहां रहने के कमरे चाहियें, यह हम को सोचना है। हम गलत भी सोच सकते हैं लेकिन हमारे पंत जी और पीठित जी जिन के सामने मुल्क का इन्टरस्ट है वह गलत बात नहीं सोच सकते। यह लोग खुद ही हर बात को सोच लें, जैसा वह चाहेंगे और हम से करने के लिये कहेंगे हम उस को मान लेंगे, हम कभी भी उस के खिलाफ नहीं जायेंगे।

अब मैं सिर्फ एक मजाक की बात कह कर बैठ जाऊंगा। कहीं पर पांच, दस नौकर इकट्ठा बैठ गये और वह इकट्ठा हो कर एक दूसरे से पूछते हैं कि तुम्हें कौन क्या तन्स्वाह मिलती है। एक बोलता है, मुझे तो १०० रु० मिलते हैं, दूसरा कहता है कि मेरा भी साहब मुझे १०० रु० देता है। आठ, दस कहने लगे कि हमें तो १०० रु० महीना और खाना मिलता है। जब राम लाल की बारी आई तो उस से पूछा कि क्यों बं, तुम्हें कौन क्या मिलता है? उस ने कहा कि मुझे तो ७० रु० मिलते हैं। उस से कहा गया कि तू ७० रु० क्यों लेता है। गरज कि उस को खूब भड़काया गया तब वह कहने लगा कि आज रात को जब मेरा साहब आयेगा तो मैं कहूंगा कि मुझे और तन्स्वाह दे। रात को साहब आता है तो कहता है कि साहब, आप मुझे ७० रु० क्यों देते हैं, दूसरों को १०० रु० मिलता है? मेरा गुजारा अब ७० रु० में नहीं होता। साहब था पंजाबी प्लिसिआ। बोला: क्यों बं उल्लू, गर्ध, तुम्हें कौन ७० रु० नहीं मिलेंगे तो और क्या मिलेंगे? अगर ७० रु० से ज्यादा न दे तो क्या करेगा? नौकर ने हाथ बांध कर कहा कि मैं इसी तन्स्वाह पर नौकरी करूंगा। सो साहबसेदर कांग्रेस में हम लोगों की, पोजीशन तो रामलाल वाली है।

Shri Bansal (Jhajjar-Rewari): I thank you for calling me at this stage of the discussion. Although I would have very much liked to lay

special stress on the economic consequences of the SRC Report, as I have been called when the discussion on Punjab is going on, I think I will have to devote more of my time to that question rather than to the economic consequences of reorganisation. I would however at the outset put that pet subject of mine aside by making a few observations on it.

I am one of those who have been prejudiced from the very beginning against the recommendations of the Commission, and in the ordinary course, that prejudice would have strengthened. But as I sat here listening to the speeches made by many hon. Members in this House and as I went through the Report again and again, I must say I feel that the Commission have done a splendid job of work in the time they had at their disposal and faced as they were with numerous complicated problems. Rightly, the Commission have stressed that language alone cannot be the criterion for realigning the States. If language alone was the criterion, I am sure some of the Members who have spoken on the floor of the House so vehemently against the recommendations of the Commission would have come to entirely different conclusions. Take, for example, the case of UP, Vindhya Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh. If language was the sole criterion, this entire area would have been made into one State. But no. The Commission have not suggested that.

An Hon. Member: They are unilingual States.

Shri Bansal: If language alone was the consideration, then all those States speaking one language would have been formed into one State.

None of the residents of these parts has said:—I want a number of States in South India or in Bombay. In fact, the residents of those parts of UP and my part of Punjab, all like that the States should be as large and economically viable as we can

[Shri Bansal]

possibly have. And one consideration which the Commission could not forget was that the States were economically viable.

Now, I would try to examine the recommendations to see whether they have succeeded in making at least some of the States economically more viable than they are at present. The case of UP is separate. It has been a large province. It has been an economically viable province. I have four States actually in this connection in view: Vindhya Pradesh, Madhya Bharat, Bhopal and Madhya Pradesh. Madhya Pradesh was more or less viable, but not Madhya Bharat completely, nor Vindhya Pradesh and certainly not Bhopal. I think it is a good recommendation that they have made to merge these States into one big unit. I must say here that I do not like this big sprawling shape of this new State, particularly that portion which borders on Andhra and the new Telangana. But I do not know what could have been done under the circumstances—frankly, I am not familiar with the language that is spoken in that tip of new Madhya Pradesh.

Now, as far as the recommendation concerning Bombay is concerned, I am one of those who are one with it. But I will not like to enter into a controversy as to whether Bombay should be divided into two or three States or should be kept as recommended by the Commission. But from the purely economic point of view, just as Kakasaheb pointed out the other day that every Maharashtrian says, 'Bombay chalo', every Gujarati says, 'Bombay chalo', and that is because all the lines of communications have been made in such a way that they converge on Bombay. This is my one criticism against the Report, that while readjusting these boundaries, the Commission have not taken into consideration the lines of communications, and I think this will be a problem which the Government of India will have to face in the very near future. Although our States

have developed, according to the Commission, on the basis of certain accidents, we should not forget that those accidents took place from 150 to 100 years back, and ever since our railway system and our communications system began to develop, there had been evolved a sort of pattern so that all the communications converge on the central capitals of those States. And inasmuch as now certain capitals will be disturbed—take the case of Bhopal, for example, which is going to be made the capital of Madhya Pradesh—I am sure a lot of difficulties will arise in the case of those States as far as communication and transport services are concerned. The same thing is going to happen in regard to the city of Bombay if the SRC recommendations are going to be changed. I am not going to say whether those recommendations should be changed or should not be changed. I am just bringing to the notice of the House the implications of the recommendations of the Commission.

Now, I come to the question of economic viability, and that will lead me straight to the problem of my State, namely, Punjab. I have been myself toying with the idea of having the Prant of Hariana. But, the more I look at the map of Punjab, the more I study the economic structure, the physical contours, the run of the rivers in my area, the sprawling desert that is invading my State, I think that unless the Hariana Prant is merged with some other neighbouring State or the erstwhile Princely States of the neighbourhood, it will not be a viable State at all.

An Hon. Member: Delhi?

Shri Bansal: I am referring to Alwar and Bharatpur. I do not know what is amusing to my friends here. I am only referring to Bharatpur and Alwar and a few other States on the border. (*Interruption*) I said, erstwhile Princely States. I think the hon. Member is listening only with one ear on my side and not with both the ears. If you look

at the map before me, this so-called Hariana Prant will consist of Hissar, Mahendargarh, Gurgaon, Rohtak and a part of Karnal, and, if it was left to my friends who spoke before me, they would also like to chip off a portion of Karnal and, perhaps, a portion of even some other districts, which I have just now mentioned, with the result that a very small portion will remain in the so-called Hariana Prant.

Please remember that a major portion of the Hariana Prant is desert land, particularly in my constituency the whole of Rewari tahsil is nothing more than a desert, a part of erst-while Dujana State which has now been merged with Rohtak district is also desert. Mahendargarh is desert and Hissar remains a desert even now. I hope its fortunes will change somewhat after it begins to get the full quota of the canal waters from Bhakra-Nangal. Therefore, I will suggest to my friends who are intent on pressing the claims of Hariana that they should consider very calmly as to what they are asking. I know that we from Hariana are very much dissatisfied with the fate that has been allotted to us by our successive governments in the Punjab. No one is more conscious than myself of that position. Go anywhere in my district, even the chaprassi comes from Jullundur. Go anywhere in my district, you will find that every Tahsildar and Naib Tasildar is sent from the northern Punjab (*Interruption*) and we really do not understand as to why it should happen like that. I am surprised that my Sikh friends say that they are suffering from some disabilities. I want to know what disabilities they are suffering from.

My friend, Shri Tek Chand, the other day gave figures of their predominance in our military. I can give you numbers to show their predominance in other services. I can give you the numbers of minister-ships they hold in our Punjab Ministry. I am surprised that instead of

recognising the very inferior position to which Hariana has been relegated, instead of telling us, 'Look here, brothers, we are with you, we are going to meet all your grievances' they come forward and claim that they have been put in a position of very great inferiority and, therefore, they want a separate homeland of their own. I quite realise that if a portion of Punjab which they claim, including even a portion of Karnal, is given to them that would be a very viable State. That would be a very prosperous State. I do realise that. May I know how does that State become viable and prosperous? It becomes viable and prosperous because it comes next to our great Himalayan ranges, because it comes close to that area which feeds our perennial rivers, because it comes closer to the headworks of our electricity and irrigation systems. Surely for anybody or any community to claim that they have the sole right to all these bounties of nature, is, I must say, not being 'just to the people who are living in other parts of the country.

What is this language question, I want to understand. It has been suggested that Punjabis want to speak in Punjabi. Welcome. May I know that great difference is there between Punjabi and Hindustani? For all these years has not the work of the combined Punjab, namely that part of the Punjab which has now gone to Pakistan and the present Punjab been carried on properly and efficiently? I ask where was the demand at that time for a separate State. May I know what difficulties they experienced in the Punjab of that day or are going to experience now? I must say frankly that we are the people who are nursing a great sense of dissatisfaction, a rightful sense of dissatisfaction against the treatment that has been given to us by our other brothers in the North Punjab—let them be Sikhs or non-Sikhs. It is for this reason that I would like to impress upon this House that in adopting the re-

[Shri Bansal]

commendations of the Reorganisation Commission on the formation of Punjab after the merger of PEPSU and Himachal Pradesh, they should give serious consideration to that part of the recommendation which says that for the backward areas there should be Special Development Boards. In fact, I would go a step further. There should be, of course, Special Development Boards but there must be special Ministers in charge for those backward areas so that.....

Sir, my hon. friends in front of me are entering into a conversation and this disturbs me. I am not a seasoned speaker like you and am, therefore, so easily upset and disturbed. I do not mean any disrespect to them.

Therefore, with all the seriousness that I can command, I will suggest to this House carefully to consider that portion of the recommendations of the Commission where they deal with the special treatment which must be accorded in the future to the backward areas of this region.

I would refer to a small recommendation of the Commission that relates to Loharu. In the Report it has been said that Loharu sub-tehsil should pass to Rajasthan. I have been receiving deputation after deputation from the erstwhile State of Loharu saying that they do not want to be merged with Rajasthan. They are even willing to have a referendum on that point. If this House remains unconvinced that the Commission has not been just to the aspirations of the people of Loharu in tacking that portion on to Rajasthan, I would suggest that some Members from this House should be sent to that area to ascertain the views of the people of that area. If that is not possible, a referendum may be taken at the proper moment so that the people of that small area are not made to suffer a sense of grievance for times to come.

I have another point in regard to this Haryana Prant. I do not know what credence to give to those rumours and reports that come in the

Press again and again and which are heard here and outside in the lobbies that in order to placate the friends who are insisting on a Punjabi Subha, in order to give them a slightly higher percentage in the Punjab Legislature, ideas are being canvassed so that Himachal Pradesh may be made into a separate State, and some other portions from the northern part of PEPSU may be tacked on to the Himachal Pradesh. And what is more, whatever the form of Haryana Prant may be at present, some portions from Haryana area may also be chipped off and either tacked on to Delhi or Rajasthan or U.P. I must say very emphatically on behalf of my constituency and the people who reside in Haryana that anything of this type will be very stoutly resisted by us. If we are not laying claim on a separate State, certainly we are going to see that whatever area we have is not cut into small portions and distributed as largesse to people who are claiming a sort of separate State in this country. Off and on we hear the demand for Greater Delhi. I was glad to hear that that demand is not being pressed by the Members of the Delhi State in this House. I will not forestall them, but I hope they will not press their demand for Greater Delhi because that will surely mean chipping off some areas from Rohtak and Gurgaon.

Shri L. N. Mishra (Darbhanga cum Bhagalpur): They are losing Delhi itself.

Shri Bansal: I must seek the ear of this House and its support on this demand of the people of my area that they will be very sorry if any suggestions like that are countenanced. We hear that part of Sonapat is likely to be tacked on to Delhi; we hear that part of Faridabad is going to be tacked on to Delhi for its future developmental needs. I would humbly suggest that this kind of a move should not be encouraged and it must be resisted.

About the demand for Greater Delhi for the future planning or expansion of Delhi so that this capital does not feel the shortage of space for its development in future, may I ask how long will you allow this city to go on spreading like a leviathan? Are we not aware of the great harm that concentration of population in large cities does to the residents of those cities? It is said that our State is likely to prosper in future—yes, it will prosper—but may I know why should every Central Government office be located in New Delhi? Is there any reason for that? What has happened to the oft-repeated assurances given on the floor of this House that as far as possible, offices of the Central Government will be dispersed and will be taken away to as large a number of cities as possible? Therefore, I say that we should not allow for the sake of future development of Delhi, the Hariana region to be dismembered, because that will be the greatest tragedy as far as my area is concerned.

Having said this, I would like to reply to one or two small points that were urged the other day and even today for dismembering U.P. I have said in the very beginning that I am not involved in the U. P. politics.

Mr. Chairman: Then why does he enter that politics? The only question is that the Deputy-Speaker has asked me to give half an hour to every Member and I think he should utilise that time for laying stress on points in which he is much interested.

Shri Bansal: I will accept your ruling.

Mr. Chairman: It is no ruling; it is just a suggestion.

An Hon. Member: All are interested in U.P.

Shri Bansal: I will finish by referring to one more point about the language controversy that is raging in my State of Punjab. As I have

said earlier, I know that Punjabi proper, which is spoken in the northern portion of Punjab, excluding Himachal Pradesh, has a semblance of a separate language, but if I sit in the Vidhan Sabha of Punjab and if I hear, for instance, my friend Sardar Hukam Singh speaking, although I do not know Punjabi, I can assure him that I can understand every word of what he says, and in the same way he can understand every word of what I may speak if I have ever the opportunity of being a member of that Sabha or of anybody from Hariana Prant. This exaggerated emphasis on the language controversy, and particularly to raise it to such a pedestal that unless this problem is solved there will be chaos in the Punjab, really surprises me. It is an astounding statement and I think the House will give serious consideration and will not be taken away by the type of arguments that have been made on the floor of this House. On the other hand, the difficulty of the people who are residing in the Hariana portion of the State is this. After partition, a large number of our brethren from West Punjab have come and settled down in our area. There are a larger number of refugee friends who have settled down in my small towns of Rewari, Rohtak and Bahadurgarh, and even if there were certain imaginary insuperable barriers between the languages and cultures of our people and the people of the so-called Punjab proper, they are being obliterated. In fact, I am sure they do not at present exist at all. Therefore, I would suggest to my friends who have spoken from the opposite side that they should not exaggerate these points out of all proportions but consider them in a way that will lead to a harmonious solution of our problems.

One small point and I have done. Here in the Report itself and even in the discussion in regard to the re-organisation of the various States, suggestions have been made, I think

[Shri Bansal]

Unfortunately, that the ultimate future of some of the areas should be decided after a lapse of five years. This is particularly the case with regard to the residuary State of Hyderabad, namely, that it may be merged with Andhra after a period of five years if two-thirds majority of that State Legislature wants it to be done in that manner. The same type of argument, the same type of reasoning is being applied to some other States—I will not name them—and I would not have really bothered very much about them except largely on matters of policy if this was confined only to Hyderabad, even though I must say that economically and from the political point of view no decision should be left over like this. After all, we want to tackle this problem now and we should do it; we should not keep the Damocles' sword of reorganisation hanging over for an unlimited period. This is the time when we are taking a decision; we should take a bold decision and do away with this question once and for all. We should not again raise this trouble after a period of five years. The difficulty in this kind of solution is this. Even in respect of my State, insidiously it is being suggested "You should demand some sort of a three-tier State". The insidious propaganda is going on that Hariana Prant should demand some sort of a two-tier State in the Punjab itself, the idea being that if the seeds of a two-tier State are laid now, ultimately a separate entity will emerge and after five years when the question is again opened in respect of one or two States, the people of Hariana and the people of Punjab would again raise their voice. I am bringing to the notice of this House the very serious implications of this kind of move, and, therefore, I would like to impress upon my hon. friends that whatever other considerations there may be, they should cast them in the background and evolve a permanent solution. For God's sake decide about the future reorganisation of our States here and now. Once for all we should finalise this entire thing

so that we do not have to come to this question of alteration of boundaries again and again. I say so even from the economic point of view. I know that the States Reorganisation Commission did not bestow much thought to this question as to how this realignment of the boundaries is going to affect the Second Five Year Plan. They have stated in passing that some re-adjustment will have to be done in the various allocations that have already been made tentatively. There may even be some waste of time and some more efforts may have to be put in. In fact Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao has gone to the extent of suggesting that we must give one year for this reorganisation and the next Five Year Plan should be ushered in after the lapse of one year. I do not agree with that view at all. Nevertheless it is true that the reorganisation of the States is going to upset to some extent the Second Five Year Plan. If we re-open this question again after five years the Third Five Year Plan will again be upset to some extent. I do not think our country can afford to pay that price.

2 P.M.

With regard to the Second Plan, I would like to say that it is our duty, the duty of this House, the Government and the various new States that will be formed, to fall into strides at once; they should not wait for the readjustment of the final boundaries and the other smaller problems like merger of the services, etc. These will have to be attended to. What I say is that they should not devote undue attention to those problems to the entire neglect of the Second Five Year Plan and I think that it would be possible. I think that in spite of the fact that the boundaries of a number of States will be changed out of recognition, given goodwill and co-operation, with the new enthusiasm that is likely to be created on account of the formation of the new States, it is possible to see that the Second Five Year Plan does not suffer. It would be our duty to see that the Second Five Year Plan is not allowed to lag behind. The

reason why I am so hopeful is this. So far we had about 28 States. Now, in future we will have 16. I think from the point of view of planning, this will be a great advantage.

Today the Planning Commission has to make allocations for small States like Bhopal and Ajmer. Now the problems of these small States will not be there. Moreover, planning itself will be more integrated in the sense that it will have to be within bigger areas. Therefore, whatever temporary drawbacks might be there due to the realignment of the boundaries, they are capable of being overcome by the very fact that we are going to have larger units, lesser in number.

I will end by appealing to this House that we should consider these problems in a dispassionate manner and not in a spirit of passion and also not from the point of view of linguism only but from the point of view of the larger good of the country as a whole.

श्री ए० एन० विद्यालंकार (जालंधर): सभापति जी, दो तीन दिन से जिस ढंग से हम रिआर्गनाइजेशन के प्रश्न पर विचार कर रहे हैं, मेरी राय में वह हमें किसी ठीक नतीजे पर पहुंचने में मदद नहीं दे सकता। हम लोग अपनी अपनी बात कहते हैं और बहुत जोर से कहते हैं, काफी गरमी भी पैदा करते हैं। दुनिया में सभी अपनी बात कहा करते हैं, ठीक है, लेकिन इस हाउस में हम लोग जब कि किसी एक नतीजे पर पहुंचना चाहते हैं और एक समस्या का हल ढूंढना चाहते हैं, तो ज्यादा बेहतर तरीका, बेहतर एप्रोच यह हो कि हम दूसरों की बात को, जो कि हमारे विचार से भिन्न मत रखते हैं, समझने की कोशिश करें और उसको जानने और पहचानने की कोशिश करें। अगर हम अपनी अपनी बात ही कहते जायें और बड़े जोर से कहें, और काफी दलीलबाजी करें, काफी लाजिक से काम लें, तो भी हम किसी नतीजे पर नहीं पहुंच सकते। मैं जानता हूँ कि इस हाउस में बड़े बड़े विद्वान हैं, बहुत अच्छे अच्छे वकील हैं। दुनिया में हर बात की वकालत की जा

सकती हैं, अच्छी से अच्छी दलीलें दी जा सकती हैं, उसके लिए अच्छे से अच्छे आंकड़े और अच्छे से अच्छे फिगर्स और अच्छे से अच्छे सबूत पेश किये जा सकते हैं। लेकिन जब आप वकील बन कर यहां दलीलें करते हैं उनसे कोई नतीजा हासिल होने का नहीं है। मैं दावे से कहता हूँ कि हमारा यह प्रश्न लाजिक का नहीं है बल्कि साइकोलोजी का है, यह प्रश्न मनोविज्ञान का है। आखिर हर बात पर विभिन्न मत हो सकते हैं। सारी बातें जो कि यहां पेश की गयी हैं, भाषाओं की दृष्टि से, आर्थिक दृष्टि से, राजनीतिक दृष्टि से और दूसरी दृष्टियों से, उन सब में अगर कुछ लाभ हैं तो कुछ हानियां भी हैं। छोटे प्रान्तों में कुछ लाभ हैं तो कुछ हानियां भी हैं। हर बात में आपको कुछ लाभ और कुछ हानियां दिखायी देंगी और आपको तोलना पड़ेगा कि आपको सब में कौनसी चीज चाहिए। अगर आप चाहते हैं कि बड़े बड़े प्रान्त हों तो ठीक हैं। बड़े प्रान्तों में एकता की बात होती है, बड़े प्रान्तों में खर्चा कम होता है, बड़े प्रान्तों में कुछ यह भावना रहती है कि आप बड़े बड़े प्लान बनाते हैं, उन पर केंद्र फॉसला कर देता है और उन को आसानी से कार्यान्वित किया जा सकता है। बड़े प्रान्तों में शायद शासन की सुविधा भी रहती है इसलिए कि केंद्र हुकम देता है और बाकियों को मानना पड़ता है। शक्ति का केंद्रीकरण भी बड़े प्रान्तों में होता है। लेकिन साथ ही साथ बड़े प्रान्तों के कुछ नुकसान भी हैं। अगर आप शक्ति का विकेंद्रीकरण नहीं करते तो शक्ति को हासिल करने के लिए संघर्ष होता है। मैं जानता हूँ कि हम जिस प्रकार से विचार कर रहे हैं उसमें लोगों के सामने यह विचार है कि राजनीतिक शक्ति इस ग्रुप के हाथ में आती है या उस ग्रुप के हाथ में आती है। इस बारे में हमको अपने आपको धोखा नहीं देना चाहिए। मैं तो यहां तक कहता हूँ अगर हम देखें और अपना साइको एनेलिसिस करें, अपनी भावनाओं का विश्लेषण करें, तो हम पायेंगे कि हम सभी एक ही मिट्टी के बने हुए हैं। हम सब

[श्री ए० एन० विद्यालंकार]

लोग चाहते हैं कि हम कॉम परस्ट वॉ, नेशनलिस्ट वॉ और हम सब चाहते हैं कि राष्ट्र एक हो। मगर मुझे दुःख हुआ यह देखकर कि सरदार हुक्म सिंह जी को यह बात साबित करने के लिए १५ या २० मिनट दलीलें देनी पड़ीं कि यह नहीं समझना चाहिए कि सिख दंश भक्त नहीं हैं। और मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर हममें से कोई भी किसी दूसरे गुप को दंशभक्त नहीं समझता तो वह खुद दंश से द्रोह करता है। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि हममें से सभी दंशभक्त हैं और इस बात को साबित करने के लिए किसी को इम हाउस में दलील देने की जरूरत नहीं होनी चाहिए। लेकिन जब हम पृथक्ता के भावों में बह जाते हैं तो हमें दलीलें देनी पड़ती हैं, जब एक दूसरे पर इल्जाम लगाये जाते हैं तो दलीलें देनी पड़ती हैं। मैं तो चाहता हूँ कि हमारे अन्दर यह भावना न हो कि हम एक दूसरे की दलीलों को काटें। लेकिन मैं यहां देख रहा हूँ कि दलीलों को नाट किया जाता है और इस बात में ज्यादा उत्साह दिखाया जाता है कि हम किस तरह से दूसरे की दलीलों को काट सकते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह कोई बहुत लाभदायक बात नहीं है कि हम एक दूसरे की दलीलों का जवाब दें, और मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसा करके हम किसी निर्णय पर नहीं पहुंच सकते। हमको दलील का जवाब नहीं देना है बल्कि हमको यह देखना चाहिए कि दूसरा क्या कहना चाहता है। हमको यह देखना चाहिए कि एक आदमी यह क्यों कहता है कि उसे फलां बात पसन्द नहीं है। हमारा हल इसी तरह से निकल सकता है कि हम देखें कि हम जो हल या प्रस्ताव रखते हैं उससे दूसरे की कहां तक दिलजमई होती है। अगर उससे उसकी दिलजमई नहीं होती तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारी तजवीज व्यर्थ है। वह तजवीज हमारे बीच में नजदीक का रिश्ता नहीं पैदा करती।

जहां तक रिपोर्ट का सवाल है इसको बहुत अच्छे बिद्वानों ने लिखा है। और

उन्होंने इसको बड़े सद्भाव से लिखा है इसमें सन्देह नहीं है। उन्होंने काफी मसाला इकट्ठा किया था और उस तमाम मसाले को देखकर एक बहुत अच्छा निर्णय देने की कोशिश की है। उनकी नीयत में मुझे कोई शक नहीं है। लेकिन एक बात हमें माननी पड़ेगी कि हमारा एंग्रोक कुछ ऐसा रहा है, कि कुछ बातें हमने ऐसी मान ली हैं जिन को हम समझते हैं कि वे स्वयंसिद्ध हैं, और उनको कमीशन ने भी ऐसा ही मान लिया है। और उसका नतीजा यह हुआ है कि बहुत बातों में निर्णय नहीं कर सके और दूसरों की दिलजमई नहीं कर सके। वह सिद्धान्त क्या है? यह सिद्धान्त माना गया है और हमने समझा है जैसा कि मुझ से पहले भी कई वक्ताओं ने कहा और अभी मेरे दोस्त श्री बंसल कह रहे थे और श्री टंक चन्द ने भी कहा, कि यह बात हमने मान ली कि हमारे प्रान्त बड़े बड़े होने चाहियें। ठीक है बड़े प्रान्त होने चाहियें और यह जाहिर बात है कि प्रान्त बड़े होंगे तो शक्ति का ज्यादा इस्तेमाल होगा और ठीक प्लान बन सकेंगे वरना प्लान ठीक तौर पर नहीं बन सकेंगे। परन्तु अगर बड़े प्रान्त नहीं बनते और छोट छोट प्रान्त बनाये जाते हैं तो तमाम दंश बिखर जायगा और टूट फूट जायगा, ऐसी आशंका करना मैं समझता हूँ वहम के सिवाय और कुछ नहीं है और अगर हम उसका बारीकी से विश्लेषण करें तो पायेंगे कि दरअसल ऐसी कोई संभावना नहीं है और ऐसा कुछ नहीं होने वाला है। दरअसल अगर आप कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को देखें तो आप पायेंगे कि उन्होंने दोनों बातों के लिए दलील दी है। कमीशन की रिपोर्ट में आपको हर तरह की दलील मिल जायगी और कई जगह ऐसा लगने लगता है कि उन्होंने परस्पर विरोधी दलीलें पेश की हैं। उन्होंने कहा है कि प्रान्त बड़े हों, ठीक है। लेकिन अगर प्रान्त बड़े हों और उसके अन्दर विरोधी अंश हों और वह आपस में टकराते रहते हैं और हर रोज उनके अन्दर कशमकश होती है, संघर्ष चलता है तो एक छोट प्रान्त की निस्वत भी वह बड़ा प्रान्त बहुत

कमजोर होगा जिसके अन्दर लगातार संघर्ष चलता रहे। अगर संघर्ष को हटा सकते हैं और फिर हम बड़ा प्रान्त बना सकते हैं तो बड़े से बड़ा प्रान्त बना लें लेकिन अगर संघर्ष बाकी है और संघर्ष का कारण बाकी है और उनका इलाज हम नहीं करते तो फिर बड़ा प्रान्त हमारे लिए ज्यादा खतरनाक हो जायेगा वनिस्वत एक छोट्टे प्रान्त के। अगर आप पंजाब के सम्बन्ध में मेरी व्यक्तिगत भावनाओं को पूछें तो मैं आपको बतलाऊँ कि मैं महा पंजाब चाहता हूँ, बहुत बड़ा प्रान्त चाहता हूँ और उसके अन्दर ५० पी० भी आ जाय और जितना बड़ा हो सकता है ऐसे महा पंजाब का निर्माण मैं चाहता हूँ लेकिन एक शर्त पर चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ बड़ा प्रान्त मैं बनाता हूँ तो उसके अन्दर रहने वाले तमाम लोगों, तमाम अंसर या एंलिमेंट की दिलजमई मैं कर सकता हूँ अगर मैं उनको यह विश्वास दिला सकता हूँ कि उनकी भाषा, उनकी संस्कृति और उनके तमाम इंटरैस्ट्स सेफ हैं तो अगर हम इकट्ठा हो सकें तो बड़ी अच्छी बात है लेकिन अगर सन्देह बना हुआ है और मैं सन्देहों को हटा नहीं सकता और मिलने के लिए सिर्फ दलीलें देता हूँ, राजनीतिक दलीलें, सुरक्षा सम्बन्धी और हर प्रकार की दलीलें, एक बड़े प्रान्त में मिलने के लिए देता हूँ, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि मेरी वह तमाम दलीलें बेकार जायेंगी। आर्थिक दृष्टि से और सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से आप एक बड़े प्रान्त के निर्माण के लिए जो दलीलें देते हैं वह अपनी जगह पर सही हैं, और मैं मानता हूँ कि आप बिलकुल ठीक फरमाते हैं। लेकिन यह आपकी दलीलें उस सवाल का जवाब तो नहीं हो सकतीं जो कि माइना-रिटीज की तरफ से आप पर किया जाता है, आपकी तरफ से तो इस बात का जवाब दिया जाना चाहिए। जो माइनोरिटी वाले आप से पूछते हैं। यह कहना महज काफी नहीं है कि आप के ऊपर क्या जुल्म होता है? हरियाना वालों की आम शिकायत है कि हम पर काफी जुल्म हुआ है और हमें हमेशा

इग्नोर किया गया है, और अभी कल पीडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव कह रहे थे कि हम पर जो जुल्म हुए हैं और पंजाब वालों ने जिस तरह से हमको इग्नोर किया है, जिस तरह से हमारी उपेक्षा की है, अगर मैं उसको बयान करूँ तो वह एक लम्बा फिस्सा होगा। तो हमें बड़ा पंजाब प्रान्त बनाते वक्त इस चार्ज का जवाब देना है कि हम इस तरह से प्रान्त बनायेंगे जिसमें कोई इग्नोर नहीं होगा। हमें यकीन दिलाना है कि आपकी भाषा की हर तरह से रक्षा होगी। अगर हम इस बात की दिलजमई दूसरों को करा सकें और संतोष दिला सकें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उस के लिए कहीं किसी को शिकायत नहीं होगी और एतराज नहीं होगा और बड़ा प्रान्त हम बना सकेंगे। लेकिन अगर हम वह नहीं कर सकते तो फिर हमें दूसरा रास्ता अख्तियार करना पड़ेगा और हमें उस असलियत को, जो रिऍलिटीज है उनको, स्वीकार करना पड़ेगा। राजनीति के अन्दर असलियत से इंकार करना एक गलत चीज होती है। अब तक हम लोग जो बहस करते आये हैं हम असल वाक्यात से इनकार करने का यत्न करते हैं, मैंने शुरू में कहा है कि हमारे भीतर दोनों प्रकार की भावनाएं हैं। हमारे अन्दर पृथक्त्व की भावना है, सैप्रेमैटिस्ट टैंडेंसीज हैं और हमारे अन्दर एकता की भावनाएं भी हैं और दोनों तरह की भावनाएं हमारे हृदयों के बीच में हैं। कभी सब के ऊपर एकता की भावना प्रबल होती है और उस भावना से हम प्रभावित होकर एक तरफ चल पड़ते हैं और जब दूसरी तरह की भावना आती है तो दूसरी तरफ चल पड़ते हैं। आज हमें इन दोनों भावनाओं का मुकाबला अपने हृदय में करना है, और दिमाग से तालना है कि हम दोनों में से क्या चीज पसन्द करते हैं। हमें इस सम्बन्ध में अपना मनो-वैज्ञानिक विश्लेषण करके देखना है। हर एक चीज के लिए आपको कुछ कीमत देनी पड़ेगी। अगर आप एक बड़ा प्रान्त बनाना चाहते हैं और एकता की भावना पर ज्यादा

[श्री ए० एन० विद्यालंकार]

और देना चाहते हैं तो फिर आपको कीमत अदा करनी पड़ेगी। जो अक्सरियत हैं उसको काफी कीमत अदा करना पड़ेगी माहना-रिट्रीज को संतुष्ट करने के लिए। अगर आप यह कहते हैं कि नहीं हम तो यह वर्दाशत नहीं कर सकते कि किसी दूसरे को उसके हिस्से से कुछ भी अधिक दें जिससे वह संतुष्ट होता हो; हम तो अपना अपना हिस्सा पूरा पूरा रखेंगे, या हम यह कहेंगे कि हमारी चीज बनी रहनी चाहिए, बाकी दूसरों की चली जाय; तो इस सब के मानी यह होंगे कि दूसरों को आप अपने साथ एक में मिलाना नहीं चाहते या उन्हें मिलाने की पूरी कीमत अदा करने के लिए आप तैयार नहीं। और आपको अलहदा अलहदा, छोट टुकड़ों में रहना पड़ेगा। और यह कदरती बात है, और व्यावहारिक बात है।

हमारे पंजाब में भाषा का प्रश्न उठा। अभी कई एक मरे दोस्तों ने कहा कि हिन्दी और पंजाबी के अन्दर कोई भेद नहीं है और पंजाबी दरअसल हिन्दी से बहुत मिलती जुलती हुई है। मैं इसको मानता हूँ और मैं जानता हूँ कि उनका ऐसा फरमाना दुरुस्त है, हमारे देश की तमाम भाषाओं के अन्दर बहुत कम भेद है। हिन्दी अगर देश की राष्ट्र भाषा बनी है तो इसीलिए नहीं बनी कि किसी ने उस पर मंहरबानी की है कि वह राष्ट्र भाषा बन जाय बल्कि मैं आपको याद दिलाऊँ कि अंग्रेजों के उमाने में जब कि अंग्रेज लोग अंग्रेजी को इस देश में चलाना चाहते थे और जब किसी को हिन्दी का स्मरण भी नहीं था कि हिन्दी भी कोई एक भाषा है और हिन्दी का गजाक होता था उस वक्त भी कांग्रेस और अन्य जो देश की सार्वदेशिक संस्थाएँ बढ़ीं वे हिन्दी को लेकर आगे बढ़ीं और हिन्दी के प्रयोग को प्रोत्साहन दिया और जहाँ वह गई हिन्दी का प्रयोग किया। हिन्दी बहुत आम समझी जाने वाली भाषा थी। इन्फर्नल देश में हिन्दी का प्रचार हुआ और वह सब जगह

चली। किसी ने उस पर अहसान नहीं किया और जो अभी कल मरे दोस्त श्री टी० एस० ए० चीट्टियार ने कहा कि हिन्दी अहिन्दी भाषी क्षेत्रों पर जबर्दस्ती टूँसी जा रही है तो मैं उनसे कहना चाहूँगा कि उनका यह आक्षेप उचित नहीं है। मुझसे पूछें तो, दरअसल जितनी भी १२ या १४ भाषाएँ संविधान में रक्खी गई हैं उनको अपना विकास करने की पूरी स्वतंत्रता दे दी जाय और यह छूट दे दी जाय कि जो आदमी जिस भाषा को बोलना चाहता है और जिस लिपि में लिखना चाहता है उसको आप उस भाषा में बोलने और उस लिपि में लिखने की पूरी स्वतंत्रता दे दीजिये; तो जाहिर है कि जो भाषा आम व्यवहार की होगी उसको लोग प्रयोग में लाना ज्यादा पसन्द करेंगे, और लोग अपने आप उसी भाषा को अपनायेंगे जिसमें सारा काम-काज चल सकता होगा और जो व्यावहारिक दृष्टि से उपयोगी होगी। दरअसल बहुत सी समस्याएँ तो हम लोग, राजनीतिक नेता पैदा करते हैं। यह नहीं कि कोई जानबूझ कर हम समस्याएँ पैदा करते हों, लेकिन हम जो बहुत ज्यादा इंटरफीयरेंस करते हैं उसका कारण बहुतेरी समस्याएँ उठ खड़ी होती हैं। जैसे कि अक्सर आपने देखा होगा कि एक मरीज की बीमारी में जब डाक्टर बहुत ज्यादा देखल देते हैं तो बीमारी घटने के बजाय और अधिक बढ़ जाती है और आजकल चिकित्सक यह कहते सुने जाते हैं कि मरीज के इलाज में इंटरफीयरेंस मत कीजिये, उसी तरह मरे मतानुसार वह गवर्नमेंट बैस्ट है जो कम से कम इंटरफीयर करती है। अगर आप यह करें कि देश के अन्दर तमाम भाषाओं को इस बात की इजाजत दें कि जहाँ जो भाषा प्रयोग करना चाहता है वह बखुशी उसको इस्तेमाल कर सकता है तो क्या होगा? मैं जानता हूँ कि अगर कोई मद्रास से आदमी आता है, तामिल या तेलगू प्रान्त से आता है तो वह पंजाब में जाकर यह गलती नहीं करेगा कि वह वहाँ पर तामिल अथवा तेलगू बोलें। उस क्षेत्र की व्यावहारिक

आवश्यकताएं उसको इसके लिए बाध्य करेंगी कि वहां पर जो भाषा समझी और बोली जाती है उसी का वह भी प्रयोग करे। मैं समझता हूं कि अगर लोगों पर इसको छोड़ दिया जाय तो स्वयं लोग हिन्दी भाषा का प्रयोग करना पसन्द करेंगे क्योंकि वह भाषा सब जगह समझी जाती है और एक व्यवहारिक भाषा है और वे ऐसा नहीं समझेंगे कि हिन्दी को उन पर जबर्दस्ती ठोसा जा रहा है। मुझे तो श्री एस० के० पाटिल के मुंह से यह सुन कर अच्छा लगा कि हिन्दी वालों के लिए यह शोभाजनक बात नहीं कि वे प्रान्तीय भाषाओं से मुकाबला करें, और इस बात में भ्रम है कि हमारा हिन्दी का भी यह प्रान्त होगा, और हमारा वह प्रान्त होगा, अथवा कितने ऐसे प्रान्त हैं जहां पर हिन्दी बोली जाती है। अगर पंजाब के लिए हम इस बात पर जिद करें कि वह भी हिन्दी प्रान्त बनेगा और उसके लिए हम चर्चा करें और भ्रम हटें और माइनारिटीज का परेशान करें, और उनको यह कहें कि हिन्दी का साथ न देना दशद्रोह है, तो मैं समझता हूं कि हमारी यह गलती है। सरदार हुकम सिंह ने पंजाबी सूबे की जो बात कही है। मैं उन से इतनी बात में सहमत नहीं हूं और मैं यह नहीं मानता कि पंजाबी सूबे की उनकी जो मांग है उसके पीछे साम्प्रदायिकता की भावना बिलकुल किसी हद तक भी काम नहीं करती रही, लेकिन साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि जो लोग पंजाबी सूबे के निर्माण का विरोध करते रहे हैं, उनके अन्दर भी काफी हद तक साम्प्रदायिकता की भावना थी और उनकी साम्प्रदायिकता की भावना दूसरों से कम नहीं थी। दरअसल दोनों तरफ साम्प्रदायिकता की भावना काम कर रही थी। जो असलीयत है, और हकीकत है उसको हमें स्वीकार कर लेना चाहिए। उसके लिए मैं किसी को दोष नहीं देता। हम लोग सब एक ही मिट्टी के बने हुए हैं, हम सबके अन्दर साम्प्रदायिकता की भावना भी है, पृथक्त्व की भावना भी है और राष्ट्रीयता और दशभक्ति की

भावना भी विद्यमान है। और अपने में और सारं लोगों में राष्ट्रीयता और दशभक्ति की भावना को लाने का तरीका यह है कि हम दूसरों के अधिकारों को स्वीकार करें और उन की दिक्कतों को समझ कर उन्हें हल करने का प्रयत्न करें। अगर एक आदमी कहता है कि मुझे जूता काटता है तो मेरा काम यही नहीं है कि उस की बात काटने के लिए दलीलें दूं कि उसको कहां जूता काटता है, बल्कि जिसको जूता काटता है उसकी तकलीफ को रफा करूं। अगर हमारी एंग्रेज ऐसी होगी, जैसा मैंने कहा है, तो हम इस समस्या को हल कर सकेंगे और हम दूसरों को अपने करीब ला सकेंगे। हमेशा से हमारे देश का जो कल्चर था, जो संस्कृति थी, उस की बड़ी चर्चा की गई है, कल्चर की दृष्टि दी गई है, लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि सब से ज्यादा अनकल्चर्ड बिहेवियर यह होता है कि हम दूसरों की बात को न समझें और दूसरों की बात से इन्कार करें, हम दूसरों को भ्रूँठा कहें, कहें कि तुम गलत कहते हो। अगर आप जरा धीरज के साथ दूसरों की बात को सुनें, उनकी बात पर विचार करें, उन के दृष्टिकोण को समझें, तो कोई दिक्कत न हो। लेकिन हम यहां क्या देखते हैं कि जब तक हम डामिनीटिंग पोजीशन में हैं, हम कहते हैं, दावे करते हैं कि हम हर एक के साथ न्याय कर रहे हैं, हम ने किसी के साथ अन्याय नहीं किया, आओ, हमारे पीछे आ जाओ, हम न्याय करेंगे, तब तक हम ऐसा ही कहते रहते हैं। जो ग्रुप मॅजोरिटी में होता है अगर आप उस के भाषणों को पढ़ें तो पायेंगे कि जब तक वह डामिनीटिंग पोजीशन में है वह कहता है कि हम सब के साथ न्याय करते हैं, सब के हितों की रक्षा कर रहे हैं, लेकिन ज्यों ही वह ग्रुप माइनारिटी में हुआ, वह कहने लगता है कि हमारे साथ अत्याचार हो रहा है और दूसरे की बातों से इन्कार करता है। वह कहता है कि दूसरे हम पर फिजूल एतराज करते हैं। एक कहता है कि मुझ पर अत्याचार हुआ करता है, हम पर जुल्म हुआ करता है, दूसरा कहता है कि हम ने उस पर कभी अत्याचार नहीं

[श्री ए० एन० विद्यालंकार]

किया, कभी अन्याय नहीं किया। इस तरह से दोनों के अन्तर बढ़ते ही जाते हैं। अगर हम इन बहसों में न पड़ कर अपने भीतर की तरफ देखें और दूसरों को भरोसा देने की कोशिश करें अपने ऊपर विश्वास उत्पन्न कराएँ तो उससे सारी मुश्किलें हल हो जायें। अगर हमारा यह एंग्रेज हो तो हमारी सारी समस्याएँ हल हो जायेंगी। और सेपरेटिस्ट टर्न्डसीज स्वल्प हो जायेंगी। हमारे देश की भावना हमेशा से यह रही है कि दूसरों को ज्यादा से ज्यादा आजादी दो, दूसरों को ज्यादा से ज्यादा सन्तुष्ट करने की कोशिश करो। यह नहीं कि दूसरों के लिये कहा जाय कि यह गलत कहता है, झूठ कहता है। हमें चाहिये कि हम अपनी तरफ देखें। आज दुनियाँ की जो आर्थिक, वैज्ञानिक और सामाजिक शक्तियाँ हैं वे दुनिया को एक दूसरे के नजदीक ला रही हैं। ये ताकतें दुनियाँ में सब को करीब लाकर संसार को सुख और शान्ति में वृद्ध कर रही हैं। वे ताकतें हमारे देश के भीतर भी काम करने लगेंगी और मुझे विश्वास है कि हमें आपस में करीब ले आयेंगी। आज दुनिया के अन्दर तरह तरह के वैज्ञानिक आविष्कार दुनिया को नजदीक ला रहे हैं, दुनिया के अन्दर एक साइंटिफिक रेवोल्यूशन हो रहा है उस सब का असर खुद ब खुद हिन्दुस्तान पर पड़ेगा—हमें नजदीक लाएगा—आप इस बात में शंका न करें। परन्तु आज हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर छोट छोट प्रान्तों के प्रश्नों को लेकर मुश्किलें पैदा हो रही हैं। हमें उन मुश्किलों को स्वल्प करना है, उनको बनाये नहीं रखना। हमें किसी से यह हठ नहीं करना कि हम यही बात कराके रहेंगे क्योंकि हमारे हाथ में ताकत है, हमारे पास बहुमत की शक्ति है। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें इन तमाम समस्याओं को हल करने के लिये एक दूसरे के दृष्टिकोण को समझना चाहिये, एक दूसरे की कठिनाइयों को समझना चाहिये और उस के अनुसार कार्य करना चाहिये। सदा से हमारे देश की एकता हमारी सांस्कृतिक एकता और शान्ति का आधार यही भावना रही है :

“रुचीनां वैचित्र्यात् ऋजुकुटिल नाना पथ जुषां, नृणामको गम्यस्त्वमीस पयसामर्णव इव” ।

तमाम लोगों की रुचियाँ भिन्न भिन्न हैं, हर एक की रुचि अलग है, दलील अलग है लेकिन आखीर में हम एक ही जगह जाना चाहते हैं। जितने भी पानी के स्रोत नदी नाले हैं वे सभी अन्त में समुद्र की ही ओर जाना चाहते हैं। हमारी संस्कृति की भावना यह रही है :

“एकं सद्बिप्राः बहुधा वदन्ति”

हम भिन्न भिन्न बातें करते हैं, भाषा अलग अलग है, लेकिन फिर भी हम एक हैं, और एक साथ आगे बढ़ने की कोशिश करें। हमको विभिन्नता को स्वीकार करना चाहिये। अगर हम विभिन्नताओं को स्वीकार करके चलेंगे तो इससे सब का भला होगा और आपस में एकता बढ़ेगी। अभी हमने देखा कि अपनी विदेश नीति के सम्बन्ध में हमने विभिन्नता को स्वीकार कर के आगे कदम बढ़ाया है। रूस और हिन्दुस्तान का जो आर्थिक ढांचा है वह बिल्कुल भिन्न भिन्न है इस बात को हमने स्वीकार किया। हमने कहा कि आप अपने मार्ग पर चलिये, हम अपने मार्ग पर चलेंगे। हमने एक दूसरे को उसके मार्ग से हटाने का प्रयत्न नहीं किया, एक दूसरे के पथ का आदर किया। फल यह हुआ कि हम दोनों रूस और भारत करीब आये। अगर हम यह न करते तो हम कभी भी एक दूसरे के करीब नहीं आ सकते थे। इसीलिये मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि हमारा एंग्रेज यही होना चाहिये अपने देश की प्रान्तों की समस्याओं को सुलभाने के लिए भी कटुता और आपसी तनाव कम करके एक दूसरे का संतोष करना। मैं इस एंग्रेज को बेहतर समझता हूँ, इसीलिये नहीं कि मैं चाहता हूँ कि बड़े बड़े प्रान्त न बनें, बल्कि इसीलिये कि इस तरह से हम एक दूसरे को भरोसा दिला सकें, और मिलकर ऐसा हल निकाल सकें जिससे हर कोई दूसरे की दिलजमई करने की कोशिश करे। अगर हमारे पास आज कोई ऐसा हल नहीं जिससे हम बिखरें हुए टुकड़ों को और ज्यादा करीब ला सकें तो घबराएँ क्यों। धैर्य से काम लें। कटुता और वैमनस्य को न

बढ़ने दें। हमारा दंश की आर्थिक और राजनीतिक आवश्यकताएँ हम को स्वयं मजबूर करेगी कि हम एक दूसरे के करीब आयें। हम आज भी अपनी राजनीतिक शक्ति से ऐसा कर सकते हैं, लेकिन हम अपनी राजनीतिक शक्ति से किसी को मजबूर नहीं करना चाहते। दूसरों की इच्छाओं को, दूसरों की भावनाओं को मसल कर यदि हम शक्ति प्रयोग करेंगे, तो हमारा दंश में फूट पड़ जायेगी, और दंश की अखण्डता खंडित हो जायेगी।

अभी मैंने प्रान्तों की बात कही। पंजाब के सम्बन्ध में जब मैंने इस अपने दृष्टिकोण से विचार करता हूँ तो मुझे इस समस्या का एक ही हल नजर आता है। हमारा भाई हरियाना प्रान्त के हैं वह अपने दृष्टिकोण से अपनी बात कहते हैं, और ठीक कहते हैं, मैं क्यों कहूँ कि वह गलत कहते हैं? सरदार हुकम सिंह ने पंजाबी बोलने वालों के सम्बन्ध में या सिखाँ के सम्बन्ध में अपनी बात कही। मैं क्यों कहूँ कि वह गलत कहते हैं, या उनकी शिकायत गलत है? अगर उन की कोई शिकायत है तो वह ठीक ही कहते होंगे, हिमाचल प्रदेश वाले अपनी बात कहते हैं। हमें चाहिये कि हम कोई प्रीक्वल रास्ता निकालें। हम इस बात को स्वीकार करें कि आखिर में हमें ही मिलकर इन सब बातों का फैसला करना है कि, हमारा राज्य का डंका कौंसा हो। हम यह भी निश्चय करें कि जो खाका या नक्शा हम तैयार करें उस का आधार विकेंद्रीकरण हो या केंद्रीकरण। चाहे आर्थिक क्षेत्र हो चाहे राजनीतिक क्षेत्र यदि विकेंद्रीकरण की ओर जाना है तो जोर जबर्दस्ती को छोड़ कर, इक्ट्ठा बैठ कर कोशिश करनी पड़ेगी। मैं मानता हूँ कि जितनी ही विकेंद्रीकरण की प्रवृत्तियाँ ज्यादा प्रबल होंगी, और दृढ़ हो जायेंगी उतने ही ज्यादा प्रदेश हमारा दंश में बन जायेंगे। परन्तु यह भी मत भूलिए कि अगर हम केंद्रीकरण की ओर झुकेंगे और एक दूसरे पर जोर जबर्दस्ती करेंगे तो उसके विरुद्ध विद्रोह होगा और विरोध और वैमनस्य बढ़ेगा। इसीलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि हम विकेंद्रीकरण को स्वीकार करें मुझे ज्यादा संख्या में छोटे छोटे राजनीतिक

केंद्र बनने से घबराहट नहीं होती। हम यह बात मानें कि सारी राजनीतिक शक्ति को एक जगह पर जबर्दस्ती से संगठित करना ठीक नहीं है। जैसा कि हमने दंश में संस्कृति के सम्बन्ध में किया, हमने किसी को मजबूर नहीं किया, हम ने हर एक को आजादी दी, फल यह हुआ कि हर एक व्यक्ति इस दंश को प्यार करने लगा, हर एक ने दंश की कौमन संस्कृति बनाने में सहयोग दिया, जिसके कारण हमारी संस्कृति में दूसरी संस्कृतियाँ आकर मिलती रहीं। हमने सबको आजादी दी। मैं समझता हूँ कि जिस तरह से सांस्कृतिक क्षेत्र में ऐसा किया गया उसी तरह से हमें राजनीतिक क्षेत्र में भी इस नीति का परीक्षण करना है। अगर हमने इस परीक्षण को किया तो मुझे इसमें कोई संदेह नहीं है कि हम सब को सन्तुष्ट कर सकेंगे और अपने सारे सवालों को हल कर सकेंगे।

पंजाब के सम्बन्ध में मैं समझता हूँ कि वही रास्ता अपनाया जाना चाहिये। मैं नहीं कहता कि मेरी ही बात ठीक है, ऐसा कहना शायद सब से बड़ी अशिष्टता होगी। जो लोग कहते हैं कि जो कुछ मैं कहता हूँ वही ठीक है, बाकी लोग जो कहते हैं वह सब भूठ है, वह एक अन्क्वैबर्ड विहीषाकर हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सब प्रान्तों को आजादी हो। अगर पंजाब में पंजाब, पेंप्सू, हिमाचल प्रदेश और हरियाना प्रदेश जाना चाहते हैं या कोई और इलाका भी जाना चाहे तो उनकी पॉलिटिकल एग्निटी हो जाय, लेकिन उन सब को कुछ न कुछ जानल एंटानमी ही जाय। जानल एंटानमी का मतलब यह है कि पेंप्सू, पंजाबी बोलने वाला इलाका, हरियाना की भाषा बोलने वाला इलाका, मैं उसको हिन्दी से बाहर नहीं मानता हूँ, हालाँकि वास्तव में हिन्दी और पंजाबी में बहुत फर्क नहीं होता, हरियाना की और हिन्दी में भी बहुत अधिक फर्क नहीं होता, पंजाबी और हिन्दी में भी फर्क नहीं होता, लेकिन एक लोग कहते हैं कि फर्क है तो वह भी हो सकता है। मैं इस पर आग्रह नहीं करना चाहता कि नहीं बँ सब भाषाएँ हिन्दी ही हैं। अगर वह इस पर आग्रह करते हैं कि दोनों

[श्री ए० एन० विद्यालंकार]

में फर्क हैं तो मान लिया जाय। क्योंकि दिलों में फर्क हैं, जोनल कॉन्फिडेंस हैं अलग अलग इलाकों में तो दलील से उस बात को काटने पर जोर नहीं देना चाहिये। तो मैं कह रहा था कि अगर पॉलीटिकल यूनिटी भी हो जाय, और प्रान्तों की, जोनल ऑटोनॉमी या स्वाधीनता भी रह जाय, तो यह बीच का मार्ग अपना लेना लाभदायक होगा। अगर पंजाब में चार प्रान्त मिलाये जा रहे हैं तो उन्हें चार उपप्रान्त मान लिया जाय। सब उपप्रान्तों के लिये एक ही अलग गवर्नर हो और एक ही हाई कोर्ट हो। सर्विसेज के लिये पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन हो, वह भी एक हो। अगर सब मान जायें तो ऐसी तजवीज सोच ली जाय। मैं तो यहां तक जाने को तैयार हूँ कि अगर कोई एक जिला कहता है कि इस जिले के अन्दर हमारा जिले के ही आदमी अफसर रखें जायेंगे, अपने ही अधिकारी रखेंगे तो उसको भी मान लिया जाय। अगर कोई कहे कि जो हमारा जिले का निवासी आफिसर होगा वही उस की आवश्यकता को ठीक तरह से पूरी कर सकेगा क्योंकि जो लोकल आवश्यकतायें होंगी उनसे वह वाकिफ होगा, तो हमको उसे भी इनकार न करना चाहिये। इसी तरीके से चलने से आगे चल कर, जो संपरीटिस्ट टर्न्डन्सीज हैं, पृथक्त्व की जो भावनायें हैं वह धीरे धीरे खत्म हो सकेंगी। लेकिन अगर आप आग्रह करेंगे कि नहीं दूसरों का कहना ठीक नहीं है, यहां पृथक्त्व की भावनाएं अधिक उत्तेजित होंगी। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर ऐसा कोई प्रस्ताव हो सके जिस में अन्दर वह लिखा हो कि सब को अपनी अपनी भाषा की प्रगति करने का अधिकार होगा, अपनी अपनी भाषा को वह प्रयोग कर सकेगा और वृद्ध कर सकेगा, अगर देश भर में हम इस बात की आजादी दे सकेंगे और इस प्रकार की भावना पैदा कर सकेंगे कि किसी पर कोई जोर जबर्दस्ती नहीं की जायेगी, यहां कोई मजबूरी नहीं है, भाषा की मजबूरी नहीं है, लीपि की भी मजबूरी नहीं है, तो हम अपने उद्देश्य को शीघ्र से शीघ्र पूरा कर लेंगे। लेकिन वह कब्जा कि

पंजाबी से कोई इन्कार नहीं कर रहा, यह बिल्कुल गलत चीज है। दो दिन हुए मैंने हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स में एक लेख देखा। कोई राय बहादुर दुर्गादास हैं, मुझे पता नहीं कि वह वही दुर्गादास हैं जो कि उस के करस्पान्डन्ट हैं या दूसरे कोई हैं।

श्री सी० डी० वांड : यह दूसरे हैं, राय बहादुर हैं।

श्री ए० एन० विद्यालंकार : उनका एक लेख निकला था। लेंग्वेज इश्यू इन पंजाब। वह कहते हैं :

"In the face of this realistic position, it is most unfair and unnatural to compel or force Hindus to read a language different from the one already chosen by them. If our Sikh friends, for religious or sentimental considerations, want to prefer Punjabi (in Gurmukhi script) as the medium of instruction for their children, they are welcome to do so, and no one has a right to interfere with their decision. But there is no sense or justification for forcing millions of Hindu students to learn a language and a script which has no such claim upon them, nor possesses any secular advantage in its favour."

आगे फिर वह कहते हैं :

"Hindus are fully justified in seeing that no time of their children is wasted in learning Punjabi, simply to oblige their Sikh countrymen."

ठीक है, अगर आप 'ओक्साइज' करना नहीं चाहते हैं, अगर आप 'पंजाबी' सीखना नहीं चाहते हैं तो मत सीखिये। लेकिन एक तरफ यह कहना कि हम तो कहते हैं कि हिन्दी और पंजाबी एक हैं और उसको एंक्सेप्ट करने की बात कही जाय, लेकिन दूसरी तरफ इस बात पर भगड़ना कि यह पढ़ाई जाय या न पढ़ाई जाय, यह गलत चीज है। आप लोग भाषा के सम्बन्ध में या तो वह एंग्रॉच अखिलयार कीजिये जो कि हमारा प्रधान मंत्री ने अखिलयार की है

और जिसमें उन्होंने कहा कि हमारे देश के अन्दर हर एक व्यक्ति को तीन तीन और चार चार प्रांतीय भाषायें पढ़नी चाहियें हमारे देश के अन्दर जितनी भाषायें हैं, हमारे देश के अन्दर जितनी कल्चर्स हैं, वह सब हमें जाननी होगी और उन्हें अपना मानना होगा और इसी आधार पर हमको चलना होगा। लेकिन होता यह है कि हम सोचते कुछ और हैं और करते कुछ और ही हैं। हम यह कहते हैं कि यह भाषा नहीं पढ़ेंगे और हम वह बात नहीं करेंगे। अगर यही बात है हमें एक दूसरे से अलग रहना ही पड़ेगा और फिर आप अपनी बात को जिस तरह से आप ठीक समझते हैं उस तरह से करें और दूसरे अपनी ही तरह से उसको करेंगे। आप अपनी भाषा पढ़िये और दूसरे अपनी भाषा को पढ़ेंगे। अगर हम एनेलीसिस करें तो हम को पता चलेगा कि अपनी भावनाओं को हम खुद ही नहीं समझते हैं। एक वक्त हम एक बात कहते हैं और दूसरे ही वक्त हम दूसरी ही बात कहते हैं। हमें अपनी भावनाओं का विश्लेषण करना चाहिये और सोचना चाहिये कि आखिर हम चाहते क्या हैं। मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि हर एक बात में कुछ फायदा भी है और साथ ही साथ कुछ नुकसान भी है। दुनिया में कोई भी चीज हासिल नहीं होती जब तक कि उसके लिए कोई कीमत अदा न की जाए। आप किसी भी चीज को चुनें आपको कीमत तो अदा करनी ही पड़ेगी। अगर आप उसकी कीमत अदा करने को तैयार नहीं हैं तो आप उस चीज को हासिल भी नहीं कर सकते हैं। इसके बगैरे काम चलता नहीं है।

मैंने आपके सामने अपने दृष्टिकोण को रखा और मैं समझता हूँ कि इस दृष्टिकोण को सामने रखकर ही हमको रिआर्गनाइजेशन की समस्या पर विचार करना पड़ेगा अगर हम सचमुच इस उलझन से निकलना चाहते हैं। हमें यह बात मानकर नहीं चलना होगा कि केंद्रीयकरण ही एक चीज है और इसके सिवाय कोई दूसरी चीज नहीं है। दुनिया के अन्दर छोट-छोट राज्य

भी हैं और बड़े बड़े भी। छोट-छोट राज्य जो हैं उनमें हम स्वित्जरलैंड का नाम ले सकते हैं, जापान का नाम ले सकते हैं और इसी तरह से और दूसरे देशों का नाम भी ले सकते हैं। छोट-छोट राज्य भी छोट होते हुए बड़े बन जाते हैं, शक्तिशाली बन जाते हैं। अगर कोई कहे कि जो छोट राज्य होते हैं वह शक्तिशाली नहीं बन सकते, तो यह बात गलत है। वह भी बड़े बन सकते हैं। बाई-लिगुअल भी चलते हैं, यूनि-लिगुअल भी चलते हैं और मस्टी-लिगुअल भी चलते हैं। हमारे पार्टिल साहब ने कहा कि उनका बम्बई राज्य बाई-लिगुअल है और बहुत कामयाबी से चलता है। लेकिन जो यह रिपोर्ट है, इसके अन्दर लिखा है कि जो बाई-लिगुअल प्रान्त हैं वह ठीक तरह से नहीं चलते हैं। भाषाओं के मामले में कशमकश होती है। मैं इस अद्वार को पढ़कर सदन का समय नहीं लेना चाहता। इस रिपोर्ट के पैरा १४४ या १४५ में, मुझे अच्छी तरह से याद नहीं है, यह बात लिखी गई है। अधिक भाषाएँ होने से आपस में कशमकश चलती है, प्रान्त के हित की भावना न हो कर अलग अलग गुणों के हित के लिए भावनाएँ प्रबल हो जाती हैं। तब मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि बाई-लिगुअल प्रान्त भी चलते हैं, यूनि-लिगुअल प्रान्त भी चलते हैं और मस्टी-लिगुअल प्रान्त भी चलते हैं और चल भी सकते हैं। लेकिन आपको यह साफ तौर से मालूम रहना चाहिए कि आप चाहते क्या हैं। आपका दिमाग क्या चाहता है आपका दिल क्या चाहता है और उसके लिए आप कौनसी कीमत अदा करने को तैयार हैं। आपको बाई-लिगुअल प्रान्त के लिए अलग कीमत अदा करनी होगी, मस्टी-लिगुअल के लिए अलगही कीमत अदा करनी होगी और यूनि-लिगुअल के लिए कुछ और ही कीमत अदा करनी होगी। इसलिए सब से पहले आपको अपने दिल में इस बात का निश्चय करना होगा कि आप की मंशा क्या है और आपको दूसरों को दोष देने के बजाय, दूसरों की बात को काटने के बजाय, जो आप चाहते हैं उसे हासिल करने के लिए एक उचित कीमत

[श्री ए० एन० विद्यालंकार]

अदा करनी होगी। जब तक हमारे अन्दर कौम परस्ती की भावना नहीं आती, जब तक हमारे अन्दर सेपैरेटिस्ट टेंडेंसीज हैं, जब तक हमारे अन्दर अलहदगी की भावना है, जब तक हमारे अन्दर लिंग्विज्म की भावना है, हमारा काम नहीं चल सकता है। हमारे यहां आम तौर पर शासन के बारे में यह शिकायत की जाती है कि कलां बजारत में उन्होंने अपने ही प्रान्त के आदीमियों को इकट्ठा कर लिया है, अपनी भाषा बोलने वाला को रख लिया है, और इसी तरह की दूसरी शिकायतें आती हैं। मैं किसी को दोष नहीं देता हूं लेकिन यह बातें होती रहती हैं और इनकी काफी चर्चा भी होती रहती है। इस वास्तु जो हमारी कमजाँरियां हैं, हमारी मर्यादाएँ हैं उनको भूलकर अगर हम बातें करें तो वह बनावटी बातें ही होंगी। हमें चाहिए कि हम उन मर्यादाओं को समझें और उनको दृष्टि में रख कर हल तलाश करने की कोशिश करें। हम अपनी संस्थाओं का अच्छा बुरा जो रूप भी देख रहे हैं, वह सब हमारी मानसिक भावनाओं का प्रतिबिम्ब मात्र है। संस्थाएँ जनता की समस्याओं का प्रतिबिम्ब या अक्स होती हैं। इसके लिए दूसरों को बुरा भला कहना, दोषी ठहराना अमृचित और व्यर्थ है। यदि हम अपनी भावनाओं को संकुचित ही रखें, अपनी विचारधारा को विशाल न बनाएं तो जो हम संस्थाएँ अथवा सामाजिक राजनीतिक चित्र हम बनाएंगे वह भी संकुचित और छोटं छोटं होंगे। आज हर कोई यही कहता है कि हमारी संस्थाएँ विशाल हों, हम विशाल पंजाब बनाएं, हम विशाल आंध्र बनाएं, और अजीब बात यह है कि भारत के अन्दर जितने लोग हैं वह सब "महा, महा" ही कहते हैं और इस महा, महा की वजह से हमारा देश एक महाभारत बना जा रहा है; हमें महाभारत नहीं बनाना है। हमें भारत को विशाल बनाना है, यह ठीक है लेकिन उसके लिए पहले हमारे दिल विशाल होने चाहिए और जब हमारे दिल विशाल होंगे तो फिर हमारे प्रान्त भी विशाल हो सकेंगे।

Shri Mohiuddin (Hyderabad City):
The Report of the States Reorganisa-

tion Commission has naturally created confusion in all the States of India and that confusion is reflected in the views expressed by the representatives of the people in this House. It is good that every part of the country, every representative of the constituencies, should have an occasion to express her or his views in this House so that the final decision that may be taken will reflect a large measure of agreement in the whole of the country.

According to the proposals of the Commission, the Hyderabad State has been disintegrated and the parts which are known as Marathwada areas are to be integrated with Maharashtra and the Karnataka parts are to be integrated with Karnataka. The residuary State is a problem which has to be solved. The Commission has recommended that because public opinion has not yet crystallised in Telangana areas, it should be allowed to run as a separate Telangana State for five years and the question whether it should join Vishalandhra should be decided later. I agree entirely with the hon. Members who have said that it is not desirable that the question of reorganisation of Hyderabad State should be left over for some future period. It should be decided now and here. That is an important question and I hope that the majority of the Members of the House agree with that aspect.

During the last three days' discussion in this House, some Members have touched the Vishalandhra and the Telangana question. Shri Heda, Shri, Raghuramaiah and Dr. Lanka Sundaram have spoken about it in particularly. Swami Ramananda Tirtha spoke mainly about Maharashtra and Bombay and incidentally referred to Telangana. This morning, Shri Ananthasayanam Ayyangar dealt in detail with this important question. At the outset, I would like to say that our Deputy-Speaker, who is extremely fair when he sits in the Chair and presides over this House—I have never seen him giving any ruling which may even be suspected of being unfair—was extremely unfair when he came down to the

floor of the House and addressed the House. How was he unfair? I do not say that because he pleaded for Visalandhra, he was unfair. That is not my point. He said that in the Hyderabad area, there have been three attempts so far since independence to create a kind of Pakistan in the belly of India. The first was the Razakar attempt in 1947-48 which was rightly and properly crushed. The other attempt was—I do not exactly remember his words—the communist movement in Telangana. That was also dealt with properly and constitutional methods have been adopted to Communists now. He said, a third Razakar attempt is now being made to have a separate Telangana State. The use of the word “Razakar” in this connection and also in connection with the communist movement was very unfortunate. It has created and it does create an impression that this is also a communal movement. As Mr. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar has said, there is also a hidden hand behind it which supports the movement. These two statements of Mr. Ayyangar create an impression that the Telangana movement is a communal movement of the type of the Razakar movement that took place in 1947-48. This reference, I am sure, will be repudiated by all sections of the House and as I said, this reference was very unfair on the part of Mr. Ayyangar. Who are the supporters of the Telangana movement? Mr. Heda, who spoke on the first day as the leader of the group, Mr. Ramaswamy and all other Members of the House who support this movement have belonged to the Congress from the very beginning and have suffered not only during the independence movement, but also during the Razakar regime of 1947-48. They are the leaders of this movement and it is very unfair to call them Razakars at this stage, because they differ in regard to the formation of a State.

Shri C. K. Nair (Outer Delhi): The word “Razakar” only means volunteer; it has no particular meaning.

Shri Mohiuddin: “Razakar” has got a history behind it. We should not forget it when the term has been used

for a particular movement, a certain meaning is attached to it. There is no sense in saying that Razakars mean only volunteers. It does have a certain meaning, because of that historic movement.

Shri C. K. Nair: I only want to point out.....

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The hon. Member cannot speak while I am on my legs. While one Member is expressing his views, another Member should not frequently interrupt him. The hon. Member has already explained that the term “Razakar” means only volunteer and there is no use repeating the same.

Shri Mohiuddin: The majority of the members of the House are perhaps not aware that the proposal for the establishment of a Telangana State is not a new one. The proposal has been there for a long time and has been studied and propagated for the last 7 or 8 years. Of course, it is not as old as the movement for the reorganisation of India into linguistic States, but, it has been propagated for the last 7 or 8 years. When the States Reorganisation Commission was appointed, those who supported the idea of a separate Telangana State, including Mr. Heda, formed a committee for the purpose of making this representation to the Commission. I was not one of the Members of that Committee; I have been always of the view that reorganisation of States on a linguistic basis at this stage is a mistake and should be postponed for at least another 15 or 20 years. I expressed that view before the Commission. But a large number of Members of the Hyderabad Assembly and other persons presented the case to the Commission and after a thorough enquiry, after going round the State and after interviewing hundreds of people, the Commission came to the proper and fair conclusion that the proposal about the merger of the Telangana areas into Andhra area has not yet crystallised in the residuary part of the Hyderabad State. Every section of the House has paid a tribute to the Members of the Commission and at this stage, I would also like to

[Shri Mohiuddin]

add my tribute that in a large number of cases their conclusions have been very fair and very correct. In this case, the conclusion that the proposal for the merger has not yet crystallised is also a very fair and very correct one. Argument has also been raised that the State of Telangana or Hyderabad, as it is now called, will not be viable. I shall not go into those details; Mr. Heda has dealt with them. But I should like to mention one thing. Dr. Jaisoorya is pointing out his fingers at me to show that instead of a surplus of Rs. 2 crores, there will be a deficit of Rs. 4 crores. I assure Dr. Jaisoorya and the House that the Telangana State is financially very strong and very viable. There is no dispute about it. Whether this surplus State will be converted into a deficit State on account of introduction of prohibition is a matter which has got to be considered not by the Hyderabad State alone, but by Punjab, U.P., Bihar and Bengal where complete prohibition is not yet imposed. A large proportion of the revenues derived from excise will have to be foregone and the loss of revenue on account of prohibition will have to be made good by economies, by additional taxes or by contributions from the Centre.

The State of Hyderabad as recommended by the Commission is mainly on the basis of local opinion. The Working Committee has also passed a resolution that though they prefer the formation of Visal Andhra, the final decision will depend on the wishes of the people. The wishes of the people have been very strongly demonstrated and there is no doubt now,—I hope there is none in the mind of the Government—that a very large majority of the people in Telangana, 90 to 95 per cent as Shri Heda has said, are in favour....

Shri Gopala Rao (Gudivada): Question.

Shri Mohiuddin:....of establishing a State which will be called Hyderabad.

Having dealt with this point, I should like to say a few words about the general aspect of the reorganisation of

the States. With the advent of Independence, the attitude of the leaders of India towards the reformation of States on language basis had considerably changed. While before Independence, language was perhaps taken to be the most important and perhaps the only factor for the reorganisation of States, after Independence, the attitude has changed. The J. V. P. report said that the primary consideration must be the security, unity and economic prosperity of India and the separatist and disruptive tendency should be rigorously discouraged. The Commission has also confirmed this opinion and it has said that it is neither possible nor desirable to reorganise the States on the basis of a single test, either of language or culture, but a balanced approach to the whole problem is necessary in the interests of our national unity. It has generally been agreed that no amendment should be proposed or voted upon the motion that has been moved by the hon. Home Minister. But, I would suggest, I hope the House will agree with me, that at least the moving amendment may be passed and that is, that we should see that the reorganisation of States should be subject to this principle laid down by the Commission that it is neither desirable nor possible to reorganise the States on the basis of a single test of language.

Dr. Jaisoorya: I support it.

An Hon. Member: The report is based on that.

Shri Mohiuddin: The report is based on that. But, from so many parts of the House we have heard that the reorganisation must take place only on the basis of language.

Some Hon. Members: Nobody has said that.

Shri Mohiuddin: The leader of the Communist Party has gone to the extent of saying that even a village should be made the basis for division, for demarcation of the areas between one State and another.

Shri Gopala Rao: If it is contiguous.

Shri Mohiuddin: The result is, if demarcation were to take place on such rigorous lines, why even a village, why not a street in a village be made the unit of demarcation between one State and another? The result will be that the division will be so rigorous that linguism will permeate so strongly into the minds of the people that it may become a real danger to the unity of India.

This feeling that all the people who speak one language must be in one State and that the reorganisation should be so rigorous as not to leave even a village or a part of a village in the other areas, I am afraid, based on a very different conception about reorganisation. Those who believe this strict and rigorous demarcation of States into language groups have a faith that the State so formed will be their ideal and that every aspiration of theirs resides in that State. The Commission has recommended that language is only an instrument for administrative purposes, that it is only a convenience for administration. The principle that the demarcation of States on the basis of language must be rigorous and must be based on the ideals of linguism is one which, I think we should condemn from all sides of this House. I shall read in this connection one or two sentences from the proceedings of the debate held in the Andhra Legislative Assembly on the 25th of November. Shri P. V. R. Gajapathi Raju—I do not know to what party he belongs—said:

“Administrative unification...”

this administrative unification refers to the adoption of Hindi as the language for official purposes

“is a dangerous doctrine if it transcends itself and ignores cultural difference. Therefore it is that I say that this tendency to feel that nationalism equates merely to language hegemony must be fought by us who are

non-Hindi speaking people...”

Must be fought by us: how are they going to fight this administrative unification? The strategy is,

“If we claim Visalandhra because of our cultural rights, we must not forget that Samyukta Maharashtra has also got such rights. And also furthermore...”

I specially invite attention to this sentence

“And also furthermore, it is by virtue of that two strong amalgamated States on the Godavri ultimately a defence-line may also be built in the future.”

So, he wants a defence-line against the administrative unification of India in the official language.

3 P.M.

Dr. N. M. Jaisoorya: Who said that?

Shri Mohiuddin: Shri P. V. R. Gajapathi Raju I do not know to which party he belongs. Perhaps, he belongs to the hon. Member's party.

Dr. N. M. Jaisoorya: No, no.

Shri Mohiuddin: Those who support the formation of States with the line of demarcation based not only on the district but even the villages have this sort of conception of the language State that they wish to develop in the future. If that is the ideal, then I am afraid that the spirit of nationalism that we wish to develop will be considerably retarded. It is for this reason that we do not want linguism to invade Telangana, and we want a separate Telanganá State. Hyderabad has been a meeting-ground of the north and the south for hundreds of years....

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: It is a railway junction.

Shri Mohiuddin: It has been a meeting-ground of the east and also the west. Hyderabad has always been a melting-pot for the ideas that emanated from the south and also the idea that came down from the north. We have never had any fanaticism about language in that area. The people there are more inclined towards learning the national language, that is, Hindi. No doubt, Telugu will remain the regional language and the official language of the State, but Hindi will have a greater chance of spreading out in that area and then from that area to the south, if the State of Hyderabad is formed into a separate State and not merged in Telangana from which the virus of linguism may penetrate the State of Hyderabad.

Shri Gopala Rao: Do you want to retain Urdu?

Shri Mohiuddin: The Commission have already recommended that the Osmania University should be taken over by the Central and converted into a Hindi university. I am very glad that such a recommendation has been made. We want that the university in Hyderabad should be the centre for the whole of the Indian culture, and that the culture from that area should emanate to all sides in the south. It is for these reasons that we support the formation of the State of Hyderabad, as recommended by the Commission.

Mr. Chairman: Now, Shri Gopala Ram. The hon. Member is making his maiden speech.

श्री गोपी राम (मंडी महासु-रीक्षित-अनुसूचित जातियां): आज हमारे सामने जो एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट जेंर गौर है, इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि काफी मेहनत के बाद यह डाक्यूमेंट हमारे सामने इस शकल में आया है और इसके लिए मैं भी कॉमिशन के मेम्बरान को बधाई का पात्र समझता हूँ। लेकिन इसका यह मतलब नहीं कि मैं कॉमिशन के फॉसले से सौ फीसदी सहमत हूँ।

कॉमिशन लिमिटेड असे के अन्दर बड़ी भारी पंचीदीर्घियां में से गुजरा है। इसमें भी कोई शक नहीं कि कॉमिशन के मेम्बरान आला दर्जे के कसौटी पर परखे हुए दिमाग हैं लेकिन आखिर को इंसान हैं और गलती कर सकते हैं। और इस में गलतियां हुई भी हैं। और इसलिए हमारी सरकार ने लोकल लीजिस्लेचर्स को उस पर गौर करने के लिए अख्तियार दिया, उसके बाद इन दोनों सदनों को भी इस पर मजिद गौर करने का अधिकार मिला है और इसके बाद भी जो कमी इसमें रह जाएगी, उसको फिर सेंट्रल कॉमिनेट पूरा करेगी। साफ जाहिर है कि इस रिपोर्ट में कमी थी, इसी कारण से सरकार को यह लम्बा प्रॉसीज्योर अख्तियार करना पड़ा है।

[SHRIMATI SUSHAMA SEN in the Chair]

सभापति महोदया, रिपोर्ट के सफे २५ में पैरा-ग्राफ ६२ में जहां पर इस कॉमिशन के टर्मस आफ रफ्रेंस का जिक्र आया है उसमें से मैं पहला ही रफ्रेंस आपके सामने पेश करता हूँ जिसमें कि यूनिटी और सिक्योरिटी आफ इंडिया का जिक्र है। जहां तक मुल्क की यूनिटी का ताल्लुक है, हमारा सिर फस् से ऊंचा होता है कि इस देश का हर फर्द बशर मुल्क की यूनिटी का हामी है इसमें हम दो राय नहीं हैं। दूसरी तरफ कॉमिशन ने सिक्योरिटी के बारे में जो मीस्वदा हमारे सामने पेश किया है वह मेरी नाफिस राय में दुरुस्त नहीं है। सिदयोरिटी आफ इंडिया एक जरूरी अम् है और इसको मद्दनजर रखना भी जरूरी है। मैं पंजाब से शुरू करता हूँ। कॉमिशन के खयाल के मुताबिक मौजूदा पंजाब वेस्टर्न पाकिस्तान के खतर से बाहर नहीं है। ठीक है, और उन्होंने इसका हल बड़ा पंजाब किया है। गूटर पंजाब जिसमें पेप्सू, हिमाचल प्रदेश को मिलाया जाना है। महा पंजाब के बनाते बकत वेस्टर्न पाकिस्तान का खतरा तो पेश आया लेकिन वहां की पंजाबी बोली का ध्यान कॉमिशन को बिल्कुल नहीं रहा। साउथ में जवान को लेकर सूबों की तकसीम हुई और उसके आधार पर अन्य सूबों की तकसीम की तबकीथ आपके सामने पेश है लेकिन ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि उधर बिहार, बंगाल, और अण्डाम से लेकर जब

कमिशन के मेम्बरान हवाईजहाज से दिल्ली से बरबाज करते हुए पंजाब पहुँचे तो उनको वहाँ की पंजाबी बोली का बिल्कुल ध्यान नहीं रहा और हमारे पहाड़ों के रहने वाले लोगों की ज़बान का भी ख्याल नहीं रहा। हरियाना प्रान्त वालों की आवाज उनके कानों तक नहीं पहुँची। मैं कमिशन की ओर भी ज्यादा मदद करने के लिए तैयार हूँ। वह मदद क्या है? मौजूदा पंजाब को वेस्टर्न पाकिस्तान से बहुत खतरा है और इस कारण उन्होंने तो सिर्फ पेंस और हिमाचल प्रदेश को ही उसमें मिलाया है लेकिन मेरी तज़वीज़ है कि राजस्थान की बेल्ट भी डाल कर हमेशा के लिए यह खतरा दूर कर दिया जाए। इससे भी अगर पंजाब के लोगों को तसल्ली न हो तो दिल्ली भी पंजाब में मिला दिया जाए ताकि पंजाब वालों की बादशाहत दिल्ली तक पहुँच जाय और मुग़लिया ज़माना उनको याद आ जाए।

An Hon. Member: Why not further?

श्री गोपी राम: अगर इससे भी कमिशन के हिन्दू दिमाग को तसल्ली न हो तो मेरा कहना यह है कि ५० पी० और राजस्थान को भी सारा मिला लिया जाए। और पूरा कोह हिमालय नं० २ बना कर पंजाब को दे दिया जाए। चैयरमैन साहब! अब मैं इस्टर्न पाकिस्तान की तरफ आपका ध्यान दिलाता हूँ। चाहिए तो यह था कि जहाँ पंजाब को वेस्टर्न पाकिस्तान के खतरों से बाहर किया वहाँ बंगाल और आसाम को इस्टर्न पाकिस्तान के खतरों से बाहर करने के लिए दोनों को मिला कर पूरी एक इस्टर्न बाउंडरी खींची जा सकती थी और जिससे इस्टर्न पाकिस्तान के खतरों से बाहर हुआ जा सकता था। लेकिन वहाँ लैंग्वेज के आधार को माना गया, कमिशन ने वहाँ लैंग्वेज की बिना पर दो सूबे बनाना आरम्भ कर दिया। जो बंगाली बोले वह बंगाली सूबे में और जो आसामी बोले वह आसामी सूबे में। आखिर क्या मामला है? साफ जाहिर है कि पंजाब के बारे में कमिशन का फ़ैसला नामुनासिब रहा है और यह फ़ैसला प्रैजुडिसियल माइन्ड से दिया गया है। असलियत

मह है कि कमिशन के चैयरमैन साहब श्री फ़ख़्त अली का जो नोट हिमाचल प्रदेश के बारे में है वह एक सही और मुनासिब फ़ैसला है। हिमाचल प्रदेश पहाड़ी इलाका है, हमारी ज़बान पहाड़ी है। अगर मैं अपनी बोली को यहाँ बोलना शुरू कर दूँ, हालाँकि मैं आप का टाइम ज्यादा नहीं लेना चाहता, तो आपके पास रिपोर्टर नहीं मिलेंगे।

हमारे लोग अमन पसन्द हैं। आज भी हमारे इलाके में लोग घरों में ताले नहीं लगाते हैं। हजारों भेड़ों के गिरोह को दो ही चार आदमी ले कर चलते हैं। आप वहाँ पर रात भर सफ़र कीजिए, आपको कोई खतरा नहीं है। ज़रा मेरे भाई पंजाब का सफ़र कर के बता दें कि उनके सफ़र में क्या बीती। उनके पास रिवाल्वर भी होगा, उसको भी ले लेंगे। पैसा जो जेब के अन्दर होगा या न भी हो तो भी उसके लिए आपकी जाब चली जाएगी। यह नक़शा हमें पंजाब में दिखाने वाले हैं।

हिमाचल प्रदेश की एसेम्बली के २५ मेम्बरान ने इस कमिशन की रिपोर्ट पर वॉटिंग की। २५ में से २४ मेम्बरों ने हिमाचल प्रदेश के रिटर्न्शन के हक में वोट दिया। सिर्फ चार मेम्बरान ने उसके खिलाफ वोट दिए। लेकिन २५ मेम्बरों में से वह चार मेम्बर कौन हैं? मेरे दोस्त राजा साहब बिलासपुर यहाँ नहीं हैं, वह उनके चले हैं। अगर आप चले का मतलब नहीं समझते तो वह लोग हैं जो कि उनकी पार्टी के हैं। यह वह लोग हैं जिनको वेस्टर्न इन्टरस्ट ने पैदा किया है, तैयार किया है। यह लोग नहीं चाहते कि हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रांगुसिब कानूनों को लागू किया जाए। वह समझते हैं कि पंजाब में जा कर वह बच जाएंगे, उनकी ज़मीनें बच जाएंगी।

हिमाचल प्रदेश की बुनियाद एक तपारीली वाक्या है। लगभग २० पहाड़ी रियासतों का यह मजमूआ सन् १९४८ में वजूद में आया। हमारे नेताओं की मेहरबानी से हमें पंजाब के पंखे से छुड़ाया गया। मैं आपकी आज्ञा से इस माननीय संसद का ध्यान भारत सरकार के उस वाद की तरफ ले जाना चाहता हूँ जिसकी इस प्रैजुडिसियल

[श्री गांधी राम]

आइन्दा न नजरअन्दाज किया हैं। मैं आप को यह कर सुनाता हूँ।

This is the communication caused to be sent by Sardar Patel, the then Home Minister of the Government of India, to Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, the then Vice-President of the All India States Peoples' Conference, in reply to letter No. S. P. 39-29 dated 10th March, 1948:

"The position is as follows. Reference to the intention if the Government of India to administer this area through a Lieut. Governor is made in the Preamble only. The cession of jurisdiction to the Government of India in respect of these States is unconditional and absolute and in no way dependent upon the fulfilment of that intention. The ultimate objective is to enable this area to attain the position of an autonomous Province of India. This objective would be attained in two stages. The area will, in the first instance be administered by an Administrator, probably an officer of the Chief Commissioner's status assisted by an Advisory Council consisting of Rulers and representatives of the people appointed in such a manner and with such functions as the Central Government may decide. Subsequently, subject to the decision of the Constituent Assembly, it is proposed that the administrations should be put in charge of a Lieut. Governor assisted by an Advisory Council representing the Princes and a Legislature in the Province. In the final stage, after this area is sufficiently developed in its resources and administration, it is proposed that its constitution should be similar to that of any other Province."

सरदार पटेल जी के लफ्जों से साफ जाहिर हैं कि हिमाचल प्रदेश जब डेवेलप हो जाएगा तो फुलफ्लेज्ड स्टेट इस देश का बन सकता हैं। इस बात से कोई इनकार नहीं कर सकता कि पहाड़ों में रहने वाले लोगों को हमेशा से एक्सप्लायट किया गया हैं। कांगड़ और गढ़वाल के

मुन्द् आप को हर एक मेम्बर के घर के बर्तन साफ करते हुए मिलेंगे। कश्मीर के हालातों से भी आप बाकिफ हाँगे क्योंकि वह भी मजदूर तबका हैं। श्री टंकचन्द जी के भाषण से साफ जाहिर हैं, शायद वह परसों बोले हैं, कि पंजाब के लोग, पहाड़ी लोगों के साथ क्या सुलूक करते आ रहे हैं और आइन्दा विन के थर्टिस के तहत वह पंजाब में हिमाचल प्रदेश को मिलाने की तजवीज कर रहे हैं। श्री टंकचन्द जी के अपने लफ्जों में देखिए। उन्होंने फरमाया कि पंजाब के एक सुपरिन्टन्डेंट के स्टेटस का आदमी हमेशा इन पहाड़ी रियासतों को रूल करता रहा हैं। आज भी वह वही ख्याब देख रहे हैं। मेरे दोस्त बहुत मुद्बर् हैं, मैं उनकी इज्जत करता हूँ, कुछ दिन पहले वह हाई कोर्ट के जज बनने जा रहे थे और उससे भी ज्यादा शानदार हींसियत यहां पाने वाले थे, लेकिन नहीं पा सके। उनकी बदकिस्मती है, मुझे उनसे हमदर्दी है, लेकिन वह भूल जाते हैं कि भारत देश में सात समुद्र पार के लोग कई सदियों तक राज्य कर गए और आज भी इस देश के कई मक्बूजात पर बाहर के लोगों का कब्जा हैं। श्री टंकचन्द जी ने हमारे हिमाचल प्रदेश के मिनिस्टर के भाषण से कुछ कोर्टशन पेश किए हैं। हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब ने इस रिपोर्ट के कांसिडरेशन के वक्त हिमाचल प्रदेश की विधान सभा में हिन्दी में स्पीच देते हुए कहा कि अगर हम पहाड़ी लोगों को पंजाब में मिला दिया गया तो उनकी बदकिस्मती होगी। उन्होंने फरमाया था कि हम उसको हींगज पंजाब में नहीं मिलने देंगे। लेकिन उसका तर्जुमा श्री टंकचन्द जी ने अपनी स्पीच में बतलाया। उनके मुद्बर् दिमाग "दूथ एंड नेल" का तर्जुमा यह किया कि हम उनके दांतों को भी उखाड़ देंगे और उनके नेल को भी उखाड़ देंगे जो कि हिमाचल प्रदेश को पंजाब से न मिलाएंगे। मैं कहता हूँ कि ऐसे दिमाग को जिसमें ऐसा भेजा भरा हुआ हैं, यह शोभा नहीं देता।

आज हिमाचल को बतौर कौंसमेंट एरिया के मांगा जा रहा हैं, अच्छा भई। सदियों तक हिन्दुस्तान अंग्रेजों का कौंसमेंट एरिया रहा,

जाँड़चैरी फ्रांसीसियों का कॅचमेंट एरिया रहा, पुर्तगाल आज भी गाँवा को कॅचमेंट एरिया बनाए हुए हैं। हमारे हिमाचल का तो कहना क्या। यह पंजाब के बने हुए हजारों साल से कॅचमेंट करते आए हैं और क्या अभी भी उनको आज बीसवीं सदी के अन्दर तसल्ली नहीं हुई।

इन चन्द सालों के अन्दर आजादी के मिलने के बाद से हमारे नेताओं की वजह से हिमाचल प्रदश ने भारी तरक्की की है डिवलपमेंट के फील्ड में। हिमाचल प्रदश का लैंड रिफार्म एक्ट जो पास हुआ है यह एक बहुत भारी प्रागैतिष स्टेप है। इस एनेक्टमेंट से बहुत से गरीब लोगों को और खास तौर से हरिजनों को बहुत फायदा पहुँचा है। मैं इस सदन से आपके द्वारा इत्तजा करूंगा कि पहाड़ों में रहने वाले लोगों के सेंटिमेंट्स को मद्देनजर रखते हुए हिमाचल को किसी स्तर में भी इन पंजाबी बनीयों को न दिया जाए। हमें सिखाएँ से कोई खतरा नहीं लेकिन जालंधर डिविजन के आर्य समाजियों से ज्यादा खतरा है।

An Hon. Member: Sardar Sahib is very happy.

Sardar Hukam Singh: When a fact comes out, why not?

श्री गोपी राम : मैं हिमाचल को अलहदा रहने देने की मांग के बारे में एक छोटा सा श्लोक आपके सामने पेश करना चाहता हूँ। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि संस्कृत पढ़े हुए लोग मुझे अगर उसमें मैं कोई गलती करूँ तो क्षमा करेंगे।

वरं वनं व्याघ्रं गजं च सौचित्तम्।

दुःखालयं पक्व फलाम्बु भक्षणम्।

त्रिणानि शय्या परिधान वल्कलम्।

पंजाब मध्ये न वरं हिमाचलम्।

इसका अर्थ है कि जंगलों में रहना अच्छा है जहाँ शेर और हाथी रहते हैं, चन्द मूल खाकर गुजारा करेंगे और तिनके की शय्या पर सो लेंगे मगर हिमाचल का पंजाब में मिलाना कभी स्वीकार नहीं करेंगे। सवाल उठाया जाता है कि हिमाचल की आबादी कम है। इसके बारे में अब

मैं चन्द अल्फाज आपके सामने अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। आप मुझे क्षमा करेंगी अगर मैं यह कहूँ कि केरल नहीं स्टेट तजवीज हुई है। उसका एरिया १४,००० वर्ग मील के करीब है। इसके मुकाबले मैं हमारे हिमाचल प्रदश का एरिया ११,००० वर्ग मील है, कर्नाटक मिलता जुलता ही है। लेकिन आबादी का बड़ा भारी अन्तर है। केरल की आबादी १२० लाख के करीब बनती है लेकिन हिमाचल की आबादी १० लाख के करीब ही है या ११ लाख है। मैं आज इस सदन को यकीन दिलाता हूँ कि अगर पांच बरस का अर्सा हमको दिया गया और सेंटर की एड हमको मिलती रही तो हम केरल की आबादी को बीट कर जाएंगे। चेंबरमैन साहिब, तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना तक हम आबादी को बाहर एक्सपोर्ट करने के भी काबिल हो जाएंगे।

इन लफ्जों के साथ मैं आपके धूँ इस सदन से निवेदन करूंगा कि हिमाचल के बारे में जब वह सोचें तो यह जरूर सोच लें कि हम भाले भाले लोग हैं, पिछड़े हुए भी हैं लेकिन हम चन्द सालों में अपने प्रदश को डिवलप करके उसको भारत का स्विटजरलैंड बनाने वाले हैं और हम इस दौड़ में किसी से भी पीछे रहने वाले नहीं हैं। हम आप ही के काम आएंगे, हम आपको लफ्डी देंगे, आपको हम फ्रूट देंगे और अगर अच्छी तरह से मशीनरी के लिहाज से भी अगर हमारा प्रदश डिवलप हो गया तो घीड़ियां भी आपको भेंजेंगे।

Shri Radha Raman (Delhi City): I am much grateful to you for having given me this opportunity of placing my views on the SRC Report before this House. This Report is the result of almost two years of hard labour of three of our eminent men who constituted the States Reorganisation Commission. Even today they are noted for having no bias of any sort, for or against anything which became the subject-matter of the Report. They enjoy the full confidence of all the parties. It will be admitted by every one of us that they enjoy the confidence of every man and woman of this country. They examined the different States

[Shri Radha Raman]
and their redistribution and they were guided only by one thought, namely that the redistributed boundaries of the new States should make the country stronger and its administration more efficient. It is true that in arriving at a final decision they gave due thought to certain principles and considerations of language, culture, homogeneity, economic life of the people etc. But, none of these factors exclusively weighed with them in deciding one way or the other. Therefore, their decisions were taken with full care and deliberations objectively and dispassionately and they should be readily accepted without any bitterness. I for one think that the Report as a whole is not merely a historical document but it offers a very good and acceptable solution of the long-pending problem of the re-organisation of the States. To my mind, the document has done full justice to the various States and has recommended solutions which should be found as the best in the larger interests of the country. It is, however, unfortunate that the Report is not accepted in certain quarters for various reasons and there is difference of opinion in the country with regard to some of their recommendations.

Imagine what enormous money, time and energy is spent on the work which the Commission has done. I was amazed to read the introductory pages of the Report; the figures of documents received, persons interviewed, places visited by the Commission, all speak of the hugeness of the task done by the Commission, and also the mass of material collected and disposed of. Yet what do we find? The Report does not find favour with some sections. The more I listen to the views of the contending parties here in this House, the more I feel there is no end to the arguments on either side. The more we think of them, the farther we go from the solution. It is strange. It is, therefore, high time that we stop all controversies and accept the recommendations as they are.

When we look back on the events of the past two years in this perspective,

what do we find? Almost the whole country has remained engaged in the work of demanding some territory or other. Some people were claiming Vishal Andhra, some Samyukta Maharashtra, some Maha Punjab, some Maha Delhi, this that and the other, and our attention was naturally drawn to their claims and their demands to our great disadvantage. Perhaps very few during this period certainly thought of Vishal Bharat, Mahan Aryavart, Mahan Bharatvarsh or Bharatdesh. The demand of Greater Delhi was not seriously advanced by many of our friends. I humbly place before this House that the people of Delhi are not after any of these demands, much more so for Greater Delhi. They want Delhi to be great indeed, but not by getting added to it large territories from either of the four sides; they want it to be great in its national character, in its ancient history and what not. We want the Indian nation to live in Delhi. We want Indian Nation to take pride in it and look forward to it. One should like to be relieved of the present controversies as soon as possible. In my opinion, we are going to discuss this Report till the 23rd of this month. I wish that date were the deadline for all controversies, because we have suffered on account of them and we might suffer more for the very same reason. So, let this House decide one way or the other with regard to the various contentious problems, but after the 23rd December, let us all seal our lips and carry on our work of reconstruction and rebuilding of the nation, which is most important at the present moment.

What has the Commission recommended for the territory of Delhi? It has mentioned that the rural areas which are at present part of the State should be taken back and they should be added to some other large neighbouring State. I may say that this will be really a most undesirable thing.

Shri Lokenath Mishra (Puri): To this extent you disagree with the S.R.C.

Shri Radha Raman: I may place before this House my views with regard to the suggestions which the Com-

mission has made. I believe Delhi is a growing town. Delhi has got an ancient history; Delhi has got all the talents. As I said earlier, we want the whole nation to live here in Delhi. It should reflect the mind and soul of the nation and as such, in spite of the desire that anyone of us may like that Delhi should not grow in population, I may say that it must grow and it will grow as everyone of us has seen. Under the circumstances, I think it would be highly desirable that we had examined the small territories which are required for the future development of the capital or for the fuller development of the existing State of Delhi. Again I may say that I am not for Greater Delhi and I do not want any large slice either from the U.P., or from the Punjab. My people do not want it. They want that Delhi should be left as it is and if there is any need for the future development of this capital, it should be for our leaders and for this House to take that into account because later on it may be still more difficult to readjust the boundaries of this State even if it remains as a Centrally administered territory as is proposed by the Commission.

I should not like to take the time of the House in giving vent to my feelings on the floor of this House further on this matter. I believe the best thing for me to do would be to confine myself to certain aspects of the recommendations of the Commission embodied in the Report and the case of Delhi which deserves greater attention from this House than has been given by the Commission in its Report. Before I do that, I should like to mention my reactions to certain other matters as well, referred to in the Report. I am extremely pleased that the Commission's Report agrees with us for abolishing the distinctions of Parts A, B and C States and for the removal of the institution of Rajpramukhs. On many an occasion we had voiced that there was no justification for our maintaining the distinction between the different States, and the institution of Rajpramukhs was much out-dated and

could hardly fit in the present circumstances. The Commission in their Report have accepted our opinion and have made recommendations for their abolition, for which I want to congratulate them. I have little doubt in my mind that the abolition of Part C States has brought to an end not merely the anomalous position of these States but many other shortcomings that were attached to them. These States, however, with the exception of a few which will be called 'Centrally administered areas', have lost nothing because they have now become a vital part of some bigger States, with full powers and full right of franchise and the fullest autonomy. This, however, is not the case with the proposed Centrally administered territories, such as Delhi, Manipur and Tripura. Therefore, they deserve special attention of this House as well as of our leaders. I may, however, add that the Commission in its Report has recommended altogether 16 States, and in doing so, it has merged all the Part C States except a few smaller States, in bigger adjoining States. Such a course has in no way deprived these States of any of their existing rights and privileges, except that they would not enjoy separate legislatures. The franchise, be it in the State or in the Centre, will still continue. They will form a part of a bigger unit where their rightful place is granted and their talents can shine better than probably in a smaller State.

Shri Feroze Gandhi (Pratapgarh Distt.-West — *cum*—Rac Bareilly-East): Is the hon. Member allowed to read his speech?

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur): Let him read. What is the harm?

Shri Radha Raman: But similar is not the position with Centrally administered areas. They have not been allowed to merge with any of the adjoining States. They have not been given their rightful place. They will be Centrally administered and therefore they will be deprived of their aspirations and popular participation so

[Shri Radha Raman]

necessary in this democratic age. I, therefore, think that looking at the position Delhi holds, it must have better consideration from this House. The recommendations of the Commission hardly touch much on the present position of Delhi. You will find that they have in the first part of the Report narrated how Delhi exists—because it is the Union's capital, the Centre wants to have its power and control on it and therefore it should not have any democratic set-up. They have also mentioned in the Report that corporation is an easy substitute for what we have at present. I somehow do not understand how this conclusion has been arrived at. We all know that hardly four years ago, in this very House, many of our colleagues and Lala Deshbandhu Gupta spoke for Delhi's democratic set-up—the position in which Delhi exists today. Delhi was the capital of the Union then. It had all those advantages and disadvantages which it presently has. Still after due deliberations and full discussion in this House, it was agreed that Delhi should be a separate State and it was made a separate State. Now, I do not understand how the passage of time has altered the position. All the arguments for and against were given then and after hearing them it was felt necessary, looking to the history and background in which Delhi existed, looking to the talent it possessed and looking to all other things, that Delhi should be created as a separate State. What is it that has now persuaded the SRC or actuated it to deprive Delhi of its present position or its right to have a separate democratic set-up.

I do not want to go in or repeat what was then said on both sides. I simply want to remind the House that all those arguments which have been used by the SRC in its Report with regard to Delhi were used then and it was only after having fully considered them and examined them that it was decided, that Delhi should be a separate State. I, therefore, feel that the case of Delhi has not received the attention it deserves from the SRC.

It has been mentioned in the SRC Report that a Corporation will be necessary. I fully agree with it. It was absolutely necessary for Delhi to have a Corporation. Some people objected, to its creation but even they have now changed their view. We all feel that there should be a very strong and good Corporation for the civil administration of this place. Whenever the question of having a Corporation came, there had always been a quarrel between us and the Government and it was said from the Government side that there should not be one but two Corporations, one for old Delhi and the other for New Delhi. We have not been able to reconcile ourselves to this position of two Corporations. We want a strong and effective Corporation for Delhi; it should cover the whole area of old Delhi and New Delhi. That was the reason which probably governed our friends' decision not to agree to it immediately after Delhi had obtained its status as a separate State.

Before I go further I should like to mention.....

An Hon. Member: You have gone far enough.

Shri Radha Raman: I should like to mention that we are not insisting that we should have a particular form of democratic Government in Delhi either A, B or C type. These were the different types and there was D also. All these different types exist in India. Each pattern was designed to suit certain conditions. We want at the present moment that our status should be enlarged or rather made more effective. What should be the pattern is left to the constitutional, *pandits* to the Government, or to our leaders. They have to find out or evolve a certain pattern which suits the conditions of Delhi. We have said, not once but on so many occasions, that Delhi's position is different from the rest of the States including the Centrally Administered Territory. I would like to remind the House that the very name—Centrally Administered Territory—that Delhi should

be a Centrally Administered Area snacks of something which is not reconcilable. It has always been said that such areas are backward in many ways or deficient economically or they have less of talent and so many other things. But in the case of Delhi all these things do not stand in the way. We have a population of nearly twenty lakhs; this is a growing population. Delhi has got a composite culture. Practically all the languages of the country are spoken here. There is no reason why it should be treated differently, and more particularly as has been treated by the SRC.

Before I go further, I wish very emphatically to place before this House and before our leaders that we have always carried out their wishes. We have been loyal to them and we shall continue to obey them if it is their decision that Delhi should remain a Centrally Administered Area in spite of all its claims—past, present and future as well. We do not want to do anything which might disturb the atmosphere in Delhi. We want to have no agitation in the capital city of the country. But we do want that our claim must be properly examined. It should receive the best of attention with all the seriousness that it deserves. I have little doubt that the decisions arrived at only three or four years ago will continue to prevail on our leaders as well as this House and the result would be what we want.

I just want to mention for the information of this House that the demand of Delhi for self-government is as old as 1918. It is not that it was put forward only lately or that the principle was accepted lately. It was started by the biggest national organisation of the country—the Indian National Congress. I want to read out the Resolution of the Congress which mentioned that Delhi must get its rightful place by having a democratic set-up or it should be a separate State having a Government of its own.

The National Congress at its 1918 session held in Delhi adopted the

following resolution which was moved by the late Rai Sahib Piyare Lal and seconded by no less a person than our revered late Hakim Ajmal Khan:

“That this Congress strongly recommends that Delhi should be constituted into a Regulation Province, that it should have a Legislative Council to assist the Chief Commissioner and that it should have at least two representatives in the Legislative Assembly.”

That was the demand which started in 1918 and since then the people of Delhi have been demanding in some form or the other the democratic rights which were not given to it. It was only in the year 1951 that these rights were conceded and Delhi was given a Part C State's status with further limitations than what other Part C States were subjected to.

It may be that the experience which we have gained in past three years is not very satisfactory, or is not according to our expectation, but it should not alter the principle on which Delhi was given a separate status. I only say that so far as the question of experience is concerned I for one maintain that it has not altogether been a bad one. We started quite afresh, most of our old leadership was gone and the whole burden had fallen in the hands of younger people. In the course of the three or four years that were given to them they have learnt so many things. I am afraid, in case this democratic right of the people of Delhi is taken away and Delhi is deprived of its present status there will be a lot of difficulties which we will have to face. In my opinion, Delhi as a State has served as a shock absorber even for the leaders or the Ministers who sat at the Centre. It has always been the headache of State Minister who were carrying on the work on behalf of the State as well as on behalf of the Centre to deal with local problems.

[Shri Radha Raman]

It has been stated that Delhi being a small State, if it is given a separate status as it is having now, will not be viable and financially it will be a burden. All these arguments have been thoroughly exposed in the past and it has been stated before, and can be stated now, that these arguments cannot stand logic and reason. From the calculations that we have made you will find that Delhi can become an economically self-sufficient unit. If all the burden that is thrown on it because of the Centre's responsibility, or the Centre being here, is taken away, it can certainly have its own self-sufficient economic status also. I, therefore, urge on this House and on the Members present here, and also those who are not present, that Delhi's case should not receive that scant attention which it has received from the Commission; and those arguments which have led the Commission to come to this conclusion and which are now contrary to what they were then, should not stand in the way of Delhi attaining its just and rightful place.

In the end I want to mention a few points which I think would be helpful in guiding our decision so far as Delhi's case is concerned. Delhi's demand for a responsible government, as I said earlier, dates back from 1918 when a resolution was adopted by the Indian National Congress in its session at Delhi. Therefore, if Delhi is made a Centrally administered territory it will be a retrograde step and it will virtually mean the denial of her just and rightful place. It will be like a body without its soul. Delhi has been and can continue to be financially a viable State. Keeping in view the future development and expansion of this ever-growing city, an area within a radius of at least 20 miles, or even less if it is thought so, should be added to Delhi's present boundaries. There are numerous precedents in the world, where the Federal Capital and the Capital of a State can co-exist without any difficulty. Therefore, here the Delhi

State as well as the Capital can both exist. A corporation or a county council or any other form of civil administration however powerful, or a Minister in the Central Government for Delhi Affairs, or the association of some people in their advisory capacity cannot be a substitute for the Government of the people by their own representatives and for their own good. A corporation and the State Government can, and should exist. They should be self-supporting in their respective spheres with their own finances. Delhi should have a democratic pattern of administration and may be called a "Metropolitan State" if nothing else, and should be given a responsible government at the State level.

Before I conclude I would like to say one more word. It has been quoted over and over again that because Delhi is the capital of the Indian Union and the Indian Union has so many responsibilities to discharge it cannot be acceded that it should remain a separate State. We have all worked for a democracy. Ours is a living democracy and we are evolving pattern after pattern for it. The world is also believing in that and new patterns are being evolved in many places and in many countries. I see no reason why in our own country we are not able to evolve a pattern which is acceptable to the Centre as well as to the people of Delhi. We are told there is Washington, Canberra and other places like that. The position of London is also mentioned to us. All these are old patterns in my opinion. If you look to the new pattern you will see the difference. See the latest model of Tokyo, see what is done at Ottawa, what is done at Berne, the capital of Switzerland, you will find that all these Capitals are enjoying a certain amount, rather a very good amount, of self-government. If we accept the recommendation of the Commission about Delhi I am afraid neither of these opportunities will be available to us and we will be dep-

rived of our very rightful and just place. Such a course will stifle our aspirations and we will be deprived of our popular participation in the governance of Delhi which is the just need of the people of Delhi.

I thank you, Madam, for the time you have given and for the indulgence of the House which I have received. I am sure that after what I have said and what my other friends will say, Delhi's case will receive that serious attention which it deserves.

4 P.M.

Shri B. K. Ray (Cuttack): Thank you very much for giving me an opportunity to place before the House, the supreme adjudicator—the Parliament—the saddest fate of Orissa, the like of which this House has probably never heard. It would have been really very unfortunate if the Report should have been prejudged or accepted as it is. Our hope lies in the very consoling words delivered during the lucid speech of our hon. Home Minister that what the States Reorganisation Commission had said are not the final words. That gives us the hope that the aggrieved will have further opportunities to be heard and I think I am now standing on behalf of the disappointed and despaired Orissa to plead her case before the highest tribunal, namely, this august House.

An Hon. Member: Take something from Bihar.

Shri B. K. Ray: I know in this sort of controversy, there are hon. Members arrayed on this side and on that side, but I think we shall give sufficient weight to the calm and peaceful atmosphere in which this matter has been discussed, by observing restraint and not interfering with the speech of the particular Member who is speaking on the side of one case or the other. By saying that Orissa has claims or has a good

claim for itself, I am not carrying the lands with me and away from Bihar, nor should Bihar do so from Orissa.

With regard to the personnel of the Commission I say—and the Members of this House have also conceded it—that they are not only men of eminence and deserve respect but also that their judgment carries great weight with it; and particularly, the Chairman is a person who has not only enjoyed in his life the highest honour of being the Chief Justice of a High Court and then a Judge of the Supreme Court, but is one to whom I am personally much obliged. His influence has imparted much to the build up of my career as a lawyer and then as a judge. But we should not consider that the human elements are not there. I should say the human element is there. On account of human elements what happens? Man is liable to err and I should say that, with all respect, they have erred.

Before coming to the Report rather in its detail, I should say that if there is any glaring instance of their error, it is the instance of their judgment over the claims of Orissa not only to certain territories now lying in Bihar but also to certain other territories lying in Madhya Pradesh and certain other areas. What is the mistake? The mistake is that they did not consider it. They closed the door against us saying that what has been done 20 years ago is quite enough for us. If the world has changed, if the time has changed, if the circumstances have changed, if the political map of India has changed, they are not for your benefit. You must be taken to be there, where you were in the year 1934. Though the mountains are no longer there, though the jungles are no longer there, so far as the Report is concerned, they are still there so far as Orissa is concerned. This, in short, is the said error that they have committed with regard to the State of Orissa.

[Shri B. K. Ray]

As a general critic of this Report, I have read and re-read it in order to find out certain principles on which it is based and I have been at a loss to find any. No doubt, in the preliminary chapter of the Report, there have been various principles defined, laid down and discussed, as principles that will govern reorganisation of States, and re-adjustment of boundaries of States. Help has also been taken from the various committees set up by the Congress, set up by the independent Government of India, for the purpose of some light as to the principles which should guide them. But have they laid down any formula by which they should govern the reorganisation of States or the redistribution of States in India? They have forgotten the genesis of the appointment of this Commission. India has been quite safe from 1947 till now. The Governments of the various States were going on quite smoothly and so also at the Centre. Then, why all of a sudden this Commission was set up for the purpose of reorganisation of States? There was something wrong. What was wrong? There was nothing wrong with regard to any administration anywhere. There was nothing wrong with regard to the security or unity of India anywhere. But the leaders, the authorities at the Centre, knew that there was this linguistic principle, this linguistic homogeneity, which was lacking in the existing formation of the States. On the advent of Independence, and of the introduction of democracy, the proposition arose that a majority group—by majority, I mean a majority of people speaking one language—had to rule over another group living within the same boundary and speaking another language. Naturally, with all restraint, with all the safeguards in the Constitution, it became a common feature, a feature which has also been noticed by the Commission in its Report. That discrimination was there and discontent was there. It seems that they have been carried away very

much by consideration of Indian unity and security. As one of the hon. Members has already said—and with whom I entirely agree—in the question of internal readjustment of boundaries between pre-existing States, where arises the question of Indian unity or Indian security? That is a proposition which has simply to be borne in mind, but some territorial formula had to be laid down by them. What have they done in the preliminary chapter of their book? They have discussed several principles but ultimately, in their assessment, they have come to say in respect of each one proposition that "this is not the sole test". Ultimately, they say that they have made a balanced approach in the Report, but that approach might be reduced, and I think has been reduced to be their own discretion and which, in some circumstances, might glide into arbitrariness. The inevitable result has been that they have recommended certain divisions on an *ad hoc* basis. It has been said on the floor of the House, with which I also agree, that to reorganise States on a linguistic basis and to prevent minorities being discriminated against, or, to use a stronger word—I do not like to use it, but in the absence of another word I have to use it—being oppressed by the majority group, the States should be reorganised so that there is linguistic homogeneity. Of course, so far as the question of unity or security of India and the economic evolution of India are concerned, they should be considered after finding out whether it is impossible to have a readjustment of boundaries on the linguistic basis on account of these considerations. If they had followed a particular principle; if they had laid down a particular yard-stick before them and according to that, if they had redistributed these States, there should not have been by now this discontent which is now tending to disruptive tendencies in the States. There are only two or three recommendations about which there can be no two opinions such as that of the

reorganisation of the States of M.P., namely, bringing in all Hindi-speaking areas together under one administration, and the setting up of the Kerala and Karnataka States. With regard to the other portions, there is visible to my eyes, which is accustomed to see things down below a little carefully, a bit of judicial nervousness. One example is the proposed State of Maharashtra, Gujarat and Bombay, because the Maharashtrians can have a State of their own; they are self-sufficient and there is financial viability also. There is no danger to the security or unity of India. There is no danger in putting all the Maharashtrians into one State and giving them the city of Bombay also, because it is clear that geographically Maharashtra and Bombay city form one unit. To make it bi-lingual, wavering about the decision whether to leave it to Gujarat or Maharashtra and all that is due to that judicial nervousness.

Let me come to the case of Bengal. There is no contradiction and there can be no contradiction over the fact that Bengal had suffered in its territory and it has been vivisected for the sake of the nation. It has suffered at the altar of the freedom of the Indian nation. Therefore, the nation has to make good what it has lost. To connect North Bengal and South Bengal by a highway only is not enough. So far as Darjeeling and other areas are concerned, they are border territories and the security of the Indian Union is mostly concerned with them. Therefore, the actual Government, namely, the State Government, which is in charge of these territories must have full facilities for those security measures which are necessary in order to guard the frontiers of the State against any external attack. For this, will the mere highway from the North to the South Bengal be sufficient? No. Sufficient territories must be added to it and those territories must bear this character, namely, they should be such as can be developed and absorbed into the territory of Bengal. They should be such that when they are amalgamated with

Bengal, the whole State may become homogeneous. In that way, sufficient progress can be made....

Shri Bibhuti Mishra (Saran *cum* Champaran): Why do you not amalgamate Bengal and Bihar?

Mr. Chairman: Can the hon. Member force him to give out some such suggestion?

Shri B. K. Ray: I now come to the recommendation with regard to Manbhum and Dalbhum, because that is a very material one. So far as Manbhum and Dalbhum are concerned, they are joined with Bengal in many ways. The majority of their population is Bengali and the tradition is that of Bengal. For a very long time, at least till 1912, they were part of Bengal Presidency. If they are given Manbhum, why should they not be given Dalbhum also? I am not pleading the cause of Bengal. I am only pointing out the inconsistencies, the absence of logic and coherence in the S. R. C. Report. It is not that there are no proposals which are logical and consistent; there are many. At the same time, where it affects the people very seriously, we should be careful. What has been said with regard to Orissa's claim in Bihar? Because, we are not giving Dalbhum to Bengal, therefore, we should not give this to the other State also. I am putting it in my own words; the Commission might have said in different words. They have said so, because they think that Dalbhum will become an enclave. If you are not going to leave any enclave whatsoever in the reorganisation of States, what is your answer for those enclaves belonging to Madhya Pradesh which will still remain in Orissa? In certain enclaves, Madhya Pradesh cannot carry on the administration itself, as excise jurisdiction and several other jurisdictions have been delegated to the Government of Orissa. Even those enclaves should not remain in that case, if logic is to prevail. With regard to Orissa, agitation was going on for 30 or 40 years for having a separate province till it was given

[Shri B. K. Ray]

in the year 1936. At that time, there was correspondence between the Secretary of State and the Governor-General and there was also a Commission which was appointed for this purpose. What has been decided under those circumstances, the Commission say, we are not going to interfere with that now. In one case, something is not given to us even though it is admittedly an Oriya area, because they say it will create an enclave; but, at the same time, so many enclaves are allowed to remain in Madhya Pradesh.

So far I have dealt with the general characteristics of the report. It is not free from reproach, it is not free from criticism. They have honestly, judicially, however, arrived at certain erroneous decisions, with regard to certain territories. On the whole, they have laid down certain principles. For this portion, I may be permitted to read. They have defined culture—I do not disagree with it—as social heritage of moral, spiritual and economic values expressing itself in the distinct way of life of a group of people living as an organised community. It covers language, habits, ideas, beliefs and even the vocational patterns. I should remind my hon. friends in this House to keep in mind this definition. They have no doubt taken linguistic homogeneity, geographical compactness, alignment of communications ensuring easy accessibility from one part to another and historical affinities to be the main considerations in the readjustment of States or boundaries. With regard to historical affinities, they have said,

“No conclusion could be drawn merely from the fact that the area proposed for retransfer to a State fell at one time within the administrative jurisdiction of that State.”

I will pause a moment here. In direct contradiction of this principle of theirs, they have said that Seraikella and Kharsawan should be retained by Bihar because it was for a certain

time within the administrative jurisdiction of Bihar or Chota Nagpur. I will read it again:

“No conclusion could be drawn merely from the fact that the area proposed for retransfer to a State fell at one time within the administrative jurisdiction of that State.”

Of course, if it had been one of the various observations, I should not attach much importance to it. But this House will be amused to learn that this is the main ground on which they decided Orissa's case saying that the historical fact is that these two States had administrative connection or were administratively within the Chota Nagpur Division.

As to the merger of princely States, they themselves have said in para. 239:

“It would be unfair to concede any prescriptive right in favour of any of the existing units on the mere ground that it escaped the sweep of political developments in the country owing to some favourable turn in the events or some such factor as a political concession, its geographical isolation, location in the border or economic backwardness.”

It means that if on any of these grounds any princely State happened to be merged in any of the States or provinces at that time, that should not give it any prescriptive right. This is their proposition. What have they done? Because Seraikella and Kharsawan had been put under the administration of Bihar, under the circumstances then,—there was riot, there was violence—the territory was divided from the then State of Orissa, from Mayurbhanj a State which had not merged in Orissa then. Under these political and other events, it was thought then politic that they should be administered by the Government of Bihar. They say that such circumstances would not give a

particular State within whose administration a territory is, any prescriptive title to be retained in it. Here, in the case of Bihar as against Orissa, Bihar will have prescriptive right.

After this, I will confine my speech to the claims of Orissa in the territories now lying in Bihar. So far as the other claims are concerned, some of my friends from Orissa will follow me, because, according to the direction of the hon. Speaker, we have arranged accordingly. He said that with regard to a particular group, you select certain people so that there will be no duplication of speeches, so that the same things may not be repeated. I think the hon. Chairman will take note of it that I am not going to make the whole speech that is necessary to place the case of Orissa before the House. I shall deal it under different heads. Let me take historical affinity. In the reference by which this Commission was given the power, which defined the scope of their enquiries and investigations, which gave them some directions as to what to do and what not to do, historical background is one of the considerations to which they have to pay attention.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has only five minutes more.

Shri B. K. Ray: I have much to say. I do not think I am taking more than others.

Mr. Chairman: I have got that complaint. The directions of the Speaker are, half an hour is the normal time.

Shri B. K. Ray: I am the representative speaker from Orissa. Several other gentlemen will only speak on specific points. I have already covered the general grounds. Now, I am going to specific points. I may take 15 minutes more. Please allow.

What is the historical background? If the administration under the British Indian Government, their formation of territorial units for that purpose is the historical background, then, I

think there was no meaning in setting up this Commission at all. The Members of the Commission say, because Seraikella and Kharsawan and the Sadar sub-division were being administered as part of the Chota Nagpur sub-division by the Britishers, that is the historical background on which they are entitled to retain it. I will place before the House the real historical background.

श्री बिभूति मिश्र : सरदार पटेल ने दो बार डिसाइड किया है। क्या आप ने रिपोर्ट को पढ़ा है ?

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : हाँ, मैं ने पढ़ा है।

Mr. Chairman: I have already requested hon. Members that these disputes should not be settled here like that....

Shri B. K. Ray: With regard to the British territories, the members of the Commission have said that it was grounded in imperial interests and the exigencies of a foreign Government and not in accordance with the actual needs, wishes and affinities of the people, and that compactness, homogeneity, factors conducive to growth of natural units were subordinated to the prime considerations of administrative and military exigencies.

With regard to history, there is no doubt that Singbhum, Seraikella and Kharsawan formed part of the old Utkal. Utkal consisted of Odra and the present districts of Balasore, Midnapore, Manbhum, Singbhum and nearabout areas. Odra in Utkal Kingdom otherwise known as Southern Tosala extended from river Baitarani in the north to the river Bansadhara in the south. It included all the hinterland to the south of Manbhum and Singbhum consisting of the present districts of Sambalpur, Bilaspur and the States of Patna, etc. To the misfortune of the Oriyas, they had a large kingdom and it was cut up at different times and some portion was given to Bengal, some portion to Madras and some portion to the then Central Provinces. With regard

(Shri B. K. Ray)

to Singbhum, I would just refer to what Walter Hamilton wrote in his book called Province of Orissa in 1820. He says that the territorial sub-divisions of the province of Orissa commencing from the north are the following though there are many other petty States and large zamindaries; Singbhum, Keonjhar, Mayurbhanj, Balasore, Cuttack and Khurdha. This was written as long back as 1820, and that was the most authentic record. The same writer again says in his *description of Hindusthan* (1820, Vol. 22, pp. 34), that Singbhum, the land of lions, in the province of Orissa was governed by a Rajah independent within his own territories, but under political subordination to the British Government. Mr. Ricket, the then member of the Board of Revenue, Bengal, in his report on Sambalpur in 1853 also described Singbhum to be an Oriya territory included in Orissa.

Going into further details, I might say that the district of Singbhum consists of three different parts, namely, Dhalbhum, Kolhan and Porahat. Here also, the history is there. This Porahat State was an Indian State, and it continued to be an Indian State till 1858 under Rana Arjun Singh whose family and dynasties were for generations past recognised as Oriyas, and exercised ruling authority over 16 *pirs* of Kolhan. This State was confiscated on account of the rebellion. Its revenue administration was made over to the Board of Revenue in 1859, although it continued in other respects to be managed as a tributary State. By the proclamation of 5th August 1892, it was incorporated in Bengal—not in Bihar, for Bihar had no existence at that time—along with Orissa in one revenue division. It was by Act II of 1892 that it was included in the district of Singbhum (Vide O'Malley's *District Gazetteer of Singbhum*).

Originally, Kolhan had only 16 *pirs*. Its area was then increased by the accretion of territories from the neighbouring Oriya States of Mayurbhanj, Seraikella and Kharswan. The

Singbhum district then constituted was assigned to the Assistant Agent to the Governor-General, a post specifically created for this purpose. In the administration report of the Government of Bengal for the year 1872-73, at page 40, there is a remark to the effect that the lands lying between Subarnarekha and Rupnarayan were parts of Orissa.

With regard to the expansion of the Oriya language, I shall take you to Dr. Grierson, who writes in his *Linguistic Survey of India*:

"The Orissa country is not confined to the division which now bears that name."

In fact, ultimately, according to the British allocation of territories, only the nucleus remained in the Orissa division. It was only in 1936 that a lot of the outlying areas were joined together, and the Orissa province was created. But originally, it was only Oriya division. Grierson further says:

"It includes a portion of the district of Midnapore on the north, which together with a part of Balasore was the Orissa of the phrase 'Bengal, Bihar and Orissa' met in the Regulations framed by the Government in the last decades of the 18th century. Oriya is also the language of most of the district of Singbhum belonging to the division of Chota Nagpur and several neighbouring native States which fall politically within the same division."

As I have already stated, so far as the administrative divisions are concerned, Bihar had no separate existence. The administration with which the Britisher started was the administration of the Presidency of Bengal which included with it Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Chota Nagpur. So, Bihar was a unit or entity; so was Orissa and so was Chota Nagpur.

An Hon. Member: You want that they should be merged again?

Shri B. K. Ray: Within the administration of Chota Nagpur, Singbhum was placed as a district, and it was only in 1892 that the Singbhum district as such was created. The real princely State which on account of the rebellion had been confiscated and reduced to an ordinary revenue or administrative division was for some time kept under management as a princely State, as a feudatory State, but its revenue division was added on to the district, and ultimately by an Act in 1892, it was made into a separate district.

When did the Provinces of Bihar and Orissa come into existence? It was in 1912 that they came into existence. We felt no separation from Singbhum at all, until the Orissa province was created in 1936. Now, the important point is that in looking to the historical affinities, these affinities also should have been looked into by the States Reorganisation Commission.

With regard to Seraikella and Kharwan, it is said that they formed part of Chota Nagpur division. Had the Commission looked into our memoranda and had they carefully looked into the documents produced before them, they could have seen easily that from 1916 till 1948 these two States were being administered along with all the princely States of Orissa at Sambalpur. They were taken away from Bihar on a representation by the people and on the basis of an agreement executed by the Hos, in which the main ground was that their mother-tongue was Oriya, that the rajahs were Oriyas and they had every affinity with the Oriya rajahs and the Orissa country. That is how the whole thing started.

Now, was the south-eastern frontier agency, which was known also as Chota Nagpur, ever administered by Bihar? No. In the entire belt from Singbhum to Sambalpur there were a number of feudatory States, and the rajahs of those States had their own forts and were maintaining their own armies for the protection of the kingdom of Utkal. All those feudatory

States which existed as States at the time of the British administration were all being governed by an Agent of the Governor-General. It was only after most of them had been transferred to the Orissa agency or the eastern agency that these two States were kept for some time under the administration of the Chota Nagpur division. That was again undone on a representation made by the rajahs. The fact that they were under the supervision of the Divisional Commissioner of Chota Nagpur does not really mean that their administration was integrated with that of Bihar, revenue, civil, or criminal. Those rajahs had their own administration. It was only for the observance of the paramountcy power of the British Government that the Commissioner was there to supervise whether these rajahs were ruling properly or not. So, that was absolutely no historical affinity at all.

With regard to language and culture, the whole position has been misconceived. As has been admitted in the census report, the position is that the Orissa are in a majority. That is one way of looking at the thing. It was admitted by Dr. Sinha—it was worthy of him—before the sub-committee of the Congress Working Committee, that on the point of language, Bihar had no case. In fact, the Hindi-speaking people are very few in number. They are only something like 34,000 or 38,000 as against an entire population of 6 lakhs or 8 lakhs. That is the real position. Excluding the Biharis, the largest group consists of Hos, who are about 4 lakhs or so in number.

But the point is that linguistic homogeneity has to be seen in this way. Now, what is the area proposed to be added? It is the Sadar sub-division of Singbhum. You will kindly note that the States Reorganisation Commission have completely forgotten Orissa's claim in this regard. Our claim for the Sadar sub-division of Singbhum is not at all mentioned in the Report. The Commission have

[Shri B. K. Ray]

confined themselves only to Seraikella and Kharswan, as if we were claiming only those two, and have said that if these two areas were transferred, they would become an enclave. But we claimed the Sadar sub-division of Singhbhum also. Now, the three districts of Orissa on the border of the three States of Seraikella, Kharswan and Singhbhum are Mayurbhanj, Keonjhar and Sundargarh

They practically embrace Singhbhum on three sides. Now, all the Hos and the Santals, more than 99 per cent. of the Hos of Bihar concentrate in Singhbhum mostly and Sarai-kella and Kharsawan partly. The entire Hos and Santal population of Orissa concentrate in the three districts of Mayurbhanj, Keonjhar and Sundargarh. So the point is that you should compare the area sought to be transferred to the area to which it is to be amalgamated. Take the Oriya language, take the Ho language and take the Santal language; you will find there will be a linguistic homogeneity amongst those people. The O'Donnell Committee Report, on which they rely, has stated that they formed a part of the village economy of Singhbhum. They are living together side by side as one community, as it were, and the Hos have the largest majority of them who speak Oriya as the second language.

Besides, with regard to geographical position, on the north there is a range of hills and so far as communication of Singhbhum with the rest of Bihar is concerned, there is nothing but one circuitous way or railway which is available. But so far as communication with Orissa is concerned, we have given a list in our memorandum. There are seven main roads and there are six railways, besides one which is proposed to be constructed for the sake of Rourkela which will connect Chaibasa with the different district towns of Orissa. Then, at the time of the O'Donnell Committee's investigation, they said that the Hos were not willing to go from Bihar to Orissa, because they

were separated from Orissa by a large belt of feudatory States, and the Hos and Santals of those States had their economic life, their social life and their affinities with these people.

But at present, the position is quite different. In the last general elections held in 1951, public opinion among the Hos and the other tribal people unmistakably expressed itself in favour of merger with Orissa. Out of 12 MLAs in the district of Singhbhum, 7 have publicly declared themselves in favour of Singhbhum's transfer to Orissa, and of these, 7 including the *ex*-Leader of the Opposition in the Bihar Assembly represent the tribal people of that district. They have made this position clear in their memoranda to the States Reorganisation Commission and the number of representations they have since submitted to the Government of India. Therefore, the Hos, the Santals and Oriyas who form 99 per cent. of the population of that area live like one community. Oriya festivals are observed by the Hos and Santals and Ho and Santal festivals are observed by the Oriyas.

Shri Jajwara (Santal Parganas *cum* Hazaribagh): What is the percentage of the Oriya-speaking people there?

Shri B. C. Das (Ganjam South): Much more than that of Beharis.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member will kindly co-operate with the Chair and see that such cross questioning is not permitted.

Shri B. K. Ray: Therefore, by not transferring this area to Orissa, not only have they violated the principle of linguistic homogeneity, the principle of geographic contiguity, compactness and facility of communication, but they have also violated the principle of the wishes of the majority of the people.

Now, I would say one word about regional planning. That is yet another factor in favour of transfer, which needs to be taken into account while considering this question. Of the five big rivers of Orissa, namely,

Mahanadi, Brahmani, Baitarani, Salandi and Subarnarekha, all except Mahanadi have their catchment areas and tributaries in Singhbhum such as Sankha, Koel etc. They flow through the Orissa districts and cause at times of flood widespread devastation in the districts of Sundargarh, Keonjhar, Cuttack and Balasore. Flood control and irrigation works over these river systems can only be effectively undertaken if the catchment areas, especially their tributaries, could be controlled by the State of Orissa through which the major parts of the rivers flow to the area. In reply to a similar argument by Shri N. C. Chatterjee in respect of another river, my hon. friend, Shri Syamnandan Sahaya replied that they had already a scheme afoot for controlling that river and setting up a dam. But that argument cannot apply here. Excepting Subarnarekha, there are other rivers which do not cause any flood in Singhbhum or Saraikella or Kharwan. So regional planning is also one of the considerations in favour of transfer.

In short, my point is that historical affinity and economic considerations are in favour of transfer. As regards economic consideration, I have a word to say. These Hos have not only their kith and kin in the districts of Orissa, but according to the Census Report of 1951, they are gradually migrating to the south, namely, Orissa, because there more economic occupations are available.

As I have already said, in the entire province of Bihar only some 4000 Hos are scattered, but there are about 4 lakhs of them in Singhbhum which is adjacent to Mayurbhanj and Keonjhar, where the Hos number about 3 lakhs.

Therefore my submission is that the SRC have not at all considered Orissa's case. In fact, I can say that even applying for the sake of argument, all the tests—even though some of them need not be taken into consideration—that they have laid down in the preliminary chapters about re-

adjustment of boundaries Orissa's claim can be justified. There can be no question of any danger to Indian unity or security if some 3000 or 4000 sq. miles of Bihar are attached to Orissa, by administratively transferring them to Orissa. Nothing of the kind. On the contrary, so far as the people are concerned, economic betterment can be effected by the transfer. According to all the tests, the case ought to have been decided in favour of Orissa. But it has been wrongly decided. I appeal to this hon. House, I appeal to the sub-Committee, to look into this matter objectively and dispassionately because the SRC have not given proper consideration to our grievance.

Shri S. M. Ghose (Malda): At the outset I express my gratitude to our Home Minister, Pantji, for giving a very correct lead to this debate by saying that we should discuss it coolly, calmly and dispassionately and remembering always the great unity of the Indian people. I congratulate Acharya Kripalani also for emphasising the cultural unity aspect of the Indian people. But, I was a little surprised when another hon. Member, a great Parliamentarian, Shri More said that we should be grateful to the British for giving us this administrative unity. I do not know why the Ashoka Chakra in our National Flag did not come to his notice. I do not know why the symbol of administrative unity, those lions on the top of the chair in which you are sitting did not attract his notice. Then, he should have realised that India achieved administrative unity covering a much larger area than the India of today, before Christ was born. In the 4th century B. C. in *Kautilya's Arthashastra*, he could have got an idea of the pattern of administrative machinery which could keep under administrative unity the Empire of Ashoka. Apart from this administrative unity, there is another aspect of which we can be proud. We are the only people, in my opinion, in the whole world today who can claim that at least

[Shri S. M. Ghose]

from Mohenjodaro till today we are continuing the same pattern of life and the same pattern of civilisation.

If we look at the articles from Mohenjodaro which are preserved in our museum, any one of them, whether it is cooking utensils, whether it is terracotta, whether it is clothes, or whether they are ornaments or any other things, we will see that throughout India, these thousands and thousands of years, in every part of India, in every village of India, the same things were being used and are being used even today. This also throws a little light as to what sort of economic organisation was behind this continuous civilisation of India. I do not want to go into detail but I will simply mention this. Even some of the European scholars themselves have admitted that India's uniqueness lies here, that although there was cultural overflow, this socio-economic pattern never crossed its boundary and from Mohenjodaro till today it is the same thing continued.

I come to another aspect. That is, what was the meaning attached to these activities by the Indian people. This will be found in their philosophy. I shall not go into detail but I simply mention that there were altogether 9 schools of philosophy in India and they were broadly divided as *Atmavadins* and *Anatmavadins*. *Atmavadins* were six, those who believed in the existence of *Atma* as it has been stated and explained in the *Vedas*. *Anatmavadins* were three—*Charvak*, *Jains* and *Buddhists*. You will find that the meaning of *Atma* has been explained by these different schools which, if we try to understand and express in our modern language, would mean that it is a thing in the conscious existence of *ours*—a subtle principle, which exists, uniting us all. That is to say, those who belonged to these six schools, believed in unity of life. The other three schools, the *Charvak*, *Jains* and *Buddhists*, even though they were *Anatmavadins*, even though they did not believe in the existence of such

a thing as *Atma*, all of them believed in *Ahimsa*. If we try to understand the meaning of *Ahimsa*, we shall find that it again confirms in a negative way the same principle of unity of life. Therefore, the heritage which we have received from generation to generation these thousands and thousands of years, whether in our economic activity, whether in spiritual or social or other activity, goes to show that the Indian people believed in unity of life.

Sir, I shall read from the Presidential address of the late Deshbandhu C.R. Dass at the Indian National Congress, 1922, in Gaya. This is how he expressed the great ideal of unity.

"Throughout the pages of Indian history, I find a great purpose unfolding itself. Movement after movement has swept over this vast country, apparently creating hostile forces, but in reality stimulating the vitality and moulding the life of the people into one great nationality. If the Aryans and the non-Aryans met, it was for the purpose of making one people out of them. Brahmanism with its great culture succeeded in binding the whole of India and was indeed a mighty unifying force. Buddhism with its protests against Brahmanism served the same great historical purpose; and from Magadha to Taxila was one great Buddhist empire which succeeded not only in broadening the basis of Indian unity, but in creating, what is perhaps not less important, the greater India beyond the Himalayas and beyond the seas, so much so that the sacred city where we have met may be regarded as a place of pilgrimage of millions and millions of people of Asiatic races. Then came the Mohammedans of diverse races, but with one culture which was their common heritage. For a time it looked as if here was a disintegrating force, an enemy to the growth of Indian nationalism, but the Mohammedans made their home in India, and, while they

brought a new outlook and a wonderful vitality to the Indian life with infinite wisdom, they did as little as possible to disturb the growth of life in the villages where India really lives. This new outlook was necessary for India; and if the two sister streams met, it was only to fulfil themselves and face the destiny of Indian history. Then came the English with their alien culture, their foreign methods, delivering a rude shock to this growing nationality; but the shock has only completed the unifying process so that the purpose of history is practically fulfilled."

5 P.M.

On the question of unity, the S.R.C. has also devoted one chapter and let us see today how we are interpreting this unity? The Report says:

"Unfortunately the manner in which certain administrations have conducted their affairs has itself partly contributed to the growth of this parochial sentiment."

Now I want to draw your attention to some of the recommendations for the protection of linguistic minorities in the different States which would be created after this reorganisation.

Shri M. P. Misra (Monghyr North-West): Now you are coming from the spiritual to the mundane level.

Shri Lokenath Mishra: But they are not self-contradictory.

Shri S. M. Ghose: It is stated in the Report that:

"when such devices as domicile rules operate to make the public services an exclusive preserve of the majority language group of the State, this is bound to cause discontent among the other groups, apart from impeding the free flow of talent and impairing administrative efficiency."

They have suggested in the Report that some of the services should be brought under the Central Government. There also I am one with them because of the problem which we shall have to face and which we are facing

today, because of our development plans and because of the dearth of talented officers. We know that there are certain backward areas in our country and we also know that there are certain parts of India where there is no dearth of talent and there is much more than they can absorb locally. In my opinion, they have rightly pointed out that for the better execution of the plan, certain services such as engineering, medical, forest, etc., should be brought under the Centre.

About the linguistic minorities they have suggested that even if it were purely on linguistic basis, then also there would have been some minorities as pockets here and there. Therefore to remove their grievances and the fear from their minds, they have recommended certain steps. Those steps can be taken even earlier than the reorganisation of the States.

I come to another very touchy affair.

श्री एस० सी० सिंघल (जिला अलीगढ़): आज हाउस पांच बजे तक बँटगा या छः बजे तक ?

The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): Upto six o'clock.

Shri S. M. Ghose: My esteemed friends Shri Chatterjee and Shri Syamnandan Sahaya created a little confusion—I do not say intentionally—but that is the case with everyone of us today. When we discuss the problem of West Bengal, we bring in the question of Bengal, the Bengal which existed and which now is a matter of history. If you look at our Constitution, if you look at the map of India, you will not find anywhere Bengal today; it is West Bengal, which is our own creation. In order that we may all enjoy this freedom and independence, this new State of West Bengal was created by all of us jointly. When we discuss the affairs of West Bengal, in my opinion, all of us should give it top priority because it was our own creation with the head and trunk separated from each other. It is not that we deliberately created it but because we referred the whole matter to an arbitrator whose decision we were bound to accept, and as a result

[Shri S. M. Ghose]

of that arbitration, this 'chinnamastha' State has been offered to us. It should receive your first consideration and top priority over everything else. The head is separated from the body and it is bleeding. Therefore, it is not a problem of only West Bengal but a problem for all of us to find out a solution. I have great faith, trust and confidence in our leaders, in our Congress Working Committee and the Committee which has been appointed by the Working Committee with Panditji, Maulana Saheb, Pantji and Dhebarbhai. I hope they will be able to find out a solution which will be acceptable to all and which will be a most happy solution of the present tangle. I have no doubt in my mind about that.

Another point is about Tripura. In the S.R.C. Report they have stated:

"The Assam Pradesh Congress Committee, the local Communist Party, the Tripura State Congress Committee and the Government of Assam are broadly in favour of the *status quo*."

After the Report was out, I know the President of Assam Pradesh Congress Committee and the President of Tripura Congress Committee submitted a joint memorandum to Pantji as the Congress leader. Assam said that they do not want to have Tripura against its wish and Tripura said that they want to remain separate. But, for the greater interest of the country, if it is felt by this hon. House that S.R.C. Report should be supported, then it lies with the Assam Government and the people of Assam to create such conditions in which the people of Tripura will most gladly merge with Assam. I felt very much assured on this point when Pantji said that nothing will be done against the wishes of the people concerned and nothing will be thrust upon anybody. This aspect of Tripura may also be remembered.

Shri Rishang Keishing (Outer Manipur—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I want to request the Government and this

hon. House not to treat the problem of the Scheduled Tribes and the minorities in a very light-hearted manner but to treat this problem seriously, carefully and tenderly because in the minorities and in the tribal people, the potential forces of national utility exist. I therefore, request again that the Government should consider the question of minorities and the backward tribal people very carefully. The successful working of democracy in this country is going to be determined in the way in which the majorities treat the minorities and the backward tribes. Today the minority groups and the backward hill tribals, due to ignorance, may keep quiet but very soon they will try to raise their voice and speak so aloud that it has to be heard not only here inside the country but outside as well and our own people and the people belonging to other countries will judge how this country and the majority group have treated the minorities and the tribals.

After Independence, I am sorry to say that we have received a lot of lip-sympathy from the majority communities. The majority have appreciated the honesty, sincerity and dutifulness of the minorities and the tribal people. Very often you will find big people and Government officers searching everywhere to employ the tribal people or such minorities as their cooks, sweepers, etc. I am glad that they have so much faith in the honesty of these tribal people and minorities that they ask them to take charge of the kitchens, latrines and bath rooms but this will not do now. We want something more than that. By looking after the kitchens of these *bara sahibs* we do not gain anything. We do not become as educated as the children of these *bara sahibs* are nor do we get a portion of their properties. We want something which we shall call our own and we must have something wherein we shall mould our own future. Therefore, it is very important that the tribal problem should be tactfully dealt with and should be given careful consideration.

The SRC Report is before us; we are discussing that. We want that this country should have a happy and prosperous future. The hill tribes and the minorities expect that in a prosperous and happy India they shall have an honourable place. In the light of what I have said I want to make a few observations about this Report.

First I shall take up the case of Manipur. My State had been existing for many centuries as an independent State. The Commission recognised this fact and they have clearly mentioned that for centuries Manipur has maintained her separate identity. Manipuri people have got a separate culture, a separate language and a separate composite race that are different from other heroes to lay down their lives by the SRC. I am glad to say that Manipur has never been lagging behind the rest of the country in the fight for freedom. When Britishers occupied Manipur it was the lot of Vir Tickendrajit, Pouna and Thangal and other heroes to lay down their lives for the cause of freedom of the country. They were hanged by the Britishers. In 1939, the women of Manipur revolted against the British regime and the British Officers were in many places surrounded. Many women were shot down. Again in 1947, during the regime of the Maharaja, Manipur with its love for democracy, revolted against his regime. They won the struggle and got a representative form of government in the State. This way, it was the first State in this Republic of India to have the first elected Assembly—representative form of government.

At the time of integration, the Assembly was dissolved and the Chief Commissioner's regime was imposed on the unwilling people of Manipur and it exists even today. When people's agitating mood to overthrow the Chief Commissioner's rule was seen the Government of India in 1952 appointed some nominated persons as advisers. Everybody knows what kind of people will accept nomination. Generally, job hunters and those who have great lust for power and money come for-

ward. Exactly the same thing happened in Manipur. People who have no position in society and who had lust for money and power came forward to fill up these posts of advisers.

[SHRI BARMAN *in the Chair*]

There was State-wide agitation in 1954 and the people of Manipur, both in the hills and plains, carried on unitedly the agitation for restoration of dissolved Legislative Assembly. The whole country witnessed the *satyagraha* movement in Manipur. Even in this House there were uproars on several occasions and adjournment motions were moved. There was a walk out by the Opposition Members from this House. All these things happened but Government did not move. We were told that the S. R. Commission would give a report on Manipur and the Government would give the matter due consideration. The agitation was suspended and we waited. What have we got now? The S.R.C. say that Manipur will be a Centrally Administered Territory. They also say that the administration will be associated with some of the nominated local persons as it is now. Thus, the old system will continue in Manipur when other parts of India wear new things. The Manipuri people have shed their blood and sacrificed their lives so that we may have a responsible form of Government; so that the people themselves may look after the welfare of the Manipuris. The Commission's recommendation that it should be a territory and the old regime should continue can never be accepted. We are fed up with it, disgusted with it, it is too bitter; a thing to be taken for the second time.

It will be interesting for the House to know what happened during these six or seven years of the Chief Commissioner's regime. No development scheme worth the name has been carried out in Manipur. The Government have started the construction of Imphal-Tamanglong road and after nearly four years have lapsed only 20 miles of this road has been motorable. The

[Shri Rishang Keishing]

community project at Thoubal is miserable failure. The national extension blocks at Imphal East and Mao Maran are at a standstill on account of the fact that necessary financial sanction has not been made. Then the advisers and others are indulging in smuggling of rice. They buy rice from the poor local people at Rs. 6 for the best rice which is sold in the outside market at Rs. 25. They make a huge amount of money by this smuggling. Big officers are involved in smuggling a large quantity of goods from Burma like 7 o'clock blades, wrist watches, fountain pens, cycle parts and other things, lorry loads of smuggled goods are carried via Imphal to other parts of India but our C.I.D. police officers are not able to detect these things.

Then there is a lot of corruption going on. The former Chief Medical Officer is stated to have misappropriated a large sum of rupees. A man who gets only Rs. 600 a month is said to have insured for about Rs. 3 lakhs with the insurance companies and Banks. How is it possible? There is also misappropriation of money in the Transport Department which involves a lakh of rupees.

Now I come to the question of Tribal cases. Several tens and scores of civil cases are still pending because the Central Government abolished the Hill Bench which was started in 1948. The power of Hill Bench was usurped by the Chief Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner to try the hill cases but by an injunction order of the Judicial Commissioner they were not allowed to try cases with the result that tens and scores of cases are still pending. If you will come to the hill areas you can see that there is hardly any administration. The S.D.O.s and the D.O.s sit tight in their chairs and nobody moves into the interior. The administration in the hill areas has been too badly neglected.

If you take the case of teachers and other Government employees you will find that they are getting the least pay in India. A primary teacher is getting Rs. 20 a month. L.M.P. doctors who

have served for over 20 years are getting Rs. 100 a month. B.A., B.T. well-trained graduate teachers are getting Rs. 100 fixed.

These are the results of the Central administration and how do you expect us to tolerate these things again? I know Manipuri people are democracy-loving people. We are as much Indian as other hon. Members here and why should this Government deny us that right which the whole country has? I think it is a great injustice and the Commission has taken a very undemocratic attitude as regards Manipur. They know that there was an agitation; they know that the Manipuri people sacrificed their lives; they know that thousands of our women were made naked in public; they know that several thousands of persons were dragged on the road like logs; they know that many were thrown into the water; they know that there was inhuman torture in jail. All these they suffered for the cause of democracy and still this is their recommendation. I feel that the Commission's attitude is entirely undemocratic and I beg this hon. House and the Government to modify this and give Manipur a legislative assembly so that they may improve themselves.

Reorganisation of States is based on linguistic considerations. With regard to Manipur the Commission has clearly stated that they have got a separate language, culture and tradition which has got no similarity whatsoever with the neighbouring State of Assam. Therefore, they have said that Manipur must maintain its separate identity. But, they have added the words "for the time being". Why should they say: "for the time being Manipur has to remain as a separate State as long as Manipuri people desire and until they do not voluntarily decide to go to Assam..." I think it is wrong to force something on the unwilling people of Manipur. That would be antinational and that goes against the principle on which the States are going to be reorganised.

The S.R.C. has said that Manipur should remain separate, but at the

same time they have put all sorts of pressure on us. They have said that Assam is overburdened at present as she has to look after the so many backward areas. Therefore, until Assam is strong enough to tackle with Manipur, Manipur should be kept separate. Is it in the interest of Manipur that the Commission has recommended to keep Manipur separate? It appears to be in the interest of the Assam State that Manipur has been recommended to be kept separate. The other thing they have mentioned is that if Manipuris want to remain separate they have to accept the present undemocratic regime of the Chief Commissioner and Adviser and if they want a representative form of government they have to go to Assam. They know perfectly well that we want a democratic and a representative form of government. They know that we have sacrificed everything for the cause of democracy and knowing well they have put this pressure on us. They have thought that if the Manipuri people are denied a separate representative form of government they will voluntarily decide to go to Assam. That is why they have put this pressure on us. Everything they have recommended is in the interests of our neighbouring State, Assam and not in the interest of Manipur.

We beg of this hon. House and the Government to take note of these facts and see that justice is done to the democracy loving people of Manipur. For centuries we have maintained a separate identity. We have suffered a lot for the cause of democracy. We have sacrificed our best men for the cause of national independence and there is no reason why today we should be asked immediately to give up everything and go to Assam. I think this is just like a magistrate passing a death sentence on somebody who is not at all involved in the case. In my opinion the Commission has fixed the date and have erected the gallows to hang the Manipuris. I think this is a great injustice. What have we done against the Government? What have

we done against the nation? We have done nothing. We are innocent. There is no charge-sheet against us. We are not involved in any crime. So, why pass this death sentence on us?

Therefore, I want to inform this hon. House and the Government that the Manipuris will not be satisfied with anything short of a representative form of government. They are still prepared to sacrifice as they did before if necessary. They are prepared for any eventuality. The six lakhs of people in Manipur demand democracy and are prepared to work for democracy. Both the hill and plain people are unitedly working for it. There is no difference and disunity.

Again, there is an argument that Manipur is a deficit area. They cannot run the administration with their own income. The revenue is Rs. 35 lakhs or so. It should not therefore remain as a separate State. Do the commission mean to say that all democratic traditions which have been handed down to us through our forefathers over the last several centuries should be sacrificed for the sake of a few lakhs of rupees? Give us responsible government, we shall take as little contribution as possible from Centre. Our M.L.A.s will be prepared to receive Rs. 5/- as pay and -/4/- as their sitting allowance. We can maintain ourselves. In 1948, when the late Assembly was functioning, they started many development schemes. Several miles of roads were constructed throughout the hills and plains of Manipur. But today, after five or more years of the Central Administration, what is the position? We find nothing more than a few pieces of broken stones scattered here and there over the roads already constructed by our own labours. I would request the hon. Minister to come with us and at least see whether we are telling a lie. We have sincerity; we are honest people and we have not yet learnt that art of telling lies and falsehoods. We are still frank and honest. Believe us. We want to be the best citizens of this

[Shri Rishang Keishing]

country and we are still so. So, my humble submission is that Manipur must have that cherished, representative form of government. Let there be no more continuance of this adviser regime; no more imposition of this regime of the Chief Commissioner. Relieve us and save us from such a regime. Otherwise, we are even prepared to face the gallows. I would ask the hon. Minister and this honourable House to consider our case sympathetically and take necessary action so that the people of Manipur can get what they want within a year.

I would like to touch upon Naga Hills and NEFA also. At page 193, in paragraphs 714 and 715, the Commission says something about the NEFA. I am glad that they have recommended the continuance of the Central administration over this area, because I know that this area is still backward. It would have been quite unwise on the part of the Government or the Commission to advise that this area should go into Assam or any other state of the country. They have got their own peculiar problems and they must be tackled by an efficient Government and that Government is the Central Government. So, I welcome the recommendation that the Central administration should be continued for some time over this area.

But then, there is another thing and I hope my Assamese friends will not be annoyed with me if I mention it. It is my sincere feeling and I must say that. The Commission has said that NEFA is part and parcel of Assam. Areas like Tuensang were unadministered areas and no man's land, the people there did not know what the Indian Government was as it was completely unadministered area. It is only very recently that Indian administration has been extended to and spread over these areas. But before they knew anything about this, the authorities have fixed some places and decided where the people should go and who should govern the areas and all that. To my mind, it is rather undemocratic. I feel

that the people should be developed and made conscious of everything and then Government can ask them to decide whether they should be with Assam or they would like to be in a separate State. That is what I sincerely feel. What the S.R.C. has said is something like finding out a bride or bridegroom before the baby is born. Nobody knows whether the baby to be born would be a male or a female baby. By the time the baby is born, the bride or bridegroom will become too old. The baby also may not like to marry. But members of the Commission have already said that this is part of Assam. This sounds a bit funny. I think the people must have a say in deciding their own future.

Mr. Chairman: Five minutes more.

Shri Rishang Keishing: In the Naga Hills, the anti-national movement has been going on. They demand complete independence. That is absurd and no Indian can give any support to that movement. I agree on that point. But then the Commission says that the Assam Government have represented to the Commission that there is no law and order problem there and that it is quite peaceful. The fact that they boycotted the last elections, that up till now not a single member from the Naga hills is in the Assam Legislative Assembly and that the Naga National Council placed its demands for complete independence before the Commission are very serious matters. It may be that the Naga National Council very cleverly adopt non-violent methods so far as the Naga Hills district is concerned, because many parts of the areas are accessible and regular administration goes on there and they know that violence will do greater harm to them, but in inaccessible areas, like Tuensang, they might be instigating the people to start violence. The fight is going on there. Many people have been killed. The root cause of the trouble to my mind is Naga Hills and not Tuensang area. The Commission has said that because the Naga Hills have been quiet

there is no law and order problem anywhere there and let there be no change. The Commission also has used the words "at the present juncture". Does it indicate that if violent trouble flares up in future the Commission would favour some administrative changes. I want the Government to go a bit deeper and try to understand the problems, because the people there have declared that they have nothing to do with India. When they have nothing to do with India, what will they have to do with the State Government of Assam which is a provincial Government? It is a very serious matter. Long before the Commission's visit Shri Jawaharlal Nehru had visited the Naga Hills. Because they were not allowed to place their demand for independence, they said, "You do not allow us, and so we do not allow you". Everybody walked out of the meeting and there were nothing but empty chairs. Are these not serious matters? To say that there is nothing going on is, I think, misleading. I want the Government to see that the situation there is handled by a strong hand and the Centre alone will be able to do this. At least, bring the Naga Hills and Tuensang together for the time being; till the normal situation is restored, the problem of these two areas must be tackled by the Central Government. That is my firm and sincere belief and I am convinced that if the Government does as suggested they will get good results. In 1949, there was a resolution of the Naga National Council that the Naga Hills should be under Central administration. So, all these things must be considered.

The Commission has recommended to abolish all Part C States. It has also taken a very hostile attitude towards the Hill States. Existing Hill States like Himachal Pradesh are to be abolished and the demand of the hill people for new separate States is denied. Of course, there may be some impracticable proposition but some of them are quite practicable. Himachal Pradesh and some of the other Hill States have been functioning quite satisfactorily and why should

they be abolished? If there can be plains, there can be hills also. If there can be States consisting of plains alone, why should there not be States consisting of hills alone? After all the beauty of India lies in the fine admixture of both the hills and the plains. I think the question of forming some Hill States in this country should be considered and the demand conceded. Then and then alone some of the tribal people can get together and develop their culture and mould their future satisfactorily and as they desire. One important principle of the re-organisation of States is linguistic basis. In the Punjab, there is a strong demand for a Punjabi-speaking State. Himachal Pradesh is not willing to be merged with Punjab. Why should not the Government accept these demands? To my mind, they are very reasonable. Even for a very small State like mine, we want to remain separate because we have a distinct language and culture. So, the unwilling areas like Himachal Pradesh should not be forced to merge themselves with other areas. If Government accepts recommendation of S.R.C., after 20 years there will be no tribal culture at all left in the country. The S.R.C. has recommended some Part C States to remain as Centrally administered areas. They make us mere cooks. What do we get in the kitchen? We do not get anything at all there. The *rasagullas* and *samosas* etc. are not ours; they are meant for somebody else. S.R.C. and Government cannot force all things on us as they like. If Hindi is the national language, we accept it and we are proud to learn the national language. But, if S.R.C. or Government want everything to happen as they wish in the case of Hindi that is very wrong. Therefore, on behalf of all the people of my State, I request the Government to consider our case and allow us to have Legislature and shape our own future, of course, with the help of the Government. Although my friend and I are here in Parliament, in our State we have no separate legislature. Manipur being a centrally administered State, and the Home

[Shri Rishang Keishing]

Minister in charge of the administration, we feel as if we are inside his pocket. We will be suffocated to death if we continue to remain like this. Sir, I am not demanding more than what is due to us. The hon. Home Minister's shirt and pant will be too big for me. What I want is a pant and shirt which will be just enough for my size and so much is just what the people of Manipur demand. Also, do not force anything on the unwilling people of Tripura. I would beg the House and the Home Minister to consider the case of Tripura. If they are not willing to be merged with Assam, do not force them. Both Tripura and Manipur should be allowed to have their own responsible form of Government.

Shri Dasaratha Deb (Tripura East):
Mr. Chairman, it is good enough that we are discussing the S.R.C. Report. At the very outset I must say that the recommendation of the S.R.C. in regard to Tripura is a very dangerous proposition. You know that the demand for a responsible Government for Tripura is not a new thing. For a long time the people of Tripura have been demanding this. Even in this House, the hon. Home Minister on several occasions has given us the assurance that some sort of democratic reform should be introduced and we were asked to wait till the S.R.C. Report came. After that Report came, we find that the very existence of Tripura as a separate State is being denied; not to speak of responsible Government. The S.R.C. recommendation is not only harmful and detrimental to the people of Tripura, but also a denial of the democratic right of the people of Tripura. At the same time, this is a definite departure from the very principles of linguistic division which should have been followed by the S.R.C., in reorganising the States. In this House I must say that the people of Tripura are so strongly against the merger with Assam. In my hand, I have several telegrams. Even at nights, I am not able to sleep, because the telegrams have been pouring in

day in and day out. In every telegram, it is said, "we do not want merger; we want a separate State with an assembly of our own". This is the demand not only of myself, but this is the demand of all the people of Tripura belonging to all the political parties like the Congress Party, the Communist Party, the P.S.P., the Kisan Mazdoor Dal and so on. All elements of public life are against the merger of Tripura in Assam. I request this honourable House to ascertain the wishes of the people of Tripura and then come to a decision one way or the other. I am sure that if you go to Tripura and ask the people, a large number of them will express the opinion against the merger of Tripura with Assam. I do not know whether there will be a single soul who will support the merger. Before going into the arguments which the S.R.C. has laid down in favour of merger, let me state a few facts regarding Tripura which should be carefully considered. In our Memorandum, we have already expressed that:

"Tripura exists as a separate State now for at least 1365 years (the present Tripura Era being 1365). During this fairly long life, Tripura developed her own distinctive culture. Though Bengali was the Court Language of the State for about a hundred years it would be wrong to identify Tripura's culture and tradition completely with that of Bengal."

In the S.R.C. Report it is said that, because there are a number of Bengali people in Assam, if Tripura is merged with Assam, the Bengali people of Tripura will mix with the Bengali people of Assam and their interests will be safeguarded. I would like to mention here that in Tripura, there are not only Bengalis, but a large number of tribal people also are there. Tripura belongs to the tribal people. In our memorandum we have said:

"Even a few decades ago upto 1947, the tribal people of Tripura

were in the majority in the State contributing to the flourishing of Tripura's special social and cultural life."

It was mentioned that the Bengalis have gained majority after the Partition. It stated:

"The present population of Tripura is not 639,029 as quoted by the S.R.C. from 1951 Census figures but about 9 lakhs. The influx of D.P.s continues and the population is on the increase.

"Tripura continued her separate existence as Part C State even after integration in 1949.

"Tripura's economy has also some special features of its own.... the whole economy of the State was hard-hit by partition. Tripura's trade and communication which was closely linked up with East Pakistan (which almost surrounds Tripura) got severely disrupted due to partition.

"The D.P.s of East Pakistan together comprise more than half of Tripura's population. The rebuilding of Tripura's economy, therefore has become inseparable from the tasks of rehabilitation of these toiling people."

These are some of the facts regarding Tripura.

Now, let me come to some of the arguments which have been put forward by the S.R.C. The S.R.C. recognises that linguistic homogeneity is an important factor. This is one of the most important principles that has to be followed in reorganising the States. Let us now examine how this principle has been applied to Tripura. The S.R.C. itself admits that not only the large number of Bengalis there, but a large majority of the Tribals also use Bengali as their common language outside their homes although the Tribal people have their separate spoken language. You will find that there is no homogeneity between Tripura and Assam whose State

language is Assamese. Even the S.R.C. admits in the report that commonness of language is highly commendable and if the legislature of the State is not to develop into a babel of tongues, it must do its work in one language, the language of the people. If you take this principle, there is nothing in common between Assam and Tripura. Their language is Assamese in Tripura, a section of the people, the Bengalis speak the Bengali language and the other section the Tribals have got their own different languages, which have nothing in common with the tribal people of Assam. It is true that there are a fairly large number of Bengalis in Assam living particularly in the border regions of Tripura. But, that cannot be posed as an argument in favour of the merger because Tripura's culture cannot be completely identified with that of the Bengalis.

If Tripura's distinctive culture and unforgettable history and tradition have given birth to any regional spirit, not to take them into account may be unrealistic. Under specific peculiar historical conditions, the historical culture of Tripura has developed which has nothing in common with that of the tribes of Assam. To deny this fact would surely be a great injustice towards the tribal people of Tripura as well as the non-tribal people. Neither do financial, economic and administrative considerations justify Tripura's merger in Assam. No doubt, Tripura is contiguous to Assam geographically. But, that factor itself cannot be a ground to merge Tripura in Assam, because there has been no culture and economic relations between Assam and Tripura. There are sufficient reasons why this relationship has not developed.

Economically, Assam is an underdeveloped and backward State with a deficit Budget of her own. The S.R.C. itself admits her inadequacy of rail road communications, lack of industries and flood control programmes. One fails to understand how the merger will help the development of Tripura financially and economically.

[Shri Dasaratha Deb]

Linguistic homogeneity and alignment of communications ensuring easy accessibility from one area to another, are some of the objectives which have to be borne in mind from the point of view of administrative convenience. This has been pointed out by the S.R.C. report. But, the merger in Assam does not take Tripura to that objective. Tripura's laws were not modelled on the Assam pattern. They were more or less on the West Bengal pattern. Please do not think that I am pleading for West Bengal. The Tribal people do not want to go to any neighbouring State. They want to remain a separate State with a full-fledged democratic form of Government.

Here, I wish to point out that two major principles, namely cultural and linguistic homogeneity and also the wishes of the people which should have guided the redistribution of the States have been completely denied in the case of Tripura. The S.R.C. by recommending the merger of Tripura in Assam has made another mistake. That is, about defence. The S.R.C. says that preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India is an essential thing. There is no doubt about that. But, one should not argue this in relation to the merger of Tripura in Assam. Defence is a central subject and it is the responsibility of the Centre to defend the country. There will be no difficulty if Tripura remains separate. It has also been argued that Tripura is a small State and has a small population and that it is also surrounded by Pakistan on three sides. Some people advance the argument that because it is a small State, it cannot resist and it would be ineffective in times of trouble unable to defend itself. This is a misleading proposition. Defence is a Central responsibility. To defend the country is not the task of this small State or that State alone. Defence is a national problem. It is not a problem for a particular province or State or district. If any part of the country is endangered by external troubles or

external forces, it is the bounden duty of the Centre and the entire country as a whole, the nation as a whole, to defend it.

There is another point which should not be forgotten. Tripura is not an independent State. If it were an independent State outside the Indian Union, its defence problem would be a vital problem. Tripura is not an independent State. It is part and parcel of the Indian Union. Why should not the Indian Union take up the responsibility of defending Tripura if at any time she is attacked by foreigners?

There is another point. The S.R.C. has recommended that Manipur should be kept as a separate State, and has advanced certain arguments. The argument is that Manipur is a border State, it has been independent for many centuries, it has no rail link with the rest of India, it has special social and cultural life and a peculiar racial and linguistic composition, that Assam has fairly difficult economic and political problems and it is receiving substantial financial aid from the Centre and that its economic development will be retarded if it is merged in any other State, and that the people are opposed to the merger. These are the grounds on which the S.R.C. recommended that Manipur should remain separate. I wish to point out that the same thing should be applied to the Tripura State also. Even a blind man can see that these are some of the basic grounds on which the people of Tripura also demanded a separate State with a democratic Government functioning.

6. P.M.

Let us look at the internal picture of Assam also. Even the States Re-organisation Commission talk of difficulties, both political and economic. There is the discontent of the Bengali minorities fighting for the protection of their rights. There are the different tribes fighting for regional autonomy to safeguard their own interests. There are also the disruptive forces kicking up separatist tendencies

among the Nagas and the North-East Frontier Agency people. The unity of India cannot be furthered, if the unwilling people of Tripura are thrown into such a cauldron of discontent.

Mr. Chairman: It is now 6.1 p.m. The House should adjourn now.

Shri Dasaratha Deb: I would take about fifteen to twenty minutes more.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member can resume his speech day after tomorrow.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned at Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 19th December, 1955.
