

3489

LOK SABHA

Wednesday, 21st December, 1955

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven
of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS AND AUDIT
REPORT ETC. OF RAILWAYS

The Parliamentary Secretary to the
Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bha-
gat): I beg to lay on the Table a copy
of each of the following documents
under article 151(1) of the Constitu-
tion:

(1) Appropriation Accounts of
Railways in India for 1953-54,
Part I—Review. [Placed in Library.
See No. S-452/55]:

(2) Appropriation Accounts of
Railways in India for 1953-54,
Part II—Detailed Appropriation
Accounts. [Placed in Library.
See No. S-453/55].

(3) The Block Accounts (in-
cluding Capital Statements com-
prising the Loan Accounts),
Balance Sheets and Profit and
Loss Accounts of Indian Govern-
ment Railways for 1953-54.
[Placed in Library. See No.
S-454/55].

(4) Balance Sheets and Review
of Working of Railway Collieries
and Statements of all-in-cost of
coal, etc. for 1953-54. [Placed in
Library. See No. S-455/55].

497 L.S.D.—1

3490

(5) Audit Report Railways 1955.
[Placed in Library. See No. S-
456/55].

NOTIFICATION UNDER CENTRAL EXCISES
AND SALT ACT

Shri B. R. Bhagat: I beg to lay on
the Table a copy of the Central Ex-
cises Notification No. 1-CER/55, dated
the 10th December 1955, under section
38 of the Central Excises and Salt
Act, 1944. [Placed in Library. See
No. S-457/55].

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION
(AMENDMENT) BILL

Shri U. C. Patnaik (Ghumsur): I
beg to lay on the Table a copy of each
of Papers Nos. V and VI containing
opinions on the Prevention of Cor-
ruption (Amendment) Bill which was
circulated for the purpose of eliciting
opinion thereon by the 31st July,
1955.

MOTION RE. REPORT OF STATES
REORGANISATION COMMISSION

Mr. Speaker: Before I proceed with
the motion on the Report of the States
Reorganisation Commission, I would
like to make an announcement or two.

I find there is some misapprehension
or misunderstanding about what I
stated in respect of memoranda which
Members may submit, not exceeding
two printed pages of the size of the
report in respect of their views on the
States Reorganisation Commission's
Report. The point is that while
Members may submit these memo-
randa, Members who get a chance of
voicing their views here will not be
entitled to have the memoranda being
taken as part of the proceedings. So
Members may submit their memo-
randa because one does not know who

[Mr. Speaker]

will get a chance and who will not get a chance to speak here. The memoranda of those who get a chance to speak here will be excluded from the proceedings. That is one thing.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah (Golaghat-Jorhat): Can we submit joint memoranda?

Mr. Speaker: No, no. Just as Members cannot be allowed to speak simultaneously, it cannot be allowed.

Dr. Gangadhara Silva (Chitoor—Reserved—Sch. Castes): What is the time-limit?

Mr. Speaker: As regards further progress of the discussion, I might just state the position, in short, before we start.

Up to now, 69 Members have participated in the debate, exclusive of the hon. Home Minister, and all States have been covered except the State of Coorg, whose representative, I am afraid, is not present in the House.

Shri Shivananjappa (Mandya): Mysore also has not got a chance.

Mr. Speaker: I know about Mysore. I do not want any suggestions now. I am merely giving Members an idea as to how the position stands.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): Andamans also has not got a chance.

Mr. Speaker: It is not separate; it is Centrally administered.

In view of this position, I now propose to have a few speakers, not State-wise, who wish to give general remarks. Then I might have just one speaker from Manipur. Then I revert to the contentious States of Bombay, Delhi—Delhi, though not contentious may have some things to say—, then Karnataka and Punjab, and Uttar Pradesh.

Shri Veerawamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes): What about Madras State?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let there be no questions. If questions are put, perhaps those very questions might lead to the exclusion of that particular State. Whatever that may be, I have all the suggestions before me. I am just giving a picture because I find that hon. Members who are so keen to speak are many times absent from the House and their names, though selected by me, have to be dropped out. That is the difficulty.

So afterwards, from tomorrow, will come those Members from those States which I have indicated and which are left over. Then we will have some time for Uttar Pradesh, then we will have Madras and other remaining miscellaneous points of view.

Shri Chattopadhyaya (Vijayavada): What about "Telangandhra"?

Mr. Speaker: Nothing.

The hon. Member, Shri R. S. Diwan was on his legs yesterday. I believe he has already taken 11 minutes. The time-limit is 15 minutes. He will bear that in mind. I have been appealing to Members to keep strictly to the time-limit; otherwise, it is not possible to accommodate more speakers.

Shri R. S. Diwan (Osmanabad): I was referring yesterday to the multi-lingual district of Bidar, Hyderabad State, which needs disintegration like Hyderabad. There is a majority of Marathi-speaking people in the Bidar district which I wish should be joined to Maharashtra. This is not with an expansionist view-point, but for the sake of administrative convenience. In three taluks, there is a solid majority of Marathi-speaking people, and in two taluks, Bhalki and Santapur, two circles have a Marathi-speaking majority. So I wish that the Bhalki and Hulsur circles from Bhalki taluk and the Aurad and Torna circles from Santapur should be joined to Maharashtra along with the Nilanga, Ahmedpur and Udhgir taluks.

Then again, in the Adilabad district, there are two taluks, Kinwat and Rajora which have got an undisputed majority area of Marathi-speaking people. These two taluks should be joined to Maharashtra. There is also another taluk which has got a majority of Gonds who have been influenced by Marathi. They have infiltrated from Chanda, and as you know, they have got their panchayat in Chanda and they have got Marathi names, Marathi culture and Marathi schools and so on. So they form the majority in the Utthanur taluk. This and the Itchod circle of Baath taluk, both these should be joined to Maharashtra.

I thank the Congress High Command for having listened to the grievances of the Maharashtrian people and for having brought them under one State excluding the city of Bombay. I appeal to the Congress leaders to listen to the fears and apprehensions which have been expressed concerning the prospect of not joining Bombay city with Maharashtra. With their help and with their advice, I am sure the fears and apprehensions of the people who are against joining Bombay city with Maharashtra could be allayed.

Lastly, let me say that we submit that it is not in the national interests that 30 millions of people should be kept disappointed and dissatisfied. So, I appeal to our leaders that every effort be made to join the city of Bombay to the whole population of Maharashtra.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Sir, this is the seventh day, I believe, of this debate and, as you have just informed us, 70 persons have previously spoken. So, I am the 71st in this long succession. I have been hesitating as to whether I should take up the time of this House in this Marathon race not because I am not only not interested in this question but I was doubtful if I could throw much light on it. I might straight off say that I am not greatly interested as to

where a particular State boundary is, and I find it very difficult to get passionate or excited about it. Naturally, I have my preferences, but it does not make much difference to me whether any internal boundary of a State is drawn here or there. What is infinitely more important is what happens on either side of the boundary, what happens within the State and more especially in those great areas, which inevitably are few. Look at that from the linguistic point of view, multi-lingual or bilingual—as there are bound to be a large number of areas—what happens to people inside a particular State who may either linguistically or in any other sense form what might be called a minority. That seems to me a far more important proposition than where you draw the line. Because, if you once lay down those basic principles correctly, and act up to them, then the vast number of problems that arise and difficulties and legitimate grievances would inevitably disappear.

Now, for a moment, I may as well say to the House that I am not speaking particularly in my capacity as Prime Minister or on behalf of Government and I am not going to make any epoch-making pronouncement. We, in Government, have been considering this Report and the other matters that flow from it for the last many weeks and we shall continue to consider them till we come up to this House in some form of placing the recommendations for this House to consider. And, it will not be proper for me or for any other member of Government to express himself in any tone of finality about any matter. But, I may give expression to my own inclinations in regard to the recommendations of the Report or the other suggestions that have been made.

One thing I should like to say is that I have regretted very greatly certain criticisms that have been made in the Press, in some newspapers—I do not know how far any hon. Member indulged in such criticisms—criticisms of the Commission. One can criticise their recommendations; of course, that

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

is a different matter; but criticisms of the Commission and sometimes very strong criticisms about their unfairness and all that, I think, that is a very unfair approach and it is a kind of approach which is bound to make such work now or hereafter much more difficult. We choose eminent men; they take a great deal of trouble and tell us what they think about the problem. You may or may not agree with it but to attack, in a sense, their *bona fides* or fairness, if I may say so, apart from its wrong approach, does indicate, to my mind, that your case is very weak. It is the old story of abusing the attorney on the other side.

May I also suggest for the consideration of this House that while Members here represent their constituencies, of course, they do something more. They are not only Members of this or that particular area of India, but each Member of Parliament is a Member of India and represents India, and at no time can we afford to forget this basic fact that India is more than the little corner of India that we represent. We know, all of us, that we have to face certain forces which may be called separatist, that is to say—I am not using the word in any bad sense—it nevertheless means that people's attention is being diverted more to local problems, parochial, State, Provincial and forgetting the larger problems of India. There should be really no conflict between the two but it is a question of the method in our thinking, in our minds, in considering our problems. There is the word in the English language 'parochial'. That is, a person thinks of his parish or village while he forgets the larger considerations; while he thinks too much of even of a State as big or important he forgets these larger considerations.

Now, it has been my good fortune and privilege to travel about India a great deal and often to go abroad. Perhaps, I have had that good fortune more than most Members of this House. The result is that I am con-

stantly compelled to think in larger terms, not only in national terms but even in international terms and see this picture of India in that context. Perhaps, that is helpful in giving a truer perspective of events. I travel about India and I see this moving drama of India and I feel excited and inspired by it. I see many things that I do not, of course like; but the major thing is this tremendous drama that is India today moving as if by the dictates of some predestined fate and destiny towards its goal. It is a tremendous thing and we see that not only in India. I would submit to this House we see it even more if we go abroad and see this country of India in the south of Asia, from some distance, see it in proper perspective. I would beg the House to consider that there are many people in the wide world who also are beginning to feel the sense of drama and adventure about what is happening in India. Now that is the perspective. And they say also how we have got over great problems and great difficulties. It is true that we have even greater problems ahead, but in the measure in which we have succeeded in the past, that is the measure with which they judge of our strength to succeed in the future. That perspective, I submit, has some importance. We may argue as to the boundary of Bihar or Bengal or Orissa or some State or other—and I have no doubt that the argument on the question is an important one and I do not say it should be brushed aside—but the word 'important' also is a relative word. There may be other things which may be more important, and one must not lose oneself in passionate excitement as to where the boundary of a State should be, provided, as I said, we have this fuller conception of India and provided we have, by Constitution, convention or otherwise, the fullest guarantees that whether a person lives on this side of the border of a State or the other, he will have the fullest rights and opportunities of progress according to his own way. In this sense I tried to approach this

matter, and I felt that perhaps this larger outlook was sometimes lost sight of. We talked about linguistic provinces and some people said that this principle of linguism should be extended more and more; some people criticised my colleague, the Home Minister, because he did not quite make that the final test. May I say quite briefly and precisely that I dislike that principle absolutely 100 per cent. as it has tended to go?

Now I want to make it perfectly clear that that does not mean that I dislike language being a very important matter in our administration or education or culture, because I do think that the language of the people is a vital matter for their development, whether it is education, administration or any other matter. But I do distinguish between the two things, this passion for putting yourself in a linguistic area and putting up a wall all round and calling it the border of your State and developing the language to the fullest extent, because I do not think that the people can really grow except through the language; I accept that completely, but it does not follow in my mind that in order to make them grow and their language, you must put a barrier between them and others, that you must put a wall all round and call that this is this language area or that. For a State, broadly speaking, there are language areas in India; of course, you cannot ignore them and there is no need to; they are welcome as they are; they represent the development of history through the ages. But considering them as something opposed to the others and putting a hard and fast line between the two areas is, I think, carrying it too far. As a matter of fact, it just does not matter where you draw your line. If you judge it from the purely linguistic point of view, you go against the wishes of some—may be many. There are invariably bilingual areas, and if they are not today bilingual areas, are you going to prevent people from going from one State to another? Are you going to stop, contrary to the dic-

tates of our Constitution, the movement of population, the movement of workers or of other people from one State to another? You cannot. Therefore, whatever fixed line you may even draw, if that movement is free, people will go, will be attracted by one side or other, and again change the linguistic composition of that State or the border area. Are we going to sit down every few years or ten years and say, "Now the ratio of this particular tehsil or taluk has changed and, therefore, it should be taken out of this State and put into another". It is quite impossible if you think in that way. Therefore, you must realise that while there are clearly marked linguistic areas of great languages, there are also almost always between two areas bilingual areas, from the language point of view and sometimes even trilingual areas. And wherever you may draw your line, you do justice to one group and injustice to another. What is our difficulty in these problems is raised in this Report and there are many difficulties. By looking at it purely from the language point of view, the difficulty is that there is good reason, good logic and good argument for every case, on both sides of the case. That is the difficulty. If there is logic only on one side, we decide it easily; but there is logic on both sides and the two logics conflict. There is argument on both sides. You may balance the two and say that this argument is stronger than that; by and large, the case of one side is somewhat better, but the fact is that the case of the other side is pretty good too. Are you to measure merely in a balance—maps and census figures have become the fashion now—how many individuals are supposed to speak in this or that language? Because there is a slight majority in this case, this kind of a thing may be all right. It might be done sometimes, but it leads us ultimately to all kinds of fantastic conclusions. Therefore, I submit that we must consider this matter separating the question of language in the sense that we must be clear that the language has to be developed, more especially all the great languages of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

India which are mentioned in the Constitution—but I would go a step further—and even those that are not mentioned in the Constitution like those in the North East Frontier Area and elsewhere ought to be developed; secondly, that the development of one language should not be and cannot be at the expense of the other. It is a strange notion that the development of one language comes in the way of another language in India. I am absolutely convinced that the development of any one of the great languages of India helps the development of the other languages of India. It is my privilege, however unworthy I might be, of being the President of the Sahitya Akadami, started a year or two ago where we deal with all the languages of India and try to encourage them; the more we discuss these matters, the more we see that every encouragement, development and growth of the language results in the other Indian languages also getting some advantage of growing. And we of course are trying to have translations of one from the other and so on. I would go a step further and say that the knowledge of a foreign language helps the growth of an Indian language. If we are cut off from foreign languages, we are cut off from the ideas that come in those foreign languages—with not only the ideas but the technology which is part of modern life. Therefore, let us not think of excluding a language. I do not for instance understand—I may be quite frank—the way some people are afraid of Urdu language. I am proud to speak Urdu and I hope to continue to speak Urdu. I just do not understand why in any State in India people should consider Urdu as a foreign language or something which invades into their own domain. I just do not understand it. Urdu is a language mentioned in our Constitution. Is it intended to live in the upper atmosphere or stratosphere without coming down to the earth? I just do not understand it. It is this narrow-mindedness that I object to.

Shri Chattopadhyaya: Tell your colleagues, please.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I consider the hon. Member opposite also my colleague.

It is no good. People go into arguments in regard to philology, in regard to other things. Take the Punjabi language. We heard learned arguments about the origin of Punjabi and Gurmukhi script and how far it is connected with Hindi and how far it is independent of Hindi; whether it has descended from Sanskrit etc., as if it was of the slightest significance, to what source it belongs. What matters is what people do today. Let scholars go into the past of Gurmukhi, Hindi or anything. What is done today? If people in Punjab or elsewhere are accustomed, or if they wish to have, to use or to speak a certain language and to use a certain script, I want to give them every freedom, every opportunity and every encouragement to do that. Because, as a matter of fact, speaking from the strictly narrowest, practical and opportunistic point of view, the more you try to suppress it the more opposition there is, and the more, if I may say, it survives the suppression. Everybody knows that in regard to language there are intimate, rather passionate ideas connected with it in people's minds—something very intimate. I can understand the passion with regard to any language—Hindi or any other. But the person who feels passionately about a language must also remember that the other fellow also feels passionately about it. That is the difficulty. Therefore, the safest and the only course is to give every freedom and opportunity to all of them. Let them develop in the natural course of events. They will adapt themselves; they will affect each other and influence each other and grow more and more important, if they have the capacity or remain less developed. It is not for any person or for me to go about and say that

any language—let us say, the Gurmukhi language—is an undeveloped language. It may be. It does not matter. We should try to develop it then and allow the natural forces to increase the importance and the use of these languages. Any attempt to decry or deny a language is bad not only from that language's point of view but from the point of view of other languages and those who use the other languages. It is the only correct policy both from the point of view of good policy and even if you look from the narrower points of view.

I am dealing with this question of language because it has somehow come to be associated with this question of States reorganisation. I repeat, if I may, that I attach the greatest importance to the language but I refuse to associate it necessarily with a State. Inevitably of course, in India as it is, there are bound to be States where one language is predominant. If that is so, let it be so; we encourage that. But there are also bound to be areas where there are two languages; as I have said, we should encourage both of them. We should make it perfectly clear that the dominant language of that State should not try to push out or suppress or ignore in any way the other language of the State. If we are clear about that, then the language issue does not arise.

Other issues may arise—economic and others. With language of course other aspects, cultural aspects which are connected with them may arise. Then the two should be treated on the same basis. That is to say, every culture, every manifestation of culture should be encouraged. Culture is not an exclusive thing. The more inclusive you are, the more cultured you are. The more barriers you put up, the more uncultured you are. That is the definition of culture. Therefore, culturally too, we should encourage every aspect of culture. If, as the world develops and changes, something falls out, let it fall out. But

if you try to push it down or push it back, then you are probably not likely to succeed and in fact it brings in conflict which injures your own culture possibly.

Thinking as I do in this matter, I personally welcome the idea of bilingual or multi-lingual areas. For my part, I would infinitely prefer living and my children being brought up in bilingual and tri-lingual areas than in a unilingual area. Because of that, I think I would gain wider understanding of India and of the world and a wider culture—not a narrow culture, however big that narrow culture may be.

The House will forgive me, if I mention a rather personal thing. This is in relation to my daughter. When I had to face the problem of her education—unfortunately, I was a bad father and I was not with her for years and years—my attempt was this; when she was a little girl I sent her to a school—not in U.P. as I wanted her, as a child, to pick up some of India's languages—in Poona; I sent her to a Gujarati school in Poona because I wanted her to know the Marathi language and the Gujarati language and their influence. I sent her subsequently to Shantiniketan because I wanted her to understand the Bengali background—not only the language but the cultural background. Whether I succeeded or she succeeded or not—that is another matter. My point is that my outlook was such. I should like her to go down south and learn Tamil or Telugu or Malayalam. But of course life is not long enough to go to every State.

Shri Meghnad Saha (Calcutta-North-West): May I interrupt? What is the percentage of people who have the capacity to learn more than one language? Ninety per cent. of the people have no capacity for learning a second language and you must legislate for those ninety per cent. of people.

Mr. Speaker: Let there be no argument in between.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member has put a question: what is the percentage of people who can learn other languages? Well, if I may say so, I imagine that the percentage is very very large. I will tell you what I mean by it. You and I may have some difficulty in picking up another language because we proceed by grammar and all that. But you take persons—pick them out from the Delhi bazaar and put them in an environment of another language. You will find in three months they will talk that language which you will not know. I know and I can tell you another instance. In our foreign missions, our Secretaries and others are supposed to learn the language of that country. They do try to learn in a scientific way. Before they know anything of that language, some of the lower staff who have to work there pick up the language and talk in it. So, it is not merely a question of learning a language correctly but being in a position to understand it and thereby entering into the life of other people; that is important. There is nothing so difficult as trying to understand another people unless you can speak to them directly without an interpreter. Interpreter is a great nuisance.

Therefore, I would say that the first question for us and the most important question in this entire Report is the last portion—the last chapters in which they mention certain safeguards. Whether they are enough or not is another matter. Add to them if you want. But the point is that there should be clear safeguards laid down, possibly in the Constitution, otherwise, by some other way, so that a fair deal could be given to every language everywhere in this country. There should be no argument about that. We should not say: we are in a majority and therefore our language should prevail. Every language has equal right to prevail even if it is a minority language in the country; of

course there have to be some good numbers. You cannot have it for every small group. I understand that the Bombay Corporation has schools in fourteen languages; because Bombay is a great city with all kinds of language groups there.

Secondly, if I may venture to lay down a rule, in very matter it is the primary responsibility of the majority to satisfy the minority. The majority by virtue of its being a majority naturally has strength to have its way; it requires no protection. It is a bad custom, a most undesirable custom to give statutory protection to minorities; it is not good. Sometimes it is right that you should do that to give an encouragement, let us say to backward classes, but it is not a good thing. Therefore, by its being in the stronger position it is the duty and responsibility of the majority community, whether it is linguistic, whether it is religious, whether it is caste—whatever it may be—to pay particular attention to what the minority there wants, to win it over. It is strong enough to crush it if other forces do not protect it. Therefore, I am always personally in favour, wherever such a question arises, of the minority there, whether it is a linguistic minority or a religious minority.

Talking about religion in the broad sense of the word, obviously in India the votaries of the Hindu religion outnumber others tremendously. Nobody is going to push them from their position; they are strong enough. Therefore, it is their responsibility, and special responsibility that people following other religions in India, which may be called minority religions, have the fullest freedom, have the fullest liberty and a feeling of satisfaction that they have their full play. If that particular principle is applied then I think most of these troubles and grievances would disappear.

About a month ago I think, or less, at that tremendous legion—meeting in Calcutta which was a kind of public

reception to the Soviet leaders who were here—much has been said about Panch Shila; as the House knows everybody talks about Panch Shila—I ventured to say that this Panch Shila was no new idea to the Indian mind—maybe, to other minds also it is not new—and that, in fact, it was inherent in Indian thinking, in Indian culture, because Panch Shila ultimately is the message of tolerance. And, I quoted at that mighty meeting—I do not know whether it was very proper on that occasion or not—Ashoka's edicts and said: "This is the basis of Indian culture and Panch Shila flows from it". Naturally it is not an imposed thing on us. We may misbehave as we sometimes do—that is a different matter—; but the basic Indian thought is that, and it has continued for these long ages.

Now, we thought of this Panch Shila and peaceful co-existence in the wide world, warring world, and we have gained a measure, a considerable measure of respect and attention because of that. Why have we done so? Well, partly, I would submit, because our thinking has been correct and based on some principles which are not so opportunist, and partly also because our thinking has been correctly laid down have not been very divergent from the action we have taken; that is, there has been an approximation in the ideals we have laid in regard to foreign policy and the action we have taken. I do not say they absolutely coincide, but there has been an approximation, and whenever thought and action fit in strength follows. It is the conflict between one's so-called ideals and one's action that leads to bad results and to frustration in the individual, or the group, or the nation. Where a nation is fortunate, or a group, or an individual, to be able to act according to his own ideals, well, then it achieves results. It is in our struggle for independence and freedom that we were fortunate in being able, largely, to combine our ideals with our day-to-day activities as well as give

strength to us as individuals and as a nation.

Therefore, we have succeeded in this measure in our foreign policy, and may I as an interlude just mention two matters not only because they are relevant, but because we have been criticised with regard to them in foreign countries? The two questions are Goa and Kashmir. We are criticised by some people that, we who talk loudly about peace and loudly about anti-colonialism and all that—well, it is said by our critics—follow a different policy in Kashmir and Goa. Now, I think that possibly when history comes to be written Kashmir and Goa will be the brightest examples of our tolerance, of our patience and the way we have suppressed our anger and resentment at many things in order to follow that broad idealistic policy that we have laid down.

Now, I was saying that what I am concerned with is not so much the boundaries here and there. I am concerned with two things: first the principles; that is the principle of life wherever you may live, on whichever side, and, secondly, the manner of approach to this problem; that is to say: how do we discuss these matters, how do we decide them, how do we accept the decisions made. That is vital. That is more important than what you decide. A person is judged more by that. Anybody can decide things according to his own wishes, but when a group meets, of varying opinions, how do they decide? There is the method of democracy, of discussion, of argument, of persuasion and ultimate decision and acceptance of that decision even though it goes against our gain and our opinion. That is the democratic method; or else, simply the bigger lathi or the bigger bomb prevails and that is not the democratic method. Whether you consider this matter in problems of atomic bombs are street demonstration the question is the same. That is to say, I am not objecting to demonstrations, but I am objecting to the violent

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

part of it, the violence of it. There are democratic ways of demonstration too. I am objecting to the violence coming in in these matters and that violence is, in quality, the same perhaps. Then there is violence of atomic bombs. At any rate the violence of the atomic bomb has a tremendous course, tremendous destruction, but it does not poison your personal thinking so much which smaller violences do. When you begin to hate your neighbour you cannot pull on with your neighbour. That is a more dangerous thing from the point of view of degradation of the individual. That hatred seeps in, the hatred of your neighbour and it is bad enough. Of course, to hate a country or a whole nation is bad but somehow that spreads out. That hatred is not good, but the hatred of an individual, group or a community, the hatred of a Hindu for a Muslim or the hatred of a Muslim for a Hindu or a Sikh, that type of thing is much worse. It poisons your daily life. So, I submit what is more important is the method of decision. Do we believe in peaceful democratic methods or means or not? That is the test question in this matter, because we feel passionately. Let us admit that many of us feel very strongly about our point of view on this matter and no doubt they have reasons for feeling strongly. I do not object to that but we must be strong enough, in spite of our feeling strongly to realise that it is far more important that this question should be discussed calmly, deliberately and peacefully, and whatever decisions are arrived at by the final authority—and the final authority of course is this Parliament—must be accepted, because there is no absolute finality about any decision. But also, at the same time, nobody wants the whole question to be brought up and discussed again and again frequently. If one can do it calmly or objectively, one can do it, so, we need not think that we are tied down to a particular decision for ever. At the same time, we should accept it and work it with all goodwill. Therefore, the basic question is one of ap-

proach, of goodwill. It really does not matter what the decision is.

Now, the two or three most important questions appear to be, let us say, the questions in regard to the State of Bombay or Punjab or any other. Now, what do we aim at? What can we aim at? Obviously to me, speaking for myself, I do not care two pins as to what happens to them provided that the people of Punjab or the people of Bombay have goodwill for each other. That is the basic thing. It does not matter how you divide or sub-divide one State or two States or three or four States. That is a matter which we could consider on administrative, economic, and linguistic and other grounds. But the basic thing is that after having done that, do you create goodwill and co-operation amongst the people who live there, because, if you do not, it does not matter how much you justify the decisions made by census figures and arguments and maps. If you do not create that goodwill, you fail completely, because we have to live and work together.

We have in India, as I ventured to say a little earlier, a moving sight. What is happening in India? We—this Parliament and the people of India—are working hard to weave this pattern of India's destiny, with its variegated, many-coloured facets and many languages and yet, it is under one Government that we are weaving gradually at present. Now, if, instead of weaving it, we take the scissors and the knife and start tearing it and make holes in it, that is bad. What is the pattern you give? Therefore, the basic thing is the goodwill that accompanies a decision and we should remember it.

Some hon. Members here may well remember that I delivered quite a number of speeches in Hyderabad opposing tooth and nail, if I may use the word, the disintegration of the State of Hyderabad. That was my view. I would still like the State of

Hyderabad not to be disintegrated, but circumstances have been too strong for me. I accept them. I cannot force the people of Hyderabad or the other people to come in a particular line because I think they should do so. I accept the decision and I adjust myself to the change that Hyderabad be disintegrated. If it is going to be disintegrated, the Commission has suggested that the Telangana area, the remaining part of Hyderabad State, should remain for five years and then it may be decided. We have no particular objection, but logically speaking, considering everything, it seems to me unwise to allow this matter to be left to argument. Let it be taken up now and let us be done with it.

When I read this Report first rather hurriedly, I may assure this House—because some people seem to doubt it—that I had seen not a single line of the Report before it was officially handed to me, and I knew very, very little about what it contained before I got it. So, I read it as something almost new. Because of that, many parts of it and many proposals that it contained were new to me. I had absolutely no notion what they are going to suggest about Bombay, Punjab, Madhya Pradesh and about any other place. I had no notion at all. The thing which for the moment rather surprised me somewhat was the proposal about Madhya Pradesh for the simple reason that it was quite novel to me. I have not thought of it in those terms at all. I said so in the broadcast—not criticised—but I said that some parts of the Report came as a surprise to me. They did; but I thought about it; we discussed it amongst ourselves. The more we discussed, the more we talked, I became more and more convinced that it was the right proposal. I had no preconceptions and prejudices about this or that. So, the House will notice how my mental approach to all these problems was—to keep an open mind and try to understand the various aspects of it and in particular to arrive at a decision which is an agreeable one and

which creates goodwill as far as possible. Because of this, apart from official approaches to this problem, we have met literally hundreds and hundreds of persons in group of five, ten or twenty, who were coming from almost every State of India and putting forward their viewpoints. We have listened to them and we have discussed it with them, because we want the greatest measure of agreement and cordiality about this and because we attach more importance to a decision having that goodwill, even though it might be logically not a good decision: for, logic is a very feeble and unworthy substitute of goodwill. I would rather have goodwill than logic, and co-operation. We have proceeded that way. How far it will succeed wholly in creating that goodwill I do not know. But I am quite positive that, however much the Government may or may not succeed, this House can succeed if it wants to create that and give that lead to the country in deciding these things—rightly or wrongly but with goodwill, and accepting the decisions made. Then, if something is wrong about the decisions, we can consider them quietly later on.

Now, take two of the major problems—the question of Bombay and Punjab.

An Hon. Member: Bihar also.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: With the greatest respect for our friends in Bihar and Bengal and Orissa, I would say that nothing is more unimportant than their problem. I am really astonished at the amount of heat, about these three or four States, which has been imported. We can consider it and decide it. But what does it matter if a patch of Bihar goes this way and a patch of Bengal or Orissa goes the other way? I cannot get excited about it provided always that they get fair treatment. That is the vital and important point.

About Bombay, which undoubtedly is one of our major difficulties, I think there are arguments advanced on the part of Maharashtrians, on the part of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

others in Bombay, and I have no doubt at all that the arguments advanced about the Maharashtrians have great force. But, unfortunately, I see the force in the other arguments too. Obviously, nobody can say that it is a one-sided affair. Then, how does one deal with it? Hon. Members know that the Congress Working Committee, after considerable discussion, suggested three States, but speaking for myself I hate them and believe that the recommendation made by the States Reorganisation Commission was the best in the circumstances. But, I do not wish to compel others to accept it, because the Maharashtrians, Gujaratis and others are the people who have to reside there. Who am I to push my opinion down their throats, more especially the Maharashtrians who played such a vital part in India's history and who have to play such a vital part in the future of India? But I do think that was a fair and equitable desion which would have promoted co-operative working and which could, if necessary later, have been added to or amended. There is nothing to prevent it; I still think that it will be the best thing. I do not know if the time is past for considering that matter afresh by the people most affected by it.

1 P.M.

Take Punjab. People talk about uni-lingual and bi-lingual States, I have already laid stress on the importance I attach to language; and, in relation to Punjab, I would lay stress on the importance I attach to the Punjabi language. I attach importance to it, because, apart from the very important fact of a large number of the Sikhs or all the Sikhs wanting it—that is the major factor good enough for me; it does not come against me—I do not know why the Hindi-knowing people should object. I say that a language should not be considered something exclusive or excluding others; we must be inclusive in our thinking. But, apart from that, the minor modulations of a language represent the growth of a particular specific culture in a group. The

folk-songs of Punjab are an immensely important part of the Punjabi culture. It does not matter to me for the moment how many books on technology exist in the Punjabi language in the Gurmukhi script. If they do not exist, it is a great drawback from the national point of view. Either that drawback will be made good, or it will suffer and it will not advance with us in the future. But I do wish to give every encouragement to the Punjabi language, not at the expense of Hindi. There is no question of expense of Hindi; Hindi is strong enough, wide enough and powerful enough in every way to go ahead. They should co-operate with each other. This whole outlook of one language trying to push out the other is a wrong outlook. So, I have laid stress on this linguistic point. If you look at the Punjab from the linguistic point of view, from the point of view of numerous proposals made, you will find that there is no proposal conceivable which makes the Punjab completely uni-lingual, that is to say, uni-lingual in the sense the entire thing being based on Punjabi in Gurmukhi script. So far as the speaking part is concerned, it might well be said that nearly all Punjabis speak Punjabi, whatever they may say. In fact, even Hindi or Urdu is half Punjabi, so that, if you look at it from the communal point of view, it is a bad attempt. It does not matter how much you may divide Punjab, but the Hindus and Sikhs are intermixed completely. You may, by adjustments make one 45 per cent. and the other 55 per cent. the one 30 per cent. and the other 70 per cent. and so on. But, you do not change the basic fact that both are completely mixed up in each village. And, therefore, the only way for Punjab to exist and prosper, rather, even to exist, is for both to pull together. There is no other way. Of course, the Punjabis are people with very great virtues; but among their great virtues, the virtue of pulling together has not been known. Perhaps it may be due to their greater vitality. They

are very vital people. Even today Punjab is probably the most prosperous of our States from the common people's point of view. Nowhere in India do people drink more milk and *lassi* than in the Punjab. They have a future before them of great advance; with Bhakra Nangal and other schemes, that is a tremendous future and it surprises me that they should waste their great energies when they have all this work before them. Again I would say, if, as they are, the Hindus in the Punjab are in a majority—I am not for a moment talking about the shape of things to come regarding boundaries; I am not going into it—it is their duty to win over the Sikhs; and, it is the duty of the Sikhs to win over the Hindus. This business of going against each other, trying to trip each other and weaken each other is not, if I may say so, mature politics. It is immaturity and we have grown out of it in India.

There are one or two things I should like to say before I finish. We have to examine all these matters, all these changes, from the point of view of our economic development, Second Five Year Plan, etc. It is highly important. It is true that in drawing up the Second Five Year Plan, there has been an attempt made to draw it up for almost each individual district, so that if the district changes over to another area, it does not affect it so much. But, if you uproot the whole State, practically all your energy and resources will be spent in the next two or three years in settling down and not in the Five Year Plan. One should like to avoid it.

Finally, the more I have thought about it, the more I have been attracted to something which I used to reject seriously and which I suppose is not at all practicable now. That is the division of India into four, five or six major groups regardless of language, but always, I will repeat, giving the greatest importance to the language in those areas. I do not want this to be a thing to suppress language, but rather to give it an encouragement.

That, I fear, is a bit difficult. We have gone too far in the contrary direction. But, I would suggest for this House's consideration a rather feeble imitation of that. That is, whatever final decisions Parliament arrives at in regard to these States, we may still have what I would call zonal councils, i.e., a group of 3, 4 or 5 States, as the case may be, having a common council. To begin with, a would say that it should be an advisory council. Let us see how it develops. Let it be advisory; let the Centre also be associated with it for dealing with economic problems as well as the multitude of border problems and other problems that arise. There can be, let us say, 5 such zonal areas.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): A common High Court.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There may be, as the hon. Member suggests, in some places a common High Court, a common Governor, etc.; but, common economy is more important. We are having these big schemes, river valley and other. It will be very helpful. In the main, I want them to develop the habit of co-operative working to break down the wall. It may be that, later, the Advisory Zonal Councils may develop into something more important. I think we should proceed slowly and cautiously so that people may not suspect an undermining of their State's structure. So, we could have, let us say, five: one for the north, one for the south, one for the east, one for the west and one for the Centre.

Shri Kamath: *Dakshin, Purva, etc.*

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Something like that. I would submit that for the consideration of this House.

Shri Chattopadhyaya: On a point of information, while I listened, as the House did, with very deep respect and interest to the speech of our beloved Prime Minister, my colleague on that other side, I should like with equally deep humility to ask whether it is in

[Shri Chattopadhyaya]

order for any Member of the Cabinet, especially the Prime Minister who announced the appointment of the States Reorganisation Commission, to speak on the principles of linguistic States, the very principles on which this Commission was constituted?

Some Hon. Members : No linguistic Commission.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The terms of reference are not at present before me. But, from what I remember, the hon. Member has not carefully read them or has misread them. It is not called the Linguistic Provinces Commission, but the States Reorganisation Commission and the terms of reference specifically stated that though language is an important consideration, there are other important considerations, the strongest being national unity. The point of order does not arise at all.

Shri Meghnad Saha : May I point out that under the terms of reference..

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. We are not concerned with that. The hon. Member will resume his seat. No Member should take the liberty of again placing his little points before the House in the form of points of order or points for information.

We will proceed further with the debate now. Shri B. Shiva Rao. The hon. Member may come and sit there. In view of his illness, I am permitting him to sit and speak.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair.]

Shri B. Shiva Rao : (South Kanara—South): I am taking part in a debate in this House after an interval of nearly three years. Even on this occasion, I would not have intervened except for the fact that one of the proposals of the States Reorganisation Commission affects my district and particularly my constituency directly and intimately. I feel bound, as the only representative in the House of that area, to place a view which, I know, is held by the vast majority of the people of my constituency. That

view is not in accordance with the proposals made by the Commission. In doing so, however, I will bear in mind the advice to which we have just listened from the Prime Minister.

Before I deal with that point, I would like to make one general observation, particularly in regard to the procedure that was followed by the Commission. I have no doubt in my mind that the rich tribute paid to the Members of the Commission by the Home Minister both in this House and in the other House is richly deserved. Nevertheless, I cannot help feeling that if the Commission had adhered strictly to the terms of the Resolution of the Government which constituted the Commission, the results would have been even more satisfactory than they are. If I may refer to the Resolution which is quoted on the very first page of the report, what was the Commission expected to do in the first stage? It was asked to submit an interim report without going into the details, but to make recommendations in regard to the broad principles which would govern the solution of the problem entrusted into the hands of the Commission. Such an interim report laying down the broad principles might have been the subject matter of a debate in both the Houses of Parliament and in the States legislatures. In the light of these debates, the Government could have given fresh directives if necessary to the Commission which might then have proceeded to the second stage of formulating precise details. As a member of the old Constituent Assembly, I have been looking into the records of the Constituent Assembly at a time when the Constitution was being fashioned, and I was interested to see that in this volume of constitutional precedents which was given to us, the members of the old Constituent Assembly, there was an interesting note by the late Shri B. N. Rau, on the problem of linguistic provinces and regional arrangements. I shall not go into the details of the proposals that he recommended to the Constituent Assembly

at that time, but in view of the remarks made by the Prime Minister this morning, I am encouraged to refer to one or two points in that note included in this volume.

It was suggested that the Constituent Assembly might usefully consider arrangements which worked with a good deal of success in Hungary and at one time were contemplated in Ireland. In general, I may say that this suggestion was not for the creation of linguistic provinces but rather of sub-provinces. And it was pointed out further in that note that the adaptation of this particular constitutional device would have met to a large extent the demand for separate linguistic provinces, and avoided unnecessary overhead expenditure without creating new provinces, and would have led to a solution of the problems with which the States Reorganisation Commission have been dealing. I shall not go further into that matter, but I venture to hope, particularly in the light of the remarks made by the Prime Minister, that it is not too late for Government to apply their mind to the suggestions contained therein.

Now, I proceed to the point with which I am directly concerned, and that is the proposal of the States Reorganisation Commission to cut up a portion of the southernmost taluk in South Kanara district, namely the Kasaragod taluk, and transfer it, or rather the whole of it, to the new State of Kerala.

In order that the House may appreciate the difference between the proposal as made by the Commission, and the modification suggested by practically everyone who counts in the district, I would like to say that my district, that is, the South Kanara district, is a long and narrow strip of territory lying between the Western Ghats and the Arabian Sea. To the south of the district is Malabar, and the southernmost taluk is known as Kasaragod taluk. This taluk is divided into two unequal halves by the Chandragiri river, of which the north-

ern arm or tributary is known as the Payasvini. South of this river, which is more or less two-thirds of Kasaragod taluk, the population is predominantly Malayalam-speaking. I believe between 90 to 95 per cent. of the people south of the Chandragiri river in this taluk speak Malayalam. The medium of instruction in most schools in this area is also Malayalam, and the system of tenancy laws is the same as prevails in the neighbouring district of Malabar.

For many centuries, this river has been regarded as the dividing line between two distinct regions. Historians, one or two historians at any rate, have said that this river was the boundary line of Ashoka's empire, and even in British times this was regarded as a distinct line of demarcation between Kerala on the one side and the Tuluva Kingdom, where Tulu is the prevailing language, on the other.

So far as Congress Committees are concerned, the Kerala Congress Committee as well as the South Kanara District Congress Committee agreed to make that the dividing line. And even the Delimitation Commission, on the eve of the last general elections, decided to make the Chandragiri river the southernmost boundary of the constituency which I have the privilege to represent in this House, except for a few villages beyond.

I must point out that when two of the members of the States Reorganisation Commission visited my district, the impression was created by the members of the Commission that the Chandragiri-Payasvini river would be the proper and natural boundary between the new State of Kerala and the district of South Kanara. That being the view expressed by the members of the Commission, the witnesses who appeared before it did not think it necessary to argue that particular point at any length. And the House can imagine after that the sense of disappointment with which the people received the proposal of the States

[Shri B. Shiva Rao]

Reorganisation Commission that the whole of Kasaragod taluk should be transferred to the new State of Kerala.

As far as the Commission is concerned, I have looked into their Report, and I find no convincing reasons set out in justification of this proposal. It is true that the Commission have referred to the fact that 72 per cent. of the people of Kasaragod taluk are Malayalam-speaking. But I must add as a qualification to this statement that while south of the Chandragiri-Payasvini river, over 90 per cent. are Malayalam-speaking, in the northern portion which is one-third of the taluk, the population speaking Malayalam is only 50 per cent., and the non-Malayalam-speaking people is practically the same in proportion.

The Commission in justifying this recommendation to transfer the whole of the taluk observed—I am quoting their view—

“Though Kanpadiga opinion in South Kanara concedes the claim of Kerala up to the Chandragiri river, administratively it will be more expedient to join the whole taluk to Kerala than to break it up purely on linguistic grounds.”

That to me seems rather a curious statement to make, because the suggestion that it would be possible to break the taluk on linguistic grounds seems to imply that there is some force in the argument put forward that the people north of the Chandragiri river who do not speak Malayalam number almost the same as those who speak Malayalam.

I have not been able to understand precisely the significance of the phrase:

“administratively it would be more expedient to transfer the whole of the Kasaragod taluk.” I looked up the *Oxford Dictionary* to find out precisely what ‘expedient’ means, and the *Oxford Dictionary* says ‘expedient’ mean something which is more politic than just. I am afraid that that meaning fits in with the circumstances of the case.

I must refer to the fact that both the Houses of the Madras Legislature, in discussing the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission suggested this very modification that only that portion of the taluk south of the Chandragiri river may be transferred to Kerala, and the northern portion retained in South Kanara district. The voting in the Madras Assembly was 100 to 18 with 14 neutrals, and I believe there was no division in the Upper House. The same verdict was given by the Mysore Legislature. It is not surprising that these two Legislatures came to the view that they did because of certain facts which were quoted on the floor of the Madras Assembly by the Finance Minister of Madras, Mr. Subramaniam, and which are contained in a memorandum which was submitted to the hon. Home Minister and his colleagues here.

I find that in the northern portion of Kasaragod taluk of 164 schools, not less than 144 have Kannada as the medium of instruction, with almost 20,000 pupils in those schools, and only in the remaining 20 schools is the medium of instruction Malayalam, the number of pupils being 3000. I have already alluded to the fact that the land tenure system in the area south of the Chandragiri river is the same as in Malabar, while in the northern portion of the taluk, the same system prevails as does in South Kanara.

Then I am told that of the 4000 documents which are registered, on an average, in a year in the northern portion, only 10 are in Malayalam and the rest are in Kannada. It is, therefore, no surprise that of the 36 panchayat boards in this area, in the northern portion of the Kasaragod taluk, no less than 34 panchayat boards have passed resolutions urging the retention of that portion in South Kanara and only one panchayat board passed a resolution, by a majority of one, favouring the transfer of that portion to Kerala.

There is one other aspect of this matter which I feel I should place

very briefly before the House, and that is that north of the Chandragiri river, the prevailing language, from the standpoint of numbers, is neither Kannada nor Malayalam but a separate language rich in expression, although it has no script of its own, known as Tulu. I think it would be unfair to cut up this region inhabited by the Tulu-speaking people into two. Sir, let me, for the sake of argument, accept for the moment the suggestion of the Commission that the whole of Kasaragod taluk may be transferred to Kerala. I must point out again that we in South Kanara are agreeable to two-thirds of this taluk, south of the Chandragiri river, being so transferred, and the dispute is only about one-third to the north. Will it really satisfy the needs of the people of Kerala? According to the Commission, the area of the new State of Kerala will be about 15,000 square miles and the population would be about 13½ million. The champions of the new State of Kerala—I am again quoting from the Report—demanded not the transfer of Kasaragod taluk alone, but the whole of South Kanara district, the whole of the Nilgiri district and the State of Coorg. The demand was made, not because of language, but because the State of Kerala would have a density of population much more than any other part of India. I ask whether the transfer of one taluk from South Kanara to Kerala would really satisfy the needs of those people.

It seems to me that the line pursued by the Commission will not lead us to any satisfactory solution. The only line that I can think of would be not only for the people of Kerala but the people of Madras and of Karnataka is to form a composite multi-lingual State in which all would have equal opportunities, and I feel that it is time for the Cabinet to consider the alternative scheme, to which I referred in the beginning.

I have taken more time than I had intended to do, but I would like to

have another two minutes to deal with....

Mr. Chairman: I am very sorry. The hon. Member has already taken more than 23 minutes.

Shri B. Shiva Rao: Then I will conclude at this stage.

Shri Meghnad Saha: I am sorry to speak to empty benches, but I want to raise only one point.

It has been said that the States Reorganisation Commission had some terms of reference. It had no terms of reference whatsoever, if you read through it carefully. You will see that they framed their own terms of reference. They were four; unity and security of India, language and culture, financial viability and requirements of national development plans, and regional planning. These are the four terms of reference which they have framed for themselves.

Let us, first of all, take unity and security of India. The unity of India can be on sure foundation provided India is one nation. Is India one nation? That is the question one has to ask oneself. What are the elements which make one nation? They are same language, religion, culture, race, geographical and economic unity. If you scan these elements, you find that they do not exist in India. So India is not a nation in the same sense that France or Italy is. Of course, by our Constitution, we have tried to solve some of these problems, the religious problem, the race problem and so forth. But the language problem cannot be solved. There are 14 well developed languages having literature of their own, and a number of dialects and Adivasi languages. The language factor constitutes the most serious fissiparous tendency. This language factor cannot be argued out. It has been said just now by no less a person than the Prime Minister that every person should learn three or four languages. I have been teaching for 40 years. I have a saying *Ladke log Pharisate nahi*, students are not angels.

[Shri Meghnad Saha]

It is not possible even for 90 per cent. of the people to learn their own language, leave apart foreign languages. Therefore, if you take a decision whereby people of any area are deprived of the use of their mother tongue that will constitute the greatest crime against the policy of socialism. So we have to guarantee every linguistic group the free use of its language for the purpose of instruction and communication.

The principle that units should be administratively divided on the language basis is a very sound one. Some 50 years ago it was thought that it was impossible for a multi-lingual group of people to form one stable nation. Here we can learn from history, an attempt was made in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, where there were six languages: German, Magyar, Serb, Croat, and Slovene and so on. They tried to form one nation out of these different groups. That experiment failed, in spite of Parliamentary democracy because the Germans and Magyars who were the ruling race, did not give up their habit of exploiting the other people. We have now since about 35 years the example of Soviet Russia. Soviet Russia which is the successor of Czarist Russia, was a hotch-potch of 60 different nations and nationalities, each speaking its own language. There were the Great Russians who were the dominant group, then the Ukrainians, Armenians, Georgians, Turks of different types and so on. There were about 60 languages.

Shri M. P. Mishra (Monghyr North-West): But the Russian nationality was dominating.

Shri Meghnad Saha : Russian was dominating. There was a process of Russification which meant that the languages of all the lesser groups should be—suppressed and replaced by Russian. But, of course, against the Czar there was a great fight in which the leaders of all these language groups fought shoulder to shoulder and the Czar was overthrown in 1917.

Then the language question again came to the forefront. It was so serious that it tended to disrupt the whole political life of Soviet Russia. Their leaders sat together and took a very wise decision. They said: We have to guarantee to every language group the use of its own mother-tongue for purposes of instruction and communication. There should be no force or compulsion in using Russian.

The second point was that they divided the country administratively into a number of units which are based on the linguistic principle. There were 11 Union Republics, the Great Russian, Ukrainian, White Russian, Armenian, Georgian, Tatars, etc. in Azerbaijan and they were all different administrative units and these 11 have now been increased to 16 by the promotion of inferior units to the Union Republic status.

Shri M. P. Mishra: What is the case in China, another Soviet country?

Shri Meghnad Saha: I am not talking of China.

Shri M. P. Mishra : That is the second country in the Soviet Empire.

Shri Meghnad Saha: I should not be interrupted like this because it is extraneous.

Even this did not satisfy the linguistic aspirations of the people because there were small language groups which were embodied in bigger areas like so many islands in the big sea. There were lots of Tatars around Kazan and there were many groups, about 22 of them. Even the aspirations of these people were satisfied by constituting them into 22 autonomous Republics. They have not the same kind of administrative freedom as the Union Republics which are absolutely supreme and they have also the power of secession if they wanted. But, these were attached to the other Union Republics. Now, five of these have been promoted to the status of Union Republics. The Great Russians though they were in an absolute majority made a sacrifice for

the sake of unity. I will read only a small passage.

"Soviet officials have been obliged to learn the language of the country in which they performed their duties, and the works of Gorki, for example, have been translated into Chuvash and those of Shakespeare and Maupassant into Kazak. The Russian names to towns have been abolished and replaced by old native names."

They took this big step because the whole Soviet Empire is to be governed by the principles of socialism, and all economic and industrial development should be directed from the centre. This system has worked very well for 35 years. Soviet Russia has been subjected to the greatest of trials. There was the Nazi menace, one of the greatest menaces to national life and in 1942 many European people thought that the disgruntled nationalities of Soviet Russia would all break asunder and it would be easy for the Germans to conquer Russia. Nothing of the kind happened. This is one of the surprises of the Second World War. The Great Russians, the Ukrainians, the Georgians, and the Armenians all fought shoulder to shoulder. This has been the great lesson that if people are loyal, if their just aspirations are satisfied, they will be loyal to the Union. Has the breaking up of the Soviet States into Union Republics based on linguistic principles interfered with the economic development? No. The economic development was in the charge of the Five Year Plan. I will now tell you what they have achieved.

Shri M. P. Mishra : May I know, if the Russian language holds a dominating position in Russia even now?

Shr. Meghnad Saha : He can find it out.

In 1950, five Asian Union Republics of Kazakistan, Uzbekistan, Turko-

menistan, Tadzikistan and Kirghizistan produced 19.6 million tons of coal, 3.5 millions tons of oil, five billion units of electricity and the corresponding figures for India are 35 million tons of coal, 300,000 tons of oil and 7 billion units of electricity, only about 40 per cent. more. If the States were left to themselves they would have achieved absolutely nothing. Here is the difference between India and the Soviet Republics. India started with a good industrial system inherited from the British and we are going on with industrialisation at snail's pace. Our leaders' attention and the attention of everybody is diverted to other things; in Russia they started from scratch. (I am talking only of the Central Russian Republics.) That shows the soundness of the Soviet system that if we accept socialism, as the Congress threatens to do, we should not be afraid of the linguistic sub-division of the country at all. I am, therefore, saying that we should revise our terms of reference and look at them more critically.

The first thing that I wish to talk about is the linguistic principle for the reorganisation of States. It has been accepted more or less in the South, West and the North. In the eastern portion it has failed very miserably as it did not give sufficient importance to the linguistic principle. If the recommendations of the SRC are carried out it will put 7 million Bengali speaking people and hill tribes under the alien rule of Bihar and Assam. This, I very strongly object to because these people have not an iota of socialism in their minds. Biharis, as everybody knows, have not a trace of socialism in their minds. It is land of castes. The Assam people have been impelled with the idea of Assamisation of all the Bengalis there. You have heard of the latest disturbance in Goalpara.

Shri M. P. Mishra : Dr. Roy is he the greatest socialist?

Shri Meghnad Saha : I will now consider the Biharis in the eastern

[Shri Meghnad Saha]

zone. (*Interruption*) There are three languages, the Bengali, Assamese and Oriya. These three languages have developed standard literatures of their own. But, Bihari is not a language; it consists of three dialects, the Maghai, Maithili and Bhojpuria. I am giving you this on the basis of a very scientific analysis which was made of the linguistic distribution (*Interruptions*) by Grierson 50 years ago.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Let the hon. Member continue.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Shahabad South): They say that they would also speak on the general aspect.

Mr. Chairman: I would request the hon. Member not to take much more time.

Shri Meghnad Saha: Unlike Bihari, Bengali and Assamese, these Bihari dialects have not developed any literature of their own.

An Hon. Member: That is the tragedy.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: He is talking about general subjects.

Mr. Chairman: This sort of intervention should not be there. Let the hon. Member continue.

Shri Meghnad Saha: They have not developed any language or literature of their own. Maithili had an old literature very much akin to Bengali so that the great poet Vidyapati is claimed by Bengal and Maithila alike. But in modern times Maithili has not developed any literature.

Shri M. P. Mishra: What is the language of Bihar?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: It is better than many languages.

Shri Meghnad Saha: Bhojpuria is better than Uzbek. The language of Bihar has been considered to be a form of the Hindi said to be spoken in the

then United Provinces, but really nothing can be farther from the fact. This is what Grierson wrote about 50 years ago. In spite of hostile feelings with which the Biharis regard everything connected with Bengal, their language is a sister of Bengali and only a distant cousin of the tongue spoken to its west. Like Bengali and Oriya, it is a direct descendant of old Magadha Apabhhransa. The literate people of Bihar adopted western Hindi as their literary language owing to historical reasons, but in the country, the rural people are as little acquainted with Hindi as the people of Bengal, Orissa or Assam.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. May I just remind the hon. Member that I have already rung the bell twice or even four times and that he has taken more than 20 minutes? May I request him to finish now?

Shri Meghnad Saha: Please give me five minutes more. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Chairman: No comments allowed at this stage. One interference leads to another. I would request the hon. Member now to resume his seat as he has already taken more than 20 minutes.

Shri Meghnad Saha: I have been interrupted for about five minutes by other Members and so let me have those five minutes.

Mr. Chairman: All that time has already been allowed for. Let the hon. Member finish within two or three minutes.

Shri Meghnad Saha: A linguistic map is given by Grierson which shows that the whole of Manbhumi district, Dhanbad, the eastern half of Mahananda, the eastern half of Santhal Parganas, Goalpara, Tripura and Bengal, and they have got about seven million Bengali-speaking people. It has been said that the city of Jamshedpur was Bengali-speaking. It was a Bengali village when it was founded and the composition of the city population was 1,88,000; the biggest being

Bengali of over 54,000, Oriya about 18,000, Biharis only 13,000.

Mr. Chairman: I am very sorry to interrupt the hon. Member. But he knows very well that so far as Jamshepur is concerned, even the Chief Minister of Bengal has said that it may be kept by the people of Bihar and it is not such a debatable question now. Apart from this, the hon. Member has taken too much time already and so I would ask him not to refer to matters in detail which are contained in the books of Grierson which other hon. Members may also have read. It is enough if he refers to the pages simply. He has taken 25 minutes now and I will allow only two more minutes, within which he should finish.

Shri Meghnad Saha: It has been stated that in the interest of defence, Assam should be a strong State. As you know, Assam is connected with India by means of a weak railway link. We know who are our enemies. If Assam is attacked, the rail link is the first thing to go. How are you going to defend Assam? After all, defence is a Central subject. Assam has to be defended from West Bengal, and therefore it is not Assam but West Bengal which has to be a very strong and loyal State, and any defence of Assam which has to be carried out will be from places in West Bengal. The S.R.C. has entirely forgotten this thing and wants to merge a number of unwilling units in Assam—the five Assamese-speaking districts—which has already shown what capacity it has for government, and the S.R.C. thinks it can make Assam into a strong State. I cannot understand a more silly suggestion than this. I would say that if you want to make India a strong nation, we have to accept socialism, for socialism is the remedy for the fissiparous tendencies. There is, of course, the Second Five Year Plan. Only police, education, medical facilities, social services etc. will be in the hands of the States and everything else will be done by the Centre. What is the mis-

take in adopting the linguistic principle for the reorganisation of States?

Shri L. Jageswar Singh (Inner Manipur): At the very outset, I may say with all due respect to the members of the Commission that I cannot but condemn some of the recommendations made by them. They have recommended two classes of units in India, that is, two different kinds of status for the people of India. According to their recommendations, India has been divided into 16 component units and three Centrally Administered Territories. These 16 component units will have full legislative assemblies, whereas in the three Centrally Administered Areas, the people will be deprived of their right to choose their own government. The people living in those 16 States will be given the right to choose their government. They have classified the people in the Territories somewhat as political untouchables. You will see two different kinds of recommendations, giving different status for different sections of the people. The Commission has done a great injustice and a great disservice to the people of the Territories. I say that they have been treated as some sort of political untouchables. This House was keen in removing away social disabilities and untouchabilities. I appeal to the good sense of this House to see that this political distinction or discrimination against a section of the Indian population is not allowed to continue.

2 P.M.

There is another point regarding border regions. According to their recommendations in the border regions, especially in North-East India and North-West India, there are certain areas such as Himachal Pradesh in the North-West, and Manipur and Tripura in the North East border, which are either proposed to be merged in the neighbouring states or retained as a separate unit without a domestic set-up. These are the most difficult places for administration. There is every chance of undesirable infiltrations and for foreign inroads

[Shri L. Jogeswar Singh]

from across the borders. During the Karen movement in Burma, I can cite some examples of what took place in my own area, Manipur State. There were undesirable infiltrations from across the border from Burma and there was kidnapping in Manipur State borders and looting took place there. So the border administration must be strengthened. If you want to strengthen the border administration, the most essential question is that the border people should be economically contented and culturally and linguistically homogenous as far as practicable and there should not be any linguistic fanaticism or imperialism. In the border areas of these states, they are almost tribal in their outlook and tribal in their culture. These customs prevail in these areas of Himachal Pradesh, Manipur and Tripura in their social, economic and cultural fields. If these are disturbed then there will be no peace in these areas. These areas are backward economically; these are backward educationally. The Centre should have some responsibility and keep these States under their supervision and control. But at the same time responsible form of Government—democratic form of Government—should be extended to these areas namely Manipur and Tripura because people in these areas have been demanding it for many years.

Coming to the State of Assam, which is my neighbouring State, I want to say something about it. Everybody wanted to secede from Assam. Why? There is a section of the Bengali population demanding Purbachal and another section of the tribals demanding a hill State. Why do they demand these? The time has now come to go into that question. They have their own apprehensions that linguistic minorities have been completely ignored in these areas. The tribals also have such a complaint that outsiders have come and settled in all the important places in the central parts of their districts. People who are tribals have had to resort to remote and difficult places of the tribal areas.

These are the difficulties which people who are living in the border areas and tribal areas are finding. So the people in these areas should be kept economically contented. Any ruling in this regard from the Centre which is at a distance of about two thousand miles if not paid due and proper attention by the State Government concerned will lead to nowhere. Unfortunately, these places have become the hot bed of undesirable party politics and power politics. The innocent and dumb people have no other alternative. They are now clamouring for a separate State because they think that in a separate State, they can preserve their language, culture and customs. They will become worse in any other State. In order to remove these apprehensions and difficulties the ruling parties in Assam should approach this problem in a co-operative spirit. That is the essential thing to do on the part of those people. There should be a new psychological approach with a sincerity of purpose and the breadth of outlook to the problems of tribals and the Bengali minorities in Assam. If this Parliament does not take this into consideration and pass a verdict that there would be no such State as would ignore the interests of the minorities, the people there will clamour for a hill State. In order to remove their grievances and difficulties, the S.R.C. has recommended and very clearly provided that linguistic minorities should be well safeguarded. There is the sixth schedule which deals with the financial powers of the district administrative councils. It should be suitably amended because no adequate financial powers have been given to the district councils. The recommendations of the S.R.C. in part IV with regard to linguistic minorities should be duly implemented and the Centre should take the entire responsibility for the administration of those safeguards according to the recommendations made by the S.R.C.

Coming to my State of Manipur, I should like to say a few words. It is historically an ancient State. People living in this State are of mixed des-

cent. The State was a meeting place of the Indo-Burmese group from the East and the Indo-Aryan group from the West. They have their own culture, their own language. The culture of the Manipuris as you know is there. You know the world famous Manipuri dance and the world famous polo which Manipuris called *Pana* came from this land of Manipur. Manipur has made its own contribution to the composite culture of India. They want to have a separate State for Manipur. Why? Because they love their culture; they love their language. They do believe that if they join some other State, their culture will suffer and not be protected or safeguarded. They believe that people in the neighbouring States do not love Manipuri culture and Manipuri language as much as Manipuris do. That is the very reason why the Manipuris want to keep their separate entity and integrity, and their separate status and language and culture.

Mr. Chairman: Your time is up.

Shri L. Jogeswar Singh: I want a few minutes more because I have to build up my case; I am speaking on behalf of Manipuri people.

Mr. Chairman: Five minutes? The hon. Member has taken so many minutes. Am I to understand that so far he has not built up any case?

Shri L. Jogeswar Singh: If you give me five minutes more, I shall try to finish. I am just referring to Manipur.

Mr. Chairman: Even in five hours he will not build up a State. (*Interruptions.*)

Shri L. Jogeswar Singh: I was saying that the people of Manipur do not like to go to any other State. Everybody thinks, what is the difference between Assamese language and Manipuri language. I say that there is a great gulf between these two languages. Not a single word of Assamese is found in the Manipuri language. Even the grammar and everything is different from that of the Assamese language. How do you expect the Manipuri people to go to Assam?

The S.R.C. says that Manipur should be kept separate because they have got their own language, their own culture, they have got a special social and cultural individuality of their own, their relationship or connection with the rest of India is very recent and that it is a border State. The S.R.C. further says that the racial and linguistic composition of the State is peculiar, and it has no linguistic affinity with Assam. These are the specific considerations for keeping this State as a separate unit which the S.R.C. has given. Having given these reasons they again say that Manipur is a small State and therefore it cannot stand long; it is not a viable State and so it cannot stand long and therefore the ultimate result will be its merger with Assam. I say it is a fantastic, not a logical conclusion. They have established a case for a separate Manipur State on certain cogent grounds such as language, culture, economy, separate individuality and so on, but at the same time they say that it cannot stand long. If these people are to be given a separate entity on grounds of culture and language then why should they be denied a democratic set-up of Government? In their recommendation the S.R.C. say that the people of Manipur, if they want to remain separate they will not have a responsible form of government and if they want a responsible form of government they should go to Assam and they will enjoy the responsible form of government, What is the meaning of this? They are given a separate status, they are given a separate entity they are given a separate unit on the grounds that have been applied to other component units of India, but at the same time they are denied a democratic set up; they have to come under a pattern of Government with which the people will have no association or directive capacity in the governance of the State but it will be only in an advisory capacity. This kind of Government is suggested by the S.R.C. and I say it is devoid of the concept of democracy. Therefore, I think that this suggestion which has been given

[Shri L. Jogeswar Singh]

By the S.R.C. is very unfair to the people of Manipur. By this suggestion, those areas which, by virtue of their language and culture, are to retain their separate statehood, are to retain their individual entity, are not going to be given the responsible form of government.

Another point is with regard to the small size of the State. My friend Shri Meghnad Saha who has just spoken mentioned about Russia. In Russia there are 16 republics. These 16 republics have got 16 languages—each republic has got its own language. Out of these 16 republics there is one, namely, Karelo Finnish S.S.R. the area of which is 16,173 square miles with a population of 4,69,100 or something like that. This population is by far less than the population of Manipur and Tripura. If such a State is allowed to exist in Russia may I ask why Manipur should be denied its right? Again, out of the 49 States in USA there are about half a dozen States whose population and area is individually less than Manipur and Tripura. Why are these allowed to exist as separate States? It is only because of the language and culture and also the social individuality of those places. If that is the case, I think we should be allowed to have our own legislature and we should be allowed to safeguard and protect our culture.

Another point is with regard to the administrative set-up in Manipur. The S.R.C. has mentioned that Manipur is not an economically viable unit. Yes, we agree that it is not an economically viable unit, but we suggest that if Manipur is given the statehood she will get income-tax under article 270 of the Constitution to the tune of Rs. 24 lakhs, Union excise duties under article 272 of the Constitution to the tune of Rs. 4 lakhs, estimated increment of land revenue on account of new cadastral survey to the tune of Rs. 6 lakhs, income from movement of agricultural products and others to the tune of Rs. 10 lakhs and thus making a total of Rs. 44 lakhs. The present normal income of Manipur is about Rs. 35 lakhs per annum and the

present normal expenditure is about Rs. 75 lakhs per annum. As a result of the introduction of the Assembly on a small and modest scale the annual expenditure will come up to about Rs. 78.5 lakhs including thereby roughly an additional amount of Rs. 1.5 lakhs over and above the present normal expenditure. The apparent deficit of Rs. 41.5 lakhs is more than made up by the estimated increment of Rs. 44.5 lakhs leaving a small surplus of Rs. 2.5 lakhs annually. With the abolition of the Manipur Rifles which is of doubtful utility another sum of Rs. 4 lakhs will be saved and a certain amount of revenue on the transfer of Kataw Valley to Burma can be made available. These two items can be profitably utilised on the nation building programme of the State.

Mr. Chairman: It appears that these figures are interminable. The hon. Member has already taken 25 minutes. He only wanted 5 minutes more whereas I have given him 8 minutes. I would request him to finish now.

Shri L. Jogeswar Singh: I will finish in a couple of minutes, Sir. There is one point which my hon. friend Shri Rishang Keishing mentioned when he spoke the other day. He mentioned that Thangal General, who was hanged for his revolt against the then British rule, was not a Naga. He was, but a Manipuri. In this connection, though not wholly relevant I may mention that in Manipur the word "Naga" is unknown. In Manipur, those Manipuris who live in the hill areas are known as Thangkhul, Kabui and Khongjay and Mao and Maram etc. They are the only people. This name Naga is given by the British rulers.

Having said this I should appeal to the House to see that these border States like Himachal, Manipur and Tripura are kept separate under the Central supervision and control, but at the same time they are given the responsible form of Government so that the people living in those areas will be economically self-contained, and culturally and linguistically safeguarded.

Another point which I want to say is.....

Chairman: I am very sorry, as the hon. Member has finished his point, he cannot be allowed to start a fresh point.

Shri Damodara Menon (Kozhikode): The people of Kerala are happy that the States Reorganisation Commission has unanimously recommended the formation of a Kerala State. As you know, Kerala is that narrow strip of country lying to the south of India between the Western Ghats and the Arabian, Sea. I wonder whether you have visited Kerala. If you have not, I would invite you to see it.

An Hon. Member: Have you invited?

Shri Damodara Menon: I have invited every one of the Members to come and see it. The people of Kerala have been agitating for the formation of a separate State for a number of years now, and I happen to be the Secretary of the Aikya Kerala Committee which on several occasions held conferences to voice forth the demand of the people there. Today, of course, the Commission has given us a State and I have no doubt that the recommendation will be implemented. But we have certain grievances regarding the area that has been given to us. I want first to refer to Gudalur Taluk of Nilgiris district. I am only summarising what I want to say because I know the time at my disposal is very limited. The Gudalur taluk is one of the three taluks of the Nilgiris district. We claim that the whole of the Nilgiris district must come to us, because that is a bilingual area lying on the border of Kerala State. But the Commission has not examined our claims for the Nilgiris district. They merely mention that a claim was put forward by the people of Kerala for that district. Of the three taluks of Nilgiris district, Gudalur happens to be on the western side of the Western Ghats and in all respects it is part of Kerala. The majority of the people there speak Malayalam language.

Shri N. M. Lingam (Coimbatore): Question.

Shri Damodara Menon: I know that my friend put the same question when Shri A. M. Thomas was speaking and challenged his figures. He said that only 35 per cent. of the people of Gudalur speak Malayalam. I would refer to the census figures compiled by the Madras Government and from that he will find that 48.3 per cent. of the people speak Malayalam. The people who speak Tamil are only 21 per cent. Now, even this, 48 per cent. has not been properly calculated. I am particularly mentioning the Chetti community of Gudalur taluk. They are Malayalam-speaking people. Even the District Gazetteer of the Gudalur taluk which was published as early as 1908.....

Shri Basappa (Tumkur): What about the rest of the community? The rest are Kannada speaking people.

Shri Damodara Menon:... mentions that the Chettis of Gudalur taluk are Malayalees and they speak Malayalam. They are allied to the Chettis of the neighbouring taluk of Wynaad. At one time, Gudalur was part of the Malabar district and Gudalur was then known as south-east Wynaad. Later on, Gudalur was added to the Nilgiris district when that district was formed. The elementary schools in Gudalur are all Malayalam schools and even the court language is Malayalam.

Shri N. M. Lingam: Both the languages are taught in those schools.

Shri Damodara Menon: Yes; in some schools, it is so. Until recently, even the voters' list was in Malayalam and Shri N. M. Lingam, who is so connected with the Nilgiris district, himself knows that almost invariably, the members elected from Gudalur taluk to the District Board of Nilgiris were Malayalees.

Shri N. M. Lingam: Chettis.

Shri Damodara Menon: Chettis are Malayalees. I know he is doubting whether Chettis are Malayalees.

Shri N. M. Lingam: I have absolutely no doubt.

Shri Damodara Menon: If it is said that this 48 per cent. of the population

[Shri Damodara Menon]

was calculated on the basis that Chettis are not Malayalees, that is true. They are Malayalees and are allied to the Chettis of Wynaad taluk, as I said before. From all these points of view, Gudalur taluk of the Nilgiris district must go to the Kerala State.

I want to read out a description of this taluk of the Nilgiris district. At page 365 of the Nilgiris District Gazetteer, it is said as follows:

"In all its physical aspects, this tract differs totally from the Nilgiris parts proper. It is 4,000 feet lower and therefore hotter and it gets heavy rainfall. This taluk is geographically contiguous to Malabar and was transferred to Nilgiris only in 1877 previous to which it formed part of Malabar".

I hope my friend Shri Lingam would not challenge these facts.

Shri N. M. Lingam: Why should I challenge facts?

Shri Damodara Menon: So, you do not challenge these facts.

Another small bit of border area which should have been included in Kerala is in Shencotta taluk. The whole of Shencotta taluk has been included in Madras State on the ground that it forms almost an enclave in the Tamil territory of the Tirunelveli district of Madras State. It is not a fact that the whole of this taluk forms an enclave. The Commission probably erred because it did not go very much into the details and it was also very, very reluctant to divide a Taluk. Only a portion of the Shencotta taluk forms an enclave in the Tirunelveli district of Madras State. Therefore, if the whole of this taluk today is transferred to Madras, it will become an enclave of the Madras State within Travancore-Cochin territory. Therefore my request, and my appeal to this House is to see that that portion of Shencotta taluk which lies within the natural boundaries of the present Travancore-Cochin State is included in Kerala State, because it is west of the Western Ghats and there is no reason why it should be added on to the Madras State.

I want to deal with the four taluks of South Travancore to which reference was made by my friend Shri A. M. Thomas in his speech. I do not want to go elaborately into the points he has raised, because that would be wasting the time of the House and as you have reminded other Members, I should limit my speech to the fifteen minutes given to me. I say that geographically, economically, culturally and historically, these four taluks form part of the Kerala State and their life is inter-twined with the district of Trivendrum of which they are a part. There is no reason why they should be taken away now. I am not unaware of the fact that there has been a lot of agitation by some people there, especially by the Tamilian people, that they must be taken out of Kerala State and made to join Madras State. But this agitation is of a very recent origin and I am sure that for the economic development of the area, it is better that those areas form part of Kerala State.

I now come to the claims made by our neighbours—the neighbours to the north of the proposed Kerala State. My friend Shri B. Shiva Rao who spoke some time earlier, pleaded that portions of Kasargode taluk may be put into the Karnataka State. Shri Shiva Rao is a person for whom I have the greatest respect, but in this particular instance, I am afraid he was pleading for a wrong cause. Kasargode taluk, according to the figures he himself gave, is predominantly Malayalam-speaking. If you take the whole of the taluk, 72 per cent. of the people speak Malayalam and even to the north of the Chandragiri and Payaswini rivers, he admitted that 50 per cent. of the people speak Malayalam. Now, why should this predominantly Malayalam-speaking taluk be split up? The Commission went into this question very elaborately and carefully and decided that the whole of the taluk must belong to Kerala. I might inform the House that according to the figures available and also according to the natural lie of the land, the whole of

South Kanara district must belong in fact to Kerala. We put forward that claim on the very ground suggested by Mr. Shiva Rao. He has said that the whole of the district is bi-lingual. It is not uni-lingual and no language-group has a definite majority. In fact, the Kanarese people are a very small minority. The majority of the people speak Tulu if you take the whole District. Therefore, we plead that in view of the geographical contiguity and the fact that the whole of the district lies west of the Western Ghats and is culturally and economically connected with Kerala, the whole district may be given to us. For instance, in the Dar Commission's report, Kerala is described as that tract of the country which lies to the south of North Kanara and between the Western Ghats and the sea. The Dar Commission felt that North Kanara was the northern-most boundary of the Kerala State and that the whole of the South Kanara would be a part of the Kerala State. The S.R.C. thought over the matter and decided that we had no claim for all the five taluks; but only one of the taluks lying to the south should be given to us. Therefore they gave Kasaragod taluk. There is, therefore, no justification on the part of the Government or even this House to change the finding of the Commission in this particular matter.

I want to make an appeal in this matter to all our big neighbours. The proposed Karnataka State has an area of over 72,000 square miles, 72,730 square miles to be exact. The proposed Madras State has an area of 50,170 square miles whereas the tiny State of Kerala has an area of 14,980 square miles only and a population of 13.6 million. Mr. Shiva Rao was asking, "What does it matter if a few thousand people or even one-third of the Kasaragod taluk is added on to Karnataka State?" I would ask my big brother whether he should stretch his arms and snatch away a small bit of territory from the small State of Kerala or whether he should stretch his arms to bestow more territory on us. I am appealing even to my Tamil

friends not to think of taking away a small bit of Kerala territory here or there, but to be generous. After all, we have to co-operate and work in many fields, economic as well as cultural. Therefore, I am not putting up this proposal in any spirit of bargaining for a bit of territory here or there. Kerala normally is that part of the country which lies to the west of the Western Ghats. Therefore, if possible our friends must give us the whole of that area. If, in a particular place or a particular area, they have an overwhelming claim, we are not standing in their way. But at least, all the area from Cape Comorin to the Kasaragoa taluk must come to us. I appeal to my friend opposite from the Nilgiri district who is smiling at me not to think of Gudalur taluk so much. After all, you have got Ooty and those fine taluks. We are not making any claim for them; but you must be satisfied with that. Let us have at least the lower region lying 4,000 feet below Ooty and separated from the Nilgiri district by a range of high mountains. Let us have the Gudalur taluk.

There are people in my own State who think that Kerala cannot prosper in a bright way because of its smallness. But I think Kerala has a bright future; only our neighbours should co-operate with us in making our country prosperous. In that way, they can also prosper. Lastly, I want to say a few words about what our Prime Minister has said this morning for the economic development of the country as a whole. I think it will be good to have some kind of development councils or economic councils. I wholeheartedly support that view, because for the development of the South—I mean Madras, Kerala, Karnataka and even Andhra—it is necessary for us to sit together and discuss common matters of development. For that purpose, it would be good to have a development council included in the Bill that is going to be brought before the House on the basis of the S.R.C. Report. If that happens, I am sure most of the misgivings of my friend from Nilgiri District will disappear.

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey): He is hearing it.

Shri Damodara Menon: I am sure we can work together. Let there be co-operation and goodwill between Madras, Kerala and Karnataka. In this connection, I very much appreciate the speech of my friend Mr. Nijalingappa. He pointed out the difficulties of the Kerala State because of its smallness and said that if more area came to it it would be welcome. That is the spirit in which Tamil Nad friends also must view this problem and not try to snatch away the small territory which has been given by the S.R.C.

Shri Mathew (Kottayam): Though the time at my disposal is very limited, I would like to begin by paying a sincere compliment to the Home Minister specially for one note that characterised his speech. Some elder statesmen in the country had suggested that it would be desirable even at this stage to shelve this whole question for something like 15 years. That gave us the impression that perhaps we were on the brink of some deep precipice and that it would be dangerous to proceed with the scheme. But the Home Minister inspired confidence in us saying that there was going to be no upheaval in the country as it were, that it would be a safe enough procedure and that there was nothing to be alarmed at. I would also wish to pay a little attention to a principle which the S.R.C. rightly emphasised and which the Prime Minister again stressed this morning, namely, that this whole thing is not to be decided by reference to just the one question of language. Language is important; but, there are other equally important considerations. Life, especially in a big nation, is a large and complex thing and this whole thing cannot be reduced to some one single rule of procedure. It is complicated and many factors have to be taken into account. That general principle will hardly be gainsaid, but sometimes it is forgotten by us when we are interested too much in any

particular point of view that we have in mind.

With these general observations, let me come to the question of the proposed Kerala State. It is too late in the day to raise the question whether it would not have been better to have a big South Indian State. Academically and abstractly that question can be discussed and different points of view can be urged. But, I repeat, it is too late in the day to raise that question. Whatever be the academic or abstract desirability of this, from what I know, the people in the proposed Kerala State and the people in the Madras State are not for it. Whether such a thing should have been attempted is another question; but, as a matter of fact, the people are not for it.

Shri N. M. Lingam: It is never too late to mend.

Shri Mathew: Of course, it is never too late to mend. But as the Prime Minister observed, even the set-up that we are going to have now is not going to be there necessarily till doomsday. In future it may be possible to take up some of these issues again. Coming to the proposed Kerala State, I need not go into all the points that have been touched on or even elaborated by some of the previous speakers. I want, however, to refer to one aspect which has not been referred to, perhaps, because it was assumed.

My hon. friend Shri Nesamony, who is absent now as far as I can see, who was the sole spokesman of the Travancore Tamil Nad Congress, elaborated on some of the grievances that he and his party had. Grievances are a matter of psychological fact. If the grievances are in the mind, it is a fact. I can quite understand sometimes how one feels too deeply aggrieved on account of certain recent happenings. A major portion of my hon. friend's speech was devoted to certain unhappy incidents of late in our State. I need not go into an examination of those incidents. Granting for argument's sake all that Shri Nesamony said to be matters of fact, as actual happenings, I am afraid he

has drawn conclusions which are not quite warranted. Suppose in a particular Ministry certain unfortunate incidents happened, suppose we concede further that the Ministry or the Chief Minister in particular was responsible for that and suppose we also concede that he is seriously to be blamed for all that, what inferences have we to draw from that? If Shri Nesamony were here, I would have reminded him that before achieving freedom, i.e. before 1947, a lot of unhappy incidents happened during the freedom fight. The gentleman who was at the head of the administration then was not a Travancorean. He was from the Madras State. He was a Tamilian. But none of us Malayalees none of us Travancoreans even has any grievance against the people of Madras State, against the Tamilians, just because a Tamilian happened to be at the head of the administration in those years, an administration in the period of which we suffered a lot by way of all kinds of undesirable incidents.

Shri N. M. Lingam: He was not an elected head.

Shri Mathew: Elected or not, it does not matter.

Shri Punnoose: He was appointed by the British.

Shri Mathew: It would be irrelevant and silly on our part to cherish such grievances and to bring that question into the present issue.

Concerning the southern taluks of our State, I do not propose to go into the geographical and historical factors which have been referred to by Shri Damodara Menon. I am prepared to discuss the question, conceding that the most important factor is the will of the people. The will of the people however is something which is shaped by the leaders. Therefore, a heavy responsibility lies on the shoulders of leaders like Shri Nesamony. I would like to ask him what he thinks to be in the best interests of the people of these taluks. I am not concerning myself for the moment with Kerala. Just now, I am referring to what

would be in the best interests of the people of these four southern taluks. I raise the question and I want an unbiassed answer, unbiassed by the recent unhappy incidents. Certainly, the southern portion of Travancore cannot complain that it has been neglected all these years. I come from Central Travancore which is educationally the most advanced part of Travancore. I daresay that this central portion has been more neglected than the southern portion. Excellent roads, good hospitals, location of one of the two Tuberculosis sanatoria in the State near Nagercoil, all these, and many other things go to show that the southern part of Travancore, from which Shri Nesamony comes, the four taluks which are in dispute, really got more than their due quota, as it were. They have not been neglected. I simply repeat the question: what would be in the best interests of these 4 taluks themselves—never mind Kerala for the moment to be a distant portion of the Madras State or to continue in Travancore-Cochin which would now be transformed and enlarged into the Kerala State?

As regards Devikulam and Peermedu, the conclusions of the S.R.C. are perfectly sound. I need not go into an examination of all the various considerations. Leaving aside the floating migrant population, the majority are not certainly Tamil-speaking people. In Devikulam, it is true that a number of labourers from Tamil Nad,—all honour to the honest work that they turn out—have been working in the plantations for some decades now. I must, however, say that they go back every year usually to their homes on leave and come again after the leave period. Incidentally, I heard with regard to the Christian labourers there, when subscriptions were asked by their parishes in Devikulam, many of them rightly used to say, "no, we are here only for the time being, when we go to our parishes in the Tamil districts, we have to give our subscription in the parishes there, and therefore, we should not be taxed afresh". There is a good deal of truth

[Shri Mathew]

in that. With regard to the economic importance of this portion for Travancore, I need not adduce any arguments at length. As far as Travancore-Cochin and the new Kerala State are concerned, they are of the utmost importance. The other day, my esteemed friend Shri T. S. A. Chettiar said, "If the proposed Kerala State has not sufficient finances, do not bother, the Centre will come to your rescue." The Centre may have to come to our rescue for a certain transitional period. But to make an arrangement which is financially not sound and then say, "you can get help from the Central Government," is not a sound argument. We are not saying, because we are financially weak, we want somebody else's territory. We are only saying, what is legitimately our territory we cannot afford to part with, especially because of our financial difficulties.

With regard to Gudalur, some people say, though it was perhaps not mentioned here, that it is analogous to Devikulam. "As a matter of fact, if you go to Devikulam," they say, "never mind whether they are migrant people or not, the majority of the people speak Tamil. In Gudalur similarly people speak Malayalam." Really however it is not analogous. In Gudalur, there is no contention that it is a migrant population. On the other hand we are referring to the permanent population of Gudalur. These are unquestionable facts. Whatever inferences we may draw, let us not gainsay facts. When my hon. friend Shri N. M. Lingam gets a chance, he may put forward some arguments. But, that the people's language is mainly Malayalam and even the voters' list used to be prepared in Malayalam, I suppose, these facts which are eloquent and symbolic would not be gainsaid by my hon. friend Shri N. M. Lingam. Though he may adduce some other arguments, the facts themselves, I think, he dares not question.

Shri N. M. Lingam: There are more compelling facts which have got to be considered.

Shri Mathew: His own desire may be a compelling factor for my hon. friend Shri N. M. Lingam! Coming to objective considerations, he would not be able to gainsay the facts that we have urged. I also wish to point out that the Commission has not gone into this question. Somehow it seems to have escaped their attention. If they had gone into this question and suggested certain conclusions, I would have been at a disadvantage to oppose those conclusions. As a matter of fact, they have not gone into this question at all. With regard to the facts, I have abductured, I hope they will not be questioned. I think it is necessary for the Government to ascertain the facts if they are questioned. A fresh census need not be taken; these are facts which can easily be ascertained otherwise.

I do not want to go into the other points referred to by Shri Damodara Menon. With regard to Kasaragod, it should not be split up. The existence of a river need not be stressed too much. Rivers are not necessarily dividing factors. The whole of the taluk must be taken as it is. The recommendation of the S.R.C. is sound.

On the whole, we do welcome the proposed Kerala State. These little things—not little, but comparatively little when we view them against the whole background of India—must be rectified. With these observations, I would join my friends from my State in heartily welcoming the proposed new State.

Shri N. Sreekantam Nair (Quilon cum Mavelikkara): This House has been for the last 7 days hearing an echo of the storm that is raging outside about the report of the States Reorganisation Commission. Today, we have also heard it being termed a drama, the drama of India, drama of the life of India, in which our Prime Minister also played his part. Today, the part he played, it seemed to me, was the role of Sir Roger De Coverly, when he said, "much can be said on both sides." But he could not accept

language as the major consideration on which States should be reorganised. Unfortunately this is a heritage that we have received from the British. I find that the States Reorganisation Commission also have laid down this qualification. If you look at the map of Europe, you will find that the small State of Yugoslavia has got three languages adopted as the national languages. The same thing is true of Switzerland also. As has been brought to your notice by my hon. friend Shri Meghnad Saha, (*Interruption*) My hon. friend here asks me what the position is in the Soviet Union. I would like to draw his attention to the small pamphlet entitled "*How the Soviet Union is governed*" by V. Karpinsky. If he goes through this booklet, he will understand that in the Soviet Union every nationality gets its representation, irrespective of whether it is big or small. In the Soviet Union, there are union republics, autonomous regions and also national areas. It comes down to very small units, that is, States within States, with limited powers, and every nationality gets its representation.

Unfortunately the members of our States Reorganisation Commission were not trained to view the problem in that light, and they could not view the question of linguistic redistribution of States in its proper perspective because they felt that if that was agreed to, then the unity of India would be shattered.

I would like to tell this House that the unity of India is only a very recent incident. I say it is an incident, because it was really of our own making. It is true that India had a certain sense of unity, and a certain type of unity, but that unity was not a political unity. As we know from the history of India, the Indian citizens have derived their origin from at least three different races, the Aryans, the Dravidians and the Mongols. Their languages were entirely different from each other. So, it is clear that the origins of the languages are also quite

distinct. In the face of this, if you say that all of us should be governed by Hindi-speaking people and that Hindi should be driven down our throats, then that is what creates fissiparous tendencies, and parochial sentiments. I say that that is at the root of the demand for linguistic States. And that has strengthened the demand for Separation, and we are going to face this music for some time to come.

Shri Gidwani (Thana): What is the position in Russia?

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: In Russia, all the national languages are represented, and they have got their autonomous regions or autonomous republics.

Shri Gidwani: Yet, Russian is a common language for all the States. I know this, for I have been there for about twenty-five days.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: I have also been there along with the hon. Member.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi): I have also been there. Russian is a common language.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: I feel that the approach adopted by the Soviet Union with regard to the question of nationalities and languages could have solved easily our most intractable problems relating to Bombay and the Punjab State. Instead of creating a bilingual State, so far the Bombay State is concerned, if we had had several autonomous regions and national areas, then we would have been able to solve the problem, and we could have had only one State.

But now if you say that these two language areas must be balanced, with the city of Bombay incorporated in between, that is not a good thing. It is not liked by anybody. So far as the city of Bombay is concerned, I would say that the claim of the Maharashtra to the city of Bombay has to be conceded geographically, historically and also culturally. As long as they

[Shri N. Sreekantan Nair]

form the largest single unit, their claim has got to be conceded. To say that if the city of Bombay is conceded to the Maharashtrians, all the merchants who are there, whether Gujaratis or *marwaris*, would simply run away from there because it is controlled by another language group, is all wrong. I am strongly of the opinion that the Bombay city must go to the Maharashtra State.

I feel also there is no reason why the Punjabi *suba* could not be granted.

Shri N. E. Muniswamy (Wandiwash): The hon. Member has left Travancore-Cochin and come to Punjab now.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Today, the discussion is general also.

Shri Punnoose: He has migrated now.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: When I was in Amritsar, I was put up with a Congress corporator of that State. He was a protagonist of the Maha Punjab movement. But at home I heard him speak in Punjabi. I asked him, what the significance of that was. He said, "We speak in Punjabi at home, and we say we want a Hindi State, because these Sikhs have to be kept out." I say that this sort of an approach is wrong. He speaks in Punjabi at home to his wife and children, and he wants a Hindi-speaking State. This is certainly wrong.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): You have got a diary of all these things?

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: I say I have seen it myself at Amritsar. If my hon. friend Shri A. M. Thomas cannot believe it, he need not believe it.

As a matter of fact, a redistribution on the basis of the principles which have been adopted in the Soviet Union would have saved us from these complicated issues of not only Punjab and Bombay but also of Kerala.

As has been pointed out already, Kerala is a very small State. The southern taluks have from time immemorial been within the concept of Kerala. I say that from time immemorial the State of Kerala was conceived as extending from Gokarnam up to Cape Commorin or Kanyakumari as we call it, and having the Western Ghats as its boundary. In spite of this, the people of the four southernmost taluks, or at least a majority of them, say that they want separation. That is the point that has been conceded in the Report. Linguistically, there is a minority there, and they have a right to speak their language. I do not think that that right can be denied to them. Sentimentally, I shall be very happy if the majority of them would like to remain with the Kerala State. But if they do not wish to remain with the Kerala State, then I cannot stop them; it is not right for us to stop them either, for we are in a democracy. So, if they want to separate, we have to bid them good-bye in a sincere feeling of freindship. There should be no acrimonious feelings or feelings of hostility and unfriendliness.

I am sorry to say that the representations that were made by Shri Nesamony were not very friendly. I would like to point that historically, this demand for separation is against them. It was sponsored by Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer, with a view to defeating the move for responsible government. Anyhow, whatever might be the origin, we are prepared to allow them to go if they want to go. But I would earnestly solicit them not to go away from us, if that is possible.

Now, I come to Aryankavupakuthy in the Shencotta taluk, which is in the Travancore-Cochin State as it is today. At least till we come to Nanjil Nad, we have to accept the Western Ghats as the boundary and Aryankavu must go to the Kerala State. When I say this, I know there is the question of Peermede and Devicolam also.

What the Commission have stated at pages 82 and 83 of their Report requires special consideration. In this connection, I would like to draw your attention to what the Chief Minister of that State has said about this matter in the State Legislative Assembly. That is an area which has been a predominantly Tamil area according to some Tamil claimants. But the population there consists of two sections. One section consists of the tillers of the soil, the people who have gone and settled there. The majority of that section consists of Malayalees. They live there amicably and happily with their friends, the Tamil settlers, and they have been fighting there their common enemies, the wild elephants and malaria. So, they have got complete unanimity of outlook and complete agreement on many matters. So far as the Tamil workers are concerned, the system of *vazhikasu* is still prevailing there, and it is paid to the workers who come from the Tamil districts of Madras State. I would like to point out that if these workers have any special interest in that area, that interest will not be prejudiced at all, because Kerala is going to be the first Left State in India, and they are going to live with us and struggle with us for the establishment of a new order of society where they will be the rulers

Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar): Left State?

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Yes, Left-governed State.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: He means Leftist State.

3 P.M.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: I strongly refute the contention of Shri Nesamony that they are being discriminated against. As a matter of fact, what has happened is that these labourers, the Tamil labourers, have been always preferred by the employers. In spite of the fact that great unemployment exists in Travancore-Cochin, Malayali labourers were not allowed to go there because they thought that the Tamil labourers would be backward

and better from their point of view. On the other hand, when they started to fight for their own terms in a collective bargaining spirit, some of the employers attempted to bring in outside labourers. It is a fact. They have attempted to bring in Muslim labourers from Malabar who carry what is known as 'Malampuram kathi'—a sort of knife—with them. They did this to break the organisation of workers. The Travancore-Cochin Government is their own Government; the T.T.N.C. M.L.A.s are supporting it. As one of the employers who brought down these labourers from Malabar has been elected to the presidency of the village panchayat on the TTNC ticket. This shows that it is not language that is important for these employers. It shows that blood relations are not as important to them as money. Blood may be thicker than water; but money is thicker to them than both. It is the class interest of Shri Nesamony and his followers that has been instrumental in bringing in rowdy elements from Malabar. It is a most tragic and surprising fact that 300 of my colleagues have been arrested and put into jail and proceeded against because we tried to prevent the wrongful intrusion of this labour from Malabar. Shri Nesamony is supporting the Government in proceeding against us and putting us in jail. And yet he comes here and says, 'We are being prejudicially treated by the Travancore-Cochin State'. It is a very wrong statement. As has been pointed out, the best road in the State is the Trivandrum-Nagercoil road; the best irrigation works are there. If it is a credit, we started total Prohibition there. It is also a fact that compulsory education has been started only in those areas. As a matter of fact, we have given them all we could. Unfortunately, the seeds of dissension sown by Shri C. P. Ramaswamy Iyer against the movement for responsible government in the State have developed to such proportions that now they are wanting to go away from us. When I say that it may be conceded, it should not be understood to mean that the vast majority of the people are Tamil-

[Shri N. Sreekantan Nair]

speaking. They prefer Tamil; that is all. I will give you a wonderful example. The dictator of the TTNC's last agitation, Shri Kunjan Nadar, MLA, speaks only Malayalam. He does not know a word of Tamil. The speeches he has made in the Travancore-Cochin Assembly are all in Malayalam. He is the dictator of the movement for separation. I would only refer to page 531 of the Travancore-Cochin Legislative Assembly proceedings of 1952. I will quote only one line. He says:

"Sir, a Nataraja Pillayude motion *anukulikkunnu*" which means, "I support the motion moved by Shri Nataraja Pillay". He spoke in Malayalam. In the whole of his speech, there is not even one word of Tamil.

Therefore, the demand for separation is there. If they insist on it, they may go. But it will not be because they do not understand Malayalam, not because they all speak Tamil, but because they have their preference for Tamil.

But I want to make one point clear. The State of Kerala cannot exist without Devikulam and Peeramede. It will be a death sentence on the Kerala State if it is deprived of these two taluks. On this issue, we challenge any power. We will challenge anybody, whether it be the Central Government or the Madras Government, because this is a matter in which our very existence is involved. Our senior political leader, Shri C. Kesavan, ex-Minister and Congress leader, came here the other day and stated that all of us are prepared to shed the last drop of our blood to retain these two taluks with us. If the State of Kerala has to live, these two taluks have to be with us.

Shri R. N. Reddy (Nalgonda): I welcome the declaration of the Leader of the House. He has made an unequivocal declaration that the logic of the disintegration of Hyderabad should be the formation of Visal Andhra, the merging of Telangana with the Andhra area to form Visal Andhra. Still

there are certain arguments put forth by the protagonists of a separate Telangana State. I feel that they should not go unanswered.

I would not like to waste time on introduction and general things, but I would go straight to two or three arguments that have been put forward by our friends. One is the question of domination over the backward areas of Telangana by the so-called forward areas of Andhra. This argument and this propaganda is being taken to its highest limit. It is being propagated as though some Emperor from Andhra is going to invade Telangana. It is not merger of the two people that is being talked of in the propaganda. The whole problem is being posed and efforts are being made to make people misunderstand that it is some Andhra Emperor who is going to invade Telangana, to exploit them, dominate them and so on and so forth. What are the facts? Yes, Telangana is certainly backward in certain respects. But so are the Andhra areas too. Andhra State as a whole is not a forward State, nor a developed State. There are certain areas which are definitely developed, but there are certain other areas which, I should say, are not only backward but more backward than Telangana. For example, the Vizag district can be put forth as a backward district, and also the famine-ridden district of Rayalaseema. What would be the picture after Visal Andhra is formed? Out of about 20 districts of which Visal Andhra would be composed, only portions of five districts—the coastal districts,—would be developed. The entire other area would be non-developed areas or backward areas. I cannot understand this argument that the people from those five districts are going to dominate the entire backward areas of both Andhra and Telangana. I cannot understand it at all.

Now, it is posed as though something very evil is going to happen to Telangana. That is one argument and propaganda to that effect is being

carried on. Let us look at the way in which the propaganda is carried on. Goondaism is indulged in, meetings are disrupted, people are beaten—all these things are going on. Our friends might talk very innocently here. But this is what is happening in Telangana today. When I come to the people's opinion, I will deal with this matter in a greater detail.

Another argument that is being put forward is the question of viability, that Telangana is going to be a viable and prosperous State. I am not in a position to understand this argument also. The same leaders—it is not of Shri Heda or Shri Ahmad Mohiuddin that I talk of because after all Shri Heda and Shri Mohiuddin have not much connection with the Telangana movement or its people—but those leaders who have been leading the movement there for a long time—I have also had the occasion to work along with them—the same leaders who were pleading about the poverty of the Telangana people, who were pleading against the excess of taxation of the Telangana people, it is those leaders that now come and say that Telangana people are more prosperous and if Vishalandhra is formed Telangana people are going to be exploited. What are the facts? (*Interruption*) A wonderful argument is given to prove the prosperity of the Telangana State and that argument is that the *per capita* income of Government is Rs. 17 there, while the *per capita* income of Government in Andhra is only Rs. 9 and odd. This is a very fine word that has been coined, this *per capita* income of Government. To put it in plain words, it is *per capita* taxation. The fact is that it is the centuries of feudal rule in Telangana that has taxed these people very heavily and today, as Shri Ananthasayanam Ayyangar has put it, the finances appear to be much. But, it is the diseased body. It is the feudal rule of the Nizam that has put this *per capita* taxation at Rs. 17. That is why it appears to be much bloated. What are the facts? Our friends do

not say anything about the *per capita* income.

The *per capita* income of Andhra as compared to Telangana is very high. According to the figures that were given in the Legislative Assembly in Hyderabad, the *per capita* income in Andhra is about Rs. 325 while the *per capita* income in Telangana is about Rs. 250. It is more than double in Andhra.

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): It is Rs. 250 and Rs. 239.

Shri R. N. Reddy: I am referring to the figures of Shri Ramakrishna Rao's speech.

Shri Heda: He referred to the total national income.

Shri R. N. Reddy: I tell you according to facts. Shri Heda does not know facts about Telangana. An acre of wet land in Telangana costs about Rs. 250 to Rs. 1,000 and an acre of wet land in Guntur and Kistna districts costs from Rs. 5,000 to Rs. 10,000—if more figures are required by Shri Heda, I will supply him. An acre of dry land in Telangana costs from about Rs. 50 to Rs. 100 while an acre of dry land in Andhra costs between Rs. 1,000 and Rs. 1,500. These are the figures and Andhra is more prosperous than Telangana. Now, it is said that Telangana is going to be a prosperous State and a viable State. But, viability is a thing that should not be stretched too far. After all, what is viability? If I have a mere hundred rupees of income I can adjust myself in that. Even a beggar can be viable. It is a question of the future development of Telangana as a separate State. It may be that some of the Ministers who are now in the Hyderabad State may loose by this merger. But, I am sure and the Telangana people also know it that by the merger of Telangana with Andhra, it is the Telangana people that are going to gain and not the Andhra people who, it is said, are going to exploit us.

I also feel that some of the figures given by our friends are cooked up figures. There are the reports of Government. For example, the memorandum that has been submitted to

[Shri R. N. Reddy]

the SRC by the protagonists of Telangana contains certain figures which are really very objectionable. They take the income of 1951-52 and the expenditure of 1953-54, (Shri Heda: question) to prove that there is a surplus, because the income of 1951-52 was the highest and the expenditure of 1953-54 was the lowest. It is with these manipulations with these cooking up that they want to show that Telangana is a viable State.

Another thing is that these gentlemen have not taken into consideration the city of Hyderabad. The city of Hyderabad is a very big city and it is one of the most beautifully constructed cities of India. It has colleges, huge medical institutions and when Telangana is separated all these institutions go to the part of Telangana. All these huge medical institutions which exist in Hyderabad are not going to be divided. These institutions are going to exist in Hyderabad and it is Telangana that has to finance them. Out of 12 or 13 colleges that exist in the whole of Hyderabad State today, only 2 colleges go to Maharashtra and Karnataka and the other 10 or 11 colleges are going to remain in Hyderabad city or Telangana. Obviously, for a separate Telangana State it is going to be a white elephant which the State will not be able to maintain. Hyderabad is not an ordinary city. It is one of the most beautiful and one of the most expensive cities. It is the Nizam's Government that has done it so. But, these huge institutions have to be maintained. For instance, there are so many Government hospitals; the Osmania Hospital is a very huge institution. What is going to be done with this institution; are you going to close it down? There are two T.B. sanatoria; there is a Cancer hospital; all these things are there.

Shri Heda: The expenditure is accounted.

Shri R. N. Reddy: Let me say that you have not divided these things properly. You add the figures that come from the Centre and say that the in-

come of Hyderabad or Telangana is Rs. 19 crores. Mr. Chenna Reddy, the protagonist of Telangana State says that it is Rs. 17 crores and Shri Heda says it is Rs. 19 crores. If the problem is not immediately settled, it will be further increased to Rs. 30 crores or so. These are the methods.

Then there is the question of Kurnool. Money is being poured into Kurnool for the construction of the capital. How many crores are to be wasted within the next 5 or 6 years? Probably Rs. 10 crores are to be spent. For all this money we can have a project in the State. Why waste that money? Why waste crores of rupees on Kurnool when we have a ready-made capital at Hyderabad? Kurnool was only a town of 40,000 people and that has been made into the capital of Andhra State. Already some 2 or 3 crores of rupees have been spent on that and if this question is to be postponed for another 5 or 6 years.....

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

Shri R. N. Reddy: Only two minutes more, Sir.

Another point that I would like to take up is the third point, that is the question about people's opinion. It is claimed that 95 per cent. of the people are for a separate Telangana State. What are the hard facts? Shri Heda has referred to a challenge that I had thrown to Shri Chenna Reddy. It is not that I have thrown that challenge to him but it is Shri Chenna Reddy that had thrown the challenge after he returned from Rome. He said: I am ready to resign my ministerial post and contest any seat in Telangana on this issue. Shri Chenna Reddy must come forward and act up to the challenge. I am ready to resign my Parliamentary seat and I ask Shri Chenna Reddy to keep to his word. What has happened?

An Hon. Member: But the ministership may be more precious to him.

Shri R. N. Reddy: Shri Heda says that ministership may be more pre-

cious to him. If ministership is more precious to him he is not going to get his Telangana.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Chenna Reddy is not here and it is useless to throw a challenge in his absence.

Shri R. N. Reddy: That challenge has been thrown and Shri Heda has also referred to it.

What are the facts? Out of 155 people, 105 were for Vishalandhra, about 25 or so for Telangana and about 10 to 15 were Neutrals. That is the public opinion. If there is any other method of ascertaining public opinion which Shri Heda wants, we are ready to take up the challenge. Any of our communist party Member is prepared to resign his seat and contest against any other person who wants to come forward and contest on this issue.

Shri Heda: I suggested so.

Shri R. N. Reddy: I am not talking on the basis of the strength of my party alone. I am talking for a cause and on the basis of the United Front Party that would be forged for this cause. If the problem is solved in this way, there will not be much of trouble. I am sure the Leader of the House has already spoken in favour of it, without any mental reservation this time. I hope our friends will not create trouble any more for separate Telangana and fall in line with the leader of the house.

Shri Punnoose: Let them follow their leader; then there is no difficulty.

श्रीमती मण्डल पटेल (कैरा—दक्षिण):

भाज सात दिन से हम यह बहस चला रहे हैं। इस के पीछे हम सब का क्याल तो यही है कि किस तरह से लोगों को अधिक से अधिक सुख हो और किस तरह से शासन अच्छी तरह से चल सके। इसी के लिये हम सब यहां पर मेहनत कर रहे हैं। भाज कल आपस में हमारा कुछ वैमनस्य हो गया है, भाज कल प्रान्तीयता कुछ बढ़ रही है। उस प्रान्तीयता को दूर करने के लिये सरकार को मेरा यह सुझाव है कि जितनी भी केन्द्रीय सविसेज हैं,

जैसे आई० ए० एस० है, आई० पी० एस० है, जिस तरह से उन में पहले रोना था कि भाज तीर से जिस प्रान्त का भादमी हो उस को अपने प्रान्त में नहीं रक्खा जाता था, उसी तरह से भाज भी करना चाहिये। साथ साथ मेरा यह भी सुझाव है कि इस समय जब बाज प्रान्तों में आपस में ही एक प्रकार का भविष्यवात हो गया है तब नजदीक के या बगल के भादमियों को भी सविसेज में न रक्खा जाये। दक्षिण के भादमी उत्तर में रक्खे जायें और उत्तर के दक्षिण में। ऐसा करने से भाज जो एक और क्याल हमारा है कि दक्षिण के लोग उत्तर की भाषा सीखें और उत्तर के लोग दक्षिण की भाषा सीखें, वह भी प्रासानी से पूरा हो जायेगा और सविसेज वाले लोग भी निर्भयता से अपना काम कर सकेंगे। उन के ऊपर किसी प्रकार का आक्षेप नहीं आयेगा कि किसी की किसी की तरफ से खींचातानी हो रही है।

आखिर हम को यह सब उन्हीं लोगों के लिये तो करना है जो देहात में रहते हैं, उन्हीं के कष्ट दूर करने के लिये सारा प्रयत्न किया जा रहा है न कि शहर वालों के लिये। हमारे यहां शहर तो समुद्र में एक बूंद जितने हैं। अधिकतर तो हमारा देश देहातों से ही भरा है। ऐसी परिस्थिति में हमें यह सोचना है कि देहात वालों का काम किस तरह से प्रासानी से हो। भाज जो लोग हिन्दी का विरोध कर रहे हैं और जिन का कभी कभी यहां जिक्र होता है, उन से भी मेरा यही कहना है कि अगर आप उत्तर प्रदेश की हिन्दी नहीं चाहते हैं, ऐसी राष्ट्रीय हिन्दी चाहते हैं जिस को आप प्रासानी से समझ सकें तो हिम्मत कर के कम से कम मेरे जैसी टूटी फटी हिन्दी बोलना तो आरम्भ कीजिये। तभी जैसी हिन्दी आप चाहते हैं वैसी हिन्दी बन सकेगी। भाज चार साल से हम यहां लोक सभा के लिये आते हैं, इतने समय के बाद भी अगर

[श्रीमती मणिबेन पटेल]

हम कहें कि हम हिन्दी नहीं समझते तब तो हमें ऐसा ही मानना चाहिये कि हम हिन्दी समझने का और सीखने का प्रयत्न ही नहीं करना चाहते हैं, नहीं तो इतने समय बाद इस तरह कहना मेरी समझ में नहीं आ सकता। मुझे पूरा भरोसा है और विश्वास है कि कुछ साल बाद दक्षिण के लोग उत्तर के लोगों से भी ज्यादा अच्छी और शुद्ध हिन्दी बोलने लग जायेंगे क्योंकि वहां की बहनें और युवक वर्ग आज इतने उत्साह से हिन्दी पढ़ रहे हैं कि यहां आने वाले जो हमारे माननीय सदस्य यह डर अपने मन में रखते हैं कि हिन्दी जानने वाले उन से आगे बढ़ जायेंगे, उस को कोई स्थान नहीं रहेगा।

सरकार से मेरा एक और सुझाव भी है। हर एक प्रांत के बीच में जो सरहदों की बांटे हैं, जो कि बार्डर एरियाज हैं, उन के बारे में तय करते समय गवर्नमेन्ट को किसी के दबाव में नहीं आना चाहिये, न किसी के डिमान्डेशन से या धमकी से डरना ही चाहिये, न किसी प्रभावशाली व्यक्ति के कहने से उस की ओर खिंचना चाहिये। हम लोगों को यह सोच कर अपना निर्णय करना चाहिये कि किस तरह से जो सरहद पर रहने वाले लोग हैं, उन को किसी जगह रखने से उन का रोज बरोज का काम आसानी से चल सकेगा और किस तरह से उन को कम से कम तकलीफ होगी। इस को देख कर उन को निर्णय करना चाहिये कि कहां डालने के आदिवासियों को सब से ज्यादा सुविधा होगी। कुछ ऐसी जगहें भी हो सकती हैं जहां स्वयम् जाने पर ही इस बात की पूरी कल्पना हो सकती है कि वहां के लोगों को कहां डालना चाहिये, उन को किस प्रदेश में डाला जाय जिस से उन को ज्यादा से ज्यादा आसानी रहे।

राज्य पर आती हूं, यहां पर हमारे महाराष्ट्री भाई यह आप्रह कर रहे हैं कि बम्बई उन को ही मिलना चाहिये। आप का यह आप्रह ठीक हो सकता है, लेकिन मैं पूछना और समझना चाहती हूं कि आखिर जो लोग बम्बई में रहते हैं उन का भी तो आप्रह हो सकता है कि वह आप के साथ आना चाहते हैं या नहीं। आप को सोचना चाहिये कि जैसे आप का आप्रह है, आप की जिद है, आप की वीलिंग है, वैसे ही उन लोगों को भी तो अपनी बात कहने और अपनी राय रखने का अधिकार है। आखिर उन की राय का उन के भविष्य के साथ कोई सम्बन्ध है या नहीं, उनको अपनी इच्छा के अनुसार कहीं भी जाने की इजाजत होनी चाहिये या नहीं। यह तो खैर आज की बात हो रही है, लेकिन मैं आज से कुछ साल पहले की बात बतलाती हूं। आज बम्बई पर महाराष्ट्र अपना हक क्लेम करने लगा है, नहीं तो जब से कांग्रेस में साल भर देश में काम करना शुरू किया और इस के लिये हर एक जगह पर कांग्रेस कमेटी बनाई गई तभी से बम्बई शहर की और महाराष्ट्र की कांग्रेस कमेटी अलग अलग बनाई गई थीं। उस समय किसी महाराष्ट्री ने नहीं कहा कि बम्बई शहर की कांग्रेस कमेटी अलग नहीं हो सकती है और उस को महाराष्ट्र में ही आना चाहिये। इस लिये मेरा कहना यह है कि आज महाराष्ट्र का बम्बई पर अपना दावा दिखलाना उचित और योग्य नहीं है।

यहां पर हमारे ऊपर यह भी आक्षेप किया गया कि महाराष्ट्र ने नानमहाराष्ट्री को यहां भेजा है लेकिन गुजरात की तरफ से कहीं भी इतनी उदारता दिखलाई गई है कि किसी महाराष्ट्रियन को भेजा गया हो? बात यह है कि आप को तो इस बात का खयाल है, कांशसनेस है, लेकिन हम को तो ऐसी कोई

बात लगती ही नहीं है कि यह गुजराती है और यह नानगुजराती है। यहां लोक सभा में हमारे नन्दा जी हैं और हमारे अध्यक्ष हम को कभी भी ऐसा नहीं लगा कि इन में से एक पंजाबी है और दूसरा महाराष्ट्रियन है। बल्कि हमें तो गर्व है कि हम ने ऐसे प्रतिनिधि भेजे हैं जो हमारा नाम ऊंचा कर रहे हैं। हम ने एक ऐसा प्रतिनिधि भेजा है जो कि यहां का स्पीकर हो कर हमारी शान को बढ़ा रहा है और इतना अच्छा पार्लियामेन्टेरियन है। हमें कभी भी ऐसा नहीं लगा कि यह लोग गुजराती नहीं हैं। आज भी हमारे अहमदाबाद कारपोरेशन में कांग्रेस पक्ष की ओर से एक महाराष्ट्री बहन तो हैं ही। जब बम्बई राज्य का पहला चुनाव हुआ था उस समय हमारे यहां के स्पीकर हमारी लोक सभा के आज के स्पीकर ही बनाये गये थे और एक और सदस्य हम ने महाराष्ट्रियन भेजा था। तो हम को तो कभी भी इस तरह का खयाल आता ही नहीं है। यहां यह भी कहा गया है कि बम्बई में कोई मीटिंग हुई और उस के बाद सारा चक्कर चला। मेरा कहना तो यह है कि हम जब गुजरात प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमिटी की ओर से कमिशन से पहली बार मिले थे तभी हम ने कहा था कि हमारे दिल में भरोसा है कि अगर लार्जर इंट्रिस्ट्स में कम्पोसिट स्टेट रहेगी तब भी हम लोगों को समझा सकेंगे और तभी हम लोगों को अपने साथ ले सकेंगे। यदि कोई बहुमत में आता है तो भी हम इस में कोई नुकसान नहीं समझते हैं। इस से कोई नुकसान होने वाला नहीं है। यदि दूसरे लोग कम भी होंगे तब भी काम ठीक तरह से चल सकता है लेकिन जो सब से बड़ी बात है वह यह है कि हमारे दिलों में एक दूसरों पर भरोसा होना चाहिए। कमिशन की रिपोर्ट के आने के बाद भी जब महाराष्ट्र प्राविशाल कांग्रेस कमेटी ने प्रस्ताव पास किया उस के बाद ही हम ने अहमदाबाद में गुजरात प्रदेश कांग्रेस

कमेटी की ओर से एक प्रस्ताव पास करवाया कि ऐसी हालत में जब वह साथ रहना चाहते नहीं हैं तो हम किसी को जबरदस्ती रखना चाहते नहीं हैं।

वह भी कहा गया कि जो पिछले महीने बम्बई में दुखद प्रसंग बने उन के बारे में केन्द्रीय सरकार जांच करे। यह बहुत अच्छी बात है और मुझे इस में कोई एतराज नहीं है। परन्तु मैं बताना चाहती हूँ कि जिन्होंने यह मांग की है वह मेरे पास आये थे यहां पर मेरी सीट पर इस के दो तीन दिन बाद और उन्होंने मुझ से कहा कि 'जितना कुछ अखबारों में छपा है उतना नहीं हुआ है बल्कि थोड़ा हुआ है। जो कुछ हुआ बुरा हुआ। परन्तु हमारे हाथ से बात चली गई,' यह उनके शब्द थे। यदि जांच करवानी हो तो बड़ी खुशी से कराये, इस में मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है।

मैं एक बात और भी कहना चाहती हूँ। वह यह है कि यहां सदन के अन्दर शायद दो चार सदस्य इस बात को जानते हैं कि सौराष्ट्र बम्बई राज्य में शामिल होने को तैयार था और यह चीज करीब करीब तय भी हो गई थी और तारीख भी तय हो गई थी। इस के लिए १९४८ के आखिर में या शुरू में, साल मुझे अच्छी तरह से याद नहीं है, सौराष्ट्र के मुख्य मंत्री इस की details तय करने के लिये बम्बई के मुख्य मंत्री से मिलने जाने वाले थे। परन्तु उस समय महाराष्ट्र का यह प्राग्रह हुआ कि मराठवाड़ा भी साथ मिलाया जाए। उस वक्त मराठवाड़ा साथ मिलाया नहीं जा सकता था। केवल कबनेट पर दस्तखत करने से काम नहीं चलता है। बहुत सी लूज स्ट्रिंग्स तिके up करनी बाकी थीं। उस समय हैदराबाद का काम भी काफी बाकी था। उस वक्त विदर्भ की बात नहीं थी। आज नई बात विदर्भ

[श्रीमति मणिबेन पटेल]

की भी हो रही है। यह बात भी मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहती थी।

मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि जो कुछ भी करना है वह सद्भाव से हमें करना चाहिए, महोदय से करना चाहिए, दूसरों के दिल में भरोसा पैदा कर के करना चाहिए न कि जोर जबरदस्ती से, अविश्वास की भावना पैदा कर के। जोर जबरदस्ती से कोई भी काम नहीं हो सकता है। कल भी हम ने देखा है कि महाराष्ट्र प्राविशाल कांग्रेस कमेटी के अध्यक्ष ने दूसरे हाउस में यही कहा है कि जो राज्य पुनर्गठन पंच की रिपोर्ट है वह हम को मान्य नहीं है और हम उस को मानते नहीं हैं। ऐसी सूरत में सिवाय कि जो कांग्रेस बकिंग कमेटी ने कहा है उस को हम मान लें और कोई चारा नहीं है। परन्तु मैं फिर कहती हूँ कि हम जो कुछ भी करें उस के अन्दर लोगों का ख्याल रखें और किसी प्रकार का भी द्वेष बैरभाव दिलों में हम पैदा न होने दें और जो देश की हया है उस को हम न बिगाड़ें। इतनी मेरी सब से प्रार्थना है।

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi): The Report of the States Reorganisation Commission is such a controversial matter that I had thought I would keep quiet. But I find that every State that is being affected by the recommendations of this Commission is strongly voicing its opinion about the recommendations. I represent Delhi and as a representative of Delhi, if I keep quiet, I would be failing in my duty to the State of Delhi.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): Do we represent here particular States or the whole of India?

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: We have a dual capacity. We represent both. The members of the Commission were able and impartial men who worked very hard to produce a fair report. If the recommendations had been accepted *in toto* and no changes

had been made, I too would have kept quiet. I would have asked the citizens of Delhi to accept it in the larger interest of the country but I find that even the Congress has announced that the broad principles of the Report would be accepted but as far as details are concerned, they can be changed and reconsidered. Under the circumstances I do not see any reason why the fate of Delhi should not be reconsidered.

One of the objects of the States Reorganisation Commission was to examine objectively and dispassionately the question of reorganisation of States in the Indian Union so that the welfare of the people of each constituent unit as well as that of the nation as a whole may be promoted. I suppose it means that we have to look to the security of India, the unity and solidarity of India as a whole as well as to protect the right of self-determination of each unit. Examining from this point of view we will have to see whether the interest of Delhi has been safeguarded and whether the welfare of the people of Delhi will be protected by the recommendations of the SRC. I feel that by its recommendation Delhi's future is going to be very badly affected. Delhi is going to lose its democratic set up. We are going to lose the status of a State. Our people will be disenfranchised. In the place of the legislature, we are going to be given a Corporation and that too with very limited powers. Therefore, I feel that Delhi is not being dealt with fairly.

While recommending the abolition of Part C States, the Commission has said that they would be merged with the neighbouring States. These C States, which are going to be merged with the neighbouring States will fare better than Delhi in a way because the citizens of these former C States will have a right to exercise their franchise in the local legislatures; they will have right to elect members and thus express themselves and draw attention to their problems in the local legislatures. What is going to happen to Delhi which was also a Part C State with very limited powers? Delhi suffered for the privi-

lege of having the capital of India located here to. We are now going to be relegated to the status of a Territory; it is not even a State. I would refer you to page 204 of this Report. (Interruptions). I feel very disturbed by the noise here.

On page 204, the list of the re-organised States is given. Delhi does not feature in the first list; it features along with Territories—Delhi, Manipur, and Andaman and Nicobar islands.

I would like to draw your attention to certain facts. Andaman Nicobar islands—there the population is about 30,000. Manipur has a population of a little less than six lakhs. Delhi's population is 17.50 lakhs.

An Hon. Member: Now it is twenty lakhs.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: Here it is given as 17.50 lakhs. But it is growing every day and it is about twenty lakhs now. You know Andaman started as a penal settlement. I am pained to see that Delhi after so many years should have the privilege of being treated in the same manner as the Andaman and Nicobar Island! Even in the small State of Manipur which is situated at the extreme end of our country the people have been agitating for democratic Government. Satyagraha was going on for months together, and I myself had an occasion to speak from the floor of this House demanding that democratic set-up should be established in Manipur and that the people of Manipur should have the right of self-determination. At that time I never thought, I never imagined that only a few months after I will have to come before you and plead for Delhi. I thought Delhi had a much higher status and I never could imagine that Delhi was going to the relegated to this kind of position by the recommendation of the S.R.C.

Then, with regard to the question of the administration of Delhi they say that Delhi will be administered as under sections 94 and 95 of the Government of India Act of 1935. I would like to draw your atten-

tion to section 96 of the Government of India Act, 1935. Under this section the President was given certain regulation making powers. Regulation making powers for which State? For the Andamans, islands, for a little place which started its life as a penal settlement. In respect of that State only such powers were given to the President under the Government of India Act 1935. The same powers are now being given to the President in respect of Delhi. Delhi is thus being relegated to the position of the penal settlement. I say it is an insult to the citizens of Delhi. Delhi has old political traditions, Delhi has a very proud place in the history of India and today they have thought it fit to relegate Delhi to this inferior status.

Then, one of the arguments that the members of the Commission have put forward for abolishing Part C States is that—I am now quoting the Report; on page 75 it says:

“Political institutions and political consciousness have been of recent origin in most of the States.”

Hence it is lacking in leadership and ability to shoulder the responsibility of self government. Therefore, they say that 'C' States should be abolished. Now, I ask you in all fairness: does it apply to Delhi? Has political consciousness and political institution come to Delhi recently? Delhi has been the capital from ancient times. It has an enduring political tradition. Then, in recent years during the freedom struggle, what part has Delhi played? It has played a very glorious and brave part in the freedom struggle. Even today if you go and visit the cells of Red Fort you will find eloquent testimony of the sacrifice of our young men. I remember, the reports we recovered in 1942 of the tortures inflicted on our young men in the cells of the Red Fort.

Then, as for leadership I am surprised that now some people are thinking it fit to say that Delhi is lacking in leadership. Delhi provided leadership to the whole of India. Is it necessary to repeat the names of the

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

leaders of Delhi. Hakim Ajmal Khan, Dr. Ansari, Shri Asaf Ali, Shri Mohammed Ali, Shri Shaukat Ali, Deshbandhu Gupta were all leaders produced by Delhi. Then among women leaders we had Satyawati, Aruna Asaf Ali and many others. Today we are told that Delhi is lacking in talent and leadership. It is indeed very surprising. The ruling party in Delhi today may be lacking in leadership and talent but if the ruling party in Delhi today is lacking in leadership and talent that is not our fault. I know that Delhi Administration has not made a very good record. Its record has been very disappointing. Delhi administration had been rent with factions and fights but that too is not the unique of the Delhi administration. The same things are seen in other Congress administrations but it was not thought fit to deprive them of a democratic set-up and bring them under the administration of the Centre. In all fairness I would also say that the Delhi Congress leaders who were responsible for the administration of Delhi suffered from certain handicaps. As Delhi was given very limited powers it suffered from the handicaps of having too many conflicting authorities.

Then again, supposing that the Congress High Command today think that in Delhi Congress leadership is lacking; whose fault is it? It is not our fault and for their faults, for their fights, for their inefficiencies the whole of Delhi is being penalised; the Delhi people are being disfranchised I would say that the Delhi Congress is lacking in leadership today the All India Congress leaders should be careful in selecting people next time. I would like to advise the All India Congress leaders that next time for the elections when they are selecting candidates they should not select candidates for caste and other considerations. Do not select a Jat because he would collect all the Jat votes. Do not select a Bania because he would get all the Bania votes. Select such people who

have got administrative ability and who can in future deliver the goods. If that is done, sufficient talent and sufficient leadership will be found in Delhi.

Delhi, had to struggle very hard to get a democratic form of Government. I remember those days in 1951 when the Government of India Part C States Bill was being discussed here Deshbandhu Gupta fought very hard. If you refer to the report you will see that for hours together he spoke eloquently pleading that Delhi should get a democratic form of Government. He spoke of its history and tradition. I had an intention of quoting from his speech but I know that very little time has been given to me and so I would not do so. He said in his speech that in 1928 the struggle started and subsequently a Committee was appointed. Then again in 1930-1932 at the Round Table Conference the claim was set forth. He says, that even the father of the Nation blessed the idea that Delhi should become an autonomous State. Lastly, in 1947 when the Pattabhi Committee was appointed, the Pattabhi Committee gave a unanimous report that Delhi should get a democratic set-up. This is what they say—I would just like to quote a few words:

"We are fully alive to the circumstances which led to the formation of Delhi Province in 1912. We also recognise the special importance of Delhi as the capital of the Federation. We are of the opinion that the people of the province which contains the metropolis of India should not be deprived of the right of self-determination enjoyed by the rest of their countrymen living in the smallest of villages."

The right that you have given to the smallest of villages you are denying to Delhi. I, therefore, stand to protest against it.

Then, repeatedly the Congress by their manifestos and resolutions have asserted this adherence to the prin-

principle of self-determination. I will just quote a few words from a resolution of 1938. Here they say:

"The Congress is not opposed to the idea of Federation; but a real federation must even apart from the question of responsibility, consist of free units enjoying more or less the same measure of freedom and civil liberty and represented by the democratic process of election."

Are you not denying that to Delhi today? What has happened? Why is it that the gear is being reversed and Delhi is being relegated to the constitutional status of a penal settlement? The reason is being given is that as Delhi is capital of the India Federation the Central Government should have certain control over it. I can understand certain safeguards being imposed so that the Central Government may have a little more on the administration of Delhi. But, why deny the constitutional set-up? Why take away the legislature? Why take away the Self Government? In defence of this stand, the examples of Washington and Canberra have been quoted. Washington and Canberra are quite different from Delhi. They came into existence as Government capitals, as governmental colonies. Delhi did not come into existence because we made it the capital of the Indian federation. It has an old history, it has an old tradition, it has its own place in the industry and trade of this country. It is one of the distributing trade centres of India. It has a life of its own.

Then take the question of population. We have about 20 lakhs of people in Delhi. Out of them how many are intimately and closely connected with the Government? I know it better than most of you because I happen to represent New Delhi. I know that in my constituency there are 43,000 Government employees; at the most you can say that there are 50,000 government servants. Let us take the diplomatic corps and other people and say that altogether there are 55,000 people who are intimately concerned with the

Government. The rest are ordinary normal citizens carrying on their ordinary normal avocations. You are denying these people of their right to have a hand in the administration, to have the right of self-government. For what reason?

Then, in the recent years because of the partition very many people from West Pakistan have come to Delhi. Who are the people who have come to Delhi? What is the type of people who have come to Delhi? The highest legal leaders have come to Delhi, the topmost-medical people have come to Delhi, top ranking educationalists have come to Delhi. The cream of West Pakistan is here today. It is to these people, to these intellectuals and other people that you want to deny the right of having a hand in the administration? I say with all the emphasis I can command that the administrative and legislative problems of Delhi regarding trade, industry, labour, rehabilitation and taxation cannot be solved by a Corporation. A Corporation can only deal with civic matters.

Then, you know more than I, how much time this Parliament can devote to Delhi affairs. You know for the last three days I have been trying to speak but it was thought that as I am representing Delhi which is a small area about which there is nothing much to speak I must not be given time. Shall we get the time to pass the enactments that Delhi needs? Probably you do not know that in Delhi nearly 143 Acts of other States have been promulgated. They are the Acts of Punjab and Uttar Pradesh which are promulgated here. Why? Because Delhi did not have a legislature. Many of these laws passed for other States and which have been promulgated for the Delhi State need to be amended, to suit the requirements of Delhi. But will the Parliament have time for all that work. If there is a local legislature, then that legislature will be able to cope with the legislative needs of the State. Otherwise, these acts cannot be passed. You are a Member of the Business Advisory Committee. You know

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

what difficulties we have in the Business Advisory Committee. How much time you will be able to give for the purpose of Delhi affairs, I would like to know. There would be other local and administrative matters and questions which would need to be raised on the floor of this House but will Parliament have the time? Though the Delhi Government may not have functioned so well, the Delhi legislature has done good work to expose so many things, for example, the scandal of the Grain Syndicate, the scandal about the police officers, spending about Rs. 18,000 extra petrol the DTS contracts scandal etc. They have been exposed, and by the exposure of these scandals, the administration has had a chance to improve. Do you think we shall have the time, this Parliament shall have the time to discuss such questions of Delhi and for raising such matters about Delhi?

Mr. Chairman: Please finish soon.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: I plead for two minutes more. I am trying to go as fast as I can. Then, it is said that C States must be abolished because they are dependent on the Centre, for finance, that they are not viable, etc. I have here a pamphlet issued by no less an authority than the Delhi Congress Committee. It says that on the democratic set up in Delhi with a legislature, Ministry and other things, the total expenditure is Rs. 7 lakhs. It works out to four annas per head per annum. By spending that much amount, we have a legislature in Delhi, we have a democratic set-up. On another page of the same pamphlet, they say that for the last three years, the Centre has given to Delhi, for administrative purposes, a sum of Rs. 26 lakhs. As there is no time, I do not want to quote what Shri Deshbandhu Gupta said in August, 1951, most eloquently. He showed in his speech that extra expenditure on to the police administration which was Rs. 12 lakhs in 1937-38 and which increased to Rs. 126 lakhs in 1951 was due to the capital city. Certain extra security arrangements had to be made

in the capital. The normal requirements of Delhi State could not exceed Rs. 25 lakhs. Then, if Delhi gets its proper share from income-tax, excise, etc. I am sure it can be a viable unit and that Delhi can manage its own expenses quite well. For all these reasons, I do not see that there is proper ground for abolishing the democratic set-up of Delhi.

We are told that an advisory committee will do the work of the legislature. I have been a member of all sorts of advisory committees, and I can frankly say that I hate to function on such committees. An advisory committee is no substitute for a democratic Government and therefore, I strongly plead that Delhi should have a democratic Government. We want the demand of the Delhi citizens to be met. The demands of the Delhi citizens are that the boundary of the Delhi State should be increased within a radius of 20 to 25 miles. Places like Faridabad, Gurgaon, etc. should be incorporated in Delhi. Let me not be misunderstood. I am expressing the views of the people of these areas who have passed such a resolution and have expressed their desire to come within Delhi.

Mr. Chairman: Then you are depriving those new areas of the rights of franchise.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: No. They have expressed a desire to come within Delhi. Secondly, for all practical purposes they are all in Delhi, because they are earning their livelihood in Delhi. Thousands of people come here every day and work for their livelihood. Delhi buses run on those routes. So, those areas are really parts of Delhi. Therefore, they should be incorporated in Delhi.

Then, I refer to the Corporation. This is also a very serious matter. Even the Corporation that is proposed to be given will have very limited power. The Corporation will not have control over the statutory bodies like the Delhi Improvement Trust, Delhi Water and Sewage Board, the Delhi Electricity Supply Board, etc. I had an occasion to speak once before on these

matters and so I do not want to prolong the time now. Even if we get a Corporation, these bodies are going to remain independent and some sort of advisory committee will be set up under the Corporation too.

Then take New Delhi. It is going to be outside the scope of the Corporation. Even if you form the Corporation, it should have New Delhi as well as all these bodies under it so that at least in civic matters, Delhi can function properly. Therefore, with all the emphasis at my command, I protest against the denial of the rights of self-determination to the people of Delhi who are advanced, progressive because Delhi has an urban population of 82 per cent of Delhi.

Shri Tulsidas (Mehsana West): I thank you for the opportunity you have given me to enable me to speak on this Report. There have been so many points raised during all these days and so many differences have been made out between one State and another, that I need not repeat any of them. Today, in the morning, the Prime Minister told us that the Member of Parliament is not only a Member of this House but also of the whole of India. I would like to remind the House here of what an eminent politician—Edmund Burke—said in the 18th century. He said that the legislators belong to the entire country and represent the entire mass of people, no matter to what State or province they belong, no matter to any area or constituency they represent. He said that it is the legislators' great and honoured task to see that whatever they say on the floor of the House is not said as if it is by a resident of a province in a particular area but as citizens of the entire country first and last. So, I do not wish to dwell on those aspects.

The point that I would like to make is that we, as Members of this House, have the right to criticise the Report of the Commission which had been appointed by the Government. We should analyse the Report critically and come to a conclusion whether we can approve this as a proper document which could settle the issues which are at

present facing the country. Let us examine this Report in that light. If we examine this Report, we will find that it has not got that consistency in the sense that the people would like. They have recommended a State which will have 76 lakhs of population and they have also recommended a State which will have about six crores of population, that is, a population which is nearly seven times that of the smallest State. They have also suggested certain transfers of areas. We find that the ratio of disparity will be 1:11 between the smallest State of Kerala which has an area of about 15,000 sq. miles and the largest State of Madhya Pradesh which has an area of 171,000 sq. miles. You will observe from that that, no matter what the Commission or any Commission for that matter may do towards the division of India, it is not possible to make divisions in a consistent manner, because one has to take into consideration not only the question of language but also the question of history, economics and so on. In coming to that conclusion, the Commission has given, in my opinion, a Report which cannot be considered as a logical or a perfect Report, but a Report which is a fair compromise between all difficult issues and which has balanced all the factors in the best way possible. I am not going to say, however, that we should not criticise the Report. There are minor points here or there and we shall certainly find out what are those points and how to decide them, and they naturally pertain to particular areas which, if not decided, would give rise to unnecessary controversies. I do not wish to go into the question of the different States because I am afraid I am not competent enough to give my opinions with regard to the recommendations on the different States. But I do want to bring one point to the notice of the House. Our neighbouring country—Pakistan—is now trying to make one united unit on the western side, besides the united unit on the eastern side. But we in this country are trying to create more and more units. The Commission has recommended a lesser number of units; but still, we do not think in terms of

[Shri Tulsidas]

remaining together. We do not think of pooling our resources and even intellectual ideas together and living as citizens of one country. Unless we do that, it is not possible for us to think in terms of the country as a whole. In our country, not only are the languages not common, but even in dress and food, we are not common. We have got to be common in some respects. Unless at least some common things are there, how are we to remain as citizens of one country?

4 P.M.

There are different angles from which we can look at the SRC Report. One aspect I would like to point out is that the Commission has recommended at least two States which will have a bi-lingual area and which will mean that people who are linguistically different will be living and working together. I do not think in Punjab the language is different; there is difference only in the script. The spoken language is the same. With regard to Gujarat and Maharashtra also, in my opinion, there is not much difference in language. They are speaking practically the same language, excepting a little bit of difference here and there, which of course will be found everywhere. But the important fact is that the Commission has placed in my opinion, a feather in the cap of the Bombay people. They have said that Bombay is the only State in which people can live together, though it is bi-lingual. It is only that point of view which the people of Bombay should not run away from. The Commission has realised that this is the only State where different language groups can remain together. For years together they have lived there happily. In fact, I would like the Bombay State to remain as it is today. The people in Bombay State have lived as one family and it is but proper to allow the State to continue as it is today. I do not mind if different linguistic groups now living in Bombay bring as much area as possible from their own language-speaking areas and add it to Bombay. Let it become as big as possible. But

why should we interfere with a State which has proved to be one of the happy families living together and has made such enormous progress? The Commission also has considered that it has been the most progressive and efficient State. So, I am suggesting that Bombay State should remain as it is today.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): Without Saurashtra.

Shri Tulsidas: I do not wish to be interrupted; my friend, Mr. Deshpande, has had his own say. I said, I don't mind the different linguistic groups in Bombay bringing in as much area as possible from their own States. The point has been made that people of Bombay State living in different linguistic areas have different approaches to this problem. Particularly, my friends from Maharashtra have said that they have been suffering all these years. I do not understand this. I cannot understand suffering coming from only one side. I would like to invite my friends from Maharashtra to come to my constituency and see whether there is one road to speak of and whether there is any irrigation to mention.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): What about bank accounts?

Shri Tulsidas: I would come to that point. My friend Mr. More is always enamoured of bank accounts; but, I am afraid he has not got the capacity to keep bank accounts. We cannot help it. That apart, I am not complaining that my constituency has got no roads or no irrigation. I only request my friends to come to my constituency and see things. There is lack of even drinking water in villages, because there is no river. We have got one river, Banas river, but it has its source in Abu taluk, which also the neighbouring State wants to take away. Look at the plight of Gujarat. Rajasthan is a huge State in my opinion and this little Abu taluk has nothing by way of any asset. The only point is its economy and it is most vital for North Gujarat. Even that is now being taken away. Again, I am not complaining, if Rajasthan

wants a little more area, because the same language is spoken there. But, if you see it from the point of view of economy, it is of vital necessity to North Gujarat, whereas it is not of very much importance to Rajasthan. I do not understand the logic of the Commission in giving Abu taluk to Rajasthan. Even in the reasons given by them, there is no logic. For instance, Bellary taluk has been given over to Andhra. The reason is that it is vitally important to Andhra. Manbhum has been given to Bengal, though it is not entirely a linguistic area belonging to Bengal. But still the Commission have recommended it because of the economic benefit to Bengal. But, in the case of Abu, they have taken a different view. That is not logic. There is no proper co-ordination, because even a vital area like Abu has been handed over to Rajasthan because of this linguistic fanaticism. They say even a small portion of it must not remain outside. That is the point I wanted to make.

I will come to the other aspect, namely, the question of the Bombay city. I may point out in the very beginning that I come from Gujarat. But as a Bombay man, I would prefer the Bombay city to be the capital of a very big State. It has its importance as the capital of a big State. Even today it is the nerve-centre of the entire country. I have no doubt that the people of the city have got a tremendous power of resistance. They can withstand any difficulty. But, certainly I can point out as a Bombay man that if it is given even to Maha Gujarat or to Maharashtra or to any uni-lingual province, it will lose all its importance. Whatever importance it has today is due to the fact that it is cosmopolitan and multi-lingual. Even the Prime Minister has said today that it is the only city where there are schools for 14 languages. The importance of Bombay city is not only from that point of view. Take the employment potential of Bombay city. The employment potential of Bombay city is so

great. Apart from the fact that about 20 per cent of the entire population belong to the labour or working class, nearly 75 per cent. of the population belong to the lower middle-class, middle-class or upper middle-class. There are 5 lakhs of "Uttar Bharatias"—we understand them like that—who belong mostly to the middle-class. We have got 2 lakhs of South Indians. They are white-collared workers. There are also small middle class merchants. There are also about 4½ lakhs of Gujaratis. About 80 or 90 per cent. of the Gujaratis are also small traders, small merchants, who live there, who work there and they are really the people who make the Bombay city a very cosmopolitan one; not only the Gujaratis, but all these people. The question is what will happen to these people who number more than a million, small traders, milkmen, labourers, all sorts of people, if it goes to a unilingual State.

Acharya Kripalani: Nothing. You have to divide your money bags with the Maharashtrians.

Shri Tulsidas: I have respect for Acharya Kripalani. I do not want to pay him back in the same way. Every time this question of reorganisation of States and policy questions come up, it is said, there are rich people, it is only by reorganisation of States that we will have a different sort of society. A socialistic pattern of society has been accepted by the country. It will take care of itself. If there are the richer classes, and if an egalitarian society is to be formed, the socialistic pattern of society will take care of it. Reorganisation of States or language will not take care of that. It is the pattern of society, it is the pattern of the State that would take care of this. Therefore, if my hon. friend Shri S. S. More is still—I do not want to use the word jealous—because he has not the capacity—it is for him to get into power and form his society.

Shri S. S. More: I contest the statement that we have not the capacity to save ourselves from exploitation.

Shri Tulsidas: It is not a question of exploitation. You have to work hard before you can do that.

I wish to point out one or two other aspects. Apart from the facts which I have already explained, there is another important aspect. Bombay city is the nerve centre of India. We have got three oil refineries. We have a naval dockyard. We have a Port Trust doing an enormous amount of work. Whenever any loans are floated by the Government of India, 80 per cent. or at least 65 or 70 per cent. of the loans are subscribed in Bombay. You know very well, everybody knows, that if anywhere any calamity occurs, the Bombay people are the first to be approached and it is only the Bombay people who pay and not others. That is the cosmopolitan character of Bombay. Whether it is Maharashtra, whether it is Bengal, or any other place, a Bombay man will not get from any other place, but everybody will get in Bombay. That is the special case of Bombay. That should not be disturbed because it has got this cosmopolitan attitude, it has this broad-mindedness. It should remain as the capital of a multilingual State. The Commission has come to this conclusion because it realised its importance. It found that, whoever may claim, Bombay cannot belong to anybody else, it belongs to the whole of India and therefore, it should remain the capital of a multi-lingual State. If, according to the decision of the Congress Working Committee, the Bombay State is to be divided into three units, in my opinion, it would be a cold-blooded murder of the most important State. Because of what? Because—my hon. friend Shri S. S. More cannot resign—a few politicians—it is not the people of Maharashtra, it is not the people of Bombay—who want to get into power, who are playing power politics, want this. It is they who want a separate State. It is not the people of Bombay that want any separation. I feel people realise this. The other day, I heard Shri Gadgil saying that it will be de-

ecided in the streets of Bombay. I would like him to fight the issue in the Bombay city in an election. Let him stand in Bombay city.

Shri Bogawat (Ahmednagar South): The Corporation defeat has shown that.

Shri Tulsidas: He will be defeated badly.

Shri S. S. More: Are you prepared to resign and contest against him?

Shri Tulsidas: Yes. That is right.

Some Hon. Members: Both of you resign.

Shri Tulsidas: Bombay city is an important city. Today, what is happening? We have got forces pulling all over the country. This is a very important issue. It has not only affected Bombay or the Bombay State; it has affected the entire country. If Bombay is disturbed, the whole country is disturbed to my mind.

Shri Bogawat: Not disturbed at all.

Shri Tulsidas: That will have to be taken into consideration. Bombay city will have to remain as an entirely different category from other cities. I heard it said the other day that if this claim is accepted, everybody will make this claim. I want to know one city in the whole of India which has got this cosmopolitan character. In Calcutta, 70 per cent. of the population is unilingual; in Madras 70 per cent. unilingual. Let anybody say that there is any other city which is as cosmopolitan as Bombay.

An Hon. Member: Bangalore.

Shri Tulsidas: I do not think it is an example.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: It is.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The hon. Members may say all these things in reply and not interfere at this stage.

Shri Tulsidas: I am prepared to say this. If Bangalore is considered vital, I do not grudge Bangalore becoming the capital. It should not be the case that because Bombay is to be treated as a separate category, everybody should have it.

At the end, I would like to appeal to all the Members, my hon. friends on this side and that do not, for Heaven's sake, disturb the Bombay State. The Bombay State is an important State. Bombay city is a part of it. Let us have, therefore, a bilingual State. Let us live as we have lived all these years. Let us live as one happy family and thereby create a better atmosphere. Let us give a lesson to the other people. Let us not fight over any small things. We can live together and we can tolerate each other, as we have lived all these years. I would appeal to them to consider this aspect and not press for any separation from any part of the Bombay State.

Shri G. H. Deshpande (Nasik Central): I rise at this late hour in this debate to express my views on the S.R.C. recommendations. I come from a region where the minds of the people are very much agitated over these recommendations. The discontent against these recommendations in the region which I have the honour to represent is going deeper and deeper every day. I want a very sympathetic hearing in this House, for, I want, with the goodwill of all, to see the day when this problem will be solved.

[SHRIMATI SUSHAMA SEN *in the Chair.*]

Why is it that there is so much discontent? I am very sorry to see that there is an amount of misunderstanding regarding the stand that my people have taken against the recommendations of the S.R.C. It has become almost a fashion to talk with an air of superiority about a bilingual

497 L.S.D.—4

State. It has almost become a fashion to run down those who say that the States should be reorganised on a linguistic basis. What was the stand of those who stood for a linguistic basis? Did they ever say that language should be the only consideration? I would like to learn from any hon. Member who could come forward and tell me that any responsible public man in India has ever said that States should be re-distributed on a linguistic basis and language alone should be the consideration. Nobody has said that. Nobody also has maintained that the experience in every multilingual State was a good one. What were the multilingual States, and what are they today? They are the States of Madhya Pradesh, Bombay, Hyderabad and Madras? What is the conclusion that has been arrived at by the States Reorganisation Commission in regard to these States? I cannot be blind to the good features of the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission. Now, what are their conclusions? They say that the experience in these multilingual States is that the families are not happy.

If there was some special virtue with these multilingual States, then why is it that people from Vidarbha claimed 50 years before that they should be separated from the Hindi-speaking people? If there was a special virtue attached to a multilingual State, then why is it that my friends from Andhra were agitating for separation since 1908? Do you mean to say that these Andhras and these Vidarbhas were less patriotic than my friends in Uttar Pradesh? Do you mean that these friends who raised that cry in public life undermined the significance of Indian unity and Indian security? I am not going to tolerate that. Nobody is going to tolerate that. Please do not misrepresent these friends in that way.

Now, what happened in the Congress? I was present at the Nagpur session of the Congress as a student. And it was then that Mahatma

[Shri G. H. Deshpande]

Gandhi said, let us have a mass movement, that mass movement is impossible unless we have the distribution of the Congress Provinces on a linguistic basis. With him, almost all the senior leaders said, whenever we shall achieve freedom, we shall see that as far as possible language will be the base for redistribution of administrative provinces. Is that not correct? If you have doubts, go and refer to your Congress resolutions.

The provincial Congress committees were redistributed on a provincial basis. My hon. friend the lady Member, for whom I have a very great respect, just said that Bombay had a separate provincial Congress committee. My talented colleague, Shri S. K. Patil tried to make out a case that a man like Mr. N. C. Kelkar had conceded a separate provincial Congress committee for Bombay. Go into the Congress history. Do you mean to say that when they were thinking of allotting certain regions to certain provincial Congress committees, they imagined that the same might be the base for administrative units? For instance, Nagpur has a separate Congress Committee, and Vidarbha has another. Is my hon. friend Shri S. K. Patil, and is my hon. friend the respected lady Member going to say that because these two provincial Congress committees were conceded, Nagpur with four districts should have a separate province, or that Berar should have a separate province? They will never say like that.

When this problem was before my leader Mr. N. C. Kelkar, there were other considerations—I was glad to see that the late lamented Kelkar whom all of us respected has become a respectable leader in the eyes of my Gujarati friends now, but I wish that respect had been there during his lifetime—he wrote a number of articles on the significance of having a Maharashtra State, or a Samyukta Maharashtra State with Bombay as its capital. I would make a presentation of those writings to my hon.

friend Shri C. C. Shah, and I hope he will carefully go through them with the respect that Shri Kelkar deserves.

Now, what are the findings of this Commission? They say that it was not a happy thing to have multi-lingual States. And what have they recommended? They have supported our case. We were run down, we were styled as inferior patriots, we were styled as provincial people, but what is the decision of the Commission ultimately? What have they done? They have proposed States which are based on language. How many States are there? There are in all 16 States. And how many major languages are there according to our Constitution? You will find every language has a State of its own. When I think about it, I feel it is like this:—

घर घर में दिवाली है मेरे घर में झंझेरा

That is the feeling that I have. Why do you want to single me out for a different treatment? You want to allot a State to every language. But when my turn comes, what do you say? The unity and security of India will not be undermined, if 15 States are carved out on the basis of one language for each State, but you say that if the Maharashtra State is granted then the whole country will topple down. This is something which I cannot swallow. If you want to have that experiment, why have it on me? We never started this agitation before the achievement of freedom. We were thinking that when freedom came, that was the proper time to consider this question of redistribution. So, we collected ourselves in Bombay and started this movement. And if I remember a right, my hon. friend Shri S. K. Patil was the chairman of the reception committee, and Shri Shankar Rao Deo was the president of the conference which propagated this movement. Later on, my hon. friend has changed. He has a right to change. I have no quarrel with him on that. But at that time, he asserted this with us; at least, he was present at that conference,—there is no doubt about it—

and he did not raise any voice of opposition. I remember it perfectly well.

What did we say then? We said that whenever there was an opportunity for redistribution of provinces, the Marathi-speaking areas which are contiguous should be brought together. It was not the idea that anybody who does not speak in Marathi in a Marathi province should be thrown away somewhere else. We were not so ridiculous about it. We had enough sense of responsibility when we propagated that movement.

Yesterday, I was very much interested to hear my hon. friends from Uttar Pradesh. I have no designs upon Uttar Pradesh. Let Uttar Pradesh be happy. If they are happy in that bigger State, I do not want to disturb their happiness. But I would like to urge my Uttar Pradesh friends to consider this: "You say that the very idea of separation of your State touches you, and it is unbearable for you. If I say, friends, we Marathi-speaking people, we are contiguous people, during the last two or three or four centuries the foreigners kept us away, now it is an opportunity for us, allow us to come together, allow us to remain under one administration, that will give a better opportunity for the common man for the development of his full individuality, that will give us an opportunity to offer our best services in an organised manner not only to Maharashtra but to this Mother India, then is there anything wrong about it? Is it less patriotic? Why deny that to us?"

When I ask for a separate State, what am I told by the States Reorganisation Commission? I am told everybody will have a separate State, but I shall not have it. And why shall I not have it? Not because they had any sound proposition to urge, but because before their eyes were the capitalists in Bombay; so, they said, because of the city of Bombay, we shall not have a separate State. If Bombay State is progressive today, I assure you that after

partition, the Gujarati State and the Maharashtra State will be still more progressive than the present Bombay State. So, do not be under any illusions on that score. Today, Bombay is progressive not because it is multi-lingual or unilingual or anything of that kind,—that has nothing to do with it—but because it has a glorious past history behind it.

So, what did the Commission say? They said that the question of Bombay is very difficult, otherwise, they would have conceded Samyukta Maharashtra and also Gujarat. So, they say that because of the dispute over the city of Bombay, they could not give us a separate State. And why were they not prepared to give us Bombay? Because they say that there are certain individuals who have placed before them the view that they have fears, they have suspicions, and so on. What is all this?

The industries of Bombay are the pride of India. We are also very proud of them. But who built these industries? Do you know that it was at the end of the nineteenth century or in the beginning of the twentieth century that Lal-Bal-Pal, was the worshipful trinity of the Indian masses, they said that we should take to *swadeshi*, and that we should take to boycott, and thus created a favourable atmosphere for the development and the inauguration of Indian industries? My hon. friend Shri Tulsidas must remember that.

It is not that only an industrialist goes to make an industry. You must have a wholesome and sympathetic community behind it; you must have organised labour, and the responsible labour to work out your projects. Then alone, an industry can be built up, and not merely by the industrialist only. I have got nothing against the industrialists in Bombay. They are as good industrialists as elsewhere in India or, in the world. I have got nothing against them. I say, let them have protection, and let them have security. I would like to ask them to

[Shri G. H. Deshpande]

sit with our leaders and then put down in writing what securities they want, and what protection they want.

What treatment do you want? We are prepared to grant you that treatment.

Shri S. S. More: They want government security.

Shri G. H. Deshpande: Why do I condemn the SRC Report? Why is it that we detest it? When you are going to decide the fate of the City of Bombay, is it only the industrialists who are concerned with it? The Maharashtrians are to be ignored. The SRC Report says that the Gujarat Pradesh Congress Committee has agreed to a bi-lingual State. But did they consult the Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee? Can that be simply ignored? If the Gujaratis agree, then don't bother about the Maharashtrians. They may or they may not agree. But did they know that from the very beginning, we, Maharashtrians, have been opposed to a multi-lingual or bi-lingual State? We have always stood for a uni-lingual State, and we stand now for a uni-lingual State. Our heart is after a uni-lingual State. We say that we want a Maharashtrian State, a Marathi-speaking State, with all the contiguous areas in it. Why do we claim Bombay? We claim Bombay because it is an integrated part of Maharashtra. I would request any hon. Member to point out to me any single instance in the SRC Report wherein an important integrated part of a uni-lingual State is carved out and thrown away, and that State is deprived of it? Is that done anywhere? Why should it be done here? I do not claim Bombay for Maharashtra because it is outside Maharashtra. It is inside Maharashtra. Whether the Gujarati friends came there first or whether the Maharashtrians came there first is a matter for academicians to discuss. I am not interested in it, though I have a strong case in my favour. What is the practical position? Can you change geography? Geography cannot be changed. Look at the map and you

will find that Bombay is now surrounded by the Marathi-speaking area. Such an important town surrounded by Marathi-speaking area—you cannot take it away from us. I do realise that Bombay has importance. I do realise that it has some speciality. But when my friend, Shri S. K. Patil, says that it is 'tax' the city in India which is important, I cannot swallow it. How can you say that Calcutta has got no importance? How can you say that Madras has got no importance? You say that language should not be the dominant factor. Yet when you come to the City of Bombay, you say, 'After all, you are 43 per cent. Had you been 60 per cent, we would have given you that. Suddenly, at once, language has become a dominant factor! What is the situation about language also? Go through the census figures and you will find that from 1881 till 1931, the pure Marathi-speaking people have formed 50 per cent of the population plus 4 per cent. Konkani speaking. What is the position today? Forty-three per cent are Marathi-speaking; there are Konkani-speaking people; then there are 10 per cent Muslims, of whom the major part is from Maharashtra. We were rather not too much worried about the linguistic aspect; otherwise, we would have persuaded them to say at the census that they come from Maharashtra and their language is Marathi, because several Muslims under the influence of some people have given their language as Gujarati. We did not go to that length. We thought we had a fair case; so we did not take recourse to that. Otherwise, we would have today more than 50 per cent population of Bombay Marathi-speaking.

What is the opinion of the population of Bombay? Somebody said: 'Oh, you want Bombay. But what about the opinion of Bombay people?' I will tell you what is their opinion. Some reference was made a few minutes ago to the tragic happenings in Bombay. But do you know that the *Times of India* has stated that in the demonstrations that took place in

the streets of Bombay, on the 21st of November 1955 six lakhs of people participated, and a demonstration of that magnitude was never witnessed in recent history in Bombay? I did not like that demonstration. I detest that demonstration. I do not like to have any violence. I am second to none in my love for Bombay City, the capital. But I will not take to violent methods. Thereby no people will achieve anything, and those who indulge in violence will only ruin and spoil the cause of Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay. But the public opinion cannot be ignored. I do not want to associate myself—nor does any of us want to associate ourselves—with anybody who indulges in violence.

What I want to say is that the SRC proposals about Bombay, for the reasons that I have given are unjust to us. Why should we be suspected? Why should a different treatment be given to us? When you have agreed to so many uni-lingual States, why not agree to a Marathi-speaking State? We do not want the SRC proposals. My friend, Shri Tulsidas, had the courage to say in this House that that is not the public opinion. Has he ascertained public opinion? Every gram panchayat, every gram Congress Committee, every local Congress Committee, every District Congress Committee and the Pradesh Congress Committee and every Municipality and every district local Board have condemned, and condemned very strongly, this SRC Report. If you say that this is not real public opinion. I tell you I am not used to looking for cheap popularity. But I am not used to ignore responsible public opinion. If anybody is going to say undermine that opinion, that will be the imperialist way. The Congress will never take to that course. I am sure about it.

So far as Maharashtra is concerned, the SRC proposals are dead and gone. I do not want to whip that dead horse any more. There is no power

on earth which can ask us to take it and work it. The Working Committee's proposals, in general, are an improvement over the SRC proposals. I would wholeheartedly support the stand that they have taken in general. To my friend, Shri Heda I will say: Please do not for God's sake, try to swim against the current—in the opposite direction. Please take into consideration the rising tide of the time spirit. Vishal Andhra is going to come. Samyukta Karnataka is going to come, my friends from Mysore must realise that. I would like to say that it will not be a distant future before I will have Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay as my capital.

The question of Bombay has to be solved with the goodwill of all with the goodwill of the citizens of Bombay, with the goodwill of my Gujarati friends. For that, I want your sympathy. Let my case be understood. Find out geography. Simply because my people are not 50 per cent, can it be denied to me? Take the case of Bangalore. Does my friend, Shri Tulsidas, know that the Kannada-speaking people are outnumbered by Tamil-speaking people in Bangalore, and that the Urdu-speaking people outnumber the Telugu-speaking people in Hyderabad? Are you going to deny Bangalore to Karnataka and Hyderabad to Telangana? You cannot do that. So on the same basis, I cannot say you cannot refuse Bombay. It is a reasonable thing. We will work for it with faith and determination. We are loyal Congressmen. We have spent the best part of our lives in the Congress and our greatest ambition is to die as honest Congressmen. I am second to none in my love for the Congress. I have not joined Congress in sunshine. Now the 'fourth party' (Muslim league) people in Bombay have become all of a sudden respectable patriots. They are now better patriots than my Maharashtrians! They have to be a better sense of unity and security of India! Where this was found out by the BPCC, I do not know. They

[Shri G. H. Deshpande] were responsible for the partition of the country. They have become all of a sudden very respectable. If my people have behaved badly, at times, the Muslim Leaguers have also behaved badly. For many of the riots, they were responsible. Were there not riots in Bombay between Parsis and Muslims? Go through the history of Bombay. There are un-social elements always. But do not take advantage of them and do not run down any community. It is merely an accident.

That is why I say that it is my considered opinion that after all, the Working Committee proposals are, comparatively, better. Hon. Members know that a letter was written to the President of the MPCC by the Congress President. An offer was made that after five years, if in an election two-thirds majority of the Bombay city State, which may be carved out, arrive at the conclusion that they should join Maharashtra, then they should join Maharashtra. I say, let it be the converse. I say, let Maharashtra have Bombay. Let there be elections. Then if in the next elections, the people of Bombay City elect to opt out of Maharashtra by a two-thirds majority, they may do so, with the goodwill of all. Let us work out this suggestion. This may solve the problem. Let senior Members come and sit together. Let Shri Krishna Menon, who has solved a number of questions in international problems, be invited to help us to work out an agreed formula. I want this problem to be solved with the goodwill of all. I do not want to take to any line of violence. But I cannot be a party to anything in which Bombay will not be included in Maharashtra.

Shri N. P. Nathwani (Sorath): I come from the State of Saurashtra. Having regard to its small size and other considerations, the people of Saurashtra wished for its merger in the adjoining State. This desire of theirs was fulfilled by the recommendation of the SRC that the State of

Saurashtra along with the State of Kutch should merge into the State of Bombay. However, as the proposed State of Bombay was a bilingual one, the friends from Maharashtra opposed it and, at their instance and request, the Congress Working Committee evolved another formula of three States.

My friend Shri Deshpande waxed eloquent and pleaded for the State of Samyukta Maharashtra. I have nothing to say against their demand for a Samyukta Maharashtra. If they do not want a bilingual State it is also against our self-respect, the self-respect of Gujaratis to ask for a bilingual State. But where I quarrel with the friends from Maharashtra is here. Please do not advance any argument, as was done the other day by their chief spokesman, Shri Kaka Saheb Gadgil, that in the present State of Bombay there has been discrimination against Maharashtrians. If they feel that Samyukta Maharashtra meets the emotional demand of their people, that the welfare of their people will be advanced considerably by evolving a separate State of Maharashtrians, let them have it. But, let them not try to advance arguments which have no basis whatsoever. When they want a separate State let them not expect too much and let them not ask for the inclusion of the city of Bombay.

An Hon. Member: Why not?

Shri N. P. Nathwani: I am coming to that. The case for Bombay State has been ably and exhaustively argued by both sides in the last week. I do not want to repeat arguments but I shall briefly advert to the reasons which have been advanced for its inclusion in the State of Maharashtra. It has been claimed on geographical, linguistic and cultural grounds. It is not true to say that the city of Bombay is surrounded on all sides by the Marathi-speaking people. It is not a pocket; it is not in the interior of the State of Maharashtra. On three sides it is surrounded by the sea and on its north there is a narrow coastal belt which has been inhabited by

bilingual people,—Gujarati speaking people along with the Marathi-speaking people. Please remember that geography is not the only ground on which any particular area is being claimed or could be claimed legitimately. If you analyse the argument based on geography, you will find that it ultimately resolves into one of language. Take, for instance, the case of Nagpur. Is it geographically a part of Maharashtra? In geography what do we consider? It is physical terrain, mountains, rivers, climate and soil and so on. I will give you another instance, namely of Kutch and Saurashtra. They are divided from the mainland of Gujarat but because of the affinity of our language with the language of Gujarat, it is sought to be included in the adjoining State. Therefore, we come to the next argument based on language and cultural affinities.

I wish my friends to remember what has been said in this behalf by the Dar Commission. I shall read only one sentence because it was at that stage the unanimous opinion of all the persons who appeared before that Commission. They say that "All the evidence before us is agreed that it would not be proper to call any area as unilingual unless the majority of one language spoken in that area is at least 70 per cent and any area below that should be considered as a bilingual or a multilingual area, as the case may be."

These observations were made not only in connection with boundary areas but also in connection with capital cities like Bombay. Therefore, when we come to the question of language we have to see whether any linguistic group claims 70 per cent of the population, or not. A reference has been made to the other cities of Calcutta and Madras. The position of Calcutta is different. It has been again and again pointed out that there is an overwhelming majority of Bengalis there. It does not share the honour of being a cosmopolitan city to the same extent as Bombay enjoys.

What was their answer to the questions whether there were schools in which 14 different languages were being taught in Calcutta? What about Madras? As has been pointed out by the JVP Report the position is different in a marked degree. I shall read out only one sentence from that. They say:

"To a large extent what we have said about Bombay city applies to Madras city also, but there is a marked difference. Bombay city, because of its size and cosmopolitan and industrial character can be made into a political entity. Madras city is smaller and is closely linked with provincial life and activities."

That is the manner in which the case of Bombay differs from the case of Madras. I do not want to enter into any elaborate discussion on this aspect and I go to another aspect.

Up till now Bombay was never looked upon by our Maharashtrian friends as the main centre of their culture and linguistic activities. They looked upon Poona as their main centre and that was the reason why, as recently as 1948, they asked for a separate University at Poona. This is precisely the reason why even after 1937 there is a temporary sitting of the Government and of the Assembly at Poona for two months. If Bombay was the centre of their intellectual and other activities, where was the necessity for asking the Bombay Government to shift to Poona? It is not for the salubrious climate of Poona. (*Interruption*). Please do not argue in that way. In former times, the members of the Central Assembly used to go to Simla. That was put an end to. It is out of regard for the sentiments of Maharashtrian people that the venue of the Bombay Assembly is shifted to Poona for a couple of months during the monsoon season.

I come to another question, namely, about assurances. Much has been

[Shri N. P. Nalhwani]

said about the assurances or securities being given by the Maharashtrians. But, you have to see the spirit in which these assurances are being given. Their chief spokesman, Shri Kaka Saheb Gadgil said the other day that to ask for securities or assurances is an insult to us. Then he proceeded to say: Who are the persons who ask for these assurances? Capitalists. I am sorry that even my friend Shri Deshpande, who spoke with much restraint today said that it was a class of capitalists who asked for these assurances. Please do not say that it is not 40 persons or 50 persons who are capitalists or property owners who ask for not including the city of Bombay in the State of Maharashtra. If you ask for their number I may come to that. There was a meeting held on the 13th November, it was called by the BPCC. At that meeting the Chief Minister of Bombay was to speak. Determined violent attempts were made to break that meeting and some of the miscreants indulged in acts of violence. That meeting was attended by over 2 lakhs of people. Do you mean to say that these people were not there to demand that Bombay should not be included in the State of Maharashtra? In spite of the efforts made to break the large meeting, people did not budge an inch from their places and they sat till the meeting was over. Still, to dismiss this demand for not including Bombay in the State of Maharashtra—by saying that it is the demand of 50 or 40 persons who constitute the Bombay Citizens' Committee—is, in my opinion, to ignore the facts of the case.

Unfortunately, my friend Kaka Saheb Gadgil said something which savours of communalism. He referred rather vaguely to Gujaratis being *soukars* or rich people while Maharashtrians were poor, having nothing, to lose except their poverty. I regret the tone of his language and the tenor of his speech, when tries to give a communal touch to the controversy between the rich and the poor people. Economic inequalities do not spread

on linguistic basis. In Bombay there are a few rich industrial and business magnates like my friend, Shri Tulsi-das Kilachand, but there are lakhs and lakhs of people who are living in a very small way. There is the labour population, which is composite in character; many of them come from Saurashtra, Kutch, Gujarat, U.P. and also from the South. Therefore, do not try to give a communal touch to the class differences. The labour classes, have to protect their interests against capitalists, whatever their colour may be. Kaka Saheb tried to speak in a vein which unfortunately seemed to me to be savouring of communalism.

Then Kaka Saheb spoke about the events which took place on the 13th, 18th and 20th in Bombay. Every responsible Maharashtrian leader, except perhaps a few, has condemned the happenings of those days. It was a determined effort on the part of the hooligans. I was present at the meeting held on the 13th November. Again on the 18th November, I along with hundreds of members of the Bombay Bar, witnessed or could see what was happening at the Flora Fountain, which was one of the scenes of the unfortunate happenings on that day. I have not got the time to state what actually happened on that day. There are amongst us Members who have sympathies with all parties in the country but I did not find any single Member who did not condemn the hooligans or who found any fault with the police. But for the firm and tactful handling by the police, the situation would have gone beyond control on that day. Even Shri Shankar Rao Deo and several other leaders went and apologised to the Chief Minister. But here comes Kaka Saheb and says: Look at the happenings of those days, some brave patriot people opened their chests and said 'fire'. It is against this background that we have to analyse or view the assurances which are being sought to be given. After all, what is the value of these assurances? I shall read out only

four or five lines from page 216 of the S. R. C. Report, which is very relevant:

"Before we conclude, we wish to emphasise that no guarantees can secure a minority against every kind of discriminatory policy of a State Government. Governmental activity at State level affects virtually every sphere of a person's life and a democratic Government must reflect the moral and political standards of the people. Therefore, if the dominant group is hostile to the minorities, the lot of minorities is bound to become unenviable."

Therefore, such assurances become useless and have no value.

There is one aspect to which I should like to refer. The life in the city of Bombay is cosmopolitan in character. Many persons do not realise its exact significance. Its importance as an economic and industrial city has been recognised, but when we say that it is in the interest of the nation that the atmosphere which prevails there should be preserved, very few persons understand its implication. Bombay has evolved a pattern of life or attitude which is free from bigotry or narrow prejudices or sectarianism arising from creed, class or religion. Everybody in Bombay City feels that he is at home, and as it has been tersely put, it is "All-India in miniature". Friends ask me, how will the position be different? I would earnestly tell them that under a linguistic administration, with the predominance of linguistic or provincial life and cultural activities, this cosmopolitan nature is bound to be affected. I give more importance to this aspect and consider the loss of cosmopolitan nature in a city like Bombay as more serious than the loss in material terms.

I have done; I only wish to add that in any solution which may be arrived at, due importance or consideration will be paid to Bombay's character as a cosmopolitan city.

Shri C. K. Nair (Outer Delhi: First of all, I rise to congratulate our Government for the appointment of the States Reorganisation Commission, because in some quarters it has been said that that was an unwise step. That is why I want to lay special emphasis on this. The same thing happened with regard to our foreign policy. When our Prime Minister promulgated that policy, there were great criticisms against it, but after four or five years, his policy has been justified not only in India but in the whole world, and it is welcomed as a glorious chapter.

I may say that the S.R.C. Report is the last link in the consolidation of India. It may be said that Mahatma Gandhi has given us freedom from foreigners, that Sardar Patel has given us freedom from the Princes, and now Pandit Nehru is going to give us freedom from.....

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Freedom from Linguism.

Shri C. K. Nair:.....ignorance, poverty and disease. But he knows also that all this is possible only if the country is completely consolidated. It is for this purpose that the Commission was appointed. And it is said that it was because of the agitation in certain provinces. It may be so and in a democracy it is always done so and it is not got as a gift from the Centre. The people must express their consciousness and demand their rights together with the reasons. Therefore it was conceded and this was done not a day too late, not a day too early; it was done at the most appropriate time. That is the reason why I congratulate the Government.

Now I come to the Report itself. Under the circumstances, this is the best that we can think of. No doubt, immediate reactions were slightly parochial. Naturally it is to be, and as Panditji himself said, the Report about U.P. almost shocked him at a bit at first, but afterwards, after further thinking, he thought the Commission was quite correct. That is

[Shri C. K. Nair]

exactly the wisdom of the S.R.C. because that is really the collective wisdom of our nation. It may be that some States or individuals might have been perplexed, but ultimately that is the only solution that the Commission could give. Therefore, we should welcome the Report wholeheartedly. We all know that the new States have been set up on a linguistic basis. There is no use quarrelling over that matter because we all know that languages are as old and as ancient as our hills and mountains and rivers and valleys. Therefore, it is no good fighting over that. The languages are there and they must be recognised. As a democratic people, if you want to develop these languages, they must be developed just as all our hills, *maidans* and rivers are developed for our economic advancement. We have to develop them in the same way if we want to develop the entire people. The importance of the languages had been repeatedly referred to. But language alone is not the criterion; other things were also considered.

5 p.m.

By and large, we have all agreed with the SRC Report that the States are to be on a linguistic basis. Two questions remain—Bombay and Punjab. Outside these, all the States have been practically settled on a linguistic basis. There may be some doubt about Visalandhra or Karnataka. Karnataka set a very good example and I hope Andhras will follow suit. The small border disputes which appear to be very important will be settled amicably. Today our Prime Minister spoke on that subject. When he speaks on international politics, he is superb and we doubted sometimes if he could make similar speeches on national problems. Today it has been remarkable and superb. He has said that minority problems in these border areas are more important than anything else and therefore they must be amicably settled. I may go a step further. We shall be proud of the States which have got bilingual areas within their territory. It is a privilege.

It must, therefore, be their duty and responsibility to look after their interests. Therefore, I will never ask for a boundary line to be fixed for my State alone. We must have a national outlook. I will welcome everybody. I am not going into these things. Our Prime Minister pointed it out today about the advisory bodies. I think it is the most wholesome thing. We should all welcome it. I hope the idea will now develop even before the next elections. It will do two good things. One will be with regard to inter-state co-operation and co-ordination with regard to planning and the other thing is that the neglected and backward areas will receive special attention, from such advisory bodies. As our Rajmata had said, it is a very nice idea and I am glad that the Prime Minister has taken it up and we hope it will very soon be realised.

I shall now come to Bombay. Other things are almost settled. It is really a big problem. On first thoughts there should have been a linguistic State. The SRC Report went into it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may confine himself to Delhi because he does not have much time.

Shri C. K. Nair: Then I come to Delhi. I represent Delhi and I must speak on Delhi also.

Mr. Chairman: He cannot get more than fifteen minutes.

Shri C. K. Nair: With regard to Delhi, the problem is absolutely different from other States. Delhi has been deprived of its political rights and they have almost been disfranchised as a unit in the Federation. It has been abolished; it is no more a Part C State; as a Part C State it has been abolished. We welcome it. We do not shed any tears. But what we expect is a better deal for Delhi just as every Part C State was added to a Part A State. It means greater advantage and greater freedom for the people of those areas. It is not so with regard to Delhi. It is always compared with Washington. I think it is quite wrong. Washington is

hardly 200 years old while Delhi is at least 5,000 years old. It has been a great historic city from the Pandavas down to the Moghals, down from the Pandavas, then the Rajputs, Chauhans, then the sturdy robust Pathans and then the great Moghals and it was the seat of these royal rulers. Therefore, to compare Delhi with Washington is an insult to Delhi.

I can tell you another thing. Two or three years ago, as soon as autonomous status was given to Delhi, I had a talk with the then Ambassador from America. He said: "You were always quoting Washington to keep Delhi under Central Administration. But now Washington people have started an agitation to get autonomy like Delhi." I wonder why we should only be followers: why not be leaders. With regard to Delhi we must give a lead. Political possibilities are not exhausted in books. I feel that we can really adopt a new pattern and a new approach to the problems of Delhi. I have been told, for instance, that in Tokyo, which is part of a unitary system, part of a State which has no federal system, they have evolved something which gives a great status to Tokyo. In the same way, for Delhi also we can certainly evolve a better system of democratic administration as for a metropolitan city. Delhi State is not a gift of the Constitution. It is still in the hands of Parliament to give the best suitable administrative set-up for Delhi. If I come to the details, then I may not have time. I can only say that I support every word of what our sister, Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani has stated. Although she belongs to another party, in the heart of hearts she is still a Congress woman. Therefore, we almost think alike. Therefore, I need not take much time in enumerating what she has already said.

Our Manipuri friend referred to his State. Honestly I feel that our border States should not be suspected or ignored. On the other hand, they are expected to be more patriotic and courageous in defending our borders. Therefore, they should be liberally

treated and given the best possible democratic set-up. After all, suspecting the borders was the imperialistic idea of the Britishers but we should not suspect. On the other hand we should encourage their patriotism and support them. They should have a set-up in whatever way they feel.

With regard to Delhi, I have to say one thing. Just as Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani said, it is left to the mercy of the Central administration. Central administration means our Central Legislature—that is Parliament. You have seen the interest Parliamentarians take with regard to Delhi. About 75-80 people spoke and not one of them cared to think about the future of Delhi and its people, including our friend Shri Kamath.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): I have not yet spoken.

Shri C. K. Nair: None spoke about Delhi except Shri Punnoose. That was also in a general way. I am very grateful to him. But this is exactly my point. If this is the interest that Parliament is taking with regard to Delhi, Delhi should be saved.

One thing more and I finish and that is about the real set-up. I am not going into the details of that, it is for our High Command and our Cabinet to decide it.

Shri Kamath: And Parliament.

Shri C. K. Nair: Parliament ultimately of course, but this is the interest Parliament takes. What I say is that it should be thought of by the High Command, by the Cabinet, and ultimately it will come up for your approval before the Parliament. Then I am sure you are going to bless us with a better constitution than the Part C States now have, giving full right to the representatives of the people to take care of their own affairs.

Shri Tek Chand, (Ambala-Simla): Come to Punjab.

Shri C. K. Nair: About Punjab.....

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up. There are a number of speakers who have to finish their speeches today. So, I would request the hon. Member to conclude his speech.

Shri C. K. Nair: I will finish in a minute.

I would only appeal to the Cabinet to call the true representatives of Delhi, confer with them and try to evolve the best possible and suitable constitution for Delhi, independently without reference to Washington or London and other States, satisfying the wishes of the people.

With regard to Punjab I feel that Punjab practically has extended up to Delhi. Even in Delhi out of nearly 15 lakhs of people more than 7 lakhs are Punjabis. Therefore it is very difficult to say where to draw the boundary line and I think they must be satisfied with the present boundary that has been given to them by the SRC.

Shri Shivananjappa (Mandya): I rise to oppose the proposals of the SRC so far as they affect the integrity, homogeneity and the economic progress of the State of Mysore.

At the very outset let me submit that the time is not opportune for undertaking any large-scale and radical reorganisation of States. Now the country is just settling itself to the task of economic development. There are national priorities of fighting the problems of poverty and unemployment and any diversion of people's minds from this aspect will result in serious administrative and financial dislocations.

I am very glad that that SRC is quite alive to these dangers. The J.V.P. Committee and the Dar Commission were quite alive to these and they advised the postponement of the issue of reorganisation until better and happier state of affairs exist in the country. I submit that the SRC itself doubts the wisdom of undertaking reorganisation at this

juncture of national development and they argue that after the formation of Andhra since this is an inescapable evil it must be undertaken speedily and expediently.

After what we saw in Bombay, Mysore, Vindhya Pradesh, Bihar and Punjab I submit that the feelings of the people are roused and we see increasing tensions every day. The people have failed to appreciate the rationale of the SRC in the proper perspective. Hence I submit that is the implementation of the recommendations of the SRC must be postponed for another 10 or 15 years.

The SRC has created more problems than it professes to solve and it has stirred the emotions of the people. It has offended the susceptibilities of the people more than it satisfies. Therefore, I submit that the implementation of this Report must be postponed by another 10 or 15 years to come.

Shri Basappa: It is too late in the day. The hon. Member has missed the bus.

Shri Shivananjappa: That is all right. The House has not yet taken any decision.

In about two pages the SRC has argued as to what must be the size of a State. They have mentioned about the benefits and advantages that accrue from large States and the benefits and advantages that accrue from small States, but nowhere it is said as to what must be the optimum size of a State. To cite an instance, I would say that Mysore, a well balanced State, is for all practical purposes a viable State. I do not know why the SRC has compulsorily proposed it to be merged with other Kannada-speaking areas when the other Kannada-speaking areas can be definitely formed into a separate State.

The SRC having denounced this rule of "one language, one State" cannot logically argue (*An Hon. Member:*

Question) for one State for all Kannada-speaking areas alone. I am always confident that the compactness of a State is always conducive to progress and prosperity. To illustrate this problem I would like you to compare the expenditure on social services and the expenditure on administrative services with the percentage of literacy in U.P. and Mysore. Then we find that largeness of a State is always not conducive to progress and prosperity. I submit that in a democracy the size of a State must be limited to the supreme task of keeping every citizen of the State in one part informed about what is happening in other parts of the State.

In my own State of Mysore the people are greatly perturbed over the proposals of the SRC for merging the Mysore State with other Kannada-speaking areas which are larger in size and population. Mysore is a composite, compact and cosmopolitan State where different linguistic groups co-exist peacefully and this happy state of affairs is disturbed by the application of the fatal logic of linguism. As a result of this we see that feelings are embittered and people are fighting in the State. Also, Mysore State is administratively, economically and culturally a homogeneous State and it is exempted from the operation of article 321 of the Constitution and for all practical purposes it is considered as a Part A State.

The SRC has not advanced any reasons for amalgamation of Mysore with other Kannada-speaking areas. I cannot understand what are the benefits that will accrue to Mysore by merging this State with other Kannada-speaking areas.

Efforts have been made by interested parties to represent that Mysore has no objection to its merger with other Kannada-speaking areas and the SRC has taken this representation very seriously. They argue that the opposition to Mysore's merger with Karnataka is only tentative and of very

recent origin and it will vanish by the efflux of time.

Shri B. Y. Reddy (Karimnagar): It is proved in practice now. Things are settled down now.

Shri Basappa: The State Assembly of Mysore has passed a resolution recently welcoming Karnataka State.

Shri Shivananajappa: The Report says that the opposition to Mysore's merger with Karnataka is only tentative and of very recent origin. This is far from truth. Anti-merger feelings is there since a very long time. To quote the relevant portion of the 1951 election manifesto of the Congress, it says:

"As a practical example, the Congress agreed to the formation of the Andhra State, because the Andhra Provincial Congress, the Tamilnad Congress and the Madras Government had agreed to it, but withheld the support to the proposal for the formation of a Karnataka State for want of agreement of the great majority of the people including the people of Mysore State".

The Dar Commission Report says in page 9, paragraph 45:

"But the Mysore State does not appear to be yet ready to merge itself in Karnataka province".

For the formation of any State, a greater measure of agreement must be there among the people concerned. This sentiment is voiced both in the Dar Commission Report, the JVP Committee Report and the Indian Statutory Commission's Report. At page 2 of the Dar Commission Report, it is said:

"A large measure of agreement within its borders and amongst the people speaking the same language in regard to its formation, care being taken that the new province should not be forced by a majority upon a substantial minority of people speaking the same language."

[Shri Shivananjappa]

The Indian Statutory Commission endorses the same sentiment. I beg to submit that this large measure of agreement is lacking in the case of Karnataka and it is simply thrust upon the people of Mysore. There are no particular affinities between the State of Mysore and other Kannada-speaking areas, either culturally, administratively or economically. Mysore has built up her own traditions, institution, and decencies of life at a great cost. We find better cultural and social homogeneity more with Madras than with other Kannada areas.

Regarding social composition, there has been a balancing of social forces in Mysore and this balance and harmony will be disturbed by the introduction of new social forces on a mass scale. The position of linguistic minorities will be deplorable in the proposed Karnataka State. They will be reduced to the position of negligible entities leading to their insecurity and continued dependence. To quote figures, if we look at the statistics of Mysore with reference to 1955, we find that including the people of Bellary, there are 66,67,872 Kannada-speaking people in Mysore. There are 17,51,173 Telugus, six lakhs of Muslims, speaking Urdu and seven lakhs of Tamilians in Mysore. Thus in Mysore, the ratio of Kannada speaking population to non-Kannada-speaking population is 2:1. In the proposed Karnataka State, the ratio will be 7:1. Then, I submit that the larger the size of the State, the smaller the practical political importance of the minorities and the poorer are the chances of securing their interests.

I next deal with the administrative and financial implications of the proposed Karnataka State. The proposed Karnataka State will result in serious administrative and financial dislocation. The financial deficits of the proposed State for meeting ordinary administrative expenditure and for bringing up social services in the non-Mysore Karnataka areas to the existing Mysore levels and for enhancing the Mysore pay-scales to those of

others will amount to several crores. The new State will be crushed financially. The public debt portion itself will amount to several crores, let alone the working of major projects. No improvement of the existing facilities in the Mysore State can be thought of in the proposed Karnataka State.

Lastly, I deal with the institution of Rajpramukhs. The continuance of the institution of Rajpramukh is not incompatible with the conception of the socialist pattern of society. The institution of Rajpramukh as well as most of the present States of India were created by our Constitution in 1951. The Rajpramukhs are appointed by the President. I cannot understand why they should be abolished within a span of four years. The Rajpramukh of Mysore is an institution which is dear to the heart of every Mysorean. They have built up healthy democratic traditions and have been highly responsive to the aspirations of the people. The SRC proposal to do away with this institution is a violation of the solemn undertakings given by the Government of India that the ruler of Mysore would be left untouched.

Mysore has far advanced in education and economic development than the other areas proposed for amalgamation. The present and past generations of Mysoreans have toiled and sacrificed much and bore unusual burdens of taxation for the benefits of posterity. It is unjust and unfair to suggest that they must part with what is theirs by right in favour of those who have no contribution to make to the common pool. The resources of the other Kannada-speaking areas whatever may be their potential value, are largely undeveloped and cannot be taken into account. Judged from all these viewpoints, Mysore has a right to effective existence as a distinct entity. The best solution would be, the formation of a Karnataka State with the Kannada areas lying to the north of Mysore, and secondly, the continuance of Mysore State with the areas of South Kanara, Coorg and Kollegal taluk. These two States will

be almost equal in area, population and resources.

Edmund Burke, in his famous conciliation speech on America said:

“A true statesman is one who has a disposition to preserve with an ability to improve”.

What is shown in regard to Mysore by the SRC is a disposition to change where there is no need for improvement.

Shri Altekar (North Satara): I have listened with rapt attention to the very broad, liberal and philosophic outlook presented to this House by the hon. Prime Minister. I too would like to cherish such an ideal, but the people outside were entertaining hopes of a linguistic State mainly on account of the formation of Andhra and recently also because of the appointment of this Commission. The Commission's Report does not only not contain suggestions for new multilingual or bilingual States but contains, on the contrary, suggestions that even those multilingual and bilingual States that existed before be disintegrated to form linguistic States. Under such circumstances, it is very difficult to persuade the people of Maharashtra, against the whole atmosphere and the trend of events, to accept a composite State.

Another point which the hon. Prime Minister dwelt upon was about the border areas. He suggested that there should be equal rights and opportunities in these areas. I too would like that, but even the SRC Report says that some States have not been keen regarding this particular aspect and have tried to move in a contrary direction. Suggestions have been made by the SRC in chapter I of Part IV that there should be certain rights to those people. But to what extent do they go? They say that the minorities in a State should get instructions in the mother-tongue but only

up to the third form. Thereafter they will be switched over to the regional language. That is, for the purpose of secondary and college education, they will have to learn through the medium of the regional language. In our times, we were learning English in order to take instructions in the various sciences through the medium of English. We found what great difficulty it was and what a handicap it was. The same handicap will have to be experienced by the people who are thrown into a different state. For people speaking a particular language are in a majority in their own tract; but, when they are thrown into big tracts of different language the majority becomes a minority in those areas. Take, for instance, the three compact Marathi-speaking taluks of Karwar, Supa and Holyal in the North Kanara District. They lie in a Marathi-speaking area where the Marathi-speaking people are in a majority. If they are thrown into Karnataka, they become a minority. For secondary and collegiate education, they will have to learn a language which is not theirs. That handicap and grievance remain for them. Is there anything suggested for the sake of these people and for the higher education of these people in their mother-tongue? There is no proposal. SRC definitely say that their secondary education will be in the regional language. That is the handicap. Therefore, we shall have to tackle this problem not haphazardly but rather from a fundamental basis. I would like to suggest that the areas where the people themselves form a majority of a particular language should be put in that language region of the State where their language is the language of a majority, and provision should be made accordingly. In that case, the people concerned would not have a handicap. The difficulty that is felt is one of administration. The SRC Report says at page 28—paragraph 103—that if such a thing is done, it would be setting aside the whole work of the Delimitation Commission and its labours. Because it would create administrative difficulties,—

[Shri Altekar]

which can be rectified in a few years — to put all these people who themselves are in a majority in their areas permanently into a minority by throwing them in a big group of different language is a great hardship which we will be causing. We should, therefore, relieve such people from such a difficult condition. My honourable friend Shri C. D. Pande was saying, "Why should we fight for this taluk or that taluk?" I do not want this problem to be looked at from that point of view at all. I approach the question from the point of view of the convenience of the people. This problem should be tackled on a fundamental basis and the people who are speaking a particular language should be kept as a separate group. If more time is required for that, the next election may be held under the same constituencies for the time being. The question can be kept open and it can be settled by a boundary commission in such a way that the people will have no grievances or handicaps. That is my humble suggestion. Do not look at it from the purely administrative point of view. Administration is for the people; the people are not for the administration. Their rights and aspirations will have to be taken into consideration and the problem should be approached from that point of view. I would like to urge that it was only by accident that certain areas were put in other taluks. Take, for instance, Nipani, the jagir of Sarlashkar, the Lieutenant Commander of the Peshwas. When he died issueless in 1848, it was annexed to Chikodi, because there was then no British Maharashtra territory to which it could be annexed. The adjoining Marathi-speaking territories to the west and north were in possession of the Maratha princes of Kolhapur, Kurundwad, Miraj & Sangli. But this should not be regarded as their fault. It was only an accident. I do not want to go into the question of the percentages in the various taluks but I would like to point out that it was declared by a resolution of the Bom-

bay Government in 1950, that Karwar, Supa and Halyal taluks formed one compact Marathi-speaking area in Kanara District in the Belgaum district, Khanapur, Belgaum, Nipani and Changad form one compact, Maharashtrian territory. Speaking for myself, I would like that the Kannada-speaking villages on the border should go to that State. As I said before, this problem should be tackled on a scientific basis once and for all. If there is no time to do it now, keep it open and let it be decided after the elections are over. That is my humble submission.

I would now come to the larger question of the formation of federal units. I would urge that federal units are different from administrative units. The administrative unit can be as small as a city or a Part C State and as big as any province one may imagine. But, the tests are different for federal units. The one important test is that it must function by itself in a homogeneous manner; the people must work for their own development in the respective areas and also contribute to the unity of the federal State. In a federal unit, there is affinity between the people and there is also loyalty to the federal State. I need not quote authorities for this purpose; there are so many of them. But, this aspect has to be taken into consideration. If we look at it from this point of view, then the only basis on which separate units can be formed is the linguistic basis and this principle has also been accepted. Therefore, I would suggest that such a federal unit cannot be too small; it should be such as to be able to exist by itself and develop in itself. Not only should it not be a burden on the Centre, but it should not be a burden on another State. That aspect also has to be considered. As far as the size of the State is concerned, no State should be too small and no State should be too large. Keeping this in view, I think that Visalandhra, Maha Gujarat and Samyukta Maharashtra will be the proper States to be formed.

I would like to come now to the question of Bombay. The proposed Bombay State has got an area of 91 square miles only, not even the area of a taluk. Again, its population is less than one-third of the population of the smallest State, Vidarbha. Some of my honourable friends like Shri Patil have said that this is consistent with the proposals made by the S.R.C. I will read only a small portion from the S.R.C. Report to prove that the Commission has taken exactly the contrary view. At page 116 they say:

"Having regard to the population and the size of the area as well as the fact that it is primarily a city unit, it will not, in our opinion, be entitled to be treated as a full State of the Union."

Again, at page 117 they say:

"The natural links of the city with its hinterland in Maharashtra are, therefore, another argument for not constituting Greater Bombay into a separate administration."

Therefore, I would like to point out that Bombay city by itself cannot be a separate State. It does not enjoy the status of a federal unit. After all, is Greater Bombay by itself a unit? The hon. Railway Minister is not here now; he would have told you that from Bombay to Kalyan there are quadrupled railway lines on which a number of locals pass carrying thousands and thousands of people from Kalyan and Thana to the Bombay city and back from it to these places per day from early morning till late at night. Such again is the case from Bombay to Virar. Why does all this happen? It is because there is no space in Bombay to live. It is all a dally floating population mostly Maharashtrians. They cannot live in Bombay city for want of housing accommodation. This is the extension of Greater Bombay further in the interior. That is the position which obtains there.

Bombay, therefore, cannot exist as a separate State. It has not got sufficient land; it has no water. For everything it is dependent on Maharashtra area. It is just a liability on Maharashtra area. That fact should also be taken into consideration. My honourable friend Mr. Patil said, "If we are taking water and electricity from Maharashtra, we are giving you cloth." I would like to submit that there are mills, cotton and everything in Maharashtra and we can prepare cloth not only for ourselves, but we can also give cloth to others. But, Bombay city with all the ingenuity of Shri Patil, cannot produce water for itself. That is the position. I would like to urge that Bombay city is receiving electricity from Khopoli in Maharashtra and will receive from the Koyana Project which is also in Maharashtra. Therefore, for everything Bombay is dependent on Maharashtra. Decentralisation of industries was misunderstood by my friend Mr. C. C. Shah. Let him consult the Planning Commission. He will find that as in the case of Greater London, these industries will have to be taken to outside areas and then it will be greater than the Greater Bombay. This will not diminish the importance of Bombay; it will only increase its importance. With apologies to a Sanskrit Poet I may say:

संपन्ना कृतिव्यासि दशनीयासि मुंबई ।
यस्मिन्क्षेत्रे त्विच्छानं राज्यं तत्र न धार्यते ॥

You are wealthy; you are possessed of various qualifications and attainments, you are attractive and you have got all sorts of accomplishments. But, the space in which you are circumscribed is so tiny that it is not enough for forming a State. That is the position. Mr. Shah said that Mayukha predominates in Bombay city and Gujarat and therefore Bombay is linked with Gujarat. I would like to point out that the writer of Mayukha Nilakanta, belongs to Paithan in the Nagar district of Maharashtra. He wrote the Mayukha and it is prevalent in Nagar, Khandesh, Poona and also Thana, Bombay and Gujarat. If at all

[Shri Altekar]

there is the influence of Nilakanta in Gujarat, it is from Maharashtra and not an influence of Gujarat on Maharashtra. He has given special rights to daughters and sisters, to inherit fully and not a limited estate as is in other parts of India. On account of Nilakanta, this system prevails in the whole of the Bombay Presidency. There are so many other points from which it could be said that all the arguments are against them and not against us.

Now, it is said that Bombay is a cosmopolitan city, an all India city, I will not repeat all those arguments again. They say it is an international window. After the J.V.P. report, China is rising into power, Indonesia has got independence. Ceylon has become an independent nation. Burma Viet-Nam and other countries are coming into power. This light of independence, this air of independence has to come from the windows of Madras and Calcutta and not Bombay. They are rising into greater power and greater importance. The light and air has to come from that side. The importance of Bombay will not in any way be lessened. If Calcutta and Madras cannot be carved into independent States, Bombay also could not be so carved. I would like to ask, what would be the feelings of my Bengal friends if Calcutta is carved into an independent State; what would be the feelings of my Karnataka friends if Bangalore were to be carved into an independent State; what would be the feelings of my Tamil friends if Madras were to be carved out into a separate State? That will be the feeling of the Maharashtrians if Bombay is carved into a separate State. Just as the palm belongs to the whole body and is also a part of the hand, the heart gives life blood to the whole system and is also a part of the thorax, even so Bombay belongs to the whole of India and is also a part of Maharashtra. Bombay gives life breath to the whole of India as also to Maharashtra. It cannot be separated from Maharashtra. It would

be, as it were, taking the heart out of Maharashtra. I do not want to take more time of the House.

Shri N. Rachiab (Mysore-Reserved-Sch. Castes): I am thankful to you for giving me this opportunity to express my views on these matters which are agitating the Members of this House.

I support the recommendations of the Commission with regard to the I.A.S. and I.P.S., and about the appointment of High Court Judges in the best interests of the country. When linguistic States are being formed, the officers in the I.A.S., etc., should have a national outlook and a broader outlook, to implement and execute the laws passed by the legislatures as such. At least 50 per cent. of the I.A.S. and I.P.S. officers in the further recruitment in this country should be on the basis of the recommendations of the Commission. Even with regard to the appointment of High Court Judges, at least one-third of the Judges should be appointed in the manner recommended by the Commission. Every citizen should feel that he could get impartial justice in the hands of impartial Judges. The Judges should also feel that they belong to one nation and they must be prepared to serve in any part of the country, in any High Court. So I support those recommendations.

I wholeheartedly support the recommendations of the S.R.C. once again, because this is the proper time for the implementation of this report and there should be an end with regard to this question of reorganisation of States. We are in a period of transition. As such, there has been a great agitation by all parties for the formation of linguistic States for the past half a century. Therefore, the Government have taken a very right attitude and a very right step to see that the entire country is reorganised into a number of smaller States. For this, I wholeheartedly congratulate the hon. Home Minister, and also particularly the Deputy Minister Sri B. N. Datar because he is piloting this motion here. More than that, in the year 1952, he

was the leader of the Karnataka delegation and I was one of the delegates with him. He fought for Karnataka. I was sure that the formation of Karnataka was safe in his hands. Nothing gives us greater pleasure than to see that we are getting our Karnataka, particularly, united Karnataka.

I have to pay my high tribute to Shri Nijalingappa who is the architect of United Karnataka. His name must be written in diamond letters in the history of Karnataka. Selflessly, with boldness, patiently, with non-violence he has sacrificed, struggled and worked hard and persuaded the people who were opposed to the formation of Karnataka. He deserves all appreciation and congratulation on behalf of the two crores of Kannadigas from the Karnataka area. I must not fail in my duty to pay my tribute to Shri Channiah, President of the Mysore Pradesh Congress Committee. He was very tactfully and patiently able to persuade those who were agitating for "Mysore for Mysoreans". As such he deserves appreciation and congratulation of all Kannadigas.

The Karnataka State is a very viable State in our big democratic republic. I wholeheartedly support the formation of Karnataka because it is a reasonably large State. It is neither too big like the U.P. or Bihar or Samyukta Maharashtra, nor too small like Coorg, or Manipur. I am sure, Karnataka will have a very prosperous and proud place in our country. I am not one of those who plead for only linguistic States. Our Government and our Parliament have taken steps to see that the demands of the people, the resolutions of the Indian National Congress and the resolutions of the other parties are respected. It is not only one party that has asked for linguistic States; all parties have passed such resolutions.

Before I go into the details in support of the formation of a Karnataka State, I should not fail to make a few observations with regard to Coorg. My

hon. friend Shri N. Somana is sick. He is the only representative from Coorg in this House. My constituency is an adjacent constituency. I know the feelings of the people of Coorg. The people of Coorg are the most advanced people, if I can say so, and it is the most advanced State. According to my hon. friend Shri Shivananjappa, does it mean that because Mysore is an advanced State, it should remain as a separate State? If that is the case, Coorg should also remain a separate State because it is the most advanced State according to the Backward Classes Commission's report. The people of Coorg have been unanimously in support of the merger of Coorg with Karnataka. Lately, even the Coorg Legislative Assembly has passed an unanimous resolution supporting the merger of Coorg with Karnataka. There is not one person who is opposed to the merger of Coorg with Karnataka. I also congratulate the people of Coorg in this respect.

[SHRI BARMAN in the Chair]

There are the blessings of the great leaders, Shri Tilak, Shri Gokhale, Sardar Patel and Mahatma Gandhiji for the formation of linguistic States, particularly for the formation of Karnataka. Even in 1920, when the Indian National Congress met in Nagpur, they admitted a resolution for forming linguistic States, particularly with reference to the Karnataka State. Therefore, I am sure that the case for the formation of a united Karnataka is a very good and sound case.

My hon. friend Shri Shivananjappa has said that the States Reorganisation Commission have not put forward any facts in support of the Karnataka State. But I would like to point out that they have put forward exhaustive data and facts in support of the Karnataka State being formed, and they have left out nothing. Still, if there is opposition to its formation, then it can only be on the ground of

[Shri N. Rachiah]

communalism. The Commission have stated at page 90 of their Report:

"It has been generally recognised that, in the provincial distribution under the British, the Kannadigas suffered most, with their area split up into four units in three of which they were at the tail end and reduced to the position of ineffective minorities. The All-India Congress Committee in 1927, the All-Parties Conference in 1928 and the Indian Statutory Commission in 1930 all recognised the legitimacy of the claim of the Kannadigas to unification. The Dar Commission also expressed the view that the Kannadigas would prosper and be able to manage their affairs much better under their own government, if such a government were possible."

Such a government has been possible for the past eight years, and I am glad that such a government is coming into existence at least now; and I congratulate our Government once again on their having acceded to the demand and the wishes of nearly two crores of Kannadigas from south.

Apart from this, I would like to state here that the people of both Mysore and also the North Karnataka area are unanimous in their demand for the unification of Karnataka. Once at Davangere the North Karnataka people had gathered together at a Conference and demanded a separate North Karnataka State. Further we find that our leaders like Shri K. Hanumanthaiya and Shri H. C. Dasappa have opposed such move of that Conference. According to the speech of Shri J. Mohamed Imam in the Legislative Assembly made on 17-11-55, these leaders demanded one Karnataka with Mysore. Yet, there has been proof, and clear data are there to that effect, that all the two crores of people who speak Kannada have been unanimously demanding the formation of a Karnataka State.

I would now like to deal with another important aspect of the Commission's recommendation. As has been pointed out by the Commission, there are three important communities in the Mysore State, namely the Vakkaligas, the Lingayats and the Harijans. The number of people belonging to the Vakkaliga community is about 18 lakhs; the number belonging to the Lingayat community is 10 lakhs, and the number belonging to the Harijan community is 19 lakhs. The Commission have clearly discussed this matter with all the full data to support the formation of Karnataka.

Besides these three communities, there are also other minorities. Of these three communities, particularly the Harijans and the Lingayats have been unanimous in their demand for the formation of the Karnataka State. But they form only 47 per cent. of the population of Karnataka in the Mysore State. What about the other 53 per cent. residing in Mysore? Nobody speak about them. All such minorities support the issue.

I was saying that all these communities, excepting one, namely the Vakkaliga community, have been unanimous in supporting the unification of Karnataka. The P.C.C. President, Shri Channah has been able to have a resolution passed on the 28th of last month, supporting the unification of Karnataka at M.P.C.C. Session. The Chief Minister of Mysore, Shri K. Hanumanthaiya also belongs to that community. Still, he is a supporter of Karnataka, and he has been doing propaganda also for the formation of Karnataka.

If in spite of all this there is opposition to the unification of Karnataka, then it is there only from people who have got vested interests. I, as a true representative of the Harijan community in Mysore, support the formation of Karnataka. And my reasons are as follows. I am not casting any aspersions on any leaders or other great personalities or on any particular community. After the achievement of

freedom and the coming into existence of responsible government in Mysore, only two communities have benefited, namely the Vakkaliga and the Lingayat communities. It is said that our leaders who are in power are national leaders; they are for all the people, they are for the entire State and so on, but in practice they have been sharing the power only between themselves.

Shri Basappa: There was a Harijan Minister also.

Shri N. Rachiah: What about the Public Service Commission? I put this straight question to my hon. friend Shri Basappa. Again, what about the Seshadri Committee, or the Fact-finding Committee which went into the details in regard to Karnataka and the other positions? Further, what is the position of Harijans in the I.A.S. and the I.P.S.?

Shri Basappa: If there is any one State in India, it is the Mysore State, where the Harijans are treated very well.

Shri N. Rachiah: Before the general elections, that was a fact. But after the achievement of freedom, only the Central Government and the Union Public Service Commission are favourable to the Harijans, but so far as the Mysore State Government is concerned, they have done nothing for the Harijans. No doubt, before the general elections, the interim Government did something, and in the interim government, Shri K. C. Reddy's Cabinet did something which was advantageous to the Harijans. But after the general elections, after the coming into office of the present Ministry, they have done more harm than good to the Harijan community.

Mr. Chairman: Why should the hon. Member bring in personalities here? It is a general question for all time. One Ministry may be good, another may be bad; but that is not to be raised as an issue here.

Shri N. Rachiah: The Commission themselves have referred to the fact that in the future Karnataka State, no one community could dominate, and any one section can be reduced to the position of a minority, if the other groups combine against it. If a State is very small, then one community could dominate. Suppose two Karnatakas are formed, then in the North Karnataka, the Lingayat community will dominate, and in the other the Vakkaliga community will dominate. And only about 18 to 20 per cent. of the people will monopolise power, wealth and everything else between themselves in both the States and the Harijans who will be in a minority will have no place at all in anything. But if there is a single Karnataka State, it will be a reasonably large unit.....

Shri Shivananjappa: Then, why do you support the formation of Karnataka?

Shri Basappa: It is too late in the day. He has missed the bus.

Shri N. Rachiah: I support it because the domination of a single community cannot be there, and the minorities and the Harijans will be in a better and stronger position in the united Karnataka to check this sort of distribution of patronage, if anything is given to the Harijan community, it is felt at present that the State's property is being squandered away. But I ask: Is not the property of the State common to all the people? We do not like this sort of patronising attitude. We do not want anything as a gift. We want things as a matter of right for our existence. We are also citizens of the country, and we want the rights guaranteed by the Constitution to everybody.

But have the Mysore Government been respecting the provisions of the Constitution? Even today, the present Ministry in Mysore has gone to the extent of cancelling a site which was intended for the building of a

[Shri N. Rachiah]

Harijan hostel. It is with a sad heart that I am bringing this to your notice. It is a disgrace. We are in a democracy in our country, and yet we find that the site for a Harijan hostel has been cancelled.

Shri Basappa: Who was that Minister? The hon. Member's own man was the Minister.

Shri N. Rachiah: I am not worried about personalities. I am worried only about what has happened in this democracy of ours.

You take the case of any committee, or any commission, or any board or any standing committee; you will find that no Harijan is there. Yet we find they want the full support of the Harijans for the formation of the Ministry and for doing various other things. They want their co-operation. But when it comes to a question of power or wealth, claims of Harijans are ignored in the name of oneness. At present, the Harijan community is united, but they want to divide that community, in order that they may perpetuate their power over Harijans. Harijans can never tolerate this inhuman discrimination any longer.

In most of the States, they have introduced compulsory education. But in my State, though it is called a model State, a progressive State, no compulsory education has been introduced. They do not want that Harijans should take advantage of compulsory education because they are afraid that if the Harijans get educated and progressed, tomorrow they will be the competitors for power and in all fields of life. So they do not want to introduce compulsory education. They want big projects. It is a model State. Yes, for whom? My friends say, 'We are advanced; North Karnataka area is backward'. Does that mean that they do not want Harijan progress? Because we are extremely backward, they do not want the progress of the extreme backward classes and also Harijans. So I wish to bring to your kind notice

that in the SRC Report, the Members have rightly pointed out the communal and political exploitation going on there. I justify the stand taken by the Commission. They have properly and clearly understood the Mysore affairs, the inner current of Mysore politics. There is communal disharmony there. Outwardly, here is harmony, but this under-current is there to undermine the progress of bigger communities. We are a big community in Mysore. But we have been reduced to the position of a minority, with respect to administrative and political affairs. As such, the entire Harijan community is in favour of a Karnataka State.

Lastly, I want to say something about Bellary. The Prime Minister said after the issue was decided last that it was finally settled and Bellary was added on to Mysore. So there is a finality about it. The question of Bellary should not now be reopened. If it was to be given over to Andhra State, that would have been done in the year 1953 itself. It is a fact that that area has a clear Kannadiga majority population; that was why, it was made a part and parcel of Mysore. It should be permitted to remain in Mysore.

Shri Lakshmayya (Anantapur): My hon. friend should know that that was only on the linguistic basis; other factors were not taken into account then.

Shri N. Rachiah: Shri M. A. Ayyangar has also conceded that Bellary should go to Mysore.

Similarly, the Kasargod taluk should also go to Karnataka.....

Dr. Gangadhara Siva: On a point of information.....

Mr. Chairman: He is not giving way. How can I allow the hon. Member to interrupt?

Shri N. Rachiah: Then Madakasira has a majority of Kannada-speaking people. The people there want that the Madakasira taluk should be merged with Karnataka. As such, I appear

to the Government that Madaksira and Hosur should be added on to Karnataka.

There is another firka, called Thairwadi, near my constituency. The representatives of the people of that area want that area to merge with Karnataka. I request the Government to allow that area to be merged with Karnataka.

On the whole, I wholeheartedly support and welcome the SRC Report and the proposals with regard to the formation of Karnataka with Bellary.

Shri Lakshmayya: What about Pavagada taluk in Tumkur?

Mr. Chairman: Th. Lakshman Singh Charak.

Dr. Gangadhara Siva: On a point of information.

The hon. Member, Shri Rachiah, was so long supporting the SRC Report, but as regards Bellary he has deliberately said.....

Shri N. Rachiah: With the exception of Bellary.

Dr. Gangadhara Siva: It is a known fact that Bellary is an area contiguous to Andhra. It is illogical and illegal to ask that that area should be transferred to Mysore.....

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. That will be delivering another speech. I have already called Th. Lakshman Singh Charak.

تھاکر لکشمین سنگھ چارک (جموں اور کشمیر): آج سے ۳۵ برس پہلے جب کانگریس جماعتی کمانڈ نے ناگپور - بھشن کے دوران میں لنگویسٹک پروونس کے بارے میں ایک ریپوزیشن پاس کیا تھا - اس وقت لنگویسٹک کی چرچا ہندوستان میں

جلی - ۱۹۵۲ میں جب ایڈمنسٹریٹو نوٹیفیکیشنز پر الیکشن ہوئے اور تمام ملک کے نمائندے اس پارلیمنٹ میں آئے تو پہلا ریپوزیشن جو کہ یہاں پر پیش ہوا تھا وہ آندھرا کی بابت تھا - آندھرا پروونس بنا اور اس کے بعد لنگویسٹک پروونس کی ہوا - ہمارے ہندوستان میں چل پڑی جس کی کہ ضرورت کو محسوس کرتے ہوئے گورنمنٹ نے ایس - آر - سی - بنایا - اس کیشن نے جو رپورٹ دی ہے وہ ہمارے سامنے ہے - اب یہ کہنا کہ ہندوستان کو لنگویسٹک کے اصول پر تقسیم نہ کیا جائے ٹھیک نہ ہوگا -

جو بحث اس ہاؤس میں پچھلے - ات روز سے ہو رہی ہے اس کو میں نے بہت غور سے سنا ہے - اس بحث میں بہت سی اعلیٰ درجے اور اعلیٰ پائے کی تقریریں ہوئی ہیں - یہاں یہ بھی دیکھنے میں آیا ہے کہ ہم لوگ اپنے ضلع اور اپنی ہی سنگھت کی بات کرنے لگ گئے ہیں اور جو ہمارے پرانے اصول ہیں اور جو پرانی باتیں ہیں ان کو ہم بھول سے گئے ہیں - اس چیز کو دیکھ کر اور ایسی باتوں کو سن کر مجھے بہت دکھ ہوا ہے - ایک کانگریس د ممبر جو کہ اس ہاؤس کے مانے ہوئے ممبر ہیں انہوں نے تو یہاں

[تھا کہ لکشمی سنگھ چارک]
 تک کہا ہے کہ بمبئی شہر کا فیصلہ
 بمبئی کی گلیوں میں ہوگا۔ یہ
 جو بات انہوں نے کہی ہے اسے میں
 بڑے اعلیٰ پائے کی بات نہیں مانتا
 ہوں۔ مہاتما گاندھی نے اہلسا کا
 پرچار کیا ہے جس پر کہ کانگریس
 آج بھی چل رہی ہے۔ اسی اصول
 پر چل کر اس نے انگریزوں کو نکالا
 ہے۔۔۔ اب جب کانگریس کے ہی نیتوں
 کے سہارے اس قسم کی آواز نکلتی
 ہے تو دل کو بہت دکھ ہوتا ہے۔
 میں ایک نیا آدمی ہوں اس ہاؤس
 میں۔ میں اتلی گہرائیوں کو نہیں
 سمجھتا ہوں۔ اتلی پیچیدگیوں کو
 میں نہیں سمجھتا ہوں۔ لیکن
 پھر بھی اس جھگڑے سے دور رہنے
 ہوئے میں اس بھٹ میں کچھ
 زیادہ بڑنا نہیں چاہتا ہوں۔
 یہ جو گرما گرمی یہاں پر چل رہی
 ہے میں اس سے دور ہی رہنا چاہتا
 ہوں۔ میں جموں اور کشمیر سے آیا
 ہوں جس کے بارے میں کہ کھشن
 نے کوئی سفارش نہیں کی ہے۔ اس
 لئے میرا اس گرما گرمی کی بھٹ
 میں حصہ لینے کا خیال نہیں تھا۔
 لیکن جب میں نے دیکھا کہ ہمارے
 بڑے بڑے نہتے لکٹی بری باتیں بول
 رہے ہیں تو میرے دل میں خیال
 آیا کہ میں ایک ناختم ہستی ہوتے
 ہوئے بھی اس ہاؤس کے سامنے تھوڑا
 سا عرض کروں۔ میں مانتا ہوں کہ

مراہٹے بہت بہادر ہیں اور انہوں نے
 پہلے بھی بہت بہادری کی ہے
 انہوں نے شوربہروں کی طرح سے
 انگریزوں کا مقابلہ کیا ہے۔ اب آپ
 یہاں پر بادشاہوں کا ذکر بھی کرتے
 ہیں۔ آندھرا والے بھی اسی طرح سے
 ذکر کرتے ہیں۔ پہلے انہوں نے آندھرا
 کی مانگ کی تھی اور اب وہ وشال
 آندھرا کی مانگ کر رہے ہیں۔
 سہارک ہو ان کو وشال آندھرا۔
 لیکن میں تو اتنا ہی عرض کرنا
 چاہتا ہوں کہ پرانی بادشاہوں اور
 پرانی شہنشاہوں کا خیال اب ہم
 و نہیں کرنا چاہیئے۔ اگر آپ
 ہسٹری دیکھیں تو آپ کو پتہ چلے گا کہ
 یوانے زمانے میں ہم لوکل پیٹریہٹزم اور
 ذاتی فائدے کو زیادہ اہمیت دیتے رہے
 ہیں اور اسی کا یہ نتیجہ نکلا کہ ہم قلم
 ہو گئے۔ انگریزوں نے آک بری آسانی
 سے ہم پر ادھیکار کر لیا۔ پرتگالی
 بھی یہاں آئے فرانسیسی بھی یہاں
 آئے اور انہوں نے بھی یہاں حکومت
 کی۔ انگریز تو یہاں پر ایسے آئے کہ
 وہ تین سو برس تک یہاں جمے
 رہے۔ اس واسطے میری پرزوریت ہے
 کہ آپ محکمہ سے، پریم سے ہندوستان
 کے صوبوں کو بدلائیں اور بنگلہ دیش
 پیدا نہ ہونے دیں۔ اگر بنگلہ دیش
 پیدا ہو گئی تو یہ تماشہ دنیا والے
 دیکھیں گے اب بھی دنیا میں جو
 ایہٹمسفیر ہے وہ ہمارے حق میں
 بہت اچھا نہیں ہے۔ ایک ایسا

طبقہ ہے جو کہ ہماری کمزوریوں سے فائدہ اٹھانا چاہتا ہے - اس لئے ہمیں چاہئے کہ ہم شانتی اور یزیم سے اپنا فیصلہ کریں - میں تو سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس جھگڑے سے جو پوانا نقشہ ہے یہ اتر رہے تو زیادہ اچھا ہے -

اب میں جو مہرا پڑوسی پر دیکھ رہا ہے اس کے بارے میں کچھ کہنا چاہتا ہوں - پنجاب کا اتھاس دیکھنے سے معلوم ہوتا ہے کہ پنجاب نے بڑے بڑے لیڈر پیدا کئے ہیں - ایک وہ وقت بھی تھا جب کہ ہندوستان میں انگریزوں کا راج قائم نہیں ہوا تھا اس وقت مہاراجہ رنجیت سنگھ جیسے لیڈر تھے اور انہوں نے پنجاب کو بڑی مضبوطی سے رکھا اور انگریزوں کو یہ جرت نہیں ہوئی کہ وہ پنجاب کی طرف دیکھ سکیں - اس کے بعد بدقسمتی سے پنجاب کے اندر گوبڑی ہونے اور پنجاب بھی غلامی کی زنجیروں میں جکڑ گیا - اس کے بعد پنجاب میں کئی لیڈر پیدا ہوئے اور ان میں سے لالہ لاجپت رائے ایک تھے جنہوں نے بہت بہادری سے انگریزوں کا مقابلہ کیا اور دیکھ کی خاطر اپنی جان دے دی - پہلی جنگ کے بعد جب پنجاب میں رولٹ ایکٹ پاس ہوا تو نان کوآپریشن کی موومینٹ چلی - چلیاتوالہ باغ میں ایک جلسہ کیا گیا جس میں کہ انگریزوں کے اندھا دھند گولیاں چلائیں اور کتلے ہی

آدمی مارے گئے - یہ کہنا درست نہ ہوگا کہ پنجابی ایک ساتھ مل کر کبھی نہیں چلے ہیں - وہ ہمیشہ سے ہی ایک ساتھ مل کر چلتے آئے ہیں - لیکن بدقسمتی سے جلد ایک برس پہلے دونوں کی طرف سے ہلندوں اور سکھوں دونوں کی طرف سے کچھ غلطیاں ہوئی ہیں جن کی وجہ سے ان کا ایک دوسرے پر بھروسہ نہیں رہا ہے - میں نے سنا ہے کہ پچھلی سیشن میں کئی ہلندوں نے جن کے گھر پنجابی بولی جاتی ہے جو ہمیشہ سے اپنے آپ کو پنجابی کہتے آئے ہیں - جب رجنل لہنگویج لکھوانے کا وقت آیا تو انہوں نے کہا کہ ہماری رجنل لہنگویج ہندی ہے - ان کی دیکھا دیکھی سکھ بھائیوں نے بھی کہنا شروع کر دیا کہ ہماری زبان گورکھی ہے -

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): Gurmukhi is no language.

ٹھاکر لکھن سنگھ چارک : مہرا
مطالب پنجابی ان گورکھی سکریٹ
سے ہے -

اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوا کہ اب ان کو ایک دوسرے پر بھروسہ نہیں رہا ہے - زبان کا مسئلہ ایک طرف رکھ دیا گیا ہے اور پارو ہالیتھکس میدان میں آ گیا ہے - جلد والا ! میں اب کے فرقہ سے ہلندوں اور سکھوں

[تہاگو لکشمین سنگھ چارک]

سے یہ اہل کرنے کے لئے کہا ہوا ہوا ہوں کہ وہ ہندوستان کے پرانے اتھاس کو یاد رکھیں - میں عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ پرانے وقت میں سکھ نہتا ہندو سماج کو بچانے کے لئے سہدان میں آئے تھے - انہوں نے ہندوؤں کے لئے وہ قربانیاں کی تھیں جن کو کوئی بھی ہندو بھول نہیں سکتا ہے - ہم تو یہ بات بھی بھولی نہیں چاہیئے کہ سکھ تو شروع سے ہی ہندو سماج کے انگ رہے ہوں - پنجاب میں یہ رواج رہا ہے کہ ایک ہندو فیملی میں بڑا لڑکا سکھ بنایا جانا تھا - لیکن آج حالت یہ ہے کہ ہندو اور سکھوں کو ایک دوسرے پر بھروسہ نہیں رہا ہے - آج ایک طرف مہا پنجاب کا نعرو لگایا جا رہا ہے اور دوسری طرف پنجابی صوبے کا نعرو بلند کیا جا رہا ہے - ایسا کہوں ہو رہا ہے - کیا آپ لوگ ۱۹۴۷ کو بھول گئے ہیں جب کہ اسی قسم کے خیالات کی وجہ سے ہندوستان کے دو ٹکڑے ہو گئے تھے - کیا آپ یہ بھول گئے ہیں کہ آج بھی پاکستان کے ساتھ ہمارے تعلقات کوئی بہت بڑھیا نہیں ہیں - ہندو اور سکھوں کو یہ بات یاد رکھانی چاہیئے کہ وہ ایک ہر قدر سٹیٹ میں رہ رہے ہیں - اگر وہ اس قسم کے خیالات وہاں بڑھ پھیلانے کے تو ہمارے وہ پنجابی دوست جو کہ ہم سے الگ ہو گئے ہیں - ہمارا تماشہ دیکھیں گے اور

کہیں گے کہ وہ بھئی واہ - خوب تقسیم ہوئی - جو ہندو اور سکھ ہمارے خلاف لڑے تھے اور جن کو لاکھوں کی تعداد میں ہم نے یہاں سے نکالا تھا - آج انہیں ہندو اور سکھوں میں خوب چوتی چل رہی ہے - میں یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس قسم کے خیالات سے اور اس قسم کی کارروائیوں سے پنجاب کا مسئلہ حل نہیں ہو سکتا ہے - اس مسئلہ کا حل نہیں ہو گا جب وہ اپنے کو پنجابی سمجھ کر - ایک جان سمجھ کر اور ایک دوسرے کا خیال رکھیں گے - ایک دو دے کی رائے کی قدر کریں گے اور ملک کے مفاد کو اپنے سامنے رکھیں گے - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ سکھ بھائیوں کا یہ کہنا درست نہیں ہے کہ پنجابی وہی ہوگی جو گورمکھی سکریٹ میں ہو گی اور اس کو تسلیم کرنے سے ہی پنجابی صوبہ بنے گا - اسی طرح ہندوؤں کا یہ کہنا بھی غلط ہے کہ اگرچہ ہم لوگ اپنے گھروں میں پنجابی بولتے ہیں مگر ہماری رجنل لہنگریج ہندی ہے - میں درخواست کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس قسم کی چھوٹی چھوٹی باتوں کو نہ بڑھایا جائے اور اس مسئلہ کو مختصر کرنے کا واحد طریقہ یہی ہے کہ ایک دوسرے پر بھروسہ کیا جائے - ایک دوسرے پر اعتماد کیا جائے - اب جس سماج پر پردیش کی نسبت کچھ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں - مجھے وہاں کی

لیجسلیٹیو کمیٹی کی رپورٹس کو پڑھنے کا موقع ملا ہے اور میں نے یہ دیکھا ہے کہ اس کا اکثر حصہ پنجاب کے ساتھ شامل نہیں ہونا چاہتا ہے۔ ان کی اس خواہش کے پیچھے بھی ایک لمبی تاریخ ہے۔ ہماچل پردیش میں انگریزوں کے زمانے میں بے شمار چھوٹی چھوٹی ریاستیں تھیں۔ کوئی ایک گلوں کی تھی تو کوئی دو گلوں کی اور ان کے مالکوں کی واپسی کو سہستائی کرنے کے لئے انگریزوں کو انڈیپنڈنٹ رولرز اور نہ جانے کیا عہدہ و غریب نام دیا کرتے تھے۔ وہ لوگ ہمیشہ اپنے ذاتی مفاد کی خاطر اس علاقے کو اپنی ذمہ داری سمجھا کرتے تھے اور وہاں کے لوگوں کی مختلف ضروریات کی طرف بالکل توجہ نہیں دیا کرتے تھے۔ اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوا کہ وہ علاقہ تعلیمی اور اقتصادی طور پر بالکل بھروسہ ہے۔ ۱۹۴۷ میں اپنی حکمت کے وجود میں آنے پر ہماچل پردیش کو الگ کیا گیا۔ وہاں پر اسمبلی سہ ۱۹۵۲ میں قائم کی گئی اور لوگوں کی تعلیم کی طرف توجہ دی گئی۔ ان کو ہر قسم کی مدد دی گئی اور اس بات کی کوشش کی گئی کہ وہاں کے لوگوں کی اقتصادی حالت بہتر بنائی جائے۔ مگر، تو پنجاب اور ہماچل پردیش میں کوئی خاص فرق نہیں سمجھتا ہوں۔ ان میں زبان کا کوئی جھگڑا نہیں ہے۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اگر کوئی جھگڑا ہے تو وہ اقتصادی

ہے۔ یہ امر واقعہ ہے کہ پنجابی بھائی زمین بڑھا ہونے کی وجہ سے اور مالدار ہونے کے لحاظ سے آگے بڑھے ہوئے ہیں۔ اس صورت میں ہماچل والے یہ محسوس کرتے ہیں کہ اگر ہماچل پردیش کو پنجاب میں شامل کر دیا گیا تو اس کی حیثیت ایک نیٹو کالونیڈ ایریا کی ہوگی۔ اس کے پیچھے ایک سائیکالوجیکل وجہ بھی ہے۔ پنجاب کے ہمارے دوست۔ جو اقتصادی طور پر زیادہ اچھے ہیں۔ پہاڑی لوگوں کو ہمیشہ نظر حقارت سے دیکھتے آئے ہیں۔ وہ سمجھتے آئے ہیں کہ ہماچل پردیش، کانگریز اور ہوشیار پور کے لوگ بہتر مانتے اور کھانا پکانے کے ہی قابل ہیں۔ اس سے زیادہ قابلیت ان میں نہیں ہے۔ وہ کہتے ہیں کہ پہاڑی بالکل بھروسہ ہوتے ہیں اور ان کو کوئی سمجھ نہیں ہوتی ہے یہ تھوڑی سی غلطی پنجاب والوں سے ضرور ہوئی ہے اور اس کا خمیازہ ان کو بھگتنا پڑ رہا ہے۔ آج ہماچل پردیش والے تو یہ ہیں کہ اگر ہم اس دریا میں شامل ہو جائیں گے تو ہم قریب جائیں گے۔ ایک بات ہے۔ آج پنجاب والوں کے اہلے مسئلے حل نہیں ہو رہے ہیں اور ان کے دیکھوں خانہ نظر نہیں آ رہا ہے۔ تو ایسی حالت میں ہماچل پردیش والوں کو بھی اس جھگڑے میں قالدیلے کا کیا فائدہ ہے۔

[تھاکر لکشمین سنگھ چارک]
 وہ بھپچارے ۱۹۳۷ کے بعد آگے
 بڑھے ہیں۔ اگر ان کو پنجاب کے
 ساتھ ملا دیا گیا تو جتنا وہ آگے بڑھے
 ہیں۔ اس سے پچاس برس پہلے
 چلے جائیں گے۔ وہ لوگ چاہتے
 ہیں کہ چونکہ ہم لوگ اقتصادی
 طور پر پچھڑے ہوئے ہیں۔ اس لئے
 ہم کو سینٹر کے ساتھ رکھا جائے۔
 ہم کو امداد دی جائے۔ پانچ دس
 برس تک ہم اقتصادی اور تعلیمی
 لحاظ سے ترقی کر لیں گے۔ اس
 وقت یہ دیکھ کر کہ ہمارا مفاد کس
 علاقے کے ساتھ وابستہ ہے اور کس
 علاقے کے ساتھ مل کر ہم اقتصادی
 طور پر زیادہ فائدہ اٹھا سکتے ہیں
 اور ترقی کر سکتے ہیں۔ اس ملحقہ
 علاقے کے ساتھ ہم کو ملا دیا جائے۔
 اس وقت وہ سینٹر سے اسٹڈیا کرینگے
 کہ اب ہم مقابلہ کرنے کو تیار ہیں
 اور فلاں علاقہ کلچرلی اور لنگویسٹیکلی
 ہمارے ساتھ ملتا ہے۔ ہم کو اس کے
 ساتھ ملا دیا جائے۔

میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ پنجاب کے
 دوستوں کی طرف سے یہ کہنا کہ ہم
 دانت نکل دیں گے اور ہاتھ توڑ دیں گے۔
 مناسب نہیں ہے۔ اس قسم کی
 ایگریسو مینٹیلٹی کسی بھی لحاظ
 سے ٹھیک نہیں ہے۔ اس سے پریم
 نہیں بڑھے گا۔ بلکہ اس سے نفرت
 کا مادہ پیدا ہوگا۔ میں یہ بھی

بتا دوں کہ ہم لوگوں کو بھی پنجاب
 کے لوگوں سے تلخ تجربہ ہے۔ اسی
 وجہ سے بیس پچیس سال پہلے ہم
 لوگوں نے اپنے یہاں ایک قانون بنایا
 کہ پنجابی ہمارے یہاں نہ کوئی
 زمین خرید سکتے ہیں اور نہ کوئی
 نوکری کر سکتے ہیں۔ واجاؤں کے
 وقت میں انگریز لوگ ہمارے علاقے
 میں ان کو افسر بنا کر بھیجتے
 تھے۔ انہوں نے وہاں پر اتنا بڑا ہولڈ
 بنا لیا کہ ہم لوگوں کے لئے کوئی
 ٹھکانہ نہ رہا۔ اس لئے ہم کو مہاراجہ
 صاحب سے کہنا پڑا کہ ان کو روکنے
 کے لئے کوئی قانون بنایا جائے۔ میرا
 خیال ہے کہ اسوقت تو ساچل پردیہی
 کو الگ ہی رہنے دینا چاہیئے۔
 پنجاب کے ہمارے دوست پانچ برس
 تک اس بات کا ثبوت دیں کہ ان کو
 واقعی ان لوگوں سے پریم ہے اور وہ
 ان کو ایکسپلائٹ نہیں کرنا چاہتے
 ہیں۔ تب وہ لوگ بڑے شوق کے ساتھ
 ان کے ساتھ شامل ہونے کے لئے تیار
 ہیں۔

[English translation of the above
 Speech]

Th. Lakshman Singh Charak (Jammu and Kashmir): Talks about linguism-started in India thirty five years ago when a resolution regarding linguistic states was passed during the Nagpur Session of the National Congress. After the general elections of 1952, which were held on the basis of adult franchise, when the representatives of the country came in this Parliament, the first resolution which was moved here, was regarding Andhra. Andhra state was formed and consequently this movement of linguistic

States got momentum and spread throughout the country. The Government subsequently appointed the States Reorganisation Commission as they felt it was necessary to do so. The report submitted by this Commission is before us. Now it would not be proper to say that India should not be divided on linguistic basis.

I have carefully followed the debate which has been going on in this House for the last seven days on this topic. Speeches of a very high standard have been delivered. Here we have also seen that many of us have indulged in talking about our own Districts and States and have forgotten our old principles. I have been very much pained to hear and see all this. A Congress member, who is a very important member of this House has even remarked that the question of Bombay city will be decided in the streets of Bombay. I do not consider this remark very proper.

Mahatma Gandhi preached non-violence which Congress is following. It has driven out the Britishers from this country by following this principle. Now, when we hear such things from the leaders of the Congress we are very much pained. I am a new man in this House and do not understand the intricacies of the problem and do not want to get myself involved in the dispute. I want to remain away from this heated discussion. I have come from Jammu and Kashmir, regarding which the Commission has not made any recommendations, therefore I had no intention to participate in this debate. However when I saw some of our great leaders indulging in tall talks, I thought that I may also put forth my humble views before the House. I accept that Maharajas are a brave people and they have shown great courage and bravery in the past. They faced the Britishers with great courage. You are talking here of past empires. Andhras also talk like this. First they demanded Andhra and now they are making a demand for Vishal Andhra. Let them have their Vishal Andhra, however I want to say that now, we should not think in terms

of past empires etc. In the past, we have been giving great importance to local patriotism and personal gains as a result of which we became slaves. The English came here and without any difficulty conquered us. Portuguese and French also ruled here. The Britishers ruled this country for more than 300 years. Therefore, I request you all that India should be reorganised without producing any bitterness. If it results in any bitterness, the whole world will laugh at us. Even now the atmosphere in the world is not very congenial to us. A certain section of this world wishes to take advantage of our weaknesses. It is, therefore, desirable that we should decide our problem with love and peace. So far as I understand if *status quo* is maintained it will be advantageous.

Now I wish to say something regarding my neighbour State i.e. the Punjab. The History of the Punjab shows that it has produced great leaders. During the regime of Maharaja Ranjit Singh Punjab was very strong, and the Britishers could not dare enter this province. But afterwards unfortunately there was disturbance in the Punjab and it also came under the British. Many a great leaders have since been born in this province and L. Lajpat Rai is one of them. He fought the Britishers with great courage, and gave his life for the country. After the First World War when Rollo Act was passed the non-co-operation movement started. In a public meeting held at Jallianwala Bagh the Britishers resorted to indiscriminate firing as a result of which thousands of persons were killed. It will not be correct to say that Punjabis have not worked with a spirit of unity. In fact they have always remained united, but unfortunately during the last few years mistakes have been committed both by Hindus and Sikhs and due to them they have lost one another's confidence. I have heard that during the last census many Hindus, who speak Punjabi in their homes and who have been calling themselves to be Punjabis, told that their regional language is Hindi.

[Th. Lakshman Singh Charak]

Following in their footsteps, the Sikh brothers, too, began to claim that their language was Gurmukhi.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Gurmukhi is no language.

Th. Lakshman Singh Charak: I mean Punjabi in Gurmukhi script. The result is, that now they have no confidence in each other. The problem of language has been solved and power politics has taken its place. Through you, Sir, I want to make an appeal to Hindus and Sikhs not to forget the past. I beg to submit, that in the days gone by, the Sikh leaders had come forward to save Hindu society. They made sacrifices for Hindus, which no Hindu can forget. We must not forget that the Sikhs, from the very beginning, have formed a part of Hindu society. It has been customary in Punjab for the eldest son of a Hindu family to be converted to Sikhism. But now the matters have come to such a pass that Hindus and Sikhs have lost confidence in each other. Today, on one hand, is being raised the slogan of Mahapunjab and on the other the slogan of a Punjabi Suba. Why? Have you forgotten 1947 when India was partitioned due to such ideas? Have you forgotten that even today our relations with Pakistan are not very good? Hindus and Sikhs must always bear this in mind that they are living in a border State. If you spread ideas like this, then we will become a laughing stock for our Punjabi friends, who have separated from us. They will think that Hindus and Sikhs, who were fighting then, who had been turned out in hundred of thousands are at logger heads with each other. I want to submit that ideas and activities of this kind cannot solve the problems of Punjab. The problem can be solved only when they have regard for each other as Punjabis and as men of the same stocks, respect each other's opinion and also keep the interests of the country always in view. I think that it is not correct on the part of Sikhs to say that Punjabi can be Punjabi why when it is in Gurmukhi script and that Punjabi Suba can be formed only when it is recognised as

Punjabi. Similarly, it is wrong on the part of Hindus to say that even though they speak Punjabi in their homes, their regional language is Hindi. I want to submit that such little things should not be allowed to assume a serious shape. The one and the only one way of simplifying this problem is to have trust in each other.

Now I want to make a few observations regarding Himachal Pradesh. I had had occasion to read their legislative debates and I have seen that a greater section of members of the State Legislature is not in favour of being merged with Punjab. This desire of theirs too, has a long story behind it. In the days of the British, there were a number of petty states in Himachal Pradesh. Some consisted of village and some of two villages. In order to satisfy the vanity of their owners the British, called them Independent Rulers and what not. The British, in their own interests, used to look upon these states as their own responsibility and never paid any heed to diverse needs of the people who lived there. The result is that that area is educationally and economically altogether backward. When we attained independence in 1947, Himachal Pradesh was separated, an Assembly was created and attention was paid to the education of the people. They were given every kind of help and an attempt was made to improve the economic conditions of the people there. I do not think there is a marked difference between Punjab and Himachal Pradesh. There is no problem of language there. To us if there is any problem, it is economic in nature. It is a fact that Punjabis are advanced owing to the greatest fertility of the land and in view of their being more prosperous. Under the circumstances the people of Himachal Pradesh think that in case they are merged with Punjab, their status will be that of a neglected area. There is also a psychological reason for this. Our friends from Punjab, who are economically better off have always looked down upon Hilly people. They have always thought that men from

Himachal Pradesh, Kangra and Hoshiarpur are to cook and clean utensils and that they do not possess any other merits. They say the people from the Hills are idiots and possess no intelligence. The Punjabis did commit this small mistake and now they are paying for it. The people of Himachal Pradesh today are afraid but they should be lost if they jumped into this river. There is one more reason. The people of Punjab are today finding it difficult to solve their problems and there is no end to their troubles. In the circumstances what is the use of putting Himachal Pradesh people also in these troubles. After 1947, they have made some advancement. If they are merged with Punjab their movement towards progress will be reversed and they will be thrown at least fifty years back. Their desire is that, as they are economically backward, they may be allowed to remain under the Centre and receive help. In five to ten years they will have made some economic and education progress. At that time they may be merged with that contiguous territory with which their interests are linked and with whose co-operation they can have greater benefits economically and make progress. At that time they will request the Centre to merge them with that territory which has cultural and linguistic affinity with them or they are ready to join the competition.

I think it is not proper on the part of our Punjabi friends to hold out threats of physical violence. There is absolutely no excuse for such an aggressive mentality. This will not lead to love but on the other hand it will give rise to hatred. I may mention that we, too, have a bitter experience of the people of Punjab. For this very reason, twenty to twenty-five years ago, we passed a law that Punjabis could neither purchase land nor get employment in our State. In the days of the Rulers of former States, the British sent them as officers in our State. They established such a hold over us that there remained absolutely no place for us. There we had to request the Maharaja that some law may be passed to keep them

in check. I think the present Himachal Pradesh may be allowed to remain a separate entity. Let our Punjabi friends furnish a proof for five to ten years of their love for these people and also show that they do not want to exploit them; and only then these people will gladly merge with them.

Shri Bidari (Bijapur South): Mr. Chairman, I heartily congratulate the States Reorganisation Commission for their historic Report. I express my gratitude to them for the recommendation about the formation of united Karnataka. I am particularly more happy over the recommendation about the abolition of Rajpramukhs. The institution of Rajpramukhs has no place in the modern conception of democracy. Six hundred and odd rulers were pensioned off as early as the year 1948. It was only by accident that the present Rajpramukhs survived the enrolment of pensioners then.

A big section in Mysore is demanding Mysore for Mysoreans. Apprehensions about losing political power, too much of fondness for their present State and the fear of dislocation in the transition period seem to haunt the minds of these people. In Mysore, Nature, has, no doubt, been bountiful in several respects. The scientists and the intelligentsia of the State have spared no pains in exploiting Nature. But still, in certain respects, nature has been deficient. In spite of all possible developments, the State has not been able to be self-sufficient in food production and also not been able to make both ends meet. The standard of living of the masses has not been satisfactory.

The northern Karnataka and other Kannada areas outside Mysore are also gifted with plenty of natural resources. The soil in certain districts is very rich and fertile. Cotton and groundnut are produced in abundance. There is ample scope for industrialisation.

The continuous fear of losing power is more harmful than actually losing it.

[Shri Bidari]

If the boast of their intelligence and all-round progress is not vain, the real antidote to their fear mania is to come forward and take hold of the wider arena and show their worth in bringing into use the tremendous resources, both human and material, lying idle and thus pave the way for making up the deficiency that is keenly felt in both the regions.

The re-transfer of Bellary area from Mysore is greatly agitating the minds of the Kannadigas. The allocation of the seat of Vijayanagar Kingdom to Andhra has roused their sentiments. It seems that exaggerated accounts by the Andhras and default in proper representation by the Mysoreans have led the Commission to base their judgment on superficial grounds.

The culture, affinity and trade relations with Mysore and other Kannada areas have not changed their course like that of a mighty river since Misra's Report. Lack of co-ordination between the individual members of the management of the project has been magnified by the Andhra Government in claiming these areas.

The very idea of transferring these areas to Andhra on the plea of better execution of the project is bound to create a big breach in the natural flow of trust between the two areas. The area served by the Tungabhadra Project will be greater in the proposed Karnataka State than in Andhra State.

The Central Government is quite competent to look to the efficient execution of the Project. The Inter-State Water Disputes Bill and the River Board Bill are on the anvil of Parliament. Above all, the reconstituted Board is doing satisfactory work.

It seems that the Commission have not anticipated the fact, that the Kannadigas will be forced to fall a prey to the mercy and benevolence of the Andhras who occupy the position of a conqueror who annexes what has

time and again been adjudged not to belong to him.

Shri Lakshmayya: Perhaps, my friend does not know that it is a project solely intended for Rayalaseema not a Hospet project.

Shri Bidari: It may be a Rayalaseema project.

Shri Basappa: When did this word "Rayalaseema" come into existence? Who coined it?

Shri Lakshmayya: I will tell you tomorrow.

Shri Bidari: To take the Andhras to be angles when they themselves have expressed fear and mistrust about the Kannadigas will be too bitter a pill to thrust down their throats. We have firm faith in Government's attitude not to impose anything and make it acceptable out of helplessness.

The demand of the Kannadigas to retain Bellary, Hospet and Sirugappa taluks and the sub-taluk of Mallapuram in Karnatak is not only sentimental and emotional but also rational. The retention of Kolar and Belgaum town in Karnataka cannot be a set off against these areas as the demand for their separation will be utterly irrational.

Shri Lakshmayya: Is the hon. Member allowed to read from his notes?

Shri Raghunath Singh (Banaras Distt.—Central): He is only consulting his notes.

Mr. Chairman: What is the use of interrupting him? Let the hon. Member continue.

Shri Bidari: Contiguity, cultural and economic ties of Kolar with Mysore for centuries past and above all their voluntary consent to remain with Mysore forbid its separation from that area. The prosperity of Belgaum town can be preserved only by retaining it in Karnataka.

I express my deep gratitude to the hon. Deputy-Speaker who was generous enough to offer Sirugappa and

Hospet taluks to Karnataka. I appeal to the Andhras to give up their claim over the entire Bellary area and show full magnanimity.

I appeal also to Government not to disinherit a posthumous child of the property that has been allotted to it as long back as 1920 and recently confirmed by Misra's Report for the negligence, if at all there be any, of till recent times an unwilling partner.

I entirely disagree with the Commission's recommendation about the retention of Telengana as a separate State for five years and then allowing it to express its desire whether to join Andhra or not. There cannot be any exception to the general theory that power corrupts. I have personal experience of even the smallest of the States contending for independent existence. The general opinion is that Vishalandhra should be formed here and now.

The smell of linguism has been stinking fast in the nose for the last 35 years or so. No Commission either set up by the British or by the Congress has recognised language alone as the basis for reorganisation. The principles that emerge from the Resolution appointing the present Commission have been stated in the Report as follows:

- (1) Preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India;
- (2) Linguistic and cultural homogeneity;
- (3) Financial, economic and administrative considerations; and
- (4) Successful working of the national plan.

Having once acceded to the above-named principles, is it in the fitness of things to impute motives to the Commission, even on the part of prominent leaders? They may not like the recommendations on their State. But

is it not proper and more dignified for them convincingly to rebut the reasonings by which they have arrived at such a decision?

I do not wish to enter into the controversy of the Bombay State. But I want to mention one thing about Belgaum and Karwar districts. On the Karnataka side, they are stretching their feathers far and wide. They demand a long strip along the border of Belgaum and Karwar districts and they claim Halyal, Supa and Karwar talukas on the plea that Konkani is akin to Marathi, if not Marathi, in spite of the fact that every Konkani knows Kannada. Their claim on Belgaum town and the border villages is rather fastidious in view of administrative considerations and economic and cultural ties with the Karnataka areas. We have no grudge for the transfer of Chandgad taluk to Maharashtra. The Commission have rightly thought of not disturbing the present administrative set-up with regard to other areas.

The Commission have recommended suitable safeguards for the minorities but it is rather unfortunate that even the intelligentsia apprehended that hell may descend on them if some locality speaking one language is allowed to remain in another locality of a different language. The innocent masses stand scared at the propaganda of these so called intelligentsia some untoward events have occurred in certain quarters. Excitement and passions have been exhibited in some other quarters.

Good comes out of evil. It is rather fortunate that the fear of dislocation in the transition period or of oppression of the minority by the majority is nowhere seen at war with the unity of the country. The unity of the country is an infant, though a healthy one. It has to be fostered and developed by infusing all the strength at the nation's command. If the Government maintains a firmer attitude in their earnest and well-meaning attempt and if the High Command and

[Shri Bidari]

the leaders of all the parties invoke saner elements by convincing the public that they will be in a far more advantageous position than before and that the door for mutual adjustment is always open, the disruptive and fissiparous tendencies will evaporate in no time.

लाला अचित राम (हिसार): मैं आपका आभारी हूँ कि आपने मुझे राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग की रिपोर्ट पर चल रहे डिस्कशन में अपने विचार रखने का अवसर दिया। मैं गवर्नमेंट को मुबारकबाद देता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट ने इस कमीशन को मुक़र्रर किया। बाज़ दोस्तों का खयाल है कि अगर इस वक्त कमीशन मुक़र्रर न किया जाता तो अच्छा होता क्योंकि इससे देश में बहुत सारे झगड़े बढ़ जायेंगे। एक बड़े जिम्मेदार हमारे मंत्री जी ने भी ऐसी बात कही थी लेकिन मेरा खयाल मुस्तलिफ है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस वक्त जितनी मुल्क के अन्दर ताक़त है वह इतनी काफ़ी है कि बड़े से बड़े मसले को भी हल कर सकती है। पंडित जी ने अपने मुताल्लिक ठीक ही कहा था कि जितने भी मुश्किल से मुश्किल मसले मेरे सामने आते हैं, मैं उनसे डरता नहीं हूँ बल्कि मैं अपने दिल में ऐसा महसूस करता हूँ कि मुझ में इतनी ताक़त है कि उसको ठीक तौर पर हल कर लूंगा। आज यह बिलकुल ठीक मौक़ा है कि ऐसी जटिल समस्या को हम अपने सामने रखें और उसको हल करें और मैं समझता हूँ कि जैसे सरदार पटेल की किस्मत में यह था कि उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान की देशी रियासतों के एकीकरण जैसे बड़े मसले और ज्वाइंट एलफ़टोरेट के प्रश्न को कितनी खूबी के साथ हल कर दिया, उसी तरह यह मालूम पड़ता है कि राज्यों के पुनर्गठन की समस्या का हल करना हमारे पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू की किस्मत में लिखा है।

कमिशन के मੈम्बरों को मैं खास तौर पर उनके काम के लिए मुबारकबाद देना चाहता

हूँ। और उनकी खिदमत की तारीफ़ करना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने बड़ी खूबी से अपने कर्तव्य को निबाहा है और इसमें कोई शक़ नहीं कि उन्होंने बड़ी मेहनत की है और कमिशन के सभी मੈम्बरों के लिए मेरे दिल में बड़ी इज्जत है लेकिन मैं खास तौर पर पंडित हृदयनाथ कुंजरू जो कि सर्वेट्स आफ़ इंडिया सोसाइटी के प्रेसीडेंट हैं उनके लिए मैं खास तौर पर अपना एप्रिशियेशन पेश करना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने अपनी सारी उम्र देश की खिदमत में लगा दी और इस वक्त भी उन्होंने एक भारी खिदमत की जो कि देश की हिस्ट्री में याद रहेगी।

अब मैं थोड़ा सा लुहारू की बात जिक़र करूंगा और उसके बारे में कमिशन की जो सिफ़ारिशात हैं उनसे थोड़ा मुस्तलिफ़ अर्ज़ करूंगा और मैं ऐसा महसूस करता हूँ कि उनकी जो सिफ़ारिशात हैं उनको और ज्यादा मौडिफ़ाइड होना चाहिए लेकिन असल बात यह है कि यह एक छोटी बात है और मैं पंडित जी के अफ़ज़ा से इतिफ़ाक़ करता हूँ कि इस बात की हमें कतअन कोई फ़िक़र नहीं होनी चाहिए कि बाउंड्रीज़ कहाँ बनती हैं, वहाँ बनती हैं या कहाँ बनती हैं, यह छोटी बात है। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि अगर हम अंग्रेज़ों के राज्य के अन्दर रह कर अंग्रेज़ी ज़बान सीखने में खुशी मानते थे, अंग्रेज़ी में तक्ररीर करने और आपस में अपने रिहतेदारों, भाई बहनों के साथ अंग्रेज़ी में गुफ़तग़ करने में फ़ख़ महसूस करते थे तो आज हम किसी ज़बान की सीखते हैं या उस ज़बान के राज्य के अन्दर रहते हैं या किसी मुल्क के अन्दर रहते हैं तो यह कोई परेशान होने की बात नहीं है और न कोई इसमें हमारी बेइज्जती का सवाल ही पैदा होता है। इस वास्ते जाती तौर पर मैं पंडित जी से बिलकुल इतिफ़ाक़ करता हूँ कि बाउंडरी कुछ भी हो, उसका हमें खयाल नहीं करना चाहिए। इस

बवत लुहारू का मसला आपके सामने पेश करना मैं अपना फ़र्ज़ समझता हूँ। लुहारू एक छोटा सा हिस्सा है जिसमें ३० हज़ार की आबादी है और वह हिंसा का हिस्सा है। वह मेरे हल्के के अन्दर है। कमिशन की रिपोर्ट जब निकली तो मेरे पास जगह जगह से तारें आनी शुरू हुई कि यह लुहारू राजस्थान में चला जायगा।

दूसरा तार आया कि उसको हिंसा में रहना चाहिए और तीसरा तार आता है कि उसको राजस्थान में रहना चाहिए। मैं तो इन तारों को पढ़कर बड़ा हैरान हो गया कि आखिर बात कैसे हल हो क्योंकि लोगों की राय मुस्लिम मुस्लिम है। तब मैंने उनको मशविरा दिया कि इस तरह से तो काम नहीं चलेगा क्योंकि आप लोगों की एक राय नहीं है और मैंने किसी फ़ैसले पर पहुंचने के खातिर एक तारीख़ मुक़रर की और उस में मैं उस तारीख़ को वहां पर गया और वहां जाकर एक कान्फ़ेस बुलाई और वहां पर मैंने पहले ऐलान कर दिया कि मैं न पंजाब के हक़ में हूँ और न राजस्थान के हक़ में हूँ बल्कि यहां पर आप लोग जो फ़ैसला करेंगे मैं उसको मानूंगा और मेरा कोई वोट पंजाब के लिए या राजस्थान के लिए नहीं है। वहां पर आपको मालूम है कि कोई ३० हज़ार की आबादी है, ७२ गांव हैं और ३६ पंचायतें हैं। हज़ारों आदमी वहां पर इट्ठा हो गये। जितनी भी ३६ पंचायतें वहां पर मौजूद थीं, सब के एक एक आदमी को बुला कर मैंने पूछा कि आपने क्या फ़ैसला किया है, आपकी पंचायत ने क्या फ़ैसला किया है और मैं तो हैरान हो गया जब ३६ की ३६ पंचायतों की प्रतिनिधियों ने यह बात कही कि हमारी पंचायतों ने यह फ़ैसला किया है कि हम पंजाब के साथ रहेंगे। जब ३६ की ३९ पंचायतों ने ऐसा फ़ैसला कर दिया तब मेरे दिल में शक़ गुज़र कि शायद ऐसा निर्णय करने के लिए किसी ने उनको

इंस्टिगेट न किया हो और ऐसा निर्णय करवा दिया हो, तब मैंने कहा कि आप में से तो कोई इसके हक़ में नहीं है कि यह राजस्थान में जाय लेकिन मैं इसका राजस्थान में मलाय जाने के हक़ में हूँ और मैंने वहां पर राजस्थान के फ़ेवर में स्पीच दी कि लुहारू के राजस्थान में जान से यह यह फ़ायदे होंगे। मैं जब राजस्थान के हक़ में स्पीच कर चुका तो उस वक्त एक और आदमी आ गया जो कि हरिजन लीडर था और वह राजस्थान के हक़ में था और जब वह आगे आया तो मैंने कहा कि बलो अच्छा हुआ "निर्बल के बल राम" राजस्थान का पक्ष कुछ तो मजबूत हुआ और उन्होंने राजस्थान के हक़ में स्पीच दी और कहा कि हरिजन लोग राजस्थान के हक़ में हैं। मैंने कहा अच्छी बात है अभी कान्फ़ेस में ही इस बात का फ़ैसला हुआ जाता है और मैंने कहा कि जितने हरिजन राजस्थान के पक्ष में हों वह सब एक तरफ़ को हो जायें।

मैंने कहा उन से बोट लो कि कौन राजस्थान के हक़ में है और कौन पंजाब के हक़ में है। तमाम हरिजन पंजाब के हक़ में निकले, कोई भी राजस्थान के हक़ में नहीं निकला। उसके बाद जब कान्फ़ेस हुई तो उस में प्रस्ताव पेश किया पंडित राम कुमार, एम० एल० ए० ने कि पंजाब का इलाका लोहारू में रहे। कई आदमियों ने कहा कि हम पंजाब के हक़ में तकरीर करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन मैंने कहा कि जो पंजाब के हक़ में है वह तकरीरें न करें, सिर्फ़ वही तकरीरें करें जो कि राजस्थान के हक़ में है। सिर्फ़ एक हरिजन लीडर था जिसने राजस्थान के हक़ में तकरीर की। उसके बाद खुले इजलास के अन्दर इस मामले पर वोटिंग हुई। तमाम के तमाम आदमियों ने कान्फ़ेस में यह फ़ैसला किया कि हम पंजाब के साथ रहना चाहते हैं। उस हरिजन लीडर ने भी राजस्थान के हक़ में बोट नहीं किया।

पंडित ठाकुरदास भागंब (गुडगांव) :
उस मीटिंग के अन्दर कितने आदमी थे ?

लाला अर्चित राम : कम से कम पांच, श्रः
हजार तो खरूर रहे होंगे। तब मैंने कहा कि
अब तक मैं इस चीज के हक में नहीं था, लेकिन
अब मैं कान्फरेन्स के हक में हूं और आप की
बात को पेश भी करूंगा। उसके बाद एक बार
फिर मैं लुहारू में आया हुआ था और सोया
हुआ था। देखा कि एक बड़ा जलूस चला आ
रहा है नारे लगाते हुए कि हम पंजाब में रहेंगे,
हम राजस्थान में नहीं रहेंगे। आखिर मैं मैं
बाहर आया तो देखा कि वह सब स्कूल के लड़के
थे। मैंने सोचा कि उन से पूछूं कि आखिर वह
पंजाब में क्यों रहना चाहते हैं। मैंने उनसे पूछा
कि आखिर तुम लोग पंजाब के हक में क्यों हो।
मैं उनकी बातें सुन कर हैरान हो गया। १६,
१६ और १७, १७ साल के नौजवान लड़कों ने
बड़ी अच्छी तकरीरें कीं। ऐसी तकरीरें
कि पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर भी शायद बहुत से न
कर सकें। उस के बाद मैं शहर के अन्दर गया,
दुकान दुकान से पूछा। गर्जें कि करीब ७०
फी सदी आदमियों ने कहा कि हम पंजाब में
रहना चाहते हैं। बहुत थोड़े लोगों ने कहा कि
हम राजस्थान के साथ रहना चाहते हैं। यही
सुबूत है कि लोहारू की तमाम जनता पंजाब के
साथ रहना चाहती है।

१९४७ में जब पार्टिशन हुआ और नवाब
लोहारू हटे तो यह फैसला कर के हटे कि लोहारू
हिस्सा रहे बीकानेर का। उस समय पाणिक्कर
साहब बीकानेर के चीफ मिनिस्टर थे। जब
यह आलूम हुआ तो लोगों को बड़ा गुस्सा आया,
उन्होंने वहां पर तारों को काट दिया, जो गवर्न-
मेन्ट के धानेदार थे उन्होंने रेजिगनेशन दे दिया।
जब सरदार पटेल को इस का पता लगा तो
सरदार पटेल ने उस फैसले को खत्म किया।
यह हालत है। मैंने वहां के लोगों से पूछा कि
आखिर तुम पंजाब में रहने के हक में क्यों

हो ? तो उन्होंने जवाब दिया कि राजस्थान में
बहुत गरीबी है, अगर हम गरीबों के साथ
मिलेंगे तो गरीबी ही तो मिलेगी। इसलिये हम
राजस्थान के साथ मिल कर क्या करेंगे ? हम
लोग पंजाब के साथ मिलेंगे तो हमारी तरक्की
जल्दी हो जायेगी। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि
आप लोहारू में चल कर देखिये। हमारी सारी
रिस्तेदारियां पंजाब में हैं। मैं तो इस बात को
कहता हूं कि हम को अपना फर्ज अदा करना
चाहिये। मैं नहीं कहता कि आप लोहारू को
पंजाब के अन्दर मिला दें, मैं तो सिर्फ यह कहता
हूं कि जो कुछ वहां की जनता चाहती है, जो
कुछ वहां की ६५ फी सदी जनता की राय है
उसको कीजिये और वह राय यह है कि हम
पंजाब के अन्दर रहेंगे। आप देखिये कि मुना-
सिब क्या है। मैं आप की बात की मुखालिफत
कभी नहीं करूंगा, आप एक डिस्ट्रिक्ट को
इस तरफ कर दें और दूसरे डिस्ट्रिक्ट को दूसरी
तरफ कर दें तो उससे हिन्दुस्तान पर क्या फर्क
पड़ता है। इस से न राजस्थान में ही फर्क
पड़ता है और न पंजाब में ही।

इस के बाद दो चार मिनट में मैं पंजाब के
बारे में अर्ज करना चाहता हूं। इस वक्त पंजाब
के मुताल्लिक बातचीत हो रही है। आज सुबह
पंडित जी ने जो स्पीच की है, उसको सुनने
के बाद मैं इसी नतीजे पर पहुंचा हूं कि मैं यह
कहूं कि मैं उनसे इत्फाक करता हूं कि मुल्क
के लिये जो कुछ उन्होंने कहा उसके अलावा
कोई दूसरा रास्ता नहीं है। उन का एक एक
लफ्ज मुनासिब था सिवा एक लफ्ज के जो कि
उन्होंने पंजाब के बारे में कहा कि पंजाब के
आदमी मिल कर नहीं बैठ सकते हैं। किसी ने
कहा कि यह पावर पालिटिक्स है, माफ कीजिये,
यह पावर पालिटिक्स तो है, लेकिन हम यहां
यह पावर पालिटिक्स देखते हैं कि कोई पंजाब
के आदमियों को ऐकोमोडेट नहीं करता है।
आप देखिये कि यू० पी० के कितने आदमी यहां

बैठते हैं, एक वजीर बन गया, दो वजीर बन गये, पांच वजीर बन गये, दस बन गये, लेकिन हमारे पंजाब का कोई नहीं बनता। दूसरों की ऐम्बिशन सैटिसफाई हो जाती है लेकिन पंजाब का कोई आदमी पार्लियामेन्ट्री सेक्रेटरी भी नहीं हो सकता है। मैं सिर्फ इस बात में पंडित जी से इत्तफाक नहीं कर सकता, बाकी सब बातों में मुझे उन से पूरा इत्तफाक है।

उन्होंने यह बात कही कि जॉनल सिस्टम हो जाय, पांच या छः जॉन हो जायें। मैं कहता हूँ कि बहुत अच्छी बात है, पांच जॉन भी अगर बनाये जायें तो करीब साढ़े सात करोड़ आदमी एक जॉन में आ जाते हैं। कम से कम पंजाब, पेप्सू, हिमाचल प्रदेश, की एक आवाज हो जायेगी। अगर आप मुनासिब समझें तो यू० पी० के भी एक आघ्र हिस्से दे दिये जायें या राजस्थान को उस जॉन में शामिल कर दिया जाये और हमारा जॉन बना दिया जाय। बड़ी खुशी की बात है। इसके बाद उनकी कौंसिल बना दी जाय। ३० परसेंट मम्बर यदि किसी असेम्बली के अपर हाउस में मामला पेश करना चाहें, या तो उस कौंसिल में हर चीज को डिस्कस कर लें। सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेन्ट जो रुपया देती है उस को खर्च करने के लिये भी आपस में वहां बातचीत कर के फैसला कर लें। अगर आप हिन्दुस्तान में जॉनल सिस्टम कर दें तो कम से कम हमें तो बड़ा अच्छा लगेगा। पांच छः जॉन्स में देश को तकसीम करें तो इससे बढ़ कर कोई बात नहीं हो सकती। और अगर इस के १७ हिस्से होने हैं तो उसके लिये भी मैं यह कहूंगा कि हिन्दुस्तान की आबादी ३६ करोड़ के करीब है। आप हर एक हिस्से को बराबर कर दें। अगर आप बड़े बड़े हिस्से बनाना चाहते हैं तो पांच, छः करोड़ आबादी के बना दें और अगर १७ हिस्से बनायें तो इस तरह से बनायें कि दो या सवा दो करोड़ आदमी हर एक हिस्से में आ

जायें। जो भी करें हिस्से आप बराबर के बनाये जैसा पंडित जी ने कहा कि वह यूनीलिंग्वल, बाईलिंग्वल या मल्टीलिंग्वल के हों उसकी कोई बात नहीं है। बहरहाल आप जैसा मुनासिब समझें करें। कमिशन ने जो रिपोर्ट दी है कि सी क्लास स्टेट्स हटा दी जायें वह बहुत अच्छा रवैया है।

अब मैं जबान के बारे में कुछ अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। पंडित जी ने बोलते हुए कहा कि अगर थोड़े जॉन बनाने हों तो एक लैंग्वेज नहीं हो सकती। उस में दो, तीन, चार यहां तक पांच लैंग्वेज तक हो सकती हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि उनकी स्पिरिट ठीक है। यह पहले फैसले में भी है कि पंजाब के अन्दर हर एक आदमी हिन्दी भी सीखे और पंजाबी भी सीखे। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि आप उसको चलायें। मैं तो इसके आगे भी जाने को तैयार हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि हर एक आदमी को उर्दू भी सीखनी चाहिये। उर्दू तो पंजाब के सभी लोग जानते हैं, काश्मीर की जबान भी उर्दू है। और मैं अपने खयाल से भी समझता हूँ कि यही ठीक है।

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : कुछ लड़कों को कठिनाई होगी।

लाला अक्षय राम : मैं समझता हूँ कि जो हिन्दी के हितैशी हैं उन के हित का भी तकाजा यही है कि उर्दू भी सिखाई जावे। हिन्दी जबान तो सारे हिन्दुस्तान की जबान होगी। अगर आप चाहते हैं कि हिन्दी इन्टर-नैशनल जबान बने तो इस के लिये आप को अपने पढ़ीस की जबानों को तो सीखना ही पड़ेगा जिन की बाउंड्री इस मुल्क से मिलती है। पाकिस्तान है, दूसरे मुल्क हैं। अगर आप चाहते हैं कि हिन्दी को भी वही स्टेट्स मिले जो कि अँग्रेज को मिला है, अंग्रेजी को मिला है तो आप को यही करना पड़ेगा। आखिर मैं

[छाला अर्चित राम]

क्या बोल रहा हूँ। मैं भी तो उर्दू बोल रहा हूँ, मैं उर्दू स्क्रिप्ट भी जानता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि हर शब्द के लिये उर्दू सीखना अच्छा है।

बाकी रहा सवाल यह कि स्टेट्स की शकल क्या बने। इस का जवाब मैं देता हूँ। मैंने पहले भी अर्ज किया कि जाती तौर पर मुझे इस में कोई दरेग नहीं है कि इस की शकल क्या बने। कोई लकीर भी खींची जा सकती है। लेकिन जैसा पंडित जी ने कहा कि लाजिक से नहीं, प्रेम से। लाजिक की बात तो हो ही जाती है, लेकिन उस को प्रेम से होना चाहिये। जो चीज लाजिक से नहीं हो सकती है वह प्रेम से हासिल की जा सकती है। दिल को प्रेम से ही जीता जा सकता है, लाजिक से नहीं। हमारे पंडित जी ने भी ऐसा ही किया। उन्होंने मास्टर तारासिंह को प्रेम से ऐप्रोच किया। इस पर मास्टर तारासिंह ने कहा कि मैं किसी के भी खिलाफ होऊँ, कांग्रेस के खिलाफ होऊँ, कांग्रेस वर्किंग कमेटी तक के खिलाफ होऊँ, लेकिन पंडित जी के खिलाफ नहीं बोल सकता। आखिर बात क्या है? पंडित जी ने उन को प्रेम से ही ऐप्रोच किया। मैं मास्टर तारासिंह को अच्छी तरह से जानता हूँ कि उनका दिल कैसा है। जब पार्टेशन हुआ तो वह कांग्रेस में नहीं थे, मैं कांग्रेस में था। मैंने उनसे पूछा कि मास्टर जी जलसा कांग्रेस के नाम से हो या कि आल पार्टीज के नाम से। उन्होंने कहा कि कांग्रेस की ही तरफ से कर लो मैं उसमें शामिल होऊँगा। मैं जानता हूँ कि उनका दिल नैरो नहीं है और मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि मास्टर तारासिंह कुछ भी कहते हों, उनका दिल देशभक्त है और वह पक्के हिन्दू हैं। और बड़े ही बहादुर हैं। यह तो मैं नहीं कह सकता कि मुझे उनकी किसी बात से इत्तलाफ नहीं होता। उनकी राय में और दूसरे की राय में इत्तलाफ हो सकता है, कुछ भी हो,

लेकिन तीन बातों में मुझे कोई शक नहीं है कि वह पक्के हिन्दू हैं, पक्के देशभक्त हैं और बहुत बहादुर हैं। मैं तो अब भी कहता हूँ कि अगर आप कोई रास्ता निकालना चाहते हैं तो जरूर निकालें मेरा फर्ज है कि मैं उसका समर्थन करूँ, मैं उन आदमियों में से नहीं हूँ कि किसी बात पर जिद करूँ। लेकिन यह जरूर चाहता हूँ कि जो कुछ कराना हो प्रेम से करो। दिल को प्रेम से जीतो, लाजिक से नहीं। आज हमारे अन्दर यह बात बहुत थोड़ी है कि हम दिल जीतने की कोशिश करें। आज जितने गवर्नमेन्ट के मेम्बर हैं, जितने वर्किंग कमेटी के मेम्बर हैं, जितने जिसके रिसोर्सेज हैं, उन से सब इस बात की कोशिश करें। जाती तौर पर मैं इस बात के हक में हूँ कि कोई भी स्टेट दो या ढाई करड़ से ज्यादा की आबादी की न बने। लेकिन यह तो सिर्फ लाजिक की बात है। लाजिक से बढ़ कर प्रेम है। हमारे पंडित जी प्रेम की भावना से काम करने वाले हैं इसलिये वह जो भी फैसला करेंगे मैं उसका समर्थक होऊँगा। लेकिन असल बात यह है जैसा कि विनोबा जी ने कहा है कि जो भी नक़्शा हमारे देश का बने उस में हर गांव एक रिपब्लिक बने, गांव वाले ही फैसला करें कि उनको क्या करना है। अगर गांव वाले फैसला करते हैं तो वह मोहब्बत से करेंगे। गांव वालों का दिल बहुत अच्छा होता है इस वास्ते अगर वह दिल से कोई भी फैसला करेंगे तो वह ठीक ही होगा। इस लिए The real solution lies in the advocacy of the methods of Vinobaji or Gandhiji in the establishment of village republics and they can be established not by working here in the Parliament or roundabout Delhi but in the villages spending days and nights for months together. That would be the final solution.

श्री हेम राज (कांगड़ा): सभापति महोदय, आज जो इस हाउस में भाषावार प्रान्तों के सवाल पर विचार हो रहा है इसका सिलसिला

जुनूबी हिन्दुस्तान से शुरू हुआ था लेकिन जिस वक्त गवर्नमेंट ने यह कमीशन बनाया तो यह मसला सारे देश का मसला बन गया और हर एक अगह इसकी वजह से जोश पैदा हो गया। लेकिन जहां इस मसले को और जगहों वाले अपने प्राक्स की तरफ से लाये हैं वहां बजाय इसके हम भी इसकी पंजाबी भाषा के आधार पर लाते, यह सवाल कुछ मजहबी रंग पकड़ गया और एक मजहबी शकल ले गया। मैं पंजाब के उस हिस्से से आता हूँ कि जो पहाड़ी हिस्सा है और वहां पर पहाड़ में हमारी अपनी एक डाइलैक्ट है जिसको हम डोगरी कहते हैं। लेकिन जहां तक पंजाबी भाषा का ताल्लुक है मैं भी उसको समझता हूँ और बोलता हूँ और हमारे यहां के पहाड़ी लोग भी उसको समझते हैं। तो जहां तक हमारे यहां पंजाब में बोलने की भाषा का सवाल है वह तो यह है कि सब पंजाबी बोलते और समझते हैं। लेकिन जो मसला है वह तब पैदा होता है जब उस भाषा को लिखने का सवाल आता है कि उसको किस भाषा में लिखा जाये। तो इस सवाल को इस तरह से देखा जाना चाहिए। कोई यह न समझ ले कि इस प्रदेश का नाम पंजाब है उसका कारण यह है कि यहां पंजाबी भाषा बोली जाती है। इस प्रदेश का नाम पंजाब तो इसलिए है कि यहां पर पांच नदियां बहती हैं।

प्रिपार्टीशन डक में जबकि पंजाब में हिन्दू, मुसलमान और सिख सभी रहते थे, उस वक्त यह भाषा का सवाल वहां पर हिन्दी और उर्दू की शकल में मौजूद था। लेकिन पार्टीशन हो जाने के बाद इस सवाल ने दूसरी शकल धरलियार कर ली और यह हिन्दी और गुरुमुखी का सवाल बन गया। यह सवाल तो कोई बहुत देरीना नहीं है लेकिन जैसा कि माननीय मेम्बर साहब अभी कह रहे थे अब यह मसला हमारे सामने आ गया है और हमको इसे हल

करना है। इस सवाल को हल करने के लिए भार्गव मिनिस्ट्री में जब श्री करतार सिंह मिनिस्टर थे और श्री सच्चर, जो कि धाजकल मुख्य मंत्री हैं, भी बजीर थे एक फार्मूला तैयार किया था और उसका नाम सच्चर फार्मूला रखा गया था। उसके अन्दर पंजाब को दो जोन्स में बांटा गया था, एक हिन्दी जोन और दूसरा पंजाबी जोन। जहां तक मेरे जिले का ताल्लुक है वह हिन्दी जोन में था और हरियाना हिन्दी जोन में था, और जो सैट्रल पंजाब के हिस्से थे वे सारे के सारे पंजाबी जोन में थे। सच्चर फार्मूला यह है कि हिन्दी जोन के लड़के स्कूलों में पहली जमाअत से तीसरी जमाअत तक हिन्दी पढ़ेंगे और चौथी जमाअत से आठवीं जमाअत तक गुरुमुखी पढ़ेंगे, और जो लड़के पंजाबी जोन के हैं वे पहली जमाअत से तीसरी जमाअत तक गुरुमुखी पढ़ेंगे और चौथी जमाअत से आठवीं जमाअत तक हिन्दी पढ़ेंगे। तो इस तरह से यह फार्मूला बनाया गया था। इसके लिए किसी ने ऊपर से दबाव नहीं डाला था, दोनों ने आपस में ही फँसला करके उसको लागू करने का फँसला किया था। मंशा यह था कि यह सूबा बाईलंग्वल हो और इसमें पंजाबी भाषा फलती फूलती रहे। किसी के दिल में यह शंका नहीं थी कि इस या उस भाषा को नहीं पढ़ा जायेगा।

सरदार इकबाल सिंह (फाजिल्का सिरसा):
क्या उसका इम्प्लीमेंटेशन मुकम्मल तौर पर किया गया ?

श्री हेम राज : अब हमारे भाई इकबाल सिंह पूछते हैं कि क्या मुकम्मल तौर पर उसका इम्प्लीमेंटेशन किया गया। मैं कहता हूँ कि हो सकता है कि मुकम्मल इम्प्लीमेंटेशन न हुआ हो, लेकिन धाज इस बास्ते यह जरूरी नहीं है कि हम बजें कि गुरुमुखी रीजनल भाषा ही या हिन्दी हो।

सरदार हुसम सिंह : मैं अपने दोस्त की तबज़ह इस तरफ़ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि एक बार वह स्क्रिप्ट कहते हैं और दूसरी बार वह उसी को लैंग्वेज कहते हैं। सवाल एक तरफ़ देवनागरी का और दूसरी तरफ़ गुरुमुखी स्क्रिप्ट का है।

श्री हेम राज : मैं मानता हूँ कि एक तरफ़ देवनागरी का सवाल है और दूसरी तरफ़ गुरुमुखी का सवाल है।

तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि सच्चर फार्मूले के मुताबिक़ हमने सारे पंजाब में पंजाबी भाषा बोलने का और दोनों स्क्रिप्ट पढ़ने का फैसला कर लिया था। सवाल यह है कि आया इसका मुकम्मल तौर पर इम्प्लीमेंटेशन हुआ या नहीं। हो सकता है कि मुकम्मल तौर पर इम्प्लीमेंटेशन न हुआ हो, मैं इस बात से इंकार नहीं करता। मिनिस्ट्री कहती है कि हो गया है।

Sardar Iqbal Singh: That is the view of the provincial Government.

श्री हेम राज : लेकिन अब तो प्राविशियल काँग्रेस कमेटी ने भी यह तस्लीम कर लिया है कि सच्चर फार्मूले पर मुकम्मल तौर पर प्रमल किया जाये। इस फार्मूले को भरहम सरदार पटेल का आशीर्वाद प्राप्त था और हमारे मोहतरिम नेता पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू का भी आशीर्वाद इसको प्राप्त है। मैं समझता हूँ कि आज जो यह कशमकश गुरुमुखी और देवनागरी में चल रही है यह हमेशा के लिए ख़त्म हो सकती है और उसका एक ही तरीका है और वह तरीका है जो कि हमारे मोहतरिम लीडर ने फरमाया है। वह यह है कि हम पंजाब के लिए इस मामले में कोई फैसला कर लें जिसको कांस्टीट्यूशनल गारंटी मुकम्मल तौर पर दे दी जाय। फिर कोई वजह नहीं हो

सकती कि वह मुकम्मल तौर से इम्प्लीमेंट न हो। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह भाषा का मसला इतना मुश्किल नहीं है कि जिसकी वजह से हमारे यहां पंजाब में सिर फुटव्वल होती फिरे। लेकिन हमने इसको जोड़ दिया है मजहब से। मेरे दिल में मास्टर जी के लिए बहुत ज्यादा इज्जत है क्योंकि वह समझते हैं कि हिन्दू और सिक्ख भाई भाई हैं। इसके अलावा उनके सामने एक और नजारा है, यानी सन् ४७ का नजारा। वे उसको भले नहीं हैं और वह नहीं चाहते कि वह नजारा फिर से पंजाब में देखने को मिले। लेकिन जब यह सवाल सामने आया तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह अपने जज़बात से ज़रा परे हट गये जब कि उन्होंने श्रमृतसर में अपना स्टेटमेंट दिया जिस वक्त कि वह गिरफ्तारी के बाद रिहा होकर गये थे।

उन्होंने कहा था कि :

"I feel we cannot save our religion without attainment of political power in the Punjabi-speaking regions."

तो मैं यह अर्थ करता हूँ कि जिस वक्त यह सवाल आता है सिक्ख सिक्खिज्म का, उस वक्त चाहे वह भाषा का सवाल हो और चाहे कोई और सवाल हो, उसको वह सिक्खिज्म से जोड़ देते हैं तो उसका कुदरती तौर पर एक नतीजा होता है और वह यह है कि दोनों सेक्शंस के बीच एक नफरत, हेट्रेड पैदा होती जाती है

Mr. Chairman: How much more time does the hon. Member require?

Shri Hem Raj: About 15 minutes more.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may continue tomorrow.

**Written statements of Members*

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya East): I have got my own plan of re-organization of States. There should be Zonal Governments for some of the States. Three levels of Governments—Provincial, Zonal & Central—as adumbrated in the scheme of May 16, 1946 were propounded by the British Government. Other States should be directly governed by the Centre on the basis of a unitary form of Government. Linguistic States—Bombay (Maharashtra with Bombay as capital), Gujarat, Tamilnad, Andhra (Vishal), Kerala, Karnataka, Assam, Bengal and Orissa—should be allowed to exist for a period of five years or more Vidarbha must be integrated with Maharashtra.

Other States should be liquidated. Here there should be Panchayat Raj to the fullest extent possible.

I am opposed to division of Power. I am in favour of delegation of powers. There should be legislative centralization along with administrative decentralization. Panchayat Raj will mean the end of bureaucracy. Democracy can flourish only under the aegis of Panchayat Raj.

The establishment of a unitary form of Government over such a wide area will pave the way for the establishment of a unitary form of Government over the whole of India.

The establishment of a unitary form of Government is inevitable. The choice before us is limited. Would it be done by Parliamentary methods or by some other method? This is the only choice before us. Let there be no mistake about it.

I was the only figure in the Constituent Assembly who from beginning to end stood for the creation of a unitary form of Government in India.

The Constitution came into operation in 1950. Within a period of six

years centrifugal forces have rapidly gained ground. The unity of India will be in jeopardy if fissiparous tendencies are not checked in time. The only way to do it is to liquidate all the Provinces—lock, stock & barrel.

Shri Kakkaiyil (Madurai—Reserved—Sch. Castes): In the interest of the unity, prosperity, and solidarity of India I beg to submit at the very outset that Devikulam and Peermadu should come to Tamilnad. The S.R.C. failed to consider the linguistic, geographical and economic welfare and administrative convenience. Though I generally welcome the recommendations of the S.R.C., I regret that the S.R.C. failed to do justice to the Tamil people living in the area of Travancore-Cochin.

Devikulam—Peermadu Taluks form an integral unit with a decisive Tamil majority. Therefore the two taluks should be transferred to Madras State along with the Southern areas of Travancore-Cochin recommended by the S.R.C. to be included in Tamilnad.

The S.R.C. states that on the basis of 1951 census Devikulam and Peermadu taluks contain 72 per cent. and 44 per cent. of Tamilians respectively and that the Tamil labour population in these two taluks are not permanent residents. This is far from the fact.

In the 1941 census the percentage of the Tamil-speaking population in these 2 taluks is given as 90 per cent and 51 per cent respectively. Even the low percentage of Malayalam-speaking population in these two taluks is not permanent. Even this small percentage consists of only Government servants, coolies, petty tea stall holders and P.W.D. Coolies.

It is therefore clear from the linguistic point based on the percentage of the population, that these two taluks should go to Madras State.

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

[Shri Kakkan]

The S.R.C. states that the Tamilians of Devikulam and Peermedu Taluks are coolies and not permanent residents. I say, this is incorrect.

In the rubber, tea and Cardamom estates of these 2 Taluks alone 95 per cent employees are Tamil labourers permanently residing in these taluks with their families for more than a century. The 90 per cent of owners of Cardamom estates in these 2 taluks are Tamilians.

The paddy-growing areas of Marayur, Kekandalur, Vattawadai are mostly owned by Tamilians. The Tamils own quite a large and appreciable extent of landed properties. The entire trade of these two taluks are in the hands of Tamilians.

The hill tribes known as Mananaan, Pulciyar, Mutharean, Manangadi and Pandaram are Tamilians. These Tamilians are original inhabitants of these 2 Taluks from times immemorial.

During the last general elections to the T.C. Assembly the candidates put up by the T.T.N.C.C. were elected by an overwhelming majority from these two taluks. In their manifesto T.T.N.C. stated that these two taluks belong to Tamilnad and should be merged with Madras State.

If these two taluks are added to Madras State, it will be highly beneficial for the economic development of the Madras State. The Periyen, Kallar etc., most of the rivers have their source in these two Taluks. These rivers run through T.C. State and empty themselves wastefully into the Arabian sea. On the other hand if these 2 taluks are added to Madras State there is a great possibility of making use of the water of these rivers. In view of this possibility the

Planning Commission has recently sanctioned a crore of rupees to Madras for investigation purposes. It is admitted by all that there is a great scope for generating electric power from these rivers if they are diverted to Madras State.

I would like to point out the whole district of Malabar now in Madras State consisting of 16 taluks and the Kasargod taluks of South Kanara are to be added to the Kerala State to be formed. Thus we are giving the rich teak forests of Nilambur of Malabar district. The income, the new Kerala State would derive from the area of Malabar district and Kasargod Taluk would more than compensate the income now derived from the Devikulam and Peermedu taluks by the present T.C. State.

I want to stress further that there are only two highways for connecting these two taluks with the Kerala State to be formed. But there are quite a number of highways for connecting Madras State with these two taluks. Since the Peermedu and Devikulam taluks are a hilly tract it is considered as single unit and so on that basis these two taluks have been constituted as a double-member constituency for the Assembly. The population in these areas is more than 80 per cent Tamilian.

Further Madras State also is not rich in economic resources and the population of the State is very great. The area which is going to be merged with Madras State is thickly populated. So it is just and reasonable that these two taluks should be added on to Madras State.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned at Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 22nd December, 1955.