

[Secretary]

(3) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 162 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Indian Tariff (Third Amendment) Bill, 1955, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 10th December, 1955, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."

MOTION RE. REPORT OF STATES
REORGANISATION COMMISSION

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion moved by Pandit G. B. Pant on the 14th December, 1955, namely:—

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

I do not wish to enter into any arguments. I am merely making a statement as to how the position stands, and I shall proceed with the planning which I have made. Up till now, 19 units have taken part in the debate. Yesterday, I made a slight mistake when I said that Uttar Pradesh had not taken part, but actually it was Uttar Pradesh that initiated the debate.

Now, there remain the following States, namely, Kutch, Bhopal, Ajmer, Rajasthan and Coorg. My idea is just to give an opportunity to representatives of each of these States. Then, I may have a part of the case of West Bengal. Then, I may proceed to Rajasthan. Then, I shall come to special interests like the Anglo-Indians and the Bihar tribals. Thereafter, I may go to Mysore. And time permitting, I shall reach U.P. late in the evening. So, we shall proceed now in this order.

We shall start with Kutch. **Shri Bhawanji.**

Shri R. D. Misra (Bulandshahr Distt.): On a point of information....

Mr. Speaker: I may make one point clear. No questions are to be put now. As I said earlier, I am not prepared to answer any questions, because we take a lot of time in answering those questions.

Shri R. D. Misra: I want to ask you one question.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to answer any questions now. The hon. Member can put the question to me in my chamber, after I retire, and not take the time of the House.

Shri R. D. Misra: I wanted to be clear about one point. You have stated that the debate was initiated by Uttar Pradesh. I want to know whether the initiator was on behalf of the Government of India or from Uttar Pradesh.

An Hon. Member: Both.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry hon. Members insist on taking the time of the House by putting one question or another in one form or another. The hon. Member who initiated the debate represents the whole of India. I wish the hon. Member, **Shri R. D. Misra**, had appreciated the humour of the thing.

Now, I should like to make one point clear once again. I have been appealing all these five days to hon. Members that they may not take more time. But I find that in spite of these appeals, one hon. Member has taken yesterday about 40 minutes. The time that the House had agreed to was about 15 minutes; it may extend to 20 minutes; there may be exceptional cases in which it may be still further extended. There cannot be any hard and fast rules.

But I may appeal to hon. Members that now that so much has been spoken already on the general aspect of reorganisation, they may make only specific points and cut short. Otherwise, the result will be that in spite of the best wishes of the Chair, some Members, and a large number perhaps, will be crowded out.

There is another point on which I may give a clarification. I said yesterday that those who want to have their views placed before the House, the Ministry or Government, may submit memoranda not exceeding about two printed pages. Some hon. Members have misunderstood that the memorandum should be of two typed pages; actually, I said two printed pages of the size in which the debates are printed; it should not be a very elaborate memorandum, again. These memoranda may be submitted by the evening of the 23rd instant. I am stating that again for the information of the House.

Now, Shri Bhawanji.

Shri Gidwani (Thana): But there is one difficulty....

Mr. Speaker: No questions now. I have called upon Shri Bhawanji.

Shri Bhawanji (Kutch West): I rise to make my observations on the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission as they affect Kutch.

Till 1948, Kutch was a forsaken region, isolated by geographical factors and undeveloped on account of the unprogressive attitude of its rulers. Even then, Kutch was known not only in our country but throughout the world for its initiative and enterprise. If Kutch was known for anything, it was known for exporting its intelligence out of its territory.

In 1948, when Kutch was about to be integrated with the rest of India, the question arose as to what constitutional set-up Kutch should have. There were two alternatives before the Government of India. One was to merge Kutch with Bombay, and the other was to make it a Centrally administered area. Looking to the geographical position and the economic backwardness of Kutch, the Government of India decided to make it a Part C State.

While taking over the administration of Kutch, the late revered Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel in a message to the people of Kutch said that the Government of India were aware of the economic backwardness of Kutch, they were aware of the contributions made by the people of Kutch spread all over our country in the freedom struggle of India, and that it would be the constant anxiety of the Government of India to bring Kutch on a par with the neighbouring States, as speedily as possible. I am very happy to say that that assurance has vigorously been put into effect by the Government of India. For that, the people of Kutch are grateful. They are also grateful to this House for having sanctioned huge amounts to the Government of India for vigorously carrying out different developmental schemes.

Perhaps, my hon. friends from Tripura and Manipur will find that we are not aspiring at all for having a separate existence and a full-fledged democratic government in Kutch. We have always disassociated ourselves from them in the past in their demand for full-fledged democratic governments in these States because we in Kutch believe that democracy is quite all right, but democracy is only a means to an end, the end being the welfare and well-being of the people, we feel that a small State like Kutch cannot have the

[Shri Bhawanji]

luxury of full-fledged government, because of its economic backwardness. There cannot be a more vigorous democracy than what we have in this sovereign Parliament of India. That is why we were happy that Kutch was under the Central Government and would have liked to continue as such for sometime.

When the States Reorganisation Commission was appointed, the question came before the representatives of Kutch as to what sort of memoranda they should send to the Commission. We were consistent in our attitude. In our memoranda as well as in our oral evidence before the Commission, we said that if in the larger interests of the country, the Commission came to the conclusion that small States should not exist, then Kutch would not object to its being merged with the State of Bombay. But if, unfortunately, the State of Bombay was to be split up, and Maha Gujarat was to be formed, then we suggested that the city of Bombay might be made a city-State.

Some people who have no knowledge of Kutch association with the city of Bombay think it strange that Kutch is suggesting that in case Bombay State was split up, Bombay City should be created into a separate State. I will come to that a little later.

We said that Kutch would be prepared to join either with the Bombay State, or if the State was split up, with Gujarat, but with an assurance that its development will not be interrupted. Some sort of arrangement should be made by which the development which is going on at present should continue. When this Report was out, we were very happy that along with other things the Commission had taken this aspect into consideration and has recommended safeguards for the transitional phase. What are those safeguards? They are: supervisory powers over the State Government, that means, over the Government of the State with which

Kutch would be merged, special allotment for the development of Kutch, and control over the disbursements of this allotment and the Development Board. I think so far as the development part is concerned, those safeguards are sufficient, and if they are worked in the proper spirit, the development of Kutch will not be interrupted. The Commission have also recommended that while applying the laws of the State with which Kutch is to be merged, care should be taken to see that they are applied with due regard to the special needs of Kutch. I hope that this House will accept these safeguards and that the Government will implement them.

Having dealt with the economic aspect, I will now come to the bigger aspect of the question, namely, merger of Kutch with the bilingual State of Bombay. When this Report was out, I was very happy to see that the Commission had taken a very broad view about the future of Bombay State and made it into a bi-lingual State excluding the Karnataka and some other portion and adding Marathwada, Saurashtra and Kutch. On the very day of the publication of the Report, I issued a statement saying that Kutch welcomes this recommendation. Subsequently, the Kutch Congress Committee also accepted this recommendation. We had hoped that all the areas which were to join this new State would accept that Maharashtra, Gujarat and Bombay would accept the recommendation, and Kutch would be joining in a happy family. This expectation was short-lived. Saurashtra accepted it. Gujarat accepted it. Maharashtra did not. Later on, the GPCC had to pass another resolution, but even in that resolution, also the GPCC said that it was and is prepared to accept it, provided certain things are there. But unfortunately, my friends in Maharashtra thought otherwise, and they did not accept the recommendation of the SRC for

a bi-lingual Bombay State. Ultimately—I need not go into details about facts and figures or the controversy that is going on in this country about the City of Bombay, as the time at my disposal is short—the Congress Working Committee had to pass a resolution on this recommendation of the SRC in which they have said that in view of the representation of the MPCC, the Working Committee find no other alternative that creating three States—Maharashtra, Gujarat and Bombay City.

We in Kutch accept the recommendation of the Congress Working Committee because we cannot afford the prospect of Bombay City going to a uni-lingual State, because, as in the case of the rest of India, the prosperity of Kutch also depends on the well-being of Bombay City. Many people are not probably aware that in the development of Bombay, Kutch has also a claim. People, as we know, first started coming to Bombay City from Gujarat. But in early 19th century, people from Kutch, on account of irregular rains in Kutch and the unprogressive attitude of its rulers, were hungry and they had to migrate somewhere. In countrycraft they started migrating to Bombay. The present docks in Bombay were not constructed then. They had to land somewhere and the place where they settled down in Bombay is even today known as Mandvi. Probably people who are associated with Bombay know that there were formerly seven wards. People who came from Ratnagiri settled down in an area which is known as Colaba. The Radio Club, where many hon. Members must have had their meals, is in Colaba. Bombay now has, I think, 37 wards. The Mandvi ward is split up into Mandvi, Dongri and Omerkhadi. I would say that 90 to 90 per cent. of the population in these areas belong to Kutch. Kutchis today there number 2,50,000 roughly consisting of Memens, Khojas, Lohanas, Bhatias and Oswals.

I say that the economy of Kutch today depends on Bombay. I told our Prime Minister when he visited Kutch that our economy is a money order economy. The economy of Kutch even today is a money order economy. Every month money orders go regularly from Bombay to Kutch. That is how many families in Kutch are sustained. If somebody disputes this, I am prepared to accept the challenge. There is hardly any house in Kutch which has not got one or two breadwinners in the City of Bombay. So naturally the House will appreciate the anxiety of Kutch in the well-being of the City of Bombay. Kutchis went from Kutch to Bombay first as labourers....

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

Shri Bhawanji: Kutch does not figure much in debates in this House on account of our constructive approach. Members always talk of Manipur and Tripura, and this is probably only the second time that I am on my legs.

Mr. Speaker: He may take five minutes more.

Shri Bhawanji: It is said that the SRC recommendation and the Working Committee resolution were for the sake of certain interests. Kaka-sahib Gadgil said that this was done for some capitalists or industrialists. As I said, we went from Kutch to Bombay as labourers. Even today, from among the 2,50,000 Kutchis people there, many are small traders. There are industrialists, there are rich people in Bombay, like my hon. friends Shri Tulsidas and Shri G. D. Somani. But what is their number? The bulk of the people in the City of Bombay are either labourers or middle-class and upper middle people. The middle class people, labourers, clerks, managerial staff—all these sections want that the City of Bombay should not form part of a uni-lingual State.

Having said this, I would appeal to this House to accept the recommendations of the SRC in regard to Bombay, provided all the components

[Shri Bhawanji]

parts, that is, Maharashtra, Bombay and Gujarat accept it voluntarily. Otherwise, Kutch would not like to be merged with a State where there is no agreement between the parties. In the event of the SRC recommendation not being accepted, Kutch would prefer the three-States formula suggested by the Working Committee.

श्री सी० एन० मालवीय (रायसन): अध्यक्ष जी स्टेट्स रिऑर्गनाइजेशन कमिशन ने जो नये मध्य प्रदेश के बनाये जाने का प्रस्ताव पेश किया है, उसका मैं पूरी तरह से समर्थन करता हूँ। इस सिलसिले में विन्ध्य प्रदेश और मध्य भारत की तरफ से यह आवाज उठी है कि यहाँ वहाँ का जनमत यह नहीं चाहता इसलिए इनको अलग रखा जाये और इस बार में उन्होंने कुछ आर्थिक और राजनीतिक कारण भी बतलाये हैं।

[SHRIMATI SUSHAMA SEN in the Chair]

जहाँ तक जनमत का सवाल है मेरा यह कहना है कि क्या हम सार्व हिन्दुस्तान के जनमत को देखें या कि हम सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर दो चार या दस गांवों या शहरों के जनमत को देखें। इस जनमत के सवाल के ऊपर भी एस० आर० सी० ने रोशनी डाली है और उन्होंने बतलाया है कि किस तरीके से जनमत देखा जाना चाहिये। जहाँ तक जनमत का सवाल है भोपाल की असेम्बली ने एक मत से, भोपाल की सब जिला कांग्रेस कमेटी ने एक मत से इस चीज की मांग की थी कि हम भोपाल को अलग रखना चाहते हैं। और सुव्यवस्था, शासन और उन्नति के कार्यों की वजह से वह मुस्तहक भी था लेकिन इसके होते हुए भी एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट जब प्रकाशित हुई तो उन्होंने देश के हित में कमिशन के इन तीन विद्वानों ने जो सिफारिशें की हैं उनका उन्होंने स्वागत किया। इस तरीके से विन्ध्य प्रदेश या मध्य भारत में जिन लोगों ने इस चीज की मांग की है कि वह अलग रहना चाहते

हैं तो मैं उनसे प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह अपने दृष्टिकोण से ही न इस चीज को देखें बल्कि समस्त भारत के हित को ध्यान में रखकर इस चीज का फैसला करें, हिन्दुस्तान की जो २६ करोड़ जनता है उसकी भलाई को उन्हें ध्यान में रखना चाहिए। हमें यह भी देखना है कि क्या आर्थिक दृष्टि से यह आत्मनिर्भर हो सकती है। यह माना गया है कि रियासतों को बनाते वकत भाषा का ही एक मात्र ध्यान नहीं रखा जाना चाहिए, दूसरी चीजों का भी ध्यान रखा जाना चाहिए। ऐसी सूरत में मध्य प्रदेश की हमारा जो फंडरल कान्स्टीट्यूशन है, उसमें क्या पोजीशन होगी, इस दृष्टि से हमें विचार करना चाहिए। इस सिलसिले में श्री राधे लाल व्यास जी ने बहुत सी बातें यहाँ पर कहीं हैं। मैं भी यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब हम रियासतें बनायें तो हमें देखना चाहिए कि हम जो बड़ी बड़ी प्रोजेक्ट्स सीक्रेट फाइल इचर प्लान में शामिल करने जा रहे हैं जहाँ तक हो सके उनको एक ही एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के कंट्रोल में रखा जाए। हमारे मध्य प्रदेश में नर्मदा, चम्बल, सिन्ध, सोन, टोंस, बंतवा, महानदी, पार्वती, इन्द्रावती और वेणुगंगा नदियाँ हैं। यह ऐसी नदियाँ हैं जो कि माईकाल, महादेव और छोटानागपुर के प्रदेशों से अपना पानी बहाती हैं और इन पर बड़े बड़े प्रोजेक्ट्स भी बनाये जा रहे हैं। इन नदियों में मैंने उन छोटी छोटी नदियों की गिनती नहीं की जोकि कितनी ही हैं। यह सब एक एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में होंगी। जब यह एक प्रान्त में होंगी तो आप बरा गौर फरमाइये कि हम अपने आप को एग्रीकल्चरली कितना आगे बढ़ा सकेंगे। किस हद तक हम पावर पैदा कर सकेंगे और कितने अच्छे ढंग से उसका उपयोग भी कर सकेंगे।

मध्यभारत में चैम्बर आफ कामर्स है उसने कुछ आंकड़े दिए हैं और उन्होंने बताया है कि मध्यभारत महाकाँशल से बहुत आगे है। इस बात को मैं तर्क के लिये मान लेता हूँ। लेकिन आज इस संसार में, इस हिन्दुस्तान

में जब हम एकता की बात करते हैं तो क्या हमें यह कहना शोभा देता है कि क्योंकि हम ज्यादा मालदार हैं, हम ज्यादा उन्नत हैं और जो हमारे भाई पड़ोस में रहते हैं और जो हमारे जितने मालदार नहीं उनको हम अपने शहर में से कुछ न दें। जब इस किस्म की आवाज उठती है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि जो लोग ऐसा कहते हैं उनकी पंजीवादी मनोवृत्ति है। इस चीज को मैं बहुत बुरा मानता हूँ और मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि ऐसी आवाज उठनी नहीं चाहिए। अध्यक्ष जी, जिस वक्त मैंने एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट को पढ़ा उस दिन मुझमें गर्व हुआ इस बात से कि आज तो मैं आठ लाख लोगों का प्रतिनिधित्व करता हूँ लेकिन अब मैं दो करोड़ ६२ लाख की एक फौजिली का मेम्बर बना हूँ। आज मेरे सामने सिर्फ ६,००० वर्ग मील का एरिया था लेकिन अब यह बढ़कर एक लाख, ७२ हजार वर्ग मील हो गया है। इतना बड़ा क्षेत्र मेरा बन गया है। जो इटाली की कालाब्रिजा फौजिली खुल रही है कल मैं उसको अपना नहीं कह सकता था लेकिन अब मैं उसको अपनी कह सकता हूँ। नैपा मिल मेरे प्रदेश में है। बस्तर और विन्ध्य प्रदेश के जो खनिज धारक हैं और जिन को हम सब हिन्दुस्तान के लोग अब डिबलेप कर रहे, उन पर भी मुझमें गर्व है। इसी तरह भारत के जो V. K. R. V. Rao इकोनॉमिस्ट हैं उनका रॉयल्टी पहलें दिया गया है। उनका लेख हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स में भी हाल में निकला था और मैंने उसको पढ़ा है। एस० आर० सी० को उन्होंने इस प्रदेश के निर्माण में सर्वोत्तम माना है। भारतवर्ष की रियासतों का जो मंथन किया है उसमें से अगर मकखन का कोई गोला निकाला है तो वह मध्य प्रदेश है। मेरे विचार में यह जो मध्य प्रदेश स्टेट बनने वाली है वह एक बहुत ही उन्नीतशील रियासत होगी। साथ ही साथ मध्य भारत में जो आज डाकूओं का बोलबाला है, जो ला एंड आउट की समस्या है, आपस के जो भगड़ हैं, उनके ऊपर भी एच० आर० सी० ने काफी रोशनी डाली है।

इसमें किसी का कस्ूर नहीं है, मध्य भारत के लोगों का ही है। अगर वह अच्छी तरह से इसका इन्तजाम कर लें तो मुमकिन है कि आज मध्य भारत को बह बनाए रखते। इसी तरह से अगर विन्ध्य प्रदेश अपनी समस्याओं को सुलभता लेता ह्युलिगनीज्म पर कंट्रोल कर लेता तो हो सकता है कि आज उनकी असंग रहने की मांग पर गौर हो जाता। इन्हीं चीजों का यह नतीजा है कि उनको मिला कर महा-कांशल को एक बड़ा प्रदेश बनाया जा रहा है।

अब मैं जो इसका राजनीतिक पहलू है उस पर आता हूँ। हिन्दुस्तान में सरदार बटल के नेतृत्व में हमने ६०० दंशी रियासतों को खत्म किया। हम ने जमींदारी को भी खत्म किया। आज एस० आर० सी० की जो रिपोर्ट है यह भी चार चांद लगाने वाली है। अंगूठों के जमाने में यहाँ पर एक तो ब्रिटिश इंडिया था और दूसरी प्रिंसली स्टेट्स थीं। इन स्टेट्स को खत्म करके हम ने एक कदम आगे बढ़ाया। लेकिन जो रियासतों के रहने वाले थे, जाहिर है कि वह लोग कुछ पीछे थे। लेकिन आज महाकांशल की जो पुरानी ट्रीटिशंस हैं, जो स्वतंत्रता संग्राम की ट्रीटिशंस हैं उनमें विन्ध्य प्रदेश, मध्य भारत और भोपाल मिल कर नये डेमोक्रेटिक आइडियल की तरफ हम बढ़ने वाले हैं। साथ ही साथ विन्ध्य प्रदेश पूरा हम मिला रहे हैं, भोपाल हम पूरा मिला रहे हैं, पूरा मध्य भारत मिला रहे हैं, और मध्य प्रदेश के सिर्फ विदर्भ के हिस्से उससे काट हैं। इस लिए एसेट्स और लायाबिलिटीज के बारे में भी कोई मुश्किल नहीं पड़ेगी। इसी तरह से इंटेंशन आफ सर्विसिस और इसी तरह की जो दूसरी समस्याएँ उठ सकती हैं, उनको भी हल करना कोई मुश्किल काम नहीं होगा। ऐसी स्थिति में मध्य प्रदेश एक बहुत ही अच्छा प्रदेश बनने वाला है। इस वास्ते में अपने मध्य भारत के दोस्तों से और विन्ध्य प्रदेश के दोस्तों से दरखास्त करूंगा कि वह इसके आर्थिक पहलू पर गौर करें और अपनी छोटी छोटी स्टेट्स बना

[श्री सी० एन० मालवीय]

कर अलग अलग रहने की कोशिश न करें। अगर मैं पुरानी बातों का हवाला दूं तो ट्राइबल स्टेट में हम पहुंचेंगे जबकि हम छोट-छोट गुणों में अलग अलग रहते थे। उस वक्त एक ट्राइब दूसरी ट्राइब से अलग थी। हमें जिस तरीके से आज जमाना तरक्की कर रहा है उसको ध्यान में रखना चाहिए और उसीके मुताबिक चलना चाहिए।

इसके बाद जहां तक राजधानी का सवाल है उसके बारे में हमारे सेंट गोविन्द दास जी ने बड़े अच्छे तरीके से बात कही है। उनका मैं इसके लिए धन्यवाद देता हूं। उनका उदार हृदय है, वह एक आल इंडिया फिगर हैं। उन्होंने जबलपुर का नाम लिया है। लेकिन मैं बतलाना चाहता हूं कि भोपाल के लोगों ने जो मध्य प्रदेश पर दिया है राजधानी पर इतनी जोर नहीं दिया। कई लोगों ने कहा है कि भोपाल के लोगों को राजधानी के प्रश्न पर कोई विशेष जोर नहीं देना चाहिए। उन्होंने साफ साफ यह कहा है, कि मध्य प्रदेश अगर बनता है तब तो ठीक है लेकिन यदि मध्य प्रदेश के बनने में भोपाल की वजह से अड़चन पड़ती है और भोपाल उसके रास्ते में आता है और इसी वजह से यह बन नहीं पाता है तो सैकड़ों भोपाल हम इसकी खातिर कुर्बान कर सकते हैं। जहां तक जबलपुर को राजधानी बनाने का प्रश्न है, कमीशन ने अपने अधिकार से बाहर जा कर उस की रीकमैण्डेशन की थी। कांग्रेस वीकनिंग कमेटी ने उस रीकमैण्डेशन को रिजेक्ट कर दिया है इस लिए नहीं कि जबलपुर राजधानी नहीं बन सकता है, बल्कि इस लिए कि कमीशन को यह निर्णय करने का अधिकार नहीं था। हाई पावर कमेटी ने सब नगरों की सम्बन्धित बातों और आंकड़ों पर विचार किया है और किसी प्रकार की पॉलीटिकल कन्सिडरेशन्स को सामने नहीं रखा है, और भोपाल को राजधानी बनाने का फैसला किया है हासलिक इस विषय में कुछ पॉलीटिकल कन्सिडरेशन्स भी हो सकती हैं। भोपाल के कम्प्यूनिक्शन्स बहुत

डवेलपड हैं और वह सब दृष्टियों से बहुत उन्नत और उपयुक्त स्थान हैं। मध्य भारत वालों को छोड़ दीजिए, बिहार के एक सज्जन ने हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स में लेटरर्स दे दि खीटर कालम में एक पत्र लिख कर यह सिद्ध किया है कि भोपाल सब से केंद्रीय स्थान है। इस हाउस के माननीय सदस्य भी इस बात पर गौर करें कि भोपाल और जबलपुर में से कौन सा स्थान केंद्र में पड़ता है। जहां तक कम्प्यूनिक्शन्स को डवेलप करने का प्रश्न है, मैं केवल यही कहना चाहता हूं कि जबलपुर को राजधानी बनाने में यहां पर हम को पांच सौ मील लम्बी रेलवे लाइन बनानी पड़ेगी। मैं यह भी बता दूं कि भोपाल के पास बुधनी से बरखंडा तक दस मील लम्बी रेलवे लाइन के बनाने में सात बरस में दस करोड़ रुपए खर्च हुए हैं। इस हिसाब से पांच सौ मील लम्बी रेलवे लाइन पर तो लगभग २५० करोड़ रुपए खर्च होंगे। इस समय हर को सैकड़ फाइव यीअर प्लान के लिए रुपए की जरूरत है, हम इतना रुपया कहां से लायेंगे। यह बात नहीं है कि हम ट्रांसपोर्ट और कम्प्यूनिक्शन्स को बढ़ायेंगे नहीं—हम उस की तरक्की करेंगे, लेकिन एक प्लान्ड और सुव्यवस्थित तरीके से करेंगे। भोपाल को राजधानी बना कर उस की तरक्की करने से ही सारा मध्य प्रदेश की तरक्की नहीं होगी। हमें सागर, रीवा, रायपुर, ग्वालियर, इन्दौर सभी को आगे बढ़ाना है। मुझे आशा है कि हाई कोर्ट और दूसरे ऑफिसियल के स्थान के बारे में जो भी फैसला किया जायगा, वह आम जनता की सुविधा और हित को दृष्टि में रख कर ही किया जायगा। मैं इस बात का हामी नहीं दूं कि इस विषय में कोई सौंदबाजी की जाय। अगर ऐसा किया गया तो ग्वालियर और इंदौर के भगड़ यहां भी पैदा हो जाएंगे। मैं तमाम दोस्तों से, जिन का कि इस समस्या से सम्बन्ध है, दूरस्वात करूंगा कि वे सौंदबाजी की स्थिरित से कोई बात न करें, बल्कि वे यह देखें कि मध्य प्रदेश की जनता को किस तरह लाभ हो सकता है। भोपाल की जनता की ओर से मैं भोपाल को राजधानी बनाने पर हाई कमांड का आभार—प्रदर्शन करता हूं और खासा करता हूं

कि उसको उसके महत्व और योग्यता के अनुसार स्थान दिया जाएगा।

ए० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट के विषय में काफी शक्य जाँच की जा चुकी है। हमारे मामले इस बात के धारितरिक्त कोई दूसरा रास्ता नहीं है कि जब तक कोई जनरली एग्जीड सालेशन सामने न आए, हम कमीशन की रिकमेंडेशन को ही मान लें। बम्बई के बारे में पाटिल साहब और शह साहब ने जिस तरीके से अपना कंस रखा है, मैं उस का समर्थन करता हूँ। मैं गाढगील साहब का बहुत सम्मान करता हूँ, लेकिन मैं नहीं समझता कि हम को उस स्पिरिट से सोचना और काम करना चाहिए, जिस स्पिरिट से उन्होंने तकरीर की है। एक तो दलील का जोर होता है और दूसरा तलवार का। उनकी स्पीच में तो मुझे तलवार का जोर ही मालूम हुआ। इस हालत में वह दलील की बात कैसे करते हैं? मैं समझता हूँ कि हम को दलीलों से ही काम लेना चाहिए और दूसरे लोगों को समझाते हुए अपना कंस रखने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए और उस के बाद जो भी डिपिजिन हो, उस को सर तस्लीम खम कर कबूल कर लेना चाहिए।

पंजाब के सिलिसिल में मेरे दोस्त श्री गांधी सम ने जो हिमाचल प्रवेश की बात कही, मैं उस का समर्थन करता हूँ। मैं मास्टर तारासिंह से भी अपील करूंगा कि इस बक्त देश के सामने बहुत बड़े बड़े सवाल हैं। जो भी सालेशन निकले, उससे कोई पहाड़ नहीं टूट पड़ेगा। कोई ऐसा एग्जीड सालेशन निकालना चाहिए, जिससे सारे देश का भला हो।

यह ठीक है कि चीफ मिनिस्टर कांफ्रेंस में ए० आर० सी० की कुछ रिकमेंडेशन को सपोर्ट नहीं किया गया। लेकिन इस बात में कोई शक नहीं हो सकता कि अगर हम ने अपने देश में सब विभागों में ठीक व्यवस्था करनी है, तो डाक्टर, इंजीनियर और फार्मिस्ट्स विषयक आज इंडिया की स्थिति को ध्यान में रखकर है। प्राथमिकीय को सत्य करने के लिए भी जरूरी है कि दो-दो, चार-चार प्राथमिक

के लिए एक कामन प्रिंसिपल सर्विस कमीशन बनाया जाय।

कमीशन ने राजप्रमुखों के इन्स्टीट्यूशन को खत्म करने की सिफारिश की है। मैं उस का स्वागत करता हूँ। हमारे राज्यों और नवाबों के सरकार पर्टल की अपील को ध्यान कर देश के हित के लिए अपने हिसाब का बलिदान किया था। मुझे पूरी उम्मीद है कि वे जब भी देश की प्रगति के रास्ते में नहीं आवेंगे। मैं इस हाउस के मंत्रियों से भी दरखास्त करूंगा कि कांस्टीट्यूशन की दफा २६१ और २६२ को, जिन में प्रिंसिपल को कुछ प्रिविलीजिज दिये गये हैं और उनके लिए कुछ सेफगार्ड रखे गए हैं, रिवाइज किया जाय। जब वे कामन मैन की तरह अपने पैरों पर खड़े हों और जो रुपया उन को दिया लेजिस्लेचर में आ सकते हैं, हकूमत कर सकते हैं, तो फिर क्या बजह है कि वे अपने लिए एक ऐसी चीज रिजर्व रखना चाहते हैं, जिसकी कोई कीमत नहीं है? अब तक हम उन को प्रिवी पीसिज दते आ रहे हैं, लेकिन अब समय आ गया है कि वे अपने पैरों पर खड़े हों और जो रुपया उन को दिया जाता है, वह देश के उत्थान के लिए इस्तेमाल किया जाय। वे खुद कहें कि हम ये पीसिज लेना पसन्द नहीं करते हैं और जितना रुपया हमें चाहिए, वह हम लोन के रूप में लेना चाहते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह की तजवीज उनकी तरफ से आए। गवर्नमेंट को भी इस में इनीशियेटिव लेना चाहिए। इस विषय में जो भी अच्छा सालेशन निकल सके, वह निकालना चाहिए। जब हम कांस्टीट्यूशन को अमेंड कर रहे हैं, तो इस बात की भी जरूरत है कि इस मसले पर गौर कर के इन दो दफात को भी निकाल दिया जाय।

हमारे डिप्टी सीक्रेटरी साहब ने अपनी स्पीच में कहा था कि एक बाउंडरी कमीशन मुम्बई के लिए चाहिए। मैं इस बात के तिलसाक हूँ। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस री-ऑर्गनाइजेशन की बजह से फर्स्ट फाइव यीजर प्लान की प्रगति में भी बाड़ी बहुत बाधा पड़ी है और सेंकंड फाइव यीजर प्लान को शुरू करने

[श्री सी० एन० मालवीय]

में भी दिक्कतें आर्येंगी, इस लिए इस में और दूर नहीं करनी चाहिए और जल्दी से जल्दी सब मरहलों को तय करना चाहिए। बाउंडरी कमिशन की कोई जरूरत नहीं है। हाई पावर कमेटी मौजूद है, जिस में प्राइम मिनिस्टर, होम मिनिस्टर, एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर हैं, जो एंसे लीडर हैं, जिन के पीछे सारे इन्डुस्तान की जनता हैं। उन के अतिरिक्त उस में यहां की मेजर पार्टी कांग्रेस के प्रीजिडेंट, डंबर भाई, भी हैं। उन से बढ़ कर कौन सा कमिशन होगा? कौन सी इन्फार्मेशन और कौन सा दृष्टिकोण उन के सामने नहीं आ सकता है? वही इस बार में फंसला करे और जल्दी फंसला करे, ताकि हमारी स्टेट्स बन कर तैयार हों और हम सैंकड फाइव थियर प्लान का काम पूरा जोर शोर से शुरू कर सकें।

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has already spoken for about 20 minutes. The Speaker has fixed the time between 15 and 20 minutes, not more than 20 minutes in any case. The hon. Member will kindly finish in two minutes.

Shri C. N. Malviya: Within two minutes? Please let me have three minutes, Madam.

तीन श्रेणी की रियासतों को खत्म कर के एक ही प्रकार की रियासतें रखने की जो सिफारिश की गई है, उसका मैं स्वागत करता हूँ। जहां तक सेंट्रली एडमिनिस्टर्ड टैरिटरियल का सल्लुक है, अगर हम कमिशन की रिपोर्ट और गवर्नमेंट के बयानांत को देखें, तो हमें मालूम होगा कि एंसा नहीं किया जायगा कि वहां पर आफिशियल्वे के द्वारा इक्मत्त की जायगी, बल्कि वहां के लोगों को लोकल सैंक गवर्नमेंट के अधिकार दिए जायेंगे और दिए जाने चाहिए। मणिपुर बॉर्डर इलाकों में जरूर सैंक गवर्नमेंट दी जानी चाहिए और कोई एंसा तरीका निकालना चाहिए कि वहां के लोग इंग्लैंड की आनन्द ले सकें और उन में कोई प्रदर्शन न हो।

एक बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सैंकड फाइव थियर प्लान में हम ने बहुत से काम

करने हैं मैं ने प्रोडक्शन मिनिस्टर की स्वीच पढ़ी है। यह बड़ी खुरी की बात है कि फरिटलाइजर फैक्टरी और दूसरी फैक्टरीब मुल्तलिफ जगहों पर खोली जायेंगी। लेकिन इस बार में इटारसी का जरूर ख्याल रखा जाना चाहिए और उसे पीछे न छोड़ दें वह एक बड़े प्रदर्श—मध्य प्रदर्श—का एक खास स्थान है, वह बम्बई के करीब है और चारों तरफ उसके कनेक्शन हैं, इस लिए उस की डेवलपमेंट—एग्रीकल्चरल डेवलपमेंट—करने की बहुत जरूरत है।

हाउस का ज्यादा टाइम न लेते हुए मैं यह उम्मीद करता हूँ कि सभी भाई मध्य प्रदर्श का अच्छी तरह से समर्थन करेंगे और भोपाल को राजधानी बनने का सम्मान देंगे।

Pandit M. B. Bhargava (Ajmer South): We have been considering the SRC Report for a pretty long time in this House. In spite of the big chorus of approbation and congratulations showered on the States Reorganisation Commission, I am sorry I cannot join in that praise. The controversy, the bitterness, the acrimony and rancour that have been aroused all through the country and even from the floor of this House show that the requisite atmosphere for the consideration of a serious problem of this character is not present. The overall consideration of the unity and security of the country requires that this problem should be shelved for the present and be kept in cold storage, but I see that where the mighty voice of such an elderly statesman as Rajaji has failed, the talk of an ordinary man—the feeble and weak voice of mine—is of no avail. Therefore, we have to see how we can, in the broader national interests, safeguard the unity and security of India which should be the primary consideration before every patriot and every parliamentarian.

My suggestion is that in the legislative enactment that will be brought before the House to implement the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission, there are

certain very important points that should not be lost sight of. Those provisions of the Constitution which provide for the supremacy of the Centre over all its constituent units, must be safeguarded and put beyond the amending power and competence of Parliament. This is the only one method by which we can ensure the security of India and safeguard the unity of this country. I mean article 368 of the Constitution, whereby any provision of the Constitution, the supreme and organic law of the land, may be changed, must be so suitably modified and amended so as to take from the competence of Parliament those provisions of the Constitution which provide for the supremacy of the Centre over all its constituent units of the federation. Article 248 gives the residuary legislative powers to the Centre and articles 352 to 360 which are enshrined in Part XVIII of the Constitution endow the Centre with over-riding powers in case of emergency. They must be taken away from the amending competence and power of Parliament so that the unity and security of India may be made sacred and sacrosanct for all time to come. Not even the requisite two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting and a majority of the total membership of the House should, in any way, tamper with the sacred and sacrosanct character of the Constitutional provisions which ensure the supremacy of the Centre over its constituent units. This is the minimum that can safeguard and ensure the unity and security of India. I think the hon. Home Minister and the Law Minister will see their way to incorporate suitable provisions in this regard.

The other safeguard that I submit is, the provision incorporated in Part IV of the Report which ensures the protection of the linguistic minority groups must also be taken away from the shepre of the executive. Otherwise, these safeguards will remain as safeguards merely on paper. For this purpose, I suggest that a permanent commission on the analogy of the

Election Commission should be brought into existence and it should be all vigilant to see that the interests of the linguistic minorities are duly protected. That can only be done by making a suitable amendment in the Constitution itself.

These are my general observations on this intricate problem. Coming to my home State of Ajmer, I have to submit that, unfortunately, my State has received a very indifferent treatment at the hands of this high-power Commission. The entire importance and greatness of Ajmer has totally been ignored and I will crave the indulgence of the House through you, to apply its mind and to see what is the problem and the grievance of this tiny State of Ajmer which has a population of about 7 lakhs and an area of 2,400 sq. miles. Its problem is of an absolutely different character as compared to the problem of the other constituent units of the Union. It has been geographically, historically, culturally and linguistically a part of Rajasthan. But, notwithstanding that, it is an incontrovertible historical fact that it has remained absolutely separate and it has never been politically and administratively a part of Rajasthan. Rajasthan saw the light of day only in May, 1949, but even prior to this, since the dawn of history, Ajmer has never been administratively and politically a part of any of the States composing the present united States of Rajasthan. History shows that Ajmer, from very early times, has assumed and obtained an importance which is a country-wide importance. The Pushkar Lake and the mountain range where Brahma, the creator of the world, had done *tapasya*, have given this beauty spot a religious importance which pervades throughout India. All through the years thousands and lakhs of pilgrims from every part of the country, and particularly in the month of Kartik, assemble there and take a dip in the sacred lake. As tradition goes, the pilgrimage of all these pilgrims who have gone to all parts of India

[Pandit M. B. Bhargava]

can never secure them the religious benefit they have in view, until they have taken the last dip in the Pushkar lake. Similarly, that great Muslim saint, Khwaja Moinuddin Chisti, spent a valuable part of his life in Ajmer and breathed his last there. The Darga Khwaja Shareef attracts not only from the Muslim world in India or from Pakistan but from all over the world thousands and lakhs of pilgrims. Similarly, Ajmer is an important centre of the Jain religion. Swami Dayanand, the great social reformer, and the founder of the Arya Samaj, breathed his last in Ajmer. Ajmer thus is the meeting place of the varied Indian culture. Therefore, the city occupies more or less a cosmopolitan position. It is the biggest centre of Christianity—Presbyterians, Protestants as well as Roman Catholics—in the whole of Rajasthan. Not only this, the entire course of Indian history shows its importance. From the earliest times, till the time of Emperor Prithvi Raj, who was the last Hindu Emperor of India and who defeated Mohamad Ghori several times till he was overpowered on account of the treachery of Raja Jayachandra of Kanauj, Ajmer has been shaping the events of history not only in Ajmer itself but in the surrounding States of Rajasthan like Jodhpur, Udaipur, etc. There are big bangalows built by the various princes of Rajasthan who frequently and regularly visited Ajmer to pay their homage. It was from this place that the centre wielded its authority throughout the Moghul period as also throughout the British period. It has been the centre of freedom movement and has led the struggle of independence in all the States of Rajasthan and Madhya Bharat throughout.

In March 1949, the fate of various States of Rajasthan was in a melting pot. It was then thought that all the various States of Rajasthan and Ajmer might be integrated together and that Ajmer should have a hand and voice in the shaping of the new Rajasthan. I from the floor of this House on the 17th March 1949 at the

top of my voice raised this cry on behalf of my constituency and approached the then Home Minister and urged that Ajmer should be taken in along with the other units of Rajasthan in order that it might occupy the central position which it had continued to occupy for centuries past. The then Minister of Home Affairs said that Rajasthan was never a State and for the first time they were making an experiment. He wanted to watch it. I would also like to mention here that the Rajasthan Provincial Congress Committee too adopted a resolution by an overwhelming majority that Ajmer should be integrated with Rajasthan and that it should be the capital of Rajasthan. That was the basis on which I presented this demand. That demand was turned down for reasons best known to the Government of India. Our apprehensions are that, because the Government of India had already committed to the Maharaja of Jaipur for locating the capital at Jaipur, the merger of Ajmer was not acceded to against the proclaimed wishes of the people. Now the picture of Rajasthan is complete; the capital had been located; branches of the High Court had been established; all the other offices had already been located at the various places. What is the intention of the Central Government now? Why was not this important aspect taken into consideration by the SRC?

I submit that even today the people of Ajmer are ready and will welcome the merger of Ajmer with Rajasthan only on the condition that Ajmer is made the capital of Rajasthan which is its legitimate demand based on historical, geographical and unassailable facts. It occupies a central position and is equally accessible to all the parts of Rajasthan. The Ajmer Provincial Congress Committee, the Ajmer Congress Party of the Legislature and such other bodies have with a unanimous voice said that they were not prepared to merge with Rajasthan unless and until Ajmer is made its capital. There are various reasons for it.

What are the reasons which the SRC has got for recommending its merger with Rajasthan? It has said in para 265 that all the Part C States including Ajmer are economically unbalanced, financially weak, and politically and administratively unstable. Let us examine. What are the facts in respect of Rajasthan? Is it economically viable and financially strong? I say: 'No.' The last budget presented, for the year 1955-56, shows an income of Rs. 22,30,00,000 while the expenditure is Rs. 24,69,00,000. There is a clear deficit of Rs. 239 lakhs. With the disappearance of the excise revenue to the tune of Rs. 275 lakhs there will be a deficit of about six crores. It cannot be said that the unit of Rajasthan is economically balanced or financially strong.

Coming to the administrative and political stability, I will ask the Home Ministry to turn the pages of its record and find out things. Is there any State in India which has been so unstable as Rajasthan? I would request you to allow me a few more minutes; I am the first spokesman on behalf of Ajmer.

Mr. Chairman: Two minutes more. Please conclude as there are many speakers.

Pandit M. B. Bhargava: During the five years from 1949 onwards, there have been five or six leaders of the Assembly Party. Shri Hiralal Shastri, Jainarain Vyas, Shri Paliwal, again Shri Vyas and now Shri Sukhadia. But take the political stability of Ajmer. From 1st April 1952 we have one and the same Ministry. I talked about the change in leadership in Rajasthan; as regards other Ministers, I am not going to take the time of the House; the less said of it the better. Economically, Rajasthan is not a viable unit; its economy is not balanced. Political and administrative stability is only in theory. If these are the grounds for the liquidation of Part C States including Ajmer, these are the very same grounds for the liquidation of Rajasthan.

1 P. M.

We mentioned to the members of the SRC that it would be in the interest of the country, if this is split into two parts: the Southern parts made into a separate unit with Ajmer as the capital; there will be the northern part independent of the southern part. But that was turned down. Then the Commission says that in Part C States the development works have been ignored, but it is absolutely wrong. So far as the State of Ajmer is concerned very recently a very senior officer of the Community Project Administration visited Ajmer and I would invite the attention of the hon. Members of this House to the observations of that senior representative of the Community Project Administration. He has said that the development work in the Community Projects and National Extension Service Blocks of Ajmer is almost at the top. He has characterised it as truly marvellous and he has said that, political and administrative considerations apart, smaller units are a great blessing to the intensive development work. So far as the basic educational institutions are concerned the verdict of the senior officer is that they are the best in India. Very recently a representative of the United Nations Organisation visited the State of Ajmer. He examined and inspected the prisons and the certificate that he has given should be a matter of pride not only to Ajmer but to the whole country. He says that the canteen arrangement in the prison of Ajmer which is entirely in the hands of prisoners as also the open air farming by the prisoners without any guard is an example that can very well be copied anywhere in the world for making the prison life less irksome. Therefore, so far as the development works are concerned they are very satisfactory. It is far ahead Rajasthan in education and other nation building activity.

Then, lastly, I submit that it is entirely the responsibility of the Centre that Ajmer has been deprived of

[Pandit M.B. Bhargava]

the valuable opportunity of securing her rightful place to which it was legitimately entitled. For that the entire responsibility is not of the people of Ajmer or the political parties functioning there, but of the centre. Consequently it is not only the moral but also the legal responsibility of the Centre to see that now if it is to be merged and intergrated with Rajasthan it must be given its rightful place and that should be laid down as a condition precedent to its merger.

I may also mention it for the information of the Deputy Minister for Home Affairs that the people of Ajmer or their representatives in Ajmer will not go with a begging bowl to the Rajasthan Ministry to make Ajmer its capital; make it a place to locate the High Court or a place of other importance because it is entirely the legal as well as moral responsibility of the Centre. Ajmer wanted its merger long before. It was kept back because of the Centre. Therefore, the entire responsibility is that of the Centre to secure Ajmer its rightful place.

Then, Sir, a few words about the State of Himachal Pradesh. My feeling is that this State has also been very unjustly treated. The Majority Report has brushed aside the claim of Himachal Pradesh to maintain its separate existence on the ground that there is no reliable evidence of the Home Ministry's any expressed undertaking. My friend who represented the case of Himachal Pradesh read to you the communique of the Home Ministry which had given an express undertaking to keep its autonomous separate existence for all times to come.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): It was never given.

Pandit M. B. Bhargava: It should not have been brushed aside on this ground. Secondly, it has been said that the public voice in Himachal Pradesh is not consolidated against merger. There is a clear opinion expressed in the Legislative Assembly

that the people of Himachal Pradesh are definitely hostile to their merger with Punjab, but even that had been brushed aside by the Majority Report. So far as Mr. Fazal Ali, the Chairman, is concerned, he has given two instances which conclusively established that public opinion in Himachal Pradesh is hostile to its merger. The first instance is that in the time of Sardar Patel when the note was prepared it was made clear that the people of Himachal Pradesh are opposed to such merger; that was long before the question of merger came. The second point is that in 1950 when the jurisdiction of the Punjab High Court was sought to be extended to the area of Himachal Pradesh the people with one voice opposed it and consequently the Government of India had to appoint a Judicial Commisisoner in place of bringing Himachal Pradesh within the jurisdiction of the Punjab High Court.

Then again the question of its economic viability. Its jungles, medicinal herbs as also its mineral resources show that it has great possibilities and potentialities of being made an economic unit.

Fourthly, it has been said that it is in a strategic position and because it is in a strategic position, therefore, its separate existence cannot be allowed. But this has not been considered that defence is the responsibility of the Centre and not of any State.

My submission, therefore, is that Himachal Pradesh should also be kept as a separate entity and should enjoy the democratic set-up which it is at present enjoying, because to make it a Centrally Administered Territory will be taking a retrograde step.

Shri Kasliwal (Kotah-Jhalawar): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my State of Rajasthan I welcome the Report of the SRC, but before I go into matters of detail about my State I want to make three or four general observations.

I most heartily welcome the abolition of distinction between Part A and Part B States. This Part B business was a matter of great heart-burning for people who were residing in those States and it is a matter of satisfaction that today the people of Part B States no longer enjoy that 'inferior status' they were having in the last few years. I also welcome the abolition of Part C States including the State of Ajmer about which my hon. friend Pandit M. B. Bhargava has waxed so eloquently just now. I am not replying to him immediately but I will reserve my right till the time I come to this particular question. I also welcome the abolition of the institution of Rajpramukh. Many hon. Members who have preceded me have spoken at great length on this question and I do not want to waste the time of the House any further on that point.

Now, on the State of Rajasthan three attacks have been made and before I go on to other questions I want to reply to those three points. Yesterday my friend Shri Radhelal Vyas—who comes from Madhya Bharat, who has lost his own home once and for all and wants to take rooms in other States—spoke about certain areas in Rajasthan. He said that he wanted Dag, Gangdhar and Pachpahar, which come in my constituency, to be merged with Madhya Bharat. Now, he was mispronouncing the names even. He was saying "Pachpur" for Pachpahar and he was saying "Gangpur" for Gangdhar. I am surprised at the knowledge which my friend possesses of these parts. He was very keen that these three areas should be merged with Madhya Bharat.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittor): Let Shri Radhelal Vyas be called here.

Shri Kasliwal: I want to remind this House that this whole question had been very thoroughly gone into by the S.R.C. At page 131, para 478, they have given all the possible reasons for the non-merger of this

area including other areas adjacent to it in Madhya Bharat and also for the merger of Mandsaur district with Rajasthan. I just want to read a few lines from this paragraph:

"The demand which has been made on behalf of Rajasthan to the Mandsaur district and the Madhya Bharat claim to Kotah and Jhalawar rest more or less on the same grounds, namely, historical association, administrative convenience and cultural affiliations. These claims are to some extent interlinked. An argument which has been urged by both the Governments is that the areas jut out inconveniently into the territories of the States claiming them and that territorial readjustments would ensure greater geographical compactness. Barring the Sunel and Sironj enclaves, however, the disputed areas are geographically contiguous to their respective States and have been administered as part of these States for a long time. Public opinion has not expressed itself in favour of the disturbance of the *status quo*. In these circumstances, we would confine our recommendations only to the transfer of the Sunel town which is an enclave now belonging to the Mandsaur district to Rajasthan and of the Sironj subdivision of the Kotah district of Rajasthan to the proposed State of Madhya Pradesh."

What was the argument of my friend Mr. Radhelal Vyas? He only said that because these portions jut out into Madhya Bharat, they should be given to that State. In the human body also, there are so many portions jutting out; is it right to say that all these portions should be cut out? It is not the function of the S.R.C. to polish the boundaries of the various States. They were only called upon to see whether for purposes of administrative convenience or for cultural affiliations, certain portions of one State could be transferred to

[Shri Kasliwal.]

another. They were also asked to look into the question of the enclaves. So, simply because they are jutting out, those portions cannot be given to the other State. In fact, so far as the question of jutting out is concerned, there is no single recommendation anywhere for the transfer of any area on this ground. I would also point out that Jhansi and Lalitpur are also portions jutting out and they have also been claimed; but the S.R.C. refused to accept it.

I will now come to the question of Loharu. My friend Mr. Bansal—he is not here now—contested the claim of Rajasthan the other day. He had nothing particular to say; he only said that the people of Loharu did not want to merge with Rajasthan and wanted to remain as they were. Because he had no other argument, he said that a referendum should be taken. I want to point out that nowhere has the Commission said that for the merger of any particular area, a referendum should be taken. In fact, all the time they have discounted the idea of referendum. This question of Loharu has also been dealt with by the S.R.C. in para 506 and I will read it out:

"Loharu is now part of the Hissar district, having been merged in 1948. It has been represented to this Commission that, for at least three and a half centuries after the State was founded, it had intimate links with Rajasthan and that, even in the period which immediately preceded the merger, the association with Bikaner was very close. Loharu, it has also been stated, has rather intimate trading connections with Rajasthan, the wool trade being particularly important. The area is geographically contiguous to Rajasthan, and it would perhaps, be easier to administer it from Jhunjhunu, with which town Loharu is incidentally intimately connected, than from Hissar. On a review of all the circumstances in which the claim has been made

we recommend that Loharu should be transferred to Rajasthan."

I will come to the question of Ajmer. My friend, Mr. M. B. Bhargava, has just spoken, but it was very difficult for me to follow what exactly he said. Probably all that he meant was that he had no objection to the merger of Ajmer with Rajasthan so long as Ajmer remained the capital. When the State of Rajasthan was being formed, it was not the Centre which came in the way of Ajmer being added on to Rajasthan. It was the people of Rajasthan who came in the way.

Shri Jwala Prasad (Ajmer North): No, no.

Shri Kasliwal: All the time they were saying that Ajmer should have made the capital and that was the only condition they were mentioning. What is the condition of Ajmer? My friend has waxed eloquent on the historicity of Ajmer. He said, it was a part of Rajasthan and it was formed by the dictator of the adjoining areas and of Rajasthan.

Shri Jwala Prasad: He never said it.

Shri Kasliwal: He virtually said it. I want to remind him that it is a part of the territory of Prithvi Raj and Rana Sanga who so bravely fought against Baber. So, to say that Ajmer has always been something politically higher up than the adjoining areas is not correct. What are the economic and other conditions of Ajmer? There is no water to drink.

Shri Jwala Prasad: That is not correct. There is a scheme costing Rs. 45 lakhs now working there.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member need not interrupt like this.

Shri Jwala Prasad: He is misleading the House.

Shri Kasliwal: You are misleading the House. There has been no water in Ajmer to drink. It is only now from in an area which is about

50 miles from Ajmer that they are going to have a scheme which will supply water just enough for 1 lakh people. On the other hand, in Jaipur, there is a water-supply scheme costing crores of rupees; there are all sorts of buildings for administrative purpose and other conveniences. So, it is the most convenient place from so many points of view. That was why Jaipur was made the capital. If to-day Ajmer is not the capital, it is not the fault of the people of Rajasthan or of the Centre; it is the fault of the people of Ajmer themselves. My friend, Mr. M. B. Bhargava, has gone out of his way in attacking the financial position of Rajasthan. I respectfully submit that this question need not have been raised here. I want to say that so far as the financial position of Rajasthan is concerned, it suffered only now because of the for's duties. Before the levy or is duties, the question of deficit so far as Rajasthan was con- never arose. I want to say three soon as the levy of sales-tax before it is going to come—the want al position of Rajasthan will be Yest ly sound. It will not be like the Vyas al position of Ajmer which has Bhar. ll along living on doles from the once. ll We have never asked for rooms from the Centre; we have only certai for a certain sum for economic that ment of backward areas.

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

Shri Kasliwal: I will dispose of Ajmer in this way. But I just want to read one or two lines from the S.R.C. Report,

Page 136:

"Ajmer is no longer geographically isolated. Nor does it any longer play the role of a sentinel."

If my friend wanted to say that Ajmer was the sentinel of Rajasthan, even that role is gone. So, there is ground for keeping Ajmer away from Rajasthan.

496 LSD.

I now come to the question of Abu. I am very happy to say that the demand of the people of Abu and the people of Rajasthan for the transfer of Abu to Rajasthan has been accepted. It makes me happy today because Abu was the solitary jewel in Rajasthan. I want to say that the salubrious climate of Abu is not meant only for the people of Rajasthan. I would like to invite people from all over India, particularly my hon. friends from Gujarat to Abu.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): All Members of Parliament.

Shri Kasliwal: Of course. I want to tell them that we will welcome them most heartily. Let them come and enjoy the salubrious climate of Abu and enjoy the hospitality of Rajasthan.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: When?

Shri Kasliwal: Whenever you like. The hon. Home Minister had said in his speech that citizenship all over India was one. It is purely on geographical considerations that Abu has been given back to Rajasthan. The question of citizenship does not arise. It is there for all the people of the country. I want to say this. The finest temple in India,—I would go farther and say—the finest of temples, mosques or churches in the world, is in Abu: the Dilwara temple.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It is the 8th wonder of the world.

Shri Kasliwal: Yes. The finest of things can be seen. I want to assure that the Government and people of Rajasthan will do their utmost to preserve this place not only for this generation, but for generations and generations to come in our country and other parts of the world.

Then, I come to some other points...

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has only two minutes more. I am afraid I cannot give more than 20 minutes. I must call the next speaker.

Shri Kasliwal: I shall be very brief. A portion of Rajasthan which is known as Sironj is going now to Madhya Pradesh. It was once in Madhya Bharat. From the administrative point of view, I welcome the merger of Sironj in Madhya Bharat.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Say Madhya Pradesh.

Shri Kasliwal: Up till now it was Madhya Bharat; now it will be Madhya Pradesh. For their own sake, they have to go to Madhya Pradesh. They have shown their own language. They have shown considerable loyalty to Rajasthan and I salute the people of Sironj for what they have done for Rajasthan, for they were only an island in Madhya Bharat.

I shall just refer to some 3 or 4 territories which have been demanded by Rajasthan. These are Mandasur, Rajgarh, Guna and Mohindergarh. The claims of Rajasthan in respect of these 4 territories have been brushed aside by the Commission. So far as Mohindergarh is concerned, the Commission is of the view that as this area is linguistically different from Rajasthan, it is not to be merged in Rajasthan. So I have nothing to say. So far as Rajgarh and Guna are concerned, they say that because these areas are contiguous to Madhya Bharat, they should remain in Madhya Bharat. I am not contesting this. On the same basis that Rajgarh and Guna should remain in Madhya Bharat because they are contiguous areas, why not allow Dag and Gangdhar also to remain in Rajasthan because they are contiguous areas to Rajasthan? The claim to Mandasaur has been brushed aside by the S.R.C. The reason for Rajasthan claiming Mandasaur has not been appreciated. What was Mandasaur before? Mandasaur was all along part of Rajasthan. In 1803, the ruler of Indore defeated the Raja of Jaipur and to pay for the maintenance of the army, Mandasaur was ceded to Holkar only on this condition that when the expenses of the army were completely met, this Mandasaur should come back to Rajasthan. But, it has continued

to remain there. It is the demand of the people of Mandasaur that they should be in Rajasthan. I am told that my hon. friend Shri U. M. Trivedi, who comes from that area, who is in favour of the merger of Mandasaur with Rajasthan has got a document signed by 1 lakh of people asking for the merger of Mandasaur with Rajasthan. Now that you are asking me to sit down, I shall resume my seat saying that on the whole I welcome this report so far as Rajasthan is concerned.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): Because of the limitation of time, I feel I can cover only 4 or 5 points and I crave the indulgence of the Chair to be liberal to me.

As I said yesterday, I want to present the tribal point of view. In this question of the reorganisation of States, there is this very large section of Indian community, 2 or 3 crores of people. The hon. Home Minister asked, "Could you not fit into this linguistic pattern?" Let me remind hon. Members of what the hon. Home Minister said when he inaugurated the debate on the S.R.C. report. He said:

"Fourteen languages are mentioned in Constitution; but there are even others which do not find a place there. There are, I think about 2 or 3 crores of people who do not speak any of these 14 languages. Yet, they have a right to unfettered growth as much as those who have the privilege of belonging to these recognised linguistic groups."

Therefore, we find that, as far as the tribal attitude is concerned, the linguistic argument is the least part of it. It does not mean that we are against the linguistic factor coming into the argument in the reorganisation and formation of States. But, we say that that is the least part of it.

I would like this House to bear one thing in mind because so much

stress has been given in this report to census figures. You know only too well how the census operations have been vilified and vitiated ever since 1911. Ever since the entry of militant politics into the political arena, there has been this most undesirable endeavour by the political parties and various sections of Communities to make the census report not a mine of the most useful and scientific information but as something which will suit their own particular political requirements. That is the position. For example, take the tribals. What is their census figure today? In 1948 it was 248 lakhs. Somehow or other, one crore of them have disappeared in the 1951 census operations. I just give you this as a part of their linguistic argument.

I happen to be in the middle of 5 warriors. I have to struggle in five fronts. I want to deal with each one of them and that is why I would like you to be more liberal to me, and permit me to develop my case against these five giants who want to swallow me up. What is the Jharkhand argument? People used to laugh at it. Today, even the Indian National Congress has to take notice of it. Much derogatory stuff has been said about it and some people have even gone to the ridiculous length of saying that it is an anti-nationalist movement.

Let them say what they like. But the Jharkhand movement stands in the national interest for the consolidation and integration of Jharkhand. What happened immediately after Independence? There was this movement in the hilly tracts of South Bihar. Jharkhandis also wanted to breathe the air of independence. So, there was this movement. The Indian National Congress leaders in Bihar found that if the Chota Nagpur States—there were eleven of them—had to be put back to the Chota Nagpur division, then the claim for Jharkhand would have been stronger. They were frightened by that. They did not even go to Puri to meet Sardar Vallabhbhai

Patel. On the contrary it was at Mussourie that the parceling out was done. How can you parcel things out like that? Pandit Ravi Shankar Shukla says, "All right, I shall have this." Then, the Orissa leaders say, "We shall have that." Of course, Bengal got no share.

Now, what happened to this Chota Nagpur States Agency? My hon. friends who have spoken from Orissa and West Bengal have been talking of history. May I just remind them that there is a way of reading history. There is British history. There is any other form of history. They started by saying that originally that agency was known as the South-West Frontier Agency. Then, it became the Chota Nagpur States Agency. Then, it became the Orissa States Agency, and lastly, before the disappearance of the rulers, it became the Eastern States Agency. But they did not, in fact, they dare not, explain why these changes had taken place. All the while, they had to admit for administrative requirements and necessities, that these eleven Chota Nagpur States, whatever you called them subsequently, had to be the charge of the Commissioner of Chota Nagpur division. Whether it was a rebellion in Surguja or Jashpur or anywhere else, it was the Commissioner of the Chota Nagpur division that was responsible for the maintenance of law and order in every one of those places in all those eleven States. It was a disgraceful performance on the part of the Bihari leaders not to have made their proper and rightful claim when these States disappeared that they should have been re-integrated into the Chota Nagpur division.

What happened after Independence? On the very first day of our Independence, there was firing in Raj Kharswan, and about 176 people were killed by the Orissa authorities. I did not want to unearth unpleasant and sorry facts. But when I hear people telling me, telling the House and telling the country that their heart is bleeding for them, I have to say this. What is their record since Independence? Again

[Shri Jaipal Singh]

that is not the only instance. What about the satyagraha movement in Mayurbhanj and the Simko firing in Raj Gangpur? There was firing all over the place and I could give the whole list of the brutal atrocities.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): Who fired? Was it the Orissa Government?

Shri Jaipal Singh: I am sorry my colleague here does not know much about that part of the country. But his leader, the hon. Member from Hooghly had the temerity to say that certain parts of Jharkhand should go to West Bengal, and in this unholy alliance with the Orissa leaders, he spoke on behalf of the Orissa claim also. Now, let us look at facts as they are, in regard to the Jharkhand area claim.

We have no hostility with either West Bengal or with Bihar or with North Bihar or even with Madhya Pradesh because some areas have been put in Madhya Pradesh, and others in Orissa. We are working for the re-consolidation of that area, whether as a separate State or of Bihar; or let the whole lot of it go back to West Bengal, or let it combine with Orissa. That is another matter. But we are going to continue in our struggle to re-consolidate that area. It is not a question of our fight against Orissa, West Bengal, or Bihar or anybody else. A great injustice has been done because of this misrepresentation of the movement for self-government of the whole hill folk of that area of the Chota Nagpur plateau, classically known as Jharkhand; it is not a new word at all, it just means jungle area.

We, not only in that particular area, but in the entire field of India, are for making the tribal people feel that oneness which is very necessary to enable them to regain their lost nerves. That is the problem of the tribal people today. How are they going to have that feeling of oneness and that feeling consolidation, if we are going to scatter them, disrupt their communities and distribute them all over the place? Is that the way you are going

to solve the problem? And here, I would make this appeal to my friends from Assam. I do not pretend to speak on their behalf. It is for them; they have their spokesmen. But I cannot help feeling that unless there are very strong reasons that Manipur should be separate and should not come into the pattern of united Assam administration, it should come into that, I do not know, it is for them to speak. But to me, looking at it in the all-India pattern, it seems that it is very necessary that they should be consolidated and become one, and thus become numerically strong and be able to be more effective in the administration of that area.

Now, the point is that the members of the Commission, especially two of them, have thrown to the winds logic, history, geography, administrative needs and the like, as far as Jharkhand area is concerned. They have not made their calculations correctly. Possibly, they are not very good mathematicians.

What happened in 1952 at the time of the elections? There was general dissatisfaction in the south of Bihar about North Bihar leadership. Not only we of the Jharkhand Party, but various other political parties fought on this issue of separation from North Bihar leaderships. As you know yourself, now the position has changed. It is not merely the Jharkhand Party but everybody there to the south of the Ganges wants to separate from North Bihar. But I do not want to talk of that today. The point is that the general elections in 1952 were specifically fought on this issue, and it was the Jharkhand Party which got the largest number of seats. Then, there was the Chota Nagpur and Santhal Parganas Janta Party, then the Lok Sevak Sangh and independent members totally on this issue. We got 52 seats out of 87, and yet we are told in this report that we did not get a majority. Very well, we did not according to the two commissioners get a majority; we can wait for it; I shall show to you in 1957 what the electorate there feels about it. I

do not want to argue on this point now. We shall continue our constitutional struggle.

Meanwhile, I want to tell this House and the country that I stand by what I said in the length and breadth of the Jharkhand area during the visit of the States Reorganisation Commission, namely that not an inch shall be disintegrated from the Jharkhand area. Now, why do my Orissa friends not ask for the whole plateau? We are prepared to be with them. But they do not want that for obvious reasons.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: We welcome you.

Shri Jaipal Singh: We would like to be consolidated with you. When Shri Naba Krishna Chaudhri, the Chief Minister of Orissa, came to see me here on October 14th—he came to see me, I did not go to see him—he said, 'Please come with me to Orissa, we shall tour the areas together'. I asked him, "Why?" "I accept the O'Donnell Committee's report" he replied. But here on the floor of this House, I find the same old arguments which have been turned down again and again being dished up with distorted history. Singhbhum district has 12 MLA's. We won 11 seats on this specific issue. And here is my hon. friend from Dhenkanal and West Cuttack, and here are a few other Members, who had the impertinence to tell us that the people want to go to the other State.

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal—West Cuttack): It is impertinence on your part.

Shri Jaipal Singh: All right, it is an impertinent claim.

Shri B. Das (Jaipur—Keonjhar): Why should my hon. friend Shri Jaipal Singh say 'impertinent'?

An Hon. Member: It is unparliamentary.

Shri Jaipal Singh: May I just point out that it is not a pertinent claim? I think I know the English language as much as my hon. colleague knows. (*Interruptions*). The claim that my hon.

friends are making is not pertinent to the democratic process. Here the electorate has unequivocally expressed in overwhelming numbers that not an inch shall go here or there. But here hon. Members are telling me. What about some MLA's.....

Shri R. N. S. Deo: What about separation from Bihar?

Shri Jaipal Singh: Now, who are these persons? They were elected on the Jharkhand party ticket, but they have gone over to the other side. I have thrown them out of the Jharkhand Party. They have not told you that.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: They have repudiated it.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Let them seek re-election. If you want, you can have it. Do you accept that?

Shri R. N. S. Deo: Have a plebiscite.

Shri Jaipal Singh: No. The general elections are coming in 1957. So, let us not waste the time of this country by plebiscite and referenda and things like that. Very soon, the elections are coming along, I can say the same thing about the people who are in the "States" of Orissa also. Memoranda have been sent by the MLA's from Mayurbhanj.

Because of the friendliness of Shri Harekrishna Mahtab, who was then a Central Minister, we said 'Let us work together'. We did and we put the Congress in power in Orissa. Today they are forgetting that. Everyone of them now says on this issue, which involves the disruption and disintegration of the Jharkhand area, that they cannot agree with Orissa claims. They have said so. Going on further I would like to examine the Orissa case. It is very very obvious. We won eleven out of the twelve seats. Even that one seat that my friends there won was not on this specific issue of that area going to Orissa.

Shri R. N. S. Doo: Of course, it was.

Shri Jaipal Singh: But the manifesto is there. (*Interruptions*). I would have liked to take it part of the proceedings. That will prove it. But I do not want to waste time. I have eleven out of twelve. That is a cogent enough argument. As I say, 1957 is round the corner. Let the electorate decide. I am not speaking as an individual. I am nobody. Nor are my friends anybody, for the matter of that. They do not belong to that area. I at least belong to that area (*Interruptions*).

As far as my friends in West Bengal are concerned, they are the second giant I have to deal with. My friends in West Bengal can never accuse me. They know my record and I can not be hostile to them. They can say plenty, and with a great deal of justification. There is a very unfortunate dispute between North Biharis and Bengalis. There is a history behind it. The Bengal-Bihar dispute has somehow or other vitiated the whole atmosphere. So let us not make too much of it. To them all that I would say is this: what have we in the Jharkhand area done, that you are disrupting us? As far as the Commissioners are concerned, when they attempted to solve the problem in Kishanganj, they created another problem by the recommendation to transfer some Manbhum area to West Bengal. As my friend from Bihar who spoke first, said, why are we thinking in terms of corridor? Is Bihar foreign territory? Is it that you feel strange when you go through Bihar territory? If that is so, could we not feel strange when we are asked to go from Jamsbedpur to Dhanbad through West Bengal? Could we not also use the same type of language? Let us not think of this country as if, at one place, we feel at home and, at another, we do not feel at home. Let us analyse the reasons that we make some of our colleagues feel like that. I repeat the same thing. Our view is that the Chhota Nagpur plateau must remain

intact. If my friends from West Bengal want the whole of it, as it was before 1911, let them have the whole of it with them. But let them not try to be too clever and use other arguments. I will repeat the words which Dr. Rajendra Prasad used 15 years ago at the 53rd Indian National Congress held at Ramgarh. This is what he said about us of that area:

"It is backward in education. We are unable to compete with others in modern methods of worldly dealing".

I tell my friends from West Bengal: "Please do not take unfair advantage of the backwardness of that area. You have a national Press in Calcutta. We have none. You have big giants to speak for you." In fact, the debate in the West Bengal Legislative Assembly has been most undignified. The President of the Indian Republic has been personally attacked. Very undesirable epithets have been given to the Leader of the House here. We will not do that. I can also call some people 'butchers' and this and that. But I will not do it. It is most undignified. We should talk in a spirit of calm tranquillity. We are prepared. Let us get together to see if there is a solution.

There is one point which we have not been able to appreciate. When you talk of national unity and security in the national interest and the like, please remember that you have got to make us appreciate that it is in the national interest. Just your shouting is not going to make a matter something of national interest. May be at the present moment, Parliament is not in a position to appreciate the position of the Jharkhand area, but one day it will. We are not going to be impatient. We are going to fight constitutionally. We are not going to have fighting in the streets of Bombay, Calcutta or in Jharkhand or something like that. We will achieve our purpose constitutionally, with the help of everyone here, with the country's solid support. But meanwhile, we go ahead.

Then I come to the third giant—Madhya Pradesh. The States of Korea, Jashpur, Surguja, Udaipur and Chhangbhakar have been put in Madhya Pradesh. Anyone who knows those areas, anyone who has travelled in those areas, knows only too well that all the trade routes and the ethnic affinities are on this side with the Ranchi district. Yet these areas have been put on that side, only to weaken the claim of Jharkhand. Today even those leaders who made that onstrous blunder are trying to make amends. They have now realised the mistake they made. Even Sardar Patel knew he made a mistake. I myself brought in an adjournment motion after the Raj Kharsawan firing. He said he did not know of the Chhota Nagpur States Agency! That was the shabby treatment I got. But today people know the Chhota Nagpur States Agency. There must be integration of those areas. It is not because it is a question of enlarging the area, but, again, as, I say, the question of unity and security, the question of consolidation of certain ethnic groups has to be considered and solved. It is not because we want a huge area to be under our control or anything of the kind. But why do you shove these areas to Madhya Pradesh?

Then I come to U. P. I know it does not favour us, but there also I think the present State of Bihar has been done an injustice by the Commissioners through their ignorance—geographical ignorance—and nothing else. The Dudhi area, as you know, is south of Mirzapur district. Its people are the Dudhis. All the means of communication and everything else is on this side. If the Mirzapur district officers have to go to the Dudhi area, they have to get into Bihar, come to Daltanganj in Palamau district and then get into the Dudhi area. It is surely too obvious that the only way that that place could be properly administered is to make it a part of Palamau district, which means putting it in the State of Bihar.

To talk, as people have done, of territory lying in Bihar is rather strange. My hon. friend for Hooghly, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, pleaded for uprooted humanity. But he does not plead for disrupted humanity. He made a very very big distinction between uprooted humanity and disrupted humanity. You know there are about 10 lakhs of people from the Chhotta Nagpur Plateau who are today wandering about in the tea gardens of Assam, Alipur Duars and the like. Do they not want to come back to their homeland? Are they not displaced persons? Are they not uprooted? I fully concede that perhaps, the Government of Bihar has not done as well as it might have in its treatment, in its reception of refugees from East Pakistan. I am prepared to accept that. But, is that a reason for punishing the Jharkhand people? Can my friends in West Bengal say that the tribal people, the Santhals, have in any way damaged them? In regard to the agricultural economy in West Bengal, they know it; there is no difficulty whatever in our getting on together. If some leaders in the north of Bihar give you trouble, do we deserve to be punished and to be disrupted? So this plea in the name of uprooted humanity is an emotional affair. (*Interruptions*). Emotion has an importance in life, but it is not everything. I want that the whole problem should not be viewed as a question of where this road shall be and where that river shall be and where that mountain shall be. We are dealing with human beings. I take today, and I have always taken, a consistent attitude; I have done it throughout my political existence. Whether you talk of the D.V.C. or the Hirakud Dam or anything like that, let us not merely talk of the engineering feats. I want to know what has happened to my people in the Hirakud Project. It may be a marvellous feat of engineering, but that is not all for me. Similarly, the D.V.C. and the same also with the reorganisation of States:

[Shri Jaipal Singh]
and I maintain that nothing should be done to disrupt or disintegrate any of these areas, because, first of all, you are dealing with human beings and already the democratic process has expressed itself positively and unequivocally against any disintegration.

Lastly, I say, it is in the national interest that if there is a common problem and we have common difficulties, rough language, acrimonious debates against each other and all that sort of behaviour is not going to help any one of us. Let us go round and let the people decide what they want. It is not my friends here that can plead for the country as a whole. I doubt whether they know a word of Ho.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: An equal number of Hos have gone to Orissa— as many as are in Singbhum district.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Because what is known as Keonjhar was assigned to Orissa wrongly. Raj Gargpur also was one of them.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: Do you say Cuttack and Dhenkanal were also like that?

Shri Jaipal Singh: No, not in the Chhota Nagpur Division. Do not fish out old history. Do not vitiate historical facts. If you want to rewrite history you can do that; the history of the freedom movement is going to be written; you can make your contribution to that.

But, in independent India the bluff of past history is not going to work. I strongly support the view taken by the speakers from Bihar. I am, of course, for a Jharkhand State. I continue to do that. But, meanwhile, I definitely say that until such time as the country is ready for that, I stand by the stand of the Bihar State.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Madam, for the last six days we are debating the SRC Report. We who had proclaimed from house-tops that ours is a secular

government, that the outlook of the Congress party is the nationalist outlook, that it is not narrow-minded, that it is not parochial, that it is not tribal, that it is not communal have come out in true colours. Every one of us sitting here had come down to this level, my house first, my district next; my province after that and the whole of the country last.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: Not every one of us.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Madam, this has been the attitude in the Punjab; this has been the attitude in Bihar; this has been the attitude in Maharashtra; this has been the attitude in Telangana; this has been the attitude in Karnataka.

An Hon. Member: Not in Maharashtra.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: The unfortunate position is this. We forget that when the Constitution was given to us, it was decided once for all that we should have a unitary type of Constitution unique in the history of the constitutions of the world. This is the first country—and the first experiment in the world—where this particular type of federation has come into being where the federating units have absolutely no power. I remember the words of Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava which he uttered in October, 1949 when this Constitution was being made. His words were "Today the Prime Minister seems to be not merely the Grand Moghul but a lion and the provincial Governments would be like lambs and goats which will tremble before him." It is this that is there in our country. "We must remember that a serious complaint is made on the ground that there is too much centralisation and that the States have been reduced to municipalities." I say and again reiterate it that they are municipalities and nothing else. Certain powers have been given to them by virtue of the State List in the Constitution. Certain subjects have been transferred to them and it is

only in regard to those that they can exercise powers and nothing else and we have had complete examples of it. How much would we have suffered had not this power been vested in the centre. We had the example of Travancore-Cochin; we had the example of Andhra before us; we had the example of PEPSU before us; we had the example of the Punjab before us and if that power had not been vested in the Centre, we would have been disrupted. We forget that India has been a whole and we must feel as a whole and as one nation. If we go on dividing India it gives rise to parochial claims that this portion of the territory should come to me, that portion should go to him and that portion must be grabbed by me. It is this that we must abhor and it is with that in view I am here and want to place my views before you.

Whosoever has gone through the whole of this Report of the SRC—I do not know how many of us have done that—will find himself very much helped by the small brochure which has been published by Shri Kaul, our Secretary. I should say that whosoever prepared it deserves a good deal of congratulation and thanks at the hands of the Members of Parliament. At page 5, it has summarised paragraphs 111 and 112 of the Report and says that the unity of the country must be the primary consideration for us to decide and it is only that consideration which should weigh with us. But, with all the labour that this SRC has put in—and the Report has been placed before the country—I should say that at times things have been suggested or are likely to happen on account of such suggestion where they have been not very logical in what they have started with. The principle enunciation of theirs was quite correct but the result at which they arrived was not arrived at logically. I can give you a clear example.

It passes my comprehension that while they have given Bombay a bilingual State, they have not kept Madhya Pradesh a bilingual State. Why have they taken a portion of Madhya Pradesh and then given Vindhya Pradesh and Madhya Bharat to it and created a new State of Madhya Pradesh? Madhya Bharat already existed. I cannot see any logic behind such a move. We know that Madhya Bharat has been a State with a different system of agricultural law than the Madhya Pradesh. I know that people have always been feeling that those in the states act as snobs towards those in 'B' states and that there were some sort of snobs in Madhya Pradesh—I say snobs particularly because I know what type of administration was carried on in the Bombay State in the merged areas. Those of us who were the subjects of those merged States, who had the misfortune to belong to those States which had been merged with the Bombay State know to our chagrin how the Bombay City Police misbehaved with us. I am very sorry that my hon. friend Shri Patil is not here. I can say that if he can use the language that Bombay is the most efficient State, I can very well say that this is the most efficiently inefficient State that ever existed in India.

2 P. M.

What has happened? Why is Abu going out the hands of Bombay? It was given as a gift to Bombay and it is going out of the hands of Bombay. It is only because they terrorised and put down the poor villagers of Rajasthan. I again say that every man there was unhappy. It is for that reason that Abu is going out of the hands of Bombay. What has Bombay done—efficiently? Visit Godhra the district town of Panch Mahal district. We know that the Hindu women were always molested by the Muslims—goondas—and they were stripped naked. No Bombay Government could do anything. It was only the good wishes of Sardar Patel and a strong Collector like

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

Shri Prinputkar which made things right. We know what the Bombay Police did. We know its efficiency. That argument does not hold water. I say it is not because of efficiency or inefficiency that Bombay State should be formed. You should realise these things. Why should the Maharashtrians say that they are afraid of the Gujeratis? The Gujeratis will be only 25 per cent. and the Maharashtrians will be 48 per cent., in the bilingual State. Why should they fear? Maharashtra, Bengal and the Punjab have given us the greatest patriots of our country.

Why should Maharashtra be afraid? Gujarat has a soft corner for them; it has given the loving term of Dada to Shri Mavalankar, of Kaka to Shri Kalelkar and of Mama to Shri Phadke. But then who is demanding the disrupting of the State and that too unnecessarily, and why creating this trouble? If you keep away this State of Madhya Bharat and create Vidarbha, create it by all means and let the S.R.C. Report stand. But if it does not stand, I will be second to none in saying that the State of Madhya Pradesh must also remain bilingual. There is no logic behind the statement that the State of Madhya Pradesh shall not remain bilingual. The same applies to the question of Telangana and also the question of Andhra. I will be travelling beyond my limit if I speak about them and so I will now come down to my home province or the State which I represent—Rajasthan. I will ask all my friends to look at the map of Rajasthan and to have a look at the district of Mandsaur. I do not see the logic in what the S.R.C. has said about the Mandsaur district. They say "The public has not clamoured for the Mandsaur district being handed over to Rajasthan." Where was the opportunity for the public to clamour about? We were in Madhya Bharat and never dreamt that there would be another type of State, Madhya Pradesh, to which the whole of our territory will go away. Telegrams after telegrams are pouring

into my house that under no circumstances Mandsaur district shall go over to Madhya Pradesh. Look at this map here and you will find that Mandsaur district is jutting peninsula into the territory of Rajasthan—on the North-east and west there is Rajasthan—and we have got a small inlet to go into Madhya Bharat, and it is not stated that it is not contiguous to the State of Rajasthan. If you throw a stone from my house, it will fall in Rajasthan territory, and we live in Madhya Bharat territory. Am I to go Jubbulpore where in the older day the lunatic asylum for our area was situated? We do not want to go there. One and all of us are opposing this area of Mandsaur going away into Rajasthan. Madhya Bharat must remain, and if Madhya Bharat remains, every tehsil of Mandsaur, Jawad, Manasa, Neemuch, Bhanpura and Sunel, would like to remain with Madhya Bharat. But if Madhya Pradesh is to be formed, as has been argued by my friend, Shri Radhelal Vyas, one and all of us are prepared to have a plebiscite and I am prepared to guarantee that 99 per cent. of us do not want to go into Madhya Pradesh, which is going to be formed now. I can see the arguments of my friend, Shri Vyas. He says that because Madhya Bharat is a small territory, people like me and people like my friend Shri Deshpande got elected and, therefore, we are afraid of the formation of Madhya Pradesh. I challenge that statement. This area of Rajasthan from where I was elected is not a very small area—like that of Madhya Bharat. It is one of the biggest States of India and there I defeated the Chief Minister of Rajasthan, and Shri Deshpande defeated the Chief Minister of Madhya Bharat and every constituency contains 7,50,000 people as it does everywhere and it does not differ. This is not the question at all here, but unfortunately what has happened is this. These old Ministers of Madhya Bharat, who were shunted out by their own fellow-traders and shunted out

from the Ministry and put into this House, now want to have their own back against the *baniyas* who have become Ministers there—the *brahmins* have been put here. It is the *brahmins* who have been clamouring to destroy the *baniyas* by the creation of Madhya Pradesh. It is on account of that thing that my friend and many people are suffering. It must be admitted by all that at least 56 per cent of the total strength of Madhya Bharat Assembly wanted to remain in Madhya Bharat and wanted to keep Madhya Bharat as a separate State. There may be justification or may not be justification for having Sironj in Madhya Bharat, but there is absolutely no necessity for taking away Madhya Bharat into Madhya Pradesh. I may still warn my friends who are anxious to go over with that territory from us not to do so and be prey to the snobs there.

I am sorry I may take a little more time. Unfortunately I find myself in the position that I am the representative of a big All-India party—Jan Sangh Party—and I have not spoken on this ground so far. That is why I am going to take a little more time than others.

What is happening here in the Punjab? What is the demand of the Punjab? Have we seen and studied this demand? Unfortunately, Sardar Hukam Singh is not here now—I have very great respect for his advocacy—but what has happened to his advocacy? He has put such a nice picture before the House that everyone thinks that Punjab has got a claim for Punjabi Suba—it is another word for Sikh Suba. In Gurdaspur it is shown that 99 per cent. of the population speaks Punjabi. In the tehsil of Nurpur 7 miles from Gurdaspur, they say that 99 per cent. is Hindi-speaking population. Who is going to swallow such a story? If we look at the old map of the linguistic survey of India, we find that Punjabi has no place. It was the *lahnda* language a branch of Western Hindi which is now called Punjabi. Punjab is

one of the provinces which has got a name because of the five rivers—*Punj-ab*. It is not like Bengal or Gujarat, it is not that those who live in Gujarat are Gujaratis and those who live in Bengal are Bengalis. That is not the case with Punjab. Anybody living in the area of Punjab belongs to Punjab and is a Punjabi. It is the other way about. In some cases, women are brought into the family and then they are given the name like these—*bhai* is there and therefore *bhabi* comes; *kaka* is there and *kaki* comes; *mama* is there and *mami* comes; but in some cases *bu* is there and therefore *phupha* comes. In this case, Punjab is there and therefore Punjabi comes. Bengalis are not all those who live in Bengal and all those who live in Bengal need not necessarily speak in Bengali. But Bengali is there and therefore Bengal has come but the reverse is the condition for Punjab. Gujarati is there and therefore Gujarat has come, and similarly with regard to other languages, except Punjabi, where the condition is just the reverse.

Shri Bahadur Singh (Ferozpur-Ludhiana-Reserved-Sch. Castes): May I know what is the language of Punjab?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I have already said what is the language there.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

When this debate started, Madam, what happened was this.

Mr. Chairman: A Punjabi is hardly a person who can be called 'Madam'!

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I am very sorry, Sir, I did not note that you are in the Chair. Now. When this debate started, it was pointed out at that time that certain areas are the only areas which have been affected by the S.R.C. Report and, therefore, those Members, whose areas are mostly affected, were given greater opportunities to convey their views.

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

I appreciate that there was a justification for it, but at the same time when this question had arisen, the hon. Home Minister, Pantji, got up and pointed out that, after the various points on which the speeches can be concentrated, there were linguistic safeguards provided in Part IV.

What are these linguistic safeguards. We had had enough of these safeguards. The disruption of the country began by the British-introducing what is known as safeguard for religious minorities. Then we have another picture of colour minority in Africa. Then we have in our country the tribal minority. Then we had the caste minority, and now we are having another rub against us which we call linguistic minority. What is this linguistic minority? What are these safeguards? Is India not a whole? This theory of dual citizenship in India must go. The only State which developed this dual citizenship theory was Bombay, I think. In Bombay, a law was made that whosoever is born and domiciled in the territory of Bombay, if he contracts a marriage—after he has already married once—even in any other place outside the territory of Bombay, and if he comes into the territory of Bombay, he shall be punished. It was a punishment by a shavage law. That was the theory. That theory must go by the board. That cannot exist.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): We did not want to encourage polygamy.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I also hate bigamy but, at the same time, I am not prepared to tolerate the dual citizenship of Bombay. No dual citizenship for our country can be tolerated. India is one whole. We are Indians first and Indians last. It is not a question of Bombay language; similarly, it is not that Madras is separate. Therefore, Punjab cannot come in with what is called Punjabi language.

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Then, where is

the necessity for linguistic States—Kerala, Maharashtra, Bengal, etc?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Just after your speech Sir in the then Constituent Assembly, during the debate, Dr. S. P. Mukerjee had said:

“There should be power reserved to the Centre full and untrammelled both in the formulation of the policy and its execution to deal effectively with such emergencies. The Constitution which ultimately emerged guarantees all this and guards against the dangers of disunity and turmoil”.

If we have to keep up this ideal, we should not apply our minds to the taking of this territory and that territory and quarrelling over small pieces of land as if those pieces of land are going to belong to us for all time to come. It is not that we are a separate nation. If they are going to effect changes only for administrative purposes, say, that Rajasthan shall govern this particular territory and Madhya Bharat should govern that particular territory, then, let them be effected with all the considerations that have been enumerated in paragraphs 162 and 163 of the Report. I invite the attention of this House to paragraph 163. Please read it carefully before any theory is put forward. What they have said is this:

“(a) to recognise linguistic homogeneity as an important factor.....” and

“(b) to ensure that communicational, educational and cultural needs of different language groups, whether resident in predominantly unilingual or composite administrative units, are adequately met”.

At the same time, they say:

“(c) where satisfactory conditions exist, and the balance of economic, political and administrative considerations favour composite States, to continue

them with the necessary safeguards.....

I ask you to cut off the words "safeguards". No safeguards need be put in our country. They say further—

".....to ensure that all sections enjoy equal rights and opportunities".

Safeguards are not necessary. Every one is equal and even the members of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes should become my equal. They were my equals yesterday and they will be my equals in the future. They are my equals. I want them to be my equals. Then the Commission says:

"(d) to repudiate the "home land" concept,....."

Mr. Chairman: He must finish now.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I will finish in a few minutes. I am sorry that although I wanted a good deal of time more, to put up a strong case, I have to finish soon.

So far as the question of Punjab is concerned, I will only say this. The whole argument which I quoted just now was smashed to the ground on the day this SRC Report was published. What was the picture that we saw on that day. What did Master Tara Singh, the Akali leader, say then? He said that the Report is a decree of complete annihilation of the Sikhs. Why Sikhs? May I put this question to the House? Cannot a man living in the Telugu country—Andhra—for instance, become a Sikh? After all, what is or who is a Sikh? He is a *sishya* of the Guru. He has only to keep his *kesh*, *kachh*, *kangan*, *kada* and *kirpan*. The moment he has these things, he is a Sikh. So, a Telugu can become a Sikh. In fact, *panchama bhang*—in my native town became a Sikh. Is it necessary that we should live in Punjab for that? Why should there be an annihilation of the Sikhs? Why this talk of annihilation of the Sikhs? The whole irony of fate is that the

Sikhs have published a pamphlet which is called *Punjabi Suba*. They cannot even argue in the language for which they are pleading. It is all in Urdu.

Shri Bahadur Singh (Ferozepur-Ludhiana-Reserved-Sch. Castes): It is for your reading.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I do not know Urdu. I am saying that this is written in Urdu language, the language of those who live in Punjab! To our great shame, we must admit that the language of Punjab for official purposes, for conversational purposes..

Shri Bahadur Singh: Not for conversation.

Shri U. M. Trivedi:.....for literary purposes, etc., has always been Urdu.

Mr. Chairman: I have already given the hon. Member more time.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: One minute. You remember the formula at the time of Sikandar Baldev Singh Poet. You Sir know better than most of our friends here. Then, it was said that Arabic, Sanskrit and Gurmukhi were to be treated as scriptural languages—the languages of the scriptures, and as religious languages. By all means we honour them. But the time has come when Hindi in the Devnagari script must be adopted in the whole country at least for writing a language. Let the language be different, but let that be written in Devnagari characters. It will be most essential for the unity of the country and for bringing about uniformity in the country. If nothing else, at least let it be as the Report says. I for one demand that there should be unitary form of Government in this country. It should be absolutely so. If it is necessary to divide this country, let it be divided into convenient administrative zones but not on a linguistic basis. Nothing on the basis of language should be divided. But, if that does not happen, then I say that the Report be accepted as it is, except that the enclave of Mandsaur district must

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

not be retained in the new Madhya Pradesh.

श्री बल्लबन्त सिंह महता (उदयपुर): राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग ने राजस्थान के बारे में जो सिफारिशें की हैं, उस के लिए मैं उस को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ—कैबल इस लिए कि उस ने राजस्थान की जनता की भावना का आदर कर उस की उचित आकांक्षा और इच्छा की पूर्ति कर के राजस्थान को अछुट्टण बनाये रखा, बल्कि इस लिए भी कि उस ने अपने सामने सब से बड़ा सिद्धान्त यह रखा जिस से भारत की एकता और सुरक्षा कायम रह सके और उस ने सिद्धान्त रूप से इस बात की भी सिफारिश की है कि ए, बी और सी स्टेट्स—क, ख और ग श्रेणी के राज्यों—का भेद-भाव खत्म कर दिया जाय। पहले किसी स्थान पर पार्लियामेंट गवर्नर होता था, किसी स्थान पर राजप्रमुख होता था और किसी स्थान पर कमिश्नर होता था। कमीशन ने कहा है कि यह भेद-भाव बिल्कुल मिटा दिया जाय। इसके लिये मैं ही नहीं, पार्ट बी और पार्ट सी स्टेट्स के सब ही लोग जिन की संख्या करोड़ों में है, उस को धन्यवाद देना कि आज उन सब को एक समान स्तर पर ला बिठाया है।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि राजस्थान की जो शक्ति आज है, पहले वह उससे भी बढ़ कर विशाल था। एक समय था जब कि राजस्थान की सीमा नर्बदा, जमना और सिन्ध तक फैली हुई थी और वह एक बहुत बड़े राज्य के रूप में वर्तमान था। राजस्थान ने तो हमेशा से ही भारत की एकता और एकरूपता की ओर ही ध्यान रखा है। आप को मालूम होना चाहिए कि भारतवर्ष में राजस्थान ही पहली रियासत है, जिसने अपने एक बहुत बड़े इलाके सिराँज को दूसरे राज्य को स्वतः आफर कर दिया, जिसकी आबादी करीब करीब एक लाख है और जो एक बहुत बड़ी मंडी है, क्योंकि वह चारों ओर से दूसरे राज्य मध्य भारत से घिरा हुआ था और जिसकी उस के साथ (contiguity) एकरूपता भी नहीं थी। यह है राजस्थान का इतिहास। राजस्थान तो हमेशा से

त्याग और बलिदान का देश रहा है। वह जब अपने प्राणों का मोह नहीं करता तो वह ऐसे टुकड़ों का क्या मोह करेगा जब कि भारत एक ही है। यदि कोई भाग इधर आता है या उधर जाता है तो उसके लिए एक दूषित वातावरण को देखकर मुझे बड़ा खेद होता है क्योंकि भारत जब एक ही है तो ऐसा विवाद क्यों? अगर कुछ हिस्सा इधर या उधर मिला दिया जाता है तो इससे तो कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता।

राजस्थान ने जो अपनी मांगें रखी हैं वे भी इसलिए नहीं कि वह अपने राज्य का विस्तार चाहता है। उसने तीन चार इलाकों के लिए अपनी मांगें रखी हैं। उसकी सबसे पहली मांग अजमेर के लिए थी। इसके अतिरिक्त उसने आब की मांग रखी थी, पंजाब के महेंद्र गढ़ की मांग रखी थी, मन्दसौर इलाके की मांग रखी थी और बनास काट की मांग रखी थी। इन मांगों के पीछे केवल ऐतिहासिक, सामाजिक या भौगोलिक एष्ट-भूमि ही नहीं थी लेकिन उनके पीछे जनता की बहुत बड़ी इच्छा भी थी। इसी लिए ये सब मांगें रखी गयी थीं। अब मैं एक एक को आपके सामने रखने का प्रयत्न करूंगा।

सबसे पहले राजस्थान की मांग अजमेर के लिए है। अजमेर की जो उसने मांग की है वह बिल्कुल साफ है। रिपोर्ट में भी उसके लिए साफ साफ लिखा है। वह राजस्थान का अंग है और हमेशा से राजस्थान का अंग रहा है। जैसा कि अभी श्री मुकट बिहारी लाल जी ने कहा है कि अजमेर राजस्थान का अंग नहीं रहा वह सही नहीं है। राज सांगा के वक्त में जब कि राजस्थान का एक साम्राज्य था, अजमेर राजस्थान का अंग था। उसके बाद मुगलों के जमाने में भी वह राजस्थान का अंग रहा और उस पर मुगल अपना कब्जा जमाये रहे। उसके बाद अंगरेजों के जमाने में भी अजमेर में सारी रियासतों

का ए० जी० जी० अजमेर में ही रहता था। इस तरह से अजमेर तो राजस्थान का अभिन्न अंग हैं और वह उससे अलग नहीं हो सकता और एंसा ही रिपोर्ट ने भी स्वीकार किया है। अच्छा होता यदि उसको शुरू में ही बाकी राजस्थान के साथ मिला दिया जाता। एंसा न होने से अजमेर घाट में रहा है। अभी हमारे भाई श्री मुक्त बिहारी लाल जी ने कहा कि अजमेर को राजस्थान की राजधानी बनाना चाहिए। केंद्र में होने से वह उप-प्रान्त है और ज़रूरत भी है और कांग्रेस कमेटी ने भी एंसा प्रस्ताव रखा था लेकिन अब पानी मुल्तान गया। समय बहुत बीत चुका और बहुत दर्द हो चुकी है। अब सारी व्यवस्था बदल चुकी है। एक राजधानी बन चुकी है और मैं समझता हूँ कि उसको बदलना मुश्किल होगा और इसलिए उसको बदलना भी नहीं चाहिए।

दूसरी मांग आबू के वार में थी। आबू तो राजस्थान का अभिन्न अंग था। उसको किसी प्रकार से बम्बई में मिला दिया गया लेकिन राजस्थान की जनता उसके लिए बराबर मांग करती रही है। और रिपोर्ट में भी लिखा है: "Rajasthan seems to be more particular about Abu taluka." मैं समझता हूँ कि वह राजस्थान के लिए बहुत बड़ा प्रीस्टिज का सवाल बन गया था। हमेशा से वह राजस्थान का अंग रहा है। किसी भी कारण से वह बम्बई में मिला दिया गया हो लेकिन उसके बाद भी उसके लिए बराबर राजस्थान की जनता की जो राय रही यह सबको मालूम है। यह प्रश्न तो इससे पहले ही हल हो चुका होता क्योंकि सरकार ने इस प्रश्न को, रीओपिन कर दिया था। यह पहला प्रश्न है जिसको कि केंद्रीय सरकार ने फिर से ओपिन किया है और वह बहुत पहले तै हो जाता लेकिन बीच में यह कमीशन आ गया। अगर यह कमीशन न आता तो यह अब से पहले ही राजस्थान में मिला दिया जाता। अब कमीशन ने भी

अपनी रिपोर्ट में राजस्थान के पक्ष में अपना निर्णय दिया है और कहा है कि हमको यह सिफारिश करते हुए बड़ी खुशी होती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि राजस्थान की यह उचित मांग थी और वह पूरी की गयी। हमको इस निर्णय से बहुत खुशी इसलिए भी हुई है कारण कि हजारों वर्षों से राजस्थान का इतिहास आबू के साथ जुड़ा हुआ है और वह राजस्थान का एंसा अंग है जिसको कि अलग नहीं किया जा सकता था। इसलिए उसके मिला दिये जाने से राजस्थान को बहुत खुशी होगी।

तीसरी जो मांग राजस्थान की थी वह मन्दासोर के इलाके की थी। जैसा कि अभी दो तीन माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा है मन्दासोर राजस्थान का, बल्लिक मेवाड़ का अंग है। यही नहीं बल्कि उसकी जितनी भी तहसीलें हैं वे सब की सब मेवाड़ की रही हैं। वह मेवाड़ का परगना था और वहाँ के लोगों का रहन सहन मेवाड़ से मिलता हुआ है। इस मांग के पीछे भी जनता की राय मुख्य थी। राजस्थान ने जो मांगें रखी हैं उनमें खास बात जनता की राय की थी। जैसा कि अभी त्रिवेदी जी ने कहा कि साखों आदिमियों के दस्तख्त उनके पास इस मांग के समर्थन में मौजूद हैं। वह ठीक है और जनता की राय को जानकर ही राजस्थान ने यह मांग रखी थी। मैं समझता हूँ कि जनता की राय की कद्र की जानी चाहिए और इस इलाके को राजस्थान के साथ मिलने का मौका दिया जाना चाहिए।

इनके अलावा भी बहुत से छोट-छोट एनक्लेव रह गये हैं जहाँ कि जनता को काफी तकलीफ है। जैसा कि एक छोटा सा इलाका सुनेल का है। ऐसे बहुत से इलाके हैं कि जिनका स्टेशन मध्यभारत में है और सारा का सारा गांव राजस्थान में है। अनेक गांव ऐसे हैं कि जिनमें लोगों के घर राजस्थान में और उनका बहावड़ा मध्यभारत में। मेरी तो यह प्रार्थना है कि जो बाउंडरी कमीशन बने उसको यह काम सौंप दिया जाना चाहिए और सब से अच्छा तो वह

[श्री बलवन्त सिंह महता]

हो कि दोनों सरकारों के नुमायन्द या पार्लियामेंट के सदस्य आपस में बैठकर इस मामले को तै कर लें। इसमें खास कर जनता की इच्छा को मुख्य रूप में ध्यान में रखा जाना चाहिए। जनता की सुविधा को देखकर ही एक हिस्से को इधर से उधर मिलाना चाहिए। यह विचार नहीं रखना चाहिए कि एक हिस्सा एक राज्य से दूसरे राज्य में चला जायेगा बल्कि जनता की सुविधा का मुख्य लक्ष्य होगा चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसे कई गांव रह गये हैं। उनके बारे में आपसी समझौता ही अच्छा हल है।

चाँधी मांग जो हमने की थी वह बनासकांट के कुछ गांव के लिए की थी। वहाँ पर भी कुछ इसी प्रकार की समस्या है। बैसे तो और जगहें भी हैं जैसे कि पालनपुर है, ईदर है, जोकि राजस्थान के अंग रहे हैं, लेकिन हमने उनके लिए कोई खास मांग नहीं की है। लेकिन कुछ गांव वास्तव में ऐसे हैं कि जिनके लोगों ने अपनी तकलीफें जाहिर की हैं और बतलाया है कि दूसरे प्रदेश में रहने के कारण उनको बहुत सी प्रशासनिक तकलीफें होती हैं। इस लिए ऐसे गांवों को मिलाने के बारे में आपस की बैठक में समझौता कर लिया जाना चाहिए।

इसी प्रकार की हमारी मांग महेन्द्र गढ़ और लुहारू के बारे में भी थी महेन्द्र गढ़ के लिए मुझे यही अर्ज करना है कि उसके बारे में कमीशन ने बताया है कि उसके राजस्थान में मिलाने के लिए वहाँ की जनता बराबर मांग करती रही है और इसके लिए आन्दोलन भी होते रहे हैं कि हमको पड़ोसी रियासतों में मिलाया जाय। इसी लिए वहाँ की जनता की इच्छा को ध्यान में रखकर महेन्द्रगढ़ के लिए मांग की गयी है।

इसी प्रकार लुहारू की भी बात है। उसके बारे में कासलीवाल जी ने आपको रिपोर्ट का उदाहरण पढ़कर सुना ही दिया है। इसका बीकानेर के साथ सम्बन्ध रहा है और इस मांग के पीछे भी मुख्य कारण जनता की मांग ही है। वहाँ की जनता इसके लिए बराबर ख्वाहिश करती

रही है। रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है कि इस इलाके के और कुछ दूसरे इलाके के लोग पड़ोसी राज्यों में मिलने का बराबर आन्दोलन करते रहे हैं। जनता चाहती है और यह हिस्सा राजस्थान का है। मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसी स्थिति में लोगों को राजस्थान में मिलने का मौका देना चाहिए। जिन इलाकों के बारे में कमीशन ने सिफारिश की है उनको तो मिला ही देना चाहिए। और दूसरे इलाकों के सम्बन्ध में लोगों की राय जानकर उसके अनुसार कार्य करना चाहिये।

अभी एक भाई ने कहा है कि लुहारू के कुछ भाई बाहर बैठे हुए हैं जो यह कहते हैं कि वहाँ की पंचायत ने यह बात पास करदी है कि वे राजस्थान में ही मिलना चाहते हैं, यदि जनता की यही राय है तो उन्हें मौका दीजिये। वे चाहें तो राजस्थान में रहें या पंजाब में रहें। मैं तो यहाँ तक कहने के लिए तैयार हूँ कि कमीशन ने इन १६ यूनिटों के बजाय अगर चार या पांच ही यूनिट बनाये होते तो राजस्थान सबसे पहले बड़ी यूनिट में मिलने को तैयार हो जाता। चाहे हमको हमारे किसी भी पड़ोसी से मिलाया जाता, पंजाब से, गुजरात से या मध्यभारत से हम उसमें मिल जाते। अगर इन सब प्रदेशों को मिला दिया जाता तो भी राजस्थान इसके लिए सब से पहले अपने आप को आफर करता। राजस्थान तो हमेशा से वीरता की भूमि रहा है। वह तो राणा प्रताप और मीरा की भूमि है। वह भक्ति और वीरता के लिए प्रसिद्ध रहा है। जो कुरबानी करने के लिए तैयार हो वही इस प्रदेश में रह सकता है और उसने छोटी मोटी चीजों पर कभी ध्यान नहीं दिया।

आज भी वह बड़े आंचल में मिलने का तैयार है, मगर कमीशन ने इसका मुनासिब नहीं समझा कि अभी दश के इतने बड़े बड़े हिस्से किये जाय। इसलिए जनता की राय एक मुख्य चीज बनती है। तो मेरा आप से यह निवेदन है कि एस० आर० सी० कमीशन ने जिन जिन स्टाँ के लिए या जिन जिन हिस्सों के लिए सिफारिश की है वह जल्द अत जल्द

मिला दिये जाय लेकिन इसका भी ध्यान रखा जाय जैसा कि मैंने आपसे अर्ज किया कि बाउंडरी कमिशन में एक यूनिट कम से कम एक जिले की रखी जाय। एस० आर० सी० कमिशन ने भी एलान किया था फिर भी उसने कहीं यूनिट इनक्लूड रखा है, कहीं पर टाउन रखा है और कहीं पर जिले की सिफारिश की है तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि पूरे जिले तक को जानने का मौका मिलना चाहिये। ताकि ऐसे जिले जो आना चाहें जैसा कि अभी मंदसौर के लिए कहा गया, अगर सारा का सारा जिला आने को तैयार है, ५९ परसेंट जनमत ले लीजिये, ६० परसेंट ले लीजिये या ७५ परसेंट रख लीजिये, जो भी कसौटी रखें, उस पर पूरा उत्तरने के बाद उन्हें मौका दिया जाय कि अगर वह आना चाहें तो आयें। बाउंडरी कमिशन को ऐसा करने का अख्तियार होना चाहिए और उसको इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था देने की इजाजत होनी चाहिए।

अब मैं केवल एक दो मिनट में चन्द एक बातें कह कर अपना भाषण समाप्त करूंगा। राजस्थान के सम्बन्ध में तो मैं अर्ज कर चुका हूँ अब मैं दो, एक बातें दूसरे राज्यों के सम्बन्ध में भी कहना चाहता हूँ। जहां तक हिमाचल प्रदेश का सम्बन्ध है, उसके लिए कई तरह की बातें कही गई हैं। यह प्रदेश पार्ट सी० राज्यों की श्रेणी में है और उसके लिए कमिशन ने दो रायें जाहिर की हैं और खासकर हमारे चंअरमैन साहब ने उसको एक अलग राज्य रखने की सिफारिश की है। मैं समझता हूँ कि उनकी यह सिफारिश वाजिब है और बहुत ही उचित है क्योंकि हिमाचल प्रदेश एक पहाड़ी इलाका है और मैं भी जिस क्षेत्र से आता हूँ वह भी अधिकांश में पहाड़ी प्रदेश है और इस नाते मैं जानता हूँ कि पहाड़ों में रहने वाले लोगों के रहने सहने और रीति रिवाजों में और मैदानी इलाकों में रहने वालों के रहने सहने और रीति रिवाजों में बहुत भिन्नता पाई जाती है। हिमाचल प्रदेश का बहुत सा हिस्सा मैंने स्वयं अपनी आंखों से देखा है और वहां पर कायद कानून, रवैन्दू लाज और टैनेन्सी

एक्ट वर्गोंह जो हमारे आसपास के पहाड़ी मैदानी प्रदेश हैं उनसे बिल्कुल भिन्न हैं।

आपको सुनकर बड़ा ताज्जुब होगा कि वहां पर एक पोलियंडरी की प्रथा प्रचलित है क्या वे राज्य जो इसको आने में मिलाना चाहते हैं इसको अपनाते को तैयार होंगे? यह ठीक है कि यह एक सामाजिक कटुरीति है और इसको बंद होना चाहिए लेकिन वह एक दम से कानून के जोर से उठने वाली नहीं है, उसके वास्ते हमें वहां के लोगों में प्रचार करना है और उपयुक्त वातावरण बनाना होगा किन्तु जब तक वे बंद नहीं होती उन्हें अपनाना ही होगा। तो कहने का मतलब यह है कि इसी तरह की और भी कई बातें हैं जो हमारे वहां पर नहीं पाई जातीं और उनके रहने सहने, आचार और विचार करने की जो एक शैली है वह मैदानी इलाके के लोगों से बिल्कुल भिन्न है। टर्म्स आफ रंफ्रेंस में काश्मीर का कोई जिक्र नहीं था इसीलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि कमिशन ने इस पहाड़ी प्रदेश को काश्मीर में मिलाने की कोई सिफारिश नहीं की लेकिन अगर कभी यह मसला हल होने के लिए आवे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उन को मौका दिया जाय कि वह काश्मीर के साथ मिलें। वहां के डिप्टी स्पीकर ने भी इसी प्रकार का एक सुभाव बहस के दौरान मैं रक्सा है और वास्तव में अगर देखा जाय तो उनका ज्यादातर लगाव और सम्बन्ध पहाड़ी लोगों के साथ ही है और काश्मीर एक ऐसा स्थान है जिससे उनकी ज्यादा एफिनिटी है और अगर कभी ऐसा मौका पेश आयें तो उनको काश्मीर के साथ रक्सा जाय। बस मुझे और अधिक नहीं कहना है।

Shri J. B. Mehta (Jodhpur): Mr. Chairman, so far the gladiators have held the field as it were and those who had claims and counter-claims, threats and counter-threats to offer including threats of martyrdom have had their say almost to the exclusion of the rest. But, Sir, there is a section of this House belonging to those States which have not been touched by the SRC; that is to say, which

[Shri J. R. Mehta]

have almost escaped untouched as a result of the recommendations of the SRC and I submit that they are in a position to take a more or less detached view of things. I submit that the stage has arrived when this section of opinion should be allowed to have its say. Of course, it was natural that those who had claims and counter-claims should have their say first because they are the people who are to deliver the goods, but there are others who can help in the delivery, in making it a safe and sound delivery without any pangs and other things with which that operation is fraught.

At one time before, this House in its wisdom thought it fit to refer this matter to a Commission. I was one of those who was inclined to think that it would be prudent not to touch this hornet's nest before we had time to consolidate our hard earned freedom. But, now having referred the matter to the Commission, and having thus made it a live issue before the country, and also having raised so many hopes and ambitions I feel equally strongly that it will not be wise now to fight shy of the issue. We must face it and face it with all the statesmanship, broad-mindedness and patriotism of which we are capable. I feel that it will be wise to grapple this matter while we have the good fortune of having in our midst a leader of Pandit Nehru's stature on whose great popularity and prestige with his countrymen we can depend, irrespective of all party considerations, to counteract any ugly or undesirable developments that linguistic fanaticism or parochial or communal frenzy might create for us.

As a Rajasthani if I am to express my views from the point of view of my own State, I would simply say this, that we welcome in our midst the people of Ajmer, our own kith and kin, who form the heart of Rajasthan as it were, and assure them of an honoured place in the big family of which hereafter they are going to be as good members as we are. Likewise we welcome our

brethren of the Abu Road Taluk, which, if Ajmer is taken to be the heart, can be said to constitute the head of Rajasthan. We welcome these brethren of ours who have been separated from us as recently as 1950, and who, in terms of the Report had never reconciled themselves to this separation. I submit, Sir, that we Rajasthanis, and particularly those whose lot is cast in the arid zones in the west, to which I also belong, notorious for its hot summer winds, do require Abu to keep our heads cool; and I do hope that our Bombay brethren, more favourably placed and more cool-headed as they are, will allow this reunion to take place with their goodwill and blessing.

Sir, I heard with great respect, which is due, to the hon. Member from Ajmer Pandit M. B. Bhargava, but I am afraid I am at a loss to understand what he wanted.

With all his claims, he should not overlook the fact that it was impossible for Ajmer now to continue as a separate unit; and, if it is to be merged, it is clear that there is no other State except Rajasthan to which it can go. I did not quite relish the idea of my friends Mr. Kasliwal and Mr. Bhargava crossing swords on the floor of the House as they did just now. This is the time when we should be prepared to embrace each other and extend our hand of fellowship and comradeship. It is no use referring to past history. From the point of history, every State in Rajasthan has something to be proud of. No less a person than Col. Tod has said in his famous "Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan"—

"There is not a single village in Rajasthan which has not produced its Thermopyllie and not had had its Leonidas."

But, that is all past history. We are now out to write a better chapter in the history of Rajasthan and we invite our brethren from Ajmer and Abu Taluk to meet us in comradeship and join us in writing the glorious chapter.

Rajasthan had made no territorial claims before the Commission. But even though some of our very modest claims, as for instance, our claim to Danta and Palanpur have not been conceded, we do not propose to raise a quarrel over them. I confess, Sir, and I believe it is an open secret to which history bears testimony, that for good or bad, we in Rajasthan have always in the past suffered from a sort of greed or lust for territory. I might even confess that these territorial ambitions sometimes extended far beyond the boundaries of Rajasthan; we sometimes even cast our eyes on Delhi also.

An Hon. Member: Or Afghanistan also.

Shri J. R. Mehta: So greatly did we value territory or land that we would not surrender an inch without shedding our blood and the blood of those who would try to snatch it away from us. But, Sir, those territorial ambitions of Rajasthanis to which I have referred were conceived in a different setting and a different political atmosphere, which no longer exists. Now kings and princes have disappeared and the sovereignty which they claims now vests in us, the free citizens of free India. Every citizen of India now shares in that sovereignty, even as every individual soul shares in the divinity of Universal Soul; and, if we fully appreciate the implications of the great and glorious Destiny which has unfolded itself before us, where is the place for the so-called territorial ambitions or lust for land? It makes me really sad to think that this greed for territory which we, Rajasthanis, have shaken off, maybe by force of circumstances, should have seized other people and seized them to such an extent that some of them seem prepared even to resort to a Jihad for the satisfaction of this greed? May I say in all humility that this ill fits those concerned and is entirely out of place in the new India of today, an India which is our common motherland and which transcends all

barriers born of geography or economics, or caste or religion or class. From this point of view, I cannot possibly understand all this sabre-rattling, these threats to do and die over the question of boundaries. I earnestly hope and pray that all of us will, on maturer consideration, be able to see things in their proper perspective and that the forces of patriotism and goodwill will ultimately prevail, and that we shall think, not in terms of territory, but in terms of the efficiency of the administration and above all of the well-being and prosperity and glory of the Indian Nation as a whole. Reorganisation or rationalisation of boundaries on linguistic basis is all right so far as it serves these objectives; but, let us not, for God's sake, make a fetish of it and let us not make it an end in itself. Let me submit in all humility that all this talk of Maha Punjab, Maha Koshal or Visalandhra or Vishal Maharashtra, overriding all considerations that point to the contrary, and at the point of the bayonet, seem to me absolutely unrealistic in the context of present conditions and even dangerous. If we appreciate the significance of the great and glorious destiny of a united and free India, which has been the unique privilege of our generation and if we are able to visualise what that destiny holds in store for us in future and if we are to rise up to the responsibilities that this destiny demands of us, then there is one and only one ideal on which we should set our hearts, one vision alone which we should cater for to the exclusion of all others, and that is the ideal and vision of Greater India.

In this context, may I crave your indulgence, Sir, to say one final word to those to whom I have ventured to address this humble appeal with all the earnestness that I can command? Let me tell them that the very conception of linguistic States is a myth. Let us remember that none of the linguistic States are without linguistic minorities. Even if we ignore the existing minorities, all the States which are uni-lingual at the present moment are going to be multi-lingual

[Shri J. R. Mehta]

States in the near future. If we can visualise the great developments that are taking place and the tremendous nature of economic changes that are coming on, there is bound to be a shift in the population and we shall have people of all languages residing in all the States in due course.

While I should like to acknowledge that while the Report bears the impress of the judicious frame of mind of its distinguished Chairman, the liberalism of Pandit Kunzru and the journalistic and political acumen of Sardar Panikkar, one misses the living touch of a real democrat or an experienced administrator. I make this observation with due respect, but not without reason, because I feel that no democrat, in the real sense of the word, would have to my mind recommended the merger of what are admittedly viable States into bigger States against the wishes of the people, as if they were dealing with cattle or chattel. Likewise, no experienced administrator to my mind would have recommended the creation of a State as large as Madhya Pradesh, composed of heterogeneous tracts and people, one and a half times the size of Uttar Pradesh which is the largest State at the moment, and which itself is, in the opinion of some, too unwieldy. With due deference to the distinguished authors of the Report, I am constrained to say that of all the proposals made by the Commission, the one suggesting the creation of Madhya Pradesh I consider as most absurd, in the same manner as I consider Sardar Panikkar's proposal to create two States out of Uttar Pradesh as the most sensible. Here, I am glad, Sardar Panikkar's experience as an administrator in his later days has asserted itself. I would respectfully ask this House to consider this suggestion seriously and not to be overawed by the massive personality of our talented and esteemed Home Minister—I am afraid he is not here at the moment—to whom goes the credit or discredit of silencing the genuine demand within that State itself for the creation of two States.

In this context, I should like to submit, what is perhaps implicit in what I have already stated, that I am one of those who strongly feel that very big States, beyond a certain size from the point of view of area or population, are an anachronism and are likely to create danger to the very federal structure of the country.

The contention that the bigger the State, the more economic and efficient is the administration is a myth which has been conclusively exploded by Sardar Panikkar in his able note of dissent concerning the U. P. which I strongly commend to this House. The well known rule of decreasing returns at a certain stage in the economic sphere applies equally to the administrative sphere and beyond a certain limit, excessive size is bound to affect adversely the administrative efficiency of a State. In this context, I should crave the indulgence of the House to make a personal appeal to our esteemed hon. Home Minister. I am sure his Deputy, who is here will kindly convey this appeal to him. He is a great man, great in body, great in mind and still greater in his services and sacrifices in the cause of the country. I earnestly appeal to him to intervene in this mad race of each State trying to get bigger than what it is. He alone is in a position to do this. If he will kindly excuse me for opening my mind and my heart to him, my appeal to him is that he should condescend to give fresh thought to the suggestion of carving two States out of the U. P. Let U. P. be small so that India may be great. I assure my friends of the U. P. that in this attempt to be smaller, they will become really greater than what they are. May I take the liberty to remind the hon. Home Minister of his own words that it is not mere numbers that make a nation or a State great. It is sacrifice, or the capacity to make sacrifice, the spirit of patriotism which is the real criterion of greatness for individuals as well as States. It is this sacrifice, I say, which accounts for his own greatness. I can appreciate that it cannot be easy for the Home Minister to think of the U. P.

in any other shape than what it is today, in the making of which he has perhaps made the greatest contribution. But, I humbly and respectfully appeal to him to rise above this sentiment in the interests of the nation. I venture to make this appeal because I believe that he is capable of rising to the occasion. I would beg of hon. Members not to misunderstand me when I say that when we of princely India were first confronted with the idea of liquidating the States to which we belonged, we had our own pangs. But, looking back at what has happened and still more at what is in store, for us, those pangs have given place to a sense of deep satisfaction. If this is true of us Rajasthanis brought up in feudal atmosphere for generations, is it too much to expect this from our friends of the U. P. who have been brought up in a more liberal atmosphere from this point of view.

I wish to make one other observation and then I shall finish. I am afraid there is another danger that is now growing in this country, a new psychology which has arisen which is bound to be dangerous. At one time, we had the problem of Hindu-Muslim minorities. It was considered that the interests of these two communities were irreconcilable. Now, we have begun to think in terms of each linguistic group having interests which are irreconcilable with the interests of others. It makes me sad to reflect that even the Commission should not have been able to get over this approach. I would just invite attention to one sentence in para 433, page 119. You have this significant phrase:

"The Maharashtrians will therefore enjoy a position of advantage in the proposed State."

I appeal to this House and I wish that we the citizens of free India learn to think that this question of advantage or disadvantage over others no longer arises. We have a Constitution which bestows equal rights on all. We have our fundamental rights. I cannot see why, if I a Rajasthani go to any other province or State, I need fear of being placed in a position of

disadvantage as compared to the others?

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated-Anglo-Indians): If it would have done any good, I would have opposed this report outright. I would remind the hon. Deputy Minister that I bitterly opposed what I regarded as an initial mistake in conceding the State of Andhra. I felt then that in making that initial mistake we were initiating a process which might ultimately lead, not today, not in this generation, perhaps in the next—I hope I shall prove a false prophet—to the ultimate disintegration of this country, I know that perhaps I shall be striking a discordant note. Both in this report and in this House we have constantly heard lip service to principles. Yet, in practice and policy, we continue to negate these principles. The Prime Minister has repeatedly told us that for the sake of the country, first things must come first. The Dhar Commission said, for the sake of the country, we must pigeonhole reorganisation at least for the present. Even the J.V.P. committee in effect, in my opinion, made the same recommendation that the reorganisation of the country as such should be put into cold storage. I believe, quite rightly, the Congress Party has progressively qualified its approach to its original dictum that the reorganisation of the country should take place on a purely linguistic basis. In any case, in politics, what is said today can never be sacrosanct in conditions five years from now. What the Congress Party said in 1920, conditioned purely by political considerations can be guide for the independent India of today. I say this with an intense feeling of sadness that I feel that in making these recommendations and in implementing them the whole problem is snarled and even defiled by political consideration, by considerations of pure political expediency. I am not unaware that language is one of the most inflammable political concepts. I know that unfortunately this linguism has been the centre of political competition. I know that the other political parties

[Shri Frank Anthony]

are today prepared to make political capital out of linguism in order to suit their own purposes. But, I feel that in this political maelstrom, in this competition for vote-catching, it is the country that is going to suffer. I had hoped that the Congress Party which has the strength, would have had the courage to resist reorganisation today. I know that it would be difficult because it would mean losing a large number of votes.

Today, when the country is making massive strides both economically and industrially, to embark on this radical reorganisation of the country is gratuitously to set the country back. I am quite certain of that. How long it will set the country back, no one can say. But, I am certain that it will set the country back economically anything from 10 to 20 years. Assuming that there is a minimum of dislocation—the Commission itself has admitted that there must be dislocation, not only political dislocation, but massive administrative dislocation—What has happened to the railways? I know something about the railways. I made an analysis of figures the other day. There too, I made the plea that today, when the country should concentrate all its resources on achieving economic strength and inducing greater political stability, we must not gratuitously undertake reorganisation.

But who listened to me? The other day I gave figures from the railway administration to show that we have paid a terrible price for regrouping of the railways, for even after the Second Five Year Plan, the railways will not recapture the operational efficiency which they had in 1950. That is my own fear. What we did on the railways was infinitesimal and microscopic to what we are going to do with regard to the country, and the problems and complexities that are going to be posed to the administration are going to be gigantic and incomparably greater than anything that the reorganisation of the railways represented. What are they going to lead to?

3 P.M.

Are your service personnel going to bother about their work? What has happened on the railways since 1950? Your service personnel today do not know what their personal position is. They have not yet had their seniority fixed. Today, what is going to happen with reorganisation? Your servicemen will be wondering what their personal prospects are going to be. They will be jockeying for personal positions, and, what is worse, your politicians will be jockeying over for potential positions, or jockeying, spending their time and energy instead of pursuing the objects of the Second Five Year Plan, or spending their time and energy in jockeying to maintain their personal interests or trying to get some kind of new position of strength.

I concede that a certain degree of rationalisation was necessary. I believe that everyone more or less in this House is unanimous in feeling that at any rate the Part C States should go. The degree of rationalisation could have been proceeded with up to that, and the Part C States could have been merged with the appropriate adjoining Part A or Part B States. But after that, we should have shelved this problem for twenty years, because I believe that if we had waited for twenty years, if we had waited to stabilise our economic and political strength in the country, then the kind of reorganisation that would be undertaken would have been completely different from the hotch-potch lop-sided pattern which we are now seeking to give to the country.

Now, what are we doing in this Report? I am not blaming anyone. They are being propelled by the compulsion of events. No one individual in this country can unfortunately in the present context, in the present background of vested political interests, do what perhaps he would like to do. But what are we doing? What is this pattern that we are giving to the country? It is not even a compromise between principle and political expe-

diency. In my opinion, it is something which is dominated and motivated entirely by political expediency where there is no question of principle at all. All the principle so eloquently postulated by the SRC have in practice or in giving effect to this report, been negated; they have been still-born. I know that when they have gone so far it is perhaps impossible for Government to retrace their footsteps. I know that if Government tried to shelve this SRC Report, political capital would be made by the other parties out of it; and it is very easy to inflame the feeling of the masses on an issue like language and culture. All I feel we can do now is to make the best of a very bad situation, to try and qualify the retrograde consequences of a necessary political evil.

The authors of this Report have done well. They were confronted with a delicate and complex problem. They were set the impossible task of trying to unravel a tangled skein and formulate certain accepted principles. They tried not with much success to hack their way through a jungle of considerations such as primacy of the nation, defence, security, administrative strength, language homogeneity etcetera. But they have been unable to evolve, understandably, any kind of mathematical formula which would satisfy all the different criteria. But the main charge that is being made today, and it is a charge which it is not only difficult but impossible to rebut, is that with regard to each State, in the final analysis, the approach has been an *ad hoc* approach, an approach conditioned by political expediency; there is no question of principle at all.

I know that the suggestion that I am going to make may sound not only novel, but even bizarre. I know also that in the present context of political conditions in the country, these suggestions are not going to be given even a moment's consideration. But I say this with all humility that if we are to reorganise our country, then only two principles should have conditioned our approach. The first was

the principle of national unity and strength, and the second the protection of the citizen. I say that tested by these two principles, namely the promotion of national unity and the protection of the citizen, the report is an abject failure.

I submit that deliberately, we should have, in fostering this first principle of national unity, created—I know perhaps what I am saying may be sounding a little platitudinous even platitudinous in a mildewed kind of way—multi-lingual States. We talk eloquently of coexistence in the international field, and yet at home we are unable to implement it. What are we doing?

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): That is for export.

Shri Frank Anthony: We are sanctifying the reactionary and evil dictum that Hindus, that is, people belonging to the same religion, who we say have the same culture, cannot co-exist with self-respect and honour. If we accept the theory that the Mahrattas cannot live with the Gujaratis, and that the Gujaratis cannot live with the Mahrattas, if we accept the principle that a language spoken by millions and millions of people cannot burgeon or flourish, and that it cannot reach its full stature....

Shri Joachim Alva: Are not the Anglo-Indians fleeing this land because they want to go back to the land where only the English language is spoken?

Shri Frank Anthony: My hon. friend has in his rather typical way tried to bring in something which is utterly irrelevant.

Shri Joachim Alva: It is very simple and relevant.

Mr. Chairman: If it is irrelevant, the hon. Member need not reply to it.

Shri Frank Anthony: I shall defer to your very good advice. What are we doing now? I say that we are accepting, in establishing linguistic States, the theory that people speaking a particular language cannot truly reach their full stature and that their langu-

[Shri Frank Anthony].

age cannot reach its full stature, unless it is identified with separate administrative and geographical boundaries. Then, what happens if we accept that theory *a fortiori* then what happens to the linguistic minorities? If tens of millions of people cannot live without fear of apprehension, then what is going to be the fate of the linguistic minorities? Do we not also accept the theory that inevitably the prospect for these linguistic minorities is not only going to be bleak but utterly hopeless?

The argument used for unilingual States—I do not know where we got this concept of unilingual States from—is that predominantly unilingual States will lead to administrative efficiency. Nothing could be more fallacious. Are we going to delude ourselves in that way?

The States Reorganisation Commission have recommended—and it is a salutary recommendation—that in a district, if a minority language is subscribed to by 70 per cent. of the people, then the administration of that district should be in that minority language. What does it mean? It means that we are going in effect to have the administration on a multilingual basis, and yet on this plea of one language for one administration, we are purporting to justify these linguistic States.

My submission is that if we had deliberately reorganised the country on a multi-lingual basis, we would have had natural salutary checks and balances. But today what are we seeking to do? We are seeking to put one language in a dominant position, in a position which will give rein to every form of linguistic fanaticism and intolerance. What would have been the position of Hindi in a multi-lingual State? Hindi would have come into its own ultimately, because there would have been this balance between regional languages at the nerve-centre of the administration, and because of that balance it may well have been that people would have accepted in the non-Hindi-speaking State Hindi as the language of

administration at the nerve-centre. But today can we delude ourselves into believing that Hindi will be anything more than still-born as the national language, that it will not be relegated inevitably to the position of a regional language? Who is going to learn Hindi in the new set-up? We are entrenching particular languages. No one is going to adopt Hindi; it is not going to be the language of the administration, it is not going to be the language of the courts, it is not going to be the language of the schools and colleges, and those who want to pursue higher studies will not look to Hindi. It is nothing but political casuistry to suggest that linguistic States will give unity to the country. How? It is nothing more than an *ipse dixit* without any meaning. How will linguistic States each ploughing its linguistic furrows, each building itself up—already they have built themselves up—into water-tight cultural and linguistic enclaves think of unity? We are seeking now to reinforce linguism. We are going to enforce the separatist trends of language by administrative and geographical boundaries. As I have said, no one is going to bother to learn Hindi. You are going to give hostages to language fanaticism. What is going to be the attitude to Hindi?

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): Is not development of regional language of equal importance?

Shri Frank Anthony: It is going to be a matter of sole importance. All these clichés are going to mean nothing. I have practical experience of what is taking place. We run schools which have uniform standards. We are anxious that those schools should be bi-lingual. We are anxious that the second language should be Hindi, but we are prevented from teaching Hindi in the non-Hindi speaking States. We want to teach Hindi, but they say, 'No; you shall not teach Hindi, except after the fifth standard'. When we put this language fanaticism into this saddle, only a person who is prepared wildly to delude himself can believe that anyone will even give a second thought to Hindi.

We are giving sanction to the multi-national theory. If we say that it is good for the Maharattas to have a State, then why is it not good for the Sikhs to have a State? I am not saying that the Sikhs should have a State. But by what process of political sophistry can we distinguish, in essence, the position between a Muslim State, a Sikh State and a Maharatta State.

Shri B. D. Pande: And an Anglo-Indian State.

Shri Frank Anthony: No. I have always been against separatism because I realise the terrible evils of communal separatism that you are going to project into the body-politic. As a member of a minority community, I know how terrible it is to belong to a minority community. And you are creating so many more permanent minorities in this country.

Shri B. D. Pande: All have become mad.

Shri Frank Anthony: Yes. The politicians have become mad. That is the tragedy of it. It is not the man in the street who has become mad. He is not worried about multi-lingual States or linguistic States. It is the politician, it is he who is jockeying for position and for potential power.

Then I come to the safeguards. I am particularly interested with regard to protection for the citizen. We have been preoccupied with giving protection to huge groups. We have stated the principle that millions of Gujaratis, millions of Kannadigas and millions of Maharattas cannot live unless they have their own State. But we have forgotten the citizen, the citizen to whom we have proclaimed so loudly in our Constitution, equality of opportunity and equality of rights. I say that in conceding linguistic States you have directly negated the position of the citizen in this country. You have given permanent political, social and cultural serfdom to millions

of people in this country. You are creating, as I have said, so many permanent minorities—the Gujaratis in Maharashtra and Maharashtrians in Gujarat. What is the good of indulging in clichés? The States Reorganisation has pointed out what is happening without linguistic States. Text-books are being brought into existence glorifying the dominant language, administrative posts are being balatantly and dishonestly given purely on considerations of the language of the majority. Minority groups are being deliberately excluded from service and from trades. Already, this poison is corroding the railway administration. I pointed it out the other day, I said the railway administration had a proud heritage of brotherhood and *camaraderie*. But today you are creating this new evil of communalism. That is the complaint of your railwaymen. The UP-wallas collect the UP-wallas around them, the Madrasis collect the Madrasis, the Bengalis are collecting Bengalis around them, and you are deliberately defacing the map of this country by putting linguism into the saddle. That tendency will become accentuated a thousand-fold.

There is one particular reason why I feel we should have had deliberately large units. I was in favour of it, not only multi-lingual units but large units, as against the kind of pattern which is now proposed. What has now been provided is, as I have said, a patchwork, lop-sided pattern. I am in favour of large States like UP, Madhya Pradesh and so on. We should have six or seven large States: Bengal, Bihar and Orissa—one; two States in the south, two in the North and so on. Because I believe in that way, we would have created a balance, and we would have created States which are economically and politically resourceful. Bombay and UP have shown that large units can also be efficient administrative units. We would have prevented this imbalance. One of the evils which our present pattern has inherent in it is this imbalance of monolithic States on the one hand and a multiplicity of pygmy States on the other. We say

[Shri Frank Anthony]

that millions of people are frustrated because they have not got their own administrative units. What will the pygmy States be after a period of time? Will they not be increasingly frustrated vis-à-vis the Centre? Will they not have so many hostages of disintegration in the country? Already your pygmy States look with suspicion, and later on they will look with hostility, towards your large monolithic States. When the Centre weakens, as it may well weaken, when people like Jawaharlal and others go—as they must ultimately go—what is going to happen? These States will break away from the Centre? That is what you are going to do by creating this pattern of imbalance.

I feel that perhaps the most commendable recommendation that has been made is with regard to the composite State of Bombay. I feel that in the separatist tendencies which we are going to want only and deliberately release into the country, Bombay will represent the rallying point for sanity in future. Yes; in Bombay alone this ideal of a sense of nationhood, this ideal of co-existence in a composite State will persist and, perhaps, Bombay, in future, will represent the rallying point for sanity in the country. If for some misguided reason—I have no axe to grind in this matter and I am talking purely on principle—Bombay is broken up, what will it mean? Whatever political casuistry may say by way of equivocation, what will it mean? It will mean just bowing unashamedly to the principle of linguism. How then will you be able to deny a Sikh State to my Sikh friends? I feel that in all this—as somebody said—there is this concession everywhere to political expediency. Everyone is saying this. One principle is enunciated in one State and the same principle is negated and stultified in the other. Under the present circumstances, it is, perhaps, inevitable, who has the most political influence, who has the greatest capacity for political blackmail, these are the principles which, unfortunately, seem to bedul

this question which should not be bemused by such considerations.

Since we are creating so many minorities, let me, as a member of an unfortunate minority, say something about safeguards. The States Reorganisation Commission has recommended safeguards, which is a good thing. But, safeguards by themselves can never be a complete guarantee. At any rate, they will be there for what they are worth and I feel that these safeguards should be of a constitutional character. They should be put into the Constitution; they should be made justiciable. Whether minorities will have the capacity and energy and the resources to agitate these safeguards before the courts, at least they will have the satisfaction of knowing that the courts are the ultimate sentinels of their minority rights. I am giving this example because it has happened. What happened? You have given certain categorical, solemn guarantees in the Fundamental Rights, to the minority communities, to administer their own schools. The Bombay Government, for reasons best known to it deliberately.....I am finishing in five minutes, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: I have given the hon. Member the utmost time that could be given to any Member. I would now request him to finish.

An Hon. Member: He may be given five minutes more.

Shri Frank Anthony: The Bombay Government deliberately tried to destroy these schools. Fortunately that order was struck down. I feel that the machinery for implementing the minority safeguards will have to be very carefully worked out. I am not at all satisfied with the suggestion that the Governor should be the repository of minority's safeguards. I have a bitter personal experience of what has happened. You have given to my community generous safeguards in the Constitution under article 333. It is the Governor who is supposed to nominate the representative of my community. What has happened? In Bombay and Bengal—I do not know who was to

blame—they have picked up people not even remotely representative, without any representative capacity and imposed them on my community. When I wrote to one Governor, he said the Chief Minister has done it and when I wrote to the Chief Minister he said that the Governor had done that. The Governors are too painfully aware of the fact.....

Shri A. M. Thomas: The President does it all right.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): The hon. Member will be disturbed but I would tell the House this. When the widow of the sitting Member was nominated, I want to know how a better person could have been nominated.

Shri Frank Anthony: I am not going into this because it is a matter in which my friend, I am sorry to say, as usual, is talking in utter ignorance of the facts

Shri Joachim Alva: These are facts.

Mr. Chairman: One hon. Member should not interfere with another hon. Member.

Shri Frank Anthony: My lady friend, behind me, says that he is talking through his hat. (*Interruption*). It was an unfortunate thing that was done in Bengal and Bombay.

I feel that a Commission should be appointed and I also feel that there should be constitutional guarantees. There should be some kind of special considerations with regard to determining what is the regional language. I will finish soon, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: This point should not take more than half a minute. I am only anxious that more than necessary time should not be taken.

Shri Frank Anthony: I was talking about the criteria for determining the regional language. The S.R.C. has recommended a certain yardstick; it is based purely on numerical percentages. I say that in determining what

the regional language should be, other yardsticks are also to be considered; the content of a language, its richness, its capacity as a medium of expression; and, I am making a deliberate plea for English which happens to be the mother-tongue of my community. The other day, the Prime Minister made a suggestion that English should be included in the Eighth Schedule, that is, among the Indian languages. The Supreme Court has said that English is an Indian language because it is the mother-tongue of the Anglo-Indian community. Unfortunately, some of our people have got used to the idea of identifying it with the rulers of this country and they still perpetuate the solecism that English is a foreign language. I feel that if it is incorporated in the 8th Schedule, that kind of fanaticism, that kind of obscurantism which still boggles at the word 'foreign' will at least be qualified.

I wanted to say something about the services, but, in deference to the bell I will resume my seat.

Shri A. Ghosh (Burdwan): I did not want to interrupt the hon. Member. One of the nominated members in Bengal was the Secretary of the Anglo-Indian Association.

Shri Frank Anthony: He was the expelled Secretary.

श्री हेम ब्राम (संभाल परगना व हजारीबाग—रहित—अनुसूचित आदिम जातियाँ) : सभापति महोदय, आपने जो आदिम जातियाँ के एक प्रतिनिधि को इस राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग के प्रतिवेदन पर अपने विचार प्रकट करने का मौका दिया है, उसके लिए मैं आपका आभारी हूँ। हमारे देश में आज आदिवासियों की जो गिरी हुई हालत है उससे मैं समझता हूँ सब लोग परिचित होंगे। आज भारत को स्वतन्त्रता मिलने के पश्चात् आपके शासन काल में हम आदिम जातियों के लोग जो देश में इधर उधर बसते हैं, यह आशा और विश्वास रखते हैं कि हमारी आर्थिक, सामाजिक और राजनीतिक सब

[श्री हेम ब्राम]

प्रकार की अवस्थाओं में सुधार होगा और हम लोग जो सद्दियों से दबाये, कुचले और उपेक्षित पड़े हैं, उनको ऊपर उठने का सुअवसर आपके समय में मिलेगा। विदर्शी शासन के दौरान मैं तो हम लोग पैरों के नीचे कुचले पड़े थे और आपके सामने उनका आना भी मुश्किल था। अभी जैसा कि हमारे भाई श्री जयपाल सिंह ने आपको बताया कि हमारे बिहार के आदिम जाति या आदिवासी लोगों ने जंगलों को साफ करके उसको खेती करने लायक जमीन में तबदील किया और वहाँ की सरकार ने एक ऐसा कानून बना दिया है कि हमारी जमीन कोई दूसरा आदिमी छीन नहीं सकता। साथ ही आपने एक और नियम बनाकर हमारी रक्षा के लिए सीमा निर्धारित कर दी और पश्चिमी बंगाल से हमसे कुछ हिस्सा ख़ास करके हमारे आदिवासी एरिया की मांग कर रहा है तो उसके लिए मेरा कहना है कि बाउंडरी कमिशन ने पब्लिक में जांच की और गवाहीयां लीं और हम लोगों ने उसको बतलाया कि हम अपने प्रदर्श को बिहार प्रान्त का अंग समझते हैं और उस प्रदर्श को हमने खुद अपने हाथुबल से जंगल साफ करके खेती बाड़ी करने लायक बनाया और उसमें अपनी मंशा मुआफिक खेती करते हैं और वहाँ पर यदि हम दस, पांच वर्ष के लिए कहीं बाहर भी चले जायें तब भी हमारे खेत हमारी जमीन हमसे नहीं छीनी जाती है, ऐसी हालत में हमें वहाँ बिहार में बने रहने में बड़ी सुभीता है और पश्चिमी बंगाल के लोगों से हम आदिवासियों की भाषा, रीति रिवाज और रहन सहन बिल्कुल अलग है। हम उन बड़े भाइयों के बीच में जा कर कैसे फायदा उठा सकते हैं। आप के शासन में, कांग्रेस गवर्नमेन्ट की ओर से यह नियम बना दिया गया है कि कहीं पर कोई भी भाषा भाषी हो जब तक उस की आबादी का ७५ फी सदी भाग वहाँ से ज़ामा न चाहे तब तक उस को वहाँ से नहीं हटाया जायेगा। अभी हाल ही में हमारे बीच में कमिशन ने जा कर जांच की और १२, १४ लाख आदिवासी वहाँ जमा हो कर गये। उन्होंने कहा कि बिहार हमारा घर है हम वहाँ

से बाहर जान के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। हाँ, अगर आप हम को वहाँ से मार पीट कर बाहर निकालें तो दूसरी बात है। लेकिन हम आप के सामने यही मांग पेश करते हैं कि बिहार एरिया से, जहाँ कि हम ने युगों से भाड़ और जंगलों के बीच अपना घर बना रक्खा है, जिस को आप ने शोइयूल्ड एरिया बना दिया है, वहाँ से हम बाहर नहीं जाना चाहते हैं। आज आप के शासन में हमें अपनी एरिया को छोड़ने के लिये मजबूर किया जा रहा है, इस के लिये हमें बड़ा दुःख है। हम बिहार में अपने मन माने काम करते हैं, अपनी इच्छा के मुताबिक अपनी शादी व्याहों में खर्चा करते हैं और अपने मन के मुताबिक नशा शराब आदि रख कर खर्च करते हैं। जो इतने दिनों से हमारे यहाँ के रीति रिवाज चले आ रहे हैं, हम को जो यहाँ पर सुविधायें मिली हुई हैं हम उन का उपयोग बंगाल प्रान्त में नहीं कर सकते क्योंकि उन के यहाँ के नियम दूसरे हैं। हमारे मानभूम के लोग दिन रात रोते रहते हैं लेकिन वह छोट लॉग हैं उन का रोना आप तक कैसे पहुँच सकता है? मैं उन लोगों की बात आप के सामने पेश करना चाहता हूँ। वह लोग किसी भी हालत में बंगाल में नहीं जाना चाहते हैं। आप इस पर ध्यान दें। कमिशन के हमारे सामने जाने के समाचार से हम को बहुत विश्वास बंधा था, लेकिन कमिशन के सदस्यों की तबियत खराब होने के कारण वह हमारे बीच में नहीं पहुँच सके, लेकिन मेम्बर लोगों के पहुँचने पर उन से हम ने निवेदन किया कि हम बिहार एरिया से बाहर नहीं जायेंगे। हम बिहार की एक इंच जमीन भी छोड़ने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। लेकिन जब तक हम गरीबों की बात आप के कानों तक नहीं पहुँचती तब तक हम को कहाँ तक सुविधा मिल सकती है? मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस कारण से कमिशन को हमारी एरिया में ख़ास तौर से जाना चाहिये और पता लगाना चाहिये कि वहाँ के लोग क्या चाहते हैं। अगर आप वहाँ जाने के लिये तैयार हैं तो हम कभी भी आप का विरोध नहीं करेंगे, हम तो आप के सामने जो हमारे हृदय में तकलीफ है उसी को

रक्खेंगे। हम ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट के जमाने में इतनी तकलीफ में रहे हैं, हमें कोई सुविधा नहीं मिलती थी, अब आप ने दो चार सालों के लिये सुविधा दी है, लेकिन हमारे सूबे को तोड़ने की कोशिश कर के उस को खत्म करने की कोशिश की जा रही है। जब तक यह संसद इस चीज को अपने ख्याल में रख कर हमारे भय को दूर नहीं करती तब तक दूसरे प्रान्तों के लोग हम को वहां से हटाने की कोशिश करेंगे। इसी लिये हम आदिवासी अपने मन में बहुत घबरा रहे हैं। पहले हमने यह आशा की थी कि आप के शासन के अन्दर जां हमारी सीमा है उस सीमा को हम को नहीं छोड़ना चाहिये क्योंकि हम लोगों को अपनी वर्तमान सीमाओं में जो सुविधायें मिली हुई हैं वह दूसरे स्थानों में नहीं मिल सकती हैं। हम लोगों को अपनी अपनी एरिया में आप ने रुपया देना आरम्भ किया है जिस के कारण इस बीच में हम में बहुत कुछ सुधार हुआ है, लेकिन आप फिर अपनी नीति को बदलना चाहते हैं, इस से हमारे मन में बड़ी तकलीफ हो रही है। मैं समझता हूँ कि आप इस चीज को अपने ध्यान में रक्खेंगे। आज उड़ीसा की सरकार हमारे सिहभूम जिले को अपने में लेने की कोशिश कर रही है, लेकिन बिहार में जितने आदिवासी हैं उतने उड़ीसा में नहीं हैं इस लिये हम वहां क्यों जायें। मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि खास तौर से उड़ीसा के तीन जिले बिहार में मिलना चाहते हैं, उन को हमारे साथ आना चाहिये। और मैं आशा करता हूँ कि हम लोगों के बार बार निवेदन करने के कारण आप इस पर ध्यान देंगे। उड़ीसा के लोग इस लिये बिहार में आना चाहते हैं कि बिहार में आदिवासियों की संख्या २५ लाख से कम नहीं है। इस लिखे उड़ीसा के आदिवासियों ने बिहार में आने की इच्छा प्रकट की है। उन लोगों का यह निवेदन है कि उन को, बिहार में जो सुविधायें आदिवासियों को मिली हुई हैं, वही मिलें। मैं अक्षर करता हूँ कि आप इस पर भी ध्यान देंगे।

जितनी हमारे मध्य प्रदेश की आदिम जातियां हैं वह भी बहुत घबरा गई हैं, उन को भी आप

उन की वर्तमान एरिया से हथेर उधर करना चाहते हैं। इसी तरह सारं हिन्दुस्तान की आदिम जातियां घबरा उठी हैं, आसाम के लोग भी बहुत परेशानी में पड़ गये हैं। आप को उन का भी ख्याल करना चाहिये। इतने दिनों तक आप ने हमें ऊपर उठाने की कोशिश की और इतनी सुविधायें दीं, लेकिन अगर आप अपनी नीति इस समय बदलते हैं तो हम लोग मुसीबत में पड़ जायेंगे। हमारे कुछ स्थानों को बंगाल को देने की भी बात चल रही है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि बंगाल और बिहार की कुछ सुविधाओं में बहुत अन्तर है। उन को हम जैसी सुविधायें नहीं हैं। हम लोग अपनी व्याह शादी में तरह तरह की चीजों का प्रयोग करते हैं, शायब आदि हम अपने पास ही रख सकते हैं। लेकिन अगर हम बंगाल में चले गये तां कैसे हम इन चीजों को दुकान से खरीद कर ला सकते हैं ?

मैं बंगाल के वीष्मूमी इलाके में बुलाया गया। वहां के लोगों ने मुझ से कहा कि उन के चाहते हुए भी उन को बिहार में सम्मिलित होने का मौका नहीं मिला। अगर आप पता लगायें तां आप के सामने भी वह लोग यही कहेंगे। मैं भी इस ओर आप का ध्यान दिलाता हूँ। जब कभी उन को किसी चीज की जरूरत पड़ती है तां हमारे यहां से चोरी बगैरह से ले जा कर शराब पीते हैं, वह लोग भी व्याह शादी में अपने मनमाने काम करना चाहते हैं क्योंकि बहुत प्राचीन काल से उन के यहां वही रीति रिवाज चले आ रहे हैं। उन का उन आदतों को जल्दी छोड़ना मुश्किल है। यदि कोई आदमी जो सिगरंट पीता हो, उस को छोड़ना चाहे तां वह तुरन्त कैसे छोड़ सकता है ? इसी तरह से उन की बात है। ऐसी हालत में मैं आप से निवेदन करूंगा कि आप हमारे बिहार के टुकड़ों को हथेर उधर के प्रान्तों से मिलाने की कोशिश न करें, बल्कि बंगाल और बिहार के जो आदमी हमारे यहां आना चाहते हैं उन को हम में मिला दिया जाये।

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे यहां जिन आदिवासियों के पास जमीन है, अगर वह अपनी जमीन को छोड़ना चाहें तां उस को कोई खरीदता नहीं है, वह उस को फिर पा सकता है। बंगाल

[श्री हेम ब्रूम]

और उड़ीसा में एंसी सुविधा नहीं हैं। इस लिये वहाँ के आदिमी तड़प तड़प कर बिहार के लिये रोते हैं, लेकिन उन की सुनने वाला कोई नहीं है। हम लोगों के पास जमीन है, छोटी या बड़ी कुछ भी हो, लेकिन बंगाल के आदिवासी अब भी मजदूरी कर के ही अपना जीवन निर्वाह करते हैं। हमारे पास कोई एंजी नहीं है, हम लोग मिट्टी खाद कर अपना जीवन निर्वाह करते हैं, हमारे पास भले ही करोड़ों रुपये हों, लेकिन हम उन का विश्वास नहीं करते हैं। हम लोगों को सिर्फ अपनी जमीनों पर ही विश्वास है, और उसी की सुविधा बंगाल के आदिवासी चाहते हैं।

इतना कह कर मैं यही कहता हूँ कि कमिशन वहाँ जा कर जांच करे और हम लोगों को सुविधायें दी जायें, आदिवासियों को इधर उधर न किया जाय।

***Shri B. Mahata** (Manbhum South cum Dhalbhum): I do not know English, neither can I express myself adequately in Hindi. My knowledge of Hindi is very poor. So I have decided to express myself in Bengali in the matter of such a great importance.

Shri R. N. Singh (Ghazipur Distt.—East Ballia Distt.—South West): The hon. Member knows Hindi.

Shri C. D. Pande (Naini Tal Distt. cum Almora Distt.—South-West cum Bareilly Distt.—North): Let him speak in Bengali.

***Shri B. Mahata**: I will examine the S.R.C.'s recommendations *vis a vis* Bihar, Bengal, Orissa and Assam border issue. The issues are being discussed in terms of the interests of the provinces only, but not in terms of the people of the areas concerned. But the issue is mainly of the areas concerned.

Some people think that the issue of border adjustments is a minor issue. But it is not so. If new States are being formed for the benefit of the people, is not the benefit of the lakhs of people of border areas a matter of equal importance? It is not the number that counts, but the question of

rights and progress of the people,—one man or a million people that counts.

There was no question of people's interests or progress during British rule. The aim was only centralised administration and exploitation. Today, after Independence, the questions before the country are: (a) People's facilities and progress and participation in the national development; (b) the convenience of those in administration; (c) the decentralised self-governance of the people; (d) speedy progress of such creative and cultural life that is inter-linked with language.

We think that the position of the linguistic areas in our country is such that no other consideration such as economic, geographic etc. can stand in the way, if we want to reorganise the States on clear linguistic principle. If one village or a group of villages are transferred from one jurisdiction to another, and if this is desirable for the development of the people, then what can be the reason for not making such adjustments, we do not understand. Those who think in terms of the *status quo* are obsessed by the 'zamindari' mentality. The southern, northern and western parts of India have been thoroughly redistributed on linguistic principle and so, why the *status quo* mentality in regard to the issues of the eastern part of India?

The linguistic demand is a scientific and salutary one. Some may wrongly demand for it with the outlook of linguistic imperialism. Some may stand against it on the promptings of the imperialism of the vested interests. But, for these outlooks, the scientific basis and method cannot be blamed. The wrong lies in the outlook and not in the method or the basis. But unfortunately the Commission encouraged the imperialistic outlook. Turning down all the cogent reasons and facts in favour of the demand for the inclusion in Bengal, of all the Bengali-speaking areas of Bihar, the Commission decided not to touch the *status quo* of Bihar as far as

possible. Our question is, where is the *status quo* of Hyderabad? Is not the whole map of southern India changed? Then, why the *status quo* of Bihar? If amalgamation with Bengal, of the Bengali-speaking areas of Bihar is desirable and urgently necessary for the benefit and progress of the people concerned, then those areas of Bihar should be taken out and Bengal-Bihar borders should be reshaped in the way that is necessary. Even the borders of other contiguous States should also be readjusted for the sake of the benefit of all concerned. Bengali-speaking areas having been taken out, if more areas are considered to be a necessity for Bihar, then areas from the place of its linguistic affinity may be given to it for its benefit. But it is a strange mentality that the *status quo* of some States should, at all costs, be maintained.

The present area of Bihar is 70,000 sq. miles and the population is 40 millions. The demand was made only for 11½ thousand sq. miles with a population of only five millions. If these areas are transferred to Bengal, the position of Bihar will remain still much better than that of Bengal and many other States in India. The Commission have said that "it would upset the economy of Bihar". But it is far from the truth. It would improve its economy. There are written admissions by the Government of Bihar more than once that these areas which are demanded for Bengal are ever-increasingly deficit areas. If even the Jharia coal-fields go out, Bihar will still retain six or seven times bigger coal areas in residuary Bihar. Jharia coal would be finished within 25 years and the coal cess does not go to the Bihar Government.

The Commission say that these Bengali-speaking areas are bilingual. This is wholly incorrect. They are unilingual areas,—Bengali-speaking areas. The bilingual belt, if there is any, is in further west. The Commission say that in those areas in ques-

tion, Hindi is predominant. It has no foundation factually and statistically whatsoever.

The Commission have worked on the basis of 1951 census, though they realised that it is wholly unreliable in matters of the areas in question. The 1951 census with regard to those areas is faked, motivated and a piece of forgery. We can prove it to the hilt. From 1931 census and the previous ones, from Grierson, and Settlement Reports and from all aspects of actual life and other resources, it has been thoroughly established that the contention in favour of Hindi is baseless. It is Bengali only which has the unique position in these areas concerned.

The contention that Bengali has been imposed on the Hindi-speaking people in these areas is a false and mischievous propaganda, which has no proof of any kind. Rather, there are thousand and one instances of persistent and futile attempts to foist Hindi on the Bengali-speaking people in the past and present. But the Commission without testing the validity of those allegations did not hesitate to say that the allegation that Hindi has been imposed is not legitimate. In these Bengali-speaking areas, some of the Adibasi groups are purely Bengali-speaking, and one or two groups, mainly Santhals, speak their own dialect, but all of them use Bengali as their subsidiary language which is virtually their second mother-tongue. This position makes the case of Bengali more stronger.

The protagonists of the Bihar Government say that the Adibasi, Harijans, Kurmis, etc., are Bihar castes, and that their social ties are with Bihar. This is false. It is Bengal with which alone all these sections of people have their social ties. The culture of these sections is of the Bengali cultural variety in all respects. They have the social affinity with their respective counterparts in Bengal. It is said that the language of a very large section of people in Manbhum, etc. is Kurmali and it is the language of the Kurmis. I belong to the Kurmi

[Shri B. Mahata]

community. I do not know Kurmali. The language of the Kurmis is Bengali and only not more than five per cent. speak this dialect of Bengali variety along with pure Bengali. Out of 22 lakhs of population, about four lakhs are Kurmis. Only about five per cent. of them speak this Bengali dialect.

The Commission by-passed the language issue here; but approached the issue from other considerations which are also meaningless and self-contradictory. The Commission contended that Purulia along with Chas Thana is separate from Dhanbad as there is the river Damodar dividing them. But again, forgetting their stand in this respect, they said, "Chas is contiguous to Dhanbad" blowing away the river from between them. If Chas is contiguous to Dhanbad, why was not Dhanbad contiguous to Purulia?

The Commission have broken the solidarity of the Manbhum district even when there was no linguistic question involved. They did not even break the district in the case of Serai-kela, though there was the language question in its favour. (See paragraphs 625 and 666). Chas is a Bengali-speaking area beyond doubt. The Commission adopted the principle that adjustment of territories would be districtwise, subject to deviation from it on unavoidable reasons. But they have come down to Thana level without any reason whatsoever; whereas they did not consider the claim of Bengal on Thana basis.

The Commission have said, "Dhanbad and Purulia have all along been administered separately". It is incorrect. Even the Government of Bihar have denied it. Then why this breaking up of the district? Dhalbhum case has been wrongly mixed up with Singhbhum by the Commission and decisions made on wrong assumptions and facts. The case of Santhal Pargana has gone unattended to by the SRC, and the Adibasi question has not been taken into consideration. Findings in all these cases are based on totally wrong facts and these are

based on 1951 figures. In the case of Purnea, the Commission have made factual mistakes and haphazard decisions. The question of the wishes of the people has been raised by the Government of Bihar. Faked Panchayats, forged signatures, a handful of hired persons are their only capital. Even faked Satyagraha is being made in favour of Bihar Government. In our Tusu Satyagraha many of us were convicted on flimsy grounds for years together, with heavy fines of thousands of rupees. But the convictions of the so-called Satyagrahis of Bihar Government today are merely convictions with a sentence of "till the rising of the court" for the same offence. I myself have come back from jail the other day after serving by term of sentence for 21 months. The offence was that I stood in defence of civic rights and self-respect.

The Bihar Government say that people are unwilling to go to Bengal. They raise this question of 'plebiscite'. They are not sincere. When we left the Congress, we gave up the district board membership. Thus eight or ten seats became vacant. They are still vacant. The Government had not the courage to face elections and the verdict of the people; and the seats remain vacant for years. We know that, if plebiscite is taken under an impartial and effective agency, people will give their verdict unequivocally for Bengal, as they have become fed up with this rule and as they would be relieved of this hostile Government and this poisonous atmosphere.

When we take up the linguistic principle as a national verdict, we think the theory of plebiscite in this matter is fallacious and contradiction in terms; piecemeal or partial plebiscite is undemocratic and would be the cause for a series of anomalies. We discard it on principle.

I would have been happy if I could have avoided reminding you of the bitter and ignominious chapter of the history of suppression and oppression on the linguistic minority in Bihar

during the last six years. Innumerable instances of various kinds of oppressions and suppressions are there. No safeguard in the Constitution or other governmental directives had their practical utility. So, when linguistic principle is in our favour then why should we not be relieved of such a hostile administration and a poisonous atmosphere?

We support the demand for the inclusion of Goalpara in Bengal; and the legitimate demand of the people of Tripura and Kachar. We demand the inclusion in Bengal from Bihar of the whole of Manbhum; the whole of Dhalbhum sub-division of Singhbhum; and in Santal Parganas, the whole of Jamtara sub-division, the whole of Pakur sub-division and the whole of Rajmahal sub-division; and the Bengali speaking parts of Dumka sub-division and Bengali-speaking parts of Deogarh sub-division; and out of Purnea, the east of Mahananda river and such other portions which are Bengali-speaking areas. From Assam, we demand Goalpara district. As for Tripura and Kachar, we think that suitable changes should be made on linguistic grounds. We support the demand of Orissa for Seraikela and Kharsoan and all the other just demands which are based on linguistic principles.

Should we not all concerned, approach the issues with unbiased attitude and fellow-feeling? We cannot conceive of any harm to any State in India but we want that the interests and progress of the people of the areas demanded along with the whole of India will also be taken into consideration sympathetically and unbiasedly. I hope we will rise to the occasion.

श्री स्यामनंदन सहाय : आर्यम किङ्करु, बुभुते
बाल्लुम नेई इनि बिहारर पद्धे बोलें चैन कि
बिपद्धे बोलें चैन ।

[Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I have not been able to understand anything;

whether he has spoken for or against Bihar.]

*Shri Chaitan Majhi (Manbhum South cum Dhalbhum—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): Mr. Chairman, I am a representative from the Scheduled Tribes seat. I have been elected from the South Manbhum—cum—Dhalbhum constituency. I know fully the state of affairs in the Bengali-speaking areas of Bihar. I support the linguistic redistribution of States and believe in its efficacy.

If it is done properly, the progress of the people will be released of many handicaps. There will also be immeasurable convenience of the people in their participation in the administrative works. The diffusion of powers for the masses will be ensured and the cultural life that relates to language will have free play to a great extent on that account.

But in the matter of reorganisation of States the linguistic position of the Adibasis has not been considered. It is the recognised languages that have place in the reorganisation. The position of the subsidiary languages of those Adibasis who are bi-lingual should have been thoroughly considered by the SRC; but they have not done so. From the point of subsidiary languages of the Adibasis, their place in the State speaking the respective languages should be ascertained; because it is through their subsidiary languages, their wider cultural life is being performed.

We have demanded the Bengali-speaking areas in Bihar. In these areas, many of the Adibasi groups have no dialect of their own. They speak Bengali only; such as Bhumij; Deswali Manjhi, Koramudi, Mahili, etc. Practically, we the Santhals alone speak a dialect of our own along with Bengali which is our second mother tongue. Santhals are 17 lakhs in Bihar. The majority of them live in these Bengali-speaking areas. If these parts are amalgamated with Bengal, then twelve lakhs of

*English Translation of the speech delivered in Bengali.

[Shri Chaitn Majhi]

Santhals of these parts will be added to 6½ lakhs of Santhals in Bengal. The number will then be 18½ lakhs.

The Government of Bihar contends that the social ties of the Adibasis are with Bihar. This is totally wrong. All our social connections are with Bengal for ages past. Our broader cultural life is a part of the Bengali culture.

The Government of Bihar say that Adibasis do not want to go to Bengal. That is false propaganda. The Adibasis as well as other people want to be relieved from the mis-rule of the Government of Bihar and from an atmosphere vitiated with their sectarian and antagonistic attitude. For the last six years, planned and persistent victimisation and unchecked oppression and suppression is going on against the linguistic minorities including Adibasis in Bihar.

When the linguistic principle can bring change in this unfortunate state of affairs, why should we be kept struggling in an atmosphere which is not congenial to the Bengali-speaking people including Adibasis?

4 P.M.

Shri T. Subrahmanyam (Bellary): Mr. Chairman, at long last, after a humiliating period of foreign rule, our country has achieved freedom and independence. Therefore it is natural for the States Reorganisation Commission to have given priority to the protection of our freedom, to the maintenance of our national unity and for the defence and security of our country. The other factors that have been mentioned by this Commission which bear on the reorganisation of States are linguistic and cultural homogeneity, economic and administrative considerations and the successful working of the Plan. But virtually, if we take into consideration the States that have been reorganised out of the former 27 States that have been reduced to 16 States many of them are

mostly linguistic with the possible exception of Bombay and Punjab. That I consider is a good arrangement in view of the past movements and forces in our country that have been going on for the last 40 years and more. In this context, therefore, I congratulate my colleagues and people of Samyukta Karnataka and I am also glad that Visal Andhra may also take its shape in the set-up that is going to come.

Sir, I consider, in the present context, that a State must have a minimum population of 10 millions, an optimum population of 20 millions and a maximum population of 30 millions. If we take this into consideration only one State—Jammu and Kashmir stands on a separate footing—Vidarbha has much less than 10 millions—it has only 7.6 millions and it is likely to be absorbed in Maharashtra. All the other States approximate to this except U.P. and Bihar which are very much beyond the maximum mark of 30 millions as I have prescribed. If the people of those two great States are patriotic and wise they will make for stability and greatness of our country. I have faith, with the experience that we have had, that the people and the leadership there will be great and wise to make our country stable and prosperous.

I feel that the principles promulgated by the States Reorganisation Commission must have been applied in a consistent manner, but, unfortunately, I find that they have not been consistent throughout. To illustrate this I am coming to my own district of Bellary. Hon. Members of this House will kindly bear with me for some time because I represent that constituency and I must therefore represent those matters touching that district.

According to the report of the States Reorganisation Commission the three taluks of Bellary—that is Hospet, Bellary and Siruguppa—and a small portion of Mallapuram sub-taluk where the Tungabhadra headworks are situated, are recommended to be transferred to Andhra State. The hon. Members of this House will remember that

Bellary district had originally 10 taluks. Of these 10 taluks, 3 taluks, namely, Alur, Adoni and Rayadrug were transferred to Andhra in 1953 when the Andhra State was formed on the ground that they had Telugu majority, and the rest of the 7 taluks were, after very great consideration, transferred to Mysore.

Now, what are the reasons assigned by the States Reorganisation Commission for this strange recommendation? They say, it is the cumulative effect of three main considerations, namely, the Tungabhadra Project, administrative convenience and economic links. It may be interesting to note that when the present Dam site was taken up for constructing the Tungabhadra Project, the people there expressed the fear even as early as 1945, and very much earlier, that, that would be made a ground for the transfer of Bellary taluk in that area to the Andhra State on the ground that the Dam and the project would be useful for Andhra State. Then on 28th April, 1947 the Madras composite Government came out with a Press note saying that in any future re-distribution of States the existence of the Dam at the present site would not be taken into consideration and the sole objects in selecting the present site were administrative convenience, better natural facilities, less cost of construction and easy access to the railway station. Therefore, I feel that when this assurance had been given by the Madras Government as early as that date the States Reorganisation Commission should have taken this into consideration and felt that this should not be a ground for the reorganisation of States.

Then, I will state something about the Tungabhadra Project. It was the joint concern of the former composite Madras Government, into the shoes of which Andhra and Mysore have stepped in, and the Hyderabad Government. It is an irrigation-cum-power generating project. Then it was devised as a famine relief measure. I admit that both on the left bank and

the right bank, the regions and tracts that are there—Raichur district to the left bank and Bellary and other districts on the right bank—are subject to frequent recurrence of famines and droughts. Therefore, this was devised and the waterspread of this great project is 140 miles submerging 65 villages. All these villages, all these tracts are in Kannada area. Both on the right and the left banks it has a power generating section. It generates 72,000 kw. on the right bank and 138,000 kw. on the left bank.

With regard to irrigation, 2½ lakhs acres are irrigated in Mysore and Andhra and 5.85 lakhs in Hyderabad State. Now, the strange plea that is put with regard to this project is that Andhra State has got a vast and vital interest in this project and therefore the headworks and Dam and all the area up to the headworks and Dam must be transferred to Andhra area. This is a strange plea.

Now, let us look at the facts. On the Raichur side, as I stated just now 5.85 lakhs acres of land are to be irrigated here. They lie in the Kannada area. On the right bank side, that is Mysore and Andhra side, 0.92 lakhs of acres are irrigated in Mysore and 1.57 lakhs acres are irrigated in Andhra. Therefore, in Karnataka area, even according to the present set-up, 6.78 lakhs acres will be irrigated and 1.57 lakhs acres will be irrigated in Andhra area. The House may also remember that when the Andhra State Bill was being discussed in this House the then Home Minister Dr. Katju gave an assurance that a Boundary Commission would be appointed to demarcate the Kannada areas in Adoni and Alur so that there may be a ratification of the boundary between Mysore and Andhra. In that case, the Kannada villages in which the low-level canal flows would have added 80,000 acres more to Kannada irrigated area. Now, we can understand which State has the major interest in this project. It is definitely Karnataka State.

[Shri T. Subrahmanyam.]

The States Reorganisation Commission has stated that the high-level canal is about to be taken up. I am glad about it. I have been one of those who have been urging that this high-level canal should be taken up. It is an anti-famine measure very necessary for this tract. Therefore, I have taken this attitude consistently and today also I say that the high-level canal should be taken up. It must be done consistently with the interest of the people in whose areas high-level canal flows and also taking into consideration the surplus water that would be available after satisfying the needs of the people of the low-level canal area. The high-level canal I say, should be taken up. But the reasons for this territory to be transferred to Andhra have been very strangely stated by the States Reorganisation Commission. They say that this Tungabhadra Board has not been functioning satisfactorily. What are the actual facts? The present Chairman of the Board, answering questions put to him by journalists on the 29th October, 1955 has said that since the Tungabhadra Board has been reconstituted, it has been functioning very smoothly and very satisfactorily. In fact, all the decisions have been taken unanimously. There has been no occasion when a vote by majority had to be taken. Also, the responsibility of the completion of the hydro-electric project rests with the Tungabhadra Board. Therefore, the question of any slackness or lack of interest of the Mysore State does not come in. The plea put forward by the S.R.C. that Mysore is not interested in it and so they have been unwilling to co-operate, is, therefore, not correct. My hon. friend from Tirupati, Mr. Ayyangar—he is not here at the moment—stated that an engineer who was on the Board resigned two or three months ago and that vacancy had not been filled since then from Mysore. That statement is not correct. In fact, the member on this Tungabhadra Board who represents Mysore is an I.A.S. officer and he is the Secretary of the P.W.D. He has been there for

the last 9 months since this Board was reconstituted. Therefore, there is no question of any resignation and the vacancy not being filled up.

The S.R.C. have put in another strange plea, namely, that the Andhra Government have no access to the headworks. This, I think, is the most grotesque and amazing plea, because the component units of India are not sovereign and independent. The representatives of Andhra Government as also every other citizen of India—there is one citizenship for the whole of India—have every right to go and inspect and discharge the duties they owe in respect of this great project. There is another important factor. There are two Bills which will come for the consideration of this House. The Rajya Sabha has passed them and I hope they will be passed by this House also before long. With regard to those Bills, the S.R.C. has said:

“In the course of our enquiry we came across a number of cases in which claims were preferred for the transfer of particular areas on the ground that control over the catchment area of a river or over the dam site or the benefit area was necessary. We have not attached too much importance to these suggestions, for the reason partly that legislation which has already been introduced in Parliament makes specific provision for the regulation and development of inter-state rivers.”

Finally they say:

“We should recommend that the contemplated legislation should be passed and brought into force as early as possible.”

I share their confidence and hope that these Bills will be passed before long. In view of these Bills, no question of conflict or controversy with regard to the sharing of water or power of this project can arise and even if it arises, it can be solved without difficulty. In this context, I would like to state that the Central Government and all of us in this House can assure

the Andhra people that proper protection would be given with regard to their legitimate rights for the sharing of water and power under this project.

The second main consideration of the Commission is the administrative consideration. I would request hon. Members to look at the map of India showing the new States.

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

Shri T. Subrahmanyam: I will take five minutes more; this is a point that touches the feelings of the people.

Shri Lakshmayya (Anantapur): I may be given chance after the hon. Member finishes. He has referred to the high-level canal and I would like to say something on it.

Mr. Chairman: If this were the procedure to be adopted by the hon. speaker, then no other State will be allowed to speak except Andhra.

Shri T. Subrahmanyam: If hon. Members will look at the map, they will find that as far as the portions proposed to be transferred to Andhra are concerned, Bellary will be relegated to the extreme south west, Raichur to the north, Kannada districts of Bombay State to the west and the rest of Mysore to the south. I feel that even from the administrative point of view, this will not be desirable. Another strange plea advanced by the S.R.C. is that there is no direct rail link between Bellary and Bangalore and that a person has to pass through Andhra area if he wants to go by rail from Bellary to Bangalore. It is a strange plea, because, as I said, our component units are not independent and sovereign. All India is one, the railway system is one and therefore, this plea should not have been advanced at all. Then they say that Kurnool is a nearer capital. Kurnool is the temporary capital; Hyderabad is likely to be the capital of Visal Andhra. Therefore, the fact that Kurnool is nearer to Bellary can never be taken into consideration. One other plea has

been advanced that Bellary has developed into a sort of a non-official capital of Rayalaseema. It is not correct, as Bellary was never thought of as a university centre, or for the location of any Government arts or technical college, or of a High Court, etc.

Shri Lakshmayya: 17 regional centres were established there; Rayalaseema is a nerve-centre.

Shri T. Subrahmanyam: I do not want my friend to interrupt like this; I promise him that when he speaks, I will not disturb him.

There is also the plea based on the pronouncements that have been made hitherto. In 1920, Shri Kelkar said that this taluk and the town of Bellary must go to the Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee. The Dar Commission was also of the same opinion. The J.V.P. Committee also gave the same opinion. As far as the Partition Committee which was appointed by the Madras Government in 1949 is concerned, it is interesting to note the personnel of that committee. Amongst others, Mr. Gopala Reddy, the present Chief Minister of Andhra, Mr. Sanjeeva Reddy, Deputy Chief Minister and Mr. Kala Venkata Rao were members of that committee. After very careful consideration, they said that the Bellary taluk and town should go to the composite Madras State and not to Andhra. This opinion was given without reservation and they upheld the Kelkar Award. Then, Justice Misra, having considered all the factors, said:

"It is a little surprising in this context to find that a controversy which should have been completely set at rest by the above decision has been raised again in a vehement and bitter form and even the Andhra leaders who previously signed the Partition Committee Report have thought fit to make a demand for Bellary city and the Bellary taluk. The Kannada leaders, therefore, bitterly complain and not without some

[Shri T. Subrahmanyam.]

justification they say that a dispute which had already found its burial should not have been allowed to be unearthed at this late stage."

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

Shri T. Subrahmanyam: I will take only a couple of minutes more. The present recommendation of the Commission is opposed to the pronouncements made earlier. There are the pronouncements of the Prime Minister and the Home Minister who considered this chapter as closed. Maulana Azad also said in 1953 that this chapter was closed. After making all these pronouncements, I think the Government should not accept this recommendation of the Commission which is opposed to all these pronouncements. The Commission have set up an unhealthy precedent by which popular faith in the official pronouncements, and in the Acts passed by this Parliament and the sanctity thereof is likely to be shaken.

Shri Barman (North Bengal—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Before I plead the cause of my province, West Bengal, I feel it my duty to pay my humble tribute to the masses of India who had equally contributed if not more for the cause of independence of India. It is they who, under the guidance of our revered leader and Father of the Nation, Mahatma Gandhi, contributed giant forces before which the British power crouched and went away from this holy land.

Coming to my province of West Bengal, I want to disabuse the minds of hon. Members of an idea that must have crept into their minds that the problem of Bengal is a minor boundary problem only. This is not my own personal observation. I shall refer to the words of this august Commission when they dealt with my State, West Bengal, in Chapter XV. These are their words:

"Although these States (meaning thereby West Bengal and

Assam and Bihar) are predominantly unilingual, the reorganisation of the border areas has not become any the less difficult or controversial."

It goes on to say:

"Indeed, as the incidents in Goalpara and the emotional upheaval that followed the appointment of this Commission in some of the disputed areas have indicated, the readjustment of West Bengal's borders has now become a major problem. We do not foresee that, with the passage of time, this problem will disappear. It must, therefore, be dealt with as part of the general settlement of the problem of reorganisation."

I beg to draw the attention of the House to certain facts which have not been mentioned as yet by the previous speakers and incidentally I shall make some observations not from any other document, but from the report of the States Reorganisation Commission itself whereby I shall try to show that the Commission itself, because of the dust and storm that has been raised by the neighbouring provinces in the matter of reorganisation, had stopped half way in doing justice to West Bengal.

First of all, let me state that after the event of 1947 by which India was partitioned, it was my unfortunate province and another province namely the Punjab that suffered the most and had to pass through the ordeal of fire. What is the State of West Bengal now? When we call it West Bengal, it does not fully represent the country because there is another part of this province which is in the north and which is disconnected with the rest of it. The Commission itself has pointed out that this is the only single State in the whole of India which is truncated in this way. The question arises whether it should be left in this way when this reorganisation matter is before this House or something should be done so that it

also becomes a compact State. That is the simple problem. My hon. friend from Bihar, the Vice-Chancellor of Patna University....

An Hon. Member: Bihar University.

Shri Barman: I stand corrected... has made certain observations in this connection. The Commission itself has said that this is the only State that is in this truncated position. They have suggested that the small tract, that is, the Kishanganj sub-division should go to West Bengal so that it may become a compact State.

This is not only the Commission's view. When I raised this very matter in a resolution in this House on 23rd August, 1951, the then Home Minister has committed himself to look into this matter. I shall simply read a few lines from his speech. I will not take much of the time of the House because the time at my disposal is very short. This has been mentioned by Shri N. C. Chatterjee. I cannot avoid referring to this. The then Home Minister said:

"It is really a question of communications and of bringing about a state of things whereby our general defence position and our administrative position may be improved. This is the real and legitimate aspect in which we should understand this resolution."

Then, he says:

"And from that point of view, I must on behalf of Government be ready to tell the House that the Government will have to consider this, and must consider it very seriously and do all that is in their power. Let there be no mistake. It is not a Bengal problem. Nor is it a Darjeeling problem. It is an Indian problem."

After this, I do not think I should elaborate that point any more. That is to say, in order to link up the two truncated parts of West Bengal and also for the purpose of removing administrative difficulties which have

been pointed out at length before the Commission by my State, I think no further labouring on that point is necessary.

But, it is unfortunate that the Commission, at the same time, have made certain observations. They have referred to culture and language. That is to say, that area is inhabited, I think, by about 80 per cent. of Muslim population. Muslim culture was the matter indicated here. I may tell this House that even today there are in West Bengal more than 50 lakhs of Muslims. My hon. friend Shri Syamnandan Sahaya said that this is the only part in the whole of India where the Muslims are concentrated....

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: At one place.

Shri Barman:...at one place. I wish to tell him that the district of Murshidabad has a 60 per cent. Muslim population. It contains a population of 17 lakhs. Out of that, 60 per cent. are Muslims. I can tell him after enquiry that there are similar places in the district of Murshidabad where the Muslims are 80 per cent. of the population at one place. Apart from this, I want to ask, is it the case of my hon. friend Shri Syamnandan Sahaya that though there are more than 50 lakhs of Muslims in West Bengal and their culture has not been endangered, the culture of these 2-1/2 lakhs of Muslims from Kishanganj would be in danger if they go to West Bengal? I ask this House rises any force at all.

Then, I come to language, because after all, language is the principal thing on which we are considering. Apart from the administrative point of view, I shall place before the House certain observations made in the report of the Commission itself in para 647. The Commission has dealt with Kishanganj in this para. They say:

"The main controversy in this district, however, relates to the classification of the dialect or dialects spoken to the east of the river Mahananda."

[Shri Barman]

This is the part which we are wanting, not today, but since the time Bengal was partitioned in 1947 which was in so many words accepted by the then Bihar leaders of repute. But what is the position? The Commission have stated:

"Grierson and following him O'Malley, classified them as North Bengali.....".

That is the dialect that is spoken in this part of Kishanganj.

"....but the Bihar Government, relying among other evidence on the views of Gait, Census Superintendent in 1901, has challenged this classification."

The challenge is there. But what is the position? In the 1911 census, we find that 97 per cent. is Bengali-speaking, and only one per cent. Hindi-speaking. If that be the case, coupled with the statements of Grierson and O'Malley, can anyone doubt that the language there is the same as North Bengali? I come from North Bengal, and I can say that nearly 80 per cent. of the inhabitants of the Pachagar and Tetulia thanas which are alongside this strip of land and contiguous are Muslims. They are cent. per cent. Bengali-speaking people. Not one of them knows Urdu. I doubt very much whether the people in this area are speaking Urdu at all, though my hon. friend Shri Syamnandan Sahaya has advocated at the top of his voice that they are speaking Urdu.

I have read my hon. friend's speech delivered on the 15th instant. I find from the proceedings that in the course of his speech, the hon. Deputy-Speaker interrupted him and asked: "What is their mother-tongue?". My hon. friend replied: "Urdu, absolutely". That is a point to which I would like to draw your attention. I may tell my hon. friend that the hon. Member who comes from this part of Kishanganj, a Member of this House, knows Bengali perfectly well, and when he speaks Bengali, no Bengali could even doubt that he is not a Bengali. We know there

are many hon. Members in this House who know Bengali. For instance, my hon. friend Shri Altekar recites Rabindranath Tagore so well, but as soon as he starts speaking, one can understand from his intonation that he is not a Bengali. Let the hon. Member from this part of Kishanganj come and speak Bengali here; I challenge any hon. Member as to whether anybody can doubt that he is not a Bengali. My hon. friend, Shri Syamnandan Sahaya can say in that case that it may not be their father's tongue. I would like to tell the House that that hon. Member has married two wives from my district. I do not want to cross the threshold of the harem, but I know that gentleman well, and I know his children also. They speak Bengali very freely, and they are nothing but Bengalis, so far as the tongue is concerned. I doubt very much whether they know Urdu at all.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Then it is step-mother tongue, not mother-tongue.

Shri Barman: It may be.

I would ask this House to consider one other factor. Contiguous to this strip of land which is populated by Muslims, is West Bengal or Pakistan. I can tell this House without any fear of contradiction in the least that there is no school in either Pakistan or West Bengal where Urdu is taught. The Commission themselves say that as we move westward, gradually Hindi is mixed with Maithili, and then, it becomes Hindi. So far as this tract is concerned, however, the Commission have stated that the languages spoken there are Siripuria or Kishanganji which are also akin to Bengali. I am not quoting from their Report for want of time, but they have stated this in so many words.

I would ask this House to consider also the fact that even after the constitution of Pakistan, in East Bengal they have maintained the Bengali language. Everybody in this House knows that West Pakistan or Karachi tried to force Urdu upon the people,

but we know what were the consequences. So, even there they are maintaining the Bengali language. In their Constituent Assembly, one hon Member from Bengal has spoken in Bengali. They might know a little of Urdu, but I do not know.

If this part of Kishanganj goes to West Bengal, then the Muslim population in this area will be together with the other Muslims in West Bengal. Even if they like to learn Urdu, I have no doubt that West Bengal will in compliance with their wishes make it possible for them to learn Urdu. In Calcutta, as everybody knows, so many languages are being taught. If that can be done at Calcutta, then what is the harm in doing a similar thing elsewhere? I have no doubt at all that the West Bengal Government will con- cede to their request.

There is one other matter on which the Commission have asked the West Bengal Government to give an assurance, and that is in respect of the area which is congested and where there is not enough space for settling the refugees. The West Bengal Chief Minister, Dr. Bidan Chandra Roy has already given that assurance. In the face of that assurance, I do not think there is any case for my hon. friend Shri Syamnandan Sahaya to contend that there will be any danger in transferring this part of Kishanganj sub-division to my State, namely West Bengal.

My hon. friend, Shri Syamnandan Sahaya, is very much apprehensive that if this area which is populated by Muslims is transferred, then they may feel apprehensive. When he said that, Shri V. G. Deshpande interrupted him by saying:

एक मुस्लिम स्टेट बना दो।

That is the reply to my hon. friend's point. I cannot improve on this.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I hope you are not of that view.

Shri Barman: Certainly not. We want them to be with us.

My hon. friend, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, had pointed out that the Muslims

in Calcutta in their representative character had held mass meetings where they had denounced this sort of a move against transference, and they had dubbed it as got-up things by interested persons. In reply to that, my hon. friend Shri Syamnandan Sahaya said:

"My hon. friend Shri N. C. Chatterjee has read out extracts from the statements of certain janab sahebs. But fortunately they all come from Bengal."

So, his case is that all the Bengali Muslims must necessarily speak in favour of the transfer; perhaps my hon. friend means, out of compulsion or some other force. Then, my hon. friend says:

"If he had read out statements of men from Bihar, of Muslims from Bihar, then I would have certainly attached great weight to them."

I would like to present to my hon. friend the statements of Muslims from Bihar.

At the time when I moved my resolution in this House in 1951, there was one representative Muslim, Mr. Hussain Imam.....

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: He has left India and gone to Pakistan. It is no wonder that he has spoken like that.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: He hails from Bihar.

Shri Barman: I do not think my hon. friend Shri Syamnandan Sahaya is a better exponent of Muslim culture than Mr. Hussain Imam.

This is what Mr. Hussain Imam said:

"I am rather in a difficult position"—

So he understood his own position—

"While I see the equity and justice of the demand of Bengal,

[Shri Barman]

I have the misfortune—or the good fortune—of coming from the province which would have to bear the brunt of this adjustment”.

What was that adjustment? That adjustment specifically related to the Kishanganj sub-division, east of the river Mahananda, which the Commission have now recommended for transfer to West Bengal.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary: That is conjecture.

Shri Barman: He further says:

“Let us examine the position of Bengal. It was a mighty province with a big population and a long tradition of leadership, and from that, it has been reduced to such a position that it does not come in the first five provinces of India, as far as population is concerned.”

After this reorganisation, what will be the position of the land of Ramakrishna and Swami Vivekananda vis-à-vis other States like Madhya Pradesh and all that? But that apart, this is what he says further:—

“I further plead that for a long time past, we have been feeling that parts of U.P., at least those districts which are permanently settled should be merged with Bihar.”

His point was that Bihar should concede to West Bengal those portions and ask for some areas from U. P. Perhaps Shri Syamnadan Sahaya fights shy of that...

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: That is an inference. I thought he was going to say something more categorical.

Shri Barman: I am speaking something on behalf of Bihar now.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary: Thank you for the mercy.

Shri Barman: I need not take much time on that point—regarding that portion which I have pleaded for and

which the Commission have recommended for transfer to West Bengal.

I next come to another part—the Purulia sub-division of Manbhum,—which has been recommended for transfer to West Bengal. These are the two parts of Bihar which the Commission have recommended for transfer to West Bengal. And what did the Commission, incidentally, observe in making these recommendations?

“Our recommendations relate to two bits of territory which have been mentioned in every claim during the last seven years; and even in these two cases, they are confined to areas, the transfer of which can be regarded as absolutely essential.”

That is the point I want to make in this connection. The Commission stopped only with recommending those two bits which are, according to their opinion, absolutely essential. I have mentioned in the beginning that the Commission, finding this problem to be complex, have said that they are generally treating this question also in the context of the general consideration of reorganization, that is to say, they stopped short of recommending absolute justice.

As regards Purulia, that is also contested by some of my friends. What are the grounds on which part of the Purulia sub-division has been recommended by the Commission for transfer? They are two. First of all, the Commission have scrutinised all facts and figures and have come to the conclusion that this area is predominantly Bengali-speaking. The next ground they have found is that the river Kansavati or Kasai flows through this area. The West Bengal Government has already undertaken certain irrigation works on this river. That Government proposes to build a dam at the proper place so that the whole area alongwith the

lower region of Kansavati may be developed.

Now, looking at it from the all-India point of view, there is a clear case for transference of this area to West Bengal, also on the ground that the area of Purulia as well as the lower region in West Bengal can be developed, as a result of which our motherland, our country, will have more food, more industries and all that. On the other hand, the Commission have themselves observed—I have no time to go into that in detail; the Commission's Report is already in the hand of each Member—that this river Kansavati is of no particular importance to the State of Bihar, but that it is very important from the point of view of West Bengal. After all this, for my friends from Bihar to contest this position and say that this area also should not go to West Bengal, is, I humbly submit, like playing the role of the village demagogue, who, "though vanquished, will argue still."

But my case is that the Commission stopped short of recommending absolute justice to West Bengal. In fact, we want the whole of Manbhum district, and for this reason, that it is still a majority Bengali-speaking district. There is one point which has been stated by Dr. B. C. Roy and that is that if Dhanbad town and the industrial area, that is to say, the coalfield area are very important from the point of view of Bihar, as the Commission say, let Bihar keep those areas, that is, the town of Dhanbad alongwith the industrial part; let Bengal have the rural area which is predominantly Bengali-speaking. That also may be contested. So I should like to take a few minutes to dilate on that. First of all, I would say that according to the Manbhum district gazetteer, 1911, page 67, the prevailing vernacular of the district is the western dialect of Bengali known as Rahri Boli. The western part of Bengal, that is, the Burdwan

Division, is called Rahr Desh, and this language is called Rahri Boli. That is, the dialect that is prevalent there—in that Rahr tract of West Bengal—is the dialect that existed, according to this Manbhum district gazetteer, in the whole of Manbhum district. Apart from that, according to the 1931 census, the percentage of Bengali speakers there was 67.5 and that of Hindi speakers 17.8. In the last census—that is, in 1951—the percentage of Bengali speakers is recorded as 43.8 and that of Hindi speakers 42.9. So in the 1951 census, there is very little disparity; still Bengali speakers number more than Hindi speakers. I want to tell you here that if we leave out the Dhanbad coal area, then, even according to the census of 1951, the percentage of Bengali speakers will be much greater than that of Hindi speakers.

About the census, I would like to point only one thing. While the Commission were considering our submission so far as the Ajay catchment area was concerned, the Commission observe that it is not an accidental or manipulated result; it is clear from the records of the earlier census. That is to say, the Commission take notice of the 1931 census and so far as the Santal Parganas district is concerned, they say that from the earlier census report, it is clear that this area is not a predominantly Bengali-speaking area. We accept that position. We lay claim only so far as the catchment area is concerned. Whether that should be conceded or not lies with this supreme Parliament. When the Commission, in the case of Rajmahal, took into consideration the earlier census figures that is, the 1931 census figures, in establishing the position that there the Bengali-speaking people are not predominant, I want to apply exactly the same test to the Manbhum district, and that the Commission ought to have come to the conclusion that the 1951 figures are manipulated ones. Not only this.

[Shri Barman]

They have said, while considering our claim to Goalpara, "It is true that the latest census figures show, as compared to the figures of 1931, very striking variations, which cannot be satisfactorily explained." Of course, they went on to say that they found it difficult to admit on that very ground alone the claim we have made to Goalpara. That is another matter.

Here, what I want to say is this. Applying this test in the case of Manbhum, the Commission ought to have said that the 1951 figures cannot be satisfactorily explained by taking into consideration the 1931 figures. I have said that this is a case for West Bengal and this case is irresistible even on the present figures. If we take along with that the fact that Dr. Roy has given up his claim to Dhanbad coal area, there is no other basis for resisting the claim of West Bengal so far as the district of Manbhum is concerned.

Now, let me say a few words so far as Dalbhum is concerned. Here also there is no coal area but there is the Jamshedpur township. Though it is admitted that Bengali is the largest spoken language, they have stated that Jamshedpur is an industrial area and it is a very important town. So far as Jamshedpur is concerned, the population is so mixed that no States—meaning thereby neither Bengal nor Bihar nor even Orissa—can lay a claim to the language that is largely spoken in Jamshedpur. I concede that. Our Chief Minister has said that "if desirable, Tatanagar town may be excluded." But, let the rest of the area which is predominantly Bengali-speaking come to West Bengal.

In this connection, there is one observation which has been made by the Commission and which has also been stated by other Members in this House. They have said, in considering the case of Orissa for Seraikela and Kharaswan, that if the claim of Orissa is admitted, in that case Dal-

bhum will become an enclave. That was the difficulty with the Commission; but they have not considered that fact that Dalbhum being a predominantly Bengali-speaking area, it should go to West Bengal and Seraikela and Kharaswan to Orissa.

So far as Dalbhum is concerned, I would like to state one or two facts only. First of all, there is a statement which I hold in my hand. It gives the list of schools in Singbhum district—under the District Board—in the Dalbhum area and published on the 30th September, 1951 by the Board. There are 154 managed stipendiary middle and primary schools and out of these 143 are Bengali schools. Therefore, you can infer that even today in the sub-division of Dalbhum it is the Bengali language that is prevalent in almost all the schools with the exception of perhaps a few Oriya and Hindi schools.

Here just now you have heard two hon. Members who have come to this House by the vote of 7 lakhs of voters both of them speaking in Bengali and they have supported our case and they say that the contrary case is nothing but a concocted move.

I have to state some other facts in this connection. The 1931 Census Report reveals that Bengali is the dominant language in Dalbhum outside Jamshedpur, Oriya comes a very bad second and Hindustani a poor third. If I give you the figures you will be astonished at the claim made by my hon. friends. From all the figures, it becomes clear that Dalbhum is a Bengali-speaking area and even under the existing position, when the Commission have once recommended the transfer of Purulia to West Bengal, automatically Dalbhum becomes a tapering enclave within the two arms of West Bengal on the one side and Orissa on the other. If this House concedes the claim of Orissa for Seraikela, there is absolutely no case at all for Bihar for the retention of Dalbhum.

I do not want to take much of your time but I shall simply mention one or two facts about my friends from Assam.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary: He has already taken 40 minutes.

Shri Barman: That is all that I want to say speaking about Goalpara.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary: How much time has the hon. Member got?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Members should not speak in this way. If he wants to raise any objection and say what he wants to say, he should address the Chair.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary: What is the time allowed to one hon. Member, Sir?

Mr. Chairman: This question is not relevant. So far as the Chair is concerned, it can allow any time to any hon. Member. So far as this hon. Member is concerned, he is only refuting the case set up by Shri Sahaya who was given more than one hour. The hon. Member has taken only forty minutes. I have already stated that the hon. Member has been given so much time and I give the reasons for that.

Shri Barman: I shall finish in two minutes. I was simply mentioning that so far as Goalpara is concerned, my hon. friend Shri Debeswar Sarmah has stated that our Chief Minister has made a statement and I cannot go beyond that. It is between the Chief Minister of Assam and the Chief Minister of West Bengal to square up accounts. But, he made a statement, after that about Cooch-Behar. He said "After Bengal got Cooch-Behar, one knows very well how the local people are being treated." I am a Cooch-Behari myself though I am now practising in Jalpaiguri. I was born and brought up in Cooch-Behar. I can say this much. Even at the time when there was a contest whether Cooch-Behar

should remain a separate State under the Centre or should go to Assam, I gave my clear view to Dr. Roy and said that Cooch-Behar being so much associated with Bengal for centuries, we have certainly much more attachment for Bengal than for Assam and we do not want to go to Assam. That was my view. After I expressed that view, something has been done in certain quarters. I can tell my friends that the Cooch-Beharis are backward no doubt. Under the Maharaja so much development was not made. But after West Bengal has taken it over, West Bengal Government is devoting much attention to that particular State with the result that it is developing very fast. Cooch-Beharis are happy and if my friends think that my own community people in Goalpara are happy, I have no quarrel with them. But, so far as Cooch-Behar is concerned, I have a right to speak because I represent that State. We are quite happy and my hon. friend has got wrong information if he has got anything to the contrary.

5 P.M.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena (Lucknow Distt. *cum* Bara Banki Distt): I rise to take part in the discussion with a heavy heart and under a compelling sense of duty. At the very outset I would like to say a few words about the authors of this Report and the manner in which they have discharged the great responsibility cast on them. These three gentlemen are eminent sons of India; they have got distinguished service to their credit and it pains me if anyone suggests that their judgment could be influenced by any extraneous consideration or by any outside agency. I would say that it is only unbecoming of those who make such insinuations and they are really irresponsible. The task of the Commission was onerous. It was appointed to examine the problem of the reorganisation of the States objectively and dispassionately so that it may promote not only to the welfare

[Shri Mohan Lal Saksena]

of each of the constituent units but also that of the nation as a whole. I have gone through most of this Report and I have also carefully examined the recommendations made therein, and I can say that the Commission has tried to discharge the great and onerous responsibility entrusted to it, not only with dignity but with care and impartiality. Unless we look at the things objectively, we are not likely to agree with them, and that reminds me of a story. A pupil painter, after finishing his training with his master and after having been declared to be a qualified painter, wanted to find out if he had the merit that he was declared to possess. He produced a painting and put it at the crossroads so that the people may point out the defects. In an hour's time the whole painting was cut to pieces; somebody said that the eyebrow of the lady painted was not right; others this part or that. Anyhow the whole picture was blurred. He came disgusted and down-hearted and told his master. "This shows how you have trained me". But he replied, "I never said that you should go and do like this. Now, ask anybody else to produce another painting without the defects that have been pointed out". And nobody was able to produce another painting with equal merits. That equally applies to the recommendations of this Report. The moment it was published, there were criticisms from all quarters. Some said injustice had been done to Bengal; others said injustice had been done to Maharashtra, and so on and so forth; there were also critics who said that U.P. was not divided as it should have been divided. The Working Committee rightly threw out a challenge to the people and said, "If you are not satisfied with this Report, come out with some agreed solutions; otherwise, we are going to accept the solution suggested in the Report." Have they been able to produce any agreed solution so far? No. My submission is that so far as the wording of the motion is concerned, it should be amended so that there may be unqualified appreciation of the labours of the members

of the Commission so far as their work is concerned.

What was their task? Their task was divided into two parts. The first part related to the fact that they should just lay down broad principles which should be followed in the solution of the problem of the reorganisation of the States. Secondly, they were required to lay down broad lines on which these States were to be reconstituted. Not only that; the Government Resolution also mentioned certain broad principles which were to be taken into account while making their recommendations. The first principle is that it should promote the unity and security of India; the second is homogeneity of language and culture; the third is administrative and economic conveniences; and lastly the successful working of the Plan. Personally I feel that the second should have come last, but the Commission, after having considered all the evidences produced before them and after having considered the *pros* and *cons*, have come to certain conclusions, and it is for this House to endorse them. They have said that in the reorganisation of the States, the basis cannot be simply language or culture. This is one of the conclusions which I would like the House to endorse, because if we do not do that, we will be promoting disruptive tendencies against which our late leader Sardar Patel had warned us. The J. V. P. Committee has expressed the view that the primary objective should be the promotion of unity, security and economic prosperity of India and all tendencies, disruptive and separatist, should be discouraged rigorously. It may be a recommendation of the J. V. P. Committee, but we know that it is the voice of Sardar Patel, the architect of modern India, it is the testament and will of the Sardar, and I would like every Member of this House as also every Indian to inscribe this warning on the tablet of his heart. When I listened to some of the speeches made in this House, their tone and the temper of the speakers reminded me of the exponents of the

two-nation theory; they reminded me of the protagonists of Pakistan. They also talked in similar strain, making charges and counter-charges, that the census figures were manipulated from time to time; they talked of race, culture, language and religion—but instead of religion, we have the language problem in the States with similar tendencies. Although the name of the Sardar had been taken in support of their claims by some members, I have no doubt it does not fit in with the wish of the Sardar and I hope every Member of this House will take it to heart and endorse this conclusion of the Commission.

The second conclusion which the Commission has come to is that these areas should be sufficiently large so as to have sufficient human and material resources so that it may be possible to have administrative efficiency and also consideration in economic development and welfare activities. The third conclusion to which I attach great importance is that the wishes of the people of a certain area is a factor to be taken into account but they should be taken into consideration along with other important factors, namely: whether the area has got sufficient human and material resources; the wishes of the substantial minority living in those areas; the essential requirements of the Indian Constitution; whether they are consistent with the larger interests of the nation. These are the three conclusions or recommendations which we should endorse first before taking the second part of the recommendations about the broad lines which they have recommended for the reorganisation of States. It has been argued and argued eloquently that people want this and that. I have had to do something with the people. I know what their problems are: they are poverty, hunger, disease, unemployment and not linguistic division of the States. I agree with those speakers who have said that this is a problem created by politicians and people are being used

as pawns—if I may say so—in the game of power politics and I raise my voice against it. (*Interruptions*).

An Hon. Member: That was what in 1930 Sir Samuel Hoare said.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: He might have said it. Therefore, it does not mean that we should not accept it. If we find it correct from our experience then we have to act according to our judgment.

From the trend of the speeches that I have heard, people of different parties have spoken in the same strain. The motion before the House should be amended suitably and the House should express its opinion and verdict on the recommendations made in S.R.C. apart from its recommendations regarding different States. That is my submission No. 2.

My third suggestion is that no State should be named after a particular language, because that is bound to perpetuate separatist tendencies as the denominational institutions perpetuate communalism and casteism. The naming of the States after the languages is to be deprecated. There was a time when U.P., it was suggested, should be named as Hindi Prant. Rightly the leaders of U.P. turned it down and they said that it should not be called by the name of any particular language. Every part of India is India; it is India first and last, and should remain India. I would name Bengal as "Eastern State" or "East Bharat" whatever it may be. I would beg of my friends to take a long view of things. What do we find at present? Persons who had lived and worked and fought together for Independence are in opposite camps and are levelling all sorts of charges and counter-charges and putting forward claims and counter-claims. What is going to happen after ten years? When people belonging to this generation die and when people who are young take

[Shri Mohan Lal Saksena] charge of these States, they will not have any previous record of common work or joint activity as we have had for the last 20 or 30 years.

If you are going to have these so many States, by all means let it be so. The best course would then be to give them regional names and the name should not be associated with a language or community. That is another suggestion.

I would now say a few words about U.P. It has been said that it is a big province. There is no doubt about it. In this very House we have got a majority—I mean a large number of Members. Has there been a single occasion when we have used that numerical superiority to influence the judgment of this House? Never. There are our leaders. We know the great quality of U.P. Whatever other failings and weaknesses we may have—and we have many—we are not provincially minded. Even those leaders who had been recognised as leaders of U.P., they are all India leaders. They have hailed from other provinces. Take for instance Malaviyaji; he hailed from Malwa. Pandit Motilal Nehru was there. Even Panditji, it is claimed, comes from Maharashtrian stock.

An Hon. Member: You have given so many leaders to us.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: Provincialism comes in our way. It is this drawback of provincialism that brings a halter around their neck. That is why I say: the sooner we get rid of this halter of lingualism or provincialism—whichever name you may give it—the better. It will raise the status of these States. Our size is very big no doubt. Then why not make others as big as U.P.? My own suggestion is that in stead of having sixteen, have only nine States. The present number of 27 should be reduced to nine. I would give my reasons. At present they are not distributed on a scientific basis. You are having Assam with a population of 99 lakhs and its area

is 89 thousand square miles, if I am not wrong; you have got Bengal with a population of 296 lakhs but with an area of 34 thousand square miles only.

[SHRI BARMAN in the Chair]

How is this conducive to planning? Often it has been said in this House that we cannot have socialism now because we cannot divide poverty; we have to produce wealth before we can distribute. Every bit of India should be developed to a certain minimum level. You may have these partnerships. I want the backward Assam or any other backward part of India to be brought up to a certain minimum level of development. You may have even 16 States as recommended by the S.R.C. but I would like the administration to be combined. For instance for Assam and Bengal, I would have one administrative unit at Calcutta with two capitals, say, Calcutta and Shillong. We may call it the Eastern State. For Bihar and Orissa, similarly, there can be one unit of administration with two capitals. You can have safeguards and evolve a machinery by which the rights of the people are safeguarded; you may also see that money is being spent properly or that the Central aid is equitably divided. Then, the third State I would have, is the Southern State—Madras, Kerala and Karnataka. I will have one State of Hyderabad, covering Telangana and Andhra. Then there will be M.P., Madhya Bharat and Bhopal. Bombay with Gujarat will be one with Maharashtra and Vidarbha.

Mr. Chairman: Your time is up.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: Am I to understand that I have taken up my time. How many minutes are there? I did not submit my views before the S.R.C. I never suspected that the repercussions of this report would be such that our old colleagues would be fighting against each other threatening with fasts unto death.

After all what are the terms of reference of the S.R.C.? You know them. Culture and language are not the only considerations, but there are three other considerations, more important considerations: unity and security of India, the success of the Plan and administrative efficiency and convenience. Similarly, I will have one state for Ajmer and Rajasthan. Then U.P. will be one; another for Punjab, Kashmir has to be treated separately. We will have one machinery for one State. We are glad that the Rajpramukhs have gone. That institution is going. I would like to reduce the number of Governors as well. We must have sufficient money for development expenditure. A lot of money is being spent on Rajpramukhs and Governors and the maintenance of their staff and other paraphernalia. You are going to have in every State High Courts and a Public Service Commission. You are going to have a separate I. G. for police and all that. This proposition because it is coming for the first time before the House may look a little strange, but I submit it is never too late to reconsider the position if we find that we are going towards something against which our revered leader Sardar Patel had given solemn warning. I put this question to everyone of you. Does this show a tendency of separatism, or are there disruptive tendencies or not? If there are such tendencies then they have to be discouraged rigorously. If that is not so, you may redraw the map of India as you may please.

Then I would like to make a suggestion about Part C States. I have already written about them and even at the time they were constituted I had felt that it was not the right step. I am glad that at least after people have had an experience of working of these States they are not for them because democracy is a costly affair; at least it presupposes a certain population and a certain area to run the democratic machinery — the Commis-

sion has recommended that they should be merged.

As regards the Centrally administered territories I have given my suggestion, and I repeat it here again, that there should be a Minister for Delhi affairs and Centrally administered areas in the Central Cabinet or the Council of Ministers.

Lastly, I would like to ask the Members to answer one question. Is the working of the next Plan going to be affected or not? Due to this reorganisation, a certain amount of heart-burning and bitterness is bound to remain and it will affect the Plan. If the constituent units are bitter, if there is friction amongst them can it be conducive to the unity or to the security and strength of the whole country? No; certainly not. Therefore, whatever we may settle, if it can be settled between ourselves well and good and a chance has been given to us to do that. If we cannot do that, then there is bound to be a certain amount of heart-burning and bitterness and if that is there I am sure the harmonious working of the whole country is going to be affected and to that extent the successful working of the Plan is also going to be affected.

पंडित मुनीरवर दत्त उपाध्याय (जिला प्रतापगढ़-पूर्व) : सभापति महोदय, कई तंत्र से मैं बराबर सुनता आ रहा था कि तीन, चार पांच मुकाम ऐसे हैं जिनके बारे में मैंने सुना कि यह इस स्टेट में, इस हिस्से में जाये या उस हिस्से में या उस स्टेट में। यह हैं, देवीकुलम, बिलारी, बस्तर, लौहारू, और चास थाना। यद्यपि आज और इसके पहले भी हमारे माननीय साधियों ने बड़ी महत्वपूर्ण बातें भी कहीं हैं, तथापि उद्देश्य जो हमारा इस समय इस रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने का है, उस को हमें, सबके, सामने रखना है, उन भगदौं, को तय करना है जो कि कहीं कहीं उठते हैं। करना आमतौर पर तो कमीशन ने जहां तक उसलों का सम्बन्ध है, उन को निर्धारित कर दिया है और उन उसलों के आधार पर ही

[पीडित मुनीश्वर दत्त उपाध्याय]

बहु चाहते हैं कि हमारा दश में जो राज्य हैं उनका पुनर्गठन हो जाए। वह यह भी चाहते हैं कि राज्यों का पुनर्गठन ऐसा हो जिस से कि हमारा दश के जितने भी छोटे बड़े अंग हैं उन सब का बहुमुखी विकास हो सके। इसके अतिरिक्त हमारा दश की सफलता पूर्वक रक्षा हो सके, यह विचार भी उनके सामने था। इस उद्देश्य को सामने रखकर के यह पुनर्गठन की योजना आई है। लेकिन इस उद्देश्य से हम तब दूर हो जाते हैं जब ज्यादातर अपना समय इसी में दे देते हैं कि यह ताल्लुका इधर आवे, यह थाना इस स्टेट में रहे और यह हिस्सा या यह थाना दूसरी स्टेट में चला जाए। मेरी समझ में यह बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण विषय नहीं है और प्रायः मैंने देखा है कि जहाँ पर ऐसी बातें पेश हो रही हैं प्रायः भाषा के आधार पर कही जा रही हैं, गो प्रारम्भ में यह आयोग भाषा को आधार बना कर स्थापित किया गया था, परन्तु अब वही केवल एक आधार हमारे सामने नहीं रह गया है। यह अकेला आधार, मेरे विचार में, हमारे सामने रह भी नहीं सकता है। उस उद्देश्य को पूरा करने के लिए, जो उद्देश्य कि हमारे सामने है, कमीशन ने कुछ उसूल अपने कायम किए हैं और उन उसूलों के आधार पर उन्होंने राज्यों के पुनर्गठन की रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने रखी है। तो अगर उन उद्देश्यों को अपने सामने हम रखें तो जैसे अभी हमारा एक माननीय सदस्य ने फरमाया हम को देखना यह है कि कैसे हम उस उद्देश्य को वह रूप दे सकते हैं, वह शक्ति दे सकते हैं, जिस से कि हमारा बहुमुखी विकास हो सके और एक सुदृढ़ और समृद्धशाली राष्ट्र बन सके। इस योजना को लेकर बातें करते करते हमारे बहुत से माननीय सदस्य, बहुत से नहीं बहुत थोड़े से माननीय सदस्य कभी कभी एक राज्य पर और कभी दूसरे राज्य पर छीटाकशी करते गए जिस का कोई प्रयोजन नहीं, कोई अवसर नहीं, ऐसा जब हम करते हैं तो हम अपने उद्देश्य से दूर

होते जाते हैं।

मैं विशेषकर इस रिपोर्ट का स्वागत करता हूँ। यदि आप इसको ध्यान पूर्वक पढ़ें तो बयारों में जा कर हर एक चीज पर विचार करके जैसे उन्होंने समस्याओं को सुलभाने का प्रयास किया है, वह सराहनीय है। परन्तु तो भी त्रुटियाँ कुछ रह जाती हैं, बातें कुछ ऐसी रह जाती हैं जोकि आप की सलाह, आप की सहायता और आपके मन्श्वर के बिना पूरी नहीं हो सकेंगी। हमारे सामने जो व्याख्यान हुए उन में मैंने देखा है कि वह लोग, वह माननीय सदस्य, जिन्होंने बड़े राज्य बनाने की योजना रखी है जैसे विशाल आंध्र, संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के लिए अनुरोध किया है साथ ही हमारे एक आध राज्य पर जो बड़े हैं, जहाँ की आबादी बड़ी है, या जिस का क्षेत्रफल बड़ा है, उसपर छीटाकशी की है। मैं नहीं जानता कि वह जिस योजना को ले कर चले हैं, जिस उद्देश्य से वह बोले हैं, जो उद्देश्य वह पूरा कराना चाहते हैं, क्या यह बात जो वह कहते हैं, उसी के खिलाफ नहीं जाती है। हमारे लंका सुन्दरम् साहब ने कहा कि ५० पी० बहुत बड़ा है। साथ ही उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि विशाल आंध्र बनना चाहिए, एक बड़ा प्रदेश बनना चाहिए। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि वह लिंग्विस्टिक कान्फ्रेंस के कई वर्षों तक सभापति रहे हैं और वह लिंग्विस्टिक आधार पर राज्यों का पुनर्गठन कराना चाहते हैं। लिंग्विस्टिक बेसिस पर राज्यों का पुनर्गठन करने का मतलब तो यह है कि हिन्दी भाषी राज्यों का यदि आप पुनर्गठन करना चाहें तो लगभग १४ करोड़ का एक राज्य बनना चाहिये था। लेकिन यह मेरी मांग नहीं है, और न इस का कोई प्रश्न है। लेकिन अगर भाषा को ही आधार मानते हैं तो यह बात यहाँ तक पहुँच जाती है कि हिन्दी भाषियों की १४ करोड़ का राज्य बने।

उन्होंने बेल्लेस आफ पावर की भी बात कही। इस विषय में मैं आप से क्या निवेदन करूँ ? मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि उत्तर और दीर्घ

का बॉलेंस आफ पावर ५० पी० के कायम रहने से कैसे बिगड़ता है। यदि दृष्टि में सब राज्य एक साथ चल सकते और उन का एक बड़ा राज्य होता, तो हमें बहुत प्रसन्नता होती और हम उस का स्वागत करते। लेकिन अगर उत्तर में कुछ राज्य एक साथ मिल कर रह सकते हैं और एक बड़ा राज्य बना सकते हैं, तो उस का भी स्वागत होना चाहिए।

मेरी दिक्कत यह है कि यह कह कर कि ५० पी० बहुत बड़ा है, ५० पी० बहुत बड़ा है, एक ऐसा वायु-मंडल बना दिया गया है कि हम अपने बचाव की चिन्ता में पड़ गए हैं और अपनी जरूरतों और तकलीफों की बात कह ही नहीं पाते। पणिक्कर साहब ने एक नोट लिख डाला, उस नोट का आधार ले कर लोग कहने लग गए हैं कि ५० पी० बहुत बड़ा है, इस को बांट देना चाहिए। पणिक्कर साहब कहते हैं कि हम यहां पर एक डामिनीटिंग पोजीशन में हैं, लेकिन मैं यह बताना चाहता हूं कि उस डामिनीटिंग पोजीशन का असर यह है कि न हमारा यहां कोई इंडस्ट्री खोली जा रही है, न कोई रिवर वैली प्राजेक्ट बनाई जा रही है। हमारी आबादी के हिसाब से जो आर्थिक सहायता हम को मिलनी चाहिए, वह भी नहीं मिल रही है। इस के बावजूद कहा जाता है कि हम लोग डामिनीटिंग पोजीशन में हैं।

हमारी स्थिति क्या है, इस विषय में मैं एक बात बता दूं। यहां पर स्टेट ग्रुप बने हुए हैं। इतिहास से मैं अपने स्टेट ग्रुप का कनवीनर हूं। मैं प्रायः उस की कोई मीटिंग करना बचाता रहा और इस लिए मैं ने कोई रिपोर्ट भी नहीं भेजी है। मैं ने एकाध बार बैठक बुलाई, पीडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी को बुलाया तो उन्होंने आते ही कहा कि "यह स्टेट ग्रुप वर्गैरह क्या है?" उन्होंने कॉरिन यह रिमार्क कर दिया। मेरे कहने का जवाब यह है कि हम लोग इस प्रकार की

विचारधारा में कभी पड़ ही नहीं हैं। हालांकि दूसरे स्टेट ग्रुप की मीटिंग्स होती हैं, लेकिन हमारी मीटिंग बहुत कम हुई। यह है हमारी डामिनीटिंग पोजीशन। हमारी हालत यह है कि हमारी आवश्यकताएं भी पूरी नहीं हो रही हैं, जो हमें मिलना चाहिए, वह भी नहीं मिल रहा है। इस का नतीजा यह है कि देश चाहे कितना भी विकास करे हमारा यहां की गरीबी दूर नहीं हो सकती है और हमारा लोगों का किसी भी तरह से विकास नहीं हो सकता है। इस प्रकार की लम्बी ऊंची बातें उत्तर प्रदेश के लिए कही जाती रहेगी, हमारी डामिनीटिंग पोजीशन का हवाला दिया जाता रहेगा, परन्तु हमारी सन्तान इसी तरह गरीबी में पड़ी रह जायेगी जो इस समय है।

अपनी आवश्यकताओं के बारे में मैं भी कुछ निवेदन करना चाहता था और हमारा और साथी भी कहना चाहते थे, लेकिन हम लोग कहें क्या? हम क्या निवेदन करें और क्या मांगें, हम तो अपने बचाव में ही पड़े हुए हैं, हमें तो यही चिन्ता है कि हम रह जायें सही। यहां पर कहा गया कि चूंकि आप का डिविजन नहीं हो रहा है, इस लिए आप का बोलने का हक भी नहीं है। आप के जरिये से, श्रीमन्, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर किसी प्रकार हमारी हालत सुधर सकती है, तो उस को सुधारने का प्रयत्न किया जायें। इस विषय में यहां पर सदन ही में सुझाव भी आये हैं। हमारी स्थिति को देख कर—यह देख कर कि हमारा साथ मिलने से भीषण में उन का हित होगा—कुछ लोगों ने ५० पी० में मिलने की इच्छा प्रकट की है। एक माननीय सदस्य ने यहां पर बड़े जोर से कहा कि हम को ५० पी० में ही मिलाइये, हम और कहीं नहीं जाना चाहते हैं, हमारा यहां बहुत खनिज पदार्थ हैं, वह एक्सप्लायट किचे परन्तु वह सब होते हुए भी हम लोग कुछ जा सकते हैं, हम उनका स्वागत करते हैं, कहने में संकोच करते रहे हैं।

[पंडित मुनीश्वर बत्त उपाध्याय]

मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हम लोग यहां पर बैठे हुए हैं सारे हिन्दुस्तान को शक्तिशाली और समृद्धिशाली बनाने के लिए और एक ऐसी व्यवस्था स्थापित कहने के लिए, जिसमें इस देश के सब हिस्सों का विकास हो—यहां पर किसी प्रदेश की बात नहीं है। हम को यह देखना है कि हमारी जो स्टेट बन रही है, उसकी क्या हैसियत होगी। मैं पहले ही बता चुका हूँ कि सब इंडस्ट्रीज और सब रिजर वैली प्रोजेक्ट्स यू० पी० के अतिरिक्त दूसरे प्रदेशों में जा रही हैं। कहा जाता है कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर और होम मिनिस्टर यू० पी० के हैं। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर और होम मिनिस्टर तो हमारे सम्पूर्ण देश के नेता हैं, जिन को दूसरे देश भी मान रहे हैं। वह केवल हमारे प्रदेश के नहीं हैं हमारी स्थिति बड़ी नाजुक है, लेकिन हम को अपनी बातें कहने का भी अवसर नहीं मिला है। मुझे जो समय दिया गया है, वह तो अभी खत्म हो जायेगा। मुमकिन है कि मैं सब कुछ न कह सकूँ। इसलिए यह उचित है कि हमारे दूसरे साथियों को कुछ कहने का अवसर दिया जाये।

पणिक्कर साहब ने यू० पी० को बहुत बड़ा बताया है और यह भी कह डाला है कि वह डामिनेंटिंग पोजीशन में है। इस विषय में मैं एक दो बातें पेश करना चाहता हूँ।

रूस में आर० एस० एफ० एस० आर० राज्य की आबादी वहां की कुल आबादी का ५७ प्रतिशत है। जर्मनी में प्रशिया की यही पोजीशन है—उस की ५० प्रतिशत आबादी है। अगर हमारी आबादी सम्पूर्ण हिन्दी भाषी चौदह करोड़ का भी एक प्रदेश हो, तो उस हालत में भी वह ५७ प्रतिशत नहीं हो सकता था केवल २५ प्रतिशत होगी। यू० पी० की आबादी तो केवल १६ फीसदी होती है।

बी सी० डी० पांडे (जिला नैनीताल व जिला बल्मोड़ा—दक्षिण-पश्चिम व जिला बरेली-

उत्तर): यू० पी० की नहीं, सब हिन्दी स्पीकिंग एरियाज की आबादी इतनी होती है।

पंडित मुनीश्वर बत्त उपाध्याय : हां, मैं हिन्दी-स्पीकिंग एरियाज की बात ही कह रहा हूँ। उन की आबादी ३५ परसेंट होती है। हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश की आबादी तो बहुत हो कम है केवल १६ प्रतिशत होगी।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भागंब (गुडगांव) : वह तो छोटा हिस्सा है।

पंडित मुनीश्वर बत्त उपाध्याय : यह कहा तो जाता है कि यू० पी० बहुत बड़ा है, लेकिन हमें यह बात भी याद रखनी चाहिये कि जब भी पंजाब में या हैदराबाद में, भूपाल में या किसी और जगह जरूरत पड़ती है, तो हमारे यहां के एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर, हमारे यहां के आफिसर और हमारे यहां की पुलिस वहां भेजी गई है। इसकी वजह यह नहीं है कि हम में कोई बहुत बड़ी खूबी है। इसकी वजह यह है कि हर एक बड़ी स्टेट में ऐसी स्थिति होती है कि वह जरूरत पड़ने पर दूसरों को भी मदद दे सकती है, दूसरों को भी आदमी दे सकती है, आफिसर दे सकती है और अपना काम भी चला सकती है, लेकिन एक छोटी सी स्टेट में जहां १० आफिसर हों, तो वह दूसरों को क्या देगी और अपना काम कैसे चलायेगी। अगर वह अपने ५ आफिसर कहीं भेज दे, तो उसका अपना काम चलना मुश्किल हो जाये। मैं तो यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की स्टेबिलिटी के लिए यह अत्यन्त आवश्यक है कि यहां पर इस तरह की बड़ी स्टेट्स रहें। उत्तर प्रदेश पहले से ही है और अब मध्य प्रदेश और बम्बई की बड़ी बड़ी स्टेट्स बन रही हैं। यह ठीक है कि वे एरिया में बड़ी हैं, आबादी में नहीं। यू० पी० की आबादी बड़ी है इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि जहां आबादी कम है, लेकिन मिनरल वैल्यू वगैरह है, अगर वह इलाका हमारे साथ मिला दिया जाय, तो हम को भी सहारा हो जाये। इस विषय में एक हमारी विधान सभा में मांग की गई है।

मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश में पार्लियामेंटरी राज पद्धति चल रही है, जैसा कि यूनाइटेड किंगडम में है। यहाँ पर यू०एस०ए० का सिस्टम नहीं है। यूनाइटेड किंगडम में हाउस आफ लार्ड्स में ८५० मेंबर है और हाउस आफ कामन्स में ६२५। सारी पावर तो हाउस आफ कामन्स के पास है, इसलिए हाउस आफ लार्ड्स के ८५० मेंबर तो बेकार हैं। लगभग यही हालत यहाँ पर राज्य सभा की है। इसलिए यह कहना गलत है कि राज्य सभा में बहुत रिप्रेजेंटेशन होने के कारण उत्तर प्रदेश की यहाँ पर डामिनेंटिंग पोजिशन है। अगर हम रिप्रेजेंटेशन को भी देखें, तो हमें ज्ञात होगा कि राज्य सभा में सी स्टेट्स का रिप्रेजेंटेशन दस लाख पर एक मेंबर है, बी स्टेट का चौदह लाख पर एक मेंबर है और ए स्टेट में अठारह लाख पर एक मेंबर है, लेकिन यू०पी० को तो बीस लाख पर एक मेंबर भेजने का अधिकार दिया गया है। उस को न पार्ट ए स्टेट्स में रखा गया है, न पार्ट बी स्टेट्स में और न पार्ट सी स्टेट्स में। उस के खिलाफ इतना बड़ा वेटेज रखा गया है। हमारी तादाद कुछ भी रहे, मगर उस का कोई खिलाफ असर हो या उसका कोई बेजा इस्तेमाल पाया गया हो तो मैं समझूँ।

मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि परिष्कार साहब ने जो बात छेड़ दी है, उस ने एक ऐसा वायुमंडल पैदा कर दिया है कि हम अपनी बुनियादी जरूरतों के बारे में भी कुछ नहीं कह सके हैं। एक माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि भाषावार प्रान्त बनना ठीक नहीं होगा। अगर भाषा के आधार पर सही ढंग से और ठीक ठीक प्रान्त बनाए जाएं, तो हमारा राज्य और भी बड़ा बन सकता था। लेकिन हम इसके समर्थन के लिए नहीं खड़े हैं। अगर अन्य बातें और सिद्धान्त जो आवश्यक हैं, हितकर हैं हम उन को छोड़कर भाषा के उसूल पर जूट जायें, तो यह उचित नहीं है। भाषावार प्रान्तों के बनाने में कुछ दिक्कतें हैं। जैसा कि हमारे एक मित्र ने बताया है आसाम में इतना बड़ा मैदान

पड़ा हुआ है, लेकिन पड़ोस में बंगाल का क्षेत्रफल बिल्कुल छोटा सा है। उस के फैलाव करने की जरूरत है, उन लोगों को और जगह चाहिये लेकिन वह उन्हें प्राप्त नहीं हो रही है। मैं आपसे निवेदन करूँ कि आप देखें कि केरल में प्रति वर्ग मील आबादी का बोझा ९०७ इन्सान का है, और कर्नाटक में जो कि उसके बगल ही में है यह बोझा प्रति वर्ग-मील २६२ का है, वैसे बंगाल में यह बोझा प्रति वर्ग मील ७५७ है तो आसाम में १०९ है, उड़ीसा में यह बोझा प्रतिवर्ग मील २४३ है और जो मध्य प्रदेश अब बनने जा रहा है उसमें १५३ होगा, और उत्तर प्रदेश में यही बोझा प्रति वर्ग मील पर ५५९ है। यह हमारी हालत है। इस तरह से अगर आप देखें तो आपको मालूम होगा कि कुछ प्रान्तों में प्रति वर्ग मील आबादी का बोझा जहाँ ८०० और ९०० व्यक्ति है वहाँ अगर बंगल के प्रदेशों में वह सौ या डेढ़ सौ ही है। अगर आप भाषावार प्रदेश बनाना चाहेंगे तो इसके सिवा और कोई शकल सम्भव नहीं हो सकती, जैसे कि भाषावार प्रान्त अब बन रहे हैं उनमें तो यही हालत रहेगी। तो मैं यह आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ कि केवल भाषा के आधार पर प्रान्त बनाना ठीक नहीं है। प्रान्त तो आर्थिक आधार पर बनाने चाहियें। अगर आर्थिक आधार पर प्रदेश बनाये जायें तो यह दिक्कत नहीं रह जाती है और आर्थिक यूनिट को स्वावलम्बी बनाने के लिए ही मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आपको उत्तर प्रदेश के साथ कुछ ऐसे भाग और भी लगाने चाहिए जिनके कारण इस प्रदेश की इकनामी ठीक हो सके। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो कुछ देश के लिए आपको हितकारी मालूम दे और इस दृष्टि से जो आप मुनासिब समझ वह करें। अगर आप ऐसा समझ कर हिन्दुस्तान का पुनर्गठन करें तो वह वास्तविक पुनर्गठन होगा। यह नहीं होना चाहिए कि अगर मैं इस राज्य का हूँ तो मैं अपनी तरफ को खींचूँ और अगर कोई दूसरे राज्य का है तो वह अपनी तरफ को खींचे। न मैं इसको मुनासिब समझता हूँ, न कमीशन ने ही इसको मुनासिब समझा है, न हमारा हाई कमांड ही

[पंडित मुनीश्वर दत्त उपाध्याय]

इसको मुनासिब समझता हैं। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि हमारा हाई कमांड और हमारा नेता जो कुछ मुनासिब समझेंगे वही करेंगे। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर यह सारा मामला उन्हीं पर छोड़ दिया जाय तो ये त्रुटियां दूर हो जायें। लेकिन इस प्रश्न को लेकर कहीं कहीं जो उचटता पैदा हो गयी हैं उसकी वजह से हमारा नेताओं को चिन्ता हो गयी हैं और वे सोच विचार में पड़ गये हैं।

मैं एक चीज और आप से निवेदन करूँ। जैसी हमारी हालत हैं और जैसा आबादी से लड़ा हुआ हमारा प्रदेश है, उसमें लोग भूखों मर रहे हैं, और दूसरी ओर दूसरे प्रदेशों में मैदान के मैदान खाली पड़े हुए हैं। यह जो आप पुनर्गठन कर रहे हैं वह तो 'Hungry people and empty land'—भूखी जनता और निर्जन भूमि—वाला पुनर्गठन देश में हो रहा है। यह मुनासिब नहीं है। मेरी समझ में इस पर गौर करना आवश्यक है, और अगर हमारा नेता इस पर विचार करें तो शायद कोई सही शकल बन सके।

एक बात और कह कर मैं समाप्त करूँगा क्योंकि समय कम है। पीणक्कर साहब ने डाइलेक्ट, बोली, को भी भाषा का दर्जा दिया है और उसके आधार पर भी उन्होंने बटवारा करने की बात सोची है। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि डाइलेक्ट तो बीस बीस मील पर बदलती जाती है, उसमें बीस या पच्चीस मील के बाद कुछ अन्तर पड़ जाता है। अगर उसके आधार पर आप प्रदेश बनाने लगेंगे तब तो प्रदेशों का कोई अन्त ही नहीं होगा।

पीणक्कर साहब ने विशेषकर ५० पी० की एफ़ीशंसि के बारे में भी अपने नोट में लिखा है। वे आंकड़ें मेरे पास मौजूद हैं। उन्होंने जो आंकड़े बताये हैं उनसे तो अर्थ का अनर्थ हो जाता है, इसलिए मैं उस बात को आपके सामने साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने उत्तर प्रदेश का बम्बई से मुकाबिला किया है। एडीमिनिस्ट्रेशन के बारे में उन्होंने लिखा है कि बम्बई में कुल खर्च का २४.२ प्रतिशत एडीमिनिस्ट्रेशन

पर खर्च होता है जब कि ५० पी० में कुल खर्च का २४.६ प्रतिशत होता है। इस कारण वे कहते हैं कि उत्तर प्रदेश में एफ़ीशंसि कम है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह हिसाब लगाने में उन्होंने और बहुत सी बातों को नजरान्दाज कर दिया है। अब आप देखें कि हमारा प्रदेश में ५९ जिले हैं जब कि बम्बई प्रदेश में कोई २५ जिले हैं। जहाँ हमको उत्तर प्रदेश में ५९ डिस्ट्रिक्ट मजिस्ट्रेट रखने होंगे, ५९ सुपरिंटेंडेंट पुलिस रखने होंगे, हर जिले में हर मुहकमे का हेड रखना होगा, अर्थात् हमको जिला अफसरों के ५९ सेंट रखने होंगे जब कि बम्बई राज्य को केवल २५ एंसे सेंट रखने होंगे। फिर अब आबादी के हिसाब से देखें कि हमारा यहां प्रीत व्यक्ति प्रशासन का कितना खर्चा होता है और बम्बई में कितना होता है। बम्बई में प्रीत व्यक्ति एडीमिनिस्ट्रेशन का खर्चा ४.५६ लख है जब कि उत्तर प्रदेश में २.५६ लपया है। फिर भी कहा जाता है कि हमारा यहां प्रशासनिक व्यय ज्यादा होता है। मैं नहीं जानता कि कहां वे पीणक्कर साहब ने यह फिगर्स निकाले हैं और कैसे यह हिसाब लगाया है। वास्तव में उनका हिसाब गलत है। इससे आपको मालूम होगा कि हम बम्बई के मुकाबले ज्यादा एफ़ीशंसि से अपना काम चला रहे हैं और इतने ही खर्च में दूसरे प्रदेशों का भी कुछ काम कर देते हैं। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि बम्बई का काम इन एफ़ीशंसि टली चलाया जा रहा है, पर चूंकि उत्तर प्रदेश का बम्बई से मुकाबला किया गया था इसलिए मैंने यह व्याख्या की है।

शिक्षण के सम्बन्ध में उन्होंने कहा था कि उत्तर प्रदेश में शिक्षा पर बहुत कम खर्चा होता है। मैं आपसे निवेदन करूँ कि सन् ४६-४७ में उत्तर प्रदेश में शिक्षा पर २.५७ करोड़ लपया खर्च होता था। मैं बीच के वर्षों के अंक नहीं दूंगा क्योंकि समय कम है। सन् १९५४-५५ में यह खर्च ९.४७ करोड़ है और इसके अतिरिक्त हमारा प्रदेश में एग्रीकल्चरल एजुकेशन आदि पर अलग खर्चा होता है। हमारा यहां शिक्षा पर लगातार खर्च बढ़ता जा रहा है और कई गुना

बढ़ गया है अगर आप सन् ४७ के आंकड़े देखें। मैं ज्यादा समय न लेकर यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यदि हम अपनी परेशानी और दिक्कत की ज्यादा चर्चा नहीं करते तो यह न समझा जाये कि हम स्वावलम्बी हैं। वास्तविकता यह है कि हमारा भविष्य अन्धकारमय है न हमारा प्रदश में कोई इंडस्ट्रीज कायम की जा रही हैं, न हमारा यहां कोई नदी घाटी योजना जा रही है जिनके द्वारा कि हम विकसित हो सकें। कहा जाता है कि हमारा तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर हैं और होम मिनिस्टर हैं। लेकिन इससे हमारी स्टेट की स्थिति तो नहीं सुधर सकती। हम यह देख रहे हैं कि कुछ दिनों में हमारा प्रदश की आर्थिक दशा बहुत खराब होने वाली है। इसलिए हमारी स्थिति को बनाने के लिए उन्हीं सिद्धान्तों पर अमल करना चाहिए जिन पर कि यह रिपोर्ट आधारित है ताकि हम भी सुखी हो सकें, हम भी समृद्धशाली हो सकें और जैसा और जगह विकास हो रहा है वैसा हमारा प्रदश में भी हो सके।

Shri C. D. Pande: Mr. Chairman, ..

Shri K. K. Basu: U.P. again?

Shri C. D. Pande: U.P. comes last of all.

Shri K. K. Basu: Domination?

Shri Raghunath Singh (Banaras Distt. Central): We want to serve you.

Shri C. D. Pande: This is indeed a unique and great moment in the history of our country. For the last 2000 years, many a time, the map of India has been drawn and re-drawn. But, that was done always by wars and conquests. The people of the land had no hand in the shaping of the map. Today, for the first time in history, this Parliament, elected by the people, in a calm place, is deliberating over the issue of how to reorganise the country into constituent parts. Because we are a federal republic, we must consider a great deal as to how we will make the component parts.

As things were, inevitably, the constituent parts centred round languages. Slowly and imperceptibly the linguistic States came into being. We could not help that. We are not opposed to it. It is said that in this country there is great diversity. It is also said with equal force that there is great unity. Both these things are correct and both these things, unity as well as diversity are our national assets. We have to base the future India on these two assets. People will say, how diversity is a national asset. I will prove that the moment we make a linguistic State, the people at once feel a great akinness to the State. There is mass contact. There is greater contact with the Government of that place. The language they speak is more homely to them. They can have the business of the State carried on in a language which is understood by everybody. Then, we can develop the language and the literature of the place. We can also develop the art and culture of the place, or we may say, the regional culture. That part of the diversity is very useful, and we must develop that diversity to its fullest extent. And we must search for the genius in the region, so that the nation may be richer in the long run.

At the same time, the emphasis should not be to that extent as to mar national greatness and national unity. From what we have heard during the last three or four days, we find that the emphasis is on the wrong place; people on the whole appear to be looking at this issue with too much emphasis on linguistic States alone. What we require is a proper blending and co-ordination of these things. We must keep in view the supreme necessity of unity and security of this land. At the same time, that should be done by strengthening the component parts also. But the difficulty arises when people are persuaded, as most of the people have been persuaded—I do not think there is a single Member in this

[Shri C. D. Pande]

House who has not been persuaded like that—to say that there must be some sort of connection between the constituent State and the language.

The question therefore arises as to what should be the optimum or the desirable size of a State? The difficulty lies precisely there, because in this country we have got 14 regional languages of various sizes. The smallest is Assamese, which is spoken by only 6 million people. Then comes Malayalam, which is spoken in Kerala by about 12 or 13 million people. Then come Oriya, Kanarese, and Gujarati (which is spoken by about 10 million people), and Marathi. Then comes the language of Vishalandhra, namely Telugu. Then comes Bengali, and then Hindi. In the face of this, it is very difficult to strike at the optimum.

I would have wished that the whole of our country were divided into six or seven parts, or nine parts, as my hon. friend Shri Mohanlal Saksena has suggested. That would have been the most desirable thing. But since we have traversed a long distance on the linguistic basis, I think it is just impossible today to suggest to my friends from Kerala, or to my friends from Bengal or to my friends from Andhradesh, that we can now abandon the theory of linguistic States. But I would appeal to them to temper their demands and to see the problems in the proper perspective. It is perfectly desirable, and it is perfectly comprehensible if they ask for a linguistic State. But they should not do so in the spirit in which they are asking for it now, or with the quibbling or fanaticism in respect of a small taluk here and there, which they are indulging in now. That is what torments us. The dispute about Bombay is so disgusting to us. Formerly, we had never realised that things had gone to that extent. When we saw that Kaka Saheb Gadgil raised the campaign for a united Maharashtra, we had no quarrel with it, for everybody should be helped to have a united State with his own language.

But the manner in which he spoke later was something which we did not like. We wanted to find a solution. But we could not find a solution. If a solution were not possible, then what they say is, if our demand is not accepted, then the issue will be decided in the streets of Bombay. I say, we are here to decide these issues in this House by calm deliberations. But if a threat is held out, that if a certain demand is not accepted, then the issue will be decided in the streets of Bombay city, I think that is something most disgusting and something which forebodes a bad future for us.

Shri Punnoose (Alleppy): He did not say like that. He only said that if the leaders did not settle it, then it would be decided by the people.

Shri C. D. Pande: That comes to the same thing.

Shri Raghunath Singh: But he represents the people.

Shri C. D. Pande: No parliamentarian will say in direct terms, either you accept this, or I shall kill you. That is not the way in which he would speak. He would only say, in case you create a situation where people will be forced to take up arms, then I shall be helpless. That is the way in which it would be said.

Shri B. Y. Reddy (Karimnagar): But if argument fails, and reason fails?

Shri G. H. Deshpande (Nasik Central): On a point of order. The speech of my hon. friend Shri Gadgil should be referred to from the reporters' copy. You will find from the uncorrected speech that what he has said is that 'this issue will be taken up in the streets of Bombay, which I want to avoid'.

Shri C. D. Pande: That is true. It means exactly the same thing. He has said, do not drive us to a position where we should be forced to do this, a situation which I want to avoid. But I tell you that this means more or less the same thing.

Shri H. G. Vaishnav (Ambad): You go on with your speech. Why are you commenting on the others' speeches?

Shri M. D. Joshi (Ratnagiri South): It is distortion. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may go on to his next point.

Shri C. D. Pande: I shall avoid that controversy now. I gave it only as a matter of instance. I gave the instance of Bombay just to show to what extent we have gone. I did not criticise the speech of my hon. friend Shri Gadgil or anybody else. But I say that this is the temper of the people which we have to guard against.

If a certain thing is not possible in the interests of national security, then we must bow our heads to the decision, and should not start imputing motives to anybody, and saying, because so and so is to be there, I have to be protected, and therefore this is the suggestion which has to be accepted, and so on. If that is the spirit in which we behave, then we will not be able to achieve our aim of national security.

Then, hon. Members have talked of affinities. The development of affinities is a historical process. People forget that affinity, homogeneity, identity of interests etc. are things which grow with human society. They have an organic growth with human society. An affinity which may have existed in the long past may disappear today, and an affinity which does not exist today may be cultivated and may grow in course of time, and thus a new affinity may be created.

I can give you one example of a new affinity. Shri M. A. Ayyangar is the best example of how new affinities could grow. He was a full-blooded Tamil Brahmin settled in Tamil Nad and in the land of Reddy's, and within a few centuries, he has developed that affinity. That is the spirit in which we should tackle these issues.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Land of Reddy's? That is Andhra.

Shri C. D. Pande: Yes, the land of Reddy's. That is how Shri M. A. Ayyangar called it. It means actually Andhra. If affinities can be developed in that way, then we must try to develop new affinities, and not go on searching as to how far we differ. We should make a search and see where we are united. If you go on excluding in one sphere after another, then I am afraid there will be nothing but exclusiveness. So, I would suggest that we should try and find out where we are united.

For instance, this country of ours can be divided linguistically, or geographically; there are other ways also of dividing it. There is also the basis of the have's and the have-not's. A labourer in one State may feel affinity with a fellow-labourer in another State. Similarly, it is quite likely that the Harijans who are down-trodden in a State and have to bear the brunt in every way may have greater affinity with their brethren in another State. Similarly, a Brahmin from the south may find in certain respects a greater affinity with the Brahmins of the north. Are you going to divide this country according to affinities on this basis? Are you going to divide this country according to Brahmins and non-Brahmins? Or are you going to divide this country on the basis of have's and have-not's? Or are you going to divide this country on the basis of caste, or on the basis of a certain language or culture around you? I say that we must find out certain greater principles which bind us to the country. One such principle is unity, which is known to everybody, and therefore I need not dilate on it at length.

This country has got a fundamental unity of outlook on life, and that is

[Shri C. D. Pande]

the philosophical outlook or the innate philosophy of Indians, which believes that human behaviour must be according to a certain pattern, which without our knowing is imperceptibly guiding our actions in daily life. We should not deviate from that higher sense of unity and try to find out points of diversity. We should see that we again recapture that outlook. Otherwise, we shall be deprived of this outlook. But if we deviate from this principle or outlook, then how can we have united leadership in our country, and how can we have a good Central Government?

Besides a Central Government, we want also a central leadership. But if the temper of the people is such that we cannot accommodate a brother of ours from another State, because we think that he is a foreign person, or such that we feel that his interests will not be satisfied best unless he is left within his own State, then I ask, is that the mental attitude with which we can create a central leadership?

6 P.M.

Who will be the leaders of this country after 15 or 20 years? When the next generation comes, we have to create an atmosphere where the man from Gujarat may find leadership in Maharashtra or anywhere else in the country, as Bal Gangadhar Tilak was the leader of the whole country. In the same way, Mahatma Gandhi was the leader of the whole country. If these fissiparous tendencies, if these differences between one State and another grow, what would be the position of the country? How could leaders like Mahatma Gandhi, who was born in one part of the country, but was accepted by the whole country, come to the fore? Let there be a temper in this country in favour of the growth of central, all-India leadership. Do you know what will be the repercussion of our discussions on the all-India services? **The services are being affected by our**

campaigns. I know that we are ourselves tools in the hands of the atmosphere created by some of us. It is the duty of the Members of Parliament, who are the representatives of the people, to reflect what people feel in their respective States; at the same time, they have a duty to the whole country. As Shri Punnoose said, he has got a duty towards Kerala, but in the same way, he has a duty towards the whole of India. The Members of Parliament have got a double duty and their responsibility is greater. People say that the S.R.C. had a great and difficult task. I should think that this Parliament has a greater responsibility and a greater and more difficult task to fulfil, because we, the Members of Parliament, represent the collective wisdom of the whole country. We are on the test. The whole country is watching us as to how we discharge our duty. I find even among ourselves people have got different opinions. They say, 'We stand for bigger units'. They say, we are not too much imbued with linguistic considerations. Things have developed to such an extent that unless we say this, we cannot survive. So it is our duty to mould that opinion. If something happens in Bellary or in Karnataka, should it affect the whole of this Parliament and should we overlook everything else? The Members of Parliament, unlike Members of State Legislatures, have got a greater burden, and the country is watching our actions. People are saying: 'Look here, the Members are now not taking an overall view of the whole thing'. I hope we will prove worthy of the burden cast on us. There is an oft-repeated criticism that U.P. is too big. My friends have replied in their own way. But I am not speaking as a man from Uttar Pradesh; it is my duty, as it is anybody's duty, to speak on behalf of India. We represent not only our constituents but the interests of the whole country. It is in this light that I request you to look at the whole problem. Whether U.P. is divided into two or not, I do not

mind. I do not mind if there are 36 States in this country, taking Shri Purnoose's State as the ideal State with 10 million population. We can have 36 States, but let us have them in the spirit of unity. It is quite conceivable that if a State like Andhra, instead of 20 million, had 40 million population, I would have given one State, if that was desirable. And I am sure my Andhra friends would have asked for a State even if they were 60 million. Similar is the case with Bengal. If God had wished to have a united Bengal and there were no partition, Bengal would have been the biggest State in the country with 80 million people. We would not have suggested the partition of Bengal because it was too big. It would not have occurred to anybody that Bengal should have been partitioned because it was too big. That is not the question. The question is how we make this country great. If it is in the interest of the country to divide U.P. into two parts, do it by all means. If it is in the interest of the country to constitute South India into one composite State, do it by all means. I will then be the happiest person. I can say without hesitation on behalf of friends from North India that we will welcome any day a Dakshin Pradesh, bigger than Uttar Pradesh. Take it from me, that I am not saying this to outwit you. In all sincerity, I say that you have gone too far with the linguistic idea. It is not now possible for you to have that. But if some day, in some form, such a re-organisation of India into different regions for certain other purposes is necessary, then we will welcome it. I appeal to my friends to look at this problem from the national angle with the right emphasis and the right concept on the functions of linguistic States in united India.

श्रीमती शिवराजबती नैहक (जिला लखनऊ मध्य): सभापति महोदय, यह बात तो सभी को मालूम है कि यह जो राज्य पुनर्गठन की रिपोर्ट है वह एक बहुत ही योग्यता से तैयार की गई

रिपोर्ट है और जिस पर हमारे देश के तीन महान व्यक्तियों के, बड़े बड़े विद्वान व्यक्तियों के हस्ताक्षर हैं। यह ऐसे व्यक्ति हैं जिनकी राय और धारणाओं को हम को बड़े सम्मान के साथ देखना है। इस कमिशन ने राज्य पुनर्गठन की समस्या को हर पहलू से देख कर, हर दृष्टिकोण से इस कठिन समस्या पर विचार करके अपने प्रस्तावों की रिपोर्ट दी है। इससे मंरा यह अभिप्राय नहीं है कि यदि इसमें अब कोई भी संशोधन की गुंजाएश नहीं। मंरा तो यह विचार है कि यदि देश के हित में कोई संशोधन की आवश्यकता हो तो उसको अवश्य किया जाए, परन्तु जब हमारे सदन के कुछ भाई देश के हित के अतिरिक्त दूसरी बातों को ले कर इस कमिशन की सिफारिशों का विरोध करते हैं तो मुझे दुःख होता है।

इस कमिशन ने ५० पी० के सम्बन्ध में यह राय दी है कि उसको जैसा वह है वैसे ही रक्खा जाए, उसको विभाजित न किया जाय। फ़ैवेल उसके एक सदस्य ने यह कहा है कि उसको छोटा कर दिया जाए। यहां पर हमारे अध्यक्ष महोदय ने यह आश्वासन दिया था कि चूंकि इस रिपोर्ट में ५० पी० का विभाजन करने का या टुकड़े करने का कोई विकल्प नहीं है इसीलिए ५० पी० के सदस्यों को भाषण देने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। हमें इससे बड़ा सन्तोष हुआ था, जितने भी ५० पी० के सदस्य हैं सभी को इस से सन्तोष हुआ था, परन्तु यहां पर सदन के कुछ सदस्यों ने जब छिपे छिपे कई बार ५० पी० पर छीटाकशी की और इस क्रम की बातें खुल्लम खुल्ला न कह कर दूरपदा कहा कि ५० पी० बहुत बड़ा है और उसके टुकड़े कर देने चाहिए तो यह नहीं मालूम होता था कि ५० पी० का कोई दोष है। बल्कि इस मांग का कारण यह था कि वह बहुत बड़ा है। इस से मन में सन्देह पैदा हुआ है कि आखिर इस पद में क्या रहस्य छिपा हुआ है ? इससे मुझ को कुछ डर लगा कि आखिर क्यों यह बात बार बार कही जाती है। फ़ैवेल इसीलिए मैं यह प्रमाणित करना चाहती हूं कि जो लोग इस उत्तर प्रदेश के १ या २ से अधिक भागों में बांटने की बात कहते

[श्रीमती शिवराजवती नेहरू]

हैं वह एक अति अनुचित व अनावश्यक बात कहते हैं।

यह कहा जाता है कि उत्तर प्रदेश का क्षेत्र बहुत बड़ा है। यही उसका कसूर है जिसके कारण वह मांग की जा रही है कि उसको विभाजित कर दिया जाए। परन्तु, समापित महादय, जब संसार में इस प्रकार की विचार धाराएं चल रही हैं कि जितने भी संसार के देश हैं वह अपनी छोटी छोटी इकाइयों को संगठित करें और बड़े बड़े राज्य बनाएं जिस में कि वह संगठित हो कर शक्तिशाली हो सकें और एकानिमिक दृष्टि से सुचारु रूप से अपना शासन चला सकें, उस समय जो हमारा सुसंगठित प्रदेश है उसको बड़ा देखा कर छोटा करने की बात सुन कर दुःख होता है। मैं पढ़ना चाहती हूं कि आखिर कोई भी ऐसा देश आज संसार जैसे अमरीका में, रूस में, आस्ट्रेलिया में कहीं भी क्या राष्ट्र की सभी इकाइयां एक समान हैं? कोई भी राष्ट्र है जिसकी सारी इकाइयां एक समान हैं? देश में कोई इकाई छोटी रहती है और कोई बड़ी रहती है। कुछ लोगों ने यह भी कहा कि चूंकि ५० पी० बहुत बड़ा प्रदेश है इसलिए देश में बॉर्लेंस नहीं हैं। लेकिन आज जैसी कि कमिशन ने रिपोर्ट दी है यदि वह इसी तरह से मान ली जाए तो मैं आपको बताना चाहती हूं कि जो मध्य प्रदेश बनने जा रहा है वह उत्तर प्रदेश से भी बड़ा बनने जा रहा है। लिहाजा संतुलन और बॉर्लेंस की जो बात की जाती है वह भी बराबर हो जाएगी। इसके साथ ही यह शिकायत भी दूर हो जाएगी कि ५० पी० बहुत बड़ा है।

मैं आपको बताना चाहती हूं कि यदि छोटे छोटे राज्य इस देश में रहे तो हमारे देश की जो एकता है वह छिन्न भिन्न हो जाएगी। फेडरल में व्यव भी अधिक होगा और यह हमारा बचाकर इसको निर्माण कार्यों में लगाया जाए तो कितना ही अच्छा हो। कमिशन ने तो १६ प्रान्तों के बनाए जान का सुझाव दिया है लेकिन मैं चाहती हूं कि १६ के बजाय यदि १४ प्रान्त ही बनाए जाएं तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा। पिछले पांच छः वर्षों में ५० पी० में जितना विकास हुआ

है जितनी प्रगति ५० पी० ने की है और जिससे हमारे देश के जो बाकी राज्य हैं वह प्रभावित हुए हैं, मैं कहती हूं वह सम्भव नहीं हो सकती थी यदि इसको छोटा कर दिया जाता। साथ ही साथ जो उसकी इकोनोमी है वह भी खराब हो जाती और जो योजनाएं वहां पर चालू हैं उनमें भी बहुत खलल पड़ता। अब भी मैं समझती हूं कि कोई कारण मुझे दिखाई नहीं देता ५० पी० का विभाजन किए जाने के पक्ष में। सारा ५० पी० एक अंग के समान है। यदि इसके अंग का कोई भी भाग, हाथ या पैर, अलग कर दिया गया तो सारा अंग बेकार हो जाएगा और ५० पी० अंगहीन और दुर्बल बन जाएगा। ऐसा करने से न सिर्फ हमारा ५० पी० अंगहीन बनेगा बल्कि सारा देश कमजोर हो जाएगा इस वास्तु यह देश के हित में ही है कि उसको बनाए रखा जाए और उसका कोई भी हिस्सा उससे अलग न किया जाए। यदि ऐसा नहीं किया गया और उसका विभाजन ही किया गया तो इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि दो मुख्य मंत्री बन जाएंगे, दो मंत्रीमंडल बन जाएंगे और जो सदस्य मंत्रीमंडल में शामिल होंगे उनके अपने निजी स्वार्थ अवश्य पूरे होंगे परन्तु इससे न उत्तर प्रदेश का हित होगा न देश का। इसलिए ५० पी० का विभाजन करने से कोई लाभ नहीं होगा और इसके बजाय हानि ही होगी।

श्री आर० एस० दीवान (उस्मानाबाद): कौन कहता है विभाजन हो।

श्रीमती शिवराजवती नेहरू: इधर से आप नहीं कहते तो उधर से तो वे लोग कहते हैं कि विभाजन हो। इसका मैं घोर विरोध करती हूं। जो लोग ५० पी० का खण्डन चाहते हैं उन्होंने भारतवर्ष के इतिहास से कोई सबक नहीं सीखा बजाए एकता उत्पन्न करने, देश के बड़े क्षेत्र में मित्रता का भाव उत्पन्न करने, वह देश के एक बड़े प्रान्त में फूट व विभाजन चाहते हैं। उत्तर प्रदेश ने बड़े बड़े नेताओं को जन्म भी दिया है यह बड़े बड़े अवतारों की जन्मभूमि है, हमारे प्रदेश की संस्कृति एक है, भाषा एक है। ५० पी० हमारे देश का हृदय है। यदि हमने इस हृदय

के टुकड़े किए तो सारा दंश कमजोर हो जाएगा और यह कोई बुद्धिमानी की बात नहीं होगी।

कहा जाता है कि ५० पी० की आबादी बहुत ज्यादा है और यह कोई ६ करोड़ के करीब है। इनका रिप्रिजेंटेशन सेंटर में ज्यादा रहता है और इस कारण से उनको भय है कि यह दूसरे प्रान्तों के ऊपर हावी हो जाएगा और यह दबाने का प्रयत्न करेगा। परन्तु सभापति महोदय, मैंने देखा है कि पिछले आठ वर्षों में हमारे प्रान्त के सदस्यों ने यह कोशिश नहीं की और न ही उनके हृदय में यह भावना ही उत्पन्न हुई कि वह सेंटर में अपना प्रभाव जमाएँ या अपने बहुमत से बेजा फायदा उठाएँ। उनकी हमेशा यह भावना रही है कि दंश एक है और इसके सारे प्रान्त हमको प्रिय व मूल्यवान हैं। जैसा अभी एक भाई साहब ने कहा उत्तर प्रदेश के लोगों में Provincialism नहीं है हम तो समस्त दंश का भला चाहते हैं और हमारा किसी भी प्रदेश से द्वेष नहीं है। हम तो सब प्रान्तों का कल्याण चाहते हैं।

जिस प्रकार के मैंने इस सदन में भाषण सुने हैं उनसे तो मुझे ऐसा भास होता है कि यह जो हमारा सदन है यह कोई दानशाला है या कोई धर्मशाला है या यहाँ पर कोई सदाव्रत लगा हुआ है। हर प्रान्त अपनी मांग लिए हुए हैं और भौली फूँलाए खड़ा है। कोई हिमाचल मांगता है, कोई महाराष्ट्र मांगता है, कोई विशाल आंध्र मांगता है और कोई पंजाबी सूबा मांगता है। सभी अपने अपने स्वार्थों में रत हैं। किसी का भी भारत माता की तरफ ध्यान नहीं है जिसको कि वह छिन्न भिन्न करते जा रहे हैं। इस संबंध में मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि लोकल पीट्रिय-टिज्म बहुत अच्छी चीज है यदि वह दंश के हित के विरुद्ध न हो। हमें समस्त भारत की भलाई को देखना चाहिए न कि अपने अपने प्रान्तों को। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं एक बात और कहना चाहती हूँ जिससे सुनकर मुझे बड़ा अचम्भा हुआ। इस सदन के सभी सदस्य किसी न किसी चीज की मांग कर रहे हैं लेकिन हमारे पूज्य हुजूम सिंह जी ने जो स्पीच दी उसमें उन्होंने

महान त्याग दिखलाया। उन्होंने कहा कि हमको जरूरी कुछ नहीं चाहिए, केवल पंजाबी सूबा चाहिए, और अगर आप चाहते हैं तो एक आध जिला आप ले सकते हैं। यह बात सुन कर मुझे बड़ी हैरानी हुई। मुझे यह बात समझ में नहीं आती कि यह महान त्याग किस लिए किया जा रहा है। क्या यह त्याग विशाल दिल्ली बनाने के लिए किया गया है या किसी और कारण से किया गया है। यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आई।

हमारे राधा रमण साहब ने अपने भाषण में कहा कि दिल्ली हम चाहते हैं और चाहते हैं कि दिल्ली सेपरेट स्टेट रहे और यदि इसको केंद्र द्वारा शासित किया गया तो हम इसको सहन नहीं करेंगे। यह भी उन्होंने कहा कि यदि वह सेपरेट स्टेट न भी रही तो भी मैं सरकार का विरोध नहीं करूँगा। साथ ही साथ उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि दिल्ली को ए क्लास की स्टेट बना दिया जाना चाहिए। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि दिल्ली बड़ा राज्य बनाया जाए लेकिन मैं किसी दूसरे राज्य के इलाके की मांग नहीं करता। यह केंद्र स्वयं सोच कर कोई निर्णय करे अब सोचने की बात यह है कि यह किस तरह से बड़ा प्रान्त बने और किस तरह से यह ए श्रेणी का राज्य बनाया जाए। सभापति महोदय, आप तो जानते ही हैं कि यह पूर्व से निश्चित था कि C Class States नहीं रखी जाएंगी। उनको चाहिए था कि वह निश्चय करके एक ही चीज मांगते। फिर यह तो वही बात हुई उंगली पकड़ कर पट्टा पकड़ना। जब दिल्ली को A Class स्टेट बनाया गया तो वह एक गलती थी। परन्तु जैसा कहा जाता है कि एक गलती को छिपाने के लिए मनुष्य दूसरी गलती करता है। यदि हम जैसा कि राधा रमण साहब कहते हैं करें तो यह एक दूसरी गलती होगी। हमारे पूज्य महत्त्वा गांधी जी ने लोगों को यह बताया कि व्यक्ति की महानता इसी में है कि वह अपनी गलती को मंजूर कर ले और कहे कि मुझसे गलती हो गई है। इसीसे उसकी गूँठेंस जाहिर होती हैं। यदि इसको सी क्लास स्टेट बने रहने दिया जाए या इसको ए क्लास स्टेट बना दिया जाए तो क्या कारण है दूसरी

[श्रीमती शिवराजवती नेहरू]

स्टैंड्स के साथ भी ऐसा ही व्यवहार न किया जाए।

अभाषित महोदय: अब आपका टाइम खत्म हो गया है, अब आप बैठ जाइए।

श्रीमती शिवराजवती नेहरू: सिर्फ दो मिनट और दीजिए, मैं जल्दी जल्दी खत्म किए देती हूँ।

मैं यह कह रही थी कि उन्होंने जो यह कहा कि इसको ए क्लास स्टैंड बना दिया जाए और साथ ही यह कहा कि यदि इसको न भी बनाया गया तो मैं इसका विरोध नहीं करूंगा, यह कहना बेकार था। यह सभी मेंबर जानते हैं कि होगा वही जो होना तय पाया है। "होई है सोई हो राम रच राखा"। यह मेरा कहना है।

सभापति महोदय: अब आप बन्द करें, आपने सिर्फ पांच मिनट ही मांगे थे।

श्रीमती शिवराजवती नेहरू: सिर्फ एक बात कह कर मैं समाप्त किए देती हूँ।

इस सदन में, सभापति महोदय, बड़े बड़े आंजस्वी व महान व्यक्ति हैं। वह अपने अपने आइडेंट्स को लेकर और अपनी अपनी मांगों को लेकर जब भाषण देते हैं तो सुनने वाला चकित रह जाता है। सभापति महोदय, जिसका भाषण इस सदन में मैं सुनती हूँ वही मुझे न्याययुक्त व सही जंचता है। जब मैंने पाटिल साहब का भाषण सुना तो ऐसा भास हुआ कि जो कुछ वह कह रहे थे उसके अतिरिक्त दूसरी बात नहीं हो सकती थी। सब बातें सच्ची ही मालूम पड़ती थीं। सार उनकी सब क्लीलियों में जंचता था। फिर जब गाडगील साहब का भाषण मैंने सुना तो सारा सार उसी में जंचने लगा। इन सब भाषणों को सुन कर मुझे ऐसा लगा कि जितने व्यक्ति हैं उतनी ही राय हैं और अपनी अपनी जगह पर सब दुरुस्त और ठीक कहते हैं। पेश्वर इसके कि वह सदन कोई निर्णय करे मैं यह उचित समझती हूँ कि इन सब बातों का फौसला करने की जिम्मेवारी हमें अपने तपे हुए नेताओं पर छोड़ देनी चाहिए और उनके चरणों में सब मामले डाल दें और जो वह फौसला दें उसको हम स्वीकार कर लें। कांग्रेस का हाई कमांड डैबर

भाई, पन्त जी और नेहरू जी देश की हर बीमारी के मसीहा हैं और जो वह फौसला करेंगे वह ठीक ही होगा।

Mr. Chairman: That is all. I would not allow any more time. Shri Diwan.

Shri R. S. Diwan (Osmanabad): I rise to reject the S.R.C. recommendations in respect of Maharashtra. I come from a State, the people of which have fought against the tyrannical rule of a native State, which ever existed in centuries. I come from Marathwada, the people of which bore the brunt of the freedom struggle in the Hyderabad State. According to the S.R.C., Marathwada has been joined with Bombay-Maharashtra, but we wish that all the Marathi-speaking population of Vidarbha, Marathwada and Bombay-Maharashtra should come together with Bombay City as its capital. But when I hear the speeches of so many Members here, we are charged of linguism, we are charged of being, though not anti-national, still not national and not looking towards the unity of the nation. About linguism, let me say that language is such a thing that man clings to it. History shows us that in spite of a thousand years of foreign rule we have not forgotten our provincial languages; since the last thousand years, Persian came, Urdu came and during the last 150 years English language also came, but in spite of all these encroachments, in spite of the bondage and slavery of Mother India, the provincial languages Bengali, Gujarati, Marathi, Tamil and Telugu, all these, developed; that means that it is in our nature to cling to the language and I do not think it is a fault that if people having one language desire to stay together, it is not linguism. Besides, language was one of the terms of reference given to the S.R.C. and we are not fighting for language alone. If at all the administrative convenience was not there, if at all the economic self-sufficiency was not

there, if at all we are not confident of the national interest and national unity, we would not have fought for Samyukta Maharashtra. But all the four points are there and that is why we want that the whole of the Marathi-speaking people should be brought under one State. My colleagues here want to give us lessons of sacrifice, lessons of service, lessons of national unity. Let me remind them that we have been treading the traditions of Ranade, Tilak, Gokhale and even today of Shri Kher, who was Chief Minister of Bombay State in the year 1937. Shri Kher left the Home portfolio to Shri Munshi, the Revenue portfolio to Shri Morarji, and the portfolio, where there was only service and sacrifice, namely Education, was taken by Shri Kher. So, these colleagues need not teach us the lessons of sacrifice and service. As regards national unity, in what way it is against the national unity or national interests if the people speaking one language come under one State, I do not understand. Secularism also was talked about by the people who joined hands with the fourth party of Bombay, which was the previous Muslim League. These people should not teach us secularism. When we say that we want Bombay City to be the capital of Maharashtra, they speak of national interest, they speak of cosmopolitanism and other things, but nobody has said how it is going to come against the interests of the nation if Bombay City is made the capital of Samyukta Maharashtra. Nobody has said how the cosmopolitan character of Bombay City as well as Samyukta Maharashtra is going to be affected by means of Bombay being the capital of Samyukta Maharashtra. Then again, secularism was talked about. May I ask the people who talked of secularism this question: After the Britishers left India, was there any Hindu-Muslim riot in Maharashtra or Bombay? There was no riot there. So, it is no use teaching us secularism.

About the fears and apprehensions in the minds of some important people who talked here. The fears and

apprehensions in the minds of industrialists are there; they say they are afraid. But what are they afraid of? Are we going to destroy all industries as soon as Bombay becomes the capital of Samyukta Maharashtra? They do not say what we are going to do if Bombay is going to be the capital of Maharashtra. Today I may say that if at all Bombay is built, Bombay is truly built by the money of the capitalists or industrialists as well as by labour and also by the help of brains of the Marathi people who are the trustees of the treasuries of Indian capitalists in Bombay. Nobody has expressed any fear. If there is any fear, why did they not come out with their fears. No. 1, No. 2, No. 3 and so on, and say that if Bombay becomes the capital of Maharashtra, these are their fears? Of course, if they are genuine, we can think of them. In this way, some unnecessary thing, some distrust has been created in the minds of the leaders of India, some prejudice has been created in the minds of our leaders, some misunderstanding has been created and we have been denied our claim to Bombay.

An Hon. Member: The leaders might have denied, but what about the S.R.C.?

Shri R. S. Diwan: I come from the Marathwada part of Hyderabad State. According to the recommendations of the S.R.C., Marathwada has been put in Maharashtra, the whole of Marathwada has been put in Maharashtra, but the district of Bidar, which is a multi-lingual district, has been put in Andhra. The population of Bidar district is 1½ lakhs. Out of the 1½ lakhs, only 1¼ lakhs are Telugu-speaking 3 lakhs are Kannada-speaking, and 5½ lakhs are Marathi-speaking. If at all the majority population were taken into consideration, the whole of Bidar district should have been put in Maharashtra, if at all they want district-wise distribution. Instead of that, in spite of the biggest Marathi-speaking population there, the whole

[Shri R. S. Diwan]

of the Bidar district has been put into Telangana. This, I think, is an injustice to Maharashtra. Therefore, I want that the village-wise distribution of the area should be done, and every village which has got Marathi-speaking population of 50 to 60 per cent. should be put in Marathwada. The taluks of Ahmedpur, Nilanga and Udgir in the Bidar district are cent. per cent. Marathi-speaking. The taluks of Santpur and Balki, which have got more than 40 per cent. Marathi-speaking population, must also be put in Marathwada or Maharashtra which is to be formed.

Mr. Chairman: How much more time will the hon. Member take?

Shri R. S. Diwan: About ten minutes more.

Mr. Chairman: Then the hon. Member may continue tomorrow.

**Written Statements of Members*

Pandit Lingaraj Misra (Khurda): I propose to restrict myself to the recommendations of the S.R.C. so far as they relate to Orissa State. The people of Orissa as well as those of the outlying Oriya speaking tracts of the Sadar and Saraikella Sub-Divisions in Bihar and Phuljhar and Bindra Nawagarh Zamidaries as well as four tahsils in Bastar in Madhya Pradesh also Mandsa, Tekali, Julantar, Budersing in Andhra have been greatly disappointed and disgruntled by the recommendations of the S.R.C. that the boundaries of Orissa State, as it is at present, should undergo no change. That the feeling of disappointment and resentment is universal throughout the State will be borne out by the Minister of Defence Dr. Katju and the Deputy Ministers of Home Affairs and Railways Shri Datar and Shri Alagesan respectively who have visited Orissa after the publication of the report of the S.R.C.

Wherever they had gone, they had been confronted with great injustice done to the Oriya-speaking people by the recommendations of the S.R.C.

The Commission have not at all taken into consideration the very unassailable arguments and facts and figures put forward in the Memorandum of the Government of Orissa and other non-official organisations for inclusion of the Sadar and Saraikella Sub-Divisions of Singhbhum district with Orissa. The Commission have summarily brushed aside all these unassailable arguments with the single observation that the Odonell Committee had thoroughly gone into the question of amalgamation of Singhbhum with Orissa in 1931 and 1932 before the separate Orissa province was formed and had recommended otherwise. The Commission has conveniently forgotten that the arguments then put forward by the Odonell Committee, namely that (1) there is no geographical contiguity between Singhbhum and the coastal districts of Orissa, (2) there is no direct road communication with Orissa, and (3) that the Hos who formed about 60 per cent. of the population of Singhbhum were against amalgamation with Orissa, do not hold good now in the changed circumstances. The recent merger of Mayurbhanj, Keonjhar and Sundergarh with Orissa has established full geographical contiguity of Singhbhum with Orissa. There are now three good road communications between Singhbhum and Orissa through Mayurbhanj, Keonjhar and Sundergarh. The present road communication of Singhbhum with Orissa is much more satisfactory than with the Chhota-Nagpur Division of Bihar. The Hos, who were reported then to be against amalgamation of Singhbhum with Orissa, are now overwhelmingly in favour of such amalgamation as will be evident from the fact that seven out of twelve M.L.A.s

**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.*

of Bihar representing Singhbhum district had met the Commission and pressed for such amalgamation. A large number of representatives of Tribals of Singhbhum have also met Central Ministers in authority after the publication of S.R.C. Report and have ventilated their great resentment and disappointment over the rejection of their legitimate claims by the S.R.C. The Orissa State has done a good deal in ameliorating the condition of the Tribal people in the course of the last seven years and with the help of the Central Government spent lavishly on the education, health and social welfare of the Scheduled Tribes who form about 40 per cent. of the population of the State. This has naturally attracted the Hos and Santals of Singhbhum district towards Orissa and they confidently feel that their interest will be better looked after by the Government of Orissa than by any other State. The Hos realise that Orissa alone is their homeland as it is in the Mayurbhanj, Keonjhar and Sundergarh districts of Orissa where the rest of their community live. In no other district of Chhotanagpur or of any other Division of Bihar is a single Hos family to be found.

Barring the aboriginal element in the district, the Oriya-speaking population far outnumbers in other Aryans, namely Hindi or Bengali speaking people. The Oriyas are 27 per cent. in Sadar Sub-Division and 25 per cent. in the Saraikella Sub-Division as compared with 5.7 per cent. and 12.3 per cent. of Hindi population. Of course, the Bengali speaking population is 30.8 per cent. in Dhalbhum Sub-Division although even in this Sub-Division the Oriyas predominate in Ghatsila, Chakulia and Bhadaguda Thanas. Hence it is but meet and proper that Sadar and Saraikella Sub-Divisions of Singhbhum should go to Orissa and Dhalbhum should go to West Bengal. Bihar, in any case, has absolutely no claim on the Singhbhum district.

As regards the claims of Orissa over the Phuljhar and Bindra-Nawa-
496 L.S.D.—6

garh zamindaries of Raipur district, I would like to quote a few sentences from the report of our linguist Finance Minister, Shri C. D. Deshmukh, who settled Phuljhar zamindari in 1930-31. It says:

"In Phuljhar there is a just trace of Bonias but there is a substantial stratum of other aboriginals such as Binhars, Konds and large proportions of the semi-aboriginals like the Gonds, Sawaras and Gandas. But the bulk of population however consists of Oriyas and Larias, the most important of whom are Kultas from Sambalpur and Agharias from Chandrapur and Sarangarh. It is principally the industry and enterprise of these last two castes that has made Phuljhar the 'flourishing tract that it is to-day.'

The percentage of Oriyas in the Mahasamud tehsil is 53 per cent., Chhatisghari 32 per cent. and Hindi 13 per cent. only. The four eastern tehsils of Bastar State, namely, Jagdalpur, Kondagon, Danteera and Konta also are predominantly Oriya speaking, and the other tribals of the area have social and economic relations with their counterparts in Koraput district in Orissa. The trade channel of this part also lies through Koraput District. Hence the claims of Oriyas to these parts of Madhya Pradesh are irrefutable. That the Commission has not at all applied its mind towards the claims of Orissa on Madhya Pradesh is evident from the fact that a group of five villages, namely, Shankara which remains as an enclave in the Sambalpur district and whose excise administration is carried on by the Sambalpur authorities on behalf of Madhya Pradesh has not even been recommended for transfer to Orissa. Now that the proposed Madhya Pradesh is going to be expanded enormously towards the west and north and is going to be the biggest State in the Union, I think Madhya Pradesh will not grudge these small Oriya speaking tracts being merged with Orissa State

[Pandit Lingaraj Misra]

It will save them the botheration and financial burden of providing education and other facilities to a small minority linguistic group.

As regards the boundary of Orissa in the South, it must be admitted that the Andhras and Oriyas are so interspersed that it is difficult to draw a line of demarcation which would entirely exclude one linguistic group from the other. As at present if the Andhras claim a population of three lakhs in the Orissa territory, the Oriyas claim a population of over 10 lakhs left behind in Andhra State in predominantly Oriya speaking areas of Mandasa, Tekali, Tarala, Budersing, Jullantar and Ichhapur. This question can be more satisfactorily settled if the two States agree to set up a boundary Committee to investigate thoroughly the whole border area and draw a line which would satisfy both the States. As I have said, the injustice done by the S.R.C. to Orissa has roused strong feelings in the State as well as in the outlying Oriya speaking areas. Orissa earnestly hopes that this injustice will be undone by the Government of India and Parliament.

Shri Raghbir Sahai (Etah Distt.—North-East *cum* Budaun Distt.—East): The terms of reference were given in the resolution of Government of India appointing the Commission on December 29, 1953. The resolution stated:

“The language and culture of an area have an undoubted importance as they represent a pattern of living which is common in that area. In considering a re-organisation of States; however, there are other important factors which have also to be borne in mind. *The first essential consideration is the preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India.* Financial, economic and administrative considerations are almost equally important, not only from the point of view of each State,

but for the whole nation. India has embarked upon a great ordered plan for her economic, cultural and moral progress. Changes which interfere with the successful prosecution of such a Plan would be harmful to the national interests.”

On the report having been submitted in September last, the Working Committee of the Congress in its meeting held on the 14th and 15th October considered it from all points of view and came to the following conclusion:

“The report deals with individual problems affecting different States. It deals with them, however, as a connected whole, keeping in view always the unity and security of India and the basic concept of the primacy of the nation and national solidarity. The report has therefore, to be considered as a whole, although individual problems, many of which are of high importance, have necessarily to be considered separately also.....It must always be remembered that progress of our people depends upon the unity of the nation and the advance made by the nation as a whole.”

Now these are some of the broad hints which should be borne in mind while discussing the report and even in considering the individual question of a State; we should not forget the more important national and all-India aspect thereof.

Some of the main recommendations of the report are:

- (1) Instead of 27 States as at present, the Commission has divided the entire country into 16 States.
- (2) The distinction between A class, B class, C class States has been done away with.
- (3) The institution of Raj Pramuks has been abolished.

(4) The Commission has rejected the theory of "one language one State."

While the Commission has rejected and has very rightly rejected the theory of "One language one State", it will be seen that the Commission throughout has been anxious to re-align the map of India on the basis of language, as far as it lay in its power. Of course, the Commission excluded the Hindi speaking region or regions from this yard-stick. For Telugu speaking people, they are anxious to give a Telugu speaking area. For Tamilians, they are anxious to give a Tamil speaking area. For Kannada speaking people, a Kannada area.

There was another exception in the case of Bombay State. They proposed a bilingual State in which both Marathi speaking and Gujarati speaking areas were put together, excluding of course Vidarbha, which, in their opinion, was not prepared to join. The Working Committee, on the other hand, taking the reactions of the people concerned on the recommendations of the Report suggested the formation of a separate Marathi speaking State, a separate Gujarati speaking State and a Multi-lingual Bombay City State. We know even this suggested solution is not acceptable to the parties concerned or to some of them.

I do not wish to play the part of an arbitrator nor would I assume to myself the role of a person who could give an award. But my only regret is that in the heat of controversy people, very sensible otherwise, able and patriotic have completely forgotten the main terms of reference, the most important stressed therein and also in the resolution of the Congress Working Committee of October, 1955, namely the "Preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India".

Judged from that standpoint, allow me to say that Uttar Pradesh has kept its head very cool and has not

permitted itself to have been swayed away by feelings. It is no doubt a big State, with a population of about 63 million people or nearly one-sixth of the population of India. It has a large area as compared to many other States, especially after the redistribution of States proposed by the S.R.C.

It should not be forgotten that although Uttar Pradesh is so large and it has a big population, it has throughout kept its head cool and irrespective of caste, colour, language, religion, it has given room to everybody and has virtually absorbed them. How many Bengalees have made a home in U.P. and are flourishing? How many Gujaratis have made a home in U.P. and are flourishing? How many Maharashtrians have made a home in U.P. and have acclimated themselves? How many Kashmiris? Is there any distinction between one and the other? Highest offices in Government service are open to them and are being occupied by them. U.P. has never been guided by these narrow considerations. If there is any one single State which throughout has kept the essential unity and security of India before its mind it is Uttar Pradesh.

If it is big in size it is no fault of U.P. It has no doubt large representation both in Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha. But whether this representation has even been used to the detriment of the country, nobody can say.

Its bigness sometimes assumes greater importance because the Prime Minister comes from Uttar Pradesh or the Home Minister comes from Uttar Pradesh. Born even in Malabar, Nehru would have been at the top for his striking merits and for his yeoman services rendered in the cause of country's emancipation and re-building.

We are sometimes put in a very embarrassing position. We cannot press our claims as others would do and rightly do. We have been negligently treated by the Planning Commission in the First Five Year Plan

[Shri Raghubir Sahai]

and we do not expect even the Second would be more generous. But on that score we have no grouse. We are anxious to maintain the unity and security of India, and to be a great bulwark in that direction.

But why should there be any impediment placed in the way of those who would like to join us both in their interest as well as ours. For instance Baghelkhand, a portion of Vindhya Pradesh, is not anxious to merge with Madhya Pradesh, but would like to be merged with Uttar Pradesh. This merger would no doubt give an industrial bias to Uttar Pradesh, which it is woefully lacking at present. It is at present a purely agricultural State, the entire economy depending upon agriculture.

We have to bear in mind the important sentence of the terms of reference given in the resolution of December 29, 1953, namely, "financial, economic and administrative considerations are almost equally important, not only from the point of view of each State, but for the whole nation."

It will not be in the larger interests of the country that Uttar Pradesh with its traditions and its past history should not be given fullest possible opportunities to develop itself industrially as well.

Government would do well to consider whether the wishes of Baghelkhand people, if they wish to join U.P., should be respected.

Sardar Lal Singh (Ferozepur-Ludhiana): It is most unfortunate that communal bias—the bane of this country is warping our judgement and making dispassionate analysis of S.R.C. Report almost impossible. Akalis contend that rejection of their demand for Punjabi Suba means "extinction or death warrant for Sikh community, Sikh Culture and even Sikh religion", while Hindu fanatics exclaim, equally vehemently,

that acceptance of Akali demand virtually means "Sikh Raj" which will not only adversely affect the interests of the Hindu community in the Punjab, but seriously endanger even the very defence of the country. Plain fact is that Punjabi Suba, even if conceded, will neither bring heaven to Sikhs nor disaster to Hindus. It is neither the Punjabi Suba nor Maha Punjab, but "the poisonous seed sown by fanatics in both camps" which will spell disaster to both Hindus and Sikhs in Punjab and give stunning blow to the defence of the country.

Lesson of partition of the country, when both Hindus and Sikhs had to jointly undergo a regular blood bath, mental and physical torture of worst kind, seems to have been so easily forgotten. In spite of pious hopes of all for communal harmony, the naked truth in its ugliest form stands out that relations between Hindus and Sikhs were never so strained as at present. Just a little spark is needed to start a big conflagration—thanks to the virulent propaganda carried on by handful of urbanites. If this fire spreads to rural areas, I shudder to think of the consequences. Instead of taking up cudgles on behalf of their respective community and keeping an eye on next elections, the patriotic element in both communities should rise above petty communal considerations, in the larger interests of the country, and show a bit of moral courage to speak out the truth and expose the hollowness and absurdity of allegations made by protagonists of both Punjabi Suba and Maha Punjab even if they have to forego temporarily cheap popular applause from their co-religionists and I propose to do it, no matter how unpalatable to fanatics in both camps.

As regards vendetta carried on by a fanatical section of Punjab Urban Hindus that Punjabi State means "Sikh Raj in the border State which will weaken the defence of the country", may one enquire that if a slight increase, or even parity of Sikhs and Hindus in population in Punjab, is

enough to dub it as a Sikh Raj, then all the States in India with Hindu majority should be logically dubbed as Hindu Raj. If so, then why all this fetish of India being called a secular State? Secondly, as regards defence of the country (which is a slur on Sikhs' patriotism), is public memory so short as to forget that in the arduous struggle of Indian independence, the Sikhs, forming only one and a half per cent. population of India, had voluntarily undergone far far greater sacrifices (maybe 20 times more than could be justified on population basis) so that if imprisonment, confiscation of property, sufferings and death sentences are at all any criteria of sacrifice, or any index of love for one's country, then patriotism is not the exclusive or sole monopoly of major community only. Thirdly, it is not only a privilege but also a moral and sacred obligation of the majority community, to inspire confidence in the minority, by fair and just treatment and affording it a sense of security. It is the greatest moral crime for a majority community to indulge in communalism. In fact a majority which cannot be generous to minorities has little moral justification to run Government. Fourthly, let it not be forgotten that fanaticism and aggressive communal outlook of a section of the Punjab-Hindus was no less responsible than that of Muslim League for the partition of our country. Let there be no repetition of the same mentality when dealing with Sikhs or forcing a section of the Sikhs to think in the same terms. Fifthly, no sane politician can afford to see a major portion of martial community, sensitive of its honour and self-respect, living in the border State, to feel sullen and discontented with its lot and hostile to Central Government. Sweet reasoning and a little gesture of goodwill can win over the Sikhs and make them shed last drop of their blood for the defence of the country as heretofore, but the worst form of strong hand by Government as advo-

cated by some Hindu fanatics, will never cow down the Sikhs.

As regards Master Tara Singh's assertion that rejection of demand for Punjabi Suba tantamounts to a "decree of extinction or death warrant to the Sikh Community and Sikh Religion", while I am all in favour of a linguistic State, if not carried too far, as will be presently discussed, it must be considered on its own merit and it is wrong to give it communal colour or excite communal passion of masses which only tends to spoil even a good cause by creating apprehensions in the minds of others. In fact the bane of Master Tara Singh's politics has always been communal approach to every problem, thereby giving death blow to almost every good cause that he has so far espoused in his life-time. The future of Sikhs depends not so much upon their numerical strength as on the strength of their character, their intrinsic worth, and their hardwork. Leaving aside Punjab, which I shall presently discuss, the lot of Sikhs outside Punjab is quite enviable. In all parts of India, M. P., U. P., Madras, Calcutta and Bombay etc., they are doing most flourishing business. In Delhi, until the time of partition the Sikh population was only infinitesimal, but they had built half of New Delhi. In Assam, Sikhs number hardly one in five thousand, yet during my last visit to Assam, I found them occupying honoured position in every walk of life. President of a District Co-operative Bank was a Sikh; agriculturists in Sikh Villages were winning State prizes for highest standard of cultivation, Sikh businessmen and Contractors were doing roaring business, Sikh Municipal Commissioners and Sikh Government servants, were leading happy life. Outside India their position is still more enviable. In Malaya Straits and Indonesia, Sikhs, small in number, are doing business worth crores. In Singapore, the biggest merchandise store, comparable with the best ones in Europe, belongs to a Sikh. A very

[Sardar Lal Singh]

big portion of wholesale business in textiles is controlled by a handful of Sikhs. In U.S.A. the Sikh farmers in spite of numerous handicaps in the beginning, have beaten American farmers hollow and they own quite sizeable properties. In academic field they are second to none, and have established enviable records in the Universities of Australia and U.S.A. as elsewhere. Sikh candidates appearing before Union Public Service Commission or serving the Centre or in States outside Punjab, have had no complaint. It is not numerical strength but internal unity, strength of character, sociability, hard work, self sacrifice, and above all, patriotism to the country that will endear them to all and will win for them an honoured place in India. In the presence of these qualities no power can ruin the Sikhs and in their absence no numerical or voting strength can save them.

A minority community in its own interests should always advocate non-communal outlook. Two golden rules and guiding principles for a minority community are "internal unity" and good relation with the majority community and with the Government of the day. Any individual or party which weakens internal unity or brings his community into unnecessary conflict with the majority community or with the existing Government especially with a national Government, cannot be credited with a sense of wise statesmanship.

As regards danger to the Sikh religion, there can be danger to the leadership of some persons but no danger to the religion of Guru Nanak—that Messenger of Peace and Love, with goodwill to all and ill-will to none, that Angel who preached one brotherhood for all mankind, the religion which preaches synthesis, that is, unity of all religions into one, and appeals for equal reverence and respect for temples and mosques, Quoran and Vedas and whose scripture *Holy Guru Granth Sahib*—

contains verses of both Hindu and Muslim saints and saints of all castes including the so-called untouchables. Can such religion ever suffer by such trivial matters as State boundaries? Real danger to that religion is from "within" and not from "without", because no religion can long survive whose places of worship become the centres of cock-fight for political ascendancy.

Plain fact is that demand for Punjabi Suba is nothing but a cry of frustration and desperation on the part of Sikhs who had been complaining for long for the redress of certain legitimate grievances. It is perversity of truth to say that Sikh grievances in the Punjab are imaginary in regard to Government service, Punjabi language, Scheduled Castes etc. and in general to the aggressive communal outlook of a section of Punjab Hindus—all honour to that section which yearns for communal harmony. Every Sikh, whether Akali, Congressite, Socialist or non-party man has always felt it, even though Congressite Sikhs did not either have the moral courage to say so openly to the Congress High Command, for fear of being dubbed as communalists, or thought it otherwise expedient to keep mum for reasons of their own. If they had apprised the Congress High Command of the intense feelings of Sikh Community in certain matters, which they have thought fit to do now when it is too late, firstly their own position in the Sikh Community would not have been so badly undermined, secondly, the communal atmosphere would not have come to such a pass and, thirdly, Congress Government prestige also would not have been so low in the Sikh Community and forthly, Sikh Community would have been saved from the present frustration. In a dozen letters addressed from time to time to the President, Prime Minister, Home Minister and others, I myself had referred to these grievances and to the intense feelings of frustration and desperation in the Sikh Community and had emphasized that Sikhs as a whole were becoming bitterly hostile to Congress Government.

Since, however, just as Akalis claimed exclusive right to speak for the Sikh Panth, Congressite Sikhs had exclusive right to speak on behalf of Government in Sikh Affairs, all pleadings of those, who on one hand, did not agree with akali politics and nor could appreciate the attitude of indifference on the part of Congress Sikhs for redress of legitimate Sikh grievances remained a voice in the wilderness. With the result that almost the entire Sikh community turned against Congress and accordingly Congress Government, as evident from the last S.G.P.C. elections and recent Akali Morcha in the Punjab which would have given rudest shock to even bureaucracy of British days. The verdict was an expression of feelings of resentment against Congress. Had legitimate grievances been removed, there may not have been any serious demand for Punjabi Suba. Even now I am certain that even if Punjabi Suba is conceded, but if legitimate Sikh grievances are not removed and suitable machinery is not devised in future to prevent injustice being done, the frustration is bound to continue, leading to still more serious consequences. Akalis will be disillusioned before long that a slight increase in population or even parity in Punjab, is of little avail. Can they ever aspire for better position in the Punjab than they had in PEPSU in regard to population? And yet they were most critical of position in PEPSU. It is not so much population adjustment or voting strength but what is urgently required (if Punjab is to be saved from serious catastrophe) is the change of heart on the part of both Hindus and Sikhs in the Punjab and strong hand by Central Government to suppress fanatics in both camps and to redress boldly all legitimate Sikh grievances. Central Government must take up the matter in its own hands as Punjab party politics is rotten to the core. A sound convention has to be established about (a) Sikh-Hindu parity in the Punjab Cabinet, (b) appointment of a Sikh either as Punjab Governor or Chief

Minister, (c) development of Punjabi language, (d) parity in Punjab Public Service Commission or to have a non-Punjabian, belonging to a minority community to be the Chairman of Public Service Commission or so long as Punjab administration is not free from communal virus, to entrust the work of recruitment to Union Public Service Commission, (e) exemplary punishment to a Government Servant whether Hindu or Sikh, showing communal bias as no crime could be graver than communalism, (f) fanatics in both communities polluting the communal atmosphere to be sternly dealt with and given no quarter, (g) celebrations of sacred days jointly by both communities; either banning provocative political slogans in religious processions altogether or allowing them to do so but encouraging such Hindus and Sikhs who do not believe in mixing religion with politics, to jointly take out procession (as separate from Akali and Hindu procession who can shout slogans if they so desire) and leave it to the good sense of the public to patronize any procession; in short to take some positive steps to ensure justice to Sikhs and promote communal harmony.

As regards Punjab State, no communal considerations should weigh with Central Government. It is true that, one language, one culture, and one tradition, are helpful in creating homogeneous atmosphere and in avoiding any friction so that linguistic consideration should receive due weight. Also if Himachal People do not wish to join Punjab, they need not be forced to join; and there is no harm in taking away Gurgaon and Mohindargarh areas because of their inaccessibility and there being little in common with Punjab. But I am strongly opposed to the idea of separating Haryana Prant from Punjab (that is, a Punjabi Suba of Master Tara Singh's conception), because it betrays complete ignorance of an elementary knowledge of State agricultural economy as will be clear from the subsequent Paras.

[Sardar Lal Singh]

When Bhakra scheme costing hundreds of crores of rupees materializes; and water and electricity become available in full, Punjab will be humming in prosperity in Agriculture and industries. Haryana will be the granary of not only the Punjab but of India, and also the Centre of Industrial activity because of abundance of raw material and electricity. Further Hissar land is not only rich but total *per capita* land available is exactly 300 per cent. more than the average of whole East Punjab—for a family of five persons, Hissar has 16.5 acres of land as against an average of 5.5 acres for the Punjab as a whole and 5 acres in Ludhiana district and 8 acres in Hoshiarpur of which only about 3½ acres are actually under cultivation, the rest being hilly or uncultivable. In Karnal district only half of the total land is actually cultivated, showing great scope, for further development. In the face of all this, Akali Party wishes to cut off Haryana Prant just for the sake of increasing a little bit of Sikh voting strength regardless of serious economic consequences. What a folly and suicide? I wonder what will be Punjab without Haryana Prant? The whole agricultural, in fact even the industrial economy of Punjab will largely depend upon Haryana. I my-

self belong to Jagadhri tehsil, as a large number of other Sikh agriculturists do, and which Master Tara Singh wishes to be excluded from the Punjab.

Apart from communal considerations which are only a passing phase the real political struggle will soon be fought on economic lines. Rural people have always been exploited and they will have to organize themselves to prevent their exploitation by handful of urbanites. Punjab Sikh agriculturists, which form majority of Sikh community, have numerous interests in common with Haryana agriculturists and they have so far been kept apart by interested parties. Jointly they will be a great force in economic struggle and they will soon be the flesh and bone of one another. Cutting out Haryana Prant is nothing short, of cutting out the right limb of Sikh agriculturist community. Haryana Prant has not of course been getting fair deal in Punjab Cabinet which should be guaranteed in future, and I would strongly advise Haryana Jats not to be dismembered from the Punjab Sikh agriculturist community.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday the 21st December, 1955.