

RESULT OF ELECTION TO THE
CENTRAL SILK BOARD

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri M. S. Gurupada Swamy being the only candidate nominated for election to the Central Silk Board, he is declared duly elected to be a member of the said Board.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE CONSTITUTION (FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT) BILL, 1963

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following Message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Constitution (Fifteenth Amendment) Bill, 1963, which has been passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 1st May, 1963, in accordance with the provisions of Article 368 of the Constitution of India."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

THE CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1963 (TO AMEND ARTICLES 16, 32, 134 AND 226 AND INSERTION OF NEW ARTICLE 37A)

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

THE MINES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1963

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Mines Act, 1952.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1963

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

THE INDIAN PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1963

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): Sir, I move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

THE CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1961 (TO AMEND THE FIRST SCHEDULE)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be taken into consideration."

Sir, this is a very simple proposal for amending the Constitution. I have got only a three-line statement under the Statement of Objects and Reasons. May I, with your permission, Sir, read this, because many hon. Members may not have got a copy of this Bill? Sir, it reads thus:

"Public opinion in the State of Madras, as well as in other parts of the country, is strongly in favour of *changing the name of the State to 'Tamilnad'* in conformity with the historical, linguistic and cultural considerations."

This is a very simple suggestion—change of name—but it is important from the cultural and other points of view. As you know, Sir, in the First Schedule of our Constitution the States are specified; a list of the States of the Union has been given in the First Schedule. Now, Sir, entry No. 7 says 'Madras'. This is what had been stated while explaining what Madras meant at that time:

"The territories which immediately before the commencement of this Constitution were either comprised in the Province of Madras or were being administered as if they formed part of that Province and the territories specified in section 4 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956, and the Second Schedule to the Andhra Pradesh and Madras (Alteration of Boundaries) Act, 1959, but excluding the territories specified in sub-section (1) of section 3 and sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Andhra State Act, 1953, the territories specified in clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 5, section 6 and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 7 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956, and the territories specified in the First Schedule to the Andhra Pradesh and Madras (Alteration of Boundaries) Act, 1959."

That is the latest position. Now, Sir, as you know, when the Constitution was passed, Madras was a composite State comprised of Andhra excluding Telangana or the Hyderabad part of it—I do not want to go into any details—and also the Malabar part of Kerala. Tamil Nad, of course, was there. Mainly, these three main parts comprised what was called at that time the Province of Madras under the British regime and then it came to be known as 'Madras' under the Constitution when it was passed. The same name remains even today, although there has been, in the meanwhile, a reorganisation of the States on the basis mainly of language, and Madras is now reconstituted shorn of the other linguistic areas of the people who do not speak Tamil. This is the State of the Tamil-speaking people in our country. At the time of the enactment of the Constitution or when the matter was being discussed in the Constituent Assembly, obviously, this question could not come up for discussion for the simple reason that at that time there was no linguistic reorganisation of the States in the south as we have today. Madras, as it was, was a composite State and it was taken as such for the time being, although many Members speaking in the Constituent Assembly spoke of the need for linguistic reorganisation of the State according to the demands made in the freedom struggle, more especially in the Resolutions of the Congress Party but then it did not become a practical question at that time because the Constituent Assembly was not discussing the re-organisation of the State or providing for it. The Constituent Assembly was drawing up the Constitution of the country, taking more or less the situation as it obtained at that time. In fact, we had a different arrangement altogether. We had Part A States, Part B States and Part C States. Now, this arrangement has been completely altered not only because of the linguistic reorganisation of the State but also because of the integration or the merger of the States or areas which were ruled by the former Princes. The position now has

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] considerably changed. What we have today is more or less the linguistic reorganisation of the States or the States reorganised on the basis of language except perhaps in the case of Punjab. There, of course, we have not got the linguistic principle applied in the same way as it has been applied in other parts of the country. Punjab is the only exception. Before then, of course, Bombay was sought to be kept as a bilingual State but after the second General Elections, when the verdict of the people was quite well known to the country and to the Government and could not be resisted, the Government was obliged to break up the bilingual State of Bombay and set up two States, the Gujarat State of the Gujarati-speaking people and the Maharashtra State of the Marathi-speaking people. You will have noted in this connection that the State is now called Maharashtra, not Bombay, and in our Constitution the eighth entry gives the name of Maharashtra. The name Bombay has been changed today. It is no longer called Bombay but it is called Maharashtra and the other part, of course, is called Gujarat. I say this thing because sometimes it is argued that Madras is an old name, a familiar name known all over the world and that it would not be proper for us to change the name but I think that the same argument could be advanced in regard to Bombay as well because Maharashtra could have easily retained the old name, Bombay. I think the decision in regard to Maharashtra was quite right. I do not see as to why the same thing should not be applied in the case of Madras.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): May I ask, who changed the name from Bombay to Maharashtra?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Constitution changed the name. We here changed it because it is not a question of . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): At the request and demand of Maharashtra.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, it was not like that. If you look up at the old thing, you will find that it could not be called Maharashtra at that time because Maharashtra and Gujarat were together in the composite State. How could you call that State as Maharashtra? It is quite obvious. Now, the hon. Member asked as to who changed the name. First of all, the names are not changed by men. They are evolved in the course of history. Maharashtra was Maharashtra whether you called it Maharashtra or not. Therefore, what we did after the reorganisation of the States was to call the Gujarati-speaking areas as Gujarat and the Marathi-speaking areas as Maharashtra and we did not use the old name, Bombay. Therefore, in the First Schedule of the Constitution, the old name Bombay completely disappears. It does not find any place at all as it ought to.

Now, I make these prefatory remarks with a view to removing misgivings in the beginning. I am not suggesting something that has not been done already. I am in line with the scheme of things, the tenor of thinking and the manner of approach with regard to matters such as this. Now, let me come to the specific question of Tamilnad.

Mr. Chairman, I rise with a heavy heart to speak. This Bill has been pending here for some time. I think I tabled this Bill before the last General Elections. At that time, our friend, Mr. Annadurai, was not here. He was not a Member of this House but we were looking forward to his coming and to the coming of many new Members so that we could discuss this thing with fresh men in this House who could give fresh thought. Now, another reason why I did not take up this Bill even after 1957 or 1958 was that I have always made it very clear that I should like our main speaker on the subject to be Mr. Ramamurti, a Member of this House, an eminent leader of Tamil Nad, a

powerful speaker and a popular man. He was at one time, as you know, also a leader or one of the leading members of the Congress, a colleague of many of the Ministers. Now, unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, how you feel I do not know, but Mr. Ramamurti is held in detention by the Madras Government under the Defence of India Rules and he has not the advantage today of coming here. I am sure you will ask why I should not wait a little longer. I would have very gladly done so if I had been given the assurance that he would be available for the next session because I think he would be the most competent speaker on the subject even though in the ballot my name came out and I am moving this Bill but unfortunately today, due to the intransigence of the Government in regard to this matter of dealing with Members of Parliament, I have to move this Bill. I have not only to move this Bill and speak on it but the only Member we have on our Benches, Mr. Ramamurti, from Tamil Nad is not present today for no fault of his. I think everybody will share my sorrow in this matter and the people of Tamil Nad will also particularly feel sorry about this whole affair. Five months have passed since the ceasefire and still he is held in detention. If there was some reason under the impact of certain circumstances, the Government took action, but I think he should have been released by now. It is a strange phenomenon. It is a good thing that we have been reading in the papers about the prisoners of war in the hands of the Chinese being released including the officers. China is doing a good thing. They should release every single one and should not do so by dribblets, and I take this opportunity of saying this but in our country the M.Ps. who are supposed to occupy some important places are held in custody today, held in detention without trial. The rules of detention are being challenged in the courts of law. Many important lawyers have given the opinion that such detentions are not justified, may be challenged in the courts of law.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you are going off the mark.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am coming to that. On this occasion, I am certainly . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: On a point of order, Sir. The comparison of India with China is very objectionable.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No question of objection. It is not, Mr. Akbar Ali Khan, you did not make the demand for the release of Indian personnel.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): I want to know whether reference to Members individually is proper or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think reference to Members should be as Hon. Member from such and such area. Naming is not proper and would lead to difficulties. I have been noticing this thing happening in this House, naming each other, calling each other and talking to each other. That should be avoided as far as possible.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I agree, Sir. Here an unnecessary interruption was made by Mr. Akbar Ali Khan. Mr. Ramamurti is not here. The situation is such that he could have been here to participate in this House even if you think that under certain impact of the situation he was detained but that situation has considerably changed. This is, what I am saying is, perhaps in our favour in every way. That is why I say that generosity could have been shown but it is not shown. Anyhow, what can I say? Hon. Members, I am sorry to say Sir, when I fight for the right of a Member of this House, who is your colleague, who has been with you, not you, Sir, he is also your pupil here . . .

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): On a point of order, Sir. My point of order is that under the Constitution, article 3, he is not empowered to move the Bill unless he has obtained a specific recommendation

from the President and secondly this is a matter which concerns the name of the State. He wants to alter the name of Madras State into Tamil Nad and this cannot be done unless the matter has been referred by the President to the legislature of the State concerned.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is amendment of the Constitution and it is for Supreme Court to decide what should have been done or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have considered your point of order and I allow him to proceed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very glad that the point of order was raised here because things should be clarified. I am all in favour of a good debate.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA (Andhra Pradesh): A point of order has been raised. You said there was no point of order. We would like to know why you consider it as no point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have considered it and I rule that he can proceed.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: Why you consider that there is no point of order; if you explain, we will understand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think so; I can rule.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: You can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And that is what I have done. I can and therefore I have done it.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: That is all right. You can do it. But it will be better if you say why you consider it as no point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are two ways of doing it. One is by amending the Constitution and that is the method he has adopted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I think you should kindly clarify because the point does not seem to be so obvious to her as it is obvious to others.

Now, let me deal with this aspect as to why I want a change of the name. Is it so important? Or is it so unimportant that I could have waited? I say, anyway it is important. In fact, I should have been happy if the amendment had come from the Government itself. You know, Sir, that in Madras they do not use this expression 'Madras'. They have given it up. In their official business they use the word 'Tamil Nad'. I made enquiries from official circles of Tamil Nad and they said that for the purposes of the State in the sphere of State activity 'Tamil Nad' had come to be in use and they had given up this nomenclature 'Madras'. So, they use this word 'Tamil Nad' and I think we should all support the stand the Tamil Nad Government have taken in this matter.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: May I ask if the Madras Government is in favour of changing the name from Madras to Tamil Nad?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You ask them as to why they have changed in their own sphere.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: They have not.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They have.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Only when Tamil is used.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Naturally their State language now is Tamil. They do not use English any more. I know that you would like English. You seem to like everything with regard to English nowadays, even the name given by the English. I am very glad we were not given names as John, Michael, etc., otherwise you would have liked those names also.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: I was not given any English name.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are Mr. Ruthnaswamy, I know. I would like your State to be called also Tamil Nad. Ruthnaswamy will go well with Tamil Nad. That is what I say.

Now, Madras, as I have said, is called Tamil Nad and in Tamil Nad the work is conducted by the State in their regional language. I made a grievance about the detention of Comrade Ramamurti but here I would like to pay a tribute to the people and the Government of Tamil Nad in this matter. I am not miserly in my approach; I pay a tribute to them because they have done it. It is one of the States where their own mother-tongue has been more or less made the official language and they are very strict about it. Only yesterday we heard that in the Tamil Nad Assembly no speeches are made nowadays except in the mother-tongue. I congratulate the legislators of Tamil Nad and those who are responsible for particularly bringing about this situation. My congratulation goes in this matter to Mr. Kamaraj Nadar, the Chief Minister of Tamil Nad. He belongs to another party; he has kept many of our people in jail and I have many grievances against him but the way he has served his language and refused to speak in English and in conducting the affairs of the State in Tamil, he deserves to be supported and congratulated by us in the present context of discussion. It is a good thing and why should it not be so? Tamil is one of the oldest languages perhaps in the world. The Tamil language was there thousands and thousands of years ago when many people had not developed even their speech in many parts of the world. The Tamil language produced literature of a high order before many languages in the world were developed. Such is the Tamil language and such is the credit of the Tamil people who have contributed in such a grand way and so richly to the cultural heritage of our country. When we talk about the Tamil we have great affec-

tion, almost a weakness for them, because India as we see today is comprised of many linguistic units and groups and among them the people of Tamil Nad get a place of great significance. In their literature, in their culture, in their song and music, in their way of life, we see the pristine beauty of what we consider to be the culture of our people. Therefore Tamil Nad is the focus of Indian culture in every way. Therefore it is but right that Tamil Nad should have been one of the first States in India, despite the fact that many of them have good knowledge of English, to insist that Tamil should be the official language of the present State of Tamil Nad, now called also in English Madras. It is a grand thing that they have done.

I wish, Sir, in my State the same thing had happened. We too have a language which is rich and of which we are proud. But who is not proud of his own mother-tongue more especially when it is developed? But unfortunately only five or six days back a decision has been taken by the Government of West Bengal that Bengali should be the official language of our State. All these years we have been carrying on in English and I know of a Chief Minister in West Bengal who when he was asked to make a speech in Bengali said he would never make a speech in Bengali and that he would always speak in English although he was not particularly well up in making speeches in English but he insisted on that. There are even now in the West Bengal Assembly in the Government benches some people, the Finance Minister in particular who is an England-returned barrister—and the barristers always create a lot of trouble—who would not make any speech except in English but here you see in the Tamil Nad Assembly whether you are a barrister, whether you are a doctor, whether you are an engineer, whether you are a lawyer, whatever you are, you make the speech in Tamil. I take my hat off to the people of Tamil Nad. I think they have set a very good

(Shri Bhupesh Gupta)

example before the country. While we should not take the initiative in bringing about the change, I do not know why the Government of Tamil Nad is not itself insisting upon it. I do not know. Maybe they think that they could get on in their own way in their State and it is immaterial whether Tamil Nad is called Madras or Tamil Nad for all-India purposes or named as such in our Constitution. I do not know. But talking to many of them connected with the Congress Party I find that there are some who share the sentiments of mine, even in my arguments in the matter. In fact, I derive my arguments in this matter from them. Who am I to teach the people of Tamil Nad what is good for them or what is bad for them? I think they can teach us in such matters many a thing because they have been ahead in such matters. Now, why should it not be so? As far as this name is concerned, I do not think the word 'Madras' occurs in the Tamil language at all. It was evolved in the days of the British, just as certain other names were evolved. The name 'Bombay' was given by the British and we have done away with that name as far as the State is concerned, although the city of Bombay is still called Bombay. Let it be so. If they like, let them call the city of Madras, Madras, but they should not call or we should not call here the State of Tamil Nad, Madras. Now, this argument is put forward that Madras is well known internationally and so on. Right at the beginning I said that Bombay was also well known in this manner. I am not saying that you change the name of the city of Madras into some other name. Call Madras city Madras city. If Madras is well known outside, well, it is mainly because of the fact that it has been an important centre under the British and the city of Madras remains to be an important centre even now. Therefore, I am not disturbing this nomenclature at all. Therefore, I say that that point is met that way. If I had suggested that Madras city should also

be renamed, then perhaps some objection could have been taken that I am trying to wipe out everything and probably I am going to suggest certain names which are not known to the world at all. I am not doing that at all. What I am suggesting is clearly in line with what we have done exactly in the case of Maharashtra. Retaining the name of the city of Bombay as Bombay, we have changed the name of the State to Maharashtra.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know what are the possible objections to it? As you know, even in respect of Bengal today, the West Bengal Government is sponsoring that it should not be called West Bengal. It should be called Bengal. The word "West" should be eliminated. I do not know if any proposal has come forward or whether the Government is considering it. But this is what they are thinking. They are not satisfied with the nomenclature of West Bengal, even though Bengal has been partitioned. What is now called West Bengal in India was the western part of the undivided Bengal and, therefore, it came to be called West Bengal. The people of West Bengal and notably the Government do not like this name to be continued. They want it to be changed. One can understand that point of view. Now, here it is entirely a different thing. Here, the name does not find a place in the literature. It is not known in the Tamil expression. It may enter the literature. So many things enter the literature and language. I understand it. But it does not originate from that. That is my point.

Now, one difficulty arises here. Let me argue what may be the possible arguments against my contention. The argument may be: It is there. Why bother about it? This is the main argument. This name is well known and familiar. Why are you going to change it? This is a small, petty thing. Well, then, I should have thought that this argument should

have been given also in connection with Maharashtra when you changed Bombay into Maharashtra. In the case of Bombay in particular you could have done it, but it was not done. The people of Maharashtra demanded that they would not be satisfied if Maharashtra State was called Bombay. In fact, their movement was called the *Samyukta* Maharashtra movement. They got the name as the people wanted it.

But what happened in the case of Tamil Nad? As you know, even in the days of the British the Congress called it the Tamil Nad Congress Committee. The composite State of Madras had three Committees, I believe. There was the Malabar Congress Committee. Anyway, two clearly, the Andhra Pradesh Congress Committee and another Pradesh Congress Committee comprising the areas which now fall in Madras and that was called the Tamil Nad Congress Committee. They never called it the Madras Provincial Congress Committee. Therefore, the Congress thought, in the first place, that the composite Madras State should be dealt with linguistically and there should be three provincial Congress organisations. It was, in a way, the precursor of the reorganisation of States. In fact, this organisational arrangement went with the concept of reorganisation of States or reorganisation of Provinces, on the basis of which the Congress sponsored it at that time. Then they had this arrangement. They had the Provincial Congress Committee in the present Madras State, but it was not called, as I said, the Madras Provincial Congress Committee. Therefore, the Congress accepted that name. The Congress never argued at that time that since it was Madras and the seat of the Provincial Congress Committee was in Madras, it should be called the Madras Provincial Congress Committee. On the contrary, the seat of the Pradesh Committee was in the city of Madras, but all the same it was called the Tamil Nad Congress Committee. At that time, Shri Rajagopalachari, if I may say so, was

particularly in support of this kind of approach. Only yesterday I was reading a little speech of Shri Rajagopalachari in 1928 where he supported that Hindi should be the official language of the Indian Union and he made an eloquent speech at that time. With regard to Hindi being the Union language, he has changed his mind. With regard to this thing I do not know whether he has changed his mind. I have not come across any writing of his where he has changed his mind. Since he is liable to change very quickly and from stage to stage, it is possible that he would like the name of Madras to be retained. Therefore, I say all people in Madras, especially the Congress people, are committed to the name of Tamil Nad. They, in fact, disliked the name of Madras to be given to their Congress organisation. This was the position. Today I do not see any reason why, when we are in power, we should not give effect to what had been done when we were not in power. When we have passed on from the provincial Congress organisation to the sphere of the State, why should we not take to it, when we were committed at that time, to the sphere of the State and bring about the necessary change in the nomenclature? Therefore, that argument does not seem to be very convincing.

Well, this is the only argument that I have come across. Then, I wanted to find out in a dialogue as to what would be the other argument. Really, no argument has been given. The other argument is, let 'Tamil Nad' be used in the State and for the whole of India we shall use the name Madras. Today we are discussing the language Bill. In the regional sphere we are passing from English to the regional language. I make it absolutely clear that English language in a State has to be replaced not by another non-regional language, but by the respective regional language. This is the position. We are opposed to retaining English as the official language of the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Indian Union for all times to come. We are equally opposed to Hindi transgressing into the field of the regional language in each State and taking the place of the regional language in the State sphere. This has been done in the case of Madras. The name Tamil Nad has been given. It is in consonance with the conception of regional regrouping and linguistic regrouping. But here is the official level, the all-India level. What do we give? Madras is certainly not a Hindi translation. It may enter the Hindi world, but it did not come from the Hindi language at all. Therefore, if you want to translate the word Tamil Nad which will be the description of the State in their mother tongue the translation of that name in Hindi is certainly not Madras. Therefore, what you are doing here seems to be certainly anomalous. For all official purposes Hindi will be the Union language. Very good. Make it in a proper way. Take your time to do so if need be, but what happens to this name? Tamil Nad is a State of ours. All the official literature will use the word Tamil Nad. Where does the word Madras come from? As far as we here at the Union level are concerned, what do we do? We translate what appears in the regional language as far as it relates to the Centre, but we import another name called Madras which the Tamil Nad people will have in the process of development given a complete go-by from all their official records, official literature, and so on. We shall be superimposing, taking from the past, another nomenclature which is called Madras. I think that would not be right. That would not be right in the sense that here our job is not to import new things, but as far as regional matters are concerned to have honest translations in the Union official language of the names and other things and matters connected with the States in their respective regional languages when such things appear. Here again we will be up against a contradiction. I say that from that

angle also we need a change. I do not know what Mr. Annadurai feels like in this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No names.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I can name a Member through you, Sir. I do not know how Mr. Annadurai feels in this matter. I am not talking to him. I think that in such matters we need not be in the 19th century House of Commons. We can be in the mid-twentieth century Indian Parliament. We have our informality in this matter, and that is to the good. I think so. We are a creative people. I know that in British Parliament you cannot even mention the name. There they say the hon. Member from Wimbledon. It is all right in England, but reading from here I do not know who that Member is from Wimbledon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because you do not care to know.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There are 600 in all from so many constituencies. Why should I know? I want the name. Mr. Churchill is better known. How many people know to which constituency Mr. Churchill belongs?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not relevant.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You touched on that point, Sir. That is why I am saying this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like the mentioning of names to be avoided.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In the House we can mention names. In that case we can have a new procedure. Then let us have it. Let us change the rules. Certainly we will mention the names, but certainly I will not talk to him, I will not enter into a direct conversation with him, I will ask him through you.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: You are only asked to address the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In this matter, Mr. Chairman, she is addressing me direct. You will understand that habits are difficult to get over, and feminine habits are more difficult to get over. Therefore, I say that here I do not know how the hon. Member feels. But I think he should support this and also all Members opposite, and I see that hon. Member on the Treasury Benches, if you do not like his name to be mentioned, looking at me, sitting in the front bench in white coat you see with glasses on, and I hope he will say something in support of it, I think he will support my measure also, and also will the lady Member sitting next to another lady. Member, my hon lady interruptor. I think they should also support this measure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's conception of a modern Parliament.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is right because, Sir, you suggested to me to develop something new. I thought I could add to the newness of it because anything new should always be dynamic and evolving. Therefore, I do not think there is any justification for the Government not to support my motion. They will have lost nothing if they accept the amendment. I should like to know through you, Sir, from the Government what is going to be lost if they just in the column where the names appear in the First Schedule of the Constitution substitute the word Tamil Nad for Madras. What will be lost, I would like to know from the Government, because I am open to conviction in such matters. But from my private study of this matter, from my consultations with these people of the Government and others, I could not get any convincing argument as to why this little change should not be made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tamil Nad people feel very strongly about it. I must say that they do feel very strongly about it, and in such a matter I think

we should be guided by the wishes of the people of Tamil Nad. I will tell you what happened. In the last session when Mr. Annadurai was not here I mentioned this Bill and I did not introduce this Bill. But on one occasion I did not take it up for discussion, hoping that Mr. Ramamurti would be here to speak on it at length.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: You have already mentioned that. You are repeating.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But there is such a thing as repetition.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There is such a thing as repetition. Yes, Sir, there is such a thing as repetition. Repetitions become necessary when certain quarters are impervious to reason. If you make an assault through a wall, you make the first hit. If the wall does not break, you make another attempt. If you shoot somebody and it misses, you fire from the same gun another shot. It is the same thing here. I said at the time—this is the trouble, Mr. Akbar Ali Khan interrupts only to break the links of my argument. Here I said that the Tamil Nad people are in favour of it.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras): No, no. I say you have no right whatsoever to speak for Tamil Nad.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is called jingoism. I am a citizen of India. I love the Tamil Nad people as much as I love my Bengali people. I do not think I have less right to speak for the great people of Tamil Nad as a humble public servant than I have the right to speak for the Bengali people for whom I stand and have come. I should have thought Mr. Santhanam, Sir,—through you again I mention that name.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: He said that the Tamil Nad people wanted this Bill. I only said that they did not want this Bill. He has got a right to

[Shri K. Santhanam]
move anything about the Constitution.
I do not deny his right to do anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is giving his impression that the Tamil Nad people want this. You are entitled to say that they do not want this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are right there, Sir. He can say that what I am saying is wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid the Chair is always right.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Have you ever heard a Chair going wrong any time? Never. It only requires a revolution to prove the Chair wrong. Nothing short of it can prove that. Besides, Sir, you are a learned man and you are right, Chair or no Chair. I said I have a right to speak for Tamil Nad in the same way as I have a right to speak for Bengal. People in Bengal may agree with me with regard to certain matters. I know what I said about language. Many people in my State may not agree with me. But I speak for the people of India. What I said here I said as a part of the people of India, and there I have a right to speak for any section of the people. And I should consider it an honour and a privilege to see more and more people of Tamil Nad speaking for the people of Bengal and I shall never get up here to question that right of the people of Tamil Nad to speak for the people of Bengal. It may be that they may speak sometime not in a right way, not quite, representing the point of view of the vast masses of the people of Bengal. But I want to develop this kind of communion between one linguistic group and another linguistic group, and I think I am doing a great thing by way of forging the unity of the people of Bengal and Tamil Nad. When a Bengalee gets up here to pay a tribute to the literature, language and culture of Tamil Nad and on the strength of that demands that the name of Madras be changed into Tamil Nad which they have done in their

own State, I think this is an act which should be appreciated even if you disagree with it, an act that I have sponsored in good spirit because of my love and affection and my deep loyalty to the people of Tamil Nad. And that is why I have sponsored the amendment. Secondly, I would like Mr. Ramamurti to speak at length on this subject being himself a man of Tamil Nad because he is most conversant with the subject. But is it possible? Last time when I did not move this Bill, certain Tamil people criticised me, misunderstanding the position as if I had withdrawn the Bill. Editorials appeared, news appeared in the Tamil Nad papers that I had moved the Bill but that I had decided not to proceed with it, and I was criticised on that score. It is not for that that I am making the speech here or moving the Bill. I did not withdraw it. But somehow or other they got the wrong impression—maybe due to lack of correct understanding of the procedure—and came down upon me with the criticism that I was not mindful of the interests and rights of the people of Tamil Nad and that was why, having moved it, I had taken it up, maybe under some pressure or so. That was not true. Now, how do you measure the opinion of the people of Tamil Nad? First of all, let us examine that aspect because Mr. Santhanam certainly can question if I want to say that the people of Tamil Nad want it. He can have his point of view but he has to give more cogent facts. What are the facts according to me?

In the last General Elections—the Communist Party participated in the campaign in Tamil Nad and I know it—we said in our election manifesto and everything, in our propaganda, that we wanted this name to be changed. Our paper had been writing about it not today but for many years now. (Interruption). Just a minute. I should satisfy your points. Our people in the Assembly had been pleading for it. Now there we got one million votes. Do not talk about the

seats. It is possible to get many votes but not seats due to the division of votes and so on. But one million people there supported it.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): On this very issue you were badly defeated in Tamil Nad.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He says that on this issue you were defeated. But you carry on your argument.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I should have thought, Sir, that his thoughts will be a little richer than they are at the moment. Now, I am not saying about it, I am leaving it to a matter of opinion. I may have been defeated, I may not have got two million votes. But the fact remains that one million people voted for our party which stood for this, ten lakhs of voters. Certainly if you take into account their families and others, there will be many more in terms of population. I am saying that a good percentage voted for it. I do not say what they got. They would have got three million votes.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: Is it my friend's contention that the only item of the Communist Party's programme for which they voted was this?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. How can I say this thing? Mr. Santhanam is an experienced parliamentarian, Sir, again through you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Like you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Sir, more experienced than I am. He had participated in the proceedings of the Constituent Assembly when I was underground, reading the deliberations of the Constituent Assembly. Even before that, he was a parliamentarian. But some people become childish old in all such matters and Mr. Santhanam's interruptions would make it look as if he had entered Parliament only the day before yesterday because he asked whether that was the only thing. This was not the only thing

but this was one of the things. You asked how I know that the people supported it. I said that the Communist Party was supported by them and I gave a measurement here taking the figures from the election result. Certainly there were many other things and among the other things there was the point about the Congress corruption also. I agree. Among the things enumerated was the Congress manifesto. But this was also there. Now we know the statistics for it, how many supported it. Here is the DMK Party. We have a very great difference with the DMK Party in some political matters; certainly on the question of separation, we are poles apart. We shall never meet. That is true.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras): But you had an alliance with them during the last General Election.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: That was an unholy alliance of Communism and Communalism.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Has the hon. Member to your right the right to mislead?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member himself has so many things to say, and suggesting the other point probably is not very politic.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, I am very glad, Sir, that apart from your wisdom, you are importing humour into this debate. I am thankful to you. Now the hon. Member opposite also sometimes made interruptions but, well, this is beside the point. If we had united with the DMK Party—since he raised that point—the Communist Party with one million votes would not have got two seats, the Communist Party would have got many more seats. One of the reasons why we lost was that there was no unity between us and the DMK, and the Congress Party took full advantage of it. Anyway—and naturally—

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

as long as they had separation as their policy, there cannot be any unity. It is quite clear. There cannot be any unity with the DMK as long as it maintains its separatist position. But we are not concerned with all that here. Here the point is in what measure the people are for it. The DMK in their propaganda, in their literature, in their journals, stands for this kind of thing, Tamil Nad. Now they have got three million votes. Four million people supported the parties which wanted a change, out of a electorate of how many votes I cannot straightway say, but it is a good percentage of people. It is a good percentage of people in Tamil Nad who in the course of the election demonstrated that they were with the parties which would like the name to be changed, and they listened to the contentions of the parties in this matter; at any rate, they did not become angry with the parties or reject them. Therefore, at least give me the credit in this matter of pointing to the voluminous support of four million people in Tamil Nad, four million voters, not people; the number of people will be much more.

Now, about the Congress. I think that their votes were nearly five millions or so, between four and five millions, but not more than five millions, but in between. Well, this is the difference. But how many people in the Congress support it? Now the Congress Party itself has changed the name in Madras in their official documents. It was quite possible for the Tamil Language to assimilate the word 'Madras' and make it a part of the Tamil language, to use this expression in their official documents at the State level. But deliberately, purposely, they have decided not to use this thing but to insist on the expression "Tamil Nad". Am I to take from this thing that the Congress Party is in principle opposed to the change of the name or will the inference be that since the Congress Party has changed the name

in the sphere of State, since they are using their rightful language, they are likely to be in favour—at any rate many of them—positively in favour, of the change of the name in the Constitution as well? What will be the reasonable presumption? Suppose we had been discussing this matter in some other country, on the documentary evidence what conclusion would you have come to from these facts, unassailable facts, coming from the Government and coming from the election results? Would you have come to the conclusion that the Tamil Nad people are opposed to it or would you be inclined to think, taking into account the electoral support on the one hand and the fact that the Tamil Nad Government itself has changed it on the other hand, that they are in favour of it? This is the argument I place before you. Normally you would be inclined to think, unless other evidence is led or produced, that they are in favour of it. I should like to hear from the hon. Members opposite as to what arguments they can give in order to counter, in the first place, if I make such a presumption and, secondly, factual evidence, the support, which I have mentioned in this connection. I should like to know.

12 Noon

Then there are others, the Tamil National Party, and so on; there are others, the splinter groups in Tamil Nad, small parties, and they all support it, apart from the Communist Party and the D. M. K., the two main opposition parties in Tamil Nad. As far as the Swatantra Party is concerned, it is much noise and fury; it has not much place there; a lot of noise is there; one great man is there; he can make great noise; it is all right. But there are other parties also, smaller parties, they support it. I tell you, Sir. Once I went to Madurai, and there it was a Communist Party meeting. A purse was presented to the party by the workers—Rs. 20,000; it

is all right. One can say that it is all Communist people that came, that it is all Communist people that came and gave the purse to me for the party. But what else happened there? The other Tamil people, the other parties, smaller groups also came and greeted us and there, naturally, the thing they said was that "Because the Communist Party had been pleading in Parliament that the name of 'Madras' should be changed into 'Tamil Nad', we have come here to signify our support to the Communist Party and the representative of the Communist Party who has come from Delhi." And it was done publicly.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: He has already taken from them Rs. 20,000 in the shape of a purse; he has already taken their brief and so he is advocating their cause.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There you are, Mr. Sheel Bhad a Yajee, Sir, can you save me from Mr. Sheel Bhadra Yajee's interruptions? You see, Sir, this Bill was given much before. You may say they paid money, but money came from the Communists.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I should save you from their interruptions, then I should also save them from your interruptions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You should save both, Sir; you do not seem to have taken into consideration that we need mutual saving.

Sir, as I said, here the Communist people came; this purse came from the supporters of the Communist Party. But other parties came, despite their opposition to the Communist Party in other matters; with nothing in common with us in other matters, they came to signify their support to, and approbation of, the stand that we had taken in regard to this very particular matter under discussion today, and I think, Sir, that that point my esteemed friend, Mr Sheel Bhadra Yajee, should have understood without further expatiation on the theme.

Now I saw this thing; everywhere I went I noted it. I toured Tamil Nad, and everywhere one question was asked, "What would happen to your Bill? Will it be taken up? Will the name be changed?" Things like that were asked. And people were not always Communists, or Communist supporters. Many other people also raised that point. Therefore I submit, Sir, there is a volume of support—how to exactly define it, how to apportion it between us and the Congress opposite—Congress opposite here, not in Tamil Nad—I cannot say. But I do submit there is a great volume of support for what I am saying today, and am submitting before this hon House, in all humility, to accept. I would not have done it had I thought that large sections of the people of Tamil Nad would be opposed to it in a positive sense. It may be due to the influence of the Congress they may not be acting in the same way as others would be acting; it may be that when the Treasury Benches shoot their guns, the other guns nearby will be silenced—I can understand it. But it does mean that a person like me, who comes up with this Bill, would not have come forward with a measure of this kind if he had thought that it was directed against the interests of the people of Tamil Nad. Am I such a fool? Have I lost common sense in such a way that I should commit such a crime as that? Would I have taken the pains to draft a Bill, bring it here and argue it out only to get the opprobrium of the people of Tamil Nad, to be run down and castigated by them, to be denounced by them? I think, Sir, whatever you may regard me as being, certainly you would not think that I am blind to all common sense—you would not say that. Therefore, in good faith I have brought it, because I felt . . .

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY (Mysore): How do you know?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am asking him. Mr. Gurupada Swamy need not assume because he has abundance of common sense, that I have no com-

[Shri. Bhupesh Gupta.]
mon sense. It is possible for him to think, but I should have thought, in all humility, that I am not so much devoid of common sense. Certainly I do not have the intelligence, wisdom and the height of common sense with which Mr. Gurupada Swamy, a colleague of ours, is invested; I am proud of it, that I have got such a colleague with so much of common sense.

Here it is not that. Now you debate the Bill on merits. I should ask the House to debate this question purely on merits, on ethical grounds, on political grounds, on grounds of democracy, on grounds of good approach to some important questions in public life, and in that context by all means take it into account, what is going to be the possible repercussions on the minds of the people of Tamil Nad. If I am told the people of Tamil Nad are opposed to it, Sir, I shall bow out of this venture and ask your leave to withdraw this Bill. But if I can make out that large sections of the people of Tamil Nad support it then I should think the hon. Members opposite should give their consideration and thought to this matter. The trouble with hon. Members opposite sitting in the Treasury Benches coming from Tamil Nad is this. When they are in Tamil Nad, they say one thing. When they are in the Treasury Benches in New Delhi they get delighted and say another thing. (*Interruptions*) We have seen the former Finance Minister, Mr. Krishnamachari, in Madras saying very excellent things, and coming to Delhi saying entirely different things.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: To say that the people of Tamil Nad speak one thing there and another thing here is, I think, personal aspersion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not personal; I am talking about the Government men, not personal, Mr. Alagesan, for instance.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): I hope he was speaking such things when he was not a Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is another aspect of this story; that is another side of the story.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do not address him direct.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He made enquiries through you of me, and I am giving the reply.

Now here, Sir, to your right is Mr. Alagesan sitting. (*Interruptions*) Then teach me Tamil. Make the name Tamil Nad here so that I learn Tamil more. But you teach me Madras. What is Madras here? Make it Tamil Nad and then give me the Tamil pronunciation. I shall certainly learn it. I am very sorry for it. You will find the same difficulty if you were to pronounce some Bengali names.

Now, Sir, Mr. Alagesan was in this House, not in this House, in this Parliament, after the first General Elections. And we heard his speeches. His ideas and his standards we got from him. Then, unfortunately he became a casualty in the next General Elections. But then he became the President of the Tamil Nad Pradesh Congress Committee. I do not know what post is now a days greater, Presidentship of the Pradesh Congress Committee, or Deputy Ministership. It is for them to say, but anyway, he became, to my mind, a very important person in Tamil Nad—President of the Pradesh Congress Committee. Now he had made many speeches somewhere reported, at least in an English paper. Did he make a statement, when I moved this Bill in this House, that it was wrong and misconceived, that it should not be done? Did he tell the Chief Minister of Madras, being the President of the Tamilnad Congress Committee, that in view of the fact that the Constitution still retains the name 'Madras' let at least the name 'Tamil Nad' be used in place of the 'State of Madras'? He did nothing of the kind; he did nothing of the kind to my knowledge—he might have done something, but I have not read

these things in the newspaper. I am anxiously looking forward to what he is going to do today.

I am anxiously looking forward to that. He will certainly intervene in this debate and I should seek light and guidance from him in this matter.

Our friend, the lady Minister from Tamil Nad, she was almost convinced that this is a right thing. It seems that she was not unconvinced of that.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): May I point out, Sir, that the question is not whether Tamil Nad should be Madras or Tamil Nad, or Bombay should be Bombay or Maharashtra, or Karnataka should be Mysore or Karnataka? It is a different story and has a different bearing from the question of Hindi and English that he is trying to make out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is saying that hon. Members from Tamil Nad while they are there support it but they do not support it here. That is the point that he is trying to make. Of course, he is making it at great length.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are quite right, Sir. In any case I know a bit of this thing. Therefore, allow me to make that point. As another hon. Member there interrupted, I said that I would like to hear what argument he has to advance. I have not got any convincing argument from them. Therefore, Sir, as you say, I think I have answered all the arguments that I could anticipate. I do not have any other argument. I know that the hon. Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs has got a well-prepared brief on the subject giving you the entire account. At least I make it possible for him to study the entire thing, and he will certainly make a speech on the basis of that when he gives a reply. But before that, I am looking forward to

hearing the hon. Members on the Treasury Benches, from the Tamil Nad.

Mr. Chairman, finally I would appeal to this House in all humility to consider whether I am projecting a controversy or whether I am trying to put an end to a controversy. If you think I am aggravating a controversy into a battle royal, hon. Members would be justified in asking me not to pursue it. But if they think that there is hardly any controversy over this matter, but certain contradictions appear due mostly to historical reasons, and that we have not made the necessary change more because of inertia and force of habit in this House, in the other House or in the Government rather than for any other reason, I think they would ask me not to withdraw it, but to proceed with this Bill. This is all I can say. I am not dogmatic in such matters. But, certainly, when I see the Tamil people themselves feeling very strongly about changing the name in their own sphere, I think it is the duty of some Members of Parliament, since the Government will not itself initiate this measure, to take up the cause of the people of Tamil Nad and see as to whether we can get the support of the Government and make it acceptable to them.

Before I sit down once again I pay my tribute to the people of Tamil Nad, and if I have offended any of them, those who do not like this thing to be changed—I do not believe there is anybody who really wants it to remain as it is in the Constitution—I am sorry for it. But I have done so in good faith. But I think, Sir, I have expressed the sentiments and urges of the people of Tamil Nad even if they are not articulate on the Treasury Benches or for reasons of the control of the Congress Party over a section of them. I know in their heart of hearts the people of Tamil Nad feel that the name should be changed and that is why I have proposed it. I have done it as a

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
token of my respect towards the people of Tamil Nad, as a token of my feelings of solidarity with the people of Tamil Nad, and I think if Parliament takes the initiative in this matter, when we are discussing the languages Bill, the people of Tamil Nad, who have legitimate misgivings about Hindi and other things, will realise that we cherish their sentiments, cherish their urges and we also sometimes take the initiative on our own outside their State to meet their desires and so on.

Mr. Chairman, once again I express my deep sorrow and resentfulness at the fact that Comrade P. Ramamurti, who has been a politician of long standing, a public servant outstanding in Tamil Nad, he is today not with us to lend his powerful voice in support of this Bill. I regret, Sir, that he is not amongst us today although he represents the people of that particular State here. He would have been in a better position perhaps to speak on this subject, with more intimate knowledge, with greater warmth, with more intense feeling and with more cogent reasons than I have done.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): May I know, Sir, what is the significance of Mr. P. Ramamurti not introducing and moving this particular Bill even when he was in this House? He introduced this even in his presence probably because he does not agree with him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Because you have put him in jail.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, you need not go into that controversy. You have finished your speech, and I think you can very easily conclude.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, since he has raised that point, he would have spoken but the ballot came in my name.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: He never even gave notice of his intention to move it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I gave notice . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: As a Member of the Party he was to have spoken. But it makes little difference as to who introduced.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I thought I have not only the honour to represent this group but lead it, and I thought that it would be to express our solidarity with the people of Tamil Nad if this Bill was sponsored by a section which does not come from Tamil Nad and also by one who leads a particular group. That is why we did it. Unfortunately, Sir, you have been denied, by no fault of yours or mine or of anybody in this House excepting the Treasury Benches, the advantage of listening to Comrade Ramamurti who would have perhaps given you better exposition of the case that I have tried to put before this House.

Once again I hope that if the Bill continues during this Session, if the discussion is not concluded, the next time we take up the motion, the speaker from our side will be Comrade P. Ramamurti, one of the outstanding leaders of the people of Tamil Nad. Thank you.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY (West Bengal): On a point of information. I have every sympathy with the urges, inner compulsions and sentiments expressed by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the point of information?

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: The point of information is: Has the opinion of the Tamil-speaking people been voiced through their recognised forum, that is, the Madras Legislature?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That point he has dealt with at great length. I would not trouble him again.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will give him the reply in the third reading.

The question was proposed.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : माननीय चैयरमैन महोदय, श्री श्री भूपेश गुप्त जी ने जो संविधान के शेड्यूल में मद्रास की जगह पर तामिलनाडु स्टेट करने का संशोधन रखा है, उसकी मैं सख्त मुखालिफत करता हूँ। इसलिये विरोध करता हूँ कि जो तामिलनाडु की जनता है, उसको इस पर विचार करना चाहिये था—लेकिन कभी-कभी उनके विचार करने में भी गलती हो सकती है—और जब सारे राज्यों का भाषा के आधार पर निर्माण हुआ था, तब उस समय जो तामिल बोलने वाले हैं, उन्होंने सोच समझ कर उस राज्य का नाम मद्रास रखा। यदि भूपेश गुप्त जी की जो दलील है, उसको स्वीकार किया जाये तो बहुत से राज्य हमारे भारतवर्ष में हैं कि भाषा के आधार पर उनके नाम नहीं हैं। उदाहरण के लिये मैं इसी जगह का नाम पहले लेता हूँ, जिस दिल्ली में हम बैठे हुए हैं। बंगाल में उत्तर प्रदेश है, हमारा बिहार प्रान्त है, मध्य प्रदेश है, राजस्थान है। ठीक भाषा के ही आधार पर प्रान्तों का नाम हो, यह कोई ठीक दलील नहीं है। मद्रास शब्द इतना प्रचलित है और उसको हिन्दुस्तान की जनता ही नहीं, सारी दुनिया के लोग जानते हैं। मद्रास शब्द बहुत अच्छा है इसलिये मद्रास के लोगों ने खूब सोच समझ कर इसका नाम मद्रास रखा है और वह अभी तक चल रहा है। श्री भूपेश गुप्त जी ने दलील पेश करते हुए कहा कि चूँकि वह मदुराई में गये थे और उनको एक थैली प्रदान की गई थी, २०,००० रुपये की, और इसीलिये थैली इकट्ठी की गई कि पार्लियामेंट में जा कर वकालत करेंगे, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की तरफ से वह थैली प्रदान करने के बाद वे पार्लियामेंट के, संसद् के, समक्ष अच्छी तरह से वकालत करके इसका नाम बदलवायेंगे और इसलिये उनके लिए जरूरी था कि जब उस नाम पर रुपया इकट्ठा हुआ, इसके लिये उन्हें फीस दी गई, तो उन्होंने जो अपना कर्तव्य

उचित समझा वह किया। लेकिन इसके साथ-साथ उन्होंने यह संशोधन बिल रखते हुए मद्रास की, अरवाम के जो रिप्रेजेंटेटिव्स हैं, उनकी तरफ से भी वकालत की, लेकिन उन्होंने साफ साफ कहा कि इस सवाल पर सिर्फ हम और द्रविड़ मुनेत्र कड़घम, सिर्फ दो पार्टियाँ, साथ थीं और इस इश्यू पर दूसरे लोग साथ नहीं थे। इसलिये उनकी जो दलील थी वह बहुत कमजोर थी, और वह यह साबित करना चाहते थे कि मद्रास की जो जनता है वह अधिकांश इस नाम के परिवर्तन को पसंद करती है। मेरा उनसे आपके थ्रू सिर्फ यह निवेदन है कि यदि इस बिमारी को वे लाना चाहते हैं, तो हमारे बिहार में भी, जहाँ एक बिहार के नाम से राज्य है, वहाँ यदि भाषा की बात की जायेगी तो वहाँ भी भाषा के नाम पर बहुत बड़े प्रान्त बनने की बात चल सकती है, क्योंकि वहाँ कभी-कभी मगध प्रान्त की बात चलती है, मैथिली प्रान्त की बात चलती है, भोजपुर प्रान्त की बात चलती है; तथा झारखंड प्रान्त बनाने का भी आन्दोलन कभी-कभी चल ही जाता है। भूपेश गुप्ता जी कभी हिन्दुस्तान में लिगुइज्म के खिलाफ बात करते हैं, कभी प्रचार भी करते हैं और अगर उनकी इस प्रकार की भाषावाद की बात चलती है, तो फिर हमारा राज्य भी चार टुकड़ों में बंट सकता है। यदि भाषा के आधार पर प्रान्तों का नाम रख दिया जाये तो देश के बड़े टुकड़े होने की आशा है, जो भाषा बोली भी नहीं जाती है, उसके नाम पर भी टुकड़े-टुकड़े हो सकते हैं। इसलिये जब वे बोल रहे थे, तो मैंने उनको इण्टरप्ट किया था और बताया था कि मद्रास का तामिलनाडु नाम नहीं होना चाहिये। इस इश्यू पर उन्होंने जो दावा किया कि हमने और द्रविड़ मुनेत्र कड़घम ने चुनाव लड़ा और हालाँकि बातें दूसरी-दूसरी थीं, लेकिन मद्रास की जनता ने प्रचंड बहुमत से यह साबित कर दिया कि

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी का जो स्लोगन है या प्रोग्राम है इलेक्शन मेनीफैस्टो का, वह गलत है और इनकी बुरी हार हुई थी। तो जैसा कि उनका दावा है कि इस मामले में मद्रास की जनता की राय हो गई, मद्रास की जनता ने यदि इसी पर चुनाव लड़ा तो वह उस चीज को नहीं चाहती और उनके चाहने पर भी जब तक हम जो पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर हैं, वे यहां पार्लियामेंट में उस चीज को कबूल नहीं करेंगे, इस बारे में संशोधन नहीं करेंगे, तब तक यह कभी पास नहीं हो सकता है; क्योंकि हो सकता है कि किसी रोज यह बीमारी और आगे बढ़ जाय, कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी की वजह से या द्रविड़ मुनेत्र कडघम की वजह से; क्योंकि उनकी तरफ से वहां असेम्बली में यह सवाल आया था। इसलिये साथी भूपेश गुप्ता जी ने जितनी दलीलें पेश की हैं, मैं भी उनका एक एक करके जवाब देना चाहता हूं कि इससे देश की भलाई, तामिलनाडु की, मद्रास की भलाई या अवाम की भलाई हो सकती है या नहीं? यहां तो चेयरमैन साहब, कभी-कभी जो भाषावाद की बीमारी की बात चलती है तो मैं समझता हूं कि संप्रदायवाद की वजह से हिन्दुस्तान का बहुत नुकसान हुआ और आजादी के बाद जो यह भाषावाद की बीमारी कभी आती है तो यह कम्यूनिज्म से भी बदतर स्वरूप धारण करती है। तो इसलिये उनका जो संशोधन है, तरमीम है, उसमें छूपा हुआ भाषावाद है कि चूंकि तामिल लैंगुएज है तो तामिलनाडु बनना चाहिये। बंगल में प्रान्त आंध्र का है, जहां तेलगू बोलने वाले लोग रहते हैं तो तेलगू प्रान्त नहीं बना, बंगल में केरल है जहां मलयालम बोलते हैं तो मलयालम प्रान्त नहीं बना, बंगल में कर्नाटक के लोग कन्नड बोलते हैं, उसका नाम मैसूर स्टेट क्यों है, इसके लिये वह जरूरी समझते हैं कि जनता का नाम लेकर घड़ियाल के आंसू बहाएं। वे

कहते हैं जनता की पुकार पर हम इस तरह का बिल यहां लाए हैं। यह बात उनको शोभा नहीं देती। इसलिये जब आंध्र के लोग तेलगू भाषी हो कर उस स्टेट का नाम नहीं बदलना चाहते हैं, मलयालम बोलने वाले केरल के लोग केरल का नाम बदल कर मलयालम नहीं रखना चाहते हैं, कन्नड बोलने वाले मैसूर का नाम नहीं बदल रहे हैं, तो ये तामिलनाडु का बात क्यों कर रहे हैं। हम बिहार का नाम नहीं बदलने देंगे, औरों का नाम नहीं बदलने देंगे; क्योंकि यह जरूरी नहीं है कि भाषा के नाम पर इस तरह का परिवर्तन हो। उन्होंने हवाला दिया कि कांग्रेस ने पुराने जमाने में जितने भाषा के आधार पर इलाके थे उनके नाम पर अपनी प्रान्तीय कांग्रेस कमेटियां रखीं। कांग्रेस ने इसलिये नाम रखा; क्योंकि उस समय यह जरूरी था, उस समय बड़े-बड़े प्रान्त थे, मद्रास एक प्रेसीडेन्सी था, उसमें कन्नड बोलने वाले भी थे, तेलगू बोलने वाले भी थे, मलयालम बोलने वाले भी थे और तामिल बोलने वाले तो थे ही। इसलिये भाषा के आधार पर यह हुआ हालांकि हमारी समझ से वह भी गलती थी, जो कांग्रेस के कुछ लोगों ने, हमारे कुछ नेताओं ने की। अतीत में भी इसी के आधार पर कार्य की सहूलियत की दृष्टि से ऐसा किया गया। लेकिन जो बीज बोया गया, उसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि आजादी के बाद एक दुर्घटना हुई, वह आंध्र में हुई और उसी दुर्घटना के शिकार आज हमारे साथी भूपेश गुप्त हो गए हैं। उससे हिन्दुस्तान का नुकसान हुआ। तो मैं कह रहा था कि उन्होंने बम्बई सिटी में एक प्रान्तीय कांग्रेस कमेटी बना दी, भाषा के आधार पर नहीं; क्योंकि बम्बई सिटी में तो कितनी ही भाषाएं बोली जाती हैं, गुजराती, कन्नड, मराठी वगैरह, लेकिन उन्होंने बम्बई प्रान्तीय कांग्रेस कमेटी के अलावा गुजरात प्रान्तीय कांग्रेस कमेटी तथा महाराष्ट्र प्रान्तीय कांग्रेस कमेटी

बनाई। तो कार्य की सहूलियत के लिये ऐसा किया गया, इसलिये नहीं किया गया कि इन्हीं आधारों पर प्रान्तों का निर्माण होगा। अगर कलकत्ता से भाग हो जाये कि कलकत्ता प्रान्तीय कांग्रेस कमेटी बननी चाहिये और कामरेड भूपेश गुप्ता के साथी मान लें, तो बंगाल में कलकत्ता प्रान्तीय कमेटी बन सकती है। तो जहां भाषा के नाम से प्रान्तीय कांग्रेस कमेटी बनी, तो वह कार्य की सहूलियत का सवाल था, उसका मतलब यह नहीं था कि भाषा ही के आधार पर राज्यों का निर्माण तथा नाम होगा। जहां तक हमारे बिहार प्रान्त का सवाल है, वहां पर भी हमारी अलग-अलग बिहार तथा उत्कल कमेटियां चलती थीं, यद्यपि उस समय बिहार व उत्कल एक ही प्रान्त था। तो इसलिये जहां भाषा के आधार पर उन्होंने कहा कि प्रान्तों का नाम बदलना चाहिये, उन्होंने उसका इशारा किया कि चूंकि कांग्रेस कमेटी ने अतीत काल में इस प्रिंसिपल को मान लिया है और इसलिये इसका नाम परिवर्तन कर देना चाहिये, उनकी यह दलील उचित नहीं है; क्योंकि कार्य की सहूलियत से एक ही प्रान्त में, शहर में भी, प्रान्तीय कांग्रेस कमेटी बनाई गई। इसलिये यह जो आर्गुमेण्ट उनका है वह लचर आर्गुमेण्ट है और यह कोई ठीक दलील नहीं है।

मैं यह कह रहा था कि जहां तक यह नाम है, मद्रास राज्य का, तो वह एक प्रचलित नाम है, मद्रास की, तामिलनाड की

जनता जो है, वह इसको जानती है। अब हो सकता है कि जैसा उन्होंने कहा मद्रास की जनता की मांग है—मैं नहीं कहता जनता की मांग है, जनता की तो मांग नहीं है—कि उसी के नाम पर “तामिलनाड” उसका उच्चारण हो। मैं यह कह रहा था कि अगर वह शब्द अच्छा होता और दूसरे लोगों को उनसे प्रेरणा होती, तो बगल में, आंध्र में, लोग वहां की सरकार को मजबूर करते कि उनके प्रान्त का नाम भी तेलगू प्रान्त रखें। तो कहीं इस चीज की मांग नहीं की गई और कहीं यदि भूपेश गुप्ता जी की बात को मान कर और लोग भी ऐसा जैसा कि मद्रास प्रान्त के, तामिलनाड के लोग हैं और जैसे द्रविड़ मुनेत्र कड़म के लोग हैं, वे भी चाहते हों—लेकिन द्रविड़ मुनेत्र कड़म के लोग तो हिन्दुस्तान से भी बहुत दूर जाना चाहते हैं—मैं यह कह रहा था कि उनके आर्गुमेण्ट को याद कुछ समय के लिये मान भी लिया जाय, तो उनकी यह बीमारी दूसरे प्रान्तों में भी जायेगी और दूसरे प्रान्तों में सिर्फ नाम के परिवर्तन की बात नहीं होगी, बल्कि एक प्रान्त चार टुकड़ों में विभक्त होगा और यह चीज देश के लिए अच्छी नहीं होगी।

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

इसलिये डिप्टी चेयरमैन महोदया, शुरू में मैंने बताया कि यह बीमारी, जो हमारे बिहार वाले हैं, उनको खटकने वाली है; क्योंकि हमारे राज्य में इस तरह के आन्दोलन

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

होते हैं कि बगध प्रान्त अलग बना दो, भोजपुरी बोलनेवाला प्रान्त अलग बना दो, दो करोड़ मैथिली बोलने वालों का प्रान्त अलग बना दो और झारखंड प्रान्त अलग बना दो। तो उनके आर्गुमेण्ट पर भाषा के आधार पर पंजाब में भी यह बीमारी होगी और हो भी रही है। यद्यपि हमारे साथी भूपेश गुप्त यह कहते हैं कि हमें भाषावाद से दूर रहना चाहिये, लेकिन वे सदन में इस तरह का संशोधन लाकर भाषावाद को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं जिससे देश को नुकसान हो सकता है। यदि मद्रास की शासक पार्टी कामरेड भूपेश गुप्त की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी और अण्णादुरै की, डी०एम०के० पार्टी वाले इस बात को मान लेते हैं कि मद्रास का नाम "तामिल नाड" होना चाहिये, तो यह देश की एकता, के लिये उचित नहीं होगा। यदि यह मान भी लिया जाये कि मद्रास की शासन पार्टी उनकी बात को मान लेती है लेकिन जब तक संसद् इस तरह का प्रस्ताव स्वीकार नहीं कर लेती, तब तक मद्रास का नाम तामिलनाड नहीं रखा जा सकता है। मद्रास प्रान्त की असेम्बली को अपनी राय देने का अधिकार है लेकिन यह पार्लियामेंट का कार्य है कि वह इस तरह के संशोधन को स्वीकार करती है या नहीं। जब तक पार्लियामेंट इस तरह के संशोधन को स्वीकार नहीं करती, तब तक इस तरह के संशोधन को नहीं माना जा सकता है। इस तरह से भाषावाद के नाम पर जो तरसीम यहां पर लाई गई है और जिसको हमारे साथी श्री भूपेश गुप्त आगे बढ़ाना चाहते हैं उससे हिन्दुस्तान के दूसरे बड़े प्रान्त टुकड़े-टुकड़े हो जायेंगे।

हमारे कांग्रेस के कर्णधारों ने भाषा के नाम पर जो बटवारा किया, वह केवल प्रशासनिक दृष्टि को सामने रख कर किया लेकिन उस समय से जो मनोवृत्ति देश में देखने में आ रही है, उससे देश को नुकसान होने वाला है।

हमारे कामरेड श्री भूपेश गुप्त कम्युनिज्म में विश्वास रखते हैं और वे चाहते हैं कि सारी दुनिया में गरीबों और मजदूरों का राज्य हो तो जाये। लेकिन वे तामिलनाड की जनता में धार्मिक भावनाओं को भड़का कर उन्हें बाकी देश की जनता से विभक्त करना चाहते हैं। यह उनकी पार्टी के लिये शोभा नहीं देता है। इसलिए मैं उनसे अपील करूंगा कि वे संविधान के फर्स्ट शिड्यूल में जो संशोधन करने की बात कर रहे हैं, उसे वापस ले लें। इस विषय में बहुसंख्यकता की आवश्यकता नहीं है क्योंकि भाषावाद की बात को रख कर इसकी बीमारी और प्रान्तों में भी फैल जायेगी। इसकी बीमारी पड़ोसी राज्य आन्ध्र में भी फैल जायेगी और वहां के लोग मांग करेंगे कि हमारे प्रान्त का नाम "तेलगू" रखा जाना चाहिये। केरल प्रान्त वाले कहेंगे कि हमारे प्रान्त का नाम "मलयालम" रख दिया जाये। इसी तरह से मैसूर प्रान्त के लोग कहेंगे कि हमारे प्रान्त का नाम "कन टिक" रख दिया जाये। इस के बाद यह बीमारी बिहार प्रान्त में भी आने वाली है और वहां के लोग मांग करेंगे कि हमारे प्रान्त को चार हिस्सों में बांट दिया जाना चाहिये। इसलिए इस समय जब कि देश में संकटकालीन अवस्था है, इस तरह का संशोधन लाना, उमको बढ़ावा देना, उचित मालूम नहीं देता है और इस तरह से देश में राष्ट्रीय एकता नहीं हो सकती है। इस तरह से तो हम हिन्दुस्तान को टुकड़ों में करने की प्रवृत्ति को बढ़ावा देना चाहते हैं। इसलिए एक कम्युनिस्ट होने के नाते साथी श्री भूपेश गुप्त को इस तरह की विश्रंखल मनोवृत्ति की बात नहीं कहनी चाहिये। इस तरह से भाषावाद की बात को भड़का कर जनता में आन्दोलन करना उचित मालूम नहीं देता है और यह बात बहुत दिनों तक चलने वाली नहीं है, हम श्री भूपेश गुप्त की बात मान भी लेते, परन्तु मद्रास की जनता यह बात नहीं चाहती है कि उसका नाम बदल दिया जाये। वहां के लोग तमिल भाषा बोलते हैं और वह उनकी एक प्रिय भाषा है। इस तरह से वह की जनता अपनी भाषा को चाहती

है और भाषा के नाम पर वह अपने प्रान्त का नाम नहीं चाहती है। लेकिन हमारे साथी श्री भूपेश गुप्त उनको यह सिखलाना चाहते हैं कि वे अपने प्रान्त का नाम भाषा के आधार पर रखें। इस तरह से वे और प्रान्तों को भी बढ़ावा देना चाहते हैं कि वहां के लोग भी अपने अपने प्रान्तों का नाम भाषा के आधार पर रखें। इसलिए मैं फिर उन से अपील करता हूँ कि वे इस तरह की बात को, इस तरह की तरमीम को यहां पर न लायें; क्योंकि इससे देश को नुकसान पहुंचने वाला है।

श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने अपने भाषण में बम्बई प्रान्त का हवाला दिया और कहा है कि बम्बई प्रान्त का नाम "महाराष्ट्र" कर दिया गया। मैं उन से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि बम्बई पहले एक द्विभाषी राज्य था। हम लोगों ने इस बात की मुखातिफ की और कहा कि बम्बई प्रान्त जो १५० सालों से एक रहा है, उसका दो भागों में विभाजन नहीं होना चाहिये। चूंकि बम्बई प्रान्त को दो प्रान्तों यानी बम्बई और गुजरात प्रान्तों में बदल दिया गया है, इसलिए वहां के लोगों ने बम्बई प्रान्त को महाराष्ट्र प्रान्त कहना उचित समझा। इसलिए वहां की जनता की मांग पर यह बात मानी गई और यह नाम स्वीकार किया गया। लेकिन यहां पर यह दलील देना कि चूंकि बम्बई की बात को आपने मान लिया इसलिए तामिलनाडु की बात भी मान लेनी चाहिये, उपयुक्त मालूम नहीं होता है। इसलिए मैं अपने साथी श्री भूपेश गुप्त से अपील करूंगा कि उन्होंने जो संशोधन रख है उससे भाषावाद की मनोवृत्ति को बढ़ावा मिलता है। देश में विश्रंखलता फैली है और राष्ट्रीय एकता को नुकसान पहुंचता है। उनकी यह दलील भी उचित मालूम नहीं होती है चूंकि उन्हें मद्रास में वहां की जनता ने तामिलनाडु का प्रचार करने के लिये २० हजार की थैली दी है, तो वे उसको लेकर सारे देश में भाषावाद का जहर फैलायें? इस

तरह की दलील का कोई औचित्य नहीं है और वे इस चीज को सामने रख कर इस सदन में इस तरह का संशोधन लाते हैं, तो यह कोई अच्छी बात नहीं है। इसलिए मैं उनसे अपील करूंगा कि वे अपना हृदय विशाल बनायें। उन्हें वहां की जनता की समस्या को हल करने का काम करना चाहिये, जनता की गरीबी को दूर करने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये न कि इस तरह की भाषा की बातों को ला कर, जिसे लोग भूल गये हों फिर से याद दिलाया जाये। आज जनता भाषा की बात को भूल गई है, लेकिन हमारे साथी श्री भूपेश गुप्त जी फिर उस को जगाना चाहते हैं। जिस तरह की वे बात कर रहे हैं उसकी बीमारी पड़ोस के प्रान्तों, यानी आंध्र, केरल और मैसूर में भी फैल जायेगी। इस तरह से ऐन उस वक्त जब कि चीन का हमारे देश के ऊपर आक्रमण हुआ है, उन्होंने भी उसे आक्रमण माना है, इस तरह की बातों को लाने का कोई अर्थ नहीं होता है। इस तरह की बातों को लाकर आगे जो खतरा होने वाला है, खासकर हमारे प्रान्त में जो खतरा होने वाला है, उसको देखते हुए उन्हें इस तरह रीजनलिज्म और भाषावाद की बात को बढ़ावा नहीं देना चाहिये। अभी हमारे प्रान्त बिहार में इस तरह की बीमारी चल रही है और वहां के लोग उस प्रान्त को चार टुकड़ों में बांट देना चाहते हैं। वहां कुछ लोग भोजपुरी, मगधी, मैथिली और झारखंड प्रान्त बनाने की बात कर रहे हैं। मैथिली बोलने वाले कहते हैं कि हमारा प्रान्त अलग होना चाहिये। इसी तरह से भोजपुरी भाषा बोलने वाले कहते हैं कि हमारा अलग प्रांत बनना चाहिये तथा झारखण्ड वाले जो यहां पर बैठे हैं वे कहते हैं कि हमारा अलग से प्रान्त बनना चाहिये। इस तरह की बीमारी हमारे बिहार प्रान्त में फैल रही है और पनप रही है, जो देश की एकता के लिए तथा समाजवाद के लिए एक खतरनाक बात है। इसलिये मैं उनसे अपील करूंगा कि वे इस संशोधन को वापस

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

ले लें। मैं सरकार तथा तामिलनाडु के सदस्यों से भा कहूंगा कि वे इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करें और राज्य सभा के सभी सदस्यों से अपील करूंगा कि वे श्री भूपेश गुप्त द्वारा रखे गये संशोधन का मुखालिफ़त करें। उन के इस प्रस्ताव का जबर्दस्त विरोध होना चाहिये; क्योंकि इसका इस समय कोई औचित्य नहीं है। इस समय तो हमें जनता की आर्थिक हालत को सुधारना है, उन का रोटों की समस्या का समाधान करना है। लेकिन हमारे साथ इस प्रस्ताव को ला कर सारे देश में भाषावाद के विवाद को फिर से उभारना चाहते हैं, जो कि एक बहुत ही खतरनाक बात है। इसलिये मैं सरकार से निवेदन करूंगा कि श्री भूपेश गुप्त संविधान के शिड्यूल में संशोधन करने के लिए जो बिल लाये है कि "मद्रास प्रान्त" का नाम "तामिलनाडु" कर दिया जाये, उसे कभी भा स्वीकार नहीं किया जाना चाहिये हर एक सदस्य को, जो इस देश की एकता चाहता है, उसे इस प्रस्ताव का हृदय से विरोध करना चाहिये। श्री भूपेश गुप्त अपने इस बिल द्वारा देश में भाषावाद, कम्युनिज्म, राजनलिज्म का बमारा को फिर से लाना चाहते हैं, इस लिए सब सदस्यों को इस बिल का विरोध करना चाहिये। मैं अन्त में उनसे भी अपील करूंगा कि देश का यूनियन के नाम पर, एकता के नाम पर, समाजवाद के नाम पर, अपने इस बिल को वे वापस ले लें और सदस्यों को भा इस बिल की सख्त मुखालिफ़त करनी चाहिये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं श्री भूपेश गुप्त का जो संशोधन है उसका विरोध करता हूँ।
जय हिन्द।

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Madam Deputy Chairman, this is a very simple measure but before I say anything on the measure itself, I would like to say to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that I am sorry that Mr. Ramamurti is not here. I consider him as a very esteem-

ed colleague but when I objected, I did not object regarding Mr. Ramamurti but I objected to the way in which he was comparing the policy of the Government of India with the policy of China.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I did not refer to Indo-China question at all.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I assure him that I am sorry Mr. Ramamurti is not here to participate in this debate.

Coming to the Bill itself, my learned friend has taken seventy minutes but I assure you, Madam, that I would not take more than seven minutes. The whole point is that the name Madras should be changed to Tamil Nad. There are two points that have been made by the mover. The first is that it is the desire of the people of Tamil Nad and the other point that he made was that in view of the reorganisation of India according to language, Madras should be called Tamil Nad. I would meet both these points and close my arguments. Regarding the first, I am glad he has paid an eloquent tribute to the Chief Minister of Madras, Mr. Kamaraj Nadar. I share his views so far as this tribute goes and I think the moment the people of Madras or Tamil Nad desire, and through the proper source of the legislature, indicate their desire for a change of the name, I am sure this Parliament will do it without any argument and without any delay. The whole thing is, so far as I know—and I am sure that my friend, Mr. Santhanam and other friends who come from Tamil Nad will be in a better position to speak—there is divided opinion there. There are people who are in favour of a change in the name while there are others who do not want the name to be changed. So it is not for Parliament to come in and say, 'do this or do not do this'. It is for the people of Tamil Nad to say what they desire. That is so far as the desire and the wishes of the people of Tamil Nad are concerned.

Regarding reorganisation, I am sorry my learned friend has not given even the slightest consideration to the fact that even after reorganisation we have not changed the names according to the language and there is no intention of doing it unless the people desire it because we know that so far as the establishment of the *prant* according to the language was concerned, it was a long-standing commitment of the Congress and they have honoured that but at the same time it is the utmost desire of all the people that in this diversity we should introduce elements which go to make for the unity and solidarity of the country. We do not want to create further differences or intensify the differences whether they may be on the basis of *prant*, whether they may be on the basis of language or anything. As my learned friend said, apart from language there are other considerations and those other considerations also should be fully kept in view. He very correctly pointed out about Andhra Pradesh. There was a move that it should be called Telugu Pradesh but the people on the whole thought that Andhra Pradesh was the proper name and we stick to it. Similarly it has been pointed out about Kerala. And as you and I know there is a very strong opinion in Mysore Assembly for that State to be called Karnataka Pradesh and there is an equally strong opinion in favour of Mysore. Is it for the Centre to say, 'no, you change it to this'? That would be a wrong policy and it would not be in the interest of the country either. So far as this is concerned, Madam, I submit it is not for us to say anything; it is for the people of the Tamil Nad. Certainly, the Parliament will see that all those forces which go for integration are strengthened and foster a unity in this diversity with love and affection of all the people concerned.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If I am prepared to say that I am prepared to defer the discussion on this and let the Bill be circulated for opinion

among the people of Tamil Nad, are you prepared to accept it?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: My friend very well knows that I would throw out his suggestion; it is obvious. It is the duty of the people of Tamil Nad and the Madras legislature. When my friend loses his ground here, he starts talking anything so that he could get at least propaganda for his party. I won't go to the length of saying—as Mr. Yajee suggested—that they get fees and a pay of Rs. 20,000/- to sponsor this but it is true that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will do if it serves the ends of his party. That is the main consideration. He has no axe to grind. He has no personal motive. I can gladly agree with it and appreciate that, but for the sake of the party he will do anything. Even sometimes voluntarily or involuntarily he will go against the basic policies of the country which go to make for integrity and solidarity of the country. Anyhow my point is this. So far as my friend is concerned, apart from the fact that he has made a propaganda stand for his party, seeing Mr. Annadurai here he wants to win a place of love and affection with him. There is nothing more in this. I think Mr. Annadurai is very experienced and I am sure he understands Mr. Bhupesh Gupta very well and so I do not think that his overtures of love and affection will influence an experienced and able leader like my hon. friend, Mr. Annadurai. So I think this measure should be thrown out. With these words I oppose this Bill.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: Madam Deputy Chairman, we are extremely grateful to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta for espousing the so-called desire of the people of Tamil Nad. It is sometimes the prayer of all that we should be saved from our friends. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is one such friend. It is a great pity that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta could think that there are no representatives here of Tamil Nad to espous the cause of Tamil Nad and

[Shri T. S. Pattabiraman.]

that he should become the self-appointed spokesman of Tamil Nad. His Bill, as my friends have already pointed out, has only propaganda value and he brought in very cleverly the question of the release of Mr. Ramamurti. He could have made a straight demand for the release of Mr. Ramamurti and the Government would have given him a straight reply that he must change his opinion and behave better. That would have been the straight course. My friend wants that the Communist Party which is tottering in Tamil Nad, which is losing all its roots in Tamil Nad, should pick up with this propaganda which he has been making here for nearly 70 minutes. Madam, it is a well known principle that it is the people of the State who have to decide what name they should have for their States. The Madras Assembly has already decided—of course it was not a decision—but there was a Resolution by Mr. Chinadurai and later it was withdrawn. Afterwards neither the Madras Assembly, nor even the Communist Members, nor other parties have brought forward any Resolution to the effect that the name of Madras must be changed to Tamil Nad. They are perfectly satisfied with the present name. We know that if we give it a linguistic twist, it will be opening the Pandora's Box, once you begin to give recognition for a language as the basis for naming a State. Let not Mr. Bhupesh Gupta forget that among the total population of three crores in Tamil Nad more than a third speak Telugu, Kanarese Urdu and other languages, and we in Tamil Nad have been living in perfect amity. There have been no linguistic clashes, no linguistic differences, no linguistic quarrels, between us and we have been living in perfect amity. And I am sure that if this Bill of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is accepted, it will create conflicts and bitterness. Moreover he must also know that in the Services in Madras more than 40 to 50 per cent are people whose mother-tongue is not Tamil but Telugu and other languages. 20

to 30 per cent are Kerala people and their language is Malayalam. So if you want to call it Tamil Nad, I am afraid Mr. Bhupesh Gupta—he is a clever orator, a brilliant speaker, a person who could argue out a case even though there is no substance in it—could still not point out or bring forth any point which the House could accept for changing the name. There were no arguments at all. He was only speaking about the wishes of the people. I am sure that we understand the wishes of the people there better than Mr. Bhupesh Gupta sitting in Bengal or in Delhi or making a whirlwind tour for three or four days. So far as the elections are concerned, they are an indication. He gave an indication about the elections. He counted some million votes and all those things. But he forgot that there are only two political parties in Tamil Nad which have as their aim in their own constitution that the name of the State should be changed to Tamil Nad. One is the "We Tamil Party" of Mr. Adityan and the other is the "Tamil Arasu Kazhagam" led by Mr. Sivagnana Gramanar. The "Tamil Arasu Kazhagam" by and large did not contest the elections. They supported all the Congress candidates during the last elections. Secondly, the "We Tamil Party", which has been led by Mr. Adityan, contested about 7 to 8 seats. They are a virulent type of Tamilians. They say that Tamil Nad must be only for people who speak Tamil and all that. Those people were routed in the elections. All of them were defeated. So, if elections are any indication to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, these two political parties, which had as their basic demand the change of the name of Madras to Tamil Nad, were completely routed. As a good democrat he is, at present, he should accept the verdict and should not raise the issue again.

Then, let him go into the other matters. He wanted to say that the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam and others got four million votes and all that. It is all accepted. We cannot

hide that. But I can assure you and I can assure Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that none of these parties had this as a slogan for the elections. This demand did not find a place in the election manifesto, i.e., the name of the State should be changed, of any of these parties. The Communist Party had an electoral alliance. He said we did not have unity. That is quite correct. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, if he thinks quietly and calmly, will know that his two candidates, Mr. Anandan Nambiar and Mr. Umanatha Rao, were returned to Parliament only with the support of the DMK in those constituencies. There they did not set up MLAs against the DMK and the DMK did not set up candidates for Parliament and as a result of the electoral alliance Mr. Bhupesh Gupta got all these things.

He used a very clever legal language that we did not have unity. But an electoral alliance is definitely injurious to unity and I am sure Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will not forget that.

I do not want to take much time. Please leave it to us. If we want to have a change, let the Madras Assembly pass a resolution for that. I am sure this Government will accept it and the Government itself will bring forward a resolution. It is better that it is left to the people of Madras and to their elected representatives.

Another point which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should consider is: Is it historically right to call Madras Tamil Nad? I submit it is not. We are better understood in this world as Madras or Madrasis than Tamilians. The name of Madras can be located and recognised by people all over the world and it has got a place all over the world.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have misunderstood it. In Bengal, if anyone came from the South, in the old days, he would be a Madrasi, whether he was from Telengana or from Malayalam.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: I will come to that. Even in Delhi and in north India anybody who comes from the south of India is called a Madrasi. It is very good. So, Madras does not denote any linguistic, regional or parochial feeling. Anybody who comes from the South of India is called a Madrasi.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is the reason why you want it.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: I do not want to be as narrow-minded as you are. Let the word 'Madrasi' connote as many people as possible. He will find that Bengal may be historically true. There has been Bengal and there must be Kerala historically. But there has been no Tamil Nad historically. It is only the creation of politicians, of political parties of a recent date. There was nothing in existence as a unified Tamil Nad till about five hundred years ago. It was 'Pandya Nad' or 'Chera Nad' or 'Chola Nad'. There has never been historically a Tamil Nad. And why do you want to create a new one, when historically it is not justified? It is not justified politically. It is not justified democratically. Just to satisfy the whims and fancies of communists and to get a proper atmosphere for Mr. Ramamurti's release, please do not make us a pawn in your game. We know you very much, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, and we appreciate you are a good friend at times. Tamil Nad people are very fond of him. But do not hinder us. Do not try to throw us into disputes. Once you create a sort of Tamil Nad, the Telugu-speaking people, who number about 50 lakhs in Tamil Nad will say: Our mother-tongue is Telugu. Why do you call it Tamil Nad? We have got plenty of border areas where Malayalis, Andhras and Kannadigas are there. They are living in amity. For example, the Hosur area and Kollegal area are populated by Kannadigas and Telugus and they are living in peace because Madras is Madras. But once you try to create the name of Tamil Nad,

[Shri T. S. Pattabiraman.] somebody else will say—I do not say that the Communist Party will demand it—the “We Tamil” Party will say that only Tamilians should reside in Tamil Nad and all others should get out. This will be opening the Pandora's box. Sane as he is, very argumentative as he is, very reasonable as he is at times, I would appeal to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta not to create dissensions amongst us. Allow us to decide it. If we want to have the name as Tamil Nad, I can assure him that the Congress as one of the biggest organisations—I will not say the only organisation, though it is the major political organisation in Madras—can take care of the interests of the people. I strongly repudiate the suggestion that Congressmen talk one thing here and talk another thing there. I would urge Mr. Bhupesh Gupta not to make such insinuations. We Congressmen can stand on our own legs. We can feel, act and speak what we have in our mind and we are at perfect liberty. As a matter of fact, I can assure him that no whip has been issued to us. We can now talk whatever we like. So, we in Tamil Nad, especially Congressmen of Tamil Nad can speak freely.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Even without a whip you are saying this. Heaven only knows what you would say if there had been a whip.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: It is because your Bill is very injurious to the people of Tamil Nad and this country. If it is allowed to become law, it will create dissensions and perhaps dissension is something in which communists can thrive. Perhaps it is with that motive that you have brought forward this Bill. If that is so, I can understand why you have brought forward this Bill. I submit that there is no justification for changing the name. We in Tamil Nad do not want this name to be changed from Madras to Tamil Nad because we are better known as Madras than as Tamil Nad people,

So, before closing my speech I would appeal to you not to press the Bill, but withdraw it in the interests of the people of Tamil Nad themselves.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: Madam Deputy Chairman, I think the Bill is altogether irregular. I was not here when it was first moved. Otherwise, I would have argued that it is wholly unconstitutional, because any legislation dealing with the reorganisation of State, viz., either to increase the area of any State diminish the area of any State, alter the boundaries of any State or alter the name of any State should be done under article 3.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has been decided by the Chairman.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: I am not questioning the ruling of the Chairman. I am only saying that even assuming that constitutionally the Bill is all right under article 368, it takes away the valuable safeguard that is provided against hasty introduction of such Bills. It provides that the President should first give his permission and then it should be sent to the Legislature and the opinion of the people should be ascertained before any such legislation is brought in Parliament.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): It is a change of name. I think his argument is wide of the mark.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: My friend has not read the Constitution. I am sorry. It is stated in article 3 (e): alter the name of any State. The Bill affects the name of a State. Therefore, this article 3 has to be read.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not think we can go into the ruling of the Chair. The Chairman has given his ruling, that the debate can go on.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Parliament may by law deal with such matters, not by changing the Constitution. Then, these things have to be done.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: That is exactly the point. They have provided this article and they have provided that it should be done by law, not by a constitutional amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No. Any way, I shall answer that.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: It will take a lot of time to elaborate this point. As my hon. friend said some time back, I was in the Constituent Assembly. We provided various ways of amending the Constitution. So far as the States' reorganisation is concerned, article 3 provided an easy method that is by law and not by a constitutional amendment. Therefore, by short-circuiting article 3, even assuming that the constitutional amendment is valid, I think he has done a great deal of harm because it is necessary that first the people of the State concerned should express their opinion before

any such issue is discussed.
1 P.M. A mere discussion of matters relating to a State may do a great deal of harm unless the opinion comes from the State concerned. The second point is, if Mr. Bhupesh Gupta had known the history, the Tamil Nad people had to wage a regular campaign for retaining the City of Madras entirely within the Tamil Nad area. There was a dispute between Andhra and Tamil Nad and on that very great leaders also began to quarrel with one another, and finally the Tamil Nad people secured their point. Today the city of Madras can be considered as one of the greatest cultural and industrial centres in the country. Therefore, the Tamil Nad people are quite content to have the name of their State called by Madras. It does not take away the greatness of the Tamil language. Madras is also becoming the centre of Tamil language, Tamil literature and Tamil culture. Therefore, there is no purpose in anybody trying to disturb the existing state, and as a friend has pointed out, if there is any such feeling, it must first come through the

Legislature of Madras. If the Legislature of Madras wants to have the name changed, I do not think the Parliament will come in the way. Therefore, I am sorry that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should have brought the Bill knowing that it is a pure publicity stunt, because the motion for consideration itself is not at all likely to get the absolute majority of the House. There is not even five per cent chance of its securing a majority of the House. Why should he bring a Bill in such circumstances especially when he is dealing with other people? This is surely fishing in troubled waters, and I think it is not a proper thing to do.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at two minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, the VICE-CHAIRMAN, (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Sir, first of all, I want to raise a point of order. It is this. One hon. Member said that the Bill had been moved for publicity stunt purpose. I think this is unparliamentary, imputing motives, imputing that it was not moved out of genuine considerations. So, either the Member should withdraw it or it should be expunged from the proceedings.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): There is no point of order involved because, as far as I can see, 'stunt' is not an unparliamentary word; 'publicity stunt' is not unparliamentary in my opinion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, it was not my point to raise it because I might say that others also say 'stunt'. That is not the point. It is not the question. Whether the word is unparliamentary or not is not the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
only consideration. You see, he used that word; it is 'publicity stunt.' Therefore, if I have been guided by any other motive than normal motives for . . .

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: I want to know what he is doing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am speaking.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: On what?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On whatever you like.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: I want to know whether you want a ruling or what.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: At the moment, the lady is speaking.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Not three at a time, one at a time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is very interesting.

* SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): I want your ruling on this question whether it is permissible for Members to talk to each other without any reference to you. I know that the procedure of the House is that the Chair must be addressed and here I have noticed that Members address each other and carry on conversation with each other.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): All interruptions should be through the Chair. If anybody wants to interrupt any other Member, he should get up and address the Chair and then interrupt.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How can we make an interruption? Are you conservative, Sir? How can I say? Interruption is interruption. You do not have all the time to look at the Chair, have somebody in mind, utter

a word through you, Sir, all this thing. . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, there cannot be a running commentary. When another Member is speaking, you cannot go on interrupting and that is what I have noticed that when any other Member is speaking, some Members make it a point to go on interrupting.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Well, interruptions are allowed in parliamentary practice.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Interruptions are allowed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How do we know? Then we have to go through the proceedings.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): We need not go into this question.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If this is not easily allowed, then we have to go through the proceedings, calculate with a watch whether it is there every minute. But suppose it is not there every minute, suppose there are ten interruptions; divide $4\frac{1}{2}$ hours by ten.

AN HON. MEMBER: Any running interruptions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Running means it must run all through.

AN HON. MEMBER: But they have also been saying.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): And then, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta probably forgets another convention that an interruption is only permissible if the other Member has yielded.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Yes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Two Members cannot be on their legs at the same time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is right. Sitting interruption and some . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Sitting interruption is to be discouraged at all costs.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Interruption . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You come to your point.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You seem to be thinking of a particular way. It is too late in the day. What about 'stunt'?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): About 'stunt' I have already said.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is it all right?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Yes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, Mr. Santhanam can make a stunt here. It is all right.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Sir, I have listened carefully, in fact very carefully, to the speeches of the hon. Members coming from Tamil Nad. They made very fighting speeches. They fought but without sword, without any argument. That is the whole point because you will notice that in all their speeches they said that the people of Tamil Nad used that nomenclature. All along they referred to Tamil Nad, the State of Tamil Nad, the people of Tamil Nad. That is what they said. In fact, their speeches make it certain that this is not for stunt, for publicity stunt, purposes. This Bill is reasonable, genuine, reflecting a genuine right

of the people of Tamil Nad. In fact, their very speeches nail down this point. So, what this Bill seeks to do is to give *de jure* recognition to a *de facto* fact that is there. That is the first point that I want to make.

Then, the argument has been advanced that there are in the State of Tamil Nad—or the State of Madras as it is now called—certain sections of people speaking the Malayalee or the Telugu languages and that if the name of the State of Madras is changed to that of Tamil Nad, it will disrupt the position. I do not know from where from which armoury, they invented or procured or secured this argument. In fact, in almost in every State of India, besides the people of that State who are speaking the language of that State and are resident of that State, all other sections, various linguistic groups, from all parts of India, reside in that State, whether it is West Bengal, Maharashtra or Madras, in any State whatsoever. But for that reason, it is not forbidden that Maharashtra should not be called the State of Maharashtra because there are Malayalees residing there, because there are Tamil people living there or because there are Hindustani-speaking people living there. No such argument could be raised. Then, why do they raise this arguments? In fact, in almost all the States, certain people from other States do reside. That is a historical fact. But that does not prevent the people of that State from having their own State Legislature, their own habits and ways of life. It is a commonly accepted democratic practice. So, I was sorry, rather I was astonished and pained, to hear this sort of argument advanced by them because even in the case of Members who advanced this argument in their speeches, their State language was the Tamil language. So, if we expand this argument, what it amounts to is this because they have made Tamil as the official language of the State of Madras, the Malayalee-speaking people may raise an objection or the Telugu-speaking people may raise an

[Shri Niren Ghosh.] objection; it may create division; it may create disruption. Then no State in India can have its own State language. What are now called as the regional languages, they are all enumerated in the Constitution as the national languages. So, this is simply a funny argument that has been put forward. And then why is there such an infatuation for the name 'Madras' given by the Britishers? It was said that the State of Malayalam-speaking people is called Kerala. But Kerala is a name which was current in our country for hundreds and hundreds of years—it was not imported, or somehow implanted—and that name was there. Similar is the case with Mysore, and any student of history knows that for hundreds of years there was such a thing called Mysore. It was not imported by the Britishers, or a strange name grafted by the Britishers on to some part of the country, or to certain city, or something like that. So I cannot follow why this sort of argument should be advanced at all.

Then, if you change the name of the State from 'Madras' to 'Tamilnad', the city of 'Madras' remains; that name is not changed. What the people all over India know, or all parts of the world know, that is, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras—names of three major cities—or Delhi, or something like that well, in their cases nobody suggests change of names, their names remain, and likewise the name of 'Madras' city will remain. So there can be no objection to Madras State being named 'Tamilnad.' But then Mr. Santhanam advanced a peculiar argument. He said, "We are happy with Madras. We do not want that name to go away." He also raised the objection saying that the people do not want it. But it is not a fact either way. If the State is 'Tamilnad,' the city yet remains unaffected, and it is 'Madras'. There has been no proposal to change the name of the city of Madras to anything else. For example, there is the State of Maharashtra. Its capital is Bombay. It is

called Bombay even after the formation of the State of Maharashtra. That name still remains. Though the name was perhaps given by the Britishers, that city and that name remain. So that is not a point at all.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM (Madras): Why not change the name of the city also?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Why?

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: Why not do it? 191

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: If the people want it, we will do it. But nobody wants it. What the people of a certain locality want, that you should respect. Somehow or other they are attached to a name for a long time, may be very ancient, may be that it is connected with their traditions or customs and they consider it to be their own, part and parcel of their social fabric, and that is why they stick to that name.

SHRI SATYACHARAN (Uttar Pradesh): By way of clarification I would like to know from the hon. Member if there is some sort of proposal on behalf of the Madras Government, or from the people, to change the name from 'Madras' to 'Tamilnad' because, from what I see, this is a Bill which has been brought on the floor of this House by the hon. Member opposite, not on behalf of the Madras State, and this is a Bill which falls within the jurisdiction of the Madras State and not that of Parliament. This is my submission, Sir.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Sir, if on account of various party considerations, or otherwise, the ruling party chooses not to reflect or honour the urges of the people there, it is perfectly honourable and open to people from other parts of India, or other representatives from that State to try to honour the people's urges obtaining there. It is for you to explain, I think, Sir, it is for them to explain why the

ruling party there, as the other Member, Mr. Pattabiraman . . .

SHRI SATYACHARAN: It will be considered if it has at all come formally, Sir.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I could not follow

SHRI SATYACHARAN: I say, if there was any formal proposal on behalf of the Madras Government, which we have turned down, we could have been accused of being apathetic to the proposal—if it had come formally through the people and the State of Madras.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: No, no, what I said is this. If the Congress Party, which rules the State of Madras, if out of certain party considerations (*Interruptions*) or other factors obtaining there, if they prefer to by pass this question, not to honour the sentiments of the people there, it is for them to explain why their party has not brought forward such a resolution in the Madras State Assembly, passed it and forwarded it to Parliament. It is for them to explain, to us here, as also to the people of Tamil Nad. That is what I want to say.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Has anybody, besides the ruling party, brought a resolution in the Madras Assembly? Has any other party than the ruling party brought a Resolution or a Bill to this effect in the Madras Assembly?

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI (Madras): May I say . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You are speaking next.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: On a point of clarification on this point I may say that the Praja Socialist Party in Madras brought forward a non-official Resolution to this effect in 1959.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: And so that is how matters stand. At least one party has done it, and now our party is bringing it here. We may as well bring it there. Perhaps we will do so in future.

Then the question was raised that since in the elections the Congress Party got the majority of the seats, so the people of Madras or the State of Madras do not want that the name be changed. I think it is rather a curious and strange argument to make, because everybody knows that in the General Elections various policies and factors are taken into consideration by the voters when they cast their votes. The opinion of the electorate of the State of Madras was not taken on the single question whether the name of the 'State of Madras' should be changed to 'Tamil Nad.' Since this question has been raised by almost all Members from the Treasury Benches I throw a challenge here and now, let a referendum be taken of the people of Tamil Nad on this single issue only, whether they want the name of the State of Madras to be changed to that of 'Tamil Nad', or not.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: We do not believe in referendum.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: You do not?

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: No.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: You do not believe in democracy then. Why should you? You need not. (*Interruptions*).

So I throw a challenge, and since they say the people of the State of Madras do not want it, if they are bold enough, let them accept the challenge. Let the Government say so, that they will arrange for such a referendum; we will withdraw the Bill. Let it be referred to the people of Tamilnad, this single question. No other policy consideration should be involved or should be imported into this matter. Let there be one single question and let the people give their verdict. Are

[Shri Niren Ghosh.]

you prepared? I think you are not. That is why you are embarrassed when we have brought forward this Bill, and that is why, in order to bypass all reasonable arguments, instead of giving any convincing, cogent or coherent arguments, you are making fighting speeches without arguments; fighting without a sword in hand, all the same you are fighting, moving your hands and legs; there are no weapons in your hands. Do not do this. Say that the election there would be fought on this single issue, and let us see the result.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: We have seen the result; you were badly defeated.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Let it be seen on this single issue, not other issues, on this single issue only. But you dare not do that; I know that.

Then my hon. friend, Shri Sheel Bhadra Yajee, who generally takes, I should say, a more or less progressive attitude though speaking from the Congress Benches . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: He is a communist, he says.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: . . . said that in the name of the unity of the country and all that this Bill should be thrown out. Well, I think it is a retrograde or backward-looking sentiment which prompted him to advance those arguments because, in Bihar, Magadhi or Bhojpuri or Maithili, whatever you call it, those are local dialects, and the written language of Bihar is Hindi. That is the prime fact.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Maithili language has got a separate script, and literature also, quite distinct from Hindi.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Yes, it is. I concede. But it is Hindi that is spoken by the majority of the people there and that is the official language, one

of the fourteen national languages. Now, Parliament is going to put its seal of approval to a single official language. So the question does not arise. They say that in order to be fully democratic and consistent one has sometimes to set up autonomous regions taking into consideration the wishes of a group of people speaking local dialects. But that is a separate question altogether. Since an overwhelming majority of the people of Bihar speak Hindi, nobody wants the dismemberment of that State. That is not the point at all. What I mean to say is that you have to recognise the linguistic States in India, you have to honour them. They have been carved out of the heterogeneous British pattern but they are based on solid, democratic consideration. You have to honour and find a place for these linguistic national groups. They are not simply language groups. They are compact, contiguous territories speaking a particular language since hundreds of years. So that is their territory inhabited by them. Unless you honour their feelings you will split India. Unless you honour their sentiment and form democratic linguistic States and disregard what is reactionary, you will destroy the fabric of India, the unity of India. You will destroy the national unity if you adopt that attitude. So, I would request hon. Mr. Yajee not to advance such arguments. Whether he concedes my point or not is up to him. But I hope he will reflect upon the points advanced by me. That is my request.

Sir, it is unfortunate, as I said—I repeat—that our colleague, Mr. P. Ramamurti, is not here. He should have been here to argue this case.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: You are arguing much better than him.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: How can I say that? I am afraid I cannot agree with my hon. friend in what he says. What I mean to say is this. Since the Government knew that such an impor-

tant Bill concerning the people of Tamil Nad was on the agenda of Parliament, that it was going to come before Parliament, they should have seen their way to releasing Comrade P. Ramamurti so that he could take part in this debate. It was unjustified uncalled for and undemocratic for the Government to arrest indiscriminately Communists under the Preventive Detention Act. And now that five months have passed, it is all the more unjustified and uncalled for to continue with that process. Since the Government knew that this Bill was on the agenda of Parliament, he should have been here on behalf of the people of Tamil Nad, not all the people of Tamil Nad, I concede. I concede that the ruling party has got the majority of seats; they secured a majority of votes there. But on this question what we say reflects the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the people of Tamil Nad. That is why I demand: Accept my challenge that a referendum should be taken on this point or election should be fought on this issue alone. I do not see any harm in this. In fact, if we concede that demand, we will be cementing the unity of India. If we change the name of the State of Madras to that of Tamil Nad, we will be not only honouring the sentiments of a particular linguistic group but protecting the national interests.

With these remarks I support the Bill.

شری عبدالغنی (پنجاب) :

وائس چھرمین صاحب - اگر صرف نام کے بدلنے کا سوال ہوتا تو مجھے شاید کوئی زیادہ چلتا نہ ہوتی لیکن جو مقصد بیان کیا گیا ہے وہ جہاں تک میں سمجھ پایا ہوں یہ ہے کہ ایک زبان کے آدھار پر ایک تمدنی کے آدھار پر، جو ان کا کچھ ہے اس کو

دھیان میں رکھتے ہوئے ہم یہ کرنا چاہتے ہیں - تو میں سوچ میں پڑ گیا کہ زبان اور کچھ کا کہاں تک اس سے تعلق ہے کہ کسی اسمت کا نام کیا رکھا جائے - کیونکہ کچھ اسمتیں ایسی بھی ہیں جن میں دو دو بولیاں بولی جاتی ہیں اور ان کو باقاعدہ کافی وزن دیا گیا ہے اور وہاں ریجنل کمیٹیاں مقرر کر دی گئی ہیں تو ایسی اسمتوں کا کہا نام رکھا جائیگا، اتر پردیش اور مدھیہ پردیش کا - تو پھر مجھے یہ تر پیدا ہوا کہ کہیں ایک نیا فتلہ اس طرح سے نہ اٹھ کھڑا ہو - اٹھایا جائے میں نہیں کہتا - میں بھوپیش گپتا جی یا کسی پر کسی طرح کا الزام نہیں لگانا - لیکن وائس چھرمین صاحب - آپ کو پتہ ہے کہ جب میرے بھائی شہید رومولو نے آندھر کے لئے بھوک ہڑتال کی تھی اور اس کے بعد ہمارے پرائم منسٹر صاحب نے آندھر کی مانگ کو قبول کر لیا تھا تو اس کا ایک نتیجہ یہ ہوا کہ جگہ جگہ الگ الگ اسمت یا صوبہ بنانے کی مانگ زور پکڑ گئی - تو اس کے لئے باقائدہ ایک کمیشن بتھایا گیا جس کو اسمتس کو ری آرگنائز کرنا تھا اور اس نے کچھ سفارشات کیں لیکن ان سفارشات پر ملک میں جو فتلہ اٹھا وہ آئریبل ہاؤس کے سامنے ہے - اگر ہسٹری کو لیا جائے تو

[شہری عبدالغنی]

آپ جانتے ہیں کہ تین چار ہزار سال پہلے کی ہستوی ایسی نہیں ہے کہ جس کے واقعات پر باقاعدہ طور پر مورخوں نے قابو پایا ہو لیکن جہاں تک پتہ چلا ہے وہ یہ ہے کہ اصل میں اس دیہی میں رہنے والے جو بھائی تھے ان کو دراوڑ کہتے تھے جن میں گوند بھی ہیں، بھیل بھی ہیں اور دوسرے بھی ہیں اور آریں جو ویسٹ ایشیا سے آئے انہوں نے آکر ان پر قابو پایا اور وہ نیچے بھاگے۔ کوئی یہ کہے کہ جہاں راجپوتانہ تھا اور اب راجستھان نام راجپوتانہ تھا اور اب راجستھان ہو گیا ہے۔ جہاں مراٹھے بستے تھے اس کا نام مہاراشٹر ہو گیا ہے جہاں گجراتی بولی جاتی ہے اس کا نام گجرات ہو گیا ہے، تو یہ بھی ہونا چاہئے۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ پچھلے دنوں جب نیشنل انٹیگریشن یا نیشنل انٹیگریشن کا قصہ چلا تو وہ اس لئے چلا تھا کہ یہاں لوگوں کو دیہی سے زیادہ ایلے ایلے پرانت سے پیار ہو گیا تھا اور دیہی کی بولیوں سے زیادہ ایلے ایلے بولیوں سے پیار ہو گیا تھا اور یہ خطرہ ہو گیا تھا کہ جیسے دیہی پرانے زمانوں میں چھوٹی چھوٹی ریاستوں میں کٹتا رہا، بگٹا رہا، اسی طرح سے پھر ذہنی طور پر کہیں ملک کے ٹکڑے نہ ہو جائیں۔ تو اس لئے یہاں کے تمام سیاسی سوجھ بوجھ رکھتے

والے بزرگوں نے آفیشل پارٹی کا ساتھ دیتے ہوئے اس طرف توجہ دی کہ ملک کی ایکتا کو قائم رکھا جائے۔ کچھ سال پہلے، کئی برس ہوئے، چھ سات یا آٹھ برس ہوئے جب میں نے ایک سنجھاو دیا تھا اور اس میں یہ کہا تھا کہ آئے دن کی جو مصوبہ پرستی ہے، جو زبان پرستی ہے اور جو علاقہ پرستی ہے وہ ذات پرستی میں بھی بدل رہی ہے۔

3 P.M.

کہیں جات بھائی ہے تو وہ ایلے بات چاہتا ہے کہ میری سلمی جائے۔ جہاں اھیر بھائی ہے تو وہ ایلے بات کی چرچا کرتا ہے۔ اسی طرح سے اور ذات برادرہاں ہیں۔ الیکشن کے دنوں میں چونکہ کانگریس نے ایک ہمت کی تھی کہ ہر بالغ کو رائے دینے کا حق دیا تھا تو وہ باوجود اس کے کہ سیکولرزم کی حامی ہے یہ ان کے بھیتر گھسنا چاہتی ہے۔ یہ بات الگ ہے کہ کبھی کبھی یہ خود بھی بہک جاتی ہے۔ الیکشنوں میں ایلے سیکولرزم کو ٹھکرا دیتی ہے اور تب مسلمان مسلمان بن جاتا ہے، ہندو ہندو بن جاتا ہے۔ خیر یہ ایلے بات ہے مجھے اس میں کوئی زیادہ دلچسپی نہیں ہے کہ یہ کہا کرتی ہے ایلے سیکولرزم کو، لیکن میں نے اس وقت یہ سنجھاو دیا تھا کہ ہندوستان کی ایکتا کو قائم رکھنے

کے لئے ، ہندوستان کی آزادی کو مضبوط بنانے کے لئے آپ یو۔ پی کے برابر کچھ زون بنا دیں تاکہ نہ ذات برادری کا جھگڑا رہے ، نہ صوبہ پرستی کا۔ ایڈمنسٹریشن کا بہت بڑا بوجھ آپ چھوٹی چھوٹی اسٹیٹیں بنا کر ڈال رہے ہیں۔ اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوتا ہے کہ ٹیکسز لگانے پڑتے ہیں کیونکہ آخر ایڈمنسٹریشن کو چلانا ہے۔

بھوپیش گپتا جی نے کسٹی ٹھوسٹ میں امڈ میٹ کی تجویز رکھی ہے اس سے مجھے تر لگتا ہے ، کہ ایک نیا فٹلہ اٹھ گا کیونکہ مرکزی یو۔ پی میں برج بھاشا کا زور ہے تو وہ اگر ایسی صورت جائے گی تو کیا نام رکھیں گے ، سمجھ میں نہیں آتا۔ ابھی تو مدراس اسٹیٹ سے کچھ بھائیوں نے ، دروازے بھائیوں نے مانگ کی ، نعرے لگائے۔ کیا وہ ملک کو برباد کرنا چاہتے ہیں، ملک کی ایکٹا کو بھنگ کرنا چاہتے ہیں کلچر کے نام پر؟ اب یہ کلچر اور زبان والا قائد اعظم جناح صاحب کا نعرہ تھا۔۔۔ ہمارا اپنا کلچر ہے ، ہمارا اپنا تمدن ہے ، ہمارے اپنی قوم ہے۔ یعنی میرے باپ دادا ہندو تھے ، میرے مسلمان ہونے سے میری ذات کیسے بدل گئی کت تو وہی برہمنوں والی دھینگے ، کوئی بدل نہیں گئی۔ لیکن جناح صاحب کو خیال آیا تو نیشنل تھیوری کا۔ اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوا کہ ان کا جو کچھ تھا

اس کی وجہ سے اس عظیم الشان دیہ کے جسکو بھارت کہتے ہیں دو ٹکڑے ہوئے ، اس کی جو بے پناہ طاقت بن سکتی تھی آزاد ہونے کے بعد اس کو کافی صدمہ ہوا۔ کہا وہی بھوپیش گپتا جی جو ساری دنیا کی برادری کو بالکل انٹرنیشنل کرنے جا رہے ہیں، ساری دنیا کو ایک کرنا چاہتے ہیں آج وہ اپنی بات اٹھا کر یہ کہتے ہیں کہ ڈیموکریسی کا تقاضہ یہ ہے کہ وہاں کے رہنے والے چاہتے ہیں کہ اس کا نام تامل ناڈو ہو جائے جیسا ایک انٹریبل ممبر نے کہا ہے وہاں کی اسٹیٹ گورنمنٹ جو ہے جو لکھنؤ سلیجر ہے اپنا نام بدل کر لکھ بھوجے یہاں سلیجر میں کہ بھائی ہم اپنا نام اس طرح بدلتا چاہتے ہیں، ہمیں یہ نام سوت نہیں کرتا ہے۔ لیکن اس کی فکر بھوپیش گپتا جی کو ہوئی۔ مجھے خوشی ہے لیکن یہ آدنیہ جانتی ہے کہ چاہے تامل ناڈو نام رکھیں یا مدراس نام رکھیں وہاں کمیونسٹ پارٹی کو اس سے کچھ زیادہ جگہ ملنے والی نہیں ہے۔ وہ لوگ بڑے بدھیمن ہیں کافی پڑھے لکھے ہیں کافی ہوشیار ہیں۔ مگر خیر ان کی یہ تجویز ہاؤس کے سامنے آئی۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس کو انہیں خود واپس لینا چاہیئے یہ اس لئے کہتا ہوں کہ یہ بڑے وشال ہردے کے مالک ہیں۔ سارے سنسار کو ایک نگاہ سے دیکھنا

[(شری عبدالغنی)]

چاہتے ہیں۔ ایکٹا دیکھنا چاہتے ہیں، اونچائی نیچائی کو ختم کرنا چاہتے ہیں۔ ذات برادری کو ختم کرنا چاہتے ہیں۔ جب ان کا دماغ اتنا وشال ہے تو پھر وہ یہاں اس کو کہوں لائے؟ اگر کوئی بھائی یہ کہے کہ وہ اپنی شہرت! چاہتے ہیں تو میں ایسا نہیں کہتا بلکہ ان کو ایک کرپڈٹ دیتا ہوں۔ کمیونسٹ بھائی بالکل جلدونی مسلمان، جلدونی ہند، جلدونی سکھ کی طرح بالکل ایک بات میں لکھو کے فقیر ہیں کہ اپنی پارٹی کا انگریسٹ بنا رہے۔ اس لئے یہ اپنی پارٹی کی قدر کے لئے یہ چاہتے ہیں یہ میں مانتا ہوں۔ میں نے ان کے بارے میں ایک بڑا اندازہ کیا۔ پانچ مہینوں میں میں نے دیکھا کہ میرے دل میں ان کے لئے بڑی گنجائش ہے لیکن گنجائش رکھتے ہوئے میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اپنی اپنی پارٹیوں کو طاقت ور بنانے کے لئے ہر ایک کو حق حاصل ہے کہ ڈیموکریسی میں وہ جو چاہے کہے۔ لیکن جب یہ سوال اٹھاتے ہیں تو پھر کل کوئی کہہ کہوں نہیں اس کا نام سارے بھارت کا نام وہ رکھوں۔ ایسا وہ نہیں کہہ سکتے کہوں کہ ملک کا مفاد اس میں ہے۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ جس وقت ایک

بڑی مصیبت بھی آئی لیکن بڑی امداد بھی آئی جب یہ چائنا کا بے مودہ حملہ ہوا تو اس سے ملک کی ایکٹا پھر زندہ ہو گئی۔ ملک کی ایکٹا کا جہاں تک سرال ہے اس میں اگر خالی مدراس کا قصہ ہے تو الگ بات ہے لیکن اس سے قدر ہے کہ جگہ جگہ یہ چیخ شرع ہو جائے گی کہ کھول کا نام کھول کیوں رکھا جائے مہسور کا نام مہسور کیوں رکھا جائے۔ مدھیہ پردیش کا نام مدھیہ پردیش کیوں رکھا جائے۔ ہر مدھیہ پردیش کیوں رکھا جائے۔ پی۔ کا نام اتو پردیش کیوں رکھا جائے۔ بھار کا نام بھار کیوں رکھا جائے۔ تو میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اتلے بڑے وشال ہردے کے مالک جو ہیں ان کو اسے روکنا چاہیئے۔ کہونکہ ہو سکتا ہے کہ وہ کوشش کریں اور اس سے ملک کی ایکٹا اور کمزور ہو جائے۔ یہاں کمیونسٹ بھائیوں کا جو وچار ہے کہ ان کا راج ہو جائے تو میں سمجھتا ہوں اس دیش میں جو تھوڑا ہی خدا کو ماننے والا کہئے، بھگوان کو ماننے والا کہئے ہے اس میں بڑا مشکل ہے ان کا راج ہو جائے۔ لیکن ہو جائے ایسی یہ کوشش کریں تو وہ تو ٹھیک ہے لیکن ان کو یہ نہیں کوشش کرنی چاہیئے کہ زبان کے آدھار پر ان کو ابھاریں کہ تمہاری زبان اس قابل ہے اس لئے اس کا نام شامل ناہ ہونا چاہیئے۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں اس سے خطرہ پیدا ہو جائیگا۔

چونکہ زبانیں ہم نے تسلیم کی ہیں اور ابھی سندھی بھائی کہتے ہیں ہماری بھی زبان مائی جائے۔ خیر اس پر پھر بحث ہوگی۔ یہ تو بالکل دوسرا مسئلہ ہے شاید اس پر کہلے گا موقع ملے تو میں بات کروں گا۔ آج میں صرف یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ بڑی بھول ہوئی جس تھلک سے آندھر پردیس کو قبول کیا گیا تھا۔ میں نہیں کہتا کہ آندھر پردیس نہیں بلتا۔ بلانے کے بڑے تھلک ہوتے ہیں لیکن اس کی شاید اس خیال سے میں تائب کرتا اگر وہ انتظامی نقطہ نگاہ سے وہاں استعمال کیا جانا۔ بھارت ایک ہے، بھارت میں ایک قوم ہے، بھارت کے الگ الگ علاقوں کی بولیاں جدا جدا ضرور ہوں لیکن سب کی بولی ہندوستانی ہے، عام طور سے ہندوستانی بولی جاتی ہے، تو ایسی صورت میں اگر انتظام کی نگاہ سے بھوپیش گپتا جی تجویز لائیں کہ فلاں علاقہ کا انتظام نہیں ہو سکتا اس لئے اس کو الگ کیا جائے تو مہری سمجھ میں بات آ سکتی ہے لیکن خالی نام بدلنے سے ان کی وہ شہرت نہیں ہوتی۔ شہرت یہ ضرور ہوتی ہے کہ ایک کمیونسٹ

بھائی ہیں جو مدراس اسمت کو تامل ناڈ کرنا چاہتے ہیں۔ جلسوں سوچتی ہے کہ وہ اس بارے میں کنسٹی ٹیوشن میں امیڈ میٹ کرنے کا بل پارلیمنٹ میں لائیں۔ تو بھوپیش گپتا جی جو کمیونسٹ پارٹی کے لیڈر ہیں ایسا بل لائے۔ اس سے ان کی پارٹی کو یقیناً کریڈٹ ملا۔ میں جانتا ہوں کہ مدراس والے بہت سمجھ دار ہیں، وہاں کے جو چیف منسٹر ہیں، جو کانگریس کے ہیں ان کی میں بڑی عزت کرتا ہوں۔ انہوں نے اپنی اسمت کی بڑی خدمات کی ہیں اور وہ خاصے سیدھے سادے ایک بزرگ ہیں جلسوں نے بڑی شان پیدا کی ہے۔ اگر وہ ضروری سمجھیں گے کہ تامل ناڈ اس کا نام ہونا چاہیئے تو وہ ضرور بھیش کریلے لیکن، خود، یہ ضروری نہیں ہے۔ شری بھوپیش گپتا جی کا یہ حق ہے کہونکہ وہ ہاؤس کے ایک انریبل ممبر ہیں، ایک بڑی پارٹی کے لیڈر ہیں اور جو چاہے وہ رکھ سکتے ہیں لیکن مہری درخواست ہے کہ ایک پارٹی کے لیڈر کو ایسے اہمان سے جو کہ بہت اونچا ہے ایسے پرستار کو واپس لینا چاہیئے۔ اگر وہ واپس نہیں لیتے

[شری عبدالغنی]

تو اس کو کرا دیدا چاہیئے تاکہ نئے نئے
قلم نہ ہوں -

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी (पंजाब) :
वाइस चेयरमैन साहब । अगर सिर्फ नाम
के बदलने का सवाल होता तो मुझे शायद
कोई ज्यादा चिन्ता न होत; लेकिन जो मकसद
बयान किया गया है वह जहां तक मैं समझ
पाया हूं यह है कि एक जवान के आधार पर,
तमदून के आधार पर, जो उन का कल्चर है
तब्दून के आधार पर, जो उन का कल्चर है
उस को ध्यान में रखते हुए हम यह करना चाहते
हैं। तो मैं सोच में पड़ गया कि जवान और
कल्चर का कहा तक इस से ताल्लुक है कि
किसा स्टेट का नाम क्या रखा जाये। क्योंकि
कुछ स्टेट्स ऐसा भा है जिनमें दो दो बोलिया
बोली जाती हैं और उन को बाकायदा काफी
वजन दिया गया है और वहां रिजनल कमेंटिया
मुकम्मल कर दी गई हैं तो ऐसा स्टेटों का क्या
नाम रखा जायेगा। उत्तर प्रदेश का और मध्य
प्रदेश का। तो फिर मुझे यह डर पैदा हुआ कि
कहीं एक नया फितना इस तरह से न उठ
खड़ा हो, उठाया जाये मैं नहीं कहता।
मैं भूपेश गुप्ता जा या किसी पर किसी तरह
का इल्जाम नहीं लगाता। लेकिन वाइस
चेयरमैन साहब, आप को यह पता है कि जब
भाई शहाद रामलु ने आन्ध्र के लिए भूख
हड़ताल का था और उस के बाद हमारे प्राइम
मिनिस्टर साहब ने आन्ध्र का मांग को कबूल
कर लिया था तो उस का एक नतीजा यह हुआ
कि जगह जगह अलग अलग स्टेट या सूबा
बनाने का मांग जोर पकड़ गई। तो उस
के लिये बाकायदा एक कमिशन बैठाया गया।
जिस को स्टेट्स को रिआर्गनाइज करना था
और उसने कुछ सिफारिशों की लेकिन उन
सिफारिशों पर मुल्क में जो फितना उठा वह
आनरेबल हाउस के सामने है। अगर हिस्ट्री
को लिया जाय तो आप जानते हैं कि तीन चार
हजार साल पहले का हिस्ट्री ऐसा नहीं है

†[] Hindi translation.

कि जिस के व्यक्तिगत वाकियात पर बाकायदा
तौर पर मौखिकी ने काबू पाया हो लेकिन
पता चला है वह यह है कि असल में
इस देश में रहने वाले जो भाई थे, उन को,
ब्राविड कहते थे जिन में गोंड भाई हैं, भाल भाई हैं
और दूसरे और आर्यन भी हैं जो
वेस्ट एशिया से आये उन्होंने आ कर उन
पर काबू पाया और वह नचे भागे। कोई
यह कहे कि जहां राजपूत बसते हैं उस
का नाम राजपूताना था और अब राजस्थान
हो गया है। जहां मराठे बसते थे उस का नाम
महाराष्ट्र हो गया है, जहां गुजराती
बोला जाता है उस का नाम गुजरात हो गया है,
तो यह भाई होना चाहिये। मैं समझता हूं कि
पिछले दिनों जब नेशनल इण्टिग्रेशन या
नोशनल इंटिग्रेशन का किस्सा चला तो वह
इसलिये चला था कि यहां लोगों को देश से
ज्यादा अपने अपने प्रान्त से प्यार हो गया था
और देश का बोलियों से ज्यादा अपनी अपनी
बोलियों से प्यार हो गया था और यह खतरा
हो गया था कि जैसे देश पहले जमाने में
छोटा छोटा रियासतों में कटता रहा, बटता
रहा, उसी तरह से फिर जहनी तौर पर
कहीं मुल्क के टुकड़े न हो जायें तो इसलिये
यहां के तमाम सियासी सूझ बूझ रखने वाले
बुजुर्गों ने आफिशियल पार्टी का साथ देते हुए
इस तरफ तवज्जो दी कि मुल्क का एकता को
कायम किया जाये। कुछ साल पहले, कई
बरस हुए, छः, सात या आठ बरस हुए
जब मैं ने एक सुझाव दिया था और उस में यह
कहा था कि यह आये दिन का जो सूबा परस्ती
है जो जवान परस्ती है और जो इलाका परस्ती
है वह जात परस्ती में भी बदल रहा है।

3 P.M.

कही जाट भाई हैं तो वह अपनी बात
बाहता है कि मेरी सुनी जाये। जहां अहीर
भाई हैं तो वह अपनी बात का चर्चा करता है।
इसी तरह से और जाट बिरादरियां हैं।
इलैक्शन के दिनों में चूक कांग्रेस ने एक हिम्मत
की थी कि हर बालिग को राय देने का हक

दिया गया था तो वह बावजूद इसके कि सेक्युलरिज्म को 'हामी' है यह उनके भाँतर घुसना चाहता है। यह बात अलग है कि कभी कभी यह खुद भी बहक जाता है। इलैक्शनों में अपने सेक्युलरिज्म को ठुकरा देती है और तब मुसलमान मुसलमान बन जाता है, हिन्दू हिन्दू बन जाता है। खैर यह अपनी बात है, मुझे इसमें कोई ज्यादा दिलचस्पी नहीं है कि यह क्या करती है अपने सेक्युलरिज्म को, लेकिन मैंने उस वक्त यह सुझाव दिया था कि हिन्दुस्तान की एकता को कायम रखने के लिये, हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी को मजबूत बनाने के लिए, आप यू० पी० के बराबर कुछ जोन बना दें ताकि न जात बिरादरी का झगड़ा रहे, न सूबापरस्ती का। एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन का बहुत बड़ा बोझ आप छोटी छोटी स्टेटें बना कर डालते हैं। उसका नतीजा यह होता है कि टैक्सिज लगाने पड़ते हैं क्योंकि आखिर एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को चलाना है।

भूपेश गुप्ता जी ने कांस्टीट्यूशन में अमेंडमेंट की तजवीज रखी है उससे मुझे डर लगता है कि एक नया फ़ितना उठेगा क्योंकि मरकजी यू० पी० में ब्रज भाषा का जोर है तो वहाँ अगर ऐसी सूरत आ जायेगी तो क्या नाम रखेंगे, समझ में नहीं आता। अभी तो मद्रास स्टेट से कुछ भाईयों ने, द्राविड़ भाईयों ने, माँग की, नारे लगाये। क्या वे मुल्क को बरबाद करना चाहते हैं, मुल्क की एकता को भंग करना चाहते हैं कल्चर के नाम पर? अब यह कल्चर और जवान वाला कायदेआज़म जिन्ना साहब का नारा था। हमारा अपना कल्चर है, हमारा अपना तमद्दुन है, हमारी अपनी कौम है, यानी मेरे बाप दादा हिन्दु थे, मेरे मुसलमान होने से मेरी जात कैसे बदल गई, गोत तो वही ब्राह्मणों वाली रहेगी, कोई बदल नहीं गई। लेकिन जिन्ना साहब को ख्याल आया टूनेशन थ्योरी का, उसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि उनका जो क्लेम था

उसकी वजह से इस अजीमुलशान देश के, जिसको भारत कहते हैं दो टुकड़े हुए। उसकी जो बेपनाह ताकत बन सकती थी, आजाद होने के बाद उसको काफी सद्भा हुआ। क्या वही भूपेश गुप्ता जी जो सारी दुनिया की बिरादरी को बिल्कुल इंटरनेशनल करने जा रहे हैं, सारी दुनिया को एक करना चाहते हैं, आज वह अपनी बात उठाकर, यह कहते हैं कि डेमोक्रेसी का नफ़ाजा यह है कि वहाँ के रहने वाले चाहते हैं कि इसका नाम तामिलनाड हो जाये जैसा एक आनरेबल मेम्बर ने कहा कि वहाँ की स्टेट गवर्नमेंट जो है, जो लेजिस्लेचर है, अपना नाम बदल कर लिख भेजे यहाँ सेन्टर में कि भाई हम अपना नाम इस इस तरह बदलना चाहते हैं, हमें यह नाम सूट नहीं करता है, लेकिन इसकी फ़िक्र भूपेश गुप्ता जी को हुई। मुझे खुशी है लेकिन यह दुनिया जानती है कि चाहे तामिलनाड नाम रखें या मद्रास नाम रखें, वहाँ कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी को इससे कुछ ज्यादा जगह मिलने वाली नहीं है। वह लोग बड़े बुद्धिमान हैं, काफी पढ़े लिखे हैं, काफी होशियार हैं। लेकिन, खैर, उनकी यह तजवीज हाउस के सामने आई, मैं समझता हूँ कि इसको उन्हें खुद वापिस लेना चाहिये। यह इसलिये कहते हैं कि यह बड़े विशाल हृदय के मालिक हैं। सारे संसार को एक निगाह में देखना चाहते हैं, एकता देखना चाहते हैं। ऊँचाई नीचाई को खत्म करना चाहते हैं, जात बिरादरी को खत्म करना चाहते हैं। जब उनका दिमाग इतना विशाल है तो फिर वह यहाँ इसको क्यों लाये। अगर कोई भाई यह कहे कि वह अपनी शोहरत चाहते हैं तो मैं ऐसा नहीं कहता बल्कि उनको एक क्रेडिट देता हूँ। कम्यूनिस्ट भाई बिल्कुल जुनूनी मुसलमान, जुनूनी हिन्दु, जुनूनी सिख की तरह बिल्कुल एक बात में लकीर के फकीर हैं कि अपनी पार्टी का इंटररेस्ट बना रहे। इसलिये यह अपनी पार्टी की

[श्री अब्दुल गनी]

कब्र के लिये यह चाहते हैं, यह मैं मानता हूँ। मैंने उनके बारे में एक बड़ा अन्दाजा किया, पांच महीनों में मैंने बेखा कि मेरे दिल में उनके लिये बड़ी गुंजाइश है लेकिन गुंजाइश रखते हुये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अपनी अपनी पार्टी को ताकतवर बनाने के लिये हर एक को हक हासिल है कि डेमोक्रेसी में वह जो चाहें कहे। लेकिन जब यह सवाल उठते हैं तो फिर कल कोई कहे क्यों नहीं इसका नाम, सारे भारत का नाम, वह रखें। वह ऐसा नहीं कहेंगे क्योंकि मुल्क का मुफाद इसी में है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जिस वक्त एक बड़ी मुसीबत भी आई लेकिन बड़ी इमदाद भी आई जब यह चायना का बेहूदा हमला हुआ तो उससे मुल्क की एकता फिर जिन्दा हो गई। मुल्क की एकता का जहाँ तक सवाल है उसमें अगर खाली मद्रास का किस्सा है तो अलग बात है लेकिन उससे डर है कि जगह जगह यह चीज शुरू हो जायेगी कि केरल का नाम केरल क्यों रखा जाये, मैसूर का नाम मैसूर क्यों रखा जाये, मध्य प्रदेश का नाम मध्य प्रदेश क्यों रखा जाये। यू० पी० का नाम उत्तर प्रदेश क्यों रखा जाये। बिहार का नाम बिहार क्यों रखा जाये। तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इतने बड़े विशाल हृदय के मालिक जो हैं उनको इसे रोकना चाहिये। क्योंकि हो सकता है कि वह कोशिश करें और इससे मुल्क की एकता और कमजोर हो जाये। यहां कम्यूनिस्ट भाईयों का जो विचार है कि उनका राज हो जाये तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस देश में जो थोड़ा भी खुदा को मानने वाला कहिये, भगवान को मानने वाला कहिये, है, उसमें बड़ा मुश्किल है उनका राज हो जाये। लेकिन हो जाये ऐसी कोशिश करें तो वह तो ठीक है लेकिन उनको यह नहीं कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि जबान के आधार पर उनको उभारें कि

तुम्हारी जबान इस काबिल है इसलिये इसका नाम तामिलनाड होना चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे छतरा पैदा हो जायेगा। १४ जबानें हमने तसलीम की हैं और अभी सिन्धी भाई कहते हैं कि हमारी भी जबान मानी जाये। खैर इस पर फिर बहस होगी। यह तो बिल्कुल दूसरा मसला है, शायद इस पर कहने का मौका मिले तो मैं बात करूँगा। आज मैं सिर्फ यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि बड़ी भूल हुई जिस ढंग से आन्ध्र प्रदेश को कुबूल किया गया था। मैं नहीं कहता कि आन्ध्र प्रदेश नहीं बनता, बनाने के ढंग होते हैं लेकिन उसकी शायद इस ख्याल से मैं तार्किक करता अगर वह इन्तजामी नुकतायेनिगाह से वहां दस्तेमाल किया जाता। भारत एक है भारत में एक कौम है। भारत के अलग अलग इलाकों की बोलियां जुदा जुदा जरूर हैं लेकिन सब की बोली हिन्दुस्तानी है, आमतौर से हिन्दुस्तानी बोली जाती है। तो ऐसी सूरत में अगर इन्तजाम की निगाह से भूपेश गुप्ताजी तजवीज लायें कि फलां इलाके का क्योंकि इन्तजाम नहीं हो सकता, इसलिये इस को अलग किया जाये तो मेरी समझ में बात आ सकती है लेकिन खाली नाम बदलने से उन की वह शोहरत नहीं होती। शोहरत यह जरूर होती है कि एक कम्यूनिस्ट भाई है जो मद्रास स्टेट को तामिलनाड करना चाहते हैं। जिन्हें सूझी है कि वह इस बारे में कांस्टीट्यूशन में अमेंडमेंट करने का बिल पार्लियामेंट में लायें। तो भूपेश गुप्ताजी जो कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी के लीडर हैं ऐसा बिल लाये। इस से उन की पार्टी को यकीनन फ़ैडिट मिला। मैं जानता हूँ कि मद्रास वाले बहुत समझदार हैं, वहां के जो चीफ मिनिस्टर हैं जो कांग्रेस के हैं उन की मैं बड़ी इज्जत करता हूँ। उन्होंने अपनी स्टेट की बड़ी खिदमात की हैं। और वह खासे सीधे सादे एक बुजुर्ग हैं जिन्होंने एक बड़ी दान पैदा की है। अगर वह जरूरी समझेंगे कि तामिलनाड इस का नाम होना चाहिये तो वह जरूर पेश करेंगे

लेकिन खैर यह जरूरी नहीं है। श्री भूपेश गुप्ताजी का यह हक है क्योंकि वह हाउस के एक आनरेबल मੈम्बर हैं। एक बड़ी पार्टी के लीडर हैं और जो चाहें वह रख सकते हैं। लेकिन मेरी दरखास्त है कि एक पार्टी के लीडर को अपने ईमान से जोकि बहुत ऊंचा है अपने प्रस्ताव को वापिस लेना चाहिये। अगर वह वापिस नहीं लेते तो इस को गिरा देना चाहिये ताकि नये नये फितने न हों।]

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, very rarely I am in full agreement with my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, but today I rise to support him whole-heartedly, fully and sincerely. The only weakness of the Bill is the nature of the Bill being a non-official one. I would have very much liked an official Bill to have been brought forward for this very necessary and very simple thing that would have satisfied millions of Tamilians of Tamil Nad. Very many arguments that were advanced against the Bill brought forward are perhaps more due to the colour of the mover rather than the arguments advanced for its support. One hon. Member was saying that he was not moving a Bill which the Madras State has asked him to move. I regret very much that sometimes it becomes necessary to explain some rudimentary principles. The Madras Government will never ask a non-official Bill to be brought forward on its behalf. If the State Government wants the Bill to be brought forward, there are the State representatives in this assembly and they would have brought it forward and, therefore, to say that the Bill cannot be supported just because the Madras Government has not asked Mr. Gupta to bring this Bill shows that their only argument to fight against the Bill is that their party or their State Government has not instructed them to act in this way. I can very well understand the political tremor in their hearts, but that is no argument against the Bill. The arguments advanced by the sponsor of the Bill for renaming Madras as Tamil Nad have not been answered by any one

of the speakers who spoke against it.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: I have answered it.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: I cannot understand—I very rarely understand—your language and, therefore, I do not know whether there is logic or not but I would say that some of the arguments advanced were not proper. One hon. Member was saying that there are Telugu-knowing people in Tamil Nad, Malayalam and Canarese-speaking people and, therefore, to name Madras as Tamil Nad will create a sort of tremor in their hearts. May I inform this House through you, Sir, that all these arguments were advanced and shattered in my part of the country? All these arguments did not stand the onslaught of reason and logic. For the sake of informing this House, I may inform you, Sir, that on the 24th February, 1961, the Leader of the House in the State Assembly stood up to say that he was accepting part of the non-official resolution brought forward not by the DMK or any other political party which is considered to be inimical to the Congress, but by a PSP Member. That PSP Member brought forward a non-official resolution for renaming Madras as Tamil Nad and it was discussed for many days and finally the then Finance Minister and Leader of the House, Mr. C. Subramaniam, stood up to say that he was accepting a part, or the spirit, of the resolution and added that thereafter all publications of the Madras Government would come in the name of Tamil Nad Government. It is in such a way that all the publications in Tamil in the Tamil Nad Government are being printed and published. As a matter of fact, after making that historic declaration on the floor of the Madras Assembly on the 24th February, the very next day the Finance Minister had to present his Budget and in presenting the Budget, the opening words of the Finance Minister were, "In consonance with the declaration made yesterday, I am now presenting to you the Budget of Tamil Nad". Therefore, all the

[Shri C. N. Annadurai].

arguments that the Telugu-speaking people, the Malayalam-speaking people, the Canarese-speaking people, all of them, will be up against this change in name, fall to the ground, because part of this has been accepted by the Government. The part relating to the amendment of the Constitution, the word "Madras" to be deleted and the word "Tamilnad" to be inserted, was not accepted. Therefore, the sentimental arguments advanced cannot be accommodated even by the Government much less by the Madras Congress leaders. Sir, I am really surprised to see how much ill-informed my hon. friends are, those who advanced arguments against the Bill. One hon. Member stated here that Kollegal is in Tamil Nad That hon. Member, unfortunately, is not present in the House at present. I may tell him, and his friends may tell him, that Kollegal today is part of Mysore. It has been taken away from the composite State of Madras and, after the formation of linguistic States, has gone to Mysore. If my hon. friend is so ill informed about Kollegal, I am not surprised at his arguments that nowhere in Tamil literature the word Tamilnad occurs. A politician who cannot understand that Kollegal today does not form part of Tamil Nad cannot be expected to be conversant with Tamil literature. For the edification of the House and for his own edification, I will point out the names of certain books wherein the word 'Tamil Nad' is to be found. These are books written 1,800 or 2,000 years ago. I am reading the name in Tamil but the hon. Member who made that allegation is a Tamilian Congressman and he can understand that, and the hon. Deputy Minister who will perhaps be making the reply she being also a Tamilian may tell him. The names of PARIPADAL, PATHITRUPATHU and the more popular names of SILAPPATHIKARAM and MANIMEKALAI. These are all Tamil classics written more than a thousand years ago and in PARIPADAL it is stated "THANDAMIZH VELI THAMIZH NATTU

AKAMELLAM" which means, Tamil Nad which is surrounded by Sweet Tamil on all the three sides. In PATHITRUPATMU a classic written about 1,800 years ago it is stated, 'IMIZH KADAL VELI THAMIZHAGAMA" meaning Tamil Nad which has got the sea as its boundary. In SILAPPATHIKARAM it is stated "THEN TAMIZH NANNADU" meaning good Tamil Nad and in MANIMEKALAI it is stated "SAMBUTHTHEEVINUL TAMIZHAGA MARUNGIL" which means Tamil Nad which is to be found in the continent which is called "SAMBUTHTHEEVU" If my hon. friends like to have more popular illustrations, I would like to refer them to the poems of Poet KHAMBAN and SEKKILAR both of whom have definitely used the word Tamil nad. It was only afterwards that there were three kingdoms, the Cheranadu, the Cholanadu and the Pandyanadu. Tamil Nad is to be found in the classics of Tamil. It is not that there is poverty of ideas in the classics but it only shows that my hon. friend does not spend much thought or time over the Tamil classics and I may tell for the edification of the House that when the Congress Government in Tamil Nad purchased the Jaipur Palace at Ooty known as Aranmore Palace, they immediately renamed that palace as TAMIZHAGAM. I am pointing this out to say that the Congress there is trying to assuage our feelings, is trying to carry the Tamil Nad people along with them by saying that they have renamed the Aranmore Palace as TAMIZHAGAM, that they are publishing all the Tamil manifestos as Tamil Nand Government publications but that only for international correspondence, only for correspondence overseas they want the name Madras and, therefore, they are not prepared to amend the Constitution. Therefore if the arguments advanced by some of the Tamil Nad Congress people were to be read by the Chief Minister of Madras, he would turn round and say, 'You too

Brutus'. Therefore it is that all the arguments advanced for not renaming it fall flat on the ground because even the Congress Government there does not approve of these arguments.

Another peculiar issue was raised here that the Bill is brought forward only as a publicity stunt of the Communist Party. Why not we appreciate the Communist Party for its sense of political expediency? Are not all political parties interested in getting political publicity? Is publicity a heinous crime? Why do you publish reports and books on Five Year Plans? Is that not publicity done at public cost? And yet you accuse other political parties, saying that this is publicity. But let me tell this House through you that even though you defeat the Bill he has gained that publicity. You are not going to rob him any more of that publicity. When he comes to Tamil Nad he can conveniently face the Tamilians and say, 'I pleaded for you but it was the ruling party that let you down.' Therefore you have unawares walked into the snare of Mr. Gupta. I would have very much appreciated if the ruling party had approached Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and stated, 'Do not bring in this non-official Bill; we ourselves are interested in it. We will bring it forward.'

Then Mr. Santhanam pointed out that we had an uphill task in retaining Madras; we had to fight with so many people and we retained Madras. I had some amount of credit in that fight and when I was in the thick of the fight I did not find Mr. Santhanam by my side.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: At the cost of Andhra.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: With the consent of Andhras. I can say that. That is because the present Government there is providing even today in the border areas measures for safeguarding Telugu culture and for imparting Telugu language. There-

fore though Madras has been taken by Tamilians we have not got any enmity with the Andhras. But my friend, Mr. Santhanam, was saying that we had such an uphill task in retaining Madras that we would like to keep Madras. This is not a question of keeping Madras or giving it up; this is the question of keeping Madras in Tamil Nad and renaming the State as Tamil Nad. Madras after all is the capital city of Tamil Nad just as Ahmedabad happens to be the capital city of Gujarat, as Chandigarh happens to be the capital city of Punjab and as it is in other places. If this logic of naming the State with the name of the capital city is to be followed, Kerala should be renamed as Trivandrum, Andhra is to be renamed as Hyderabad, Punjab is to be renamed as Chandigarh and Gujarat should be renamed as Ahmedabad.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And Bengal should be renamed as Calcutta.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: My Government, my Congress Government in Madras is interested in bilingualism. That is because its head Government is interested in having two names for everything: India that is Bharat; Jana Gana Mana and Bande Matharam. And they want to keep always two blocks, take something from there and take something from here. So the Madras Government is also having Tamil Nad for the consumption of the Tamilians and Madras for all India consumption. This—I do not know; I am not still fully conversant with parliamentary procedure; if it is unparliamentary you may call me to order—is political duplicity. Is it parliamentary?

HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: I am glad but it is a very awkward word 'duplicity'. And that is why my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was saying that some of the Congress people

[Shri C. N. Annadurai]. talk in one way there and talk in another way here. No Congress member can face a Tamilian audience and say that the name of Madras should be retained. I challenge it.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: We have faced it during the agitation of Tamil Arasu Khazagam and my friend knows it. What he is saying is a complete travesty of facts.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: I know how Mr. Pattabiraman faces; I won't say. Let us not face as Congressmen and as D.M.K. Let us face the Tamilian public on this single sanctified issue of renaming the State and if you carry along with you 51 per cent of the people, I am prepared to bow my head before you. This is not a party issue at all. The renaming of Madras as Tamil Nad has been accepted by the Communist Party, by the D.M.K., by the P.S.P. and you will be surprised, by the Madras Branch of the Swatantra Party too. Therefore all parties are one in this issue of renaming Madras as Tamil Nad.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: None of them put it in their election manifesto.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: I would present a copy of the D.M.K. election manifesto to him tomorrow. I am sure Mr. Pattabiraman knows Tamil. This has been an issue in the Tamil Nad for more than 10 to 15 years. He was saying that only the Tamil Arasu Khazagam was fighting for it. It is true partially because it was only the Tamil Arasu Khazagam which started an agitation for it but all other political parties were immensely, intimately, interested in this issue and they have printed it in their manifestoes, in their political speeches and no District Conference of the D.M.K. took place without passing this Resolution for renaming Madras as Tamil Nad. Therefore it is not simply on the spur of the moment

that I am pleading for it. My sorrow is that my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, has stolen the thunder from me by sponsoring this Bill. But for that I would like to present before the House that this has been the issue all along in Tamil Nad. And they have not answered Mr. Bhupesh Gupta; what do you lose by renaming Madras as Tamil Nad? Nobody has answered that.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: It is you who must prove that it is better to rename Madras as Tamil Nad. Yours is the negative approach.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: But.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: Anyway, what do you gain by renaming it as Tamil Nad?

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: What do I gain? What have you gained by renaming Parliament as Lok Sabha? What have you gained by renaming Council of States as Rajya Sabha? What have you gained by renaming President as Rashtrapati?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, you are having it.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: The Lok Sabha is known as the House of the People also. The Rajya Sabha is known also as the Council of States.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: That is exactly the thing I am against this split personality.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Here is a form in English; there is no Council of States here. (Interruptions).

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: It is also known as the Council of States.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: I am exactly against this split personality. Therefore it is that I say that they have not answered the question, 'what do you lose?' That is important because if you were to lose something precious, we would not press for it. If you do not lose something

fundamental, we will press for it. That other point that was raised was—what do you gain? We gain satisfaction sentimentally; we gain the satisfaction that an ancient name is inculcated in the hearts of millions and scores of millions of people. Is that not enough compensation for the small trouble of changing the name? Therefore it is that all the arguments that have been advanced have been shattered.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

They have advanced an apologetic argument by saying that if the State Government had come forward with this, we would have accepted it.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: State legislature.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: And they are perfectly aware of the composition of the State legislature where the Congress party is in a majority. Would you ask the Congress Members in the Madras State Legislature to vote for such a Bill, if it were to come there, without Party whip? No.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: Your Party members could have brought forward a resolution in the Madras Assembly to change the name. Why have you not done it for the past seven or eight years?

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: I am coming to that. When we present such a Bill to the Madras Legislature, they say that if you want to rename, an amendment of the Constitution is necessary and an amendment of the Constitution is possible only when you go to Parliament.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: I am saying a resolution, not a Bill. A resolution can be made.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: I may say for the information of the hon. Member that we pressed this point

during the discussion on a non-official Bill of the P.S.P. In fact we even staged a walk-out. The DMK and the Communist Party joined together in the walk-out. That is our numerical position there.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN (Madras): There, walk-out is a permanent feature.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Madam Deputy Chairman, may I request, through you, the hon. Member to stand up and tell what he wants to tell? So, it is only an aside. All right. When the non-official resolution was discussed in the Madras Assembly, we pressed for the constitutional amendment and the only explanation offered to us was that it is possible only at the level of Parliament. And when we come to Parliament we are asked to go back to the State Legislature. When we go to the State Legislature, we are asked to go to Parliament all because you are entrenched in both places, not because your logic is sound, not because your justice is sound, but simply because you are entrenched in both places.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: We are entrenched because the people vote for us. It has been discussed even during the elections. There had been fasts by certain members and one person even lost his life after fasting. Even after that we won the election. That shows that the people still want it as it is—not for the satisfaction of some politicians who want a slogan.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am very glad that the discussion is becoming very interesting. But I may say for the information of the House that the DMK has got nothing to do with fasting. The fasting was undertaken by a non-party man in fact a relative of the Chief Minister of Madras, Mr. Sankaralinga Nadar.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: That is what I am saying.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: And to say that in spite of the fasting you have not changed shows how human you are. Therefore, the question was discussed there. We were asked to go to Parliament. When we come to Parliament, we are again sent back to the Legislature. In both places, the answer is as my hon. friend has stated, the people have voted for us. Well, that is a fact, a tragic fact, a black fact which ought to be seen.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: In spite of you, the tragedy is still there.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: He says that the tragedy will be permanent. The tragedy of the Congress getting a majority at every election will be a permanent feature and we are prepared to accommodate you.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Will the hon. Members from Tamil Nad be prepared to take a referendum on this single issue? Are you prepared?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think, let Mr. Annadurai please go on

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Madam Deputy Chairman, I can very well understand.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: The communis wants a new slogan because they are afraid of any other slogan.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Madam Deputy Chairman, my friend was saying that this tragedy is going to be permanent. Woe to the country and to the people. That is all what I can say. But I would like to press this point that a constitutional amendment can be thought of and made only through Parliament. That

is why we have approached Parliament for this. If any amendment is brought forward to this or any suggestion is given that it should be circulated to gather public opinion, we take up that challenge.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We take it up. I take it up.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: Because there is no agitation, you want it to be sent for public opinion, so that you can shout and create an agitation.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: If you have the majority, why are you afraid of it?

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: To give you political slogans and political platforms. It is for you to choose.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: I can dispel the fear of Mr. Rajagopalan. I am not prepared or I do not ask you to take this as an election issue. Do not be afraid of that. (Interruptions). We are not making it an election issue. This is an issue to be taken to the people for getting their consent or otherwise. That is not going to affect your offices. Nobody thinks about that. You may remain there.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: If you do not want offices, then why do you contest elections? Is it for the fun of sitting in the Assembly or . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: We do tell them to lose.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: . . . collecting money?

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: This is not a question of elections.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Madam, what strange bedfellows? Communism and communalism are together.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What a strange lamentation, Mr. Akbar Ali Khan!

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are in the midst of a tragedy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But Mr. Akbar Ali Khan wants to make it a comedy.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: This is not a question of election. This is a question wherein the issue is to be decided by the people. That is the point that I wanted to stress and my friend was talking about elections. I heard only part of his sentence. He was talking something about money. Our money does not come from Mr. Serajuddin.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: Because you do not know the source from where you get it. You get black money. We do not get black money. We may get anything through account.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Mr. I take a part of my friend's speech? We do not know Mr. Serajuddin. We do not know how to get money from them.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: But tell me your source.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: This is not a question of elections. This is a question of referring the issue to the people and getting their consent. Do not be under the illusion that I am asking the Congress Party to stand for elections on this alone. The Congress Party has done so many acts of commission and omission that we are confident of dethroning them in Madras State next time. Therefore, we need not have . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: You tried it last time and proved to be a miserable failure. You lost.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Therefore, it is not an election issue.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: At least with this hope you run your Party for some time. At least with the hope of

replacing us, you give satisfaction to your workers for some time.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Madam, simple logic would tell that I know about my Party workers more than Mr. Rajagopalan.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: I can also say. I know more about your Party and your quarrels. Ours is public. Yours is inside and then you patch up.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Mr. Rajagopalan, we know you quite well.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: I also know yours.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please let him continue.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: This is not a question of an analysis of our different Parties. This is a question wherein a particular issue has to be referred to the public. Are you prepared for that? That is what we ask. You are not prepared for that and that is why I say . . .

SHRI N. M. ANWAR (Madras): Madam, on a point of information, I have got the highest respect and regard for my good friend, Mr. Annadurai. But will he kindly explain what is there in retaining this name 'Madras' which has got such world wide publicity? How is he going to meet that point of view? Where is the difficulty in retaining this world-wide name of Madras?

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Annadurai, you continue. I do not think that party factions should be mentioned in that much length in the House.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: When party matters are brought in, we must reply to them.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: The only point in answer to the hon. Member, Mr. Anwar, is this. What we gain is, we gain sentimental satisfaction and status for our ancient land. That is all, and for that I have stated that when we rename the Parliament as the Lok Sabha, we gain some sentimental satisfaction. If in Madras we change the name of China Bazar into Netaji Subhas Chandra Road, nothing is changed in the street but something is changed in our thinking, in our soul, in our fibre. That is why we are pressing for it, not because we think that keeping Madras there will be wrong or something.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: My question is not that. We agree that there is something good in calling it Tamil Nad. But what is your allergy to Madras which has got a world-wide publicity?

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: My allergy is, if Madras is used for the name of the State, you confuse the capital with the State also. Madras is the name of the capital city. Tamil Nad is the name that ought to be given to the State. There ought to be a distinction between the name of the State and its capital, and therefore it is that I wholeheartedly support the Bill brought forward and I would commend it to the House.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I had no intention of taking part in this debate, but since this morning I have been listening to the speeches made in this House, and seeing the trend of these speeches, I have reason to strongly oppose the Bill moved by Shri Bhupesh Gupta. It looks as if Shri Bhupesh Gupta is pleading like a lawyer who has no brief from the party whom he is representing. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons he says that public opinion in the State of Madras as well as in other parts of the country is strongly in favour of changing the name of the State to Tamil Nad in conformity with the historical,

linguistic and cultural considerations. May I humbly ask him what barometer or what thermometer he has used in assessing the public opinion, whether he has got any representations from any parties in Tamil Nad, whether he has any representations from the people of Tamil Nad. What is the source by which he has got the public opinion of Tamil Nad about this Bill?

Then, if public opinion is to be gauged by what is said and done in the Madras Assembly, my friend, Mr. Annadurai, just now stated that a resolution in this connection was brought in the Madras Assembly in 1959, and it was defeated. What does it show, may I ask my friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta? Does it show that the people, the elected representatives of Madras State wanted the change or does it show otherwise?

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Madam, the hon. Member was saying that the resolution brought in the Legislative Assembly of Madras was defeated. It was not defeated. Part of it was accepted by the Government, and the Minister made a declaration to that effect.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Mr. Annadurai has stated something. May I ask him whether, if part of the resolution was accepted, it was to the effect that the name of Madras be changed into Tamil Nad? Was that recommendation communicated to the Centre? Was a request made to the Government of India to take steps to enact a law in Parliament to effect the necessary change? I am certain there was no such communication from Madras State to the Centre.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: I do not say that the Madras Government pressed for an amendment of the Constitution. They did not press. When the non-official resolution was brought forward, the Minister after meeting all the speeches said that so far as the State was concerned, it

will make use of the word Tamil Nad and the Madras Government was not prepared to ask for an amendment of the Constitution.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Mr. Annadurai is a parliamentarian and he knows what steps have to be taken to achieve a certain thing. If anybody makes a statement in the House that he accepts part of the resolution, that does not become an Act. It does not. Anybody saying that he accepts this proposition does not mean that the whole House has accepted it. So, that is a very false position for Mr. Annadurai to take.

As far as the charge is concerned that the ruling Party is not doing it, I may tell the House that the ruling Party as far back as 1920 made its position very clear as far as the linguistic provinces were concerned, and since then in the State of Madras it is called the Tamil Nad Pradesh Congress Committee and not the Madras State Congress Committee. In view of that if the people of Madras wanted that the name of Madras State should be changed to Tamil Nad, the course was very easy for them. They had the clear views of the ruling Party before them, because the Tamil Nad P.C.C. has always been there in existence since 1920 or even before, and they knew that the Centre would have no objection. So the very argument which Mr Annadurai wants to advance today is negated. The people of Madras do not want that the name of Madras should be changed into Tamil Nad, and therefore they have taken no action in this connection. It is simply some people who want to agitate on some issue or the other who raise this.

Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has always been speaking with two minds. I have quoted it before and I quote it in the present context also. He says that in the emergency the Government should be supported fully and nothing should be done which will damage the war effort. This is one side of the picture, and on the other

side he moves this Bill saying that the name of the State of Madras be changed into Tamil Nad. May I ask him where was the occasion today to press this Bill? Mr. Bhupesh Gupta introduced this Bill a long time before, and this Bill has been pending before this House for over a year or so, and he never thought it fit to press this Bill. He always said: "No, I do not want"

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would just make that clear. That does not depend on me. As you know, the ballot takes place and it depends upon the order in which it comes. It is just a matter of luck that it is at the top of the ballot this time.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta probably has a short memory. I have been after one of my non-official Bills, and Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has been after several of his bills, mainly Constitutional amendments. If I remember aright, it was on the top of the ballot once before also. He was asked by the Chairman whether he intended to press the Bill, and he said "no". It is on record, he cannot change the record, he cannot deny a fact.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I tell you that it was third or fourth or fifth. Then before that I wrote to the Chairman saying that I would take up my next Bill which according to me was more topical just at the time. I said that instead of the fourth I would move the fifth. One of the reasons was that Mr. Ramamurti was not here. Therefore, say that you should remember things fully.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: Even now he is not here.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: It was at a time when Mr. Ramamurti was sitting behind him that Mr Bhupesh Gupta said that he did not press the Bill that day, and that he wanted to take the next Bill which was also in his name. This is a matter of record and can be referred to there. Moreover, he is never serious about this matter. Why? It is because, if

[Shri M. P. Bhargava.]

he was serious he would have taken the normal procedure provided for in the Constitution for effecting such a change, and the normal procedure would have been to get a Resolution moved in the Madras Assembly and see that it was passed. Then he would have been on surer grounds about what he is writing in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. Then he could have said that he had ascertained public opinion, and he would have been strengthened in his efforts to bring forward the Bill here. But he did not do so. He goes the other way round. He knows full well that a Constitutional amendment requires a certain majority of Members present and voting, and out of the Members present and voting, there should be a clear majority if any Constitutional amendment is to be passed. And he knows full well, again, that he cannot get that majority here. And even then, he had the audacity to bring the Bill before the House rather than first approaching the Madras Assembly. So, I will humbly request Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that we are passing through a very critical time in the history of the nation and there should not be any attempt to bring up such controversial things at this time. When things settle down, if the people of Tamil Nad do want this change, they would certainly be welcome to do so. There have been precedents in the past when these things have been done. When Bombay was bifurcated, it was not Bombay and Gujarat but what emerged out was Maharashtra and Gujarat because the people of Bombay wanted that their State should be called Maharashtra and therefore there was no difficulty in accepting at the Central level that the new State would be called the State of Maharashtra and not the State of Bombay. So, it is very clear that there is nothing which prevents the people of Tamil Nad from demanding that their State should be called the State of Tamil Nad and not the State of Madras. Therefore,

the present Bill seems to be unnecessary and it is uncalled for at the present moment. Thank you.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: Madam Deputy Chairman, as has been already made clear, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta once gave notice of this Bill and withdrew it. I do not know what the present urgency is for him now to have brought it forward here.

DR. A SUBBA RAO (Kerala): Has he withdrawn it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then it would not have come again.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: He referred to something else, and actually he said that Mr. Ramamurti was not there. It is . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I did not withdraw it.

AN HON. MEMBER: You withdrew

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: Whatever it is, he did not move it then, he is moving it now and the reason he gave . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: One of the reasons was that you were not there at that time and I would have provided a speech for you.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: I talk about things that have happened in the Rajya Sabha. The record will be there as to who were there. (Interruption) Just because a person is not there, you cannot hoodwink or do something like that. And Mr. Bhargava has said that when actually Mr. Ramamurti was there, he did not move it. Now he says that Mr. Ramamurti was not there. And actually when Mr. Ramamurti is not there, he is moving it. Just because we are in trouble, just now, he wants to take advantage of it. It is their nature, it is the nature of the Communist Party. As somebody has said just now, there is no other slogan, no

other platform. So, they have invented this now to catch some votes from Tamil Nad. He has said much about Tamil Nad, the Tamil language and all that. Everybody knows about everybody's language. How old a language is, people connected with only will know. And Mr. Annadurai has quoted at some places some books wherein he finds the mention of Tamil Nad and all that. Andhra has been quoted long ago. It does not matter. We are not going into that matter now. We have not called Andhra the Telugu Desam. Maharashtra . . .

DR. A. SUBBA RAO: Andhra, it is how you call it; why did you not call it Hyderabad?

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: I do not know whether you want the State . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: On a point of information I may tell my friend that it was agreed on behalf of all that it would remain Hyderabad but as there was a case on behalf of our neighbourly friend in the U.N.O., we all unanimously decided that it should be Andhra Pradesh. Otherwise, there was no argument about this question. Everybody agreed that it should be Hyderabad.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. Not at all.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: Everybody seems to be . . .

(Interruption)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are not a Communist.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: They want the names to be changed after the language; just because it was named by the British people, they want to change it. Mr. Ghosh said that it was the name given by the British and so the name of Madras should be changed. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta says that the language

spoken is Tamil and so, it should be Tamil Nad. Actually, as far as I know . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The name was there. It is nothing new.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: As far as I know, a language is named after the name of the State: Bengal—Bengali. The language spoken by the people of Bengal is Bengali. A State does not take the name of the language, it is not taken after the language. Assam—Assamese, it is like that. I do not know why he has taken a particular fancy to names . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Will you kindly wait for a while . . .

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: Why do you disturb me? You should have a lot of patience. I know how long Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will take for his reply. So, why should he interrupt other people when they are speaking?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: So that you could speak and get . . .

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: You always help people, I know. Actually, the people of Madras had a better sense, had better consideration for other people living in the State. That is why they did not want to drive them or add insult to injury. As we all know, there are a number of—I do not know the statistics—Telugu-speaking people and other people staying in Madras. When the question of dividing Madras into Andhra and Tamil Nad came up, Mr. Rajagopalachari was supposed to have written to the Governor that there would be bloodshed in the streets of Madras because if Andhra State was carved out, there would come up the question of where Madras should go.

[Shrimati C. Ammanna Raja.]

It is very difficult to say. In the City of Madras itself, there are a number of Andhras still living. And in almost all the other districts, at least one-third of the population is Telugu-speaking; in Madurai they live; in Coimbatore there are the Naidus and in north Arcot there are the Reddys. Even today they speak Telugu. Take Salem. You know that Mr. Ramaswamy comes from Salem. In his house he speaks Telugu. All these Chettians, excepting the Nattukottai Chettians, these Komutti Chettians, all speak Telugu. Somehow or other, fortunately or unfortunately, Madras and some of these districts have come to be called Tamil Nad, and they have chosen Tamil as their language. Just because 42 per cent. of the people in India speak Hindi, we do not call it Hindi Nad. The majority language spoken by the majority has been adopted and so other people need not be insulted. That is why they had a better sense. And I thought that Mr. Annadurai at least for the sake, of votes was not going to clamour for naming it as Tamil Nad. He wanted Telugu support also. Even yesterday he said so. I do not know how he claims that; I do not know how he will call it hereafter. The whole Madras State is Tamil Nad. So, it is very wrong to have such an approach particularly at a time when we have more important things to do, when we have to work for greater things. Just as Mr. Santhanam said, there are some people who are always anxious to fish in troubled waters. Whatever it is, the Madras Government knows better the people of Madras, they have better consideration for them, and they are mutually interested in each other, probably more than anybody else.

4 P.M.

As for Rajya Sabha and Lok Sabha, which Mr. Annadurai referred to, well, they are mere translations. But in the case of Madras, if you change it to 'Tamilnad', it is not a mere trans-

lation. It is naming a State as something else. So it is not a parallel at all. Only few other States are named after the languages spoken there. What about Mysore? What about Kerala? What about Madhya Pradesh? What about U.P.? If you go on calling the states according to the languages spoken, then Kashmir should be called 'Urdu State' perhaps. I mean, it is an absurd thing to start with, and I do not know where it will end if other people take it up. It may be an interesting fact if I say that the Sheriff of the Madras High Court used to take his oath in Telugu till recently—I do not know if it has been changed since. What I mean to say is in most of Madras city and in a great part of the whole State of Madras there is the Telugu language spoken, and for the first time, I think in 1951, Mr. Bhaktavatsalam approached Mr. Gopala Reddi (*Interruptions*).

That is why I am opposing. We are asking for fairness. We do not want to provoke people and excite people unnecessarily to take to other controversies. I am saying it because we want to live at peace and not create greater troubles when we have already to face so much of trouble now.

DR. A. SUBBA RAO: The people of Madras and those people who speak Telugu there, I do not think, will be excited if the name is so changed. It is only people from outside . . .

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: What else? That is another reason why they do not want to change it. It is because of all these reasons, for the first time, I think in 1951—I do not remember—Mr. Bhaktavatsalam approached Mr. Gopala Reddi—Chingleput electoral list was only in Telugu till then—and said, "Please give us this list in Tamil also so that people may know." So there was so much Telugu, and gradually it was being converted into Tamil there. Now Mr. Annadurai said that so many names

were being converted into Tamil forms. But it has been going on for a long time, even when we were there.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Why has 'Banaras' been renamed 'Varanasi', and 'Cawnpore' changed to 'Kanpur'?

SHRIMATI C AMMANNA RAJA: It is not renamed. It was the original name 'Madras' and 'Tamilnad'.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: The spelling has been corrected.

SHRIMATI C AMMANNA RAJA: 'Varanasi' was the original name, but then the Britishers could not pronounce it properly and they made it 'Benaras'. Likewise the present 'Vijayawada' was 'Bezawada'. That is a different thing altogether. Now you want to call a State by the language spoken there, by the language adopted as the official regional language of the State. They are not two parallels. (Interruptions) Please do not unnecessarily interrupt. They are not two parallels. 'Banaras' to 'Varanasi' is different from 'Madras' being called 'Tamilnad'; I mean, the principle is different. Do not think you can confuse us. There may be people who may be confused by your arguments—not here but elsewhere.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But there was a place called 'Tamilnad'.

SHRIMATI C AMMANNA RAJA: It has become a habit with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta; he cannot keep quiet; he must go on with his running commentary throughout.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Be graceful; be chivalrous.

SHRIMATI C AMMANNA RAJA: If at all any action has to be taken by Parliament to amend the Constitution, particularly in things like this which affect the States, we have no business to arrogate the power to ourselves. It will be interference.

Mr. Annadurai explained that a part of it was unofficially adopted by Mr. Subramaniam. He perhaps thought that was all right to satisfy some people. But officially, as a Government, he did not want to change the name, because that would upset matters and interfere with the freedom, at least with the sentiments of so many other people. When there are so many others, the Tamil people themselves—they are clever enough; they are numerically greater in number than the others—why this cry about democracy day in and day out, I do not understand. Why this cry that they have got oppressive majority, they have got brute majority? I cannot understand it. Yes, it is because we were voted by the majority. The majority of the people have got confidence in us and we have to carry on in a democratic way. Democracy means that. For everything you cannot ask for a referendum. If you do not indulge in referendum, it does not mean there is no democracy. If a referendum is conceded on this, then anybody may ask for a referendum on anything and everything. Well, that is not democracy. People have voted the Congress Party to power because they have confidence in them to carry on the administration properly. And that is democracy. Why are you then bothered about this oppressive or brute majority? Why do you describe it so when they have come by a democratic process? And if you do not like it, what can anybody do for that? It will be there. They have confidence in us that is democracy: democracy means rule by the majority. Because you cannot get a big number, a majority, you cannot ask for a referendum for everything. Democracy means rule by the majority, and that is why we have to carry on and you will have to bear with it whether you like it or not. I know the Communist Party and the DMK go on saying, 'Oh, yes, they have got a majority. They will not allow this Resolution or this Bill to come up.' Don't you know that we

[Shrimati C Ammanna Raja]

are quite used to seeing that just because you have no majority you seek a referendum? You may take up that issue, but why should we be dictated to by people in whom the people have no confidence? (Interruptions) That is not democracy. Democracy is rule by the majority, and the majority are voted to power by the people, and as long as they have confidence in us we go on doing whatever we feel is good for the country, is good for the people and is good for the nation, and that is what people will do, who like peace to prevail in the country. And other people like to upset it and they go on inventing one excuse after another one plea or another, so that they may have a platform. So I feel this is not being brought up with a good motive. It should be defeated. It cannot be accepted.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया
(मध्य प्रदेश) उपसभापति महोदया, जो बहस की गई और माननीय भार्गव साहब ने और अभी जो पूर्व वक्ता थी उन्होंने कुछ ऐसा प्रगत किया कि संशोधन के आ जाने से देश में ऐसी व्यवस्था हो जायेगी कि हमारी इस संकटकालीन स्थिति में हमको नियंत्रण करने में बड़ी कठिनाई आयेगी। न तो ऐसा कोई विशेष कठता उत्पन्न करने वाला यह संशोधन प्रतीत होता है और न ऐसी ही बात है कि यह नहीं होगा तो हमारे यहां की स्थिति खराब हो जाने वाली है। परन्तु जो दलीले दी गईं, उनको देख कर ऐसा लगता है कि दलीले देनी थी, इसलिये दी गई। माननीय भार्गव साहब ने भी कहा कि प्रान्तीय विधान मन्त्रालय में इसके बारे में प्रस्ताव पारित करके केन्द्र में भेजे जाने चाहिये। इसी तरह से पूर्व वक्ता महोदया ने भी सब कुछ कहा। मगर यह किसी ने नहीं कहा कि यह माननीय भूपेश गुप्त ने जो बिल यहां पर रखा, वह अवैधानिक है, कास्टिट्यूशन के अन्तर्गत उनको इसे लाने का अधिकार

नहीं है और उन्होंने बिलकुल अपने अधिकारों का दुस्प्रयोग किया है, उसको यहां पर ला कर के और उनको किसी प्रकार का अधिकार नहीं था। इस आधार पर किसी ने भी कोई बात नहीं उठाई और न उठाने के कारण है। एक तो वैधानिक तौर से किसी भी माननीय सदस्य को, चाहे कांग्रेस दल का होता, चाहे किसी अन्य दल का होता, इस बारे में संशोधन प्रस्तुत करने का अधिकार था कि यह चूक यहां किया है वहां क्यों नहीं किया, वहां किया है यहां क्यों नहीं किया। तो इसमें कोई विशेष फर्क पड़ता हो, ऐसा मैं नहीं मानता। यह जरूर है कि माननीय सदस्य, जोकि इतनी दिलचस्पी ले रहे हैं, इसकी बहस में, उनको ऐसा कुछ लगता तो वे इसको पब्लिक ओपिनियन के लिये भेज कर इस प्रश्न की ही जांच करवा लेते, पूरा तमिलनाडु जिसे मद्रास कहा जाता है उस क्षेत्र के लोगों से जांच करवा लेते कि आपका इस बारे में क्या मत है और अपनी अपनी राय ले करके भेजे, मगर इस के बारे में भी किसी ने कोई प्रस्ताव भेजा नहीं और इस तरह की कोई कार्यवाही की नहीं, तो ऐसा लगता है कि चूक विरोधी दल के किसी सदस्य ने, या कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के किसी सदस्य ने प्रस्ताव रखा है इसलिये इस का विरोध किया जाय—यह कुछ न्यायसंगत प्रतीत नहीं होता। वाराणसी के बारे में बात हुई कि अंग्रेजों से उसका ठीक तरह से उच्चारण नहीं हुआ इसलिए बनारस हो गया और इसलिये बनारस नाम चलता रहा, मगर हमारे भारतीय नागरिकों के मन में जो हमारे पुराने सांस्कृतिक नाम हैं, उनके प्रति कुछ आकर्षण सा है, चाहे वह जाने में हो चाहे अनजाने में हों, तो बनारस का वाराणसी करना उसी भावना का आदर करना है। अब वहां की कांग्रेस “मद्रास कांग्रेस” के नाम से होगी इस के लिए मुझे शक है। जैसाकि माननीय भार्गव साहब ने बताया वहां पर तमिलनाडु कांग्रेस के नाम से है, तो यह आखिर क्यों है? क्यों नहीं मद्रास कांग्रेस के नाम से प्रारम्भ किया और मद्रास कांग्रेस के नाम से सारी

कार्यवाही की गई ? लेकिन ऐसा कुछ नहीं है । तो हम लोगों के हृदय में पुराने नामों के प्रति, पुराने वैभव के प्रति आकर्षण है और उसी आधार पर हम चाहते हैं कि हमारे प्रान्तों के, जगहों आदि के, नाम पुराने हों जो हमारी पुरानी संस्कृति है—तामिलनाड क्षेत्र की जो पुरानी संस्कृति है और पुराना साहित्य है—उस को जाग्रत किया जाय और लोगों के मन में उसके प्रति आकर्षण हो । इसी भावना में आ कर के यह संगोधन उन्होंने रखा है । वाराणसी के लिये दलील दी गई कि उस नाम को कुछ लोग बोल नहीं सकते थे इसलिये बनारस नाम हो गया, लेकिन मैं एक और उदाहरण देता हूं । मध्य भारत में भैलसा नाम का स्थान है, किन्तु उसका नाम विदिशा किया गया । क्यों उसके प्रति हमें आकर्षण था, क्यों कांग्रेस के सदस्यों ने और दूसरे लोगों ने इसके लिए प्रयत्न किया कि उसका नाम विदिशा रखा जाय ? इसलिये कि कालिदास के ग्रन्थों में इस का वर्णन आता था और इस के सम्बन्ध में पुरानी संस्कृति थी, पुराना इतिहास था और उससे पुराने इतिहास की कड़ी जुड़ी हुई थी और इसी आधार पर उसका नाम विदिशा रखा गया । इसलिये नहीं रखा गया कि ऐसा कांग्रेस पसन्द करती है या कम्युनिस्ट नापसन्द करते हैं । तो इस आधार पर कोई बहस करना न्यायसंगत प्रतीत नहीं होता । इसका आधार यह है कि हमारा पुराने नामों से स्टैमिटल अटैचमेंट है । तो फिर क्यों हम मद्रास नाम को चालू रखें ? भारतवर्ष में इस बात के लिये आन्दोलन किया जाता है कि विदेशी बोर्डों को हटाया जाय, जितनी विदेशियों की मूर्तियां हैं, उनको हटाया जाय । क्यों, क्या कारण है ? क्योंकि उनका अपना गुलामी का इतिहास है । जो विदेशियों की मूर्तिया या विदेशी बोर्ड हम यहां देखते हैं वह बताते हैं कि हम गुलाम रहे थे, लेकिन हमारे सिर पर गुलामी के ये चिह्न अभी तक हैं जैसेकि अंग्रेजी गुलामी के रूप में हमारे सिर पर अभी

तक लदी हुई है । तो वैसे ही ये जो नाम हैं, वे गुलामी के प्रतीक हैं । मद्रास आखिर किस का दिया हुआ नाम है ? जो अंग्रेज आये थे, उन्होंने यह नाम शुरू किया । मद्रास Madras है । यह एम. ए. डी. "मैड" से शुरू होने वाला नाम है तथा "Rash" का "H" हटा कर बना दिया है । मुझे इससे कोई खास नफरत नहीं है, तो भी मैं जानना चाहता हूं जो Mad अर्थात् पागल से शुरू होता है और Rash अर्थात् जल्दबाद से खत्म होता है, ऐसे मद्रास नाम के प्रति ऐसा कौन सा आकर्षण है, जो तामिलनाड नाम से नफरत करें । कांग्रेस अपने नाम के लिए तामिलनाड रखना चाहेंगी और खदी भंडार का नाम भी तामिलनाड खादी भंडार है, तामिलनाड के नाम से उसकी प्रतिष्ठा है, तामिलनाड की खादी बहुत अच्छी समझी जाती है और उसका नाम तामिलनाड खदी रखना चाहते हैं लेकिन मद्रास का नाम तामिलनाड नहीं रखेंगे । अब झगड़ा यह है कि वहां तेलगु बोलने वाले भी हैं, तेलंगाना वाले भी हैं और तामिल बोलने वाले तामिलनाड वाले भी हैं, तेलंगाना और तामिलनाड दोनों को मिला कर मद्रास बना हुआ है, इसलिये हम अगर इसका नाम तामिलनाड रखेंगे, तो तेलंगाना वाले नाराज हो जायेंगे और अगर तेलंगाना रखेंगे, तो तामिलनाड वाले नाराज हो जायेंगे -- इसलिये इस आपस के झगड़े को मिटाने के लिए विदेशियों द्वारा दिया गया जो नाम है, उसको ही रखना कोई न्यायसंगत प्रतीत नहीं होता है । अगर दो भाषाओं का झगड़ा होता है, तो फिर बन्दर-बांट वाला किस्सा हो जाना है । जब दो बिल्लियों में झगड़ा हुआ, तो बन्दर ने भारी रोटी बांटते बांटते खा ली । और इसी तरह से हमारा तेलंगाना और तामिलनाड का झगड़ा अगर चले, उसका हिस्सा अंग्रेजी ले, उचित नहीं है । इसमें कोई झगड़े को पैदा करने की बात नहीं है, बल्कि मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि वहां के रहने वाले यह समझेंगे और यह पसन्द करेंगे कि विदेशियों द्वारा

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया]

जो दिया गया नाम है, उनकी उपयोगिता नहीं रही है और उनकी जगह जो उनके पड़ोसी का, उन के भाई का, उनके अपने ही लोगों का नाम तामिलनाडु है, वह रखा जाय और उनको यह नाम ज़ादा प्रिय होत, वजाय उन विदेशियों द्वारा रखे गये नाम के। इसी तरह से बम्बई के बारे में कहा गया। मेरे खयाल से वहां भी यही बात की गई, जो अच्छी ही है। बम्बई प्रान्त की जगह महाराष्ट्र रखा गया है।

अब यह कहना है कि इसी प्वाइंट को आप पारित आपोनिथन जानने के लिये भेज दीजिये, अगर सिसिअर हैं, जनतंत्र में विश्वास करने हैं और यह चाहते हैं कि डेमोक्रेटिक आधार पर ही सारे का भारा कार्य होना चाहिये, तो फिर इसको पब्लिक ओपीनिथन जानने के लिए भेज दीजिए— न भूपेश गुप्त की बात को मानना चाहिये और न माननीय भार्गव साहब के विरोध के आधार पर कुछ किया जाना चाहिये। यह दोनों नहीं होना चाहिये, बल्कि पब्लिक ओपीनिथन के लिये भेज देना चाहिये। इसलिए यह अत्यन्त आवश्यक है कि ऐसा भ्रंशकार करे। अगर किसी माननीय सदस्य को ऐसा लगता है कि चूंकि माननीय भूपेश गुप्त ने प्रस्ताव रखा है, इसलिये इस वक्त इसको नहीं मानना चाहिये, तो वह पब्लिक ओपीनिथन के लिये भ्रंशकृत करने का प्रस्ताव दे सकते थे मगर ऐसा कुछ नहीं किया। हां, कुछ ऐसा आरोप लगाया गया कि वोट प्राप्त करने का एक तरीका है और यह प्रस्ताव माननीय भूपेश गुप्त इसलिए ले आये है और वह इसके आधार पर अधिक वोट प्राप्त कर सकेंगे, यानी कुछ न कुछ शंका पैदा हो गई है। वह भी महसूस करते हैं कि लोग इस चीज़ का समर्थन करते हैं और इसी वजह से कांग्रेस कैम्प में ऐसी हलचल मचने लग गई है कि यह ऐसा कदम उठा रहे हैं कि इससे अधिक वोट प्राप्त कर लेंगे— तो अगर वह इससे वोट प्राप्त कर लेंगे, तब

इस का सीधा मतलब यही है कि लोग चाहते हैं कि वहां का नाम तामिलनाडु हो और मद्रास के बजाय यह नाम उनकी प्रिय है। तो यह भय कुछ मित्रों को लग रहा है। मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि अगर ऐसा है तो आप स्वयं ही इस प्रस्ताव को क्यों नहीं रखते, कांग्रेस पार्टी स्वयं ही क्यों नहीं तामिलनाडु का नाम दे देती। अगर वह ऐसा करते हैं, तो हम माननीय गुप्ता से प्रार्थना करेंगे कि वह इसका श्रेय कांग्रेस को ही लेने दें और यह सेहग कांग्रेस के सिर पर ही बंधने दे कि तामिलनाडु का नाम उन्होंने रखा है, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी या किसी दूसरी पार्टी के लोगों ने नहीं रखा है। अगर आप तामिलनाडु का नाम स्वीकार कर लेते हैं, तो फिर इस बिल को वह वापिस ले लेंगे और यह नहीं कहेंगे कि मैं ने यह नाम रखा है। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के लीडर भूपेश गुप्त के बिल पर तामिलनाडु का नाम रखा गया है। इसमें हमें कोई दिलचस्पी नहीं है कि यह श्रेय कौन प्राप्त करना चाहता है और इसी आधार पर इसका समर्थन करें या विरोध करे। अगर सचमुच यह बात है कि चूंकि विरोधी दल के सदस्य द्वारा यह प्रस्ताव रखा गया है, इसलिये यह आपके वोट्स पर अतिक्रमण करने वाला है और आपके वोट्स को कम करने वाला है, तो आप स्वयं ही अपनी स्वच्छा से इस नाम को बदल दीजिये और इस बिल को पारित होने का मौका न दीजिये और कांग्रेस द्वारा लाये गये बिल को पारित कर दीजिये।

अब, कहा जाता है कि कांग्रेस बहुमत में आई है और बहुमत के आधार पर हम सब कर रहे हैं। बहुमत में आई है, इस के लिये दो मत नहीं हैं, मगर किस तरह से आई है, इसके बारे में बहुत मतभेद है; क्योंकि रुपया किस के हाथ से आया, यह सारे का मांग प्रतिदिन अखबारों में आता है। किस किस ने कौन कौन से हथकंडे अपनाये, किस किस ने क्या क्या कार्यवाही

की, इन सब बातों को दुहराने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। इसको हमारे कांग्रेस के माननीय सदस्य भी अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं। अभी तो १० हजार का मिराजुद्दीन के केस का हिमाव आया है, मगर लोग तो कहते हैं कि न जाने कितने लाखों का हिमाव-किताब उसमें है। ऐसी सारी गडबडियाँ जो हैं वह इक्वायरी पर ही पता लग सकती हैं। फिर यह कहना कि बहुमत में आई है कुछ ठीक नहीं है। बहुमत को प्राप्त करने के लिये कौन कौन से हथकड़ों को अपनाया है, किन किन को क्या क्या कहा है, किन किन को क्या क्या सतोष दिया है? वैसा ही है कि मस्जिद में गये तो नमाज भी पढ़ ली और शराबखाने में गये तो शराब भी पी ली, न ख़दा नाराज हुआ और न जैतान नाराज हुआ, दोनों को खुश कर दिया और उस तरह से अपना काम चलाया और इस तरह से बहुमत प्राप्त किया। खैर, जो भी किया उस से मतलब नहीं, बहुमत में है इस को कोई डिनाई नहीं कर सकता, लेकिन हम यह प्रार्थना करते हैं कि आप किसी केस को, किसी चीज को, बहुमत के आधार पर नहीं बल्कि मेरिट पर डिसाइड करने की कोशिश करें। ऐसा नहीं करें कि चूँकि विरोधी दल वाले ने प्रस्तुत किया है इसलिये उस का विरोध करें या जनसघ और कम्युनिस्ट के ठीक रीतिशस्त्र नहीं है इसलिये कम्युनिस्टों द्वारा रखे गये प्रस्ताव का हम विरोध करें, इस भावना को हम नहीं मानते। हम तो इस को मानते हैं कि न्याय के आधार पर, जस्टिस के आधार पर क्या ठीक है और हमारी पुरानी मस्कृति को जागरूक करने के लिये कौन सा ऐसा साधन हो सकता है कि लोगों को उस के लिए प्रेरणा मिल सके। क्यों हम अब “इंडिया दैट इज भारत” को मानते हैं, हम क्यों नहीं खाली “इंडिया” को मानते हैं? वह इसलिए कि चक्रवर्ती भारत के नाम पर “भारत” पड़ा है। हम क्यों उसके लिये आकर्षित हैं? इसलिये आकर्षित है कि भारत शब्द में हमें एक

आत्मीयता मालूम होती है, एक अपनापन मालूम पड़ता है और भारत शब्द के साथ जो इतिहास लगा हुआ है, उस के साथ जो संस्कृति लगी हुई है, उम्मे हमें प्रेरणा मिलती है और उस प्रेरणा को प्राप्त करने की दृष्टि से ही हम “इंडिया दैट इज भारत” मानने लगे हैं और फिर उसकी जगह केवल “भारत” कह देंगे, यह हमारा आगे का लक्ष्य है। तो मेरा निवेदन है कि अगर अभी आप को ऐसा कुछ लगता हो कि एकदम से तामिलनाडु लिख देंगे तो लोग बुरा मानेंगे, ना मैं माननीय प्रस्तावक महोदय से प्रार्थना करूँगा कि अभी वह पाँच वर्ष तक मद्रास का नाम “मद्रास दैट इज तामिलनाडु” कर के चलने दें और फिर बाद में हम तामिलनाडु करें। केवल तामिलनाडु उम को किया जा सकता है। वह तब हो सकता है, जबकि बहुमत उस भावना के महत्व को समझे, उस का मूल्य आके। पृष्ठिये अपने पी० सी० मी० से, तामिलनाडु की पी० सी० सी० से कि क्यों तुमने इसका मद्रास का नाम नहीं रखा है, क्यों ऐसा विशेष आकर्षण है? अपने कांग्रेस ग्रुप के लिए तो तामिलनाडु बहुत अच्छा है और सारी जनता के लिये तामिलनाडु बुरा है, यह समझ में नहीं आता। इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि यह जो संविधान में संशोधन करने का विधेयक श्री भूपेश गुप्ता ने रखा है इसको स्वीकार किया जाय।

रहा सवाल नामों के बारे में, तो कई नाम हमने बदल दिये। हमने सेन्ट्रल प्राविन्सेज को बदल कर मध्य प्रदेश किया, यूनाइटेड प्राविन्सेज को बदल कर उत्तर प्रदेश किया। ऐसा नहीं है कि हम कोई बंधे हुए हैं कि एक ही नाम होना चाहिये। अगर कोई दूसरा शब्द तामिलनाडु से बढ़िया मिले, उसके पीछे अच्छा इतिहास मिले, अच्छी मस्कृति मिले, तो उसको हमें स्वीकार कर लेना चाहिये। हम कोई बंधे नहीं हैं कि तामिलनाडु ही हो जाय, क्योंकि एक दफा

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया]

नाम इसके फेवर में थे। वर्तमान में जो हमारे पास नामग्री है, जो हमारे पास नाम उपलब्ध हैं उन नामों में हम यह नाम ज्यादा पसन्द करते हैं। हमने भंगी को हरिजन कहना शुरू किया। काहे गांधी जी ने तकलीफ उठाई? सारी दुनिया भंगी को इसी नाम से जानती थी लेकिन उनको हमने हरिजन की मज्ञा दी क्योंकि ये भी देवता का, ईश्वर का, ग्रेज है इनसे बराबरी की भावना मन में आई। हरिजन शब्द के पीछे जो मतलब है, उसका जितना असर दिमाग में आता है, उसके प्रति जो श्रद्धा और प्रेम पैदा होता है वह भंगी शब्द में नहीं होता। भंगी शब्द से हममें कई प्रकार की नकरत और अनेक प्रकार की भावनाएँ जाग्रत होती थीं और हरिजन शब्द से एक शुद्ध भावना जाग्रत होती थी, इसी कारण से यह सब सोच समझकर पूज्य बापू ने भंगी को या गिरे हुए बर्ग के लोगों को हरिजन शब्द से पुकारा। उन्होंने यह शब्द इसलिये नहीं दिया कि दुनिया के किन्हीं लोगों ने प्रस्ताव पास करके दिया या भंगी या चमारों ने प्रस्ताव पास करके दिया कि हमको दुनिया वाले चमार या भंगी कहते हैं इसलिये हमको हरिजन कहो। मगर गांधी जी ने यह अनुभूति की कि जो अनगिनत भाई हैं भंगी, चमार के नाम से और घृणा की दृष्टि से देखे जाते हैं, उन शब्द के साथ ही घृणा का भाव लोगों के मन में पैदा हो गया था, जिसमें अगर कोई भंगी अथवा चमार पास से निकलना तो एक दम “फाउनिंग” जिसे कहा जाता है उस नफरत के भाव से देखा जाता था।

श्री भाऊराव कृष्णराव गायकवाड़ (महाराष्ट्र) : हरिजन कहने से गले में पड़ना है, क्या होता है ?

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया : मैं उसको भी बता दूंगा एक फाउनिंग की भावना थी। उस एक हरिजन शब्द के प्रयोग से उस स्थिति में बदलाव पैदा होने लगा।

शुद्ध अर्थ तो इसका यह होता है कि हरिजन अर्थात् ईश्वर का मनुष्य, मनुष्य-मनुष्य में भेदभाव नहीं होना चाहिये इसलिये पहले जितनी नफरत होती थी उसके मुकाबले में अब कम होती जा रही है और प्रति दिन उस भाव में वृद्धि होती जा रही है, उनके प्रति नफरत कम हो रही है।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : क्या हरिजन ये नहीं है ?

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया : याजी जी भी हरिजन हैं और मैं भी हरिजन हूँ। अगर याजी जी अपने को देवजन अथवा अमुरजन मानते हों तो बात दूसरी है, अगर भंगी जन मानते हैं तब तो बात दूसरी है। अगर कोई और जन मानते हैं मुझे उससे मतलब नहीं है। अगर अपने आप को हरिजन कहते हैं, तब तो मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना। तो एक विशेष भावना से प्रेरित होकर पूज्य बापू ने गिरे हुए क्लासेज के लोगों को हरिजन की मज्ञा दी जिसमें लोगों के मन में पहले जो बहुत ही घृणा का भाव उनके प्रति था कि अगर भंगी की परछाई पड़ जाती तो स्नान करने जाना पड़ता, गंगा में गोते लगाने जाना पड़ता था, गंगा जल छिड़कना पड़ता था।

श्री पंडरीनाथ सीतारामजी पाटोल (महाराष्ट्र) : विषय कौन सा चल रहा है ?

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया : समझ में नहीं आने सरीखा है।

तो मैं प्रार्थना करूँगा कि श्री भूपेश गुप्ता ने जो दृष्टान्त रखे उसकी आवश्यकता की अनुभूति करें, क्योंकि मैं भी तामिलनाडु शब्द से खुश हूँ। ऐसी बात नहीं मगर मुझे वहाँ एक दो बार जाने का अवसर मिला और वैसे ही किसी चर्चा के दौरान बातचीत करते हुये “तामिलनाडु” के प्रति लोगों का आकर्षण देखा। उसी की अनुभूति के कारण मैं भी इसका समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा

हुआ हूँ मेरे समर्थन करने का आशय यह नहीं है कि मैं वहाँ कोई वोट मांगने जाने वाला हूँ। अगर श्री भूपेश गुप्त वोट लेने वाले हैं . . . (Interruption) . . . जरा खड़े होकर कहो।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : जरा बोलने की तमीज भी सीखें “खड़े होकर बोलो” is not parliamentary.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him speak on. You have too much of your commentary. His chain of thought is broken.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया : धन्यवाद माननीय उपसभापति महोदया। मैं श्रीमान याजी जी से नम्र निवेदन करूँगा कि कृपा करके जब कभी वे अपनी तीरंदाजी करना चाहें तो कृपा करके पार्लियामेंट के नियमों के अनुसार तमीज में खड़े हो जाय करें और मेरी तरफ देखा करें और जब मेरी आंख उनकी तरफ हो जाय और मैं उनकी तरफ मुखानिब होकर बैठ जाऊँ तो . . .

श्री तारकेश्वर पांडे (उत्तर प्रदेश) : तीरंदाजी बैठे बैठे वे कैसे कर सकते हैं ?

श्री पंडरीनाथ सीतारामजी पाटील : उपसभापति महोदया, ये जो विषय पर कह रहे हैं वह कुछ मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। विषय तामिलनाडु का है और बात हरिजन की चल रही है।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया : मैं उन से नम्र प्रार्थना करूँगा कि संभवतः कहीं माफे के फेटे में मुनाई बराबर नहीं दे रहा हो तो उसे खोल कर मुन लें। तो विषय इस बारे में है कि मद्रास का नाम तामिलनाडु क्यों किया जाय और नाम क्यों नहीं बदल दिया जाता है। इस सारे का इतिहास देने के लिये पूरी पृष्ठभूमि देनी पड़ती है, बिना उसके संभवतः आपकी

समझ में नहीं आ सकता कि क्यों मद्रास का नाम तामिलनाडु किया जाय क्योंकि आपके मन में मद्रास के प्रति ऐसा मोह हो गया है कि अंग्रेज चले गये लेकिन अंग्रेजों के दिये हुए नामों के प्रति मोह नहीं छूटा है, उसकी कुर्सी के कारण या उसके किसी और प्रभाव के कारण या अंग्रेजियत के कारण। तो यह साथ बैठने का जो असर हो गया है उससे ही ऐसा लगता है। तो मेरी प्रार्थना है कि हम लोग किसी एक चीज से बंधे रहें, ऐसा मैं नहीं मानता। अगर वहाँ के रहने वाले समझते हैं कि परिवर्तन करना आवश्यक है, और तामिल भाषी लोगों की भावना जाग्रत करने के लिये, तामिल में जो साहित्य भरा हुआ है उसको भी प्रकाश में लाने की दृष्टि से और तामिल की संस्कृति के प्रति भी लोगों को आकर्षित करने की दृष्टि से यह अत्यंत आवश्यक है तो हम इस विषय में विचार करें। अगर कुछ बंधुओं को यह अप्रिय लगता है कि यह प्रस्ताव जो भूपेश गुप्ता द्वारा लाया गया है यह ठीक नहीं तो उसमें मंगोर्धन करके दूसरा प्रस्ताव पेश करें और अगर उन्हें लगता है कि यह जनता का मत नहीं तो फिर यह जनमत जानने के लिये भेजा जाय। वे कृपा करके एक प्रस्ताव दें कि यह पब्लिक ओपीनियन के लिये भेजा जाय और इसमें केवल मद्रास प्रान्त के लोगों का मत लिया जायगा और फ्रिग् वाद में निर्णय किया जाय कि रिफरेन्डम होना चाहिये या नहीं होना चाहिये। केवल इसी बात पर चुनाव लड़ कर देख लीजिए, यह कहना निरर्थक है। जहाँ तक शासन का सवाल है, वह पब्लिक ओपीनियन के लिये इसको भेज सकती है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं माननीय भूपेश गुप्ता द्वारा रखे गये संशोधन बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ और कांग्रेस दल के माननीय सदस्यों से प्रार्थना करूँगा कि वे भी अपनी तामिलनाडु की थीसिस से राय मिला कर इसका समर्थन करने की कृपा करेंगे। धन्यवाद।

SHRI N. M. LINGAM Madam, I had not intended to take part in this debate but seeing the trend of the discussion I thought perhaps I would be able to contribute something to the matter under discussion. The first impression that I got when I knew that my hon friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was moving this measure was that he was trying to spend the weekend in a lighthearted way by introducing a discussion of this kind in this august House because the House knows that he is a serious student of politics and that he usually concerns himself with matters of grave import to our country.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR This is part of his fireworks

SHRI N. M. LINGAM You may put it that way but even so I thought, having regard to the items of work with which we are grappling at the fag end of the Session, he would not find time or the inclination to deal with a subject like this because, in the first place, the subject is not a burning one in the country and secondly, it concerns primarily the State of Madras. As the House knows, the Madras Government did have an opportunity, on the motion of a private Member, to discuss this very subject and they did not think it necessary to recommend any change in the Constitution with regard to the name of the State. If in spite of all this, my hon friend has found it necessary to initiate a full-fledged debate on this question here, it could only mean that either he wanted to play the role which his friend, namely, Mr. Ramamurti, wanted to play in this matter or that he wanted to provide this House with a discussion which would not be serious and which would at the same time give us some kind of relaxation. I would not impute any other motive to my hon friend.

Now, coming to the merits of the question, Madam, I would, at the very

outset, say that we on this side of the House do not oppose any good change that may be suggested. After all, we are in the process of great changes in the country. We are changing not only names and norms but also our very way of life. We are trying to catch up with the latest developments in the modern world with regard to science and technology. The whole face of the country is changing and it is indeed our objective to so change the society that it not only reflects what is best in our own ancient traditions but also what is best in modern thought. That being the position in which we live, it is inconceivable that any responsible individual or State is opposed to any wholesome change but in this matter of the change of the name of the State, it will be agreed that we have to proceed cautiously. Only yesterday we initiated discussion on the Languages Bill and there it was said that we have to take the people with us by consultation and by getting their consent, although people who are opposed to a certain policy of the Government may be in a minority. Here, in this matter, it is probably true that many would like to have a change in the name and change it into Tamil Nad but at the same time I would like to remind my hon friend that many do not like the change at the present moment and if the Madras Legislature has not thought it necessary to recommend a change in the name, it is because they want to take the people along with them, although the people who oppose the change may be in a minority. We do not know what form ultimately the name of the State will take. It is for the people to decide but it was considered that the present time is not propitious for recommending such a change in the Constitution.

And what is the hurry to proceed with a measure like this, I would ask my hon friend. We have many problems of importance concerning the daily life of the people with which we are trying to grapple here. Taking

the case of his own State and the city in which he lives, it will be agreed that it has the largest relics of the past, relics reminding us of our slavery and of the imposition of the culture and way of life of a foreign society. Are the West Bengal Government or the hon. Member himself exercised over changing these names? Rightly, they are not frittering away their energies in trying to solve these problems. It is perhaps necessary to remind ourselves that in this House we are trying to tackle fundamentals. Once we find proper solutions to basic questions affecting our life, the life of the society, its economics, its goals, political and social, the rest will take care of themselves. When we solve our economic problems, when we solve our cultural problems, these changes in names of places and of roads and of persons will adjust themselves to the changing conditions. It is, therefore, necessary, I would submit in all humility that we have a sense of perspective in these matters and do not make use of the privilege given to us of initiating discussion in regard to every subject on the floor of this august House. If the question has been brought in, being motivated by political considerations, the greater is the pity because a question like this will not bring in any political harvest one way or the other. As far as the Madras Government is concerned, it has dealt with the question broadly on its merits, as I stated. They wanted to take the whole people with them; they were not opposed in principle to any change. In fact, as the hon. leader of the DMK has stated here, the Madras Government have agreed to the use of Tamilnad in the regional language and in all internal correspondence. They do not think that the time is ripe for changing the name of the State for international purposes or for purposes where it had to deal with other States and the Centre. After all, certain traditions have grown during the last two hundred years and certain traditions do serve us

well and even if they do not, it is not wise always to bring them to an abrupt end. So, neither on political nor on economic considerations can we persuade ourselves that such a change is called for. My hon. friend, Mr. Annadurai, when confronted with the question, "What would be the benefit of a change like this to the people?" was able to say only that it would give a kind of sentimental satisfaction. If that is all that we are going to achieve by giving our consent to a Bill of this kind, I would submit that the benefits by keeping the name would be more than what we would conceivably gain by having a kind of sentimental satisfaction. For one thing, there are various groups, as my hon. friends have pointed out, speaking different languages, having different cultures. Tamil Nad has the connotation that it is an exclusive society, that others will not or cannot have equal status or opportunity and although the Madras Government is one of the most liberal, even a superficial change of name like this may give the impression that it is trying to be exclusive that it is trying to become inward-looking and parochial. It is not desirable to create this feeling. I for one would not be sorry if the name of Madras is retained for ever. As I said at the outset this is a matter essentially for the people and in the fulness of time people will decide and it is at that time that we here in this House will be called upon to make a decision.

A lot of irrelevant considerations, I am sorry to say, were brought into the discussion of this question. Some people went so far to say that the Madras Government, as indeed the Congress Party itself, was suffering from schizophrenia, saying one thing and practising another, saying one thing at the State level and advocating another at the forum of the Centre. I need not take the time of the House in repeating these baseless

[Shri N M Lingam]

charges Our approach in this matter has been essentially pragmatic We do not hustle through changes affecting the life of the people and we have an order of priorities in the scheme of reconstruction of our country So, there is nothing that is questionable in what has been done with regard to this question either by the Congress Party or by the Government of the State of Madras Let us face facts frankly Changes are necessary perhaps in the country from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin and from Assam to Gujarat We have foreign monuments and roads and streets named after foreign persons We have other buildings reminding us of our past rulers We have indeed so much else of the hang-over of the past that we cannot take a big broom and sweep them away Even if we could, it is in this perspective that I would like the House to look at the problem

My hon friend, the Mover of the Bill, is intelligent enough to know the bearing of a measure of this kind I am sure he is not going to press for its passage in this House He has provided an occasion for discussion of what I regard is purely a State subject here in this House The only benefit that has accrued to the House is that in future we have to think not once or twice but a hundred times before we bring forward any measure of this kind for discussion at the final forum of the country We are pressed with other questions For instance we are grappling with the language Bill We have business which we are not able to complete before the allotted time Certainly, it would not be said by my hon friend that this should take precedence over what we are concerned with during the remaining period of the current session If the Business Advisory Committee or the Chairman has been good enough to allot this day for purely non-official purposes, it is only out of deference to the wish-

es of Members But I would submit that having put the problem before this House, let us not repeat such performances and waste the time of the House and the resources of the country Let us do—I submit in all humility—more serious work, work which would contribute, in however small a measure, to the well-being of the country With these words

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA You speak for another ten minutes and save the time of the House In any case you can speak for ten minutes more

SHRI N M LINGAM I will be the most disappointed man if after all that I have said my hon friend wants more time for the discussion of a measure of this kind

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA They have to give a reply So many things are there Are you speaking for the Government?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Are you being persuaded by Mr Bhupesh Gupta?

SHRI N M LINGAM No, not at all I am not I thought after hearing what I have said he would even move for closure of the debate and withdraw his Bill or not press for its passage

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA I want your speech to continue So much I appreciate you, I want your speech to continue (*Interruption*) I very much appreciate the hon Member's speech and I want him to continue

SHRI N M LINGAM I am sorry I am at my wit's end at the moment because the scope of the subject is limited Even so, to infuse a serious element in what we discuss here, it is my considered opinion that these matters should be initiated probably at the lowest level, at the level of the people The State should consider it at the next stage and only at the final stage should Parliament concern itself with this question

Much has been made of the fact that people are passionately in favour of a change, as if people have no other issue to concern themselves with. Members have thrown challenges. Even my friend, Mr. Chordia, has joined the fray and has said that there should be a referendum on this question.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: He has said it.

श्री बिमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :
पब्लिक ओपिनियन का मतलब अगर रिफ्रेंडम लेते हैं अंग्रेजी में तो ले लीजिए। 'पब्लिक ओपिनियन' का शब्द अंग्रेजी का ही उपयोग में लिया गया है, हिन्दी का नहीं लिया गया है।

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: I do not know how public opinion can be ascertained without a referendum. Referendum is one of the methods.

श्री बिमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :
इतने दिनों तक राज्य सभा में आपने देखा होगा कि कई बिलों पर पब्लिक ओपिनियन मांगते हैं। उसका मतलब रिफ्रेंडम नहीं होता है। उसमें बहुत फर्क है।

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: My friend, Mr. Annadurai, a little while ago said that he was not going to make it an election issue. At the same time he wanted it to be decided through a referendum as a non-political question. And Mr. Chordia wants again public opinion, he does not want a referendum. I do know what exactly they are aiming at. They say that it is a non-political question. But all the time they want to make political capital out of it. It is clear that they are confused over this issue and my greatest regret is that my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, has got involved in this storm in a tea cup. So Madam, I would only say that while we are thankful to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta for this opportunity for a discussion, let

us not magnify a small issue like this and let us see it in its proper perspective and leave it to the State and the Madras Legislature to decide in the fulness of time.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, I have been listening to both shades of the opinion and I think that Comrade Bhupesh Gupta is justified in bringing forward this Bill. There is no other State in India now where the name of the State coincides with the name of its capital city. Madras is the only State where the State is called Madras and the capital city is also called Madras. There has been plenty of agitation for the change of name. As Shri Annadurai has said it is just a sentimental satisfaction and what is wrong in allowing this sentimental satisfaction when it does not materially affect anything? And Shri Niren Ghosh of the Communist Party along with many others has thrown a challenge to the Congress to resign some seats of the Assembly and fight a bye-election on this issue. I think there is nothing wrong in accepting the challenge because the Congress has such a majority in that State that even the resignation of four or five members to fight a by-election will not materially affect them in the Legislative Assembly. This is a question which should be decided by the people and a decision from the people can be had only if there is an election on this issue. The Congress Party is not favouring a referendum. Naturally, the only other alternative can be that there should be an election on this issue. In all countries of the world where democracy exists, issues are always decided by fighting bye-elections.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Orissa bye-election . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: We did not fight on this issue. I concede we did not fight, we fought on other issues and you do not know it probably. The man behind the scene in Orissa is a man who works wonders. He works

[Shri Lokanath Misra.] wonders in your Capital City, in the Capital of India. He comes and takes up a room next to the Prime Minister and he does as he wishes. He goes over to America and says whatever comes in his mind. You cannot take him to task for that. He is a man who works wonders. So, naturally, . . . (Interruption) It tempts me to say so many things. That is all. Probably he got all the three seats in the bye-elections in Orissa not because the Congress was popular but because he knew how to tackle the voters.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: You confess your ignorance and your incapacity to fight an election.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Mr. Arora is completely ignorant about Orissa. He should not get up and interrupt me about things in Orissa. He can talk about other things but particularly about Orissa, I can teach him for years. So, he should not get up and interrupt just for the sake of interruption. (Interruption) Yes, we are discussing Tamil Nad. But your party brought in Orissa. That is the thing

AN HON. MEMBER: You come to Tamil Nad, you forget Orissa.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Mr. Sri Rama Reddy referred to the bye-elections in Orissa. Naturally I had to come back to Orissa, my own State

AN HON. MEMBER: Lovely State

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Lovely State. We have a lovely Prime Minister . . . I am sorry, a lovely man as the Chief Minister.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: We have got a lovely Prime Minister and a lovely Chief Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No interruptions. Let him come to the point and to the Bill

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: So, Madam, I would suggest to the Congress Party, the ruling party, that they ought to accept the challenge, if they really want to assess the opinion of the people. And . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: What is this method of challenging? The usual challenge in a democratic process is bye-elections and in the bye-election the Swatantra Party of Mr. Lokanath Misra appears to be nowhere in any part of the country.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, I would say again that the hon Member is so ignorant. We did not fight elections on this issue in Orissa at all

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: You never fight elections on any issue, you fight elections with money bags.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: The Congress has money bags. If I refer to the matter, I have to come back again to Serajuddin and . . .

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: It is always welcome.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: And of course, I do not refer to that matter on this occasion.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: You do.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should be relevant.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I do not want to be irrelevant even though my friends in the Congress Party are, and want me to be.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ (Jammu and Kashmir): There is something about . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Naturally, all the opposition parties in Madras are one regarding the change of the name and the change of the

name from Madras which was given during the British rule and which has come over from the British does not affect either the dignity or the respect of the ruling party. Naturally, when there is such an urge from among the people that the name should be changed that their sentiment would be satisfied, the Government should re-think about it. They have the majority, of course, to turn down any suggestion coming from the Opposition but on this score they should think over the matter. We are not probably completing the discussion on this subject today. They have time at their disposal, and in the meantime, they should rethink about it.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: The hon. Member should have moved that the name of Orissa should be changed into Kalinga. But he is afraid of Kalinga Tubes.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, I am not responsible for the irrelevancy which is there. It all goes to the Congress Benches. When there is an interruption from the other side, I am supposed to say something about it. (*Interruption*) Shri Arora who has been trying to learn something about Orissa either from me or from any of the hon. Members who belong to Orissa in this House, has been speaking about Kalinga. Kalinga is the name, ancient name of Orissa. But now in the entire State this name is squeezed into some industries which the Chief Minister owns and he has monopolised the entire Kalinga in all his industries. And he being the champion of the Congress in the State, naturally, I shall have to refer to him because he is also the owner of all the Kalinga industries in Orissa and the less I say about them the better it is.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Are we discussing Kalinga Industry?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Come back to Tamil Nad. You cannot travel so far. You must come back to Tamil Nad.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: Come back to Tamil Nad.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Come back via Kalinga.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: Change your platform and come back.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: All the opposition parties in that State are one for the change of the name and naturally a substantial section of the people want the change. So, it is a serious matter not to be out-voted as it is, but some decision should be taken. As I was just saying, since we have some days to go through the matter, the Government would kindly rethink about it and if possible accept the Bill.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: Just I want to know one point from the hon. Member. If tomorrow there is a demand in his constituency that Shri Lokanath Misra, the hon. Member of the Rajya Sabha, should change his name and take the name of Shri Bhupesh Gupta, what will be his reaction to that?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I would not have supported that change but for the fact that the party to which my hon. friend has the privilege to belong has changed the names in the case of Maharashtra and Gujarat, and that too on the basis of language and nothing else. One of the States at least could have been named 'Bombay' since the old State from which it was carved out was 'Bombay'. If the arguments of our Congress friends are based on facts, then one of the States should have been named 'Bombay', while the other could have taken another name.

DR. A. SUBBA RAO: Mr. Tariq should understand that it is already there; it has already got the name 'Tamilnad' there for local consumption and only outside it is Madras.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Are we sitting beyond five?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I think he should continue his speech.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I leave it to the House. Is it the pleasure of the House to adjourn now or to continue till 5.30?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, we do not want to continue any more; we adjourn.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the House that we adjourn now . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: . . . or sit till 5.30?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, let us adjourn now.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Saturday, the 4th May 1963.