

that in this country there is one policeman for every thousand of the population whereas in other countries which are more advanced and where the crime figures are not so high as here, the ratio is one to five hundred, as in the United Kingdom. Now, our police is much too preoccupied with many other serious crimes—robbery, dacoity and all that, and they are increasing in number every day. So, it will be merely idle on our part to expect that this ordinary police would neglect those more serious cases and would look to these cases. I, therefore, suggest that we may have some fifty or a hundred constables spread over these different territories—big cities and religious centres—whose duty may be to prosecute such cases. Especially, the next Kumbh Mela fair is coming at Allahabad and at Hardwar—in Allahabad it is coming sooner, in January or February next. You have there a large number of minors, maimed and kidnapped and all that, and you can easily get hold of a number of them and that would set an example. This is the one suggestion that I have to make for the consideration of the hon. Deputy Minister.

The other suggestion which I need not repeat is, she might consider the advisability of having an enactment like the Naik Girls Protection Act of 1929 which we have in U.P. I need not repeat what I have already said about it, but I am merely making this suggestion once again. I congratulate her once again, Sir.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I want to add only one word in the Third Reading stage. I am glad that the hon. Deputy Minister has found the necessity for a provision like the one for which I struggled. Now, she has said that it will be incorporated in the Children's Act. Well, that shows that the necessity is realised. May I at the end request her to give the House a little more specific information as to the nature of the provision that is intended to be incorporated in

the Children's Act with regard to this matter?

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA: Sir, the suggestions made by Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor were indeed good, but already they are being put into practice. Whenever there is a big assembly, the Kumbh Mela or any other mela or a big assembly, there is always a missing spot and the police there do look after not only children, but grown-ups also. Missing persons are taken care of and the announcement goes on through the mike and therefore, he need not have this unnecessary fear. But about the Kumbh Mela of which he is worried, I think ample provision is being made and always is made.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: Do I understand the hon. Deputy Minister to say that some further provision will be made in the Children's Act or will they rely upon the existing provision?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: She spoke about Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor's remarks.

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA: Shri Basu talked about Children's Act. Children's Acts are before the States. Each State passes its own Children's Act. The Ministry of Education will very soon lay before the Houses of Parliament the Children's Act for the Union Territories only.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: That is what I am asking about.

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA: There is no Central legislation as far as children are concerned. Each State is looking after its own children. But where there is no law, we have requested the States to think over the matter and adopt the model enactment of the Bombay State which we consider is a good model. We have requested those States to do it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

**THE ANDHRA PRADESH AND
MADRAS (ALTERATION OF BOUN-
DARIES) BILL, 1959**

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS
(SHRI B. N. DATAR): Mr. Deputy
Chairman, Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the alteration of boundaries of the States of Andhra Pradesh and Madras and for matters connected therewith, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, in order to appreciate the propriety of this Bill, I shall have to place certain facts before hon. Members. They are aware that the Andhras who formed part of the Madras State had been anxious to have a State carved out for themselves. Therefore, on the 19th December, 1952, the Prime Minister made an announcement that the Andhra State would be formed and that the Bill therefor would be placed before both Houses of Parliament. There were certain disputes between the Andhras and others and if those disputes were to be settled, then there would have been a delay in the formation of the Andhra State. Therefore, after considering all the circumstances, the Prime Minister announced on the 25th March, 1953, that the Andhra State that would be immediately formed would consist of the undisputed Telugu areas in the undivided Madras State, leaving the question of the exact settlement or demarcation of the boundary between the two States after the formation of the Andhra State. On that basis, Sir, a Bill was placed before Parliament on 10th August, 1953. It was considered by both the Houses of Parliament and the Bill was passed into law, and on 1st October, 1953, the Act came into effect, and the Andhra State was duly formed. As I have stated, it consisted of the undisputed Telugu areas in the former Madras State. Therefore, after the formation of the Andhra State, the question had to be taken in hand as to what was

the nature of the dispute and what ought to be done for resolving the dispute. Then a question was raised, Sir, that the linguistic composition of the areas that formed part of the boundaries between Madras and Andhra should be found out. For that purpose Sir, the linguistic slips of the Census of 1951 had to be duly sorted out with a view to finding out which were the villages on the border between the two States that had the composition of a particular linguistic group, whether they were Telugus or whether they were Tamilians or whether there were other linguistic groups in the villages of border areas. This question was, therefore, referred to the census authorities and from October, 1953, till June, 1955, the census authorities had duly sorted all these slips and they gave us the figures about the linguistic composition of each of these border areas. Therefore, you will find, Sir, that a certain amount of material was made available, from which it was possible to know what was the linguistic composition of a particular area, whether the Telugu people formed the majority or whether the Tamilians, or others, formed the preponderating majority in an area. Then, Sir, this particular material so available was duly sorted, the figures were tabled and they were put down in the form of statements regarding the linguistic composition of a number of villages in the border districts.

Thereafter, Sir, there was a letter addressed to the Andhra Government by the Madras State Government because, you will find, Sir, certain principles had to be decided on and agreed to, as far as possible. Ordinarily, as you are aware, Sir, either a boundary commission is appointed or some other arrangement is made. Here in this case, Sir, naturally the question arose as to what ought to be the line of action that should be taken in this respect. At that time, the Government of Madras wrote a letter to the Government of Andhra State and laid down four principles for the guidance of the authorities concerned in settling or in demarcating the bound-

daries between these two States. Those four principles are these. These I am reading from Shri Pataskar's Report, where he has laid down these four principles, where he has summarised the letter of the Government of Madras to the Government of Andhra State and he has mentioned these four principles. The Government of Madras has also suggested these broad principles on which a readjustment of the boundary between the two States may be effected. These are the four principles that were laid down. One was that the boundary line may be a continuous one and isolated pockets should be avoided to the extent practicable. That was principle No. 1. Principle No. 2 was that village should be the unit for consideration, and partition of villages should be avoided. Now, sometimes, it does happen that in a village, there is a different linguistic composition, especially in border areas. Therefore, it was rightly laid down that village as the unit should be taken into account, and not that the village itself should be divided. The third principle was that villages with over 50 per cent. Telugu population should be incorporated in the Andhra State to the extent practicable and *vice versa*. In other words, Sir, it was laid down that if there is a 51 per cent. Telugu population in a village, then, subject to other considerations, that village should go to the Andhra State. And similarly if in a village, there is 51 per cent. or more of Tamil population, then, subject to other considerations, it ought to remain in the Madras State. That was the third principle laid down by the Government of Madras. Then there was the fourth and the last principle, which is a more important one, because it is a general principle which is to be always accepted in demarcating boundaries, namely, that due consideration should be given to geographical features, such as hills, forests and rivers as constituting natural boundaries. That also has to be taken into account. If between two States, there are things like a hill, a forest or a river which formed the natural boundary between two States, they

ought to be taken into account; due consideration ought to be given to them and also to economic features such as irrigation sources or the *ayacuts* being allowed to remain in the same State.

Thus it will be found, Sir, that these four principles were enunciated, and they were communicated to the Government of Andhra, because these were the two States that were concerned, and naturally, Sir, the Government of Madras, which initiated the action in this respect, sent these four principles for acceptance, to the Government of Andhra. It was Government of Andhra then, and this was on 2nd July, 1955. In the next month, Sir, in August, 1955, the Government of Andhra agreed to the working out of these principles for the purpose of demarcating the boundary between the two States—it was then the Andhra State and the Madras State. Thus there was an agreement between the two parties. Then, for working out this particular agreement and for suggesting a boundary in consonance with the working or the implementation of these four principles together, some person had to be appointed. There, Sir, both the Governments desired that Shri Pataskar, who was then in the Government of India as the Minister for Legal Affairs, and who is now the Governor of Madhya Pradesh State, should mediate in this dispute. He was approached by both the parties as a mediator. He was a mediator because those criteria had been accepted, and the criteria had to be applied to the existing conditions in the two States of Madras and Andhra. He went into the whole matter. He went to Madras and also to Andhra; he heard a number of deputations and ultimately he gave his Report, the first report, on 25th July, 1957. He was asked to be a mediator in December, 1956. But, as the House is aware, general elections ensued and, therefore, he could carry out the work only after the general elections had been completed. After going through all the materials that were placed before him, including also the maps, and

[Shri B. N. Datar.]

after considering the representations from the people and from the Governments of Andhra and Madras, he gave his first report on 25th July, 1957—and that report is the major report. What he decided I will be explaining very soon. But certain points were thereafter raised by the Andhra Pradesh Government. The Andhra Pradesh Government was of the view that they were entitled to certain portions, especially from the two taluks or tehsils of Krishnagiri and Hosur, in addition to what had been given to them from the Madras State. The matter was again referred to Shri Pataskar for further consideration on the points raised by the Andhra Pradesh Government. The matter was again considered by him. He found it difficult to accept the claim made by the Andhra Pradesh State except in the case of three villages in the Krishnagiri taluk of Madras State which, he said, should be included in the area that was to be transferred from Madras to Andhra Pradesh.

So far as the other claim was concerned, he found that either these villages were not contiguous or, in the case of Hosur taluk villages, they did not satisfy the condition of contiguity.

Secondly, Sir, he found that in respect of most of the disputed villages between Madras and Andhra Pradesh to some extent another dispute had been raised by the then Chief Minister of Mysore. The latter had stated that Mysore also ought to be a party to this dispute. This was not accepted by the other parties and, therefore, Shri Pataskar did not go into the question of the claims made by the Mysore State. Now, the parties that remained were only Madras and Andhra Pradesh. In respect of Hosur taluk villages he found a difficulty because there was no decided single-language majority. It was more or less a trilingual area, in the sense that in the same village there were Kannada-speaking people, there were Telugu-speaking people and there were Tamil-speaking people. Their com-

position varied round about 30 or 32 per cent. Therefore, he stated that one of the principles that was laid down in the agreement between Andhra Pradesh and Madras was that villages with over 50 per cent. of Telugu-speaking people should be incorporated in the Andhra State or *vice versa*. On this ground he turned down the request or these claims made by the Andhra Pradesh State. In his supplementary report of 7th September, 1957, he said that after considering the claims of the Andhra State all that he could recommend was the transfer of only three villages from the Krishnagiri taluk to the Andhra State.

After this report of the mediator, the matter was taken up at higher levels. About that time there was a meeting of the Southern Zonal Council at Hyderabad on 28th September, 1957. There, the two Chief Ministers of Madras and Andhra Pradesh State agreed to accept *in toto* the two reports of Shri Pataskar. Thereafter, Sir, the matter had to be taken up at Government levels. Then, the Government of India came into the picture because the two Governments had agreed that on the principles that were settled between the parties—there was this report or this mediation of Shri Pataskar—whatever Mr. Pataskar had stated in his report ought to be accepted or implemented. Therefore, Sir, the Government of India came into picture. We prepared a Bill. The Bill was duly drafted on the basis of the Pataskar Report. The Bill had to be sent to the State Legislatures for their opinion under article 3 of the Constitution. Sir, you are aware that whenever the boundaries of a State are going to be altered, though ultimately it is the right or the privilege of Parliament to pass a Bill in this respect, there is a condition precedent that the two State Legislatures, namely the Councils as also the Assemblies of Madras and Andhra Pradesh ought to be consulted. That Bill was sent to both the State Governments. They placed them before

their respective Legislatures and both Legislatures accepted the draft Bill that had been sent to them. This was in April and in July of this year. They passed a resolution that they accepted the provisions of the draft Bill. After that was done, the Bill was introduced and accepted in the other House. Now it has come up for the consideration of this honourable House.

Now, Sir, I shall give very briefly the broad features of the transfer and the consequent changes made in this respect. So far as the transfer to Andhra Pradesh from Madras and vice-versa is concerned, I shall give the details of this transfer presently.

So far as the transfer of areas to Andhra Pradesh from Madras is concerned, 151 villages from certain taluks of Madras have to be transferred to the Andhra Pradesh Government. The total population of these villages is about 95,000, and the area sought to be transferred from Madras to Andhra Pradesh is 325.39 sq. miles.

Sir, so far as the transfer to Madras from Andhra State is concerned, Shri Pataskar suggested—and it has been duly incorporated in this Bill—that 318 villages from Andhra Pradesh should be transferred to Madras State. All of them are in the Chittoor District. I need not give the break-up. There are 288 villages from Tiruttani taluk—in a large chunk of area there was Tamil-speaking population—which have been transferred from Andhra Pradesh to Madras. There is one village from Puttur taluk also in Chittoor District, and again 29 villages from the same taluk which have been transferred from Andhra Pradesh to Madras. Thus, it comes to

318 villages. The population of these villages is 2.40 lakhs, comprising an area of 405.89 sq. miles.

Apparently, Sir, the area that has been given appears to be larger than what is retained in Andhra Pradesh. This question was considered by Shri Pataskar. This is what Shri Pataskar stated on page 22 of his last report:

"It can be seen that as a result of my proposal, though a large part of the taluk of Tiruttani goes to Madras, a correspondingly large area from the taluks of Ponner and Tiruvallur goes to Andhra. So, by this adjustment, no State loses appreciably in any extent. The Andhra State was formed mainly on the basis of language and they got all Telugu-speaking compact areas except a few pockets in the Tamil area."

Thus, in the Bill you will find that under the arrangement that has been made, so many villages with so much population and so much area have been transferred to Andhra Pradesh from Madras. Similarly, some villages with a certain population and area have been transferred to Madras. Now, there are consequential . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How much more time would you take?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: I would naturally take some time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then you can continue tomorrow. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 3rd December, 1959.