

ELECTION TO STATE INSURANCE CORPORATION

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR LABOUR (SHRI ABID ALI): Sir, I move the following motion:

"That in pursuance of clause (1) of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1940, read with rule 2(A) of the Employees' State Insurance (Central) Rules, 1950, this Council do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chairman may direct, a member from among themselves to serve on the Employees' State Insurance Corporation."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That in pursuance of clause (i) of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948, read with rule 2(A) of the Employees' State Insurance (Central) Rules, 1950, this Council do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chairman may direct, a member from among themselves to serve on the Employees' State Insurance Corporation."

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform hon. Members that the 7th September 1953 has been fixed as the last date for receiving nominations and the 10th September 1953 for holding election, if necessary, to the Employees' State Insurance Corporation.

The nominations will be received in the Council Notice Office up to 12 noon on the 7th September. The election, which will be conducted in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote, will be held in the Secretary's Room (Room No. 29), Ground Floor, Parliament House, between the hours of 10 A.M. and 1 P.M.

THE FACTORIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1953

SHRI ABID ALI: Sir, I move:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Factories Act, 1948."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Factories Act, 1948."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI ABID ALI: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

THE FORWARD CONTRACTS (REGULATION) AMENDMENT BILL, 1953

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI): Sir, I move:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

THE ANDHRA STATE BILL, 1953—
continued

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa): Mr. Chairman, Sir, yesterday before the House rose, I was trying to dilate on one point, viz., the rendition of the 7 taluks of Bellary, however meritorious it might be in itself,—if I may venture to say so,—is rather inappropriate in the given context. The ground on which I sought to build the case was that the purpose of the Bill was the creation of an Andhra State—that was the specific issue—and not the extension of the territory of a Part

[Shri S. Mahanty.]

B State, viz., Mysore. Sir, this House should bear in mind that Mysore is not a Karnataka State which has been formed on linguistic basis. Mysore is an ex-Princely State with a Rajpramukh. If the creation of Karnataka on a linguistic basis had synchronised with the formation of the Andhra State, then probably I would have been the first man to approve the rendition of the 7 taluks of Bellary to the Karnataka State on linguistic basis—but the Karnataka State has not been formed. It may be the thin end of the wedge, but the fact remains to be said that Mysore is an ex-Princely State and by the rendition of the 7 taluks of Bellary we have extended the territory of an ex-Princely State, viz., Mysore. Secondly, as I have already said at length, the division of Bellary is going to affect the expeditious execution of the Tungabhadra project on which so much depends, both on the side of Andhra and of Mysore. Thirdly, the original terms of reference were that an Andhra State should come into being consisting of the non-controversial districts which have been enumerated in Mr. Justice Wanchoo's report. But, I venture to say that all the districts which have been included in the Andhra State are not non-controversial. Take the case of Anantapur. Districtwise it may be an overwhelmingly Telugu district but the fact remains to be said that there are certain firkas which are predominantly Canarese-speaking. Therefore, when the Bellary issue was referred to Mr. Justice Misra, why was Anantapur not referred as well? And similarly Mr. Justice Wanchoo has indicated in his report that there is also the Chittoor District on which the residuary State of Madras is staking its claim on linguistic basis. Therefore what I urge is, if rectification or rationalisation of the linguistic borders of the various States in South India is aimed at by the rendition of these 7 taluks of Bellary to Mysore, then why was this matter not taken up in its entirety and why only a part of it, viz., the specific issue of Bellary was referred

to Mr. Justice Misra for report? It may be argued that Bellary is so situated that if it had not been transferred to Mysore, then two things would have followed—either it would have remained with the residuary State or it would have been administered as a Part C State. Sir, the workings of Part C States are such that no sensible person would ever recommend further creation of new Part C States. I will cite the case of one Part C State, viz., Himachal Pradesh. This House may be astonished to learn that due to lack of tracing papers, two high-paid officers—Executive Engineers—are sitting idle for the last 2 years. That is so because the Central Government could not supply them tracing papers in time. That is a sample of the administration that we are having in the Part C States under the patronage and aegis of our esteemed friend Dr. Kailas Nath Katju. Therefore no sensible person will ever recommend the creation of further new Part C States. Then the next proposition is that it should have remained as an island territory under the administration of the residuary State. Now, however improbable that might sound, we have the example of the Kulu Valley in Himachal Pradesh, an island territory, which is being governed by the Punjab Government. From Simla to Kulu Valley the distance is about 70 miles. If Kulu Valley can be governed by the Punjab Government as an island territory in Himachal Pradesh, why could not the residuary State govern the Bellary District as such? Let me not be misunderstood for saying that I am against rendition of the seven taluks of Bellary District—on a linguistic basis to Mysore. I am in favour of it but my submission is in the given context, it is most inappropriate inasmuch as the issue has not been taken up in its entirety. You have taken up a part of the question probably under political pressure. Therefore, while concluding, I have got only one point to make and that is, that there should be no more shilly-shallying about the creation of other linguistic States and—the most impor-

tant thing—the rectification of the borders of the existing linguistic States. To the alarmists, I might most respectfully submit that the unity of India is never going to be jeopardised if we are going to have linguistic States. The unity of India does not rest in the borders of linguistic States. The unity of India rests on our Constitution, rests on our civil code, rests on our common Civil Service, it rests on our common military, it rests on our common defence programmes. It is futile now to argue at this hour of the day that the unity of India is going to be jeopardised by the creation of linguistic States. I might here cite the case of Soviet Russia which is a highly centralised State, and which has emerged as one of the most stable and powerful States after the Second Great War. Its 16 Republics are quite autonomous except in ceded subjects. Even now there are two Republics—I think Ukraine and Byelo-Russia—who have their own representatives on the U.N.O. Even the Republic of Kinghiz on its coat of arms does not have the ubiquitous symbol of the sickle and hammer and that Republic has its own coat of arms. To that extent autonomy has been experimented upon in Soviet Russia but that has never jeopardised their unity. The unifying force lies elsewhere, not in the linguistic borders.

Therefore, while concluding, I have only one wish, one desire, that after the formation of Andhra, the other linguistic States should come and along with it should come the rectification of the borders of the existing linguistic States.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras) : Mr. Chairman, the measure before the House is of great constitutional importance, to my mind its importance is next only to that of the Constitution Act of 1950. I conceive this measure as the first step in re-drawing the linguistic States of this country. Dr. K. T. J. was pleased to put down the facts in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. The circumstances surrounding the creation of this State go

fully to illustrate that this is the first step towards the re-drawing of the boundaries of the States in India.

I am extremely happy that this day is a historic day in the history of the Andhras. I have very happy memories of my Andhra friends with whom I have lived in close touch intimately for a good part of my life in my younger days. I dare say, Sir, and I mean no flattery that the Andhras are idealistically minded, quite emotional and quite patriotic. If anybody supposes for a moment that the Andhras are less patriotic or less nationalistic than any other section of the people of this great land, then he is sadly mistaken. During the British regime, long before Orissa and Sind were formed into separate provinces, had only the Andhra leaders sacrificed their national sentiments and been prepared to subordinate themselves to the British, they would probably have had their State much earlier than the other States. But their spirit of patriotism, their spirit of nationalism was such that they were not prepared to sacrifice one inch, one iota of their patriotism. If there has been delay in the formation of the Andhra State, it is because of their intense patriotism and their unwillingness to sacrifice even an iota thereof. I do know they have had difficult times. They had famine in Rayalaseema. They have had the floods in the Godavari. They have political instability. But all these are but tests for them. They are there only to test their ability and their statesmanship. I am told—I do not know whether it is right or not—that God tests those whom He loves mostly, by the severest of tests. If you have faith in the traditions of our past, you will remember how men like Prahlada, Dhruva and Harischandra had to undergo these difficult tests. I take the present tests before the Andhras in the same spirit and I am sure our Andhra friends will rise equal to the occasion and, united, they will create a State which will be the envy of the other parts of this land. It is true that sometimes it is felt that in some matters—I am not saying it

[Shri K. S. Hegde]

in any spirit of criticism—on some occasions, they allow their judgment to be controlled by their emotions. But all idealistic people do that. However, on some occasions, especially at the time of the creation of a State, practical statesmanship probably would be better than mere idealism. I am only doing a little loud thinking.

On the floor of the House yesterday, some carping critics of the Congress had laid the charge that the Congress had gone back upon its promise about the creation of linguistic States. I am sorry they have not fully understood the implications of the stand that the Congress has been taking all along. It was never felt by the Congress that linguistic States by themselves were opposed to national unity. Far from it. What was being thought was that the process of the creation of these linguistic States might jeopardise our national interests and they might divert our attention to objects which were not of quite immediate importance. It is true that the Congress has pledged itself to the creation of linguistic States. This resolve was taken as early as 1921 and never was there any deviation from this stand. But when we attained independence in 1947 the question before the Congress was: Should we immediately plunge ourselves into the formation of the linguistic States and divert and bend all our energies in that direction? Could it be conveniently postponed to a future date and shall we bend all our energies towards more immediate purposes? (*Interruption*) It is natural that there should be difference of opinion. But it is only from that point of view that the Congress thought that it could be conveniently postponed to a future date. When we have had a time of peace and prosperity, then within a convenient period of five or ten years, we could take up this question of linguistic States.

I have always believed in the formation of linguistic States. When the Dhar Committee visited my place, I

was one of the witnesses who came before that Committee. I told the Committee that it might be convenient to postpone this question by about five years so that we could concentrate all our energies on the development of the nation, so that the difficult questions which inevitably arise at the time of the division of the country, such as boundary questions, division of assets, etc.—all these controversial questions might be postponed to a later date. Whether that decision was right or wrong is entirely a different matter. All that I am saying is that the charge that the Congress has gone back upon its pledge of creating linguistic States may not be accurate.

Yesterday Dr. Ambedkar—unfortunately he is not here—made a brilliant but a contradictory speech. I was not sure whether he was not contradicting himself at every stage. To me his was rather a pitiable case. He was at one time acclaimed by the public as the modern Manu who drafted the Constitution, but in a highly painful speech he said he was prepared to burn the Constitution. Once before I had to ask on the floor of the House whether Dr. Ambedkar continued in the Cabinet for a mere mess of pottage. I would not like to repeat it. It was rather astounding, something which cannot be appreciated in constitutional phraseology or by political commonsense for a member who was a Minister entirely in charge of the framing of the Constitution to come and tell you, Sir, that he was a mere hack. Is he setting a good political precedent? I am sorry Dr. Ambedkar only abused and got out of the House. If he abuses he should be prepared to receive the reactions thereof. It came with ill grace from Dr. Ambedkar when he said that his heart was not in the Constitution that he was merely perpetuating a fraud, to put it in the mildest form. Well, I will leave Dr. Ambedkar severely alone. His whole life has been one of a series of contradictions. First he tried to live in communalism and now probably it is too late in the day for him to get himself

out of that past. I have nothing but pity for him. But even as regards the linguistic Provinces, his remarks were a series of contradictions. He started by saying that out of the 27 States in this land, about 24 were linguistic and no serious damage would be done if you added another four—if four more States became linguistic States. But ultimately there was a sudden change of mind and he sounded a note of warning against linguistic States.

Sir, another charge was laid against Government both by Dr. Ambedkar and by my friend Mr. Mahanty, that the Government only appreciates the argument of the big stick. Government only yields when it is forced to yield. It is a plea of ignorance of facts. You will remember, Sir, that even during the framing of the Constitution a Committee known as the J.V.P. Committee was set up by the Congress, consisting of eminent statesmen of this land, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and Dr. Pattabhi, the highest in the land and the tallest of the poppies

SHRI S. MAHANTY: What was the year?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: In the year 1948.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: What is the year now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: You will have to learn a lot. If you will have patience, I shall let you know. That Committee came out with the report. They said that they appreciated the urgency of forming an Andhra State; that they had always appreciated the patriotism of the Andhras; and they had always respected the sentiments of the Andhras. They came to the conclusion that, though as a matter of procedure they would postpone to a future date—the formation of the linguistic provinces as such—appreciat-

ing the intensity of the feelings of the Andhras they would immediately constitute an Andhra State on one condition, that is, the Andhra State should consist of the undisputed Telugu-speaking portions of the Madras State. The present Andhra Bill does not go one iota, one inch, beyond the declaration made in the J.V.P. Report. On the basis of the J.V.P. Report the Madras Government formed what was called a Partition Committee consisting of four Andhras and four non-Andhras, including the revered Andhra leader, Shri Prakasam. They went on dividing the stores, land, buildings and everything. Ultimately, they said that unless the City of Madras was included, they were not going to have the Andhra State. Now, who was responsible for the delay? Is it the Andhra leaders or is it the Government of India?

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: Yes, the latter.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: They were the persons who were responsible and not the Government of India. The Government of India at all stages, on every occasion, said, 'by all means have your Andhra State but on only one condition, the condition being that it shall consist of the undisputed Telugu-speaking areas of the Madras State'?

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: Or agreement?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: No question of agreement at all. Every section of the Andhras of the State wriggled out of the old pronouncement. They said "we shall not have a State without the City of Madras."

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Only Mr. Prakasam said that the rest of them agreed.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Anyway, Mr. Sundarayya and the comrades of his party were hiding in the jungles of Telengana and.....

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: You were hiding in your South Kanara. (*Interruptions.*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: We were not hiding.

So far as we are concerned, all the leaders of Andhra who are well known, whose opinions are worth consideration, whose opinions are the opinions of the people, were not willing to form that State. In those circumstances, in those conditions, the Andhra State could not be formed before the Constitution of India was ushered in. There is no point, there is no logic, there is no truth, in the allegation that the Central Government at any time postponed the question of the formation of the Andhra State. (*Interruptions.*)

If today anybody has changed their opinion, after the death of the great martyr, Shri Potti Sriramulu, it is that section of the Andhra leaders who at one time were unwilling to have an Andhra State without the City of Madras. The charge should be laid against them and not against the Central Government. The Government of India has not changed one comma, one full stop, from the original declaration made in the J.V.P. Report. That Report stands and it is that decision which is being implemented today and I may say, Sir, with courage that the delay in the formation of the Andhra State is not to any extent due to the dilly-dallying, as said by my hon. friend Mr. Mahanty, of the Central Government of India. I do feel, Sir, that there is a considerable body of public opinion which feels a doubt as to whether the Government was right in conceding the formation of the State at the point of time that they did—not about the contents of the declaration but about the procedure that is adopted. I have very great respect for the martyr who sacrificed his life for the cause of the Andhra State. I may very rightly say that he is the modern Jeemoothayahana. For a cause

which he considered to be good and noble he sacrificed his life inch by inch. I am not detracting anything from the nobility of the man, but if you permit me, Sir, I say that we consider that it was an error of judgment on his part to have sacrificed himself. He did not fully comprehend the reactions that might set in because of the great act in one sense that he was doing. He was probably not comprehending the forces of violence that would be let loose after that self-immolation. He had so much fixed his ideas on Andhras for the time being that his vision about the entire India possibly was dimmed. Well, whatever it is, whether it is politically right or not, all of us are agreed that a noble soul, a patriotic soul, a gentleman of gentlemen, has laid down his life. We pay our homage to him; we take this opportunity, Sir, to wish Godspeed to the new Andhra State. We wish the Andhras all prosperity and happiness. In their prosperity lies our happiness; in their growth of stature lies our growth of stature. We shall certainly be with them arm in arm, shoulder to shoulder.

The main question that arises out of this Bill is about the formation of the linguistic States. Dr. Katju, in his opening speech, told the House that some people accused him of having deliberately dropped the word "linguistic". Whatever be the reason, why the word is not there. I refuse to see, Sir, that this Bill is anything but the implementation of the promise that was given to this country in 1921. The very declaration of the Prime Minister of the 19th December 1952, wherein he said "undisputed Telugu-speaking areas of the Madras State shall be constituted into a State". Is it not a declaration of the formation of linguistic States? Could it be anything different if you say that you are only constituting the undisputed Telugu-speaking areas into a State? You are declaring that you are creating a linguistic Andhra State. Transferring seven taluks of Bellary District to the Mysore State: Is it not a further recognition of the linguistic States? Facts

speak for themselves. I have no doubt that we are on the onward march in the formation of linguistic States.

To some extent, I share the apprehensions of the Government about the formation of linguistic States. In many places, Sir, it has taken a very ugly turn. You are aware, Sir, what happened after the death of the great soul, Potti Sriramulu. Many railway stations were burnt; goods were destroyed; railway trains were damaged—our national assets were damaged. You know, Sir, what is happening in Bellary. Life was miserable for the last several months. Innocent people were harassed; there were hartals galore; there were obstructions in every street corner. To our disgrace, I know what is happening in Karnataka. The other day I was travelling from Kadur to Bombay. My train was 12 hours late. The reason was that some misguided persons in the name of the formation of an Akhila Karnataka had removed fishplates. Very many people were assaulted. A pilot train had to run. While I must apologise on behalf of those brother Kannadigas for some of the shameful acts that they had indulged in, all that I can say is: Oh Lord, forgive them; they know not what they do. (*Interruption*).

My friend Mr. Kakkilaya protests against what I said. He has done it, I regret it.

Sir, an occasion of this type is availed of by the enemies of the land, both internal and external. Now there are politically discontented groups and leaders whom the currents of election had washed away during the last elections. Then there are the friends sitting there, and Mr. Sundarayya is smiling of course. They are availing themselves of every opportunity, every discontent, good or bad, for their own ends. They are taking advantage of the fruits of the labour of the Congress during the last 30 years.

AN HON. MEMBER: They exploit the situation.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: They have been exploiting the situation and also they have been goading the innocent people to commit acts of violence, and nobody is happy about it. That is exactly what has been frightening the leaders at the Centre about the formation of linguistic States. It is true, Sir, in some sense that when an intense provincial feeling comes, oftentimes it conflicts with our loyalty to the nation as a whole. I say 'intense feeling', but it is sometimes a hostile one too. That is what has been happening in some parts of the country. But what exactly should be our stand at this stage? Can we suppress it? The demand for linguistic provinces started in 1921 and the Congress then had pledged itself to the fulfilment of that demand. That demand has now percolated to the masses and there is a growing demand among the people that linguistic States should be immediately formed. That decision may be right or that decision may be wrong but it is a fact. Well, today merely by getting frightened about the formation of linguistic States—if we delayed or postponed it, it may result in repercussions which are anti-national—we are unnecessarily creating a conflict between our loyalty to the language and our loyalty to the State. There should be no conflict whatsoever at all. I for one can happily live in any State—be it Hindi-speaking, Kannada-speaking or Tamil-speaking. But one thing is certain, that you cannot ignore the promises of the Congress during the past 30 years. We cannot ignore the intense desire of a large section of the people to have a State mainly speaking one language, so that I would implore the Government of India that the time is ripe when we should take a bold decision to regroup our States mainly on considerations of language. I am only saying "mainly on considerations of

[Shri K. S. Hegde.] language'. It must be a geographic unit; it must be an economically self-sufficient state, and if these be there a linguistic state could be formed at an early stage.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): But not otherwise?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: But certainly not otherwise. Postponement of the formation of linguistic States is likely to create more and more irritation and more and more the Government may come in for unnecessary criticism. To a large extent, Sir, I know that the charges levelled against the majority group in a multi-lingual State are unfounded. I come from a State which is a multi-lingual one and I come from the smallest of the lingual groups. My friend, Mr. Kakkilaya, has himself not failed to tell the public that the Madras State, the Tamilians there, are deceiving other groups, but if you examine the facts it is otherwise, Sir. Ever since our freedom in 1947 I am glad to say that our Tamil friends and our Telugu friends are more generous to us, to an extent more than we are entitled to. In fact, in my district more money is being spent; more expenditure is being incurred by the Government. I am prepared to sit down with anybody and satisfy them that no linguistic group ever did quarrel with the other and they are not doing so at least since 1947. But still there is a lurking suspicion because our wants are many; our needs are many; there are many things which we are in need of. The only facile way of explaining it away is to say that the Tamil group is not doing you justice. That is a mere propaganda stunt. But yet there is a feeling which has crept into the minds of not merely the uneducated circle but also amongst the educated circle that their due share is not being received. With this object in view, I am requesting Dr. Katju to consider if the Boundary Commissioner which he proposes to appoint can be appointed at the earliest possible opportunity. I

shall be grateful to him if he could find it convenient to announce the personnel of the Commission in the month of October itself. This will go a long way in satisfying the demand at least in my part of the country. You must take note of the fact, Sir, that in the linguistic areas the opinion is almost unanimous. Whatever the differences may be at the top of the organisation, the Karnataka Pradesh Congress Committee had been repeatedly requesting you to form a Karnataka State; the Praja Socialists had been requesting you to form a Karnataka State. Such was the demand by every other political group including our friends of the Communist Party. Everyone of us is agreed that you should form a Karnataka State at the earliest opportunity. You may agree with their logic or not. Even if it is the madness of the majority, but then you have got to yield. Once it has taken a firm stand, it is far better we yield to it at the earliest opportunity.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Why is it assumed that I am against it?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I know you are all with me and I also share your apprehension as to what is going to happen during the process. I don't mean to say that you are against it. All men who are in charge of Government will have to necessarily think of the consequences that might arise at the time of the formation of such States. It is the pains during the birth and not the birth you are afraid of.

Now one more request. May I suggest, Sir, that the Commission should begin to work in the South at the first instance? The suspicion is more acute in the South than in the North. To my mind it is better to have two Commissions, one working in the North and the other working in the South. The Commissions probably will be more useful than one. But if you cannot see your way to appoint two Commissions and if there is to be only one Commission you should kindly make it

convenient to see that it begins its work rather in the South in the first instance than in the North because in the South the problem is more acute. Not merely that. I would also make another request to you. You can request the Commission to send interim reports on the advisability of the formation of the States. If interim reports are sent then many of the problems cropping up could be tackled and solved then and there. If the Commission could examine the problems connected with the formation of linguistic States in the South and submit a report, it will be extremely convenient. And what is more is—Don't allow the Commission to grope their way in the darkness. Give them specific directions. The mistake that you committed at the time of appointing Mr. Justice Wanchoo and Mr. Justice Misra must be avoided. All the controversies have arisen today because you did not give them precise instructions on which they were to proceed. The terms of reference were not quite precise. In a matter of this nature there would be no dispute in the initial stage so that the decision made may be a reasonable one. If you minimise the scope for a dispute it would be to the advantage of the country. I would like you to tell the Commission that the main consideration for division shall be the language basis, the main, not the sole, but at the same time that would be only conceded if it is economically self-sufficient, financially feasible and geographically contiguous. These are the predominant factors that must be borne in mind.

Then again there is the question of drawing of the boundary line. I do not mind, you take any unit. Take the district as a unit, take the taluk as a unit, take the firka as a unit, take the village as a unit, but decide which you will have beforehand. If you do not decide beforehand, the controversy will always be there. Even at the time of appointing the Commission, if you tell the Commission that the unit that you are going

to consider will be, say, taluk or firka, then there will be no scope for controversy. I, for my part, would request you to see if you can accept the village as a unit.

One more request I would make. There is a false lurking suspicion among the people.

DR K. N. KATJU: How many villages are there in the proposed Karnataka?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: There are not many, but I will give you a solution by which you can solve it. All these difficulties come in if you start right from the beginning. Take the 1951 census as final. Tell the Commission that the 1951 census enumeration is final. Nobody will object to it, because many people do not know the linguistic composition of the 1951 census at present. It is only when the decision goes against them, they say that the census is not a correct enumeration. For that reason if you make these principles known beforehand, if you make this as the terms of reference of the linguistic commission, then there will not be any difficulty at all. If only you had told Mr. Justice Misra that the census figure of 1951 would be taken as final, all this controversy could never have arisen at all. If you had only told him that only the village or the firka or the taluk was going to be the unit of consideration, all these troubles could have been avoided. So shall we not profit by the mistakes that we have committed? As human beings we are apt to commit mistakes, but the only thing that we must do is that we must learn from our experience, from the mistakes that we have committed in the past. I do not think the question whether linguistic States should be formed or not is a moot question. It is a settled question. The question now is one of implementation and it would be desirable if early steps are taken in that direction. I would invite you, Sir, to look to the pointers. Our enemies are taking advantage of the situation. Do

[SHRI K. S. HEGDE:]
you know the result of the two Dharwar bye-elections?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Defeat for the Congress.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Two bye-elections in the course of the last two months we lost.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore): Is that the reason why linguistic provinces should be formed?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: That is the reason why it should be immediately formed. There are people speaking with two voices. The leaders of the Praja Socialist Party, as my friend Mr. Reddy is pleased to interfere, at the top say, 'no question of linguistic nonsense' but that party is pledged to linguistic provinces in the States. The leaders of Akhila Karnataka in my State are the so-called leaders of the Praja Socialist Party. They pass one Resolution in the Betul Conference and they speak another thing on the floor of the House.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: What is the Resolution? Can my friend say that?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: They passed a Resolution that whenever a Commission was appointed for the purpose of deciding the question, they should ungrudgingly accept its decision and that there should be no controversy and.....

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: And that decision stands.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: ...when it came to the question of accepting Mr. Justice Misra's findings, the leaders of the Praja Socialist Party and the whole group say that they should have a plebiscite for it. I shall deal with that aspect a little later.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): That is politics.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: But consistency? Consistency, they say, is the virtue of an ass and probably they say that.....

[MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: They believe in it.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Leaving that aspect alone, I would point out to the Congress leaders at the Centre that though their objective in delaying the formation of linguistic States is certainly praiseworthy from the point of view of the unity of the country, the reaction to it was something unexpected and as such we must take note of the reactions and we must formulate our policies and programmes in the light of public opinion that has expressed itself.

I shall not go into details of every aspect of the case because there are many friends who would like to talk on the subject. But representing as I do, to some extent, Bellary, it is my duty to speak something about this question of Bellary. It is not my desire to rake up questions which are not very germane, nor do I want to engender heat, for I would like to part with my Andhra friends as friends and companions. There seems to be a certain amount of misconception about this Bellary question. Bellary is claimed by our Andhra friends mainly on the ground that the Telugu-speaking population in Bellary taluk.....

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Town.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: ...is in a majority. Undoubtedly, my friend Mr. Mahanty put forward some other argument in the course of his speech yesterday and today. Several arguments have been advanced by our Andhra friends for claiming Bellary Taluk or the town or any firkas as their own. Good and indifferent arguments have been made. In a matter of this kind our emotion is the main guiding factor. Reason is the last element that is taken into consideration. With our Andhra

friends, good and patriotic as they are, their linguistic claims are of an imperialist character. They believe that wherever a single Andhra lives, that area must go to the Andhra State. In one sense it may be good, because the whole of India may be formed into one single Andhra State. Sir, arguments have been advanced on the basis of history that Bellary is a Telugu district. It was claimed that Bellary taluk was the seat of the Government of Krishnadevaraya who was a Telugu and as such the Telugus are entitled to Bellary taluk. In the modern world it is fantastic logic—an argument without any validity whatsoever. A similar claim was made for the city of Madras on the basis that one of the Telugu kings gave it to the British. Absurd as the argument is, I should, as a student of history, still like to examine the validity of this argument. It is historically inaccurate to say that Bellary was at any time a Telugu city or a Telugu taluk. It is further historically wrong to say that Krishnadevaraya was a Telugu himself. Undoubtedly, Krishnadevaraya was a great Telugu poet and a Telugu writer, but so also was he a great Kannada writer. He had written a number of books both in Telugu and in Kannada. But he was neither a Kannadiga nor a Telugu; he was a Tuluva. I am proud to say he came from that part of the country speaking Tulu from which I hail. My friends probably are forgetful of history.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: A new claim.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: No, Sir. A new revelation to him. I request him to open any elementary history book and he will find it.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras): In unwritten language.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Sir, the Vijayanagara kingdom was not founded by Krishnadevaraya but was founded by Bukka and Harihara in the early part of the 14th Century. So far as Krishnadevaraya was concerned, he was one of the Generals in the Vijayanagara kingdom. He was recruited

from my part of the district and I am proud to claim, if I may say so, that he belongs to the Tulu-speaking section of the country to which I have the privilege to belong. We, as Tulus generally are, never view anything from a parochial aspect; we always take a broad view of the case. We patronise the Kannadigas or the Telugus or anybody. So, Sir, it is historically inaccurate to say that he was a Telugu king and I would remind my friends to correct their historical facts so that they might not be carried away by wrong impressions of history. The manual on Bellary was written some time in 1872 by an Englishman who had no bias either in favour of Telugu or in favour of Kannada. It was written at an undisputed point of time. And on the defeat of Tipu, this portion of the country was handed over to Hyderabad, and when the Hyderabad Nizam ceded the ceded districts of Bellary, Anantapur, Cuddapah and Kurnool, Bellary became a part of the Madras Province. Till then Bellary was not a part of the Madras Province. It so happened, Sir, that geographically Bellary was situated along with other portions of Rayalaseema. The weather of Bellary was very good. The Englishmen always liked the weather. So it was made the divisional headquarters of Rayalaseema. Naturally, wherever the seat of Government is, trade follows, the administrative personnel follows. The Andhra invasion began from that time. Of course, you come to my place and I will accept you. There is no question about that. But it is that way that a good portion of Anantapur, a good portion of Cuddapah district, and Alur, Adoni and Rayadurg became parts of Telugu-speaking areas. Now, even coming to Bellary taluk as a whole, the *Gazette of Bellary* in 1904, and the *Imperial Gazetteer* written in 1908, would show, Sir, that Bellary was predominantly occupied by the Kannadigas. If my friends have no respect for these documents written at an undisputed point of time, let them take the other evidence. There was a census operation in 1921, and

[Shri K. S. Hegde.]

I can challenge any one of my friends and I will show that in the whole of Bellary taluk and every firka thereof, Kannadigas were in a majority as compared to Telugu-speaking people. In everyone of the firkas it was so. There was a census in 1931 and the same was the story. There was a census in 1951 and the same again was the story. I can read out the figures also. Now, in spite of these documents, Sir, my friends still claim Bellary or some portion thereof. In fact, if you remember aright, the original claim was for the whole of Bellary taluk. It is now only a modified claim that has been made for some of the firkas of Bellary. May I remind my friends of the recent history? As I said once before, in 1950, a Partition Committee was appointed in Madras, consisting of eight eminent persons, and there was not one Kannadiga in it. Out of the eight gentlemen, four were Telugus, the Telugu gentlemen being Shri T. Prakasam, Shri Kala Venkata Rao, Shri Sanjeeva Reddy and Shri Gopala Reddy. So, Sir, you will see that there was not a single Kannadiga in that Committee. That Committee decided that Bellary was Kannada area. And since the year 1950, what has happened to justify a change in the course of history? Today, the very leaders who signed the solemn declaration that Bellary was a Kannada area, have gone back upon their declaration. They are now having a claim on the Bellary taluk; and with what grace? It is being said, and it is true also, that Bellary is a very good town with nice weather, with nice buildings, etc. Well, I know my Telugu friends are too ambitious. They tried to grab Madras. Having lost that, you are trying to grab Bellary. The logical conclusion is the same in both the places.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA: Why are you afraid of a plebiscite?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Well, I will come to the question of plebiscite.

Just wait for a minute. Now, the next question that came up was the appointment of Mr. Wanchoo. I have the report of Mr. Wanchoo in my hands. Mr. Wanchoo went into the matter. He went beyond the terms of reference given to him. Before I refer to that report, I would just like to mention to you the fact that in 1950 it was agreed that the seven taluks of Bellary district shall remain with the residuary State, which I prefer to call the Madras State. When Mr. Wanchoo was in Madras, I went on deputation to him, being one of the representatives representing the K.P.C.C. We were told that the Madras Government, for one reason or the other, which reason I shall explain at a little later stage, was not willing to accept the seven taluks of Bellary on the ground that they were not contiguous to the Madras State and that they may not be able to maintain law and order in that land. So, the problem before Mr. Wanchoo was: What to do with the seven taluks? He had not been authorised to allot them to Mysore at that stage. The Government of India proceeded on the footing that the Madras State could take up the non-Telugu-speaking areas under their aegis. So, under those circumstances, Mr. Wanchoo recommended three alternative suggestions. He said that the people of Bellary wanted to remain with the residuary State. I am speaking only of the seven taluks of Bellary. But in the alternative, they said that they may be annexed or transferred to Mysore. The third alternative was that they may be constituted as a Part C State. Sir, coming to the question of their transfer to Mysore, he said that that was beyond his terms of reference and therefore he could not do that. He also appreciated that the seven taluks of Bellary could be formed into a separate district for the sake of administrative convenience. He said he was not authorised to transfer them to Mysore. You will be pleased to know, Sir,—and I would not take the time of the House by reading Mr. Wanchoo's report—that Mr. Wanchoo definitely

dealt with Alur, Adoni and Rayadrug as one unit, and the seven other taluks as another unit. In fact, Sir, it reminds me of the history from 1921. When the Congress formed its own provinces—the Congress provinces—there was a dispute about this district of Bellary or a portion thereof. Mr. Kelkar was appointed as arbitrator to decide that dispute. That is for the information of Mr. Mahanty. He went into the matter and gave his decision. May I say, Sir, that in that report he said “I would have been justified, had I allotted the whole of Bellary district to the K.P.C.C.”. Yet he said that he yielded to the clamour of the Andhra friends. I have no quarrel about the decision. (*Interruption.*) I am prepared to take the position as it exists today. I am not prepared to rake up the old history and say that we ruled over the country in the past. Now, having done that, I would like to say that Mr. Wanchoo specifically dealt with the seven taluks as one unit and the three taluks as another unit. The decision of Mr. Wanchoo is there. My friends quote the decision of Mr. Wanchoo. I want them to read it over and over again. Now naturally, the people of Bellary were very apprehensive of Andhras. We love Andhras, and there is no doubt about it; but one thing must be remembered..... (*Interruption.*) I am not **speaking in any light-hearted sense**, Mr. Reddy. But when there is trouble whether it is Telugu or Kannada, when conflict and animosity come in, when both of us.....

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Do not address me. I am a Kannadiga.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: We welcome the Andhras. The attitude of the Kannadigas is: We have no quarrel with anybody, but we have an apprehension—as very correctly epitomised by Mr. Misra—about the onrush of Telugu linguism. That is the fear of the Kannadigas. The

problem of the Tungabhadra is also the apprehension of the Kannadigas. My friend over there talked about Tungabhadra. Probably he does not know the history of Tungabhadra. One of the main reasons why the Bellary people were not willing to come into the Andhra State is due to this problem of Tungabhadra. May I say for the information of the House what happened? The Tungabhadra River mainly flows in the Bellary District and Bellary Taluk. The head-works are situated in Bellary Taluk. The water can be very well utilised in the Bellary Taluk. What has happened is that by the pressure of my Andhra friends, by the pull that they had in the Government, preference was given to what is called the low level canal in preference to the high level canal. I was one of those in the Committee which went into this matter. The benefit of the development of a high level canal will mainly go to the Kannada people, while the benefit of the low level canal will mainly go to the Rayalaseema people, other than the Kannadiga people of the Bellary District. Naturally, the Andhras are more in number and they had a greater pull with the Government and the low level canal was developed. I am not one of those who say that because the head-works are in the Kannada area, the benefits must go exclusively to the Kannadigas. Let it be equitably distributed. Do not expect us to neglect our own interests and show charity to others; this is all we ask. What is happening is that there is a great controversy whether the high level canal should be developed or the waters of Tungabhadra should be let into the K.C. canal. I am now entering rather into technical details. Now, my Andhra friends are eager to let the whole water of the Tungabhadra into the K.C. canal and thus take it to the Cuddappah and Kurnool districts of Rayalaseema, whereas the Kannadiga people are anxious to develop not only the Kannadiga areas but also the Telugu areas. But the Telugus seem to have agreed more or

[Shri K S Hegde]

less that the high level canal can be put off to a later date and that the KC canal should be developed now. Once the water is allowed to flow into the KC canal, there will be no water for the high level canal. That is the fear that oppresses the minds of the Kannadigas. They said "No. The administration of the Tungabhadra Project shall not be left solely to the Andhra friends." After all, self-interest is there. That has been a great motivating force. It is for this reason that we urge that the Central Government should take over the Tungabhadra Project completely. We are very willing to do this. Let the Central Government administer this project. There is no quarrel. The Mysore Government or the Kannada people never did say that the water should not go from the Tungabhadra to the Telugu area. All that the Kannadigas say is that, so far as the head-works are concerned, they are on their side and so legally theirs, but they are certainly not going to harm or jeopardise the interests of the Andhras. We are willing to agree to the setting up of a Corporation in the same way as was done in the case of the Damodar Valley Project.

SHRI S MAHANTY All right, create a Corporation.

SHRI K S HEGDE Surely, I welcome it. Let us consider what happened in the immediate past. In the immediate past the control of the whole district was in their hands so that the entire administrative machinery could be used to change the linguistic composition of the area, and to run the Tungabhadra project to the detriment of the Bellary area. This has created the apprehension. It may be right or wrong, but it is there. It is with that apprehension that they said that, if the residuary State of Madras was not willing to take them, they would prefer to go to the Mysore State. The Bellary people never said that they would prefer to go to Mysore. In fact, they implor-

ed Rajaji to have them included in the residuary State. The Kannada people never said of their own accord that they would go to Mysore. It was entirely necessitated by the attitude taken up by the Madras State. Probably the Madras Government remembered all the violence associated with the linguistic movement since 1950 and 1951. Probably they were apprehensive whether they would after all be able to maintain law and order in the Bellary part of the State if that was attached to the Madras State, or very probably they were afraid of the financial burden going with the Tungabhadra Project. This also might have frightened them. We are thankful, all the Bellary people are thankful, to the Mysore State for having accepted them.

My friend Mr Venkatanarayana, is now a convert to the plebiscite idea. When the Wanchoo Report came an agitation was started in Bellary for the first time in a very organised manner that the Bellary Taluk was a Telugu Taluk. Many of us were astonished. The facts were otherwise. But one fine morning we saw in the Delhi papers that the Government of India had announced that six taluks would go to Mysore, three taluks to Andhra and one taluk would remain in Trisanku. We were taken aback. What was the reason for the Government of India to place the Bellary Taluk in that position? There was absolutely nothing concrete before the Government of India. A certain pamphlet published by the Bellary Andhras consisted figures which had no relation to facts, and which were in the region of fiction. Completely inaccurate and false figures were given in it, and it is that which seemed to have influenced some responsible Ministers of the Central Government. Government perhaps thought that they had already sent the Telugus from the city of Madras and they thought also that there might be some justice in the claims made by the Andhras with

regard to Bellary Taluk and wanted to be helpful to the Andhras. A Commission was appointed. Once it was appointed, a tearing agitation was started in Bellary and attempts were made to create facts and figures in order to justify the claim of the Andhras for the Bellary Taluk. Many of us would be ashamed to hear of the atrocities committed at the time in the town of Bellary and in the taluk of Bellary.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Atrocities?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Let the hon. Member kindly read the report of Mr. Misra.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I have read it.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Justice Misra is not a Kannadiga, he is not a Telugu. He is a gentleman hailing from Allahabad.

AN HON. MEMBER: From Lucknow.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: He is the Chief Justice of a High Court. There was not one word about a plebiscite at the time. Mr. Venkatanarayana did not mention anything about a plebiscite at that stage. The Andhra Congress Committee appointed a sub-committee to present their facts and figures to Mr. Misra. Other parties also presented facts before Mr. Misra. He analysed those facts and came to the conclusion that the Kannadigas were in a majority in the Bellary Taluk.

It was at this stage that this idea of a plebiscite was put forward. The question of a plebiscite may or may not arise. If you take a plebiscite in the city of Madras or the city of Bombay, will it be restricted to the people of the locality or the people who have come there for other purposes? Take the composition of the jail population in Bellary. Out of the 4,000 convicts there, there are hardly a few hundred Kannadigas. I am not saying that the Telugus are more cri-

minally-minded or that the Kannadigas are less criminally-minded. It so happens that convicts from the different parts of Andhra are sent there. Similarly, several other persons have come to settle down there. What is the proposition of my friend, Mr. Venkatanarayana? Are these people to participate in the plebiscite or not? That is one question. After all, Bellary is not an isolated factor; hundreds of Bellaries are yet to come in the course of the formation of linguistic provinces. And if each one of them were to press this position, the heat that would be generated would be so enormous that the benefit of the formation of linguistic provinces would be wiped out completely. Knowing Bellary as I do, and relying upon the assurances given by the friends, I have no fear about the result of the plebiscite. I am disputing the principle of a plebiscite not only in so far as Bellary is concerned, but other areas as well. Every man who was defeated in a court of law in olden days challenged the other party to a duel; perhaps my Communist friends belong to that class. I know their capacity for violence. In that respect I take my hat off to them. I know they will be able to intimidate that section of the people who are not with them.

Now, Sir, I have taken a good part of the time of the House. I do not think that the Andhras have a *prima facie* case for Bellary. My hon. friend Mr. Venkatanarayana said that the three firkas of Bellary Taluk should not go to Mysore. In Mokha, for example, the Kannadigas constitute 52 per cent.; in Rupangudy they are 53 per cent.; and in Bellary itself we are far in excess of our Andhra brothers. But their view seems to be that everybody who is not a Kannadiga is an Andhra.....

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the Bellary town population?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: My hon. friend Mr. Gangappa from Bellary in his election leaflet said, "I shall be true

● [SHRI K S Hegde]
to the interests of the Kannadigas" and so on. Now Sir these words are forgotten. This plebiscite question is the last gamble. I earnestly hope this House will kindly reject a fantastic claim of this nature. Let me, in conclusion, plead with them; circumstances have compelled us to divide, let us divide as friends, let us divide and let us be friends. Let us wish them well, and they in their turn wish us well, and let us together wish India all prosperity.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU Mr Deputy Chairman. I have to talk on this Bill with a certain amount of restraint and at the same time with certain amount of feeling, restraint for the simple reason that I am a Telugu domiciled in the residuary State of Madras, not now, but probably my ancestors two or three generations ago but at the same time maintaining the tradition and culture of the Andhras and with a certain amount of feeling also for the Telugus who are now being separated from the residuary State of Madras. I do not want to embarrass the feelings of the Telugus by my speech who are going away and forming their own State as the Andhra State, at the same time, I do not want to incur the displeasure of my Tamil brethren with whom we have been living so amicably and who have been treating us for generations in a very friendly way.

Sir, it is embarrassing also for me at the same time and why it is embarrassing, I shall come to that at a later stage. Personally speaking speaking on behalf of the Telugu minority in the residuary State we do not wish that any Andhra State should be formed, but in the larger interests of the Telugus—the Andhras—we certainly welcome that they should have a State of their own. Sir, the Telugus who will be left out in the residuary State will roughly form one-sixth of the population of State. Out of nearly 30 millions of the population of the residuary

State nearly 5 million will be Telugus and the State of Madras which has been built over ages by the joint efforts of both the Tamils and the Telugus is now going to be divided, split up, truncated, mutilated and what not.

Sir, I am opposed to the idea of dividing the country on a linguistic basis. My friend, Mr Hegde, has been waxing eloquent on the division of the country on a linguistic basis. It may be good (*Interruption*), he hails from a district which is predominantly Kanarese-speaking and where the Tamils are not probably more than 5 per cent of the population—the South Kanara district. So, the convenience or the inconvenience of the linguistic minorities living in the residuary State will not be felt by him and other friends like him.

Coming to the origin of the linguistic States, I think I have got to level an accusation against the Congress Party which is responsible for bringing into the minds of people this tribal idea of the formation of linguistic provinces.

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA. It is Rajaji who has said this.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU. I am glad that my friend Mr Sundarayya has reminded me that the Chief Minister of Madras has said very recently at a meeting that linguism is a tribal idea and said that it should not be thought of. It was probably in the year 1921-22 and subsequently in the various annual meetings of the Congress Party that resolutions have been passed for dividing the country on a linguistic basis. Probably they have no idea as to what is to happen to the linguistic minorities in that State if a State is formed on linguistic basis. Never for a moment has this difficulty been contemplated. For instance I come from a district where the majority is Tamil-speaking people. But there is a good number of Telugu-speaking people also. Probably we have the maximum percentage of Telugu-

speaking population when compared to the other areas in the residuary State of Madras. Administratively my district, prior to 1911, was called the old North Arcot District which consisted of the present North Arcot district and 6 taluks out of the 8 of the present Chittoor district. Prior to 1911, because the Headquarters of the district was Chittoor—then it was called old North Arcot—the entire language was Telugu, but subsequent to 1911 when the district was split into two as North Arcot and Chittoor and the district headquarters was shifted to Vellore, Tamil was adopted as the district language. The Telugus who had facilities to study their own language prior to 1911 had afterwards been denied that privilege of studying their own language. Prior to 1911 the schools in every alternate village had Telugu in North Arcot but what is the state of affairs today? There is probably one college for the whole of the district and probably about half-a-dozen high schools only from the first form class are having Telugu in high schools. So much so that the Telugus of the district are denied the privilege of studying in their own language. I may mention also here that though the Muslims form only 5 or 10 per cent. of the population of the District, not only in the North Arcot District but elsewhere in the State of Madras also, they are given the privilege of studying their own language. They are having Urdu in every school but why, when the Telugus form about 25 to 30 per cent. in certain areas, they are denied the privilege of studying their own language. What would be the state of the linguistic minorities if States are formed on linguistic basis? Probably my friend Mr. Hegde did not have this trouble in his district because it is predominantly a Kanarese district.

I certainly welcome the idea of the States being divided on administrative and economic bases. It has got its own advantages and conveniences and it will be certainly calamitous if States are formed on linguistic basis.

Take the district of Chittoor that is going to be part of the Andhra State. It may be that people who are fanatics about the language may desire to be with the Andhra, but in their heart of hearts, they desire to be only with the residuary State of Madras because administratively it is very convenient for them to remain so. When I say that, I say that with a certain amount of authority and knowledge because Chittoor district is not far away from my place; it is only a few miles from my place. Whenever I come into touch with any Chittoor friend, he only says that he desires to be with the State of Madras because Madras is only about 100 miles from Chittoor and it takes only about 2 or 3 hours to go by rail or road to Madras. Those who know and who feel the difficulty of the administration feel that they should remain with the residuary State of Madras. Take the history even of Chittoor district. I mentioned about it in the beginning. The so-called Andhra State consists of only the Circars and the ceded districts. Chittoor was never a ceded district. It has got its own history and there was no district like Chittoor prior to 1911. It was constituted only for administrative purposes and it came into being only subsequent to 1911. It may be said that about one or two taluks of Chittoor district formed part of the ceded districts; three-fourths of Chittoor never formed part of the ceded district but it only formed the old North Arcot district. Chittoor District was split into two only for administrative convenience and it was not split on the basis of language. There are a good number of Tamilians in the Chittoor district in about half-a-dozen taluks and *vice versa* in the border taluks of North Arcot District. I cannot imagine what an amount of rupture we will have if a Boundary Commission comes because I know there are several pockets of Telugu villages in the North Arcot district, pockets of 70 and 80 villages clustered and grouped together where the Tamils are only a microscopic

[Shri Rajagopal Naidu]

minority—only about 30 per cent—and likewise in the Chittoor district also there are clusters of Tamil villages where Telugus are in minority. The feeling that had been roused between these two sections for the last one year is unimaginable. Only a person living in that area might feel the amount of inconvenience and displeasure that we, who, unfortunately speaking a different language, are experiencing. In a similar manner people who talk the Tamil language in Chittoor district must be having similar experience. There have been insurmountable difficulties in the last one year. Trains are being stopped in the name of the transfer of territory from one State to the other. Several harrowing details are being told and several privileges that one section of the community is enjoying are being denied to the other. This is all because of this tribal idea of forming States on a linguistic basis. If only the Government of India had announced that Madras is too big—from Visakhapatnam to Thirunelveli it is about 1000 miles and odd and it is very inconvenient administratively, and so let us divide the State into two, as far as possible on linguistic basis—if that had been done, I would have certainly appreciated it, but what were the terms of reference to Mr Justice Wanchoo? It was to form a State with undisputed Telugu areas—that means indirectly to form a linguistic State viz a linguistic Andhra State. At this time we think of the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel who, after Independence, undertook the tremendous idea of integration of the States and the whole of India was brought under one Government. But now what is the position? Fissiparous tendencies have set in and demands are being made to split India, to disintegrate India, on linguistic basis, and the worst of it is that the Government has yielded and is yielding. On top of it, the Government of India is contemplating to constitute a high-powered Commission to go about the whole of India

and see how far India can be divided on a linguistic basis. Sir, certainly I deprecate this idea and I do not desire that such a commission should be constituted to disintegrate India into different units on a linguistic basis. We are still in the stage of political consolidation of the country. Nothing will go wrong, of course, so long as a dominant personality like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is at the helm of affairs. In my opinion, he is a great cementing factor in our country. But just imagine for a moment what would happen if he was not in supreme command? I am sure these fissiparous tendencies, namely, States speaking different languages, would begin to quarrel with each other if there is no powerful Centre, and I am sure the States talking one language will certainly begin to quarrel with States talking another language.

Sir, my revered and honoured friend Dr Ambedkar was speaking yesterday. He is acclaimed as one of the architects of the Constitution; but at the same time he did not hesitate for a moment to say that he would burn the Constitution, and that according to me was certainly unparliamentary. He began by saying that 23 States out of the 27 States that find a place in the I Schedule attached to the Constitution were formed, more or less, on a linguistic basis. I tried to go through the list and I could not come to the conclusion that there was even a single State that was formed on linguistic basis. Is Madras State a linguistic State? Certainly not. Is Bombay a linguistic State? Certainly not.

SHRI H P SAKSENA: What about UP?

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: My hon friend here prompts me with the name of Uttar Pradesh. Uttar Pradesh certainly is a linguistic State and

SHRI H P SAKSENA: Sir, I repudiate that statement. In UP, there are people speaking different languages—Audhi, Brij Bhasha, Hindi,

Urdu and others. But we are powerful enough to assimilate all the people. After all, human beings are not birds which flock together.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Saksena.....

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA:.....like parrots and mainas.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: I do not know why my friend should get so excited when I speak about Uttar Pradesh.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: The official language is Hindi.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: People in the South feel that it is due to Uttar Pradesh that the States are being split into several groups so that U.P. will always remain big. It is the brain of Uttar Pradesh that is ruling the country, trying to disintegrate the South by putting one language against the other.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: The brain of Uttar Pradesh is governing India.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: That is exactly what he says.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: I am not divulging any secret if I say that that is the feeling among every Member of this House who comes from the South and in the other House also—the entire section of the population of the South; and if I say that, I do so boldly and openly on the floor of this House.

Sir, the Andhra State is coming into being at a particular moment when I can say that though the Andhras had aspired for more, they got less. Probably, if this agitation had started—the agitation was there of course—rather if it had fructified a few years back, probably the Andhras could have got a portion of Madras City and probably the whole of Bellary. But now a great soul had to sacrifice his life—Potti Sriramulu. He is really a martyr. We

must take our hats off to the man who sacrificed his life for the formation of the State. But the idea with which he fasted, does not come into being now. He fasted for the inclusion of Madras City also as part of the Andhra State, and unfortunately his desire has not been fulfilled.

SHRI M. BASAVAPUNNAIAH (Madras): That is a story.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: My friend thinks he is going to get Madras City; but I am sure it is only wishful thinking. Andhras will never get Madras City.

SHRI M. BASAVAPUNNAIAH: Are you now advocating on the lines of those who want Madras City to be included in the Andhra State?

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: Shri Potti Sriramulu, according to my information, certainly desired that Madras City should form—at least a portion of the city—part of Andhra State. But whatever it is, you certainly lost a gem like Madras City. You lost Bellary also; and I do not know how much more you are going to lose when the Boundary Commission comes into being. You think that the Telugus who are in the residuary State would certainly co-operate with you when the Boundary Commission comes.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: No, not at all.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: They are more keen upon having only an administrative unit, more keen upon having a capital nearer home, not on having a capital far away at Kurnool, some 400 or 500 miles off, and which is two days' journey from the border areas.

Sir, as I said, this State is coming into being immediately after the death of that great soul—Shri Potti Sriramulu. The announcement was made by the Prime Minister after he saw rioting and looting of railway property and such other things after

[Shri Rajagopal Naidu.]
the death of Potti Sriramulu. This State is being ushered into being under these circumstances. I do not want to say anything about the political groups in the Andhra State. But there is a sort of feeling amongst the public that this State will not come into effective being so long as there is not a good and proper democratic party ruling this State. Well, it is not for me, or rather it is not to my interest, to say anything about it and I shall leave it at that.

Sir, coming then to the Bill proper, the Bill that has been put before us is a Bill where the name of the capital of the Andhra State has not been mentioned. Can there be a body without the head? The Bill now before the House is like that. I can never imagine a Bill of this sort being introduced without even mentioning the name of the capital. Sir, the decision was left in the hands of the Members of the Madras Legislative Assembly who form the portion of the Andhra State. By one word they had decided Kurnool to be the capital. Sir, Mr. Justice Wanchoo refers to Kurnool in his report and he has only just two lines for it, and that is on page seven of his report. He says:

"Kurnool is at one end of the new State and though it is on the Tungabhadra river, it is very awkwardly situated, the distance being roughly 600 miles."

Sir, this is the only sentence in which he has mentioned anything about Kurnool and that city has been chosen to be the capital of this State. I have toured the Andhra area most extensively and, probably with the exception of one or two little towns, I have been to almost every place in Andhra. I can never imagine what made these Andhra Members think of the city of Kurnool—this town, or rather this glorified village of Kurnool should be the capital of the State.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Congress politics.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: I do not know about Andhra politics, but this certainly is a very injudicious selection of their capital.

I do not know why they did not think of big towns in Andhra, like Vijayawada or Visakhapatnam or even, as a matter of fact, the ill-fated town of Rajahmundry or Kakinada or Guntur or even Nellore.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Go back to villages.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: I do not know, Sir, whether it is the wish of the Andhras when they have their own State to live in a capital underneath the tents. I was told, Sir, that several hundreds of tents had been requisitioned from the military for purposes of starting the capital on October 1, in the glorified village of Kurnool.

PRINCIPAL DEVAPRASAD GHOSH: It will be indeed a "tentative" capital, it seems.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: Then, Sir, coming to the High Court, I find that the Andhra State is going to be a Part A State and yet that State will not have a High Court formed immediately with the formation of the State. We find provision made in the Bill for the extension of the jurisdiction of the present Madras High Court to the Andhra State and the time limit that is fixed is 1st January 1956. Sir, I can never imagine or I can never even contemplate a Part A, State that is going to be given birth to on the 1st October 1953 to carry on without a High Court of its own. It is high time that the Members of the Andhra Legislature, after the formation of the Andhra State, sit together and decide within a week or ten days, that they should have a High Court of their own.

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA: Provided the Congress calls the Assembly to meet.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: Provided you co-operate.

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA: Where is the co-operation if you don't call the Assembly?

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: Sir, there will be several difficulties if the Madras High Court is to have an extended jurisdiction for the Andhra State. There will be several administrative inconveniences and difficulties in the matter of appointment to the subordinate judicial service and for the proper functioning of the judiciary. Of course, we find that power has been given to the Chief Justice of Madras but, with all that, I feel that if a Part A State is to function properly,—it may be different in the case of a Part B or Part C State—it should have a High Court of its own.

Then, Sir, I want to say a few words about the Boundary Commission. I do not desire for a moment that there should be a Boundary Commission formed, if a Boundary Commission is formed, it should be to divide the State on administrative grounds but certainly not on grounds of linguism. But, in spite of it, if a Boundary Commission is to be appointed, as has been said by the hon. Dr. Katju, let that Boundary Commission be appointed soon and immediately. It is only now, when an announcement has been made by the hon. the Home Minister that a Boundary Commission would be formed, that the agitation has subsided in the border towns to a certain extent. It is better that if a Boundary Commission is to be appointed it is appointed immediately so that this agitation may not once again be started. We have had endless troubles in the border areas. That would be my honest and

sincere suggestion about the Boundary Commission.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Time is up.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: I will finish in two minutes, Sir.

I wanted to say something about the division of assets and liabilities but the time that has been allotted to me has been spent, as has been pointed out by the Deputy Chairman, and I would conclude by saying that, with the formation of the Andhra State, let not the present Andhra Members who had cultural affinity with their Tamil-speaking brethren in the South drop them or neglect them. Let that affinity continue; let the friendship which existed for centuries continue—that affinity and that joint effort with which the great shape of Madras was built continue for long. Let there be no bitterness as had been exhibited in the past. Let that bitterness die down from the 1st October. Let the Andhra State prosper.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Why not today?

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: It will not die down so long as the Boundary Commission does not come in, as I have already said.

Sir, lastly, I want that there should be certain safeguards, certain privileges for the linguistic minorities—I belong to a linguistic minority, speaking Telugu, there are also Malayalee-speaking minorities, Kanarese-speaking minorities. . .

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: We do not want any privileges.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: Let there be protection for these minorities. Let their culture and their language be adequately safeguarded. Sir, at a future date, I want the Central Government to bear in mind to make provision for the linguistic minorities being adequately safeguarded in the

[Shri Rajagopal Naidu.]
residuary State or in any State that is formed on a linguistic basis.

SHRI M. MANJURAN (Travancore-Cochin): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to join the general chorus of welcome to this Bill which assures the Andhras a State on the 1st October 1953. It is, however, incomplete; it is inadequate and it lacks in principle. I would like to congratulate the people of Andhradesh on the successful consummation of the great agitation that they have been leading culminating in the martyrdom of Potti Sriramulu; but, I would also like to remind them that their efforts would not be complete if they do not dislodge the ancient Nizam and merge the Andhra areas under his feudal heel in the proposed State. I know that a movement is going on in Andhra to this end and it is better that the Central Government realises the earnestness and intensity of it earlier.

The Home Minister was comparing the birth of this State with the birth of Lord Krishna, and the floods in the Godavari with the floods in the Jumna. I liked the comparison very much. To me, Mahabharata means certain things more than the birth of Lord Krishna. It is a long story and if the hon. the Home Minister had projected himself in his clairvoyance a little further, he would have found that it was developed as a fight against the serpent Kaliya and the tyrant Kamsa. I would compare the Home Minister with this Kamsa when he denounces the principle of linguistic States.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: He never did that.

SHRI MATHAI MANJURAN: He did and he said that he did not like the idea at all and, accordingly, he has omitted it from the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Bill.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: He did not say that; he said others accused him of that. That is what he said.

SHRI MATHAI MANJURAN: Well, whatever it is—whether he did say it or not—the whole matter is based on the linguistic formation of States. There is no doubt about it. Mr. Justice Wanchoo was appointed to look into matters connected with the establishment of a State of the Telugu-speaking people and, I think, “speaking a language” is what is implied by linguistic States. Again, the Government of India appointed Mr. Justice Misra to go into the dispute arising between the Kannadigas and the Andhras over the district of Bellary and Mr. Justice Misra has brought out a long report. His terms of reference included consideration of such factors, as linguistic composition and cultural affinity, administrative convenience and economic well-being. He has treated these four subjects. He has taken ten pages and fifteen paragraphs over the matter of linguistic composition. He has taken three paragraphs regarding administrative convenience just to say that it did not matter much. He states that from the point of view of the economic well-being of the people there is not much to be said because it is plain there was not much whether a district was in a particular State or in another State. He dismisses what is called cultural affinity as a very light matter. If the Home Minister thought that there was a reason and there was an object in bringing forward this Bill he should have stated it in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. He should have stated that if not on linguistic basis there was going to be an effort and the States were going to be redistributed on the four points referred. He should have stated that further efforts for redistribution of the Indian States would take place on the terms prescribed by Justice Misra. If it were so, it would have contained a principle. Now it does not contain any principle. He has said that a Boundary Commission is going to be appointed to look into the matter. Again, we want to know on what basis? These matters cannot be kept secret for a long time. All over the country

especially in the South, there has been a clamour for linguistic States. It is not because the Tamils dislike Andhras, nor the Kannadigas are against the Andhras. It is not because the Malayalees are against anyone of these people. It is just because there has been a historic movement for the attainment of national States and one of the particular features of a national State is language in which are embodied also administrative convenience and cultural affinity. It is a strange thing to say that cultural affinity lies between people speaking different languages and it is stranger to say that administrative convenience arises in areas which talk different languages. The Home Minister has never favoured the idea of linguistic States and although some Congressmen now here are in favour of it, others at different times and elsewhere have disfavoured such an idea. We reiterate that there is no quarrel about territories. The bigness or smallness of a State matters not in the concept of Indian unity. It is a question of readjustment and whenever there is a suggestion of linguistic States all the extraneous facts are brought in and discussed as the disunity of India. There is no question of disunity. There is no other question involved in the formation of linguistic States except, as Mr. Rajagopal Naidu said, a tribal idea behind it. I accept that it is a tribal idea, because human growth has been essentially tribal and history teaches us that this principle of the tribe would not be taken away from the life of a people at any stage. If we are conversant with world history and especially European history from the 18th century up to date, we will be convinced that there has been an intense drive for the formation of linguistic States. The break up of the Holy Roman Empire, that is, the Austrian Empire, into the various components was on the basis of language. Even today, all culture is measured in terms of identity of language. We have got certain kinds of strange political

philosophies which have come to light not through books written on the subject but from certain whims and fancies. It is not because any particular people want to attack any other particular people, it is not because ill-feelings are to be nurtured that linguistic provinces should come, but in order that each State should obtain the maximum amount of homogeneity that linguistic States should be formed. The Government should accept it as a principle and the whole of South India should be formed on the basis of the different languages there as early as possible. It has been stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that on the 19th December 1952 the Prime Minister informed Parliament that the Government of India had decided to establish an Andhra State. It is not like that. It was because the people of Andhra for a long number of years demanded a State of their own. It was because the intensity of the agitation that developed in Andhradesha could not be checked by the Government that they had finally to concede it. I very well remember the day when a resolution for a separate Andhra State was moved in this very Council and eminent people, including Mr. Hegde, then opposed it on principle. I am very glad to find that he is supporting it to-day. Again, Dr. Ambedkar in all his wisdom and in a moment of despair says that if linguistic States were formed the Scheduled Castes would go into the seas and it will come off when an eminent Doctor like him was fighting for their cause for a long number of years. It is only despair that still confronts him. I am surprised that he was not able to lead them anywhere, much less himself. He has led himself nowhere. That is the position. Because frustration has caught hold of him he transposes himself in the name of the Federation and says that frustration has crept upon the Scheduled Castes Federation. I do not understand how. I also come from a place where there are people of the Scheduled Castes

[Shri M. Manjuran.]

Federation but with none of the complaints that this Doctor has got. They are far advanced. They have become much more advanced than their great leader. I can put anyone of the Scheduled Castes from my place before Dr. Ambedkar and he will tell you that his ideas are much more advanced than those of the eminent Doctor. It is a misnomer in the middle of the 20th century to say that Scheduled Castes are existing. We are trying to see that they are assimilated along with us and we want to find a common medium for that. We want to bring them under the culture of a common language. We want to take all members of the Scheduled Castes as honest and equal citizens of this country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: I would have liked to say something more about this Bill but it is enough for me to indicate now and at this stage that I again congratulate the Andhras and remind them that they have further tasks in Hyderabad where people talk Telugu to dislodge the Nizam permanently. I would also request the Government of India to take early steps to see that the States are demarcated linguistically and on no other basis, or to tell the people on what principle they are going to do it. We do not want arbitrary rules because it would appeal to the Government in power at one time to do some thing they consider right then and to do a certain other thing at another time as they choose. But the same will have to be redone if they do not do it in accordance with a definite principle, and the only acceptable principle for the demarcation of States is language and language alone. We want that all States in the South should be formed on this basis within the coming year so that we will live in peace, progress and prosperity.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this

period during which the Andhra State Bill has been on the anvil of both Houses of Parliament is no doubt a great era not only in the annals of Andhra but in the annals of independent India. After India achieved independence, this is the first linguistic State to be formed. By whatever name the mover calls it, it is going to be an accomplished fact in the very near future. So we are the pioneers. We have undergone all the difficulties. This will be followed. I am sure, ere long, by the distribution of the entire country on the basis of language, culture and other administrative convenience taking into account economic, financial and geographical factors.

Now, we have suffered a great deal because we have lost the city of Madras and again we are being sandwiched between the Tamils and the Kannadigas—those two great linguistic races—and now they also want to take away, at any rate, the three firkas of the Bellary taluk.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Sometimes sandwiches are very good and tasty.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA: Now I would like to take you to those days, i.e., July 16th and 21st last year, when I moved the first non-official Resolution on the formation of the Andhra State. It was supported by many here, even by many of the Congress friends though, against their conscience, they voted against the Resolution, of course, in the light of the Party mandate. Many of us never thought that a Bill in these terms constituting an Andhra State would be before us at such an early date. However, after that Resolution great events took place that ultimately ended in the sacrifice of the great soul Shri Potti Sriramulu which has expedited the matter very much. Then the Government were insisting on the settlement of several issues which were ultimately given up because of subsequent developments. Dr. Katju, the mover, and also my friend Mr. Manjuran, referred to the birth of Sri Krishna which

was followed by the arrest of his father, mover and some other persons and their being kept in jail. Here also people were killed, many were arrested.

I am so grateful to all the Members for their blessings and good wishes and I hope with the co-operation of all the new State will prosper.

The Home Minister, a responsible Member of the Government in charge of this Bill, ridiculed the position of Kurnool and the entire process that was undergone. He said that somebody had told him that Kurnool had big buildings while some others had said that Kurnool did not even have huts. But it was quite easy for him, having access to the entire records of the Administration, to get correct information. He need not have said all that. He could have got hold of the facts and told them here. He even referred to the climate and several other things. No doubt when the Members of the Andhra Assembly met under the direction of the Central Government, they passed some Resolution. At any rate the Central Government today are in a position to know the general consensus of opinion. They could know whether Kurnool, Bezwada, Guntur or some other place could be selected for the location of the capital and they could have inserted that in this Bill itself. They said it was a domestic question. He said that if the Central Government were approached for subsidy or grant or some loan then only they would think about it otherwise they were not concerned at all with any particular State either in existence or to be formed. That is a very irresponsible statement for him to have made. He said India should be one country, and that all the States, linguistic or otherwise, should consider the interests of the country as a whole. Then why should he make such an irresponsible statement on the floor of the House saying that the Central Government were not at all concerned with them until they were ap-

proached for some financial help? Even now it is not too late. He can bring forward an amendment fixing up some place as the capital so that this vacillation on the part of the Andhras may be ended at least now.

The Home Minister then placed more emphasis on the law courts and litigation. I think he must have taken more than half an hour—a major part of his speech—for that point. I wonder why he did that. He said he was speaking as a lawyer. We are concerned with our friend as Home Minister and not as a lawyer or erstwhile lawyer. He thought fit to give more amenities to the litigant public, to the lawyers, to the judiciary, to the High Court and all that. He must know that if the courts are prosperous, it means that the people are not prosperous, because they must be fighting amongst themselves drowned in litigation and wasting their funds.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY Don't you want a court there?

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA We want a court there, but first we want the Executive Government. The Administration should go on well first and not litigation. It is something like encouraging the public to take to more litigation so that the lawyers may prosper. If the lawyers and the High Courts prosper, that means that the people and the country are not prospering at all. So the Home Minister who is the sponsor of this Bill, instead of laying more emphasis on this litigation, law courts and other things could have paid more attention to the Administrative and Executive side of the new Province. Perhaps as a lawyer he was personally interested in that aspect. I know he might have referred to all these things humorously. He might not have been serious. Then he referred to the dropping of the word "linguistic" from the Bill. By whatever name you may call it, this is being carved out of Madras State mainly on the basis of language, and probably culture, administrative con-

[Shri P. V. Narayana.]
venience and other things also. He might have been afraid of the demands from other linguistic areas. Whatever it may be, the fact remains the same.

Now, with reference to Madras city, first there was the Dhar Commission which said that it should be constituted into a Chief Commissioner's Province. It did not say specifically that ultimately it should go to the Tamils. Then the JVP Report came. It also did not say in so many words that it should go to the Tamil area. Then came the Wanchoo Report. I was not anxious even to look into the Wanchoo Report in the beginning, because I knew that even if it went against the Tamil Nad, I was quite sure that there would be another Commission or Committee appointed until that Committee decides cent. per cent. against the Andhras. So Committee after Committee was being appointed to see that the Andhras were granted their legitimate due. Afterwards Mr. Justice Misra came in. Even about that I was not very anxious. Mr. Justice Misra said that excepting the three taluks of Alur, Adoni and Rayadurg, the rest of the taluks of Bellary should be included in Mysore. If this had gone in favour of the Andhras, then another gentleman would have been called in to go into the matter and so on like that until it ultimately went against the Andhras. And hardly was the Misra Report published, the Government published their view.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: The whole world is against the Andhras. You cannot help it.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Did any report go in your favour at any time?

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA: There are several. I will presently refer to those things. And I know how comfortably he avoids the figures of Bellary town. And so that happened and the Andhras were divided, and that was a very

good opportunity for others to exploit us. But still the Central Government is there to look after the interests of all, particularly the weak. We ought to have got the sympathy of the Central Government, because we were the victims. When the Home Minister referred to the natural resources of some areas there, he said that they were enormous. Then my question is: Why were they not exploited? Why were they not developed in spite of this natural wealth? That was because we were not able to do it, and because we were constantly being exploited by the majority and we were helpless. And, even now, the treatment that we are having at the hands of the Central Government, is just in continuation of the previous one, absolutely nothing better, and we do not know when we shall be lucky enough to see good times and secure some help from the Central Government.

About Bellary what we all want is that a plebiscite, a referendum, should take place there. When Mr. Hegde and other Karnatak friends were quite sure of the decision, they should not have objected to what we said. We feel that we shall gain, and they feel that they shall not lose anything. If they are not going to lose anything, what objection is there to accede to our request? Look at the town of Bellary. My friend was referring to the census figures of 1951, but he very comfortably and conveniently avoided any reference to the census figures of Bellary town, where there is a predominantly Telugu majority.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Twenty-seven per cent.?

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA: Much more than your number there.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: That is how your majority works.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA: Sir, I have also got with me the figures. Where you are 17 per cent., we are 23 per cent. Where you are 17,000, we are 23,000. You are 24 persons and we are 32 persons, i.e., 8 persons

more. So, that is enough for his purpose. You say that our majority is not sufficient. But where you are in majority by one per cent., you say you are predominantly in majority. Therefore, it will be seen that he so comfortably avoided any reference to the Bellary city or the Bellary town, because that did not suit him at all. He was referring to the census figures. I will also refer him to page 3, paragraph 7, of that Report where it is said that the claim of the people is that the census figures of 1951 are incorrect. Where was the necessity for the appointment of Mr. Misra to go into these details?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Five minutes more.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA: Sir, I am an Andhra candidate. I have some connection previously.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. According to the list, you wanted only 20 minutes. Five minutes are left. Please go on.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA: So, where was the necessity for the appointment of Mr. Misra to enquire into these matters at all? A high-power commission is going to be appointed about a year after the formation of the Andhra Province, which will enquire into these things and decide the question whether the entire country is to be re-distributed on the basis of linguistic and cultural considerations. Mr. Wanchoo had said that no committee, no Boundary Commission, should be appointed at that stage because the people were highly excited and that excitement would harm the formation of the Andhra Province. That was the specific advice given by Mr. Wanchoo. But again they appointed Mr. Misra to give a judicial tinge to the views of the Government which they already had in their mind. It was so surprising of Dr. Ambedkar to have come and said that he was hacked and all that. He wanted regional committees. He thinks of Scotland. That is a different country altogether. But here it is a single State.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please hurry up.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA: Just one or two things more, Sir. As regards the Upper House, there is no reason why Andhra should not have an Upper House. According to article 171, it can have an Upper House if the proviso is deleted. About the Colleges Sir, they must be affiliated to the Andhra University. There is absolutely no such provision. It seems the Chief Minister of Madras has given some assurance that this would be looked after by the Central Government. But it has not taken place. Of course, there are four or five other points I want to touch upon, but I won't have the time to speak on them.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI B. N. DATAR): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have no desire to intervene in this debate which has been proceeding in a very dignified manner but for two speeches, one by a former member of the Central Cabinet and the other by the Leader of the Opposition. It was to me a matter of great distress that Dr. Ambedkar had denounced not only the Constitution but in denouncing the Constitution he was unfortunately denouncing his own public career. If and when the time comes for writing the biography of Dr. Ambedkar, I think that his admiring biographer would mention his participation in the framing of the Indian Constitution, as constituting the most glorious part of his life, but sometimes you and I are aware that by the inexorable laws of Karma a man is goaded by fate to act in such a way that thereby he will undo even the good things that he has done, and therefore we have the sorry spectacle of hearing a man of Dr. Ambedkar's genius and public stature condemn himself as a hack and a nireling and ask us to denounce the Constitution.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: And burn it.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: On behalf of the Government of India, I humbly

[Shri B. N. Datar.]
submit before you that so far as the Constitution that has been prepared by some of the most talented people of this land is concerned, it is one of the most eminent and successful performances and has stood the test of time during the last three years.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: How many amendments have been made?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: If there is anything of which we ought to feel proud, it is the Constitution that has been prepared by us.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Of unemployment also.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: So far as Dr. Ambedkar was concerned, all that he had to complain against were not the fundamental provisions of the Constitution but what can be called certain omissions and, so far as these omissions are concerned, I have to say this. The first omission that he referred to was that the Constitution had not invested the Governors of States with certain special powers. We are aware, Sir, of the special responsibilities of the Governors and the Governor General mentioned in the Government of India Act of 1919 and also of 1935, and one of the greatest constitutional jurists said that the Governors had been so over-weighted with special powers that either the Governors would fall or the Constitution itself would crumble. That is exactly what has happened. To clothe a Governor who has not been elected by the people with special powers would be highly undemocratic and would make the Governor not merely the constitutional head of the State but also some sort of super-Minister. That is a proposition that cannot be accepted at all.

So far as the minorities are concerned or so far as the Scheduled Castes are concerned, they are entitled either on the general roll or on the special roll to have their representation, and we know that during the

last three or four years, as a result of the working of this Constitution, all the minorities—the Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Castes—have got such a fair and substantial measure of representation that they can make their will felt not only in Parliament but also in the various State Legislatures. Therefore, it is the duty and obligation of all the minorities to co-operate with the Government which they themselves have elected to office. That way lies their salvation, not in looking up to the Governors or any Committee as has been suggested by Dr. Ambedkar. He said that there ought to be a special committee for this purpose and that that committee's views should be the final views. There also you will agree that the institution of such a committee is highly undemocratic because, after all, the Council of Ministers itself is the most important committee constituted by the elected Legislatures for this purpose. Therefore, it is that body which ought to govern with your consent and with your co-operation. Therefore, with due deference to the learned Doctor, I must say that the grounds on which he desires the Constitution to be amended are entirely untenable and cannot be accepted.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: He is suffering from a safeguard phobia.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: Then the Leader of the Opposition had the Congress on his brain all along. The unfortunate portion of his speech was where he said that the Congress had not redeemed its pledges, but these friends of ours come here and condemn us for doing exactly what we have pledged ourselves to do. So far as the linguistic provinces question is concerned, it is true that in 1921 the Congress, under the leadership of the Father of the Nation, accepted this principle. Then it was also given out and assured to the people that as soon as the Congress came to power, it would implement this particular assurance. In 1946 or 1947 the Congress came to power. Immediately thereafter this question was taken up. Dr. Ambedkar unfortunately was entirely wrong

and inaccurate in citing certain portions and leaving out certain other portions unsaid. You are aware of the definition of what is known as fraud. We have heard of *suggestio falsi* as also *suppressio veri*. Now, *suppressio veri* is as dangerous if not more dangerous than even the positive suggestion of falsehood. When the Constituent Assembly met, one of the first acts of the Constituent Assembly was to appoint what was known as the Linguistic Provinces Commission. That Commission toured round the country and they gave a certain report to the Constituent Assembly of India. When subsequently it was found that there were certain provisions in the report which were not acceptable to the people, the Congress appointed what was known as the JVP Committee and that Committee was presided over by a distinguished Andhra *viz.* Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya.

That Committee went into the whole question and mentioned certain conditions on which it would be open to the Government of India to tackle this question. They said in very clear terms that so far as the Andhras were concerned they would not have the Madras City at any cost. If, for example, they desire that they should have a province then they should give up their case for Madras which is exactly what they have said.

Therefore Sir, the matter was made clear that if an Andhra State has to be formed its protagonists will have to abandon their claims to the City of Madras. After this Report was made and accepted by the Congress in November 1949—Sir, here I would point out to this House in all humility—the question of the Andhra State was not kept in the background or in cold storage but an attempt was made to solve the differences as best as possible. Therefore I am giving you certain dates to show that the Government of India need not be accused either of opposition or of any spirit of hesitation so far as this question was concerned. On 16th Novem-

ber 1949 the Congress Working Committee passed a resolution that the Government of India should undertake the formation of an Andhra State. They laid down certain conditions. Immediately after the Working Committee's resolution was received by the Government of India they initiated measures and you within one week and on 25th November 1949 they sent out a communication to the Government of Madras and requested them to undertake all preliminary measures for the formation of an Andhra State before the 26th January 1950. The Government of Madras also, with great alacrity, appointed a Partition Committee which went through a number of problems and the whole material was ready then as it has been ready now.

So far as the Partition Council was concerned the majority view was that the Andhra Province should be formed before the 26th January 1950 and it should be enumerated as a Part A State in Schedule I of the Constitution and some Andhra members of this Partition Council also were parties to this majority resolution. But ultimately what happened was that one of the foremost of the Andhra leaders did not accept this view.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA It was only an excuse of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel for not giving the Andhra Province.

SHRI B. N. DATAR I have here with me documentary evidence to show that one of the foremost and liberal Andhras of the day—he was also a member of the Partition Council—stated that there could be no Andhra Province without the City of Madras; that is what he has said. If the hon. Member is anxious I shall read that portion now. I am as anxious as they (the majority leaders) that the Province should be formed before the 26th of January 1950 provided the strong differences of view between my colleagues and myself are settled by impartial arbitrators as we are unable to reach an un-

[Shri B. N. Datar.]
 animous conclusion. These matters
 can be examined by an Arbitrator."
 Certain matters have been stated.

This Report was signed on the 3rd or the 4th of January 1950. Till then, the Constituent Assembly was ready; the Government of India was ready; the Partition Council and the Government of Madras had made all preparations for the transfer of the services and for the division of the assets and liabilities and certain preliminary orders were almost ready to be passed for the establishment of an Andhra State on the 26th January 1950, because, otherwise, the provisions of article 3 of the Constitution would come into force and there would be certain difficulties and a long procedure would have to be gone through such as the one we are going through now. That was as late as 3rd January 1950, when a revered Andhra leader states that the matter has to be referred to an Arbitrator. You will agree with me, Sir, that it is not possible, within the short space of only a few weeks, to go through all this material and to have this matter settled. So, the Government of India had to come very reluctantly to the conclusion that they could not go through the whole laborious procedure of resolving the differences between the Andhras themselves and then form the Province. Therefore, on the 24th January 1950, that is, two days before the inauguration of the Constitution, the Government of India had to issue a communiqué stating that unfortunately as there was no agreement on certain substantial points, the Andhra Province could not come into existence and the Andhra Province could not be enumerated in the First Schedule of the Constitution. All these facts, you will find, ought to have been known to Dr. Ambedkar himself because he was a Member of the Central Cabinet, and unfortunately, very unfortunately, yesterday he stated something which was palpably wrong. He said that he made a reference to the Prime Minister and that the Prime

Minister did not reply. But, in the background of all the facts I have stated just now, you will agree with me, Sir, that so far as the Prime Minister and the then Cabinet and the Government of India were concerned they did all that they could do. They did all that lay in their power to do. I am so very sure because they began after the middle of November 1949. Within two months, all the preparations and preliminaries had been gone through till the unfortunate hitch had occurred at the last moment—for which the Government of India were not at all responsible. Nothing could be done and unfortunately the Andhra State could not come into existence with the inauguration of the Constitution. If, Sir, all these facts are properly appreciated, you will agree with me—except perhaps my friends on the opposite side—that so far as the Government is concerned, they cannot be accused of either opposition or having had a spirit of hesitancy in tackling this question.

That takes me also to the next question so far as the general re-distribution of States is concerned. It is true that the Congress had, all along within its own jurisdiction, promised the formation of provinces on a linguistic basis. But you would also agree with me that in the last period of the life of the Father of the Nation, when this question was referred to him—as it was constantly being referred to him after the 15th August 1947—he had said something which was prophetic, which was true. When a deputation waited on him only a few days before his unfortunate passing away at Delhi, he called upon all the sponsors of the linguistic provinces to come to an agreement so far as the boundaries were concerned. This instance of agreement cannot be compared to the instance of agreement by the former British Administrators. Gandhiji had reason to believe, he knew that passions would run riot so far as the boundaries were concerned. So, Gandhiji desired, as an apostle of non-violence, that the differences should be settled. After all, the division is

not going to be like the one between India and Pakistan or like that between one independent State and another but within or, *inter se*, the Indian Union itself. Therefore, he ought to be extremely tolerant and especially as neighbours it should be possible to accept a certain principle and then to work upon it and as far as possible to come to an agreement. I am happy, Sir, that this correct principle was laid down and had this principle been followed even now, much of what has happened, much of the bitterness that was in evidence or was indicated, would not be there at all. Because, after all, so far as the boundaries are concerned, it is open to sober-minded leaders to sit together round a table and settle the matter. After all we are not giving away one village to an enemy and therefore we ought to be extremely careful. Therefore the Government of India, in spite of all that has been stated against them, has been extremely careful to see that in implementing the pledge of linguistic provinces, they carried out things as cautiously, as properly and as non-violently as possible. It is only on account of this circumstance that there should be no display of unwarranted passion. Secondly, as the Prime Minister has correctly put it, he has stated on a number of occasions in this House and elsewhere that he is not against linguistic provinces at all, but all that he insisted upon was that first things should be given first priority. Therefore after the inauguration of Independence we had certain large problems to go through first—I will not mention them now—and the Government of India have now taken up and have shown to the world that in bringing forward this Andhra Bill, they have the best interests of the country at heart. Secondly, the Central Government have absolutely no right to remain in office except with the willing consent of all the people and if the Andhras desire that they must have a province, then it was the duty of the Government of India that that particular demand ought to be acceded to. Therefore, I am extremely anxious that the An-

dhras, as also their neighbours and the whole country at large, should watch this particular experiment with great interest, with a feeling of toleration and if this experiment is successful, as I am quite confident that it will be, there would be no difficulty in expecting other coming Provinces to succeed as well because it was then felt that Andhra's case was perhaps the simplest of all because, after all, what had to be carved out was only from one province. There were certain difficulties then so far as Karnataka was concerned and gradually they are being resolved. So far as Maharashtra is concerned, there are certain other difficulties which I am quite convinced that the genius of Maharashtra would solve and when the High Power Commission comes, then it is quite possible, if not certainly, to have the desire of the southern part of India fulfilled and fulfilled in a constructive way. Therefore I am anxious that this particular experiment should be considered as a very important experiment and that is why I was pleased that all the sections of this House have blessed this measure; but for the left-handed compliment of a Member here or there or on the Opposition, it has been received extremely well.

Then I would make reference only to a few points and leave the others. Now it was stated that so far as the question of capital was concerned, it was entirely wrong to have a province without a capital and then certain analogies were given and certain comparisons were made, such as that you cannot have a body without a soul or a body without the head or some such analogies were made. Comparisons are always odious and generally unrealistic. Whatever it may be, so far as the question of capital is concerned, you would agree that at all stages the Government of India have left this question solely to the Andhras themselves because when it was agreed that they would have a province without the town of Madras, then naturally the question was whether it should be a permanent or a temporary capital. The Andhras have naturally an eye upon Hydera-

[Shri B. N. Datar]

bad. I am not entering into the big and disputed question regarding the disintegration of Hyderabad.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why not?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: But so far as Andhras are concerned, their attitude in this respect is entirely motivated by their expectations or certainty that they would have Visala Andhra and they would have Hyderabad as their permanent capital. So far as Government are concerned, they were aware of the position that if Andhras had to go out of Madras as it was settled that they had to, then naturally some other place had to be found out. Now this some other place had to be found out by the Andhras themselves and it was extremely wrong on the part of some Members to have asked the Government of India to impose their decision upon the Andhras. The Government of India therefore left the question of the capital to the Andhra Members of the Madras Legislative Assembly for the simple reason that the Andhra Members of the Madras Legislative Assembly would, on 1st October 1953, constitute the first Legislative Assembly of the Andhra State. Therefore, a special meeting of the Andhra Members was called and the Chairman was Shri Prakasam and then we had a very clear vote so far as Kurnool was concerned.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: I want one clarification from the hon. Minister. I would like to ask, when the hon. Members in the Legislative Assembly of Madras had decided about Kurnool as their capital, and this Bill has been introduced subsequently in the other House as well as in this House, why is it that the decision about Kurnool has not been incorporated in this Bill?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: We are not changing our ideas. Unfortunately some people are changing their ideas. So far as the Andhras were concerned, you will please note this. I shall

just now answer the question put by my hon. friend. The Andhra Members of the Legislature of Madras under the Chairmanship of their own leader met, discussed the matter for 4 or 5 long days and then—you may kindly note—the division was that there were 80 Andhra Legislators in favour of Kurnool as against only 52. So against 52 we had a very clear majority—we had this, what may be called, a substantial majority so far as Andhras were concerned and naturally at that time, as even now, some Andhra leaders—I am hoping a very large number of them—pledged their support to Kurnool on the basis of what is known as Sri Baug Pact. The Sri Baug Pact was entered into as early as 1937—long before the Province came within the realm even of actuality or practicality. Then they came to certain conclusions because there were very clearly defined parts of Rayalaseema on the one hand and the coastal areas. Then they stated that the capital should be at one place and the High Court at the other and so far as the question of choice was concerned, the choice was to be given first to Rayalaseema and therefore it was, Sir, that we have to congratulate the Andhras on having acted up to the promise given as early as 1937. It is only on account of this promise that all the leading Andhra Members fully supported Kurnool and I would read to you only one word to show.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: I don't deny that. But ...

SHRI B. N. DATAR: I am just coming to the next sentence. You will please note that so far as the views of the Madras Government and those who sent their reports about this meeting is concerned, I am very happy that on all most controversial issues like this all the democratic parties could come together. All the democratic parties—Congress, P.S.P., K.L.P. and some independents. Then naturally what happened was what has been settled in respect of Kurnool was subsequently found to be inconvenient and therefore immediately after this Resolution was passed, a counter agi-

tation was started with the willing help of our friends on the Opposition and then suddenly there developed a very large amount of affection for Guntur-Vijayawada and they started an agitation, and then when an agitation is started and when it gains in volume, it is always the practice that some unwary persons also get into it. That is how unfortunately some Members who had voted for this Kurnool began to waver and then figures were placed before us. The matter came before the Madras Legislative Assembly and Council. There the question of the temporary capital was not very prominent because under article 3 what the Government of India has to do is to ascertain the views of the Legislature concerned.

The most important body was the Andhra section of the Madras Legislature and they were in favour of Kurnool. And then, as I stated, there was some hesitation and, all the same, it must be stated very clearly that even in the Assembly as also in the Council the amendment regarding • Vijayawada—Guntur as being the temporary capital was voted down.

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA Not at all. The Andhra legislators voted for it.

SHRI K S HEGDE But it was not merely for the Andhras.

SHRI B N DATAR The Andhras had their conclusive and decisive say. But when it was found that so far as the Government of India was concerned or so far as the framing of the Bill was concerned, the Government of India believed that there was some rift somewhere and it was quite likely that if that rift was to gain ground the decision about Kurnool might be gone back upon. It was only for this very purpose that though Kurnool had been mentioned as the hon. Home Minister stated through inadvertence but still ultimately it was considered that even the mention of this name would be taken objection to by our friends and by others because some of these Members desired that Kurnool should not be even the temporary capital. Now the Government's posi-

tion is extremely clear. Government is always prepared to go by the decision of Andhras, and it is still open to the first meeting of the Andhra Legislative Assembly to come to a decision to reverse this particular decision and to go to any town or village or whatever place they like and the Government of India would respect their decision.

Something was stated about the Government's inability or reluctance to do their part of this bargain. So far as the Government is concerned, it is committed to the policy that on the 1st of October 1953, the Andhra Government was bound to come into being in spite of the hesitation on the part of some members, some Andhras. Some of them actually pleaded for postponement, but the Government said they would have no postponement at all. Therefore it was that the Government had to make preliminary preparations and that is why under the able guidance of Shri Trivedi, all that is possible is being done. And, secondly, with a view to making room for a possible reversal of this decision the Government of India are spending as little as possible on Kurnool, consistent with the maintenance of elementary efficiency. So this is the attitude of Government so far as the question of the capital is concerned.

Unfortunately Sir—I hope it was in the heat of the argument yesterday—some references were made by some Members of the Opposition, some unflattering reference was made to Shri Trivedi. I may say that Shri Trivedi is one of the best sons of the land and, I may add one of the most impartial administrators that India has got. He has experience of being Governor in a number of States. Therefore he has been sent there and I am quite confident that under his leadership and guidance the Andhra Province would be placed on a stable footing. On behalf of the Government of India, I repudiate the insinuation.

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA Why did he not take representatives of the Communist Party? You answer that question.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: I am answering it. So far as the Communist Party is concerned, they form a minority, an absolute minority. If I mistake not, they are 40 out of 140.

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM (Madras): What about the K.L.P.?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: And so far as their attitude is concerned, I am afraid their attitude is not constructive at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: It has never been.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: You cannot have it both ways. Either oppose us or help us. You cannot have it both ways. Therefore, it was extremely wrong and futile for the Leader of the Opposition to have stated or to have bemoaned the fact that his Party had no representation in the Advisory Committee that has been formed.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: We expose you.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: The Advisory Committee was formed to carry on preparations and not for the purpose of frustrating the preparations.

Therefore, the Government of India had to be extremely careful and the work that the Special Officer, the Governor-Designate, has been doing is extremely good and Government have appreciated it and I desire that the...

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Is he the Governor-Designate, Sir?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: That is what the hon. Minister himself stated.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Has the Minister the power to appoint a Governor?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: If it satisfies my hon. friend, I shall say the Special Officer for Andhra Affairs.

The Government of India are obliged to the Special Officer for Andhra

Affairs for carrying on his work in a very effective and vigilant manner.

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM:.....and partial manner.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: The aspersion cast against him is entirely wrong.

Another Member stated something which was also not flattering so far as the Chief Justice of the Madras High Court was concerned. My impression is that the Chief Justice of the Madras High Court is an eminent Andhra himself—I speak subject to correction.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Yes.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: Certain powers had to be given to the Chief Justice of the Madras High Court. You would cut at the root of the foundations of society if, for example, you go on making allegations and insinuations in this privileged House against officers for whom it is not possible to come out and defend themselves.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: You are there to defend them.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: Yes, I am defending them. So far as the Chief Justice is concerned, he has done nothing. Because certain powers had to be given to him under the Act, it is entirely wrong to make insinuations against him; it is a wrong and diseased mind. You see red because you belong to a Red Party. You see red in everything that is properly done.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: You see black because your party is black.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Like MacCarthy.

(Interruption.)

SHRI B. N. DATAR: My submission is that so far as the officers are concerned, they are carrying on the work well and nothing derogatory to them ought to have been said.

So far as the Rayalaseema area is concerned, the Government of India,

as well as all of us are extremely sorry that Rayalaseema constitutes one of the most backward parts of the Indian Union. For a number of historical reasons, it has remained backward and it is the desire of all of us, including the Government of India, that Rayalaseema comes up to a level of advancement with the Circars, the Coastal districts if not more and the Government of India are interested in the development and advancement of Rayalaseema to the same extent that the Andhras are. Therefore, it was our desire, had it been possible, when the final touches were being given to the Bill, to include some special provision by way of a directive or a recommendation for giving special consideration to the Rayalaseema districts. There were two objections; one was the legal objection. Under the Constitution you can give special protection to certain classes, not to certain regions. Educationally and economically backward classes have been referred to in the Constitution, but there is no reference to economically backward parts or tracts of India. Legal advice was taken and we were informed that constitutionally it would not be legal to make a mention in the Andhra State Act of any such provision. Secondly was the question of propriety. After all, the Andhras in the Rayalaseema and the Coastal District are one; they are members of the same brotherhood and, therefore, it would be an indication of doubt about the men in the Andhra Legislature if certain recommendations, especially statutory recommendations, were to be made from here in the Andhra State Act. For these reasons it has not been possible for us to make a provision on the lines suggested by some Members. All the same, it is open to the Government of Andhra to take that up. I am quite confident, Sir, that they would establish a special Board as even now exists under the Government. There is, if I am not mistaken, a Rayalaseema Development Board. They should have a special Board that would take into account the wishes and desires and also the backwardness of this area because, after all, if five districts

out of eleven are backward, then the whole Province is backward and the country suffers to that extent. Therefore, it is quite possible. Sir, and we can expect the Andhra Government to take into account the needs and the backward character of this area and to do whatever they can. It is open to them also to approach the Government of India for special assistance because, as you are aware, the Planning Commission has stated that one of the principles is that there ought to be an equitable regional development of all the parts of India and, on that ground, I would advise the future Andhra Government and the Andhra leaders here, as well as elsewhere, to approach the Government, to have proper plans and, it will be a privilege to the Government of India to help the Andhras in so far as the advancement of the Rayalaseema part is concerned because, in the advancement of Rayalaseema not only the interests of Andhra are involved but the interests of India also are involved.

Then, Sir, I would make reference to one or two circumstances. It was stated that the All India Services, like the I.C.S. and the I.A.S. and others, were not divided in such a way as to include only Andhra members. Now, you would agree that, so far as India is concerned, there must be certain elements which go to strengthen the ties even in respect of administration, and that is the reason why we have maintained the character of these All India Services. These Services are manned by officers who are in charge of districts and carry on very important work not only at district headquarters but in the Secretariat also. Therefore, we have made a rule that, as far as possible, neither regional nor linguistic consideration should be entered into.

It does not mean that Andhras are not to be put in there. So far as the all India cadres are concerned, Andhras would be there, but Andhra should not expect that only Andhras should be put in. It would be an entirely wrong procedure. A certain

[Shri B N Datta]

corrective is necessary. After all, if I am an Andhra or a Kannadiga or a Maharashtrian, it is quite likely. Sir, with the human failings of all of us, that I might think first as an Andhra and then as an Indian. In order to prevent the consummation of such an undesirable result we have decided that, if not possible on a 50-50 basis, a fair proportion of non-regional all India officers should be maintained in the States and the same principle would be followed so far as the Andhra State is concerned. It is good in the interests of the Andhras and in the interests of India as a whole. It is true that we must have proper and compact provinces but behind these provinces we must have the idea of India as a nation and therefore it is that Government have been proceeding slowly and cautiously and certainly in this matter also we are going to keep the character of the All India Services. Also I would inform the hon. Members that so far as these Services are concerned they are not pledged to any weak loyalties. They are independent. They have to carry on all work and they have to carry on the work entirely in a detached spirit and they should have nothing to do with politics and therefore whoever the officers be should not matter. Even a Bengali officer in the Andhra State would prove more competent than, for example, say, an Andhra in certain exceptional circumstances. I know that there are a number of great Andhra members of the All India Services. They have carried on their work very well and one of them was even the Governor of my own State, namely, the Bombay State and, therefore, I am proud of this All India Services and I am also proud that there are such Andhra members of the All India Services. Therefore you would agree with me, Sir, that in order to maintain uniformity of standards and a high degree of efficiency we should send to the various States officers some of whom belong to that State and others from other States also. We have also to remember that in all these provinces

it is true that we accept the linguistic basis. It does not mean that we only insist upon linguistic basis for all purposes. In the Andhra State you will find, as in all the States, you cannot have what may be called watertight compartments. So far as the Andhra State is concerned, a large population would be there who would not be speaking the Telugu language. Out of the total population of the proposed Andhra State—it is 2 crores and 5 lakhs, I am giving the figure broadly—about 20 lakhs of people would be non-Andhras who will be speaking either Tamil or Kannada or some other language. Now it is the duty of the Andhras to protect such legitimate linguistic and other interests of these people, and therefore we have to take into account that circumstance that it is a linguistic province only to a certain extent and not to a complete extent and good neighbourly relations have to be established. After all, though Telugu will be the principal language, Kannada will have to be given importance and Tamil also will have to be given due importance. Therefore if you take into account this larger view I am quite confident that some members from other States also so far as All India Services are concerned should be sent out there.

I am obliged to the House for having given me this opportunity for explaining some of the important points and I join with others, Sir, in wishing a very prosperous career and a stable Government to the Andhra State because some of my friends have started even now, even before the province has come into being—you know who starts, I would not mention them—to work for the disruption of the State. I know there are certain forces which are working for the disruption of the Andhra State and I desire that all such disruptive forces should be completely curbed and the Andhra State should have a stable Government and a prosperous Government to boot.

PRINCIPAL DEVAPRASAD GHOSH
(West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chair-

man, Sir, it is with the greatest interest and pleasure that we have been listening for the last two days to this discussion on the formation of the Andhra State and various other issues linguistic and otherwise, arising out of its formation. These last two days have been gala days for the South Indian Members of this House, and that is in the nature of things. For Sir the wearer knows where the shoe pinches and if the present speeches are any index, it seems that pinching is taking place on many fronts. We listened with the greatest interest to the various speeches that have been delivered during these two days. It was a very interesting study in personalities and passions if I may be permitted to say so. And the delicious performance was the initial performance which was put in yesterday by Dr Bhim Rao Ambedkar. He lived up completely to the reputation of his first name because like the mighty Bhima of old, yesterday he wielded his *gada* (mace) right and left smashing all and sundry and ultimately coming down with a thump on the Constitution itself with which he himself is supposed to have had something to do. It was really a very delightful performance. I only wondered why my other friend the usually gentle Mr Sundarayya delivered a not very *sundar* (gentle) speech with regard to Dr Ambedkar, for he might have very well left Dr Ambedkar to stew in his own juice involved in the implications of his own inimitable speech of yesterday, by which he committed political *harakiri* by disowning everything that he did, and saying that he merely acted as a hack and a hireling—though I do not myself believe half a word of it. Now, I think it is high time that somebody on behalf of Northern India stood up and welcomed and blessed this measure which naturally has commanded the confidence of practically the bulk of this House, though maybe with some mental reservations on the part of some Members. I am sorry that Dr Katju is not present here just now. Yesterday he said that we were witnessing the birth of a new State and the birth of a new State, like the

birth of a new baby, is always an auspicious occasion and deserves the good will of everybody concerned. He also said something with regard to birth pangs. Well Sir that was an unfortunate reference—the reference to the birth pangs associated with the birth of this Andhra State. For these birth pangs were avoidable. They might have been avoided if care had been taken by adequate nursing in proper time. My friends Mr Hegde and Mr Datar have taken a great deal of pains to furnish a chronological narrative of dates thereby attempting to show that the Government of India was never averse to the formation of the Andhra State seeing that there was such a universal demand for its formation. Nobody says that the Government of India was averse. But it is hardly true to say that the Government of India was eager to follow the popular mandate in this case. At any rate it is clear that it had at last made up its mind about it. I still remember the day—about ten months hence—and that was a dark day for India the 15th of December 1952, when that pious soul that patriotic son of India, Mr Potti Sriramulu, had to lay down his life for a cause to which, according to the protagonists of the Government, the Government was certainly not averse. And two or three months before that in July 1952 in this very House a resolution was moved by a friend of mine Mr Venkatanarayana, urging the formation of an Andhra State. Though the general opinion in this House was favourable to the formation of an Andhra State on grounds known to all of us here, still the Congress as a Party had to oppose it and the resolution was defeated. Actions speak much louder than words. Had that resolution been accepted in July 1952, I make bold to say that the life of Potti Sriramulu would not have been lost. It was only four days after that precious life had been lost on the 15th of December—I repeat it, it was only four days after the 15th of December, i.e., on the 19th of December, our Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal

[Principal Devaprasad Ghosh.]
Nehru, came before us here in this House and informed Parliament that the Government of India had decided to establish an Andhra State consisting of the Telugu-speaking areas of the Madras State. The decision was welcomed, but it was a bit too late to save that precious life. Not only that.....

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Probably you are not aware that Potti Sriramulu wanted the city of Madras also.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: But did he get it?

PRINCIPAL DEVAPRASAD GHOSH: Anyway, these are matters of detail. What I put before you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, is this that had this identical decision been unmistakably taken and announced by the Prime Minister of India in July 1952, when that resolution was moved by Mr. Venkatana-rayana, I make bold to say that this tragedy could have been averted. City of Madras or no city of Madras, that was not the main point, the main and grand objective was the formation of an Andhra State. Anyway, I do not like to dilate on the distressing circumstances for long.

Only one other thing I would like to say in this connection and that is this. The distressing circumstances in which the death of that pious and patriotic son of India took place, were not the only thing that happened before the announcement of this decision. You will remember that there were extensive riots, unhappy things, which every one of us regrets. There were burnings and lootings; there were so many other things—digging up of railway tracks and all that—resulting in the loss of crores of rupees. It was only then that the Government came to realise the seriousness of the situation. Now, that is my complaint; that is really my grievance as it is of every peaceful citizen of India. It has so happened, it has so come to pass, not merely in connection with this particular public demand, but in connection

with various public demands which have come up of late, that the Government is not amenable to arguments. Government is not amenable to facts and figures. Government is not convinced by reasons. It is only when things get out of hand, when some people fast, when some people die of fasting, when some people take the law into their own hands that the Government becomes alive to the seriousness of the situation and feels that something must be done about it. Only the other day, in the month of July, we had a hell of a lot of trouble in Calcutta. What was the reason? Mr. Deputy Chairman, you will please pardon me for this short digression, but it illustrates the point. What happened? There was a paltry dispute about a certain increase in tram fares. That dispute, that objection, might have been right or wrong. If for two or three hours the Members of the Government and the Members of the Resistance Movement had sat together armed with facts and figures, they might have hammered out the differences and come to some decision or other, but nothing like that happened. So long as matters were confined to the realm of reason, arguments and facts and figures, Government was inclined simply to ignore them. I am not supporting the deeds or the misdeeds of this party or the other; I am speaking as a peace-loving citizen; I happened to be in Calcutta during those days of nightmare in July last. I am not concerned with rights and wrongs but I do maintain that only when unfortunately things get out of hand, that the Government came down and yielded and that too without any dignity. Had the Government made that gesture a week or a fortnight earlier, it would have been more graceful and dignified. I might also refer here to a very unpleasant incident which occurred—which in Calcutta we dubbed as the 'monumental' assault—as the assault that took place on the members of the public, particularly the members of the Press at the base of the Ashutosh Monument at Calcutta, of which my hon. friend there, Mr. Satyapriya Banerjee, was at the

same time a witness and a victim. That assault was of such a flagrant character that it resounded throughout the length and breadth of the country, and brought down the censure of no less a person than our Prime Minister himself, and the Government of West Bengal had to yield. All these things I say more in sorrow than in anger, because this is not the way in which public demands have to be met. They have to be met on the basis of facts and figures, on the basis of reasons and arguments. Sometimes it seems to me that the foreign rulers of India who preceded the Congress regime were responsive in a greater measure to the demands of the public than the present set-up of our Swaraj administration. That is a pathetic situation. Perhaps the foreigners felt that it was not right to ride roughshod over the feelings and sentiments of the people committed to their care, but presumably our indigenous administrators suffer from no such inhibitions. Their attitude seems to be one of cold, callous contemptuous disregard of public opinion. It has now come to be the public impression—unfortunate public impression I must admit—that in order to get anything sensible done by the Government, it is no use adducing facts and figures, it is no use advancing arguments and reasons; all you have to do is to ask somebody to go on a hunger strike, somebody who is prepared to die—if one dies, so much the better—and to make your own lives and the lives of everybody else (and of the Government officers) also miserable, and then the Government will sit up and take notice of you. This is an exceedingly unfortunate situation. I hope and pray—and I hope everybody here will hope and pray—that this bad tradition might become a closed chapter in the history of our administration and a more national chapter might begin from now on; and that is why I welcome the announcement of a general sort of boundary commission which will go into all these questions, not on the basis of *argumentum baculinum* but on the basis of facts and figures, on the basis of reasons and arguments.

I welcome it because it is on this basis alone that anything can be rationally decided. People can sit down around a table, appear before the Commission with deputations, produce witnesses before them, and then, on the basis of arguments, thrash out all these things and come to definite and reasonable conclusion.

I shall not detain the House much longer. As a matter of fact, as to the details of the merits and demerits of the Bill, some of the South Indian Members have spoken and they are in a much better position to do so than I am. I have only one other thing to say and shall utter a few words of caution to my friends of Andhra; and I hope they will not take these words amiss. After all, the Andhra people have got their own State. It may be not to as full an extent as they might have hoped for; but the sum and substance of their mission have been fulfilled. Their quarrel with the Government is more or less ended. So far as the relations between the Tamil and the Telugu people are concerned (I am speaking subject to correction) I was always under the impression that it was the Telugu people or the Andhras who used to rule over the entire Presidency of Madras, just as the Scotsmen have been ruling over England for the last three centuries. I sometimes wonder why the Andhras have chosen to abdicate their empire over Tamilnad, and modestly confine themselves to their own homeland. I also wonder why the people of Tamilnad have not yet announced the "Appointed Day"—"Der Tag" as the Germans used to say—the First of October 1953, as a "Day of Deliverance" from the shackles of Andhra imperialism. In talking of Andhra imperialism, I am not drawing upon my own imagination—it is not an invention of mine. If I have read our history aright, it appears that sometime in the first century B.C. or first century A.D., great Andhra emperors were ruling not merely over the bulk of Southern India but also over some portions of the North. I hope, however, that that imperialism is now gone, and none of

[Principal Devaprasad Ghosh]

my friends either to the right or to the left will subscribe to it I trust therefore that the Andhra people, in view of the fact that they have now achieved their heart-felt desire of owning their own homeland and have abjured imperialistic ambitions will not any more cast longing lingering looks all round and look for bits of land here in Orissa or there in Mysore, but will be content with trying to develop the new-born State as best they can

I shall tell you one thing more and that is this. Now that they have no further cause for any quarrel with the Government, let them not waste their time and energy in quarrelling with one another, in quarrelling over the capital, whether it should be in Kurnool or Vijayawada or Hyderabad or whatever it may or other little things. Certainly they can afford to wait. I may foretell, if foretelling is not a presumption on my part, that Nehru or no Nehru, the Andhras will get Hyderabad in the fulness of time as their permanent capital, in place of this tentative capital of Kurnool. Our amiable Prime Minister, that generous patron of his friends will not be able, I tell you, to save his friend the Nizam of Hyderabad any more than he has been able to save his other bosom friend Sheikh Abdullah of Kashmir. Our Andhra friends need not be over anxious on that score. To whatever persuasion of political thought they might belong, they should put their shoulders to the wheel, and try to build up the new and great structure which task has happily fallen upon their shoulders. The omens are not very propitious, the signs are not very auspicious. Mother Godavari seems to be angry. She seems to be beside herself with rage, that rage has got to be assuaged. She threatens to engulf the whole of Andhradesha presumably for the way in which her erring sons are behaving. There is an old saying, a famous couplet in the Upanishads which warns people against rushing about here and there like fools, like the blind being led by the blind. May

I have your permission, Sir, to modify that couplet a little and say

"Dandramya mana pariyanti mudhab Andrenaiva Niyamana yathandhrah"

Let that not be said of my Andhra friends now that their hour of victory has dawned. I have nothing more to say. We all wish god-speed and good luck to the Andhra State. There is an old Vedic chant which I presume to quote for the benefit of my Andhra brothers. As one coming from distant and agonized Bengal, which knows the pangs of separation if any State does let me quote the Vedic mantram

"Sam gachchadhvam
Sam Vadadhvam
Sanvo manansi janatam"

March in unison, speak in unison and think in unison. Then Mother Godavari will bless you. Mother India will bless you, and the Divinity that presides over the destinies of our Motherland will bless you.

SHRI D NARAYAN (Bombay).

श्री डी० नारायण (बम्बई) सभापति महोदय, आप जानते हैं कि न तो मैं आन्ध्र का हूँ और न तामिलनाडु का। मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करने के लिये इसलिये उपस्थित हुआ हूँ, कि जिन तर्कों के ऊपर इस बिल का आधार है उसका मैं पक्षपाती हूँ। क्योंकि मैं चाहता हूँ कि जल्द से जल्द इस देश में भाषावार प्रान्त रचना हो। हमारे आन्ध्र के भाइयों ने कष्ट उठाये, मेहनत की, तपस्या की और अतः मेरा प्राण तक अर्पण किया और इसका उनको आज फल मिल रहा है। उन्होंने एक रास्ता हम लोगों के लिये खोल दिया है, जिस रास्ते से मैं भी आशा करता हूँ कि एक दिन वह जल्द ही आने वाला है जब कि जिस प्रान्त से मैं आ रहा हूँ वह महाराष्ट्र प्रान्त भी, जो कि आज तीन प्रदेशों (मध्य प्रदेश, हैदराबाद और बम्बई स्टेट) में बटा हुआ है भाषा के नाते एक राज्य बन जायगा।

मेरा प्रान्त भी एक भाषा के आधार पर अलग राज्य हो सकेगा यह आशा आज इस बिल के द्वारा दिखाई दे रही है और मैं अपने आन्ध्र के देशवासियों को बधाई देता हूँ कि आज उन के श्रम कामयाब हो रहे हैं।

आप को विदित है कि यह एक स्वाभाविक बात है कि भाषावार प्रान्त रचना हिन्दुस्तान जैसे देश में होना जरूरी है। हमारे माननीय गृह मंत्री जी ने कल कहा कि यह जो आन्ध्र बिल पेश किया जा रहा है यह कोई भाषावार प्रान्त रचना की वजह से नहीं किया जा रहा। मैं इस बात को नहीं मानता। एक दफा नहीं अनेक बार यह बात मानी गई है, कई वर्षों से कांग्रेस ने भी माना है कि हम इस देश में भाषावार प्रान्त चाहते हैं। अंगरेजों ने इस देश का बटवारा किया, इस देश को छिन्न-विच्छिन्न किया और इस तरह से इस देश के प्रदेश और प्रान्त बनाये कि उनके इस कार्य में न तो बुद्धि थी और न कोई तर्क था। हा एक बात थी, उन्हें यहां राज्य करना था और अपना मतलब सिद्ध करना था, जिस तरह से उनका स्वार्थ सिद्ध हुआ उस तरह से वे विभाजन करते रहे, कहीं गवर्नर बिठाया, कहीं लेफ्टिनेन्ट गवर्नर बिठाया, कहीं कमिश्नर कायम किया, किसी को बड़ा किया किसी को छोटा किया, अर्थात् कोई तर्कसंगत या भलाई की बात उन्होंने नहीं की। और आप इस बात को भी जानते हैं कि सब से ज्यादा अन्याय अगर अंगरेजों ने किसी के साथ किया तो वह महाराष्ट्र के साथ किया। अनेक प्रदेशों में उसका विभाजन किया। यह स्वाभाविक था क्योंकि अंगरेजों को ज्यादा से ज्यादा विरोध और रुकावटें भी, जब से वे यहां आये और जब तक वे गये तब तक, महाराष्ट्र से ही मिली क्योंकि शुरू से आजादी के लिये यदि कोई प्रान्त अधिक से अधिक लड़ा होगा तो वह महाराष्ट्र लड़ता आया है। अब आजादी के बाद वह आवश्यकता पूरी

होनी चाहिये थी कि भाषा के आधार पर प्रान्तों का विभाजन हो। मैं शुरू से ही यह मानता रहा हूँ कि यह तो होकर रहेगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि आज एक आन्ध्र देश एक हुआ, परन्तु यदि ऐसा करने में और जल्दी की होनी तो आज जो हवा पैदा हो गई है वह पैदा न होती। अंगरेजों के वक्त के ९ प्रान्तों और देशी रियासतों को मिलाकर आज हमने समय के अनुकूल २८ प्रदेश बना दिये हैं : ९ 'ए' क्लास है, ९ 'बी' क्लास है और १० 'सी' क्लास है। तीनों क्लास एक से नहीं हैं, कोई छोटे हैं कोई बड़े और कई इतने छोटे हैं जिन को राज्य कहना आज के जमाने में कोई ठीक बात नहीं। हाँ, एक जमाना था अंगरेजों का जब पांच पच्चीस गावों के राज्य थे। मैंने तो सुना है कि सौराष्ट्र में एक ऐसा राज्य था जिसकी सालाना आमदनी साढ़े बाईस रुपये थी। दुर्भाग्य से आज २८ प्रदेशों में चार प्रदेश ऐसे हैं, बम्बई, मद्रास, हैदराबाद और मध्य प्रदेश कि जहाँ के रहने वालों की भाषाओं के अलग राज्य नहीं है। २३ प्रदेश ऐसे हैं कि जिनको लिंग्विस्टिक प्राविन्सेज (linguistic provinces) ही कहा जा सकता है। ऐसी हालत में मैं नहीं समझता कि इन चार प्रदेशों के ही साथ यह अन्याय क्यों हो रहा है? अच्छा होता कि आन्ध्र राज्य निर्मिति के साथ इन प्रदेशों का सवाल भी तय किया जाता।

आपने देखा होगा कि हमारे विधान में हम ने १४ भाषाएं मानी हैं, उन १४ में से संस्कृत और उर्दू को छोड़ दीजिए। १२ भाषाएं ऐसी हैं जिनको हम ने देश की भाषाएं कर के माना है और उनमें से ५ भाषाएं ऐसी हैं कि जिन्हें अपने भाषावार राज्य प्राप्त है। मराठी, गुजराती, तामिल, कनाड़ा और मलयालम ऐसी हैं कि जिन्हें अपना कोई प्रान्त राज्य प्राप्त नहीं है।

AN HON. MEMBER:

एक माननीय सदस्य : बंगाली क्यों नहीं ?

SHRI D. NARAYAN:

श्री डी० नारायण : बंगाल में बंगाली ही बोली जाती है और कोई अन्य भाषा नहीं बोली जाती। बंगाल का तो अपना प्रदेश है। बंगाल को अपनी भाषा का अभिमान है, कविवर गुरुदेव बंगला में ही कविता करते थे।

AN HON MEMBER:

एक माननीय सदस्य : हमारे माननीय कवि रवीन्द्रनाथ टैगोर बंगला और अंगरेजी दोनों जबानों में कविता करते थे।

SHRI D. NARAYAN:

श्री डी० नारायण : उन्होंने हमेशा बंगला में ही रचनाएं की, यह दूसरी बात है कि बाद में उन का अंगरेजी में ट्रांसलेशन किया गया। मैं आपसे इस मिलसिले में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी जी भी आखीर में इस नतीजे पर आ गये थे कि वे जो कुछ लिखेंगे वह हिन्दी और गुजराती में ही, अंग्रेजी में नहीं। उन्होंने ने जो अपना आत्मचरित्र लिखा था वह गुजराती भाषा में लिखा। मेरे यहां यह सब कहने का मतलब यह है कि आज बम्बई स्टेट ही एक ऐसा स्टेट है जहां तीन भाषाये बोली जाती हैं, गुजराती, कनाडी और मराठी। और इसका नतीजा क्या होता है? वहां राजकाज अधिक अंग्रेजी में ही चलता है। मैं आप से एक बात कहूँ, कोई छुपी हुई बात नहीं है, कि जब असेम्बलियों के इलेक्शन हुए और उनके बाद जब पहली असेम्बली की मीटिंग हुई, मुझे मालूम है कि एक मिनिस्टर साहब अपनी मादरी जवान में बोलते रहे। उस वक्त तो उन्हें बोलने दिया गया परन्तु बाद में उनसे कहा गया कि "यह देखिये, आप मिनिस्टर होते हुए अंग्रेजी में

बात नहीं करते, मराठी में बात करते हो, यह प्रतिष्ठा के खिलाफ है, आप अंग्रेजी में बात करियेगा नहीं तो लोग कुछ का कुछ समझेंगे"। और कुछ लोगों ने कहा कि साहब आप मराठी में बात करेंगे तो कनाडा वाले नहीं समझेंगे, गुजराती वाले नहीं समझेंगे। यानी आप समझ सकते हैं कि किस तरह की दिक्कत हमारे सामने पेश है। यही हाल हैदराबाद का है। वहां क्या हुआ? निजाम का राज्य रहा तो सारे मुल्क के अन्दर उर्दू ही उर्दू चलाई गई, स्कूलों में उर्दू, कालिजों में उर्दू, सब जगह उर्दू। गवर्नमेंट की ओर से कही मराठी स्कूल नहीं, कही तेलगू नहीं, कही कन्नड़ नहीं, कही भी जनता की भाषा नहीं मिखाई जाती थी। अब आजादी मिलने के बाद वहां कुछ काम हो रहा है, और हम आशा कर रहे हैं कि मराठी वाले महाराष्ट्र में मिल जायेंगे, कन्नड़ वाले कर्नाटक में मिल जायेंगे और तेलगू वाले आंध्र में मिल जायेंगे।

कहा जाता है कि भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना हो जायेगी तो हिन्दुस्तान की एकता नष्ट हो जायेगी। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि हम हिन्दुस्तान के सब प्रान्तों के लोगों ने हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी के लिये लड़ाई लड़ी और आजादी पैदा की तो अब आजादी पैदा करने के बाद हम उस एकता को कैसे नष्ट करेंगे। हमारा विधान एक है, हमारा आदर्श एक है, हमारी फौज एक है और हमारा नेता एक है, इन मानी हुई बातों के होते हुए भी यह कहा जाता है कि एकता बिगड़ जायेगी। एकता दो प्रकार की होती है, एक सियासी एकता होती है यानी पोलिटिकल, और एक कल्चरल एकता होती है। सियासी एकता तो हमने आजादी ले कर पैदा की है। हमारा हिन्दुस्तान एक है, हमारा विधान एक है, जैसा कि मैंने अभी कहा, तो यह कहना मेरी समझ से बिल्कुल गलत है कि प्रान्तिक रचना से सियासी एकता बिगड़ जायेगी। हां, कल्चरल

एकता का भी सवाल खड़ा किया जाता है परन्तु उसके सम्बन्ध में भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह कहना तो और भी गलत है। हमारी कल्चरल एकता तो उस वक्त भी रही जब कि हम गुलाम थे, उस वक्त भी हमने अपनी कल्चरल एकता नहीं छोड़ी थी। मुसलमानों का राज्य रहा, अंगरेजों का राज्य रहा तब भी गंगोत्री का गंगाजल रामेश्वर को पहुंचता रहा, हजारों वर्षों से वह पहुंचता रहा है और आज भी पहुंचता है। द्वारिका के पुजारी तब भी जगन्नाथ को जा कर भात खाते थे और आज भी जा कर खाते हैं। आज तक कल्चर का तो कोई सवाल हिन्दुस्तान में पैदा ही नहीं हुआ परन्तु आज जब कि हम भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना चाहते हैं तो यह सवाल पैदा किया जाता है। हमारा कल्चर कोई ऐसी चीज़ नहीं है जिसमें कोई बढ़ाव न हो, कोई बदल न हो और कोई वैचित्र्य न हो। ऐसा नहीं है। यह हमारी संस्कृति तो एक वृक्ष के समान है। भारत का कल्चर, भारत की संस्कृति एक वृक्ष के समान है। आप जानते हैं कि वृक्ष की शाखायें एक सी नहीं होतीं, छोटी बड़ी भी होती हैं, उनका स्वरूप अलग अलग होता है। इसी तरह से भारतीय संस्कृति एक होते हुए भी भारत के अलग अलग हिस्सों की कुछ विशेषतायें हैं, कुछ अपनापन है, हर एक प्रान्त और हर एक प्रदेश की अपनी विशेषता है। भारतीय संस्कृति को एक मानते हुए भी हर एक प्रदेश की जो विशेषता है उसे भी हमें मानना होगा और उन का भी विकास करना होगा। भारत की संस्कृति इंद्र-धनुष के समान है जिस में कि अनेकों रंग हैं परन्तु यह कही नहीं दिखाई देता कि एक रंग यहां खत्म हुआ और दूसरा यहां से शुरू हुआ। इसी तरह की हमारी मिली जुली संस्कृति है। इसलिये भाषावार प्रान्त रचना के बारे में संस्कृति की बात उठाना मेरे खयाल में बहुत ही गलत है।

तीसरा सवाल फाइनैस का, अर्थ का, उठाया जाता है कि पैसा इसके लिये कहाँ है? जहां तक मेरे प्रान्त का सवाल है उसके सम्बन्ध में तो मैं कह सकता हूँ कि यह सवाल उठता ही नहीं। जैसा कि हम अपने प्रान्त के लिये चाहते हैं कि महाराष्ट्र के १२ जिले, मध्य प्रदेश के ८ जिले, हैदराबाद के ५ जिले और बम्बई, जहां कि मराठी भाषा की प्रधानता है, इन सब को आप एक कर दीजिये तो फाइनैस का कभी कोई सवाल पैदा ही नहीं होगा।

DR. K. N. KATJU:

डा० के० एन० काटजू : बम्बई में तो सब भाषायें बोली जाती हैं।

SHRI D. NARAYAN.

श्री डी० नारायण : नहीं, सब भाषायें नहीं बोली जाती हैं, जैसा आप समझते हैं वैसा नहीं है। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि बम्बई में खासकर मराठी बोली जाती है हालांकि उत्तर के लोगों ने आज तक बम्बई के ऊपर आक्रमण किया है और उस आक्रमण की वजह से ही आप कह सकते हैं कि वहां बहुत सी भाषायें बोली जाती हैं परन्तु यह ऐतिहासिक सत्य है, भौगोलिक सत्य है कि बम्बई में मराठी बोली जाती है।

DR. K. N. KATJU:

डा० के० एन० काटजू : और गुजराती भी बोली जाती है।

SHRI D. NARAYAN:

श्री डी० नारायण : मैं जिस गांव से आता हूँ वहां भी गुजराती आपको मिल जायगी। यहां दिल्ली में भी गुजराती है। यह कोई बात नहीं है। मुझे कहने दीजिये, ये बातें तो सुनी हुई हैं। तो मैं फाइनैस के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहां तक मेरे प्रान्त का सवाल है वहां तो फाइनैस के बारे में हम

[Shri D. Narayan.]

स्वयं पूर्ण होंगे। परन्तु मैं इस को बहुत बड़ा महत्व नहीं देता क्योंकि जो भाषावार प्रान्त बनने वाले हैं वे ऐसे छोटे नहीं बनने वाले हैं, न तो कर्नाटक ऐसा छोटा बनाया गया है, न तामिलनाडु ऐसा छोटा बनेगा, कि जिससे वे प्रान्त अपना अपना खर्च न चला सकें। इस सम्बन्ध में डर क्यों पैदा होता है, इसलिये कि हमने अपनी सरकार का काम इस तरह से महंगा, खर्चीला कर रखा है कि हमें डर लगता है कि इतना पैसा कहां में आयेगा। अरे भाई, हम गरीब हैं तो गरीब जैसे रहें, हम अमीर हैं नहीं तो अमीरों की सी बात क्यों करें? हमारे पास बड़ी इमारतें, महल नहीं हैं तो न हों, हम अपनी झोपड़ी से ही काम ले लेंगे, छोटे मकानों में ही काम करेंगे, अफसरों को चार हजार तनख्वाह नहीं देंगे, पांच सौ में ही काम करायेंगे परन्तु कम से कम हम अपने घर में स्वाभिमान से तो रहेंगे। यदि रिश्वत की बात है तो क्या छोटी पगार पाने वाले ही रिश्वत लेते हैं? मेरा तो खयाल है कि बड़ी पगार वाले अधिक से अधिक रिश्वत लेते हैं। अधिक तनख्वाह से रिश्वत कम होती है ऐसा मेरा अनुभव नहीं है। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि स्वाभिमान के सामने, स्वत्व के सामने, फाइनेंस की कोई कीमत नहीं है। जितना हमारा बिछौना होगा उतने ही हम पांव फँलायेंगे।

आखीर में यह कहा जाता है कि यदि कम्पोजिट प्रान्त होता है तो उस की एफिसियेंसी बहुत अच्छी होती है यानी जो उत्तर के प्रान्त हैं वहां कोई एफिसियेंसी है ही नहीं। इस वक्त मेरे भाई सबसेना जी नहीं हैं, नहीं तो वे कहते कि यह बिल्कुल गलत है। उन्होंने अभी कहा था कि उत्तर प्रदेश तो हिन्दुस्तान की ब्रेन (brain) है। तो हम कम्पोजिट प्रान्त वालों के पास कोई ब्रेन ही नहीं है? मैं कहता हूँ कि हमारे पास ब्रेन है और दूसरे कहते हैं कि नहीं है। तो मैं कहता हूँ कि हम

जो कुछ हैं सो हैं परन्तु हमें स्वतंत्र भाषा प्रान्त होने दो जिस से हम अपनी प्रगति कर सकें, अपनी भाषा, अपनी संस्कृति और अपने उद्योग धंधों की प्रगति कर सकें।

SHRI T. PANDE:

श्री टी० पांडे : क्या आप स्वतन्त्र होना चाहते हैं ?

SHRI D. NARAYAN:

श्री डी० नारायण : मेरे खयाल से आप समझ सकते हैं कि जिस वक्त स्वतंत्र भाषावार प्रान्त की बात कही जाती है तो उसका क्या मतलब है। आज आंध्र स्वतंत्र हो रहा है तो क्या वह हिन्दुस्तान से स्वतन्त्र हो रहा है।

इसके बाद आखीर में मुझे एक दो बातें और कहनी हैं। कल हमारे सम्माननीय डाक्टर अम्बेदकर साहब यहां कुछ बातें कह रहे थे। मैं सुन रहा था। मुझे अभिमान था क्योंकि वे मेरे प्रान्त महाराष्ट्र से आ रहे हैं हालांकि उन्होंने कल कह दिया कि "I am not a Maharashtrian"। बहुत सी ऐसी बातें जो कि वह पहले कह चुके थे लेकिन कल बदल दीं और जो कुछ कल कह गये उसको फिर जा कर कल बदल दें किसको खबर? क्योंकि उन्होंने तो यह समझ रखा है कि "consistency is the virtue of an ass."। इसके वे शिकार नहीं होना चाहते हैं। कांसिसटेंट रहना नहीं चाहते, क्योंकि १०, १५ ही दिन हुए उन्होंने कहा था कि महाराष्ट्र हो और महाविदर्भ अलग हो। और वे खुद अब बम्बई छोड़ कर औरंगाबाद में जा कर रहे हैं वह भी तो मराठी प्रदेश है। खैर यह तो डाक्टर अम्बेदकर साहब की आदत है कि वह बदलते रहते हैं। परन्तु मुझे एक बात और कहनी थी। उन्होंने कहा कि यदि भाषावार प्रान्त की रचना हो जायेगी तो "Linguism

will be loaded with communalism"। मैं उनसे उसी वक्त पूछना चाहता था कि साहब यह तो बनलाइये कि आज क्या हालत है। बम्बई राज्य का उदाहरण ही ले लीजिये। क्या बम्बई राज्य में अस्पृश्य ज्यादा है और अगर भाषावार प्रान्त हो जायेंगे तो क्या अस्पृश्यों की तादाद कम हो जायेगी। हरिजनों की हालत कल कौन सी बदल जायेगी जब कि भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना हो जायेगी? आज के स्पृश्य कल कैसे अधिक जुल्म करने लगेंगे? मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि आज जो हालत है वही रहने वाली है या इससे बेहतर होने वाली है? मेरे खयाल से तो अच्छी होने वाली है। तो यह डर क्यों दिखाया जाता है? डा० अम्बेदकर को डराने की आदत सी है। पहले यह डर दिखाया था कि मैं मुसलमान हो जाऊंगा, बुद्धिस्ट हो जाऊंगा। और कल यहा तक कह दिया कि वे विधान को जला देंगे "I shall burn the Constitution"। माननीय अम्बेदकर साहब ने कुछ वर्षों पहले स्मृति जगाई थी तो यह भी कोई अचम्भे की बात न होगी कि वह कल कहीं बाजार में आम तौर पर हमारे विधान को भी जला दें। यह कोई आश्चर्य की बात नहीं है। परन्तु मुझे डा० अम्बेदकर साहब से कहना यह है कि यह जो आपने कहा कि यदि भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना हो जायेगी तो अछूतों के ऊपर जुल्म होने लगेगा, यह बिल्कुल गलत है क्योंकि आज जितना जुल्म अछूतों के ऊपर हो रहा है उससे ज्यादा होने वाला नहीं है, यदि हुआ तो कम ही होगा।

आखीर मैं मेरी आप लोगों से प्रार्थना है कि आप इस सवाल को आम जनता की निगाह से देखें। जनता क्या चाहती है? आज जनता अचम्भे में है। आप हिन्दुस्तान के किसी किसान को यहां ला कर खड़ा कर दीजिये, चकरा जायेगा कि कहां मुझे ला कर अजाबघर में खड़ा कर दिया।

यह कहा जाता है कि आज देश में जनता का राज्य है परन्तु जनता का राज्य कहीं नहीं दिखाई देता। कारण यह है कि उसकी समझ में नहीं आता कि आज देश में हो क्या रहा है क्योंकि वह जो कुछ देखता है वह उसकी समझ में नहीं आ सकता है। कल मेरे किसी एक भाई ने यहां पर कहा था कि "वी मस्ट नाट बारो फ्राम दि वैस्ट" (We must not borrow from the west)।

AN HON. MEMBER:

एक माननीय सदस्य : "टोटली" (totally)।

SHRI D. NARAYAN:

श्री डी० नारायण : मगर मैं अपने उस भाई और तमाम भाइयों से कहूंगा कि आप पहिले अंग्रेजी भाषा बारो करना छोड़ दें, बोलना छोड़ दें। अगर आप इस चीज को छोड़ देते हैं तो बाद में दूसरी पश्चिम की चीजों को छोड़ने में भी कामयाब हो सकते हैं।

पिछले चुनावों में क्या हुआ, अंग्रेजी बिन पढ़े चार उम्मीदवार के खिलाफ जिस समय किसी आदमी का चुनाव होता था तो कहा जाता था कि "अरे भाई यह तो अंग्रेजी नहीं जानता, यह वहा जाकर क्या करेगा"? इस तरह से चुनाव में भले आदिमियों तक का विरोध किया गया। आज हम देखते हैं कि सब जगह अंग्रेजी का ही राज्य चल रहा है खासकर मद्रास में अंग्रेजी का राज्य चल रहा है, बम्बई में अंग्रेजी का राज्य चल रहा है और जनता की भाषा का कहीं राज्य नहीं है।

AN HON. MEMBER:

एक माननीय सदस्य : यू० पी० में हिन्दी है और बिहार में हिन्दी है।

SHRI D. NARAYAN.

श्री डी० नारायण : हम भी यही चाहते हैं कि महाराष्ट्र में मराठी हो। हमें भी मौका दो। उसी तरह का राज्य हम चाहते हैं जिससे कि जनता अपने देश की हर बात को अच्छी तरह से समझ सके। उसी को जनता

[Shri D. Narayan]

का राज्य कहते हैं जहाँ की जनता सरकार की हर कार्रवाई को अच्छी तरह से समझ सके, उसमें हिस्सा ले सके। हिन्दी वालों का सा ही हम राज्य चाहते हैं तो आप लोग क्यों हमारे रास्ते में अड़ंगा डालते हैं ? हम यह चाहते हैं कि इस तरह हमारे जनता के राज्य बनाने में आप लोग अड़ंगा न डालें।

SHRI RAMA RAO: As a matter of fact, in U.P. also they have not dropped English. 90 per cent. of the Administration is being run in English.

SHRI D. NARAYAN:

श्री डी० नारयण : नहीं, आप जो कहते हैं वह भी सत्य नहीं है क्योंकि आप अतिशयोक्ति कर रहे हैं। मेरे पास भी आंकड़े हैं मगर मेरा इससे कोई मतलब नहीं है। मेरा कहना तो आप लोगों से सिर्फ यही है कि अगर आप इस देश में जनता का राज्य चाहते हैं तो आपको इस मुल्क में जनता की भाषा में ही सब काम करना होगा। इस देश की आम जनता जिस भाषा द्वारा आपके कार्यों को समझ सके, जान सके और उसमें हिस्सा ले सके, सब राजकार्य उसी में हो तब हम यह कह सकते हैं कि आज देश में जनता का राज्य है। मगर आज हम देखते हैं कि यहाँ पर अंग्रेजों का ही राज्य अब भी विद्यमान है। इसका कारण यह है कि जो लोग यहाँ पर अंग्रेजी में भाषण करते हैं उनको इस बात का डर है कि अगर अंग्रेजी में नहीं बोलेंगे तो कहीं उनकी यह विरासत उन से छुट न जाय। इसलिये आपने देखा होगा कि प्रान्तों की रचनाओं का विरोध करने वाले ज्यादातर वही लोग हैं जो कि अंग्रेजी के पंडित कहलाये जाते हैं। मुझे यह बारबार कहना है कि अगर आप जनता का राज्य चाहते हैं तो आपको जनता की भाषा में राजकाज चलाना होगा और जनता की भाषा में राज्य तब ही चल स कता है जब कि आप "लिविस्टिक प्राविन्स"

यानी भाषावार राज्यों की रचना करेंगे। इसलिए मेरी आप लोगों से यह प्रार्थना है कि आप इस सवाल को जब देखें तो जनता की निगाह से देखें दूसरो की निगाह से न देखें।

जब हम अंग्रेजी भाषा को निकालने की बात कहते हैं तो साथ ही साथ हमको उसे रहन सहन, खान पान में से भी निकालना होगा। अगर यह बात हो जायगी तो आप देखेंगे कि जनता आपके कितने नजदीक आ जाती है। वह आपको अच्छी तरह से समझने लगेगी और हर चीज में हिस्सा लेने लगगी। इससे हमारे देश की कायापलट हो जायगी, हमारे देश का स्वरूप ही बदल जायगा, हमारे राज्य का स्वरूप हिन्दी हो जायेगा, भारतीय हो जायेगा। नहीं तो बम्बई में अंग्रेजी, मद्रास में अंग्रेजी, बंगाल में अंग्रेजी और अभी जैसा बतलाया गया यू० पी० में हिन्दी ही रहेगी।

मैं आपसे यह अनुरोध करूंगा कि जब आप इस प्रश्न पर सोचें तो इस बात को सर्व-प्रथम ध्यान में रखें कि आज देश की जनता क्या चाहती है ? आज देश की जनता यह चाहती है कि भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना हो। आंध्र के लोगों की यही इच्छा बहुत समय से चली आ रही थी। आन्ध्रवासियों ने जब देखा कि जो हिस्सा उन को मद्रास से मिलना चाहिय था वह नहीं मिल रहा है तो उन्हो ने अपने अलग आन्ध्र प्रान्त की रचना की माग की। इसी तरह से आज कर्नाटक और महाराष्ट्र के लोगों की भी अपनी यह इच्छा है कि वह बम्बई प्रदेश राज्य से अलग हो, वे भी अपने प्रांतों की अलग से रचना करना चाहते हैं। क्यों चाहते हैं, इस बात को आप सब लोगों को सोचना चाहिये। अगर जनता किसी चीज को नहीं चाहती है तो उस की इच्छा के विरुद्ध सरकार कार्य करती है तो इस से देश में एकता नहीं बढेगी दुश्मनी बढेगी। आज तो यह देखने में आ रहा है कि बहुभाषी राज्यों की जनता के

दिलों में परस्पर अविश्वास बढ़ रहा है । दुश्मनी की भावना पैदा हो गई है । इसलिए मैं आप लोगों से कहूंगा कि भाषावार राज्य बनाकर जनता की इच्छा की पूर्ति की जानी चाहिये । इसमें जनता भी खुश रहेगी और देश की एकता भी बनी रहेगी ।

आखीर में, मेरी आंध्र भाइयों से प्रार्थना है कि आप अपना नया राज्य, नया प्रदेश बनाने जा रहे हैं तो आप राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी जी के उपदेश को नहीं भूलें । मैं जहां तक जानता हूं आप लोग महात्मा गांधी जी के अच्छे भक्त हैं और इस बात का आप लोग दावा भी करते आये हैं और आपका यह दावा एक हद तक ठीक भी है । जब आप नया राज्य बनाने जा रहे हैं तो आप अंग्रेजों की नकल न करें, आप दिल्ली की नकल न करें । अगर आपने यह सोचा कि प्रोहिबिशन को हटा करके हम पैसा बचा सकते हैं तो आप को कभी भी महात्मा गांधी जी द्वारा स्वर्ग से आशीर्वाद नहीं मिल सकता है । यदि पैसे के लोभ से, खर्च चलाने के लोभ से, आप लोगों ने प्रोहिबिशन को बन्द करने को सोचा तो बहुत बड़ी गलती होगी और आपके नये राज्य को महात्मा गांधी का कभी भी आशीर्वाद नहीं मिल सकेगा । प्रोहिबिशन आप जारी रखें ।

मैं चाहता हूं कि आपके नये राज्य को यश मिले, आप का नया प्रान्त यशस्वी हो और दिन पर दिन उन्नति के मार्ग पर चलता रहे । इस देश में पहिला भाषावार राज्य बना कर आपने जो शुरूआत की है वह आप के लिए शुभ हो और इस मुल्क के लिए भी शुभ हो । आप के राज्य के साथ साथ और जिन लोगों की भाषावार राज्य की मांग है उन के प्रान्तों की भी जल्दी से जल्दी रचना हो जाय और वे अपने प्रान्त में अपना भाषावार राज्य कायम कर सकें ।

[For English translation, see Appendix V, Annexure No. 46.]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before we adjourn, I have to make an announcement. Tomorrow's business as at present relates only to Non-official Bills. If however there is time left after the disposal of Non-official Bills, we shall take up further discussion of the Andhra State Bill.

The House stands adjourned till 8-15 A.M. tomorrow.

The Council then adjourned till a quarter past eight of the clock on Friday, the 4th September 1953.

*Editor of Debates,
Rajya Sabha Secretariat.*