

Parliament can give up its authority over the nationalised industries in this manner, and Government cannot seek protection under the fact that the company is a private limited company, and therefore the people should not know anything about such matters.

THE MINISTER FOR PRODUCTION (SHRI K. C. REDDY): I will answer it on a different occasion. If the hon. Member raises a separate discussion over this question, we can go into all aspects of the question.

THE ANDHRA STATE BILL, 1953— *Continued.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now take up the discussion of the Andhra State Bill. The Business Advisory Committee wanted the consideration stage to be completed on Saturday afternoon, but in view of the large number of Members who have given their names we have extended the time to this morning. The Minister will answer tomorrow morning, immediately after the Question Hour. So far as today is concerned, I am anxious that as there are a large number of Members who have given their names, the speeches should be brief and shall in no case exceed 15 minutes; because other Members have taken a longer time, today I beg of you to limit your speeches to fifteen minutes at the utmost. Mr. Rajagopalan.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN (Madras): Sir, while welcoming this Bill, I wish to make one point clear, that this is an experiment for the redistribution of States in India. Personally, Sir, I am opposed to the redistribution of this country on a linguistic basis. If there is to be redistribution at all, my view is that it should not be on the basis of language. Sir, it is said that people have asked for it and that the Government is obliged to grant this demand. It is true that before Independence we thought of linguistic provinces. After the achievement of independence, when we took over the Administration of the country, we saw the difficulties in the formation of linguistic provinces. People may say

that the Congress has pledged itself to linguistic provinces, and may ask how they can go back on it. There is no question of going back. In any scheme of things, Sir, there should be a question of priorities, of what is needed for the country at the moment. We should see whether such a step will conduce to the economic advancement of the country. I would like, with your permission, Sir, to go through some portion of the J.V.P. Report. The J.V.P. Report says:

“We have seen, during the past year or more passionate demands not only for new linguistic provinces to be formed, but also for a readjustment of boundaries between the existing provinces. These demands may often be justified on the merits, but the manner in which they have been presented and the passion that lay behind this presentation, has been a warning to all of us about the inherent danger of changing the existing structure.”

They go on to say:

“Immediately conflict will arise and passions will be aroused. People's attention will be diverted from the urgent problems of the day, which are essentially economic, to this totally unnecessary conflict which can do good to no one.”

Sir, it is known to all on the basis of this Report, that the Government have pledged themselves to redistribute provinces. It is the Congress that formed the Committee and the Committee has submitted its report. This is a question of an experiment; how far this is going to take the country, how far this will cause disintegration, is an experiment. So, Sir, we should not hastily do many things. Many people would say: “It is a popular demand”. What is a popular demand? All of us are politicians; we know what a popular demand is. If the people tomorrow join together and say: “Do not pay your taxes to the Government, do not pay them anything”, are you to respect this popular demand? Again, it is also true that it may not be entirely

[Shri G. Rajagopalan.]

wrong to divide the provinces, but it is very bad to rouse passions. Once passions are roused it is very difficult to stop them. Last time, when there was a discussion on this subject, Prof. Ranga also said that once passions were roused it was very difficult to quench them. So, you ought to settle this problem somehow or other. This has got to be faced, however, dangerous it might be. It is the duty of politicians to settle this problem. It is wrong to divide the country, so to say, completely and entirely on the basis of language. The J.V.P. Report says:

"We feel that the conditions that have emerged in India since the achievement of Independence are such as to make us view the problem of linguistic provinces in a new light. The first consideration must be the security, unity and economic prosperity of India and every separatist and disruptive tendency should be rigorously discouraged. Therefore the old Congress policy of having linguistic provinces can only be applied after careful thought being given to each separate case, and without creating serious administrative dislocation or mutual conflicts which would jeopardise the political and economic stability of the country."

Sir, we may have achieved a sort of political stability; we cannot say we have achieved economic stability. In these circumstances we cannot afford to divert the attention of the people from the more urgent needs of the country to the question of linguistic provinces.

Then, Sir, when we are dealing with the Andhra Bill, we should not forget the fact that this is only an experiment. We must be careful to see that we do not set up unhealthy precedents. We have to redistribute this country not on a linguistic basis but on economic and geographical considerations. When we begin to redistribute the States in the country we must take

into consideration that we do not violate the fundamental principles that have been laid down. When I say fundamental principles, I mean fundamental principles dealing with general administration in the country. Now I wish to deal with the question of compensation. It has been decided that compensation should be given to the new Andhra State for the buildings in the Madras City. In 1949, when the Partition Committee was set up, some of the non-Andhra members were content with a nominal *ad hoc* payment of Rs. 1 crore as a token amount and not as a compensation. Now it is sought to be given as compensation. This principle is wrong. When the non-Andhra members presented a memorandum to Mr. Justice Wanchoo, he said: "It has been urged, however, by the non-Andhras that the new State is not entitled to any adjustment with respect to these buildings." It is said that when Orissa and Sind were created separate provinces, they were not allowed any compensation for buildings in Patna and Bombay which were for the use of the respective composite provinces. They were however deficit areas as is clear from the fact that both of them had to be given subventions. As such they may have contributed nothing towards the buildings in the capital or the composite province. But, he says the analogy of Sind and Orissa does not apply to Andhra as this has not been a deficit district. Sir, it is beyond doubt that Andhra areas have always been deficit. Sir, you may be aware that in the olden days, land revenue was the only source of revenue to the States; if you take the question of land revenue, Andhra is mostly a zamindari tract. The land tax that goes to State treasury in the zamindari area is much less than that in a ryotwari area. Most of the ryotwari area is in the residuary State of Madras and 75 per cent. of land in Andhra is zamindari tract. Even in 1952, Sir, after the abolition of zamindari system the land revenue, including the portion due to irrigation, has been only Rs 399.63 lakhs in the Andhra area, whereas in the residuary State of Madras it is Rs 521.9 lakhs; that is, if

after the abolition of the zamindari, and after the introduction of ryotwari system in the Andhra, the land revenue has been only Rs. 399.63 lakhs, it goes to prove that land revenue from Andhra area must have been much less and so, it is fallacious to argue that the Andhras could have contributed towards the buildings in Madras City. It is true that some amount should be given to the Andhras to build their capital. But if it is to be a compensation for the buildings in Madras City, it is very wrong in principle. Today if we set up this precedent on a wrong principle, tomorrow when we form the other States we shall have to face similar problems.

If the Andhra State needs money, it is equally true that the Madras State also needs money. So, it is the duty of the Centre when they redistribute the States to see to it that the money is made available to them to meet the consequential expenses, because of the redistribution. So if Andhra State is to be paid for capital buildings it is the duty of the Central Government to pay Andhra State the money and the Madras Government should not be burdened with payment of Rs. 230.4 lakhs as contemplated in the Bill.

Then the Government of India have violated the principles enunciated in the Finance Commission's report in another aspect. In re-allocating the part of income-tax and excise duty as between the Andhra State and Madras State, the Bill lays down that it will be on a population basis whereas the Finance Commission laid down that as far as income-tax was concerned, it should be 80 per cent. on the basis of population and 20 per cent. on the basis of collection. Why did the Government bypass that principle and say that it was to be on a population basis? It is a violation and the Madras Legislature has passed an amendment to the effect that it should be as enunciated in the Finance Commission's Report and I ask the Government of India why they bypassed the Finance Commission's Report. The Government of India have not given

any explanation. I understand the hon. Minister for Finance said in the other House that it is because the Finance Commission may revise its opinion and say that the income-tax should be divided on the principle of population. What the Finance Commission would report after some time can only be a lame excuse. When there is the Finance Commission's Report and the Government of India have accepted it, it should stick to it completely but the Government of India have not given any explanation as to why they overlooked the amendment passed by the Madras Legislature.

Coming to one or two other points, on the question of the High Court, article 214 says that there shall be a High Court for each State. But the Government of India may say that there is article 230 as well saying that Parliament may by law extend the jurisdiction of a High Court to any State specified in the First Schedule other than, or any area not within, the State in which the High Court has its principal seat. But Mr. Justice Wanchoo's report says that as regards the question whether article 214 stands aloof from article 230 and whether it is mandatory that every Part A State shall have a High Court, it is for legal opinion to decide. I don't know whether legal opinion has been taken. Perhaps Government may have consulted the Legal Department and they may have said, 'Let us try it'. It is necessary that the Government of India should take the advice of the Attorney General before they come to any decision on the question of the High Court. I feel that the Andhra State should have a High Court and article 214 is mandatory and it should not be overlooked.

Coming to the question of contracts, clause 48 deals with contracts started by the Madras Government for capital works, irrigation, etc., and it states:

"Where before the appointed day the State of Madras has made any contract in the exercise of the executive power of that State for any

[Shri G. Rajagopalan.]

purposes of the State, then such contract shall—

(a) if such purposes are as from that day—

(i) exclusively purposes of the State of Andhra, or

(ii) partly purposes of the State of Andhra and partly purposes of the State of Mysore and not purposes of the State of Madras as constituted on the appointed day,

be deemed to have been made in the exercise of the executive power of the State of Andhra instead of the State of Madras

* * * *

(c) in any other case, continue to have effect as having been made in the exercise of the executive power of the State of Madras;"

This is not clear. A project like Muchkund is for the purposes of Orissa and the new Andhra State, and it has nothing to do with Madras. The clause says:

"exclusively purposes of the State of Andhra or partly purposes of the State of Andhra and partly purposes of the State of Mysore etc. will be deemed to have been made in the exercise of the executive power of the State of Andhra."

What about projects such as Muchkund serving Orissa and Andhra and which have nothing to do with Madras? So the Madras Legislative Council passed an amendment moved by the Government, to the effect that it should be clarified as follows:

"All contracts which are not exclusively for purposes of Madras must be deemed for the purpose of Andhra and the Andhra State should be responsible for them."

The Government of India have neither accepted the amendment nor clarified their point. I request them to consider this seriously and make a decision.

With these few words, I support the Bill

PROF G RANGA (Madras). Mr. Chairman, I hope that when next the Business Committee decides upon these things, they would keep in mind the need of the Group Leaders to have a little more time irrespective of whether or not they find it possible to rise to make their contribution to the debate.

MR CHAIRMAN. Provided they are present in the House all through.

PROF G RANGA. Before the discussion is over.

I rise today to speak on this Bill with a heavy heart. The whole of last week I have been touring in the flood affected areas of Godavari and I have had the misfortune of meeting so many people who have lost their homes, their lands and their everything. It is true that the Government has been trying to do its best and giving aid to them rather expeditiously and I wish to pay my tribute to the ready manner to the inspiring manner I should say, in which Rajaji and his Ministry have tried to come to the rescue of the sufferers. At the same time what all the Madras State can possibly spare will not be even one-tenth of what we can expect from public funds and from State authorities and indeed what the people have to do for their own resuscitation would be many times much more and their capacity today to regenerate themselves or reconstruct their own homes is practically nil. It is under these circumstances that this State is being brought into being and the people have to contemplate the idea of this new State under very serious and severe circumstances. The Kistna Anicut was threatened only the other day and there is need for constructing a regulator bridge. We don't know the policy of the Government of India in regard to that. The Tungabhadra Project, which is expected, according to this Bill itself and the speeches made by hon. Ministers, to benefit the Andhra area and the Rayalaseema peasants, has been placed

under the jurisdiction of Mysore State and the Mysore Chief Minister has not been very wise or friendly in the manner in which he has been holding out threats to the policy of these people and also to Andhras.....

AN HON. MEMBER: Certainly not.

PROF. G. RANGA: You know what statement he has been making. The Andhras feel that they have lost Madras. I myself was not in favour of raising any controversy over that, but they are also likely to lose Bellary. I am not prepared to accept this Misra Report and if and when it is possible for me to raise this question in an effective manner, I, for one, and our party will try our best to place the facts either through a plebiscite or before an impartial judge and, if at all possible, to prove our claim to the city of Bellary and a few villages that will connect it with Andhra. I don't pitch my demand very much higher than this, but this much demand is irreducible and we will certainly press this demand as far as it is possible and as long as it is tenable. There was just now a reference made to Muchkund Project. Nine years ago it was thought of and an agreement was reached with the Orissa Government. Till now it has not been completed and it needs money possibly from the Centre. Gandikotta was passed seven years ago and yet something happened in the Madras Government—through whose fault I cannot say—and it has not yet been taken up. The minor irrigation works in all the under-developed areas of Andhra as well as in the residuary State have been neglected hopelessly. It has been said that the Centre was placing some funds at the disposal of the State Governments under the Grow More Food campaign but they have not been enough and for the last 1½ years Rajaji was obliged to stop all expenditure even though some of the works were half finished or three-quarters finished so that the Rayalaseema area of Andhra which forms the major portion of their territory today comes for more and more money. Just now my hon. friend there was complaining about the demand made

by so many of our Andhra friends that the compensation, that has been offered to Andhra for the loss of Madras City and for the other things, has been too small. There is no doubt whatsoever that the compensation allowed is too small; but the point is whether we should think in terms of compensation when this redistribution of States comes up. In regard to that there is scope for argument and that is why I am one with my friends in maintaining that it is the duty of the Centre, whenever they decide upon these things, to be prepared to place adequate funds at the disposal of that State which is specially brought into existence, in order to see that there may not be any room for such complaints and for such internecine complaints and quarrels. One thing is clear that my hon. friend Dr. Katju was not quite right nor was the hon. Finance Minister sufficiently, I should not say generous, rather sufficiently far-sighted, when they said that it would be open to the new State of Andhra to come to the Centre and ask for money, and if they—the Centre—were satisfied with the project for which they want money, then the Centre would always be ready to help them. It would have been very much more generous and decent on the part of the Union Government if they had said that while they expected the residuary Madras State to place at the disposal of Andhra State two and odd crores of rupees, the Central Government themselves were prepared to place Rs. 10 crores at the disposal of the new State, instead of making it depend upon their requests first, then upon the goodwill of the Centre, thirdly upon the opinion that they form of the Ministry that Andhra would be able to throw up in the next five or six years and fourthly on the manner in which the Andhra State would be kowtowing to the Centre. This is a very unfortunate position and it is the Centre which is responsible for having created it.

Sir, I have a lot of complaints to make about the Central Government here. There would have been no need for this Bill and the Andhra State

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

could have been brought into existence when the Constitution Act was passed if only the will had been there, if only they had been really and genuinely keen on implementing what Mahatma Gandhi had asked them to do. They waited until that great man, the late Shri Sriramulu, died and then the people went mad, rather they got so much excited that they destroyed property worth over a crore of rupees. The Government of India appointed special officers, only to dismiss the recommendations of the first Special Officer and accept *in toto* the recommendations of the second Special Officer. On the first occasion and on the second occasion the people asked for judges to give judgments. Instead of that, our friends have picked up judges for being special officers so that they could have the last say. On the first occasion, the Special Officer suggested that the temporary capital should be in Madras. What did the Government of India do? That everybody knows. And then he suggested another place. What did the Government of India do? Instead of waiting till the Andhra Legislature came into formal being, they asked the Andhra Legislators in Madras to decide, instead of themselves deciding upon the place which the Special Officer had recommended and where there would have been no necessity to spend even a half or one-fourth of the amount of money that they are now spending, most of which, I am afraid, is likely to be a waste. They have not done that. They would not take a decision on it, but they left it to somebody else. Then those people said, "We want revision", and they expressed their wish in no equivocal manner, but the Government of India did nothing. We are going to wait until the Andhra Legislature is formally brought into existence. Now, there is no guarantee—I speak subject to correction—there is no guarantee when the Andhra Legislature is likely to be convened and there is every possibility of the Governor being sworn in and the Ministers being sworn in and the Legislators not being sworn in and the Legislature not being

convened and the Members not being given an opportunity to express their wishes regarding the location of the temporary capital or in regard to the constitution of the Ministry.

THE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS (DR. K. N. KATJU): May I intervene, Sir, and say that probably that fear of my hon. friend is not justified.

PROF. G. RANGA: I am glad the hon. Minister has given me this assurance and I hope they will stand by this assurance.

DR. K. N. KATJU: There is no question of my standing by any assurance. There is no justification for that fear.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Madras): Sir, because of this intervention, can we take it that on the 1st of October the Andhra Legislature is going to be called?

DR. K. N. KATJU: Put it to the Ministers who will be summoned on the 1st of October.

PROF. G. RANGA: That is exactly my own point. There are so many secrets up their sleeve to queer the pitch at every stage. That is the gravamen of my charge against the Union Government. They use their discretion on the reports on every occasion against the best interests of Andhra. Mr. Justice Misra's Report my hon. friend has accepted, as is usual with him. He accepts any decision coming to him from any gentleman provided he carries the label of a High Court Judge. I can only tell my hon. friend that he has missed his vocation, that he is not here merely as a lawyer, but that he is here as a Minister. It was wrong of him to have simply fallen before this Report, mistaking it for a judgment. It was not worthy of a Chief Justice, not even of a High Court Judge, although my hon. friend.....

MR CHAIRMAN: Let us not refer to it.

PROF. G. RANGA: I am arguing about the report and not about a High Court Judge. If I had been, in that case, of course, I would have been out of court. It is not a judge who has given any such judgment. It is only a special officer sent by the gentleman. He was only an agent of the Union Government, nobody else.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I have been called a gentleman, a lawyer-Minister, a lawyer, and goodness knows what.

PROF. G. RANGA: But the misfortune is the hon. Minister refuses to forget that he is even today a lawyer in this House. That is his main disability. Every speech that he makes here is replete with his experiences, limited as they are, of his.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are running short of time, indulging in asides.

PROF. G. RANGA: About the assets and liabilities, and the contribution of the Union Government, it has been suggested that they should be prepared to place at the disposal of the Andhra State not less than Rs. 10 crores and I hope the Union Government will take an early occasion to make their decision quite clear with regard to this matter.

I am very unhappy about the manner in which the Tungabhadra Project is going to be managed. I think it is necessary that there should be a separate authority created and that authority should not be liable to the jurisdiction of the Mysore State, in regard to the usual things, and a particular area should be carved out and that area should be kept under the authority of the Union Government, otherwise there is bound to be continuous quarrels between these two States in the future.

Several of my hon. friends raised their objection to the principle of the linguistic redistribution of the States and have said that to ask for them is wrong, that we should be considerate about this demand. Sir, I have never been enthusiastic about the linguistic redistribution so far as North India is

concerned, but I am certainly in favour of it in the case of the others. To my mind there are only Karnataka, Malabar, Maharashtra and Gujerat to be considered.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): What is the fault of North India?

PROF. G. RANGA: They should have their own States and it is high time that these States were brought into existence. If and when the Government come to the conclusion to redistribute these States in the South on these lines, it would be necessary for them—I do not want them to draw any line—I say it would be necessary for them to disintegrate the Hyderabad State and distribute that area between these States that are to be brought into existence.

I do not know whether Government is justified in thinking that the Special Officer who has been sent out to Andhra also should become the Governor of that State. This is a peculiar precedent and I hope they will not pursue it in future because it is not likely to be conducive to good administration.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad): The Deputy Minister said that he was the Governor-designate.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore): They have no authority to do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, proceed. "Lastly....."

PROF. G. RANGA: I cannot say, "lastly". Sir.

I had written to the Prime Minister, as a Member of the House, that the decision taken by the Andhra Legislators in favour of Kurnool as a temporary capital came to be revised by the decision taken by a majority of the Andhra Legislators who took part in the Madras Legislative Assembly proceedings, and I wanted him to accept the later decision as a democratic decision. If he had any doubts

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

in regard to that matter, I had requested him to convene a meeting of the Andhra Legislators to give them an opportunity of making a final decision. Government have not cared to take any steps in that regard. They are, on the other hand, spending huge sums of money on tents. I do not know how long they are expected to last.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: It is a tentative capital.

PROF. G. RANGA: They are spending huge sums; they are clearing patches everywhere. I consider this to be wrong. The least that could have been expected from the Prime Minister was a reply to his own colleague in Parliament which was not forthcoming, a reply in the Legislature, in this Parliament which was not also forthcoming, and the convening of these people to give them an opportunity, which also the Prime Minister was not prepared to do. I consider it to be highly improper and it is derogatory to the dignity of Parliament.

Sir, lastly, I wish to say that although it may be considered to be unconventional, Andhras have not much to be grateful for to the Central Government. As I have said earlier in the very preface of my speech, the Central Government has done everything possible to make it more and more difficult for the Andhras to settle down even to the management of their new State. My hon. friend expressed his good wishes. Yes, they are good wishes indeed. After Duryodhana was felled, Dharmaraja expressed his good wishes. It is like that. You tied the Andhras hand and foot in every possible manner, gagged them also, starved them and left them to the wolves. (*Interruptions.*) Not political, but the others. And then you say, "if you want any help come to us, prostrate before us and then, in our good sense, we will help you". It looks as if these people were

so very unhappy that they have been forced to create this State, because they feel that it is going to create a precedent for the reorganisation of the States in the South. I can tell my friends that nothing, not even their majority for the time being, will prevent them from creating the Karnataka State, the Malabar State, the Maharashtra State and the Gujrat State. These States have got to come into existence and Hyderabad has got to go into pieces. Their dream of creating a Centrally administered State in Hyderabad and of creating a sort of cosmopolitan cultural State in the South cannot be realised.

SHRI J. M. KUMARAPPA (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I wish to speak on this Bill not because I am a politician nor an economist—I cannot say much about the political implications of the formation of the Andhra State nor can I say much on its economic implications—I only want to make a few remarks with regard to the speech that Dr. Ambedkar made on this subject. Ever since he spoke, we have been hearing during the last few days nothing but criticism of Dr. Ambedkar, and so I thought I should take up the unpopular cause of defending him at least in certain implications of his speech.

I feel, Sir, that Dr. Ambedkar's speech was very provoking because of the unpopular cause he has been championing during the last many years. I had the pleasure of knowing Dr. Ambedkar as a student at the Columbia University, New York. At that time, he made a brilliant record as a student and, after his return, I have followed his career with much interest. But I did find all along that he and his community had to suffer from severe disabilities, humiliations and social injustices. He was described by an hon. Member as a political puzzle, as a psychological conundrum and as a pathological problem. Now, if he is all that, I would like to know why and how a brilliant scholar like Dr. Ambedkar has been brought to that state of mind. If he is mentally pathological, then, it seems to me that

it is necessary for us to analyse and find out what circumstances and social conditions have made him what he is. I believe that we are products of a social system and our personality is either enriched or warped by the social forces which play upon us. Dr. Ambedkar, as a pathological problem, is a product of our social system, as I see it. It is necessary at this time when we are thinking of bringing about new linguistic States to consider some of the social implications which were evident in Dr. Ambedkar's speech. A man cannot go through trials and tribulations throughout his life and not suffer a certain warping of his personality.

I believe that some of the conditions which were responsible for bringing Pakistan into existence were also responsible for the sort of speech that Dr. Ambedkar made on the opening day of the debate on this Bill. Of course, there are many causes which brought Pakistan into being, but I believe that there was one fundamental cause which we have often neglected to consider and that is the sort of treatment that was meted out to the Muslims along with the British policy of 'divide and rule'.

I remember that when I first began my career as a teacher in Lucknow, I used to see in the examination hall a Brahmin supplying drinking water and, later, I found that there were two men, one a Muslim and another a Brahmin. I called my Muslim students and asked them why there were two watermen in the hall and the Muslim students replied, "Sir, all along the Hindus have been treating us as untouchables and now we would like to show them that the Hindus are untouchables, as far as we are concerned, and so we are having a Muslim waterman". Now, that was the beginning; and that was way back in 1916 or 1917. A little later, I found that in the railway stations there were three drinking rooms—one Hindu, another Muslim, and the third European. Then I found the hawkers shouting 'Hindu cha' and 'Muslim cha' at the stations. In my opinion the

treatment given to them had produced naturally a sort of reaction in their minds and an apprehension that unequal treatment would be given to Muslims by the Hindu majority in free India.

In the same way Dr. Ambedkar had suffered socially; and what I admire in him most is that he, in spite of his distinction as a scholar and eminence as a leader, did not despise his own community. He identified himself with his community and fought, without sparing himself, to uphold their rights. In these circumstances it is but natural for Dr. Ambedkar to feel that the formation of an Andhra State will interfere with the welfare of his community. He pointed out that the Reddys owned much of the land and that the depressed classes were exploited as landless labourers.

I feel, Sir, on the eve of bringing into existence the Andhra State that matters of this kind should also engage our serious attention. If the Andhra leaders would only uphold the rights of the minorities and do the best they could to organize a casteless and classless State, I believe they would be setting a good example for the formation of other linguistic States. So I only wish to plead with the Andhra leaders that during the period of the formation of the new State they should give as much consideration as possible to these pressing social problems of the minorities.

Dr. Ambedkar advocated the principle of vesting the Governor with special powers or having a committee appointed for aggrieved persons to appeal against social injustice. But, Sir, these safeguards will not serve the purpose. What we need is a change of heart on the part of the Hindus. No better safeguard can we find than the goodwill of the people. This would be the best guarantee against the fears and suspicions that the minorities have in connection with the formation of new linguistic States.

We often say with pride that we have a wonderful Constitution. Undoubtedly we have a well thought out

[Shri J. M. Kumarappa.]

Constitution. It may need to be amended in course of time but nevertheless the best legal talents available in our country were engaged in drafting this Constitution, but that does not mean that the Constitution in itself could help to overcome the disadvantages from which they suffer. I believe, Sir, that if we do not do something to change our social system, we would have two essentials going on parallel lines. On the one hand, we have great ideals embodied in our Constitution and, on the other hand, we have a social system in which some groups are subjected to social injustice *sanctioned both by religion and by society*. If these disabilities were to go on, our Constitution would remain a dead letter. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary to bring about a change in our social order to help us to realise the ideals embodied in our Constitution.

So I make this plea that in bringing this Andhra State into existence, the leaders should strive to usher in a new social order. We talk about a classless and casteless society; we talk about a secular society. But what is actually being done to bring that about? Simply having these noble ideals in the Constitution would never help. Are we doing anything, for instance, in the way of changing our educational system to offer courses which would bring about a new mental outlook that would help the younger generation to put these ideals into practice and always work in the interest of the nation and of its progress? But, I am sorry to say, we have not done anything so far with regard to this most important matter. Society is going on as usual and our Constitution also remains as it was formed.

So I earnestly pray that in our efforts to form the Andhra State, instead of throwing mud at each other and rousing passions, let us get together and work harmoniously and give the necessary assurance to the minority groups in the Andhra State so that they can all live peacefully. I am sure, if we do that we will be setting an excellent example for the other States

which are yet to come. I wish the Andhras peace and happiness, and also success in this experiment.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH (Madhya Bharat): Sir, I heartily welcome this Andhra State Bill. I deem it as the first step for rationalising the boundaries and the composition of the various units that comprise our Indian Republic. The Part A States that we inherited were exactly in the form in which the Britishers constituted them and left behind and which we have continued all along. All the Provinces that the Britishers left behind were formed as the results of historic accidents and their political accretions and not on any rational basis. It is thus, Sir, that Part A States so formed have continued although the need for making them rational was very urgent. Sir, I may add here that the position in respect of Part B States is also equally bad. When these unions of States were formed, some of us who had some hand in bringing them about, pleaded with Mr. Menon that the opportunity thus presented should be made use of to rationalise the boundaries of at least some of these Part B States. But unfortunately Mr. Menon could not rise above the existing political agencies and the boundary outlines that were formed by the Britishers. I am afraid it must be recorded here, Sir, that Mr. Menon did so in spite of the expressed wishes of the people of some of the States then integrated, for the people of those States realised that their future lay not with one union but with another union; and I know it, Sir, at that time Mr. Menon had promised that the boundaries of the Part B States would be duly rationalised at a later date. I do think, Sir, that when the high power commission comes into being all these irrelevancies and these inconsistencies will be duly set right. It seems, Sir, that the Princes have gone but the spirit of the Princes has been inherited by the successor States, for we do find that even though the State of Baroda has disappeared the Saurashtra State has got many islands. There is the island of Okha Port, there is the island of the famous holy place

of pilgrimage Dwarka and there is also the island of Amraeli. I cannot understand why these islands should have been allowed to exist and nothing has been done so far to rationalise the boundaries of the State. Similarly the island of the Sironj sub-division in the heart of the Malwa tract which should have long since been put in Madhya Bharat still continues to be with Rajasthan. These are political and regional inconsistencies which should have been set right. I cannot understand, Sir, why—merely because an additional territory was going to one State or because the same could not be duly balanced by the islands being given in exchange—these islands were not transferred. I do hope, Sir, that these hard geographical facts will be borne in mind when the proper time comes.

Now, coming to the linguistic States, Sir, I find that at different times in the history of the nations certain facts emerge; certain ideas attract the attention of the people and hold the ground, and they form the basis on which the various States were formed at that time. In Indian history we find at one time there was a series of republics all over Northern India; while it is also not yet so late that we can forget that once in the whole of Europe there was a time when there was a craze for republics. Then we saw a series of the fascist States coming into being. Therefore, if this question of the linguistic States has come before us at this time and we are talking about it today, it is mainly because of our initiative and also because in the past we have raised these hopes in the minds of the people. Hopes once raised, if they are not fulfilled, create frustration; and frustration, if it persists, is bound to create disaster in the nation's life. Sir, I am not in any way afraid of these linguistic States, for history tells us very clearly that in India from time immemorial the one conception that has been in the minds of all people of any place is that of extending the frontiers of their republic, or whatever that may be, down to the seas. That ideal has come down to us from the

Vedic time and I can quote cases after cases that this ideal has been the fundamental fact throughout our history. For instance, lately when the Marathas rose and when they wanted to assert their independence against the Moghul Empire, they did not rest content with Maharashtra alone. They went up to Attock on one side and on the other side they proved a real menace to Bengal itself. The Andhras also, when under the Satavahanas they started to establish their first kingdom—and probably the last one then—did not rest content with their own empire but they subjugated Gujerat. They conquered Vidarbha and even occupied Malwa. So this is one prevailing factor in India's political ideology. So I do not think that the establishment of linguistic provinces will in any way overcome this ideology, and, therefore, I am not afraid that the establishment of provinces on a linguistic basis will in any way impair or harm the unity of India.

Well, Sir, the second factor that history provides to us is that whenever empires have tumbled, they have not tumbled because of the rise of the provinces but they have broken up mainly because of the weakness of the Central Government. It is because of this fact, Sir, that we find that even when empires have completely crumbled, their shadows continue to exist and fictions have persisted there which took much time to disappear. We have the case of the Moghul emperors—those impotent potentates—existing in this very Delhi till 1858, about a century after they ceased to be a power. We know about the later Peshwas who were merely a tool in the hands of others. It is true, Sir, that it is very difficult to say as to what is exactly the beginning and what is the consequences in a vicious circle, but personally I am of the opinion that here it is the crumbling of the Central power that has been the cause of the rise of these different provincial States. So, in my opinion, if there is felt any danger from these linguistic provinces, the remedy does not lie in denying them; but it lies only in one

[Dr. Raghubir Sinh.]

thing, that is, strengthening the Central Government. Thus if we earnestly want that India's unity is to be ensured, the Central Government must be made all the stronger. By denying these linguistic provinces, I think we will be creating a sense of frustration and a sort of condition which would be harmful to the entire nation as a whole.

Sir, the unity of India, as I have said, lies in making the Central Government stronger and it can be implemented not only by means of Constitution, but also by having a common national language on one side and having sound efficient all-India services on the other. In this House, earlier we have heard it said by more than one speaker that the Andhras do not want Tamilian officers and the Tamilians do not want Andhra officers of the All-India services. I am afraid persons who say this do not know the very essentials of administration. The personnel of the all-India services cannot possibly be allotted to the States on the basis of their language. What we want of these all-India service officers is that they must know at the most the regional language of the State they serve. For that I can mention that when the Britishers came here, they made it compulsory that any officer who is deputed to a certain province had to learn the regional language of that province. I think my Tamilian friends will bear me out that many of their earlier Tamil grammars or dictionaries have been prepared not by Tamilians but by these British officers who knew the language well.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: No, no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not all.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: I stand corrected. But my point is that they must have fully mastered the language. All that they can insist on is that the all-India officers who are deputed to these provinces should know the provincial languages: nothing more than this. I am sure if we only insist on this and do not otherwise interfere with the

services it will mean much in the way of the betterment of the all-India service officers and of the administration of the provinces also.

Finally, I only want to make one appeal to my Andhra friends. That province is being born at a time when better passions have been roused and we may say that the mountains have churned the ocean. The sea of Indian political life is churned and at the very outset poison has come out. The poison has got to be swallowed by somebody. It is for the Andhras to swallow it and to pacify the bad effects of this poison. They have a great destiny to fulfil and I do hope that they will not be mere politicians but statesmen as well. This reminds me of a very interesting story which readily comes to my mind in this context. At one time there was a long debate as to whose profession was the most antiquated one and in the debate there were three persons. There was an engineer, a doctor and a politician. In the beginning the doctor said that the doctor's profession was the oldest because it was his profession which separated the man and the woman from each other, but when the engineer put down his claim that man had to find an earth to live upon, the doctor had to admit that the engineer's profession of creating a thing was definitely much older. But, unfortunately, both of them had to admit defeat at the hands of the politician; when he asked the engineer, "Out of what have you created the earth?", the engineer had to say, "Out of confusion" and the politician simply asked him, "Who created confusion". I think it would be a very unhappy day if our dear colleagues and fellow-statesmen from Andhra were to fulfil that definition and have the satisfaction of belonging to a profession which is obviously the oldest. Now, when the Andhra State will be created the Andhras will become the true inheritors of their great past. Sir, it were the Andhras who created a new culture by bringing about a fusion between the Brahmanical ideals and the Buddhist tenets and no other than the Andhras, Sir,

took the Indian culture across the distant seas. I hope Destiny will take them to a stage when they will be the makers of a new ideal and guides of this ancient nation.

SHRI B. V. KAKKILAYA (Madras): Mr. Chairman, in 1928 the Nehru Committee Report stated that everyone knew that the division of provinces in India had no rational basis. I am surprised to hear some of my friends today defending the present distribution of States in India. Even the British imperialists admitted in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report that "the map of British India was shaped by military, political or administrative exigencies of the moment with small regard to the actual affinities or wishes of the people".

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Sir, I do not know how our hon. friends here can defend this division of India into these irrational provinces. The demand for the redistribution of provinces on the basis of language and culture of the people was born out of the consciousness and struggle of the people against British imperialism. The movement for linguistic provinces developed along with and as a part of the struggle for independence of our country. Never in the history of our national movement did this demand for the redistribution of provinces work against the interests of the general struggle for the independence of our country. That being the case, to come here today and say that the reorganisation of the States will jeopardise the unity of the country, is nothing but to give a lame excuse to put off this just demand of the people. We know that ever since 1947 the Government of India began sliding back and betraying every pledge that they had made during the course of our independence struggle. My hon. friend, Mr. Rajagopalan, just referred to the J.V.P. Report, and he said that if at all we are to reorganise the States in India, we should do so with due consideration, to the unity, stability and security of the country. I am unable to under-

stand how the formation of linguistic States in India is going to jeopardise the unity, stability and security of the country. In fact, the demand for the formation of linguistic provinces in India is based on the fact that real democracy and lasting unity in India can be achieved only by forming linguistic States and enabling the people to participate in the day-to-day administration of the country. So the formation of linguistic provinces is not against the unity, stability and security of India. On the contrary, that is going to reinforce the unity, stability and security of the country.

Now, Sir, coming to this Bill, I welcome this Bill. I do so for two chief reasons. Firstly, it is stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that this Bill is intended to establish an Andhra State consisting of the Telugu-speaking areas of the present Madras State, and secondly, it is intended to merge the Kannada-speaking taluks of Bellary district into the adjoining State of Mysore, which, we ought to remember, is a Part B State. So this Bill recognises two principles; firstly, the formation of linguistic provinces, i.e., the formation of provinces on the basis of language, and secondly, adding a part of a Part A State to a Part B State. Now, the Central Government, having accepted these two principles, cannot, even for a day, delay the formation of the Karnataka province. After all the formation of Karnataka province today will only mean the addition of Kannada portions of the Part A States of Bombay and Madras, the Kannada-speaking parts of the Part B State of Hyderabad and the Part C State of Coorg to Mysore. The hon. Minister while introducing this Bill said that they had to overcome so many difficulties with regard to the capital of Andhra State, and that various other difficulties were there. But as far as Karnataka is concerned, none of these difficulties exists. We have capital; we have High Court; we have University. The only thing lacking is willingness on the part of the Central Government. Only if the Central Government is willing to extend those principles already accepted by

[Shri B V Kakkilaya]
them to a neighbouring area of Karnataka certainly they can form the Karnataka State without any difficulty or delay

SHRI ABDUL RAZAK (Travancore-Cochin) But Mysore is not willing

SHRI B V KAKKILAYA Now, coming to that, Sir I would like to point out that in the JVP Report and in the Dhar Commission's Report the only argument that was advanced against the immediate formation of Karnataka State was the existence of Mysore as a Part B State. They said that unless Mysore agreed to go into Karnataka the formation of a Karnataka State would not be a feasible proposition. Now, it is made quite clear that Mysore is willing to welcome any part of the neighbouring areas, any part of Kannada-speaking areas, in the Mysore State and to form the Karnataka State. It has been made quite clear in the course of the debate on this very same Bill in the Mysore Assembly—all the elected representatives of the Mysore people and the Government of Mysore have made it very clear—that it is not Mysore that stands in the way of the formation of Karnataka State but it is the Central Government which stands in the way of its formation. (Interruption) When the Prime Minister went to Belgaum immediately after making the statement on the formation of Andhra here he declared there that if Mysore was willing to come into Karnataka the Central Government would not stand in the way. But today when the Mysore Government and the Mysore people have unequivocally stated that they would welcome all the Karnataka areas into Mysore, the Central Government is shifting its position. Now the Central Government states that if Karnataka State is to be formed the great State of Bombay will have to be disintegrated the great State of Hyderabad will have to be disintegrated. I cannot understand why they give one excuse after another to evade the issue. After all they are disintegrating the State of Madras. Then why can they not disintegrate the State of Bombay? Why

can they not disintegrate the State of Hyderabad? The Bombay Assembly and the Madras Assembly Sir, even as far back as 1938 passed resolutions recommending the disintegration of those States into their component parts. Sir I need not go as far back as 1938. Even in 1947 when the Constitution of India was being drafted here in Delhi, the Legislative Assemblies of Madras and Bombay passed resolutions recommending to the Constituent Assembly to disintegrate those States and to carve out the provinces of Karnataka, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Kerala, Tamil Nad and Andhra. That being the case, it is quite clear that it is the Central Government alone that stands in the way of Karnataka State. Now they may say that Hyderabad is there. The hon. the Prime Minister once stated that if Hyderabad was disintegrated, that would mean a calamity for the whole of South India, that would mean destruction of the South Indian culture. I do not know what the Prime Minister meant by that. I cannot understand how the Nizam of Hyderabad is considered to be the representative of the South Indian culture. If at all any meaning can be given to this declaration of the Prime Minister it can only be this that the Central Government wants to maintain the State of Hyderabad to hold the balance between the Telugus, the Kannadigas and the Maharashtrians. If the Central Government is really a national Government, it need not have such a State there to maintain the balance of power as the imperialists were doing in their days. Imperialists created the native States in order to divide the people to create ill-feelings between them and to create a base for their own rule over India. I do not think the Central Government today need have any such base in any part of the country to maintain their power. The Central Government should be a real representative of the willing co-operation and association of the free peoples of our country.

Now Sir, my hon. friend Mr Hegde, while speaking the other day, said that he was ashamed of what was going on in Karnataka. Really speaking Sir, whatever is happening in Karnataka

is a matter of shame for him. I am glad that his sense of shame is not dead. The Action Committee of the Akhand Karnataka Rajya Nirman Parishad was to meet on the 8th of August to reconsider their former decision to launch *satyagraha* on the 9th of August, but the members of the Action Committee were arrested and detained without trial on the 6th of August. I would ask the hon. Minister and the hon. Member Mr. Hegde: Was it not shameful on the part of the Government to have arrested those leaders? I would also ask them: Was it not shameful for them to have arrested all the supporters of the candidate who was opposing the Congress candidate in the bye-election in Hubli, and at the same time for Minister after Minister going to Hubli to support the Congress candidate? But the candidate who opposed the Congress on the issue of the formation of Karnataka got elected. Is it not shameful for the Congress? Perhaps Mr. Hegde was referring to these things when he said that he was ashamed of what was happening in Karnataka. He said that fish-plates were removed and the train was delayed. But Mr. Hegde reached here safely. I also reached here. Several other members have reached here. There was not a single accident; there was not a single incident of derailment in any part of Karnataka. There are so many accidents happening in the country. We read about goods trains being derailed. Perhaps the hon. Minister will lay the blame on the Karnataka people. We were very careful to see that no such incidents took place in Karnataka because we knew perfectly well that these people would lay the blame on us and make it an excuse to put our people behind bars. We have taken very good care to see that the party-men of Mr. Hegde do not succeed in doing some acts of sabotage themselves to implicate us and thus to sabotage the realisation of the long-cherished aspirations of the Kannadigas. I would tell the hon. Minister that it is high time that he gave an assurance to the Kannadiga people that their long-cherished goal of uni-

fication of their homeland will also be realised as soon as the formation of the Andhra State takes place. I would remind the hon. Minister that this demand for a Karnataka province took shape as early as 1903 and that it became a real people's movement by 1915 or 1916 along with the movement for the formation of an Andhra State. A few months ago when a resolution was being discussed in this House on the formation of an Andhra Province, the hon. the Prime Minister said that he was prepared to consider the question of Andhra as a special case. He also said that each case would be considered separately on merits. If they take up each case on merits, certainly they cannot deny the formation of a Karnataka State. Then today they say that they do not want to take up this question in a piecemeal manner. Even then the formation of Karnataka cannot be delayed. I would appeal to the hon. the Home Minister, and especially to the Deputy Home Minister who comes from Karnataka and who had been at one time the leader of the movement for a separate province of Karnataka, to give this solemn assurance that the Karnataka State will be formed at least within one year after the formation of the Andhra State, that the Karnataka State will come into existence on the 1st October 1954. Let him take steps to see that the boundaries are fixed properly, and if there is a Boundary Commission appointed simultaneously with the formation of the Andhra State, this question can be settled peacefully; the dispute between the Mysore State and the Andhra State in respect of Bellary District or the Kolar District or for the matter any other dispute can be settled satisfactorily and we can satisfy the aspirations of the people in the South. I hope that the hon. the Home Minister, when he replies to the debate, will make this declaration and assure the people of Karnataka that their long-cherished aspiration for the unification of their homeland into a separate State will be satisfied.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupte. There are about 14 Members still on the list and there are 165

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.] minutes. So, I would request you to be precise and brief.

SHRI B. M. GUPTE (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, first of all I congratulate the Andhras on the fulfilment of their long-cherished aspirations and then I thank them on behalf of all those who are similar aspirants for linguistic States. I come from Maharashtra, and Visala Maharashtra including the city of Bombay is our goal. I thank Andhras because they set the ball rolling. Prior to the announcement about Andhra, there was a deadlock in this matter, almost a dead set against linguistic States. On account of the sacrifices of the Andhras and especially of that greater martyr, Potti Sriramulu things began to move, and now an all-India Commission is to be appointed. No one can say today what will come out of the labours of the Commission; one can only hope for the best. However, it is a matter of no small satisfaction that at last the deadlock resolved and the problem of the creation of linguistic States is to be examined comprehensively and authoritatively on an all-India basis. The Commission is coming none too soon. The delay in appointing it has already caused a good deal of harm. If the question had been considered on an all-India basis, then financially it would have been much cheaper to form the new provinces. Take the case of Andhra itself. If the question had been considered on an all-India basis, then Hyderabad would have gone to Andhra, as their natural capital. The money to be spent on the temporary capital, whether it is Kurnool or Visakhapatnam or Guntur or any other place, would have been saved. Dr. Ambedkar said that Rs. 5 crores would have to be spent on the temporary capital and Rs. 10 crores on the permanent capital. I think he is not correct, because if part of Hyderabad goes to Andhras, Hyderabad City would be a ready-made capital for them, and I do not think that Rs. 10 crores would be required to be spent on that capital. Anyhow, the amount to be spent on the temporary capital would be a loss. My hon. friend Shri

Rama Rao, said that he expected to go to Hyderabad in two years. I think his estimate is too optimistic to be correct. If it can really happen within two years, they can carry on with tented accommodation, but then it may be longer and so a substantial amount will have to be spent on the temporary capital. It is a loss not only to our Andhra friends, but also to the whole country, because a major portion of the expenditure will be met from the grant of the Central Government for that purpose. But financial loss is only a minor result of the delay. The delay has caused more serious mischief by poisoning the relations between the various sections of the population in multi-lingual States. The atmosphere in those States is surcharged with misunderstanding and distrust and resentment. It is no use telling the people that a multi-lingual State is a better form of organisation from the national point of view. It is too late in the day to say that. We, the Congressmen, we have ourselves raised these hopes and aspirations and they have to be fulfilled. It is also no use telling the people that it is not yet time for this and that it is better to direct their attention to the execution of the Five Year Plan. For the Plan itself has become a subject of discontent and bickering. This area is starved and that area is pampered is a complaint one hears everywhere in the multi-lingual States and this is not very congenial for the vigorous execution of the Plan. A situation has arisen which is similar to that which often arises in any joint Hindu family. Once the sense of unity is lost, there is no point in persisting in a forced union with its perpetual frustration and perpetual bitterness. It will be wiser to separate in good time and with good grace so that there may be greater harmony and better relationship amongst all. I, therefore, welcome this announcement of the All-India Boundary Commission and our attention must now be directed towards making it a success. The first requisite is to create proper atmosphere for the Commission to work in. I am very sorry to confess, it is sad but true, that some of the happenings in connection with the establishment

of the Andhra State have partially justified the apprehensions of those who are opposed to the formation of linguistic provinces.

Sir, they ask, and ask with some justification, that if this has happened when only one province was concerned, when only one State was involved, what would be the conditions in the country when the boundaries of a number of States are in the melting pot? The whole country will be aflame with controversy. It is, therefore, the bounden duty of all well-wishers of the country, that every endeavour should be made to minimise the heat and mitigate the mischief.

In this connection, Sir, I humbly suggest that all forms of popular agitation should cease for the time being, forms which inflame public opinion, forms such as *morchas*, processions, meetings and counter-meetings. I submit that the only thing to be done would be that responsible persons and representative bodies should place all they want to say before the high powered Commission and calmly await the results of their deliberations, in the hope that the Commission will act with the requisite tact, sympathy and expedition and will arrive at conclusions in consonance with the wishes of the people. It will be helpful and effective in creating proper atmosphere if, at the time of the announcement of the personnel of the Commission, the Prime Minister issues an appeal to the nation on the lines I have just indicated.

After these general observations on the issue, I shall now address myself to some of the points raised by Dr. Ambedkar. I entirely agree with him in his vigorous defence of the proposition that the establishment of linguistic provinces cannot in any way disrupt the unity of India. There is absolutely no danger on that score. However, I cannot share his apprehension with regard to the treatment of the minorities. I do not think his apprehensions are justified or well-founded. Though I do not share his fears, I certainly sympathise like Dr.

Kumarappa with his attitude. I realise that his vision is clouded with bitter memories of ages past. I realise that iron has entered deep into his soul so that he is unable to appreciate that things have changed, and changed immensely, especially after Mahatma Gandhi took up the cause of the Harijans. He referred particularly to the land problem. We all know that most of the States are grappling with the land problem and they have introduced or are introducing land reforms. Then there is the '*bhoodan yajna*' movement of Acharya Vinobha Bhave. All landless labour whether Harijan or non-Harijan will benefit from these measures and movements. The grievances of Harijan landless are not different or distinct from those of the non-Harijan landless labourer. But the fundamental question is whether by mere division of a multi-lingual State, the position of the Harijans is going to be worse. Even if we suppose that in the undivided Madras State, the Tamil and the Andhra caste Hindus were united in crushing the Harijans, they will be doing the same thing singly in their respective linguistic States. There is no reason why the situation should become worse. But this is a mere supposition for the sake of argument and has no basis in fact. I am quite sure that things have changed and are changing very rapidly. I was very much heartened to read in papers that in the recent Panchayat elections in Punjab, Harijans secured more than their share on population basis. But I do not mean to say that everything is all right with Harijans. There may be lapses in distant backward villages. But I am quite sure that in this country no Government, whatever its communal complexion, whether it is composed of Reddys, Kammas or Brahmins can now tolerate or connive at the persecution of the Harijans. In expressing the fears which Dr. Ambedkar expressed, he has minimised, he has under-rated the force of the march of time, the force of adult suffrage and democracy, the force of public opinion and above all the force of a free and vigilant Press. I think these are real safeguards far more potent than any con-

[Shri B M Gupte]

stitutional safeguards can be. And even if a State makes a lapse there is the Centre powerful enough with its direct powers and indirect influence to correct the States in this matter. May I therefore humbly suggest that the fears of Dr Ambedkar are exaggerated and his remedies are misconceived?

Dr Ambedkar who was a prominent architect of the Constitution is now prepared to burn it. But like many other members of the Constituent Assembly, I am proud of my humble part in that glorious achievement. In spite of certain defects and blemishes—and nothing is perfect in this world—I think our Constitution possesses certain features which any Constitution maker may well be proud of. And even with regard to Dr Ambedkar, I do not believe his outburst represents his true feelings about the Constitution—very probably the outburst was due to momentary irritation caused by persistent reminders of his part in the drafting of the Constitution. Otherwise, there is no reason why he should be so wrathful against the whole Constitution. I can understand his chagrin at the non-inclusion of some of the safeguards he may have wished for his community, but he must admit that at the time the whole question was discussed threadbare. A special Minority Committee was appointed and it went into the business with the utmost care and utmost sympathy. Everything that was possible in the collective judgment of the Constituent Assembly and everything that was in consonance with the spirit of the Constitution was included in the Constitution. The fundamental rights were prescribed, untouchability was made an offence, it was laid down that the claims of the Harijans shall be taken into consideration in services, reservation for a period of ten years was given in Legislatures, a special Commission called the Backward Classes Commission was to be appointed and a Special Officer was provided for. All these safeguards were inserted. The special powers and special

responsibilities of the Governors which he contemplates were proper in the old Government of India Act of 1935, but they were quite incompatible with our present status as a completely independent and sovereign State and were therefore properly rejected. Pandit Kunzru has rightly pointed out that even in the Canadian Constitution the special powers for the Governor-General were not vested in the Governor-General but the Governor-General-in-Council, i.e., in the Centre as against the provinces. In our Constitution also most of the safeguards just enumerated are in the domain of the Centre. Thus already adequate safeguards are there for the Scheduled Castes and the spirit of the time is in their favour. There is, therefore, no necessity for making any provision on the lines Dr Ambedkar has suggested. In conclusion, I support this Bill and express the hope that "May Andhra prosper under the new dispensation and may it be the forerunner of other linguistic States".

DR SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh) Mr Deputy Chairman, the Andhra State has become an accomplished fact and in fact the "Muhurta" for its coming into existence has also been fixed. So at this stage as far as Andhra Province is concerned there is nothing more to be said except giving my blessings to it.

Sir, I should like to refer to Dr. Ambedkar's speech cursorily. He used the word 'hack'. He said he was a 'hack' of the Cabinet as far as the Constitution was concerned. May I ask 'Who is not a hack in a democratic country?' and for that matter even in dictatorial State? You may be a 'hack' of the party or a 'hack' of the Cabinet but in a Communist State you are not only a 'hack' but you may be 'hacked' literally. Where was Dr. Ambedkar when bouquets were showered on him about being the Manu of modern days in framing the Constitution? At that time he did not ask the Cabinet to share those bouquets with him.

Sir, these are days of self-determination and if provinces ask for separation, one should not have anything to say to that but I should like to say that at least for the first fifteen years of Independence, when things are yet to be settled, they must put the interests of the country first and those of their States afterwards. We have been told, with regard to Andhra, and with regard to linguistic provinces of the plighted word of Mahatma Gandhi. The J.V.P. Report and reports of other Committees have been referred to, but what of the plighted word? In the interests of the country is not there full scope to change the plighted word? What is more important is the prosperity of the country and not abiding by the plighted word.

When we had a debate on linguistic provinces, Andhra was referred to, and at that time many an hon. Member said that Andhra would be the thin end of the wedge, and it has come true. In a moment of weakness, during the course of the debate promises have been extracted, and particularly after the last disturbances in Andhra and the threatened disturbance in Karnataka, that a Boundary Commission would be appointed. I would therefore like at this time to utter a warning; because at the critical time when conditions are disturbed, and when there is little time to take a calm view of things, decisions are taken, without even proper reference to the Party, or to the people in the country; and for that reason it is on such occasions that there is time to think as to what should be the attitude of the Party before they are again faced with a similar issue. Sir, no less a person than Acharya Kripalani—he may be a leader of the Praja Socialist Party now, but there is very little difference between the ideology of that party and that of the Congress—gave a warning against linguistic provinces. For that matter our leader Pandit Nehru was once a Socialist and even today the Congress Party is marching more or less on Socialistic ideologies. Acharya Kripalani had

said that the formation of provinces on a linguistic basis would lead to disruption of the country and to disunity. I personally am one with him in this view because if we were to read the history of both ancient and present India, India was formerly divided as a result mostly of haphazard conquests no doubt. The forces that bound her together, the Maratha Empire, the Bengali unity, the Muslim and Urdu States suzerainty—they were all on the basis of language. If it is stated that because out of ten names from the North and South at least six are based on Rama or Krishna, India was always one, it would not be correct. Even in Europe which has been Balkanized on a linguistic basis there are so many Jacobs and Arthurs and so many other common Christian names. The same can be said about religion. Religion is a common bond no doubt. But whole Europe is Christian and yet divided. But what ultimately does bind people together, and that has been put forward as an argument here, is language, and if that language unites the people internally, it can as well be argued that in relation to the outer provinces it disunites them. Even today, I think we are a strange people. Even today we who did not mind studying a foreign language like English under the strong heel of the British Empire, are raising voices against the attempt to make Hindi the common language and learn it—as an attempt to foist Hindi on the Southern people. When there is still unity in the country, when India is one country and such voices are heard, I would like to ask you what the condition would be if linguistic provinces with autonomy become an established fact after a few years. Today you will find that in the South, along the coast in Kerala and even in Malabar and Madras, in fact all along the coast, Communism is making headway through Hyderabad. With linguistic consciousness, and making a slogan of Aryans against non-Aryans, the cry of Dravidistan also may be raised to support it. Communist influence, with its centre in Hyderabad, is trying to create a spirit of separation of the South in this part of the country, as stated al-

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] ready. What will become of the country is a matter for the people in the Party and for those people of the country who have the responsibility of seeing to the interests of the country. Sir, I would like to ask also about this backward class question. Before I take it up, Sir, I would like to deal with the cry raised by those in favour of linguistic States, about language being the real thing for self-realization and self-expression. Nobody would deny that right. Is that the only reason or self interest also? But, Sir, in these days when in foreign countries the people study three or four languages, bilingualism should hardly be an excuse. The people who are asking for division of the country on linguistic basis, the agitators who are asking for that and who claim that they are following in the footsteps of the revered leader, Mahatma Gandhi—I am referring particularly to the people of the Congress side—if they will give an undertaking that they will not enjoy the fruits of this agitation in the form of power, one would never question their real motive, but if you have studied the history of any of these movements for separation of provinces, you would find, what lies behind it; and in connection with that, I would come to the question that was asked by me yesterday about the Marathas being a backward class. It has a long history behind it. I was given a tip by my hon. friend from Berar that I should study the Census Report. I can assure the hon. Member that I have done that—even much more. I have been watching quietly from behind the scenes how this movement had originated and how the Census reports are made. Now with the trend in the country towards advantageous division into Scheduled and Tribal Castes and Backward Classes, certain classes of people have gone and represented that they should be styled as Backward Classes. I would like to mention in this connection that this is not such an innocent move as only to correct a mistake. Socially these people want to be called advanced, but politically they want to remain backward. We on the Congress side have particularly

to think as to what should be the basis of division. It is all right to say that the basis of division under the British was a monstrosity and it was an administrative convenience. In these days when economics is the governing factor of our civilized life, I feel even though language and culture are other factors, economic suitability as well as administrative convenience have to be taken into consideration. I would like also to ask this: Today when English has not been replaced, when Hindi has not come to stay, and there is a move for removing English, what will be the binding factor in India? Have we forgotten our history? Have we to forget that it is because of the English language under the British that India became one which it was never before within recent memory? We should be grateful where we have to be grateful.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore):
Question

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: You may question. India was never one—the whole country as she is today. I would like to meet this argument but there is time-limit to speaking.

PROF. G. RANGA: Then why did you want to say that?

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I would like to say that the Members on this side in any case should appreciate that this is not the time for the reconstruction of the country.

Sir, somebody asked, "What is there in the Five Year Plan and how will the Plan be sabotaged by the creation of the linguistic States?" The answer should be simple. Sir, if you look carefully into what happens when there is separation of a big joint family, then you will know. After all a State is but a magnified joint family and division always diverts the efforts of the members. When separation comes the normal activities of constructive effort, etc. are side-tracked. For that reason the Government has said that these things should not come up at this time; otherwise there would

be disputes over division and so many fissiparous tendencies would be caused. There will even be misunderstandings between the people of different provinces and bitterness might result which might endanger country's security. Even a literary man like Shri Rama Rao, last time when this subject was before this House, said that if Andhra was not coming, they would march into Hyderabad. If these are the passions aroused in a scholar, we can well imagine what will be the passions aroused when boundary commissions are set up. Sir, I should like to refer, in passing, to some utterances made on the floor of this House. Some of them were somewhat surprising. They say, instead of joining a part to a big linguistic State, that part should be created as a separate State, a small State. To give an example, without referring to the actual State, somebody would create a Chota Karnataka from Mysore and there will be a Brihat Karnataka later on. What does it indicate? Again it shows that the people concerned are thinking of their own prospects, how it will all affect their influence and how it will affect their own power.

Finally, I would like to say that it is somewhat surprising that our Communist friends also should join those in the Congress Party over this measure, that they should agree that to have 14 States would be more economical than to have 25 States.

PROF. G. RANGA: Certainly.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: That is not the only thing. When a party wants to bring down the power of the political party that is in power, it begins to take action which smacks of co-operation; but later on difficulties would increase, and the plans for construction would also be dashed to pieces. That perhaps is one of the reasons why, in addition to the idea of Dravidashtan, that is there in the Deccan part of the country, the Communists also have joined in the move for division on a linguistic basis.

Sir, I would like to say finally, that though it should not perhaps be a politician's way to raise his voice to support an unpopular cause, nevertheless I feel that where the interests of the country are concerned, one should not be interested in the loaves and fishes of office that may be available, but should.....

PROF. G. RANGA: One of the loaves and fishes is membership of this House.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND:One should do his duty first and it is one's duty, as I have said, to point out what is in the best interests of the country, for as Lowell says: "They are slaves who dare not be in the right with two or three." For that reason and also for the reason that I wanted to end on a friendly note, and also because no woman Member has so far been associated with this Bill on this side of the House, to give her blessings to the new Province, I stood up to speak even at this late hour in the debate on this Bill.

SHRI D. D. ITALIA (Hyderabad): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I thank you first of all, for giving me this opportunity to speak on this Andhra State Bill. Sir, perhaps many of my friends will be surprised to hear me when I say that I had my primary education at Rajahmundry where I was in the years 1895, 1896 and 1897. I was at Rajahmundry during those three years and in those days there was no railway bridge over the Godavari and we had to cross this river by boat. So it is but natural that I should have certain feelings and affections towards the people of Andhradesh and those feelings of affection compel me to stand up and whole-heartedly support this Andhra State Bill.

I congratulate the people of Andhradesh on achieving their aspirations and their long-cherished desire and on their success. I know very well that for years they have been thinking of separating themselves from the State of Madras and forming their own State. Even when I was a student at Rajahmundry, I used to hear some-

[Shri D. D. Italia.]

thing about this and I am glad that this State is coming into existence at last. No doubt, in achieving their desire, they had to suffer heavily and undergo hardship. They had even to sacrifice their properties and their lives; and recently that great patriot Potti Sriramulu sacrificed his life, and I bow my head before that departed soul for his patriotism. Thanks to the wise policy of our Prime Minister in deciding on and in announcing the formation of the Andhra State, that State will be coming into existence earlier than many had expected. We are well aware that there was a move for the creation of the Andhra State even before the Constitution came into existence. Even the framers of the Constitution had desired to include the Andhra State in the Constitution; but due to some fundamental difficulties, they had to postpone it at the last moment. The people of Andhra unnecessarily blame the Government of India for the delay. But the other day the Deputy Minister for Home Affairs, the hon. Shri Datar, in his speech has plainly said that it was never the intention of the Government of India to delay fulfilling the legitimate desires of the people. The Government had to settle a hundred and one things and they had to consider the pros and cons before they could come to any decision.

Coming from Hyderabad as I do, I think it would have been better if the Government of India had decided to separate the twelve Telugu-speaking districts from the Madras State and included them in the Hyderabad State so that they could have solved the question of location of the capital as well as the question of the High Court and so many other questions. They would even have saved a lot of money. You know well, that there are eight districts in the Hyderabad State known as the Telugu-speaking districts or Telangana. About 95 per cent. of the people of those districts speak Telugu. The area of Telangana is about 45,000 square miles and the population is 10,000,000. It is a well-known fact

that the four districts of Rayalaseema, usually called the Ceded Districts, consist of Kurnool, Cuddapah, Anantapur and Bellary, as well as the Kistna District of the Northern Circars, were in Hyderabad before they were handed over to the Madras State.

So, it is but natural that Hyderabad should have some claim on those districts. If Government had thought fit to include those districts in Hyderabad, it would have paved the path in the disintegration of the Hyderabad State as well as in the creation of other linguistic States, namely, Maharashtra and Karnataka.

Many of the hon. Members spoke and attacked the people of Hyderabad as interfering with the disintegration of Hyderabad and the formation of linguistic States. But, may I draw the attention of some of the Members to the fact that recently, two weeks ago, the two big Municipal Corporations of twin cities of Hyderabad and Secunderabad, openly announced that they were in favour of Vishal Andhra with Hyderabad as its capital even the President of the Hyderabad Pradesh Congress Committee, Swami Ramanand Tirth, has also declared that he wants the Vishal Andhra to come about. No doubt there is some fear in the minds of the non-Telugu speaking people that if Vishal Andhra comes into being their rights will be affected. I am sure that that is not correct because we are in a democratic country and the rights of every individual, whether he be a Telugu speaking one or a non-Telugu speaking one, will be equally safeguarded.

I am sorry, Sir, that many of the Members of this House were unnecessarily blaming and even abusing the Nizam, the Rajpramukh of Hyderabad. This shows nothing but their narrow mentality. As we all know, Sir, the Nizam is only a figurehead of the Hyderabad State. He is no more a ruling Prince; he is no longer in enjoyment of that honour which he was enjoying a few years ago. He cannot interfere even in the administration of the Hyderabad State. The bone of

contention, to my mind, is only the huge remuneration which he is getting. That is not his fault. There is an agreement between the Government of India and the Hyderabad State. He is receiving the agreed amount. If you say that that agreement is nothing but a piece of paper, then burn it and advise the Government of India to stop the remuneration, but for that, we have to amend the Constitution also. It is not advisable to abuse a person in his absence.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Did the Congress ask for the deposition of the Nizam? The Hyderabad Congress passed a resolution at Nizamabad session.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Please go on Mr. Italia.

SHRI CHANNA REDDY (Hyderabad): Is it necessary?

SHRI D. D. ITALIA: Then, Sir, the other day, some of my Maharashtrian friends speaking on this Bill and in support of linguistic States urged that they had built the city of Bombay and, as such, they had a better claim to that city. I may say emphatically that the builders of the city of Bombay were the Parsees who took a great part in building that city industrially as well as socially. The Parsees are Gujarati speaking people. After they came into India 1,300 years ago, they adopted India as their motherland and they even adopted Gujarati as their mother tongue. So, I think, it is but natural that Bombay should go to the Gujarati State if it is established or else remain neutral.

I welcome the idea of appointing a high power Commission to settle the boundary question. I think the Government of India has made a mistake in not definitely announcing where the capital of the Andhra State would be. If they had done it in the Bill itself, I think most of the criticism would not have been necessary. The capital is supposed to be the heart and soul of a State, and so the announcement of the capital must be in the Bill itself and not left out.

59 C.S.D.

Now comes the question of the High Court and the assets and liabilities. These things are left in the hands of the Andhra Legislature and I think I must not say anything more on it.

Now, as it is finally settled that the Andhra State will come into existence on that auspicious date of 1st October, 1953, may I humbly request my friends, whether they are speaking Telugu or Tamil or Kanarese, to part as friends and peacefully, and to live as friends because they are, after all, neighbours, and neighbours must live in a friendly way.

Lastly, Sir, I wish the Andhra State every success and prosperity because in their success and prosperity lies the success and prosperity of our country.

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA (Bihar): Mr. Deputy Chairman, at the very outset I welcome the Bill. I do so because, after all, after a great amount of trouble and acrimony, it has been accepted and acted upon by this Government that the principle of the formation of linguistic States should be given effect to. In this House, Sir, it is refreshing to find that most of the hon. Members are at one and are agreed on the principle of the Congress Party and of the Praja Socialist Party for the establishment of States on a linguistic basis. There is no doubt about that. Some of the hon. Members, and particularly the last lady Member who has just spoken—I mean Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand—have their doubts whether it could be a sound proposition. For example, two hon. Members, Mr. Hegde and another gentleman, have said that it is true that the Congress is wedded to the principle of formation of linguistic States but that they have to choose between two things, either to go ahead with the formation of the States on this basis or to look to the development of the States. I think, Sir, that these two can be reconciled. It is not necessary, Sir, to develop a State and then to be unmindful of the wishes of the people of the different sections of that State

[Shri M. P. N. Sinha.]

and their desire for readjustment. If we have to develop a State, I think it is much better to settle the question of boundary, settle the question of re-formation and then go ahead with the bigger projects. So, I do not agree that the Government should have waited for these seven long years in this matter.

Dr. Katju has said that before every birth, there is a pang. Now his pains are over and he is somewhere outside the House convalescing. I want to tell him that after a few days of the birth, the lady feels quite pleasant. He must be having that pleasant feeling. I would only request him to do one thing, not to repeat the process, that is to say, the process of distrust and acrimony in the matter of the formation of other provinces in future. Well, Andhra has been formed, the State has been created, and it will be inaugurated by our hon. Prime Minister soon. Some of the fortunate friends sitting opposite will go in a body to attend the opening ceremony. But why did you do this after so much of trouble and difficulty? And why after the death of that prince among men, Sriramulu? Why after the destruction of so much of valuable property? So, Sir, I say that now that the birth of this child has taken place, regarding the birth of other children, the same process of trouble, difficulty and destruction should not be necessary. The second and subsequent births are always easy! It is promised that a Commission will be soon appointed. I think that will be the right place, Sir, for all of us, who ask for the adjustment of the boundary or for the formation of a new province on linguistic basis, to put our case before that Commission. I, for myself, Sir, would put the case for the formation of Mithila before that Commission in detail. I can, however, tell you one thing, Sir, that there are some people who are under the misapprehension that while creating new provinces or adjusting them we are likely to weaken the economic and political strength of the country. It is not that,

Sir. A lady Member has just said, "Well, what is the use of dividing a family?" But what is it actually in practice? It is much better to divide a family and make it a happy unit than to have a family which is quarrelling over certain matters every morning and every evening. We have seen families that tried to keep together but they could not do so and they ultimately went into division after a lot of unnecessary hardship and acrimony. But there are wise men, and they are good statesmen, who will effect a division in good time when the feeling is not running high.

So far as the formation of the Mithila Province is concerned, Sir, I can tell you that it has got a history of its own. It is not a new agitation. For the last twenty years people have been crying for it. Soon after the Bihar Province was taken out of Bengal we wanted a separate province of Mithila. Orissa also came with its demand. Bhojpur came with its demand. Chota Nagpur also came with its own demand. All these were with Bengal. Sir, it was as a result of an agitation of the Oriyas that Orissa was formed into a separate province. There is an agitation, a desire and a wish of the people of Chota Nagpur for a separate province and I think, Sir, they are within their rights in making this demand. Likewise is the demand for Mithila. It has a distinct culture, a distinct separate law of life and inheritance. The people who are ruling there since the independence of this country are much different from the people of Mithila. I tell you, Sir, when you think of Bihar, you think of the tract south of the Ganges.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You need not go into details.

SHRI M. P. N. SINHA: This part of the country in Northern India which is Mithila—like certain portions of the country in the south—has maintained and kept the old culture of ancient India. They never fell a victim to other influences of outsiders. Attempts were made by the Buddha kings of

Magadha to include it in their territory but they failed. Then similar attempts were made by Muhammad Tughlak he could take his army only to a certain extent and had to go back. Even during the English regime our culture remained what it was. Sir we had many times this humiliation and hardship of being under the heels of the people of Magadha which is a distinct country distinct from my part of the country. Therefore Sir I say that when once you have agreed to the principle please do not allow any time to be lost over it. Just try to expedite the matter. Take also the case of the formation of Maharashtra, Kerala and Karnataka States and the adjustment of the Orissa boundaries as also the boundaries between Bengal and Bihar. Take also the question of unification of the different States in the Punjab who speak the Punjabi language, do not sleep over these matters until things go out of your hands. You have given the Andhras a separate State but as Prof Ranga said you have given it without any grace attached to your gift. Last year you defeated a resolution on the formation of an Andhra State and you allowed Sriramulu to die on this issue. You announced it at 'you won't have it' saying that this is the difficulty and that is the difficulty, 'you are demanding this and you are demanding that'. But then when you saw that the people as a whole wanted it and began to demonstrate by marching on the streets, you woke up and took to business. Thus you have spoiled the grace of it. Therefore in respect of the formation of the Mithila Province, I would request the Government most earnestly not to spoil the grace of it. We will have it. Nobody in the world can stop it. The people there consider that administratively, economically and politically it will be sound to have a separate province of Mithila. That is all I have got to say.

DR ANUP SINGH (Punjab) Sir since sending my name I have developed a very bad cold and both as kindness to the throat and to the House that should not be subjected to any

lengthy speech I shall be very brief in my speech.

My distinguished friend Dr Kumaraappa, offered a sociological explanation of Dr Ambedkar's speech or behaviour. Well, I fully subscribe to the view that we are all products of our environment and to this Dr Ambedkar is no exception. Saints and sinners they all belong to the same category from that point of view. Nevertheless we do pass judgment on individual behaviour and collective behaviour, and I personally do not see even after making due allowance for some of the frustrations from which Dr Ambedkar may be suffering or alleged to be suffering, why he should not be subjected to the same kind of examination more so, because he has developed the irritating habit of hitting and then running away. Ever since I have been in this House I have seen that he has emerged on the scene three or four times and invariably he hits and hits hard and then he performs the rope-trick and disappears completely and he is nowhere to be seen.

Now as for the points that he made, Sir he castigated the Congress Bench for their inability to make up their mind and he said that even a dullard should be able to make up his mind after twenty years. I am afraid, Sir that perhaps more can be said about Dr Ambedkar. I have followed his statements, speeches and points of view. I think, for the last thirty years and I am sure that he has not been able to make up his mind and he continues to treat us to all kinds of intellectual somersaults. I for one have put it on the credit side of his account that he had so much to do with the Constitution. It certainly came to me as a great surprise when to my utter dismay he completely repudiated it and said that he had had absolutely nothing to do with it and that he simply did what he was told to do. That certainly puts him in the position of a glorified draftsman or a glorified clerk and I am very much afraid that Dr Ambedkar is turning out to be the worst enemy. He seems to be hell-bent—if I may use such an expression—in wiping out his past.

[Dr Anup Singh]

For the present I think he is in a state of suspended animation, and, as for the future I am reminded of the observation that was once made about Churchill's great-grandfather who was a young man and who was very brilliant when he started out but later on began to deteriorate. One day while he was passing by, one of his neighbours a great jurist, looked at him and turned to the person next to him and said "There goes the man with his future behind him"

So I think if Dr Ambedkar is not very careful he might turn out to be a very peculiar phenomenon. Past he himself has wiped out, present non-existing and future behind him.

As for the subject-matter Sir I presume the Commission will go into this problem thoroughly and dispassionately, but what has been said here so far gives me the impression that we tend to indulge in over-simplifications. A thesis has been advanced that conceding linguistic provinces will strengthen India's unity and the opposite thesis is that it will disintegrate. I think there is far too much over-simplification. For my part, Sir I feel that it is not proper to single out one factor—mainly language. We have placed too much emphasis on language. As many of the speakers have said—and I subscribe to their point of view—the economic aspect, the political aspect, the geographical aspect, the larger national aspect—all these should be taken into consideration. I do hope that the party in power, the Congress and the present Government will do a little bit more of clear thinking than they have done so far. I do not believe when some of the Congress spokesmen and those on the Government benches come forward and say that they have always been considering the establishment of Andhra that they have not yielded to any pressure and that they do not propose to yield to any pressure in the future. That Sir I would say with all respect is mere pedantry. Everyone knows that there has not been clear thinking and this is not the only such case

And I say this with the greatest responsibility. Unless the Government begin to think ahead and anticipate the coming events and give up this habit of improvising solutions we will be drifting towards conditions which will not be very commendable.

I would like to make just one observation more. So far as India's unity is concerned Sir we need to be reminded all the time that our unity, our nationalism which in modern countries is the basis of unity is very nebulous. It is very very weak. All the nationalism that we have shown so far till now has been in a negative way in the sense that it was anti-British. The moment they disappeared from the scene we found there were the Muhammadan, the Hindu, the Sikh and all these loyalties. Of course, we do owe loyalty to our communities, to our provinces, to our families, but in the modern world unless we realise as a nation the necessity to develop the larger loyalty which should have priority whenever any national question comes up, we shall be heading for disaster. And those who say 'let us concede linguistic provinces this will strengthen India' are, I think, just indulging in wishful thinking. I for one would say—'concede those demands if they are reasonable and legitimate, but let it be on the basis of some other criterion'. Let us do it gracefully but at the same time let us not be oblivious to one fact that we as a nation have to go a long way. We may say the people of the north, south or anywhere, but when we say India it should conjure us to a vision of an entity to which we all owe allegiance first and foremost.

SHRI BASAPPA SHETTY (Mysore)
Mr Deputy Chairman Sir I offer my hearty congratulations to my Andhra friends who, after all, as a result of their great sacrifices suffering and constant demand for a separate State have got their Andhra State which was their long-cherished desire. While supporting the Bill wholeheartedly coming as I do from Mysore I should like to say a few words. Sir, there is a suggestion that in spite of the

Misra Report and all that, the Bellary Taluk should be merged with Andhra. In this connection I should like to say that the Bellary Taluk is purely a Kannada area and that there is a fort also called the Mysore Fort. My Andhra friends never agitated till the time of discussion of the inclusion of Bellary Taluk by the Dhar Commission and the Partition Committee. When several of these issues were being discussed the question of Bellary was not raised by my Andhra friends at all. It surprises me now that they should have an eye on Bellary and its buildings because they could not succeed in their efforts to secure Madras as their capital. Sir, Bellary has been neglected for a long time. They did not care even to sanction a college for Bellary. While the other districts of Andhra have secured colleges, arts colleges, engineering college and all that, Bellary was neglected. That shows how Bellary was excluded from Andhra. Again when the Andhra University Bill was introduced in the Madras Legislative Council in the year 1925, they excluded Bellary District. Why? Because it happens to be a Kannada area. It was not included in that Bill. That itself is clear that Bellary District has been considered as a purely Kannada area. My friend Mr. Hegde very clearly stated in great detail how historically it belonged to Mysore and how the kings of Vijayanagara also were Kannadigas.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA (Madras) May I interrupt, Sir? Was Bellary only excluded from the Andhra University Bill or was the whole of Rayalaseema excluded?

SHRI BASAPPA SHETTY I am talking of Bellary. Bellary was excluded from the Andhra University Bill.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA Bellary was not the only place excluded. The whole of Rayalaseema was excluded so far as I know.

SHRI BASAPPA SHETTY Nobody can deny that Bellary is a part of Karnataka Province and hence there

is no reason or justification to reopen that question or to ask for a plebiscite. Two prominent and disinterested High Court Judges have given their decision that Bellary should go to Mysore. Sir, the 10 taluks have joined together and established intimate and close connections for more than a century and there have been business and social connections. Now bifurcation of that district will cause sudden dislocation of economic stability. Along with language administrative convenience should also be taken into account and examined.

If the Government of India go on dissecting taluk by taluk, village by village and so on, troubles are bound to grow. On language as well as on administrative grounds, it would have been wise if they had allotted the entire district to us. It is quite necessary that the entire Bellary District should be maintained as a single unit on grounds of administrative convenience and it should go to Mysore for these reasons: (1) the future set-up of the Government, (2) in the interest of the Tungabhadra project which embraces the whole area, (3) business relations with the Chitaldrug District and (4) more than anything else the cultural background. Sir, dual control and management of the Tungabhadra project may lead to frequent friction, quarrels and disputes. In other words it will not be conducive to the future completion and progress of the project. In order that these quarrels and disputes may not arise, it is but right that all rights in respect of the administration of the project in the transferred area should vest exclusively in the State of Mysore and all rights in respect of the administration and operation of the project situated in the territories of Andhra should vest in the State of Andhra. Sir, the Mysore Government have been accused of not helping our Andhra friends and all that. Sir, I say that Mysore Government have been generous in supplying power to Andhra districts—for the construction of the project also. They have given power to Kurnool and Ooty and they are now proposing to supply power to South Kanara also.

[Shri Basappa Shetty.]

There need not be any apprehension on the part of our neighbours that Mysore is not going to supply them power or give them water facilities for irrigation purposes. All these things can be done later on by entering into agreements between the States. It is for the sake of administrative convenience that the control and management of the project in the transferred area should vest in the Mysore Government otherwise it would surely excite controversy leading to various complications.

Sir, as the scope of the Bill is to increase the area of the Mysore State and to diminish the area of the Madras State, I should like to emphasise that this is the proper time for Central Government to consider seriously the inclusion of other Kannada-speaking areas of the residuary State of Madras into the State of Mysore. It is always desirable, in the interests of the country, to take all these questions as a whole and decide them once for all. That would lessen our troubles and further controversies in future.

With regard to South Kanara, people are anxious to join Mysore and they do not like to remain in the residuary State of Madras. Though Mangalore is a big city consisting of a population of 2,00,000, yet it has no water supply and it is 400 miles away from the capital town of Madras. Such a big city has no drinking water facility. This shows how much it has been neglected. The District Board of Mangalore, the Mangalore Municipality and the District Congress Committee of the South Kanara District have also passed resolutions in favour of being merged with Mysore. Secondly, Sir, Madakasira and Hosur Taluks—Madakasira is an enclave surrounded by the Mysore State—have also expressed their desire to join Mysore. The people of Nilgiris have also shown their anxiety to join Mysore. Similarly, the people of Kollegal Taluk of Madras State are

also anxious to join Mysore. People are anxious to settle their future once and for all. It is easy for the Government of India to make a declaration before the 1st of October as to what their attitude is towards these Kannada speaking areas. The question of the formation of Karnataka Province is being postponed to an unknown date. All our Karnataka people are agitating to secure their State. Andhra friends have laid the foundation for the future formation of linguistic provinces. The vacillating attitude and evasive policy of the Government towards the formation of Karnataka Province won't do. I am not one of those who believe in disruption, disunion, etc., if linguistic States are formed. On the other hand, solidarity and unity of the country will grow immensely. How we are losing our hold on the masses, can be illustrated by the result of recent bye-elections held in Hubli. Within four months the two Congress candidates failed miserably. The other candidates who were not so popular and were unknown to the electorate, have been elected on the issue of this formation of Karnataka Province. That shows the intense feelings of the public and all that. The Chief Minister of Bombay and other four Ministers went there and did propaganda, supporting the Congress candidates, but in spite of all that, they could not succeed, because the people were seen to have lost their confidence in the present Government as their long cherished desire to secure their State, i.e. Karnataka Province, was not fulfilled. Therefore, it is very essential that the present Government should make a declaration as early as possible that the Karnataka State would be formed within a definite period. Sir, the present atmosphere is favourable to the formation of the Karnataka Province. Mysore is willing to welcome all those States which are willing to be merged with Mysore. Here there is no question of capital; there is no question of High Court; there is no question of roads and buildings. The formation of Karnataka Province is

easier than the formation of even this Andhra State

Sir, let us take a broad view I should like to tell a few words to my hon friends Because we have been friends all these years, let us continue as friends Andhra and Mysore have to live together happily and intimately We need mutual help Did Mysore not supply power to the entire Andhra District sacrificing their interest? But for the co-operation of the Mysore State this would not have happened In future also we have to be inter-dependent and I wish Andhra State every prosperity and success

With these few words, I resume my seat

SHRI ABDUL RAZAK: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I welcome this measure stained though it is with the blood of the great martyr, Potti Sriramulu The sacrifices of the great people of Andhradesh and the lives that have been laid down in this cause have not been in vain I heartily congratulate the Andhra people on their proud achievement Sir, in doing so I earnestly exhort them to take the hint that came the other day from the ex-Congress Minister "On to Hyderabad via Kurnool" I am sure, Sir, that the great people of Andhradesh are capable of fulfilling this bold writing on the wall But, Sir, the Andhra leaders I say with due deference to them, should cease crystal-gazing The time has come now, Sir, when they should stop here and set themselves to the great task of building up the infant State Sir, the task—the path to Hyderabad—is not easy. Considering the heavy price that the Andhra people have paid even for those areas in Madras which were conceded as early as 1949 by the Government of Madras, and also considering the manner in which it has now come to be wrested from the hands of the Government of India, I am afraid, great sacrifices will be called for from the people of Andhradesh I fear, Sir, that they will have to let go some of their leaders of the type of Prof Ranga and Shri Prakasam, the way that Potti

Sriramulu went Yet, with all that, Sir, the doctrine of the integrated economy of the multi-lingual miscellany called Hyderabad will be talked about against them Sir, to talk about integrated economy of particular areas within the overall Indian economic set up, is a myth and a complete travesty of the fundamentals of economics In fact Sir, this theory artfully designed in defence of the Hyderabad State is the meeting place of feudal vestiges and rank reactionaries. Be that what it may, one thing is clear that the major struggle of the Andhra people is yet to begin, and I am sure, no sacrifice will be considered great or difficult by the Andhra people in achieving their cherished goal of Visala Andhra I wish them godspeed on behalf of the Travancore Tamil Nad Congress

Now Sir, I come to the Andhra Bill As one reads the Bill, one wonders as to what remains of the residuary Madras State Sir the residuary Madras State is 3,277 square miles less than the new Andhra State and yet with three more babies struggling in the pit of its womb Sir, the present Madras State is big with a quadruplets, namely, the Andhra Tamil, Kannada and Kerala It is clear, Sir, that it has required a surgical treat to take the Andhra out of it By the very same act of surgery, three more babies could also be brought into existence. But the hon the Home Minister, like the imprudent surgeon would only leave the other three to struggle in its womb lest linguism, according to him, would find its fullest expression in the South We know, Sir, that the hon the Home Minister is the sworn enemy of linguistic States Then why make the larger part of the Bellary District as a gift to Mysore

DR K N KATJU When did I say that? Nothing should be put in my mouth which I never uttered

SHRI ABDUL RAZAK That is the impression that one gathered from what he has said in the other House.

DR. K N KATJU I should like to be confronted with quotations of what I said

SHRI ABDUL RAZAK There is enough evidence in my hands to justify what I have said. According to us he is the sworn enemy of the formation of linguistic provinces. He has categorically time and again condemned what he was happy to characterise as linguism. I have clear proof to prove that. The other day in the House of the People he was exhorting Congressmen particularly to follow **more and more** the J V P Report rather than the Congress Resolution of 1922 or the Nehru Report of 1928. *What does this report proclaim?* Is it not opposed to the policy of surrendering territories of Part A States to Part B States? Does it not proclaim that the process of integration should work the other way? Why, then, surrender what I may call the residuary district of Bellary to Mysore? The Mysore State, I am constrained to express, has never associated itself with the demand for a united Karnataka. On the other hand, it has always been the desire of Mysore to grab more territory and be the despotic and final arbiter of the destinies of the vast masses of Kannadigas living in the Hyderabad State, in the Bombay State and in the Madras State. It is for this reason that the Partition Committee appointed by the Government of Madras in 1949 held the view that the residuary Bellary District that is to say, the predominantly Kanarese-speaking areas of Bellary District should remain, with the residuary Madras State. Here I would request the indulgence of the House to read the concluding part of the report of the Partition Committee. The Committee concludes

"The Committee accordingly recommend that the Andhra Province may be formed before 26th January 1950, including in it the districts of Visakhapatnam, East Godavari, West Godavari, Cudappah, Kurnool and Anantapur and the Adoni Alur and Rayadurg taluks of the Bellary District. The new Madras Province will accordingly comprise the rest of the present province of Madras"

Instead of following that report, one finds here that the residuary Bellary District is being transferred to the Mysore State. Even the Prime Minister's statement made in the House of the People on the 19th December 1952 did not hold out any such proposition. For the first time, this proposal was expressed only in the statement of the Prime Minister in the House of the People on the 25th March 1953. I ask, Sir, why this innovation was made. It may be said that the people living in the residuary district of Bellary desire that the residuary should be handed over to Mysore. If that is so, I say that the wishes of the people living in South Kanara are nothing different. Why not surrender South Kanara also to Mysore? And if possible North Kanara also? If South Kanara is handed over to Mysore the residuary Madras State would become more homogeneous except for the single Malayalam district of Malabar. The Andhra friends and the Tamil friends are engaged in the vain task of finding out the assets of the Madras State. How could there be any asset left in that State when that State has for over one hundred and fifty years fed this barren district of Malabar? By culture by geographical contiguity and historical traditions, this Malabar District should form part of Travancore-Cochin. Cede this district of Malabar to Travancore-Cochin and then it will be the turn for Travancore-Cochin to undergo the process of moulting. Travancore-Cochin will have to gracefully surrender the five southern taluks in Trivandrum District, the Shenkotta taluk in Quilon District and the taluks of Peermade and Devikulam in Kottayam District to greater Tamil Nad. Sir, more than 15 lakhs of people are living in these areas which are contiguous to the Tamil districts in Madras State and from time immemorial it has been the declared wish of these people to become part of Greater Tamil Nad. Sir my purpose here is not to trace the origin of this movement. I wish to be brief and relevant to the occasion. This wish of the people there found its fullest expression in 1949 when Travancore and Cochin were sought to be

integrated. But when Mr. V. P. Menon came there in 1949 to interpreting the arbitrary decision of the Central Government to integrating the two States intact into one State, the Tamils living in these areas rose in rebellion against it. It was a historic rebellion, and even the arms of the Government of Travancore could not reach them.

SHRI K. P. MADHAVAN NAIR (Travancore-Cochin): Where was that rebellion, in which part of the world?

SHRI ABDUL RAZAK: It was at a time when Mr. Madhavan Nair was not even heard of.

SHRI K. C. GEORGE (Travancore-Cochin): In which area did the rebellion take place?

SHRI ABDUL RAZAK: Specially in South Travancore. The coinage of the Travancore Government was refused to be of legal tender. It was a historic and memorable rebellion which my hon. friend, Mr. Madhavan Nair, seeks to forget. Probably at that time he (Shri K. P. Madhavan Nair) was at Cochin and was not heard of anywhere in Travancore.

Coming to the point, the virus of this agitation was such that Sardar Patel had to reckon with it. The hon. the Home Minister was telling the other House that he is a worthy successor of a great predecessor, Sardar Patel.

DR. K. N. KATJU: If you want to quote me, please quote me aright. I do not think I said I was a worthy successor.

SHRI ABDUL RAZAK: Sir, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel had to send his personal envoy, in the person of Shri Kamraj Nadar, who is still a living force, and through him an assurance that our claim to form part of Tamil Nad would be considered if and when the formation of linguistic provinces was taken in hand.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Razak, all this is irrelevant.

SHRI ABDUL RAZAK: Sir, I am closing. It was then said that our demand for the formation of a united Tamil Nad will be considered at the time of the formation of linguistic pro-

vinces and that the inclusion of the Tamil-speaking districts will also be considered. Now, may I ask the hon. the Home Minister, as the worthy successor of a great predecessor, whether he is prepared to respect that assurance given in writing and in the hand of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel himself. If he respects that, here is an occasion for him to bring into being at one stroke the great States of Andhra, the Tamil Nad, the State of Karnataka and the State of Kerala. If he misses this opportunity, I regret that he only flouts the wishes of the people and the solemn assurance of this great predecessor in office.

SHRI CHANNA REDDY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I welcome this Bill whole heartedly and I congratulate my 'Sodara Andhras'—my Andhra brethren on having achieved their long cherished goal. Even from this side, I have no hesitation in admitting this fact that this Bill is a belated one. If this new Andhra State had been included in the Schedule which was appended to our stupendous Constitution, and the State had been formed on that occasion, I think the difficulties which we are facing today would have been no more and the demand for linguistic provinces would not have gained so much of wild momentum. Who has been responsible for all this unwanted and undesirable delay? I do not want to enter into a futile controversy of this sort. I think it is proper for us, especially when we are standing on the eve of the birth of a new State, that all of us send our best wishes for the well-being and well-beginning of this new-born state. So did our hon. the Home Minister the other day. But my request in this connection will be that blessing a State with mere words is of no use. We request him earnestly to bless this State with sufficient funds so that it may be developed properly.

As regards the reorganisation and the reorientation of the States, this is a problem which is engaging the attention of every patriot in our country. I

[Shri Channa Reddy.]

need not stress the point that the original formation of the present day States is neither scientific nor founded on any fundamental principle. That is the reason why we want an immediate change in the structure of the present States. The wide disparity which is now existing between the sizes of the States and the populations of the States do not require special mention on this occasion. Anyhow, it is felt everywhere and by everybody that these States must be reorganised. But before embarking on an enterprise of this magnitude, we must be clear in our minds about the pattern of the future States, whether we are going to have big States of big sizes or whether we want to have small viable economic units as our States just on the pattern of the United States of America. We have to decide this first and foremost.

I think that the latter pattern is always preferable. This sort of pattern or structure of our States will not only fulfil our demands for linguistic provinces but will also give due place for all other fundamental considerations in this respect. I am very glad to know that a high power Commission is coming into existence before the end of the year. My only request is that it must come into existence as early as possible and dispose of this agitating issue as soon as possible.

I, with all the emphasis at my command, am constrained to say that now, at this juncture, it is no use in delaying the proposals by assessing the assets and liabilities of linguistic provinces. It is high time already, the march for linguistic provinces cannot be stopped; it is irresistible.

Now, I will say a few words about my own State of Hyderabad. We are rightly convinced that the ultimate fate of our State is in its disintegration. Not only the Andhras, but the Kannadigas and the Maharashtrians also are not lagging behind in this respect. Each and every public organisation including the Congress and two municipal corporations of our twin

cities, viz., Secunderabad and Hyderabad—have adopted a resolution in clear and unequivocal terms to this effect.

There may be a bit of opposition from any corner but that is negligible. Just for the information of this august House, I want to bring to your notice, Sir, that the Vice-President of the Visala Andhra Mahasabha, which is going to hold its meetings on the 12th and 13th of this month, is Mr. Ahmad Ali Khan, the Deputy Mayor of Hyderabad, a seasoned Congressman even before the Police Action. Keeping this in view, it would have been a proper step for the Government to form the Andhra State with Hyderabad as its capital. There are difficulties; I appreciate them; but people do not appreciate generally—that is another difficulty. Well, the disintegration of Hyderabad cannot be implemented prior to the formation of Samyukta Karnataka and the Brihan Maharashtra; that is true; and the Nizam of Hyderabad as Rajpramukh is another bottleneck.

But in spite of all these implications we have to think twice in this regard. If Hyderabad is not allowed as a capital for the new-born Andhra State, then it would have been in the fitness of things to allow the Andhras to have their temporary capital in Madras. I know the lack of generosity which has been exhibited by my Tamilian friends in this connection. But the Government should have insisted upon this as it is doing on various other occasions. I am of this opinion because I want to see that this infant State should not face much more economical difficulties. Anyhow this State is coming with Kurnool as its capital. I will conclude my speech by making an ardent appeal to the Andhra leaders. They will excuse me if I venture to say that the Andhra leadership is an alarmingly divided house. I need not dilate on this point. History bears testimony to this. Under the force of circumstances, may I hope that they will exhibit sound courage and profound unity and unflinching adherence to the

lofty ideals of nationalism and fair-play. Moreover I request them to be as economical as possible, as theirs is a State with deficit from its very inception. I would ask them not to have the Legislative Council or Upper House there. The Upper House or Legislative Council is a white elephant in general, much more so to this new infant State.

Last, but not of least importance, I cannot resist the tendency of explaining my people's apprehensions and fears about their rightful position in the contemplated Visala Andhra. I know that these fears have no proper footing, and should not have proper place in a democratic structure, but they exist today indeed. The Rayalaseema people feel somehow insecure and my people also feel some apprehensions about their security. They cannot be exceptions. In this regard my only request is that it is time for the coastal Andhras to prove practically that these apprehensions and fears are entirely baseless. If this is done, I am sure that the people of Telengana will spare no efforts to embrace their brethren on the other side of Tungabhadra and our march on to Hyderabad via Kurnool is definite and easy. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI N. B. DESHMUKH (Hyderabad):

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख (हैदराबाद) :
श्री उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस वक्त आन्ध्रदेश का जो स्टेट बनाया जा रहा है वह वहां की जनता के त्याग और श्रीरामूलू के इन्तकाल के नतीजे पर ही बन रहा है। इस नये आन्ध्रदेश के बनने पर हम यह समझ रहे हैं कि “आन्ध्र” देश को “एक पूरा आन्ध्रदेश” बनाया जायेगा, लेकिन यह बिल जो हमारे सामने लाया गया है उसमें पता चलता है कि सिर्फ मद्रास स्टेट के वह इलाके जो आन्ध्र जबान बोलते हैं, उसी हद तक यह आन्ध्र स्टेट बनाया जा रहा है। हैदराबाद स्टेट

की तकरीबन ८ जिलों की करीब एक करोड़ आबादी का इलाका जिसमें कि हैदराबाद जैसा सुन्दर शहर राजधानी बनाने के लिए मौजूद है, वे इलाके इसमें अलग कर दिये गये हैं, इसकी कोई वजह हमको नहीं बतलाई गई है। आन्ध्रदेश बनाने के पहले यह कहा गया था कि चूंकि आन्ध्र के लोग आन्ध्रदेश चाहते हैं इस वास्ते आन्ध्रदेश बनाया जा रहा है। तो क्या हैदराबाद के आन्ध्र जबान बोलने वाले लोग या आन्ध्र वाले इस इलाके को आन्ध्र राज्य में नहीं मिलाना चाहते हैं? यकीनन हैदराबाद के आन्ध्र जबान बोलने वाले लोग यह चाहते हैं कि वे इस नये आन्ध्र स्टेट में मिला दिये जायें। आन्ध्र वाले यह चाहते हैं कि जो आन्ध्र लोग हैदराबाद में तैलंग भाषा बोलते हैं उनको अपने में मिला लिया जाय। इन सब बातों की वजह से फिर मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि हैदराबाद के आन्ध्र लोगों को नये आन्ध्र स्टेट में क्यों नहीं मिलाया जा रहा है। जब आन्ध्रदेश के लोग उनको अपने साथ मिलाना चाहते हैं और जब वह यह ख्याल करते हैं कि नये आन्ध्र स्टेट की, बगैर उन इलाकों को मिलाये, अच्छी तरह से उन्नति नहीं हो सकती है तो क्या वजह है कि वह हिस्सा नये आन्ध्र स्टेट में नहीं मिलाया जा रहा है?

दरअसल इसकी जड़ यह है कि पाकिस्तान के एजेंट (agent) हैदराबाद में रह कर पुलिस एक्शन (Police Action) के पहिले आजाद हैदराबाद का नारा यहां से बुलन्द करके यह चाहते थे कि हैदराबाद को हिन्दुस्तान से अलग किया जाय। यही लोग कहते हैं कि हैदराबाद और हिन्दुस्तान का अलग अलग कलचर (culture) है इसलिए उसको आजाद किया जाय और आगे चलकर पाकिस्तान के साथ उसको

[Shri N. B. Deshmukh.]

जोड़ दिया जाय । अभी भी वह लोग जो आजाद हैदराबाद का नारा लगाते हैं, हैदराबाद से बाहर नहीं चले गये हैं बल्कि वे पाकिस्तान के एजेन्ट की हैसियत से अब भी हैदराबाद में मौजूद हैं । वह निजाम को जिनका राजा का खिताब निकाल कर राज-प्रमुख कर दिया गया है उनको सामने रख कर कि सावक की तरह निजाम हमको आगे चलकर मदद करेंगे अब यह स्वप्न देख रहे हैं कि हैदराबाद का डिसइंटिग्रेशन (disintegration) न किया जाय और उसका एक अलग स्टेट बनाया जाय और वहां पर उनकी मेजॉरिटी (majority) रहे । इस तरह का एक अलग हैदराबाद शहर का स्टेट बनाकर पाकिस्तान के एजेन्ट बन कर वह एक अलग डोमीनियन (Dominion) बनाना चाहते हैं । आज भी ये लोग यह नारा लगा रहे हैं कि हैदराबाद में हैदराबादियों का एक अलग कलचर है । क्या हैदराबादियों का यही कलचर है कि वे लोग निजाम के साथ दक्खिन में आकर वहां के मराठी, तैलंग और कर्नाटकी जनता पर राज्य करें और वहां के लोगों को हमेशा गुलाम रखें ? क्या यही हैदराबादियों का कलचर है कि वहां के लोगों को अपनी जबान में तालीम न दे कर एक दूसरी जबान, उर्दू, उनके ऊपर ठूस दी जाय और फिर यह कहा जाय कि यह हैदराबाद का कलचर है ? हैदराबाद का अपना कभी भी अलग कलचर नहीं रहा है । इस बास्ते में कहूंगा कि हैदराबाद का अलग कलचर नहीं है । मैं इस हुकूमत की इस तरफ तवज्जह दिलाना चाहता हूं कि जल्द से जल्द इस हैदराबाद का विभाजन किया जाना जरूरी है क्योंकि पाकिस्तान के कुछ एजेन्ट यहां आजाद हैदराबादी कलचर के नाम पर हैदराबाद को

“सी स्टेट” बनाने की कोशिश में लगे हुए हैं । इस तरह से वह हमारे इस लिंगुइस्टिक स्टेट (linguistic state) को नुकसान पहुंचाने की कोशिश करेंगे । मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि यहां के लोग हमारे दक्षिण हिन्दुस्तान के जबान वाले मसले को समझने से कासिर हैं । दरअसल दक्षिण की जबान वाला मसला तब तक हल नहीं हो सकता है जब तक हैदराबाद का डिसइंटिग्रेशन (disintegration) न किया जाय या उसका विभाजन न किया जाय । हैदराबाद इस जबान वाले मसले के लिये एक लिचपिन (linchpin) की हैसियत रखता है । जब तक हैदराबाद के टुकड़े न किये जाय भाषावार प्रान्त रचना दक्षिण में पूरी तौर से सफल नहीं हो सकती है । इसके साथ साथ डा० अम्बेडकर ने भाषावार विभाजन के खिलाफ जो इस राय का इजहार किया कि यह कम्यूनल (communal) मसला है, यह जबान का मसला नहीं है, मैं इस चीज को तसलीम नहीं करता हूं । संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र का जब सवाल उठाया जाता है तो संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र में रहने वाले सारे लोग उस संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र को चाहते हैं । कोई एक विशिष्ट जाति संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र चाहती है या विशाल आन्ध्र चाहती है या ऐक्य कर्नाटक चाहती है, ऐसी बात नहीं है, बल्कि पूरी की पूरी जातियां वहां पर यह चाहती हैं । अब रहा माॅइनारिटीज (minorities) का सवाल, तो पूरे हिन्दुस्तान में जिस तरह से मानारिटीज का सवाल हल हो जाय उसी तरह से इन अलग अलग स्टेटों का सवाल भी हल होने वाला है । अभी मेरे भाई डी० डी० इटालिया साहब ने विशाल आन्ध्र की तो सहमति दे दी, लेकिन इसके साथ साथ यह भी कहा कि चूंकि पारसी लोगों ने बम्बई बनाई है और पारसी लोग चूंकि गुजराती जबान

अस्तियार किये हुये है इस वास्ते बम्बई महाराष्ट्र में नहा आयेगी बल्कि उसको गुजरात में होना है, यह उनका कहना सही नहीं है। उनको मैं हिस्ट्री की याद दिखाना चाहता हूँ कि महाराष्ट्र ने जब पर्शिया में मुसलमानों के आक्रमण के समय पारसियों को निकाला गया तो उन्हें अपने यहाँ आने की इजाजत दी इस तरह वे यहाँ आकर बसे, यहाँ आकर एक खास किस्म का पेशा अस्तियार किया और लोगों की नौबत खमोटा जारी रखी, और उसके बाद उनके जो माथी बम्बई में आकर बसे वे हम पेशा, एक पेशा करने वाले लोग, अब उनकी जबान अस्तियार करके यह कहे कि चूँकि वहाँ पर पारसियों ने और गुजरातियों ने अपना पैसा खर्च करके बम्बई को बनाया है इस वजह से वह गुजरात की होनी चाहिये, यह कोई आर्ग्यूमेंट (argument) नहीं हो सकता है। मैं आपको बतलाता हूँ कि हमारे इंदौराबाद में, औरंगाबाद जिले में निजामी जमाने में दुनगाव मुकाम पर बम्बई से कच्छी, मेमन और खोज लाकर आबाद करने की कोशिश की गई। इसलिये आप देखेंगे कि बम्बई के कच्छी लोग वहाँ पर दरगाह बनाये हुये हैं और वहाँ पर रहते हैं। अगर उस इलाके के लोगों ने यह कह दिया कि चूँकि हम लोग यहाँ आबाद हैं, हमारे यहाँ दरगाह हैं और हमारी जबान गुजराती है इसलिये यह दुनगाव जो औरंगाबाद के पेट के अन्दर है वह गुजराती बनाया जाय यह जिस तरह से कोई आर्ग्यूमेंट नहीं हो सकता उसी तरह से आनरेबल दोस्त डी० डी० इटालिया माहव का भी यह आर्ग्यूमेंट सही नहीं हो सकता है। इन अल्फाज के साथ मैं इस आन्ध्र स्टेट बिल की तारीफ करते हुये अपनी तकरीर खत्म करता हूँ।

(For English translation, see Appendix V, Annexure No 59)

SHRI S C KARAYALAR (Travancore-Cochin) Mr Deputy Chairman, I belong to the State of Travancore-Cochin which is adjacent to the State of Madras and as a Tamilian in the State of Travancore-Cochin I have been following with some interest the developments in the Madras State which have led up to the proposed formation of the Andhra State

Sir, I know the conditions that have existed in the Madras State. The Tamilians and the Telugu-speaking people in Madras State have got on very amicably for generations. I know there are in existence several predominantly Telugu-speaking pockets in the Madras State where the Telugu-speaking Reddys and Kammas have moved very amicably with the Tamilians. The Telugu-speaking people settled in Madras State had never complained of any ill-treatment and they had never thought that they were aliens in the Madras State. Sir, in this frame of mind the Tamilians have never opposed the formation of the Telugu State, they have never put any obstruction in the way. Friendly and cordial relationships have always existed between them and in this spirit, the Tamilians of Madras State along with the Tamilians of the adjoining State of Travancore welcome the formation of the new Andhra State and I hope Sir, that the Tamilians of the South and the Andhras of the new State will always move on cordial and intimate terms in future also. In this spirit Sir they wish them godspeed in the development of their new State. I trust, Sir and I express the hope on behalf of the Tamilians of the Travancore-Cochin State and of the Madras State that the Andhras will get a Government which is suited to their needs which will give them ample opportunities for developing their resources and, at the same time devoting their energies for securing the unity of India. We wish them godspeed in the new venture that they have embarked upon.

Sir, the formation of the Andhra State raises the question of linguistic

[Shri S C Karayalar]

States very prominently Sir, I should say that the formation of the Andhra State by itself is no authority for the proposition that the Government are committed to the principle of the linguistic division of India. It has been stated and it was asserted by an hon. Member on this side of the House that the formation of linguistic States is a settled fact. I do not know, Sir, where that hon. Member derived authority from for making such a sweeping statement. All that the Government have stated in regard to this question is that they are in favour of redistribution of States and in the process of redistribution, linguistic considerations also will be taken into account. That is all that they have stated. There is, therefore, no authority for the proposition that the Government are committed to the formation of linguistic States. But, all the same Sir, it is necessary to take note of the fact that there is a large volume of public opinion—which is growing steadily—in favour of the formation of three or four States in the South, namely, the Karnataka State, the Maharashtra State and the Kerala State. This is a thing which has got to be taken note of by the Government that the volume of opinion is growing in favour of formation of these States. Now, the Government have got to consider very seriously whether they should not tackle this problem of the formation of these three States in the South immediately. Otherwise Sir, I fear that there are people and there are sections of people who are prepared to take the initiative who will create opinion in favour of the formation of these States and create tensions and bitterness among the people. That is a factor Sir, which ought to engage the attention of the Government and they ought to recognise the fact that the volume of opinion is growing from day to day and unless they tackle the problem immediately and unless they deal with it quickly Sir, the situation will be very serious.

I am not for a moment suggesting that I am in favour of linguistic States

but what I am suggesting is that there is a strong volume of opinion in favour of the formation of these three States. I may also draw the attention of the Government to the fact that there is a strong feeling in favour of the formation of what is called Visal Andhra. That shows which way the wind is blowing and Government ought to take note of the fact.

Then I would suggest that with regard to the Commission that is going to be set up in order to investigate the question of the redistribution of States Government ought to make it clear in their terms of reference to the Commission that there is very strong and enlightened public opinion in favour of the formation of these three or four States so that the Commission might not divert their attention in other directions and might restrict themselves to the narrow question of the feasibility of the formation of these three or four States. That should be the range of their investigation. I do not want the Government or the high power Commission to divert their energies towards the question of forming other States in the North. Of course, if there is a demand they may investigate it. Otherwise it is no use directing their attention to that question. That will be unnecessarily frittering away their energies in unprofitable channels.

Sir, in this connection, I should like to refer to a statement which is reported to have been made on the floor of the other House where one Member is reported to have said that there is a very strong and growing volume of enlightened public opinion in favour of the integration of the Travancore-Cochin State with the Madras State. Coming from Travancore-Cochin, I am not aware of any such public opinion, nor is it growing nor is it enlightened. I am sure that there is no such feeling.

Sir, having said this much I should like to make a reference to one or two clauses in the Bill itself. I should draw the attention of the Minister in-charge to the financial provisions in

Part V of the Bill. Sir, reference is made in clause 43 to the authorisation of expenditure pending its sanction by Legislature. It is said that "the Governor of Madras may, at any time before the appointed day, authorise such expenditure from the Consolidated Fund of the State of Andhra and the Consolidated Fund of the State of Madras as he deems necessary for a period of not more than four months beginning with the appointed day pending the sanction of such expenditure by the Legislature of the State of Andhra or the State of Madras as the case may be." Sir, I should like to point out that the provision in this clause seems to be beyond the legislative competence of Parliament. As an authority for this, I would just refer to clause (3) of article 266 which reads: "No moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of a State shall be appropriated except in accordance with law and for the purposes and in the manner provided in this Constitution." My point is that this provision for the authorisation of expenditure out of the *Consolidated Fund of the State of Andhra or the State of Madras* is not in accordance with the provisions of clause (3) of article 266 and is therefore not in order. The point is that provision should be made for such appropriation in the manner provided in this Constitution. The manner referred to in this article is laid down in articles 203 to 206. So, Sir, the provision made in clause 43 of this Bill is not in accordance with the provisions made for the manner in which the appropriation of moneys from the Consolidated Fund can be made. I, therefore, urge that the Minister in charge should consider the question seriously, whether this is within the legislative competence of Parliament. otherwise it may lead to complications. Sir, I wish to suggest, that instead of making provisions for the authorisation of expenditure from the Consolidated Fund of the State in the manner provided in clause 43, suitable provision may be made in clause 43 for the purpose. There is no such restriction on such authorisations when moneys are drawn from either the Contingency

Fund provided for under article 267 or when moneys are proposed to be appropriated from the Fund in the public account of the State concerned. I should like to suggest that suitable provision may be made in clause 43 so as to provide for authorisation of expenditure and appropriation of funds from either of the sources mentioned above.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please read article 4 of the Constitution. That gives sufficient powers. It will not be considered as amending the Constitution.

SHRI S. C. KARAYALAR: That relates to representation in Parliament and Legislature. It is very restricted in its scope. I do not think it is comprehensive enough to relate to financial provisions. Whatever that may be, it is a point which requires attention by the hon. Minister, and I hope he will look into this before it is too late. Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting this Bill.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I welcome this Bill wholeheartedly for I believe that at least as far as South India is concerned, linguistic States must come into existence. But I feel that this Bill is a very halting one and it has been ill-drafted and ill-timed. When I make these accusations, I propose to substantiate them and suggest certain remedies for rectifying them. It has already been pointed out by several Members that the public of the South demand linguistic States and an hon. Member referred to recent bye-elections in Hubli where the Congress nominees were defeated solely on this issue of linguistic States. The writing is clear on the wall and I think the Government should come forward with a comprehensive Bill granting linguistic States in the South as early as possible. They should not try to concede with ill grace and put in certain clauses in the Bill which are going to hamper the formation of linguistic States. The Andhra State has come

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

into existence—will come into existence immediately this Bill is passed, but it is an incomplete State. We have been hearing in this House from all sides cries for the disintegration of Hyderabad State. I would request Members to change the word 'disintegration' and use the word 'integration'. Several Members have said on behalf of Mysore that they will gladly welcome it if the Kannada-speaking districts of Bombay, Madras and Hyderabad are attached to them. They never said that the Kannada-speaking districts of Madras and Bombay should be formed into a State and Mysore disintegrated, because there is one district of Telugu-speaking people, and the remaining disintegrated Mysore districts attached to the newly formed State. When we think of disintegration of a State and the creation of a new State, we are creating all sorts of difficulties. Why should we disrupt the administration? If instead of disintegration we follow the method of integration, dispensing of justice and continuity of administration will not be dislocated and integration will be a homogeneous affair. I say this because in the case of Kerala several speakers have pointed out that it would be far better if the Malayalam-speaking districts are attached to Travancore-Cochin. Of course, these States will have to be converted from Part B to Part A States. The Rajpramukhs are there by an Order of the President. The agreement between the ruling Princes and the Indian Union guaranteeing their privy purses is quite apart from their appointment as Rajpramukhs. So they may continue to enjoy their privy purses. That is quite a different question. But their appointment as Rajpramukhs can be cancelled and we can easily convert these States into Part A States by a proper integration on a linguistic basis. The reason why I say this is quite clear. Hyderabad, in my opinion, has always been a Telugu State. Look at its history for the last two hundred years. It was predominantly a Telugu State with 90 per cent of the people speaking Telugu language, but by the

circumstances of history or by treaties between the Nizam and the British the Telugu-speaking parts ceded from Hyderabad. Why don't we join them again to Hyderabad? Will that not be far better? All these problems—the problem of capital, the problem of High Court, etc.—will be solved if that is done. My contention is that even now, if we examine the State figures, it will be found that Hyderabad has got 51 per cent of Telugu-speaking people, there are only 24 per cent of Marathi-speaking people, only 11 per cent of Kannada-speaking people and there are about 14 per cent of the people who speak Urdu and Hindi. But of these 14 per cent, at least 9 to 10 per cent know Telugu. If we add these Telugu-speaking people to the main Telugu-speaking population of 51 per cent, we get 60 per cent. In spite of all care there will be some percentage of linguistic minorities in every State. The minorities' percentage may vary from 30 to 10 per cent. We may have a State where there may be 60 per cent of the people speaking the main regional language or 90 per cent of the people speaking the principal regional language, but the minorities will continue to be there. And therefore, even at this late stage I would request the Home Minister to reconsider this question that instead of going into all these expensive and complicated matters, he should consider the question of integrating these 11 or 12 districts with the Hyderabad State. I do not know how the question of transferring non-Telugu districts comes in, when we are discussing this Andhra Bill. If the Government takes back this Bill and brings in a complete Bill, embracing all the States I will have no objection, if the two or three districts of Kannada-speaking people are transferred from this newly-created Andhra State to Mysore State; and similarly, the Marathi-speaking districts

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY Do you know the feelings of that one district in Mysore State? The people do not want to go outside Mysore.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: We are quite prepared to give two districts.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): But you have wholeheartedly supported the Bill.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I have said that the two districts of Kannada-speaking people in the Hyderabad State be immediately joined to the Mysore State. Because we are considering just now the Andhra State Bill and the question of Karnataka Province has not arisen, we can create the Andhra State by joining the Telugu-speaking districts of Madras State to Hyderabad State. It is a process of integration.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: It will be monstrosity.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Mr. Sundar-ayya says that it will be monstrous. Now let us consider that. The Telugu-speaking districts which are going to be joined to Hyderabad, according to my proposal, will have a population of 23 millions of which 20 millions will be Telugu-speaking and 3 millions non-Telugu-speaking.

Hyderabad has a population of 17 million, of which 9 million are Telugu and 8 million are non-Telugu-speaking. If we join up, we will get a total population of 40 million out of which 30 million will be Telugu-speaking; that is 75 per cent. I fail to see how it becomes a monstrosity.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: What about the Maharashtrians?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: There will be 10 millions of Maharashtrians, Tamilians and Kannadigas. Immediately we may bring in another Bill transferring the Kannada portions to Mysore. I welcome the words "Boundary Commission". A high power Boundary Commission is going to be set up. Mark the words that have been used in this connection by the Government. We are not instituting a high power Commission to break

up old States in order to create new States. The high power Commission is going to consider the simple question of how by adjusting the boundaries and by transferring one district or one taluk here or there, we can make our States more homogeneous linguistically. We are really going in for the wrong method of creating linguistic States. Our method should be merely adjustment of boundaries in creating new States and not to disintegrate the old States. That way we will be disrupting continuity of administration. Somebody said that we were in the midst of the Five Year Plan and that the creation of linguistic States will upset our economic programmes. But if we have merely transference of districts, our planning will not be affected, our administration will not be affected. With Hyderabad, the new Andhra State will have a population of 40 million and its revenues will be Rs. 65 crores, and it will be the biggest State in India after U.P. With Rs. 65 crores we can do greater justice to the future planning of the Andhra State. All the river valley projects can be taken up. This will be a big advantage. The other advantage is that even when the 7 or 8 million people who speak Marathi or Kanarese languages leave Hyderabad, still we shall have a population of nearly 33 million people and a revenue of Rs. 55 crores. It will be a very viable and economic unit. We are talking about the Tungabhadra Project. So far the Tungabhadra Project has been a matter between Hyderabad and Madras. If we transfer these Madras districts where they actually belong, the Tungabhadra Project will become the sole concern of Andhra. According to this Bill, some parts will go to Mysore, some will remain with Andhra, and actually we are creating new problems. By my method we will solve all these problems. The people of Hyderabad have no love for the Nizam. The Nizam has always stood in their way, has always acted against the interests of Hyderabadis, and if for the sake of this Nizam you want to keep Hyderabad intact now and then after three or four years disintegrate it. then

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

during these three or four years there will be great deal of heart-burning. Why allow room for this? Let all the four linguistic States be brought into being by the Boundary Commission transferring some districts from this side to the other side. The Boundary Commission should not go to the areas concerned because, if they do, people will come forward with all sorts of representations and deputations. The Boundary Commission should sit in Delhi. They have got all the data, and on the basis of the census figures they can easily decide which district should go to which State.

SHRI K. B. LALL (Bihar): Sir, I must thank you for affording me an opportunity to address this empty House. I don't even know whether there is a quorum now. I must congratulate the Government on bringing forward this Bill and I give my support to this Bill. Although I do not personally believe in linguistic provinces, realities cannot be ignored. Time was when I had put a question here that the posts in the Railways should go to the different provinces on the population basis. When there was a cry that services in Railways should be given to the men of a particular province in proportion to the mileage of line that runs in that particular province, at once Government said that they did not believe in distribution of services on the provincial basis. Then there was clapping from all sides of the House, from the patriots of the House, and they said "We cannot afford to speak in terms of provincialism". It is quite all right if you can't speak about provincialism; but it is just the thing I would like to call hypocrisy. Take any man, scratch him, he is a provincialist; open out his heart and ask him; he will say: "Yes, I am a provincialist". If this is true, then why don't you set about adjusting things properly. The linguistic provinces demand is only a cry for adjustment. This is, of course, necessary; it is also an evil. So you will have to adjust between these two things. There is no use saying that if you dis-

integrate States, we cannot have nationalism and so on. The demand of the people here is for the formation of linguistic provinces and you cannot cover it up with any specious argument. You will have to look at the question wholly. Even to beget progeny is an evil; how many people are there to avoid it? Having begotten of them, are you going to kill them? You will have to make some sort of adjustment. So also with the Provinces or States on a linguistic basis. Here is love in the heart of everybody for that. Face the fact before you; please do not take resort to hypocrisy. If somebody talks of high philosophy in the name of integration and at the same time practises the low and mean method of filling the posts in his office with men of his province, is that not hypocrisy? What is the use of covering this by specious arguments. Be honest. Do not say, we do not believe in linguistic provinces, we do not believe in the disintegration of the country. So, I was telling you how you ought to adjust these. I have a suggestion to make. So far as Bihar is concerned, I can tell you outright we have no provincial feeling; I am opening out my heart and even give a challenge to all that let us drown the provincial languages and literatures in the ocean and let us not have anything to do with anything that smacks of provincialism. Let us henceforth be ashamed of calling ourselves Biharis, Bengalees, Madrasis, Punjabis, Gujratis or by any name that is provincial. We are all cosmopolitan in our language, in our dress and everything. So, we have nothing to lose. But ask if the Bengalees or people from any other province whose language and literature are well developed and have a distinctive culture are prepared to drown their separate distinctive culture and merge in one national culture whatever it may be decided upon. So I was only going to give you an idea that we are not provincial minded people. If I argue for a linguistic province, I do so because it is a necessity just as you have to tolerate a progeny which turns out to be bad. You have to send him to the school and not to the gallows.

Similarly you have to adjust and not to send them to the gallows. That adjustment can only be made by recognising the real facts. You go on covering up everything under the specious plea that you don't believe in provincialism, etc. and that you believe in open competition in order to take people from all provinces, and then in the U.P.S.C. you support your own people. What you should do is to fix a proportion in the Central Services for all the provinces. But then you say 'Our efficiency will suffer' as if only certain provinces are a repository of efficiency and not others.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: If that is done Bihar will get nothing.

SHRI K. B. LALL: I understand what Bihar will get. In the beginning when we had our province we were also told 'You have no merit'. Now Bihar is manning even the High Court and there are judges from Bihar not only in the Supreme Court but Bihar is providing judges to other provinces. Bihar is proud of even providing the first President to the country. Those who said Bihar had nothing have lived to see what is happening in Bihar. Not only in Bihar. Take any backward province. I am not arguing for one State and I am arguing for the whole of India—even the most backward State. You give an opportunity and you will find that brain will come from there. Your hands will be tied if proportion is fixed in the matter of recruitment to the Central Services. Because you are sitting in the chair in the high office, you find that all the brains come from your own province. I am not accusing any particular province. So long as you bring this specious plea that efficiency will suffer, that is only for swallowing down the loaves and fishes of office. If you fix proportions in the Central Services according to population in the various States, you will see that this idea will be put an end to. You talk of nationalism. The Andhras say they were suffering like anything in Madras. I can very well realize what could have been their condition. You will say it is bad to

talk of provincialism or that parochialism is bad. You give very good advice when it suits you but when it comes to your own self, then you forget it. People said 'Don't talk of provincialism or this or that language', but when it was suggested that there should be one language for the whole of India, that we are having the necessity of having a common language for the whole of India and that Hindi should be that language, then out came your nationalism. Those nationalists who used to talk about it said 'We cannot tolerate that'. Voices came from Maharashtra, from Gujrat, from Tamil Nad, from Andhra and from all sides—Why? Because they said that the Hindi people will have an advantage over us as they have their mother-tongue of Hindi and so they will be taken in the services and we will lose the services. The question of the services came up when this subject was discussed in the Constituent Assembly. So there was so much opposition to this even from ardent nationalists because of the loaves and fishes of office, I mean in opposition to the national language being Hindi, the non-Hindi speaking people said that the Hindi-speaking people will be ahead of them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr Kailas Behari Lall, you are speaking on the Andhra Bill and not on the question of the services.

SHRI K. B. LALL: Sir, what I say is relevant, but if you consider it irrelevant, I shall stop there. The question of irrelevancy arises only in my case.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I characterise it as a loaves and fishes speech.

SHRI K. B. LALL: Yes, about which the hon. Member also is very particular.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have only five more minutes left.

SHRI K. B. LALL: Yes, Sir, I have only five more minutes and as I was interrupted two minutes have gone and

[Shri K. B. Lall.]

I have also lost the thread of my argument. As I was saying, this question of national language was also disregarded by those tall nationalists who used to talk so much about nationalism in the good old days, and again the question of loaves and fishes of office was the deciding factor. If we want to be frank, if we want to be candid, we should admit that there is a feeling that certain provinces have appropriated half of the Central offices, that some provinces have appropriated a fourth or a third of them. It will be very convenient to say that one should not talk about these things because it is parochialism, that it smacks of provincialism, that it smacks of the disintegration of the country and that it is a dangerous thing. But you are all along following this policy of disintegration of the country and sowing the germs of it, the poison of it, the poison of hatred of one another, the germ of fighting with each other all this time. If you once square up the matter, then there will be no scope for injustice, no scope for grabbing somebody else's share and then you will find people taking their right places. And that will show nationalism in the right place. That is how you will settle this matter. To cover it all up by false arguments will not do.

It was stated that what I was saying was not relevant. I was also asked what a Bihari had to do when Andhra Bill was being discussed? How is a man from Bihar concerned with the Andhra Bill? I may not be, but when the question of principle came up I thought I should stand up and say a few words. Yesterday, my hon. friend Shri Satyapriya Banerjee was referring to Bihar giving up certain portion of its area to Bengal. That, of course, was relevant. But I should also be given the opportunity to say that so far as that is concerned, old provinces should not be disrupted. I feel there should be linguistic provinces, but to think of disrupting them on false analogies will not do. I have got here a book on Manbhum to which my friend was referring and it relates to those

days when Bihar was separated and when memorandums were submitted to the British and it was decided very clearly that these parts should go to Bihar. As I have not much time at my disposal, I am unable to read out the relevant portions from this book and what the Chief Commissioner and others said about this question. But I have the book here and if my hon. friend wants, he can see it and he will find out the position for himself so that he may not all the time be repeating the same untruth in the hope that some time some people may come to believe it. That will not help anyone in any way. But as I have no time and as I have only one minute more perhaps, I stop here and ask my friend to refer to this book and he will find that his arguments have no legs to stand on.

SHRI S. BANERJEE (West Bengal)
Yes, I will do it.

SHRI K. B. LALL: Now, I will refer only to one more point.

An hon. Member from my own province, Babu Maheshwar Prasad Narain Sinha, referred to the formation of a Mithila Province. I say, if he is for a Mithila Province, I am for a Bhagalpur Province; we will also have to have a Magadha Province or, for that matter, each one of us politicians here must have one province formed. If that is to be the question, if all of us were to ask for a province, then there must be as many States as there are Members here. Of course, there should be some basis. Andhras have got it because Andhras are a distinct people and Telugu is a developed language; the Maharashtrians have their language and literature developed and they are a distinct people: so also is the case with the Bengalees. That should be the basis, not that every colloquial language must have a State; in that case, each one of us can have a State to boost us up. That is not the spirit and nothing useful will be done that way. I say that it is better not to rake up such questions. I am not slighting any man but I say that such things do not bring grace to the per-

sons who even propose it. Sir, there may be a Mithila State, there may be a Maghada State, there may be a Bhojpuri State and it may go on like that. But here is Dr. Mitra from Manbhum who does not like dismemberment of the province of Bihar even for Bengali language.

(Time Bell rings.)

With these words, I give my support to the Bill and I say that the hon. the Home Minister when bringing up a subsequent Bill, will look into proper adjustment so that there may be no bitterness between peoples of different States. He has said that an all-India Boundary Commission will look into these things. If at all integration of India is aimed at then such things must be avoided, such bitterness of heart as generates from injustice. You can only settle this question by going into the matter deep and doing justice for all, which only can cut at the root of the evils that are eating into the vitals of Indian integration.

With these words, Sir, I support the Bill.

SHRI T. V. KAMALASWAMY (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, listening to the debate, I find that while Members representing the fifty millions who are vitally affected by this Bill have not been given adequate opportunity to speak on this Bill at all. Members from non-Madras State have monopolised the debate. Any listener would have entertained a doubt as to whether this Bill dealt with the Andhra State or with Dr. Ambedkar, because every Member of the House has spent not less than half the time allotted to him in hacking down this historic "hack", as Dr. Ambedkar called himself.

Sir, I rise to congratulate the Andhra people on this historic occasion when they are on the point of achieving their long cherished goal of the formation of a State of Andhra, a goal which was accelerated by the self-immolation of that great martyr, Potti Sriramulu. Sir, the path that lies before the

Andhras is a hard one and full of difficulties. Their treasury is empty. Although they are rich in natural resources, they require money and technical skill to be exploited fully. They have got the Godavari and the Krishna and the Pennar which could be adequately exploited and made to yield rich dividends provided sufficient funds are forthcoming from the Centre and provided they are able to get them harnessed through technical engineering skill for the use of the people. On behalf of the Tamilians I assure the Andhras that whatever problems and whatever difficulties face you we will always be with you, we will offer you our unstinted co-operation and I am sure with our joint efforts you will reach higher and higher stages of prosperity.

Sir, it is of the utmost importance to remember that our economies have been intermingled most intimately. Yours is an agricultural economy and ours is an industrial economy. Let us in our efforts in future try to supplement and complement each other. Let us not try to compete with each other. We have our textile mills and our other industries and you have a surplus of food crops. Let us try to exchange goods. Let us not waste our efforts in competitive schemes. As an example to show that all our economies are mingled together most intimately I will only show the example of the film trade. In the South the audience to whom the films are exhibited is restricted to some 20 or 30 millions because that is the size of each language group. So during the past ten years it has become the fashion to do so and it is profitable only if the film producer produces his film in a bi-lingual language, that is to say, there will have to be Telugu versions and Tamil versions of the same film and this has helped not a too little to put the industry on a sound footing in that part of the country.

Sir, while I stress the importance of there being cordial relations and goodwill and co-operation between the

[Shri T. V. Kamalaswamy.]

Andhra and the Tamil I may just say that there will still be 50 lakhs of domiciled Andhras spread over the entire length and breadth of Tamil Nad starting with Cape Comorin and ending with Katpadi, and hon Members will remember that at one time, out of the ten Tamil districts the Presidents of the District Boards and the public prosecutors were all Andhras. So many Chief Ministers have been Andhras, e.g., Kumaraswami Reddiar and Omandur Ramaswami Reddiar. They have all occupied high positions of prestige and respect. It is, therefore, Sir, up to the Andhras, when they think of their own State, to behave in such a manner as to instil confidence in the Tamils who will still be left there so that these five million Andhras spread over the length and breadth of Tamil Nad might not be made into hostages.

Then I come to the question of linguistic States. It pained me very much to see my friend Mr. Rajagopalan, one of the members of the Tamil Nad Congress, to come forward and say that this is not the opportune moment for creating Tamil Nad. Sir, he says, "First things first." He does not understand the feeling of the people at the present juncture.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: I said that the Tamil Nad people do not want a separate Tamil State.

SHRI T. V. KAMALASWAMY: The demon of linguism has been liberated once and for all. I would draw his attention to the fable in the Arabian Nights where the fisherman who fished out the pot from the ocean and liberated the demon could not put it back again, when it was about to devour him, by any method, other than a trickery. No such trickery can avail against the wishes of the people who have clearly demonstrated their strength by winning against the Government party during the recent bye-elections. The advantages of living in a multi-lingual State are many. It teaches us a spirit of tolerance—to

tolerate other people and their opinions. It does not make us fanatics of one's own language in the same way as the protagonists of Hindi are behaving today. We in the South know how to appreciate the culture of other people I would draw the attention of those people who speak Hindi and who want to impose this Hindi on the non-Hindi areas to the famous saying of Kipling who was the greatest lover of the English language.

How little of England do they know

Who only England know!

In the same way I will tell my Hind friends—

How little of Hindi do they know

Who only Hindi know!

You try to learn some language of the South and then you will know the difficulty of learning a new language and then only you will appreciate our difficulties in learning Hindi. Sir, linguistic States have come to stay; they cannot be made to vanish with a wave of the wand.

Having made these general observations, Sir, I should like to say a few words about Tamil Nad. While I am happy that the Andhra friends have already got their State, we have got a feeling of sadness, because in this same surgical operation the State of Tamil Nad could have been brought into being by the Government of India. It is a very painful thing for the "residuary State" as it is called to be brought on to the operation table frequently. All these operations create a lot of bad blood. Many of our friends who have been our friends all along are parting company. Passions have been roused to a great extent. The Government of India could have very easily carved out the district of South Kanara and added it on to Mysore; they could have added the district of Malabar to Travancore-Cochin and simultaneously we would have had our Tamil Nad. Four States—Kannada, Kerala, Andhra and Tamil—could have been formed at the same time. The inability of the

Central Government to do this is certain to result in internecine quarrels for some years to come, until the Boundary Commission settles it.

One other point. In the district of Chittoor there are six taluks including Tiruttani which are predominantly Tamilian. I cannot understand why the framers of the Bill should have adopted one procedure for the Kannada-speaking area in Bellary taluk and a different procedure in respect of these six taluks. Why could they not have given the same treatment to those six taluks of the Chittoor district and incorporated it in this Bill itself. I do not want to labour the argument and I would leave it at that. Anyhow it is too late and I would leave it to the Boundary Commission to rectify those defects.

Then, Sir, there is the case of 1½ million Tamilians living in the 8 taluks of Travancore-Cochin in areas contiguous to Tamil Nad areas. These people have been agitating constitutionally for the past seven years—ever since independence—indicating their desire to merge with the State of Tamil Nad. But constitutional agitations and representations have no effect on this Government. This Government sits up and takes notice only when lots of its property are looted or burnt. These people of South Travancore have no railway stations to burn. They have some post offices. Even if these are burnt down, there is an alternative *anjali* service of the State Government which is run on more efficient lines. So they started burning Travancore paper currency and stamps which, as you know, Sir, are scarce in the State of Travancore-Cochin. The people there are in a

most dangerous and explosive state of mind. The sooner the Government realises the strength of their feelings and takes steps to integrate the 15 lakhs of people with their brethren in Tamil Nad the better it will be for the country.

Sir, as regards the payment of compensation for the city of Madras, I would like to emphasise that Madras is an open city. Madras City is a most cosmopolitan city and the mayoralty is given by rotation to members of different communities—Hindus, Christians, Muslims, Harijans, etc. There are seven or eight classes to whom it is given by rotation. The Andhras are welcome to that city and I do think they will do well not to press for any compensation, because they have not lost Madras City. Madras will always welcome them. No compensation on account of Madras should be given to the Andhras. Moreover we have no money to pay.

And finally, Sir, I would appeal to all linguistic States—because most of them are represented here in this House—not to indulge in quarrels with each other, because all the States in the South are economically backward and they should co-operate with each other more fully, as they have got to fight a common fight against the Centre, because in the Central Government we all have a common step-mother.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Katju will reply tomorrow. The House stands adjourned till 8-15 A.M. tomorrow.

The Council then adjourned till a quarter past eight of the clock on Tuesday the 8th September 1953.