

COUNCIL OF STATES

Saturday, 12th September 1953

The Council met at a quarter past eight of the clock, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

THE ANDHRA STATE BILL, 1953—continued

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it was not my intention to participate in the discussion on the Seventh Schedule, but the provocative speeches made on the other side have compelled me to speak. Sir, the hon. Shri Kommareddi Suryanarayana was saying that the Madras Government had been very harsh to them all those days and the people of Andhra had been neglected for the past so many years. He said, "Let us have 1920 as the basic year and we shall proceed on that basis." When I questioned him about the sanctity of the year 1920, he could not say anything. He had fixed the year 1920 peremptorily. Sir, even if we take 1920 as the basic year, from 1920 up to 1937 the Justice Party was in power in Madras and all the Ministers were either Andhras or Malayalees and there was not a single Tamilian.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore): Does the hon. Member mean the Premier or the Minister?

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: The Chief Minister. The diarchical system was there. The Justice Party Chief Ministers were either Andhras or Malayalees. And if they did not get a proper share or equal treatment at their hands, it is not our fault. Sir, then Rajaji came in 1937 and remained in power for two and a half years. But at the same time our revered leader Shri Prakasam was the Deputy Chief Minister, and he had nothing to complain about all those two and a half years. And even then the Britishers were in power. Sir, it will be better if we take 1947 as the basic year. Prior to 1947—to use a very off-quoted phrase—the British

imperialists were there in this country. Whatever has been done in the Madras State or in any part of India, should be attributed to them—the British imperialists—because they did not want our country to prosper and they had no soft corner either for Tamilians or for Andhras. So, prior to 1947, whatever was done, was by the British Administration. On August 15, 1947, we attained freedom and it would be better if we see from August 15, 1947, whether the State of Madras has been unfair or partial to the Andhra State. Sir, it has been claimed here by my friend Mr. Kommareddi Suryanarayana that enormous money has been invested in Tamil Nad out of the funds collected from the Andhra people. Sir, the facts are clear. Even till the very end of the last Ministry, an Andhra had been the Finance Minister, and it would not have been difficult for them to get the necessary figures from him. It is now said here that they were not supplied with the figures. They had enough Andhra officers in the Secretariat Departments, and I do not think they would have refused them the figures. But because the figures were not convenient for them to be quoted, they have tried to take shelter under the plea that they were not able to get the necessary figures. Sir, out of Rs. 117 crores of investment made in the capital expenditure in the State of Madras since 1947, a sum of Rs. 87 crores was raised by means of loans either from the public or from the Government of India and only Rs. 30 crores have been spent from the Revenue Reserves. Out of that, Sir, the total expenditure in the residuary Madras State is Rs. 68 crores in the Andhra State it is Rs. 35 crores, and in the territories that are going to the Mysore State it is Rs. 14 crores. Sir, in respect of the loan of Rs. 87 crores, the Andhra State is not going to be burdened with repayment of the loan. It will be seen, Sir, that even then the allocation has been quite unfair to us. We have been asked to shoulder more responsibilities than what legitimately belong to us. Sir, I am not going to

[Shri T S Pattabiraman]

burden the House by giving any detailed figures, but if these figures are worked out it will be seen that the burden of taxes on the residuary State of Madras will be greater in proportion to the investment that has been made in the State of Madras Sir, that is with regard to the assets and liabilities

Then Sir some Members have alleged that the hon Dr Katju has arbitrarily fixed up an amount in his own way Sir those hon Members can pursue in this connection Mr Justice Wanchoo's Report The Seventh Schedule is only a reproduction of Mr Justice Wanchoo's Report The Wanchoo Report has clearly laid down what should be the apportionment of assets and liabilities and that has been faithfully followed by the Home Minister There has been no deviation in regard to that And therefore it is no use blaming the Central Government The Seventh Schedule is the entire reproduction of Wanchoo Report and nothing more Sir, it may be pointed out that the Wanchoo Report has made some deviation from the well-accepted principle What is the principle, Sir? The shares of income-tax and Union excise duties are given to the State of Madras now 80 per cent on the basis of population and 20 per cent on the basis of collection that is made in the State But, today what does the Wanchoo Report say? What has the Home Minister said? He has deviated from the very well defined principle and has said "You will get the entire 100 per cent on the basis of population" Sir it may look very small it may look very simple, but do you know that till the next financial allocation is made, the residuary State of Madras will have to lose Rs 30 lakhs every year because of this wrong allocation? Well, we are given a share from the Central Government 80 per cent on the basis of population and 20 per cent on the basis of collection, but when we give a share to the Andhra State we have to give the entire 100 per cent on the basis of population Sir, the principle on

which we get our share from the Central Government has not been made applicable to what we have to give to the Andhra State Sir, this is a very great deviation and nobody seems to have pointed it out

Then Sir coming to the question of the second deviation I would like to say that the distribution of the Central Road Fund to the State Government is made according to Parliament's Resolution dated 14th April 1950 The distribution of this Road Fund to the States is made on the principle laid down by Parliament. Sir you will find that this principle again has been deviated from and it has been thrown overboard, and the Andhra State is getting more out of this Fund I do not want to burden this House with details but I would certainly say that this second deviation has been made in favour of the Andhra State

Then, Sir there has been another deviation and the most important deviation, which has been without precedent, and that is that we have been asked to pay compensation of Rs 230.4 lakhs I am not worried about the amount because the amount of Rs 230.4 lakhs is not going to the Andhra leaders The amount is going to the Andhra people and therefore we are not worried at all But what is the principle involved in it Sir, I would not have raised this point but for the unwarranted allegation that has been levelled against us that the Tamilians are well treated Therefore I will have to voice my feelings. What about the distribution of Rs 230.4 lakhs? Sir, paragraph 89 of Mr. Justice Wanchoo's Report lays down how he got that figure of Rs 230 lakhs Sir the principle laid down in that Report is that all the properties on the soil will be going to the respective States Sir, that principle has been laid down there and it has been accepted that wherever the property is situated it will go to that particular State But he has asked us to pay compensation To pay compensation, on what grounds? Did the

Tamilians want the Andhras to go' Did the Tamilians ask the Andhras to get out of their State Andhras wanted a province Now it is being claimed that they want compensation in order to make their economic position strong and all that Sir, if any logic is applied this claim of theirs would not stand There is absolutely no precedent Sir the tables will be turned against them when Hyderabad is going to be demarcated and disintegrated The Andhra leaders are claiming that the hon Minister Dr Katju, has been very good to them in giving them Rs 230.4 lakhs But they will have to face the music when Hyderabad is going to be the capital of Andhra And they will get it very soon Hyderabad city is worth several crores and when the Andhras get it, Prof Ranga and Mr Sundarayya will have to face trouble because Karnataka and Maharashtra will claim Rs 70 crores as compensation And the entire Andhra State will have to be mortgaged for that I am not opposed to it But you are setting a wrong precedent and you will have to face the music then When you set up a wrong precedent you are going to face the music Sir, when the Hyderabad question comes up, you will find that the Kannada and Maharashtra friends will quote chapter and verse from the speeches of the hon the Home Minister here and also the speeches of Prof Ranga Mr Suryanarayana and others and will be asking for crores of rupees from the Andhra State and then it will be our turn to look at you and smile

Then Sir, in paragraph 93 of Mr Justice Wanchoo's Report, how has he arrived at the figure of Rs 230.4 lakhs? He has taken into consideration the educational institutions in the residuary Madras State, the hospitals, the workshops, the museum and the aquarium The inclusion of the aquarium and the museum is certainly illogical and indefensible The official buildings can of course, be included, but what about the museum? Anybody from any State can come and see the museum My friend, Mr C. G. K. Reddy, can come and

have a look at it whenever he finds the time When all people can come and see it why should we be made to compensate the Andhras for it? This seems illogical and indefensible Only the official buildings and residences and the Legislative buildings should have been taken into account. If this had been done if this principle had been accepted, the book value of the relevant assets, without ever allowing for depreciation, would be only less than Rs 150 lakhs But what is the principle adopted in paragraph 12 of the Seventh Schedule? If was emphasised by the Finance Minister in the other House that the actual expenditure in the books should be taken into consideration without making any allowance for variations in the level of price from time to time On this principle the so-called compensation would only be 36 per cent of Rs 150 lakhs, i.e. Rs 54 lakhs Even if we double the book value the compensation would only be Rs 1 crore

Then Sir, I come to the Partition Committee's findings They said at the time that the Andhras would be satisfied with Rs 1 crore that this amount was sufficient for them At that time the conditions were entirely different We had Rs 40 crores in the Revenue Reserve Fund but today we have not even 40 pies Today when we have not even a pie when we have spent everything we had on the famine stricken areas of Tamil Nad and Andhra you are taking away this amount You are only robbing us The Government is only robbing poor Peter to pay Paul The Home Minister has been very kindly and considerate to the Andhras He is being addressed by the Andhras as Katju Pantulugaru because he has been so considerate to them because he has been so good to them

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar) What is 'Pantulugaru'?

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN Pantulugaru is an affectionate title

● MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. It is a title of honour.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: He is called Katju Pantulugaru in Andhra and I am sure my Andhra friends will soon erect a statue for him along with that of Potti Sriramulu. The hon. the Home Minister has been so kind to them, but we are not sorry. We Tamilians have suffered. Nature has been unkind to us. Floods have been unkind to us. Parties have been unkind to us. But Tamilians are not sorry.

Then I come to Tirupathi. In Tirupathi there is property worth Rs. 1 crore mainly contributed by Tamilians. Shri Venkatachalapathi is not the family diety of the Andhras, but every Tamilian, wherever he is, worships Venkatachalapathi of Tirupathi.

SHRI RAMA RAO (Madras): Take it away, take it away.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: We are giving the whole temple to you. We would like you to prosper in the new State, and that is why we will come there year after year and pay our offerings to Lord Sundarayya and Lord Ranga through Lord Venkatachalapathi. We have no grouse against them. What we say is that we are not asking for compensation for this. There have been many other things also for which we could have asked for compensation but we did not do it because we do not want to burden the new State. If we must part, let us part with a kiss and not with a kick. When the delta of Cauvery was suffering, the whole province came to our rescue. Today the Delta of Godavari is unkind to you. What happened. We were the first to transfer Rs. 50 thousand for rescue of the flood-stricken people of Godavari. Sir, politicians can afford to quarrel, politicians can afford to talk of linguism but the common people do not mind to which linguistic area they belong, because it is grinding poverty which is the cementing factor between them. It is not linguism that binds them. It is not religion that binds them.

I said, Sir, that politicians have been unkind to us. Nature has been

unkind to us. Today the handloom weavers of Madras are suffering, and my heart bleeds when I see hundreds of handloom weavers of Salem going about begging in the streets of Delhi. It is not a question of which part of the country they belong to. How is this problem going to be solved? Today the Andhra province has come and in the process it has led to terrible unemployment. As the new State was to come, all work was stopped, all projects were stopped, and that has resulted in terrible retrenchment and unemployment. This has been the first result of the creation of a new State of Andhra. Sir, as Shylock said in *The Merchant of Venice* "Suffering is the badge of our tribe", I can say today that suffering is the badge of Tamilians, but I have every confidence and hope that like the phoenix of old, we will once again rise from the ashes as a great State.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): I would request you, Sir, to see that our Tamilian and Andhra friends do not proceed from words to blows.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They will not.

THE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS AND STATES (DR. K. N. KATJU): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I, for one, am greatly indebted for the kindness with which I have been treated in this House and elsewhere. I have no grievance for all the soft words that have been spoken about me by my hon. friends, Prof. Ranga and Mr. Sundarayya. They are very dear friends, and I do not wish to make any long speech at the end of this discussion which on the whole in this House has been very seemly, and very cordial and has been conducted in an atmosphere which suits the dignity of the House.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Madras): He is making his speech as though it were the Third Reading now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He knows it.

DR K N. KATJU: The Third Reading will come later. I know it. The question under discussion now relates to clause 47 and the Seventh Schedule. This section is of great importance. Apart from the details of the Bill, this particular matter has aroused great passion, great excitement, as was witnessed in the speech that was just now delivered.

PROF G RANGA (Madras). I think it was a make-believe.

DR K N KATJU: He says it was a make-believe. Then he is a very fine advocate of it. Now I must say that I am greatly indebted to my hon friend Mr Sundarayya who, in this House, has, I think with justification, pleaded that he is almost the sole representative of the Andhras and he has evidently devoted great labours and great pains to the consideration of every clause in this Bill. I had heard elsewhere and in some discussions that there was a lot of hocus pocus about the division of assets and liabilities and that this refusal to consider it under the various detailed provisions of the Seventh Schedule and to distribute it on the basis of the population was likely to cause enormous damage to the Andhras. Somewhere Rs. 20 crores were mentioned, somewhere Rs. 40 crores were mentioned and elsewhere the figure was estimated at Rs. 24 crores, and I tell you that I was very considerably relieved to learn from Mr. Sundarayya's analysis that the only difference which would remain would be a crore and a half. So I thought that was the most convincing answer to the complaints which have been made by the Andhra people that clause 47 and the Seventh Schedule are likely to cause them untold damage. The untold damage on an analysis of figures by Mr Sundarayya, who went into the figures at great length, is only a crore and a half. What is a crore and a half? I have been saying many times that I am most anxious you are most anxious, the Government of India is most anxious, the whole country is most anxious that this chapter of

controversy between the two parts of Madras should close and as from the appointed day the Government should settle down to its great problems. Why was this Andhra province being established? What was the necessity of it at all? The call came because they said, "We are one homogeneous people, our interests have been neglected, we have not got our due share. Make us masters of our own homes and we will show you what can be done. We are a very fine people." We are all agreed upon that. They said, "We will as soon as we start on our own, within five years, show what can be done towards the welfare of our people, raising the standard of living, removing unemployment, and making the tenants and cultivators prosperous"—the tenants and cultivators whom my hon friend Prof Ranga has represented with so much distinction for the last 30 years. Now that time will come from the 1st October and I am personally most anxious that there should be nothing to divert the attention of the Andhra Government from that great purpose to any other indirect, small purpose—and that small purpose now comes to a crore and a half.

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA: Provided that 30 crores is

DR. K N KATJU. Please don't get away from your own speech.

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA: I calculated the figures on the basis of Rs 87 crores but we are given another figure of Rs 117 crores of which Rs 30 crores, you say, have come from the revenues and I asked a question and I would like you to reply, as to how these 30 crores of rupees which have been spent from the revenues on the income-bearing assets are divided between Tamil Nad and Andhra.

DR K N. KATJU: I would ask my hon friend to read his own speech and not raise the figure to about Rs 30 crores. He said himself that it was only Rs 1½ crores. I have got that one point. In the first place, now I

[Dr K N Katju]

don't have the figures and I don't know how much has been, for instance, spent on the recent Godavari floods. Everybody agrees and there is unanimous opinion that the Madras Government under the leadership of Shri Rajaji has done wonders. Nobody on the face of the earth could have gone more quickly to the relief and the distress and suffering in the Godavari areas. I am very happy—Prof Ranga says and so everybody says and it must have meant some money. So if this sum is so small, then I respectfully suggest this. The moment you give the Commission—we thought over it when we framed the Bill—there would be Andhra representatives, Tamil representatives and the Judge, and—I don't know why the institution of a Judge calls for advocacy, and the advocacy is bound to be a very disturbing function and the result would be that the people in both these States and their energies will be devoted not to nation-building purposes but to this particular purpose. My hon friend raised the question about Rs 30 crores and all that. I have suggested a very small expedient and that is this. Let the Andhra Government depute certain officers of their own to go into all these questions in the Secretariat, ask for the help of Mr Sundarayya—he is an expert because he has studied it so acutely and he will be there to help them—and within 3, 4 or 5 months in the light of the information that may be available make out a case and send it to the Chief Minister of Madras Government and ask him what he has to say. Ask him, "Or this distribution we are entitled to so much money." Ask for some sort of harmonious discussion. If you cannot arrive at an agreement, there is clause 51 of the Bill specifically enacted or to be enacted now, for this very purpose authorizing the President to remove inequities and inequalities on a very wide scale. Three years' time has been given for this very purpose. Take advantage of it. Don't wait for 3 years. Do it in six months' time instead of having a public enquiry and drum-beating

about it and evidence-taking and summoning people and public investigation, and so on and so forth. The sum, I tell you, will not be very large. I don't want to go into this process because Mr Justice Wanchoo has dealt with it. I was reading his report again for the seventh time and he has gone into the details. One question he posed himself was this: "If an enquiry is to be made from what date?" Somebody suggested 1920—I don't know for what particular reason. There are so many factors. You are poor and neglected, and your contribution to the public exchequer must have been comparatively small. Then someone said that yours is a zamindari area and the zamindars—whom Prof Ranga like so much—contributed comparatively very little to the exchequer. It is the poor ryotwari, the poor cultivator who directly contributes. That makes a lot of difference. In Uttar Pradesh we had the figures. The cultivator pays Rs 18 crores. The zamindars in their turn paid anything between six to seven crores of rupees in the shape of land revenue.

SHRI H P SAKSENA Rs eight crores

DR K N KATJU Well, have it at eight crores. Maybe the rent amount then must have been a little larger. Anyway the difference between the two figures is about ten crores. Now that zamindari has been abolished, this Rs 10 crores will go to the treasury. Similarly in the southern parts the Tamil people who have the ryotwari system they must have been contributing to the public treasury something like double what was being paid by the zamindars in the shape of land revenue. Therefore, there are so many difficult questions.

SHRI T S PATTABIRAMAN And payment of compensation to zamindars

DR K N KATJU That is a different thing you may pay it or not pay it. That is a different matter altogether.

Therefore we considered this matter in the greatest detail with the aid of our experts. We came to the conclusion that the best thing would be in the interest of all both of Andhra-desh and of Tamil Nad, to close this chapter and leave it for discussion in a quite manner between the two ministries, and then if necessary, to the mediation if I may put it that way of the President so that this matter may be more amicably decided. We must avoid excitement—public excitement. Now the great Madras State in which they have been living for so many years together is now breaking up and we must restore if not preserve the utmost cordiality between the two parts. Of course you will have your own capital wherever it may be but there will be Madras and I am certain that there is among you great affection for the cit of Madras and people will come and go.

PROF. G. RANGA: There is even today great affection.

DR. K. N. KATJU: But I want that you should continue to live together and that continuance will come only if there is the best affection between the people. It is not a question of something on the governmental scale or level. If bickerings go on you would not like to go there. Where you are received in an atmosphere of hostility you would not like to go. We would not like to go there. That is the point.

To the Seventh Schedule many amendments have been moved. But what is the basic thing? I quite agree that the basic and real principle of division should be the population, and we have adopted it in so far as outsiders are concerned, loans payable and receivable shares in public utilities, shares of the excise income and the income-tax. My hon. friend here actually made a grievance of it. But I was told that the drift has been from the source or accrual to the consideration of population. When these States began to get a portion of the income-tax in their own budgets it was accrual or the place

where the income-tax had accrued. But gradually the Fiscal Commissions have been going towards the population basis. The present Fiscal Commission has I think gone to the extent of 80 per cent on the population and 20 per cent on the accrual basis. We have gone a little further we have in a way anticipated the decision of the future Fiscal Commission and given them the whole.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: The amount is only Rs. 30 lakhs.

DR. K. N. KATJU: What is Rs. 30 lakhs? Work hard and you will get Rs. 3 crores.

As I said we have had these amendments. One was that amounts given as advances to municipalities should be divided on the population basis, also money that has been advanced to co-operative societies in the shape of *taccavi*. Now, my experience has been that there is very little difference sometimes between a subsidy and a loan. If I were in the position of a man who wants money and if I go to the Government and they are prepared to give me a loan, I will take it. Who knows? If I get the money I may not pay it. If I do not happen to pay the money nobody is going to bring a suit. The Union Government is not going to bring a suit against the Madras State or the other State. Supposing the Union Government lends a loan of Rs. 5 crores to Bengal and Bengal spends it. After ten years when the time for

THE MINISTER FOR LAW AND MINORITY AFFAIRS (SHRI C. C. BRISVAS): You are giving very bad advice.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Please remember I am giving very sound advice. Let us suppose that after ten years the loan has to be paid. The repayment is demanded, but the Bengal Government says "Here is our Budget. How can we repay the loan? We have no money. Actually we want more."

[Dr. K. N. Katju.]

What is the Union Government to do? Are they going to take up the cudgels, bring a suit and take out a decree? If they do that, there will be further shouting.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Is this the view of the Central Government? Is the hon. Minister expressing the view of his Government?

PROF. G. RANGA: He is carried away by the beauty of his own argument.

SHRI B. RATH (Orissa): The Finance Minister probably agrees, for he remains mum.

DR. K. N. KATJU: All that I say is that for practical purposes, between a loan and a subsidy there is very little difference. I am only suggesting it as a private Member.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kunzru wants to know if this is the view of the Central Government.

SHRI B. RATH: The Finance Minister keeps mum.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Dr. Kunzru is much too serious. But my life has been mostly spent in the work of persuading people and when I saw the judge was a human being and he could be persuaded by a little light talk, I tried it.

What I have been suggesting is to look at the thing not from the financial angle but from the practical angle or.....

PROF. G. RANGA: The human angle?

DR. K. N. KATJU: Yes, from the human angle. Every State Government has been asking for more. Every day there is a demand. The Finance Minister says, "I will give you a loan, take it." They say, "Very well, give us the loan, payable, say, 10 years later." If I am well-off I will not only repay the loan but also contri-

bute something to the Central Government, because the Central Treasury is my own also. We are all tied together. But after ten years when the repayment ought to be made, if I am still starving or starving a little more than before, when the Finance Minister tells me that I should repay the loan, I ask him, "How can I? I will repay the loan with one hand and ask for more with the other." It comes to the same thing. That is the practical side, not the financial side. Financial purists and banks will put it in a different way. But I make no difference between the Central Government and the State Governments. The Central Government is not a third party banker which like Shylock must have its pound of flesh. The Central Government is part of you, it is all one indivisible whole. Therefore, I say the condition is, when you advance money to the cultivators as *taccavi*, or to the municipal boards, nobody knows when it would actually come back. Suppose you advance Rs. 4 lakhs to the Madura municipality and the date for repayment comes. But the Madura municipality is hard up, almost insolvent. What is the result? The Madras Government may send an auditor, they may send an accountant, and they may have a very detailed and close examination of the financial position of the municipality. But what will they do? They will say—having regard to the present financial condition of the Madura Municipal Board, the period of repayment is extended and instead of beginning from the 1st or March 1954, it might begin from the 1st of March 1958.

PROF. G. RANGA: The municipality will be superseded.

DR. K. N. KATJU: It will go on in that fashion even if it is done on a population basis, when repayment is considered. The same thing has been done in this case. Everybody knows that in the case of *taccavi* loans the cultivator if he is a solvent cultivator pays the money back. If the cultivator is poor then the *taccavi* is written off.

PROF. G. RANGA: I wish it were as easy as all that for our cultivators.

DR. K. N. KATJU: My submission is that if you go into this, item by item, it cannot be done. It is not like that that the Seventh Schedule has been formulated. My hon. friend here was very right in saying that so far as this subject is concerned, we have followed literally the recommendations in the Wanchoo Report.

For instance, I refer to that small item about the division of unused stores. You compare the language of the Seventh Schedule with that of the language of Mr. Justice Wanchoo. It is exactly the same—"three years' average". Then come many things. My hon. friend raised the question about Rs. 2,30,00,000 payable to the Andhra State for the very fine buildings. Of course, they are very good. The Madras Beach is one of the loveliest in the world. So also are the buildings of the High Court, the Board of Revenue and the Secretariat and we should be grateful ...

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: They were built by the Prince of Arcot and the British.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I always treat the Tamilians as the elder brother, and my experience is that when there is a separation in a joint family, the younger brother is given his share and the elder brother gives him a parting gift which is extra. He might say, "I am going to live in the ancestral house, it is a very precious thing, very dear and beloved. You will have to go and make up a new home of your own with which associations will have to spring up. Therefore, take Rs. 5 crores or Rs. 5,000, whatever it may be, as a parting gift from me". What is the good of your talking? Show your brotherliness by giving them money.

So, Sir, I can only say that I am unable to accept anyone of the amendments. I hope that the hon. House will pass clause 47 and the Seventh Schedule with general approval.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA (Madras): Sir, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I want to press my amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at page 15, ^{lines} 9-10, for the words 'in accordance with the provisions contained in the Seventh Schedule', the words and figures in proportion of their respective population, i.e., 62 2/3:36:1 1/3 as described in Seventh Schedule' be substituted."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 47 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 47 was added to the Bill

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will now take up the Seventh Schedule, paragraph by paragraph.

SHRI B. RATH: May I suggest, Sir, that all the amendments be put together without reading?

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: It cannot be done. Every amendment will have to be put separately.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Does the House approve of it.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: No, Sir, how can we put all of them?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have to put the amendments one by one.

The question is:

"That at pages 35-36, for paragraph 3, the following be substituted, namely:—

'3. Any unissued stores, articles or goods of any class shall be

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.]

divided between the States of Madras, Andhra and Mysore in the proportion of 62 2/3:36:1 1/3 or their value be adjusted in the same ratio in the assets of the three States'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at page 36, lines 8 to 10, for the words 'less depreciation where such depreciation is adjusted in the accounts of the Press', the words 'without any depreciation being deducted' be substituted."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at page 36 after line 18, the following be added namely:—

'Provided that the amount of such loans or advances is adjusted in the assets of the Madras, Andhra and Mysore States in the proportion of 62 2/3 :36:1 1/3'."

The motion was negatived.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras): I do not want to press my amendments Nos. 47 and 48.

The amendments were, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at page 37, after line 19, the following be added, namely:—

'Provided that the amount of such securities are adjusted in the assets of the Madras, Andhra and Mysore States in the proportion of 62 2/3 : 36 : 1 1/3'."

The motion was negatived.

9 A.M.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at page 37, after line 24, the following be added, namely:—

'Provided that the amount of assets and liabilities are adjusted between Madras, Andhra and Mysore States in the proportion of 62 2/3:36:1 1/3'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at page 38, lines 8 to 12, for the words 'to the total expenditure on all capital works and other capital outlays incurred in the territories of the States of Madras and Andhra and the transferred territory up to the commencement of the appointed day including the items dealt with in paragraph 9 of this Schedule', the word and figures 'of 62 2/3:36:1 1/3' be substituted."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at page 38, line 8, after the words 'total expenditure' the words 'incurred either from annual revenues or from loans raised from public or Central Government' be inserted."

The motion was negatived.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA: Sir, I want to press my amendments.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at page 38, line 16, after the word 'Andhra' the words 'which shall be decided before the appointed day at a meeting of the Andhra Members of the Madras Assembly to be convened by the Speaker of that Assembly' be inserted."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at page 38, after line 18, the following be added, namely:—

'Provided that the capital of the Andhra State shall be known as Sriramanagar.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at page 38, lines 19 to 22 be deleted."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at page 38, line 23, before the word 'amount' the word 'total' be inserted and the words 'public debt on account of' be deleted."

The motion was negatived.

SHRI S. VENKATARAMAN (Madras): Sir, I want to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Seventh Schedule stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Seventh Schedule was added to the Bill.

The Eighth Schedule was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We take up the Ninth Schedule. There is an amendment.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, I move:

"That at page 41, after line 13, the following be added, namely:—

'15. Nurses Training College attached to the Central Hospital, Madras.

16. The Government General Hospital and Stanley Hospital—post-graduate and up-graded department.

17. The Madras Medical College D.S.S.C. course.

18. The Government Dental College.

19. The Engineering College, Guindy—especially Tele-communication department'."

SHRI S. VENKATARAMAN: I am not moving my amendment, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment moved:

"That at page 41, after line 13, the following be added, namely:—

'15. Nurses Training College attached to the Central Hospital, Madras.

16. The Government General Hospital and Stanley Hospital—post-graduate and up-graded department.

17. The Madras Medical College D.S.S.C. course.

18. The Government Dental College.

19. The Engineering College, Guindy—especially Tele-communication department'."

Both the amendment and the Schedule are open for discussion.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, my amendment is a very modest one. The principle that has been followed in regard to other institutions in this Schedule is that these institutions or their counterparts do not exist in the Andhra area and, as such, the Andhra State should be allowed the same facilities as are now being enjoyed by people from Andhra. As there are no such institutions in the Andhra State, for such period—say at least ten years—as the Governments of Madras and Andhra may agree, these facilities should continue to be available. The principle is that those facilities which were available for both the Andhras and the Tamilians so far should continue to be available to the Andhras in future till such time

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]

as they are able to establish such institutions in their own territory.

It is for these reasons that I have mentioned these five items, namely, (1) The Nurses Training College attached to the Central Hospital, Madras, (2) The Government General Hospital and Stanley Hospital—post-graduate and up-graded department, (3) The Madras Medical College D.S.S.C. course, (4) The Government Dental College, and (5) The Engineering College, Guindy—especially Telecommunication department, for inclusion in the Ninth Schedule. There is no Nurses' Training College in Andhra and as such it is but reasonable that this thing should be also mentioned in the Ninth Schedule. Of course, there are two colleges in Andhra of which one is just half finished, but still in them there is no post-graduate and up-graded department. That is why I plead for the inclusion of item (2) and that is why I mentioned it so that the Andhras may get facilities in this regard. Similarly as regards item (3) above I must say that there is no D.S.S.C. course in Andhra and so item (3) should also be included. The same is the reason for the inclusion of item (4) above in the Ninth Schedule. Now I come to item (5) above, namely the Engineering College, Guindy, especially Telecommunication department. We have only one Engineering College and that is in Anantapuram which is just now starting but there is no Telecommunication department which this old established college has and that is the reason why I plead for its inclusion in the Ninth Schedule so that the Andhra students might get the benefit out of it. We have no post-graduate and other higher technical institutions and it is because they are not available in the Andhra State that I have moved for their inclusion in the Schedule. I do not know on what principle the Government have omitted these five institutions when they have included some 14 institutions in the Schedule as they are not available in Andhra and on the same ground they should have included

these five institutions also in the Schedule for the common use of both Madras and Andhra at least for a certain period. I do not know why the Government have excluded these five institutions. That is why I have moved this amendment and I hope that the Government even at this late hour will say that they accept this amendment.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I oppose the amendment because there is a fallacy in his argument and that is why I have to oppose. When the Ninth Schedule was drafted the framers of the Bill took into consideration what educational facilities were or were not available in the new Andhra State and in respect of those facilities which are not available now in Andhra State they have been allowed those facilities by the inclusion of some 14 items in the Ninth Schedule although the residuary Madras State could not be compelled to show this concession to Andhra. If certain items have not been included in the Schedule it is because facilities in respect of those items are certainly available in the proposed Andhra State.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Tell me where they are.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: Mr. Sundarayya can have a little patience. I am coming to his point. He mentioned about the Medical College.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Tell me where we have a Nurses Training College, which college is attached to the Central Hospital, Madras.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: Why don't you just wait a minute? There are two medical colleges in Andhra. My friend complains that there must be certain courses. As a matter of fact in the Vizag Medical College there is the staff for imparting education in dentistry and if my friend wants to institute D.S.S.C. course this can easily be done in these two colleges. These things can be introduced in a very short time, say, with-

in three months or six months. These courses can be introduced in your existing colleges by your State Government. When this can be easily done why do you want us to carry on the weight still further. Why do you want to swamp our colleges with your students still further when you can have the thing provided in your own colleges in your own State? Then, Sir, he talked about the Nurses Training College. As a matter of fact, Sir, it is well known that the nurses are trained in the General Hospital or in the available big hospitals. There are two hospitals in your area and attached to them you can start a Nurses College or a Nurses School immediately, even before the 15th of October if you so like. It is not a great thing. It is not impossible and it will not take a long time to do all these things. Now coming to the Engineering College, there is already an Engineering College available to them in their own proposed Andhra State and they have got a number of polytechnics also. I am objecting to the amendment not on the ground that the people of the residuary State of Madras do not want to allow the Andhras to continue to avail of certain facilities in Madras—it is far from our mind. When certain facilities are available to them in their proposed Andhra State itself why should they want to come to Madras and thus avail themselves of double facilities both in Andhra and in Madras as up to now and thus deprive the people of the residuary State of Madras of adequate facilities. I can see no controversy on that point. The list of institutions included in the Ninth Schedule is already exhaustive and undue concessions have been given to them. If they want to have double facilities they can go to the Bombay State which is very near or the Hyderabad State and why should they want more and more from Madras when they are already being given so many privileges and concessions at the time of their separation from Madras. I object to the amendment on the grounds put forward by me and I say that the list of institutions shown

in the Ninth Schedule should not be increased. Further, Sir, under clause 60 of the Bill the Madras Government and the Andhra Government can always have consultations and arrive at some agreements in this regard and if the Andhra Government is willing to abide by certain terms which may be necessary, financial and other, in this regard, by mutual agreement the list can be enlarged. They can always arrive at some agreements and clause 60 provides for that. We should not increase the list at this stage as it will be highly prejudicial to the interests of the residuary State of Madras. I oppose the amendment.

PROF. G. RANGA: I am extremely sorry for the attitude that has been displayed by my hon. friend. I thought he would be contented with what he had poured out on the earlier occasion. It is this attitude displayed by quite a number of friends like himself on both sides which has been responsible for what has come to be deplored by my hon. friend Dr. Katju and various other people also as being a bad atmosphere between these people. It is most unfortunate that these friends think mistakenly that they are helping their cause. On the other hand they are only harming it. By trying to appear like Shylock himself they do not help themselves but on the other hand they create such bad blood that it will worsen the relations between the people who are to settle down to good and friendly co-operation between themselves. I do not think my hon. friend has advanced any argument at all. He only brought about a petulant atmosphere

There is Pilani and there is an engineering college there but it is so far away from Andhra. It invites Andhras, Tamils and various other people from all over India. They are giving them seats in their engineering college. As my hon. friend has himself said, Banaras has always been an All-India University. It has welcomed Andhras as well as Tamil friends. So is the Calcutta University. All what Mr. Sundarayya's amendment seeks

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

to ask the Council to agree to is this. In addition to giving encouragement and help to Andhras in the manner in which all these other non-Andhra institutions are doing, since we had been together till now as partners in the same State, since all of us were responsible in bringing into existence and then developing all these institutions, since we do not have as good and as many of such institutions as you have, you will continue to allow us the benefit of those institutions for some time more in the future also. We would say that it is only right that for some years to come our boys and girls should be allowed the facilities as a matter of right because of our past association.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: Will you allow your colleges?

PROF. G. RANGA: If there is any which is good enough for you, you are surely welcome. Please be reasonable. You yourselves know that we do not have such institutions. (*Interruption.*)

As a matter of right let them be made welcome. That is all that the amendment seeks to say. Even that is not welcome to my hon. friend because he is too young and therefore he does not realise the wisdom of this amendment and this suggestion.

Sir, we have one Engineering College in Anantapur, but it is a baby college I should say. We have a Medical College in Guntur. It is only half of a college because after the first two or three years our students are obliged to go to Madras in order to complete their courses of studies. Then we have a full-fledged college in Vizagapatam. It reached its adult stage only a few years ago and it is short of equipment in very many directions. One relevant remark was made by Mr. Sundarayya to which there can be no answer at all from the other side, because there is only one Nurses College in the whole of the State. We waited for years and years. I remember reading the reports of the Nurses' Association and the Red Cross Association where the

Governors used to preside, making appeals to the people for contributing money in order that this noble Order of Nurses could be provided with a college. Now, at least the Madras State has come to have a first-class Nurses Training College and also quarters attached to it. We spent Rs. 90 lakhs and I am proud of that institution; I am proud because this is one of the unique institutions in the whole of this country but we waited for so many years. For how much longer would the Andhras have to wait before they could possibly come to have half as good an institution as this? Is it wrong on the part of the Andhras to expect that accommodation should be provided for their students, that hospitality should be offered for their students in that excellent nurses training institute?

SHRI M. S. RANAWAT (Rajasthan): Will the Andhras not be allowed in the present institute?

PROF. G. RANGA: That is exactly what Mr. Sundarayya's amendment seeks to suggest. In addition to their being able to go to a similar institution anywhere else in the whole of India, they should be expected to go there as a matter of right, as Dr. Katju had put it, to their own elder brother's institution. We had been waiting till now but I need not go into all that. Let us have a prior right here than we would be having in any other part of India. There is nothing wrong in it. This is not the approach that is to be made in answer to those people. If it is argued by our friends that first priority should be given to our own boys and girls, one could have understood. But they say, "No, no; do not come to us at all; go anywhere else." That is an attitude which is absolutely unbecoming of a Congressman—and my friend is a Congressman.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: Will he extend us the same facilities? That he is not prepared to answer.

PROF. G. RANGA: I have put the status of a Congressman on a very high level and I would like you to uphold it.

SHRI T S PATTABIRAMAN He is not replying to my point

PROF G RANGA Here is a recommendation made by Mr Justice Wanchoo and the Partition Committee Shri Kumaraswami Raja was there. He presided over the Partition Committee. He was a Telugu gentleman but he was the Premier of the whole State. He was a proud Tamilian of whom the Tamilians themselves are proud. Under his leadership the Committee went into this matter. They made these suggestions. The provision of this paragraph shall be enforced—that is in regard to educational institutions—for 25 years commencing from the appointed day and shall have effect with respect to such Government hospitals and educational institutions in Madras city and as before the appointed day serve the areas included in both the States. Now this is not being respected according to the provisions of this Bill. Even if you are prepared to fix this particular time limit of 25 years, it is only natural for the Andhras to expect you to show some consideration and that is all I think that the amendment seeks to do. And we know only too well that we can only advance arguments here for whatever they are worth—on both sides—and then leave it to the goodwill of our Tamilian friends and the good sense of the Union Government and in spite of the failure of our amendments and our pleas to carry weight with you, we can possibly come back again to the consideration of these matters and you can offer some more accommodation than your will seeks to do today just as Rajaji has done now on this occasion of the Godavari floods, and then posterity would be grateful to you.

DR K N KATJU Mr Deputy Chairman there has been some confusion of thought about this matter. I imagine that what my hon friend Shri Pattabiraman is objecting to is the element of statutory compulsion in this matter. I am sure that he is not objecting to the entry of the students from Andhradesh into these or other institutions which are not

enumerated in the Ninth Schedule. I feel certain that as between boys coming, let us say, from Bombay or from Northern India the college authorities in Madras will give preference to the boys from Andhradesh. I remember—I am not sure about the figures—that there are lakhs and lakhs of Andhras settled in the Southern Districts of Madras. It is not as if by the establishment of this new Telugu Andhra State

PROF G RANGA They are Telugus

DR K N KATJU Yes, Telugus and vice versa. It is not as if by establishing this new State you were taking away every single Andhra and removing him from Madras into Andhradesh and removing every single Tamilian from Andhradesh into Tamil Nad. They will continue. When I was in Madras I was told that there were about four million Andhras or Telugus whatever you may call them, in Madras. The question is one of statutory compulsion. Personally I do not like this idea at all. The moment you have this idea of compulsion, it breeds absence of affection.

SHRI B RATH Then why have you put this?

DR K N KATJU Mr Pattabiraman is quite right in saying that in framing the Ninth Schedule and enumerating the institutions what we had in mind was this: was there a corresponding institution of that kind in Andhradesh or not?

SHRI C G K REDDY Are there in these cases? That is the point which Mr Sundarayya has made out.

DR K N KATJU Is that a point of order or a point of interruption? In framing the Ninth Schedule we put ourselves this question—Is there a competent institution of this description in Andhradesh or not? If there is then it does not require any special enumeration. Leave it alone. If there is not, then we might consider it. It

[Dr. K. N. Katju.]
was on that basis that we did it. Clause 60, to which my hon. friend referred, refers only to the Ninth Schedule, namely that the two Governments are to agree with each other as to how long a period protection shall be required and if the two Governments are unable to agree, the President intervenes and fixes some sort of a period. But it was not for one moment in our mind that if there is an institution of that kind, let us say, in Madras, or, let us say in Vizagapatam or elsewhere, then you will not have a single student of the opposite State coming over to Madras or going over to Vizagapatam. I am certain of that. Supposing there is a famous eye specialist in the Vizagapatam College.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I would like you to answer whether these five institutions which I have mentioned in my amendment exist in Andhra or not. My point is that they do not exist.

DR. K. N. KATJU: My point is.....

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: At least the hon. Minister should specify where they are. The hon. Member is saying that they do not exist.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Is there not a medical college?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: The point is about those five institutions.

SHRI B. RATH: Where is the Nurses College?

DR. K. N. KATJU: There are two medical colleges in Andhradesh. Are there or are there not?

SHRI B. RATH: Are there any post-graduate colleges? (*Interruptions.*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I cannot carry on a talk in this confusion. I am accustomed to talk by myself and it was only the Judge who use to interrupt me, not many Members like this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are in Parliament.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I beg your pardon. What I was saying was, if you have got a medical college, develop it. It is very funny—to have a college and not develop it. You are rubbing me the wrong way. You won't develop your colleges and you want to go there. I tell you, you are not assessing the atmosphere properly and that the element of compulsion will do you more harm than good. Therefore, I would say if the House does not accept the amendment what I wish to do is this. I shall write to the Chief Minister, who is also one of our revered leaders, and say, "These are the views expressed during the debate on this amendment, will you kindly assure us that the Andhra students will not be kept away from these institutions?"

When we were in the U.P., when the first ministries were formed in 1937, in Bihar they had a fine Veterinary College but no Agricultural College. We in the U.P. had a splendid Agricultural College in Kanpur but no Veterinary College in that big state. There was a demand in Bihar for an Agricultural College and the people of U.P. demanded a Veterinary College. Then the two Ministers met; I was one at that time and hon. Dr. Syed Mahmud who is now in the other House, was the Minister for Bihar. We said: "What is all this? You send your students here and we shall send our students to you", and now it is functioning very well. So, I shall write to Rajaji saying that these are the feelings expressed in the House on this question. But, I tell you that this statutory compulsion will not, I plead, be in the interests of the country as a whole and that the less the element of compulsion, the better. So, I oppose the amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sundarayya, do you press your amendment?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Yes, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at page 41, after line 13, the following be added, namely:—

'15. Nurses Training College attached to the Central Hospital, Madras.

16. The Government General Hospital and Stanley Hospital—post-graduate and up-graded department.

17. The Madras Medical College D.S.S.C. Course.

18. The Government Dental College.

19. The Engineering College, Guindy—especially Tele-communication department'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The amendment is lost. The question is:

"That the Ninth Schedule stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Ninth Schedule was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

There is one amendment; it is a consequential one.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

The Enacting Formula was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Title stand part of the Bill."

There are three amendments to this. Amendments 1 and 2 are out of

82 C.S.D.

order and they are disallowed. Then No. 3 Mr. Sundarayya.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I beg to move:

"That at page 1, in the Long Title, the following words be added at the end:—

'as a first step towards the formation of linguistic States'."

Sir, mine is a very simple amendment. I want the words "as a first step towards the formation of linguistic states" to be added to the title so that the Government's assurances, the Congress party's assurances, in fact, our national movement's assurances that linguistic States will be formed in the country may be incorporated in the Bill. Since we do not have the Statement of Objects and Reasons and since the present Andhra State is formed—not a full-fledged Andhra State, but only with the existing Telugu-speaking districts naturally, I thought there would be no objection to the Government accepting my amendment. As I said, on the 1st October 1953, not a full-fledged Andhra State but an Andhra State comprising the Telugu speaking districts of Madras is coming into existence; that is why I added the words "as a first step towards the formation of linguistic States". In fact, this is the first step towards the fulfilment of the assurance regarding the formation of the Andhra State, especially, as I mentioned in my previous speech, it is a first step towards the formation of Tamil, Kannada, Maharashtra, Kerala and Punjabi-speaking States. As such, my amendment is simple and I want the Government to accept it.

SHRI L. BOROOAH (Assam): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this amendment is not harmless as it seems; it seeks to lay down a principle that the country should be divided on linguistic basis alone. I, for one Sir, do not want to accept the principle of the division of the country on the basis of language alone. Sir, while congratulating

[Shri L. Borooah.]

my Andhra friends on their success in the attainment of their objective, namely the formation of the Andhra State and paying my homage to late Sriramulu, who laid down his life for this cause, and others who suffered, I oppose the principle of division of the country on linguistic basis alone, and also I do not agree that the formation of the Andhra State is the "first step towards the formation of the linguistic States" in this country. Sir, I am in perfect agreement with those hon. Members who preceded me and who were of the opinion that linguism alone should not be the basis of division of the country and I am of the view expressed by Dr. Katju the other day that the formation of States on linguistic basis alone gives rise to political complexities and open avenues for political propaganda. Sir, we know to our regret the bitterness of feelings that subsists between Bihari and Bengali friends over the two or three districts of Bihar. If newspaper reports are to be believed, in spite of all efforts made by the Centre, the State of Madras and the State of Mysore to form a homogenous administrative unit, the agitation for formation of Vishala Karnataka is afloat. Sir, I am very sorry to say that those hon. Members who advocated the formation of linguistic States have not taken an overall picture of the country they forget the fact that there are many States in our country that are multi-lingual; they do not throw out any suggestions as to how self-supporting and efficient administrative units are possible in multi-lingual states in our country. At this stage, I consider it necessary to give a picture of the multi-lingual State of Assam: it is a State where about 13 or 14 languages are spoken.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Borooah, you should confine yourself to the amendment. All this is out of place. You are going beyond the amendment to the Bill; I think we shall have to close the debate.

SHRI L. BOROOAH: Therefore I do not accept the principle that the coun-

try should be divided on a linguistic basis. That is my point. Then, Sir, I wanted to give a brief description of Assam.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I feel that will not be relevant.

SHRI L. BOROOAH: I accept your ruling Sir. I wish well of the Andhra State and god speed and prosperity to the Andhra State. Let us cry halt to the agitation for creation of further linguistic States in the country and not create bad blood among the people living in different parts of our country. Sir, the Five Year Plan period is a period of our nation's test, we rise or fall in the estimation of the world according as we succeed or fail in implementation of numerous projects under the Plan. Let us concentrate our energies on the successful implementation of the Five Year Plan and not distract our attention and dissipate our energies, our pursuits, which I humbly submit are of doubtful value. With these words, Sir, I resume my seat.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I beg to oppose this amendment on a very short ground and that short ground is that in the long Title of the Bill we state not the object of the Bill but the purpose of the Bill. The purpose of the Bill is to establish a new Andhra State. Why it is being done, that is never stated in the long title. That is stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. I could understand the criticism when it was said "Well, look at Dr. Katju's enormities. He has deliberately refrained from using the word 'linguistic' in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. It is a two-and-a-half page Statement but he has deliberately avoided the use of the word 'linguistic'." That was a just criticism.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: That is true.

DR. K. N. KATJU: It was a proper criticism. And when the All-India Boundaries Commission is appointed—it is going to come before the end of the year—you may take as many steps

as you like Therefore, Sir, on that short ground I commend to the House that this should not be added on there, and I hope the hon Member would withdraw it

SHRI B RATH I want to know whether or not it is the purpose of this Bill to create the Andhra State on a linguistic basis

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN It is a different matter

The question is

"That at page 1, in the Long Title, the following words be added at the end —

'as a first step towards the formation of linguistic States' "

The motion was negatived

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is

"That the Title stand part of the Bill "

The motion was adopted

The Title was added to the Bill

DR K N KATJU Sir, I beg to move that the Bill be passed

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Motion moved

"That the Bill be passed "

SHRI C G K REDDY Sir, at this late stage it was not my intention to either criticise or condemn the hon Minister who has been guilty of certain lapses in so far as this Bill is concerned I should only like to make what the hon Minister would welcome as some constructive criticisms, on the formation of the Andhra State and the attitude that the Union Government should take towards the State, so that the experiment, the guinea pig experiment, if I may call it, that it proposed to be conducted on the Andhra State, may be successful and may also be true

Sir before I go into that, I was very sorry to find that during the dis-

cussion of the Bill many hon Members here as well as in the other House have chosen to point out the disputes that have arisen over the formation of the Andhra State, and have tried to warn us and the nation as to the consequences of forming linguistic States I should like to submit, Sir, that whatever the disputes that may have arisen, they could have been avoided if the Government of India, if the Union Government, had approached this problem in the right spirit, in the right manner and at the right time

First of all, I think that if this matter had been dealt with some three or four years ago, the disputes would not have taken such a sharp shape as they have taken at the present moment If the Government of India had also accepted the principle of dividing India, of re-dividing India, on the basis of language, and even if they had done it at the time of bringing forward this Bill, even then I am sure that such disputes would not have arisen It is because of—shall I say—the hesitant, the timid, and the faithless policy of the Government of India that these disputes have arisen Now, Sir we have been told that over the Madras city there has been so much of controversy, over Bellary there is still a satyagraha and a movement on, and again over Bellary we have heard so much in this House and in the other House Could not these things have been avoided if the Government of India had approached this problem not only with regard to Andhra, but with regard to the whole question of the linguistic provinces in the manner in which they ought to have done?

I should like to say, Sir, that the resentment of the Andhra people against the loss of Madras city, and against the so-called loss of Bellary taluk, would not have assumed such proportions if the Andhra State, the Vishala Andhra State, had been brought into being It is because they feel—in the Madras State they have the feeling—and they have come to be convinced that slowly and gradually they are losing more and more

[Shri C G K Reddy]

territory, and their State is going to be one of the smallest in India, that they want to fight for every inch of land. But on the other hand, if the Government of India had come to a decision, a firm decision, a decision based on the principle of linguistic provinces—when I say 'linguistic provinces' I do not mean that language should be the one and only consideration in so far as the re-demarcation of the States is concerned but there are other factors also, but the principle of linguistic provinces should have been accepted, and if that had been accepted, the Andhra State would have had a ready-made capital, would have had a more extensive area, and there would not have been such disputes as there are today.

I should like also to suggest that the manner in which even the present Andhra State has been demarcated also gave rise to avoidable disputes.

Now, let us take for instance the appointment of Mr Wanchoo as the special officer to examine not only the feasibility but the manner in which the Andhra State was to be brought into being. Although the Government, in principle, has the supreme power over any special Commission or any special officer deputed to investigate into a particular thing, although the Government has the power to override such decisions, I should like most humbly to suggest that it was wrong for the Government to have overridden in some matters the recommendations of a special officer, an eminent officer who was deputed for a specific purpose. The reason for the deputation of that officer was precisely to avoid any disputes, it was precisely to see that there would not be any charge of partiality or injustice levelled against the Union Government. If only the terms of reference given to him were more precise, if only his recommendations had been accepted by the Government in toto perhaps all these disputes would not have arisen.

If the Government of India had come out—even now comes out—with

an unambiguous statement that linguistic provinces would be formed according to the recommendations of the Boundary Commission and that they would not be sitting in judgment over the Boundary Commission, then I am sure most of these disputes would not have arisen. I see that the hon the Home Minister is taking a note of it. Perhaps he will ask me whether there will not be any disputes so far as the Boundary Commission is concerned. There will be disputes, there will be criticisms even against the Boundary Commission, but once you have accepted the principle, once you have appointed a Commission, once its recommendations have come, I want the Government to take a firm stand and not to give in to any criticism. First of all, I want them to accept the principle. Secondly, I want them to appoint an impartial Commission as the final, only and sole authority and if there are disputes—there will be disputes, there will be criticisms, there will be disappointments—I want the Government of India to take a firm stand and not to give into any political, linguistic or any other pressure from any influential quarter, and in that, Sir, I can assure them that so far as we are concerned, our support will be entirely on their behalf to see that nobody criticises the decisions of an impartial body like the Boundary Commission.

Now, there has been so much discussion about the assets also. We have been told that there has been a quarrel over Rs 1½ crores. Even this, I should like to humbly suggest, could have been avoided if a neutral Commission had been appointed. I do not want to rake up this controversy again. I want these disputes to be buried for ever so far as Andhra is concerned. Whatever comments I have to offer now are only in respect of the future conduct and attitude of the Government of India in relation not only to the Andhra State but also to the other States that may have to be formed, that will have to be formed some time or other. I would only request them to see that the experiment that they propose to conduct in

the Andhra State is successful. By their own statement, by their own attitude, it would appear to me that they are watching the experiment of Andhra and would later decide as to when, where and how they shall demarcate the other States. If you are going to make Andhra a guineapig—I am sure the Andhras resent their being made guineapigs for experiments—you must see to it that that guineapig is given every facility, and not every hardship so that this experiment may fail. You must see to it that normal conditions are given to them so that your experiments will be true experiments and so that the conclusions that you arrive at will be conclusions that are right and can be applied in so far as your decisions as regards the other States are concerned.

Therefore, both in regard to the border and to the assets and liabilities and other matters which are agitating the present Andhra State, I should like most humbly to suggest to the Government of India that they must lay down a certain policy, they must abide by that policy, they must announce that policy now or in the very near future and then act according to that policy, according to those principles definitely, categorically and unambiguously stated.

I think also that any delay on the part of the Union Government in so far as the question of linguistic States is concerned would be suicidal. We are told that every day disputes are arising, every day heat is being generated. That is exactly the reason why I want the Government of India to take action here and now, if not now, at least within a month or two months or three months.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: Why not put a stop to it?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: My hon. friend says, "Why not put a stop to it?" First of all, I would say that I oppose putting a stop to any good thing. Linguistic provinces, in spite of the formidable arguments advanced by many Members here and there are

good things. It is the only principle on which administration could be carried on in this country. In any case, even if I concede the argument of my hon. friend that it is a bad thing, I think that you have tolerated that bad thing for too long, and it is too late to stop it now. If you try to stop it—you cannot and that is my argument—no politician today can be honest to his convictions or enjoy any prestige if he opposes the move for linguistic provinces.

PROF. G. RANGA: In South India at least.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: My argument is this: Whether it is the Congress Party or the Communist Party or the Socialist Party, everyone vies with the other as to who should take the lead in the linguistic provinces movement and I know also that even within the Parties themselves there is a very unhealthy and ridiculous competition as to who should take the lead in the linguistic provinces movement. Today, the politics of the country at least in the South seems to be reduced and confined only to the linguistic question. I plead guilty that even so far as my Party is concerned, sometimes we seem to forget that there are other problems, other more pressing problems, more important to the people, and that is why I say, "Do not let this competition grow, do not encourage these unhealthy disputes and unhealthy clashes. See to it that this question is settled here and now. If you delay it further, do not blame the contestants in the disputes. You will have to blame yourselves." The Union Government and the Union Government alone is responsible for the atmosphere that they have created in Madras State. The Union Government alone is responsible for the bitterness that they have caused in Andhra and Tamil Nad.

If they had had four years ago, the firmness and courage to have taken the decision which they have now taken, then they would have avoided all this bitterness. They may take the line that the Andhras wanted the

[Shri C. G. K. Reddy.]

Madras City at that time. But have you given Madras City to the Andhras now? First lay down the principle and abide by the recommendations of the Commission and if anybody opposes it, whoever he may be, even the tallest in the land, he will have to be put down. Therefore I would most earnestly submit—not because it is my Party's question or somebody else's question; it is a national question, it is a people's question, a question which is deteriorating all spheres of activity in the country—that, unless you take a clear decision, a firm decision and a quick decision, I am afraid that things will grow from bad to worse.

If the Government of India has any hopes that by dilly-dallying, by postponing a decision, they will be able to put down this movement, whether they think it healthy or not, they will be greatly disillusioned, as they were disillusioned within six months after their decision of July last year.

Sir, I was greatly tickled, if I may say so, when the hon. Prime Minister jumped on his feet, as if he was a youth of 25 years, and said that he would not surrender to this, but six months later he had to change his decision. I tell him and the Government that if they think that they have the power or authority to control or stop this movement, they will be disillusioned. The linguistic provinces are going to come and have to come and the quicker they come the better it is. Lastly I would like to say one or two things.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are a number of Members to speak.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: I did not speak in the first and second reading and I hope I am talking some sense because I see the hon. Home Minister is attentive. That is an indication.

There are one or two small points that I would like to make before I sit down. Sometimes it surprises me that the hon. Home Minister, who is a custodian of democracy—formal democracy if I may say so—sometimes steps

into improprieties. Sir, I don't know what authority he had to announce that a certain individual is the Governor-Designate of Andhra. Sir, it is a most improper thing and not only is it improper, it makes things difficult in so far as the State of Andhra is concerned. He is a special officer deputed to do certain things. He is the special officer who is to take the co-operation and perhaps take the directions also of people who may have to come under him tomorrow when he becomes Governor. First of all on principle I would oppose any repetition of this thing where a special officer appointed to do certain things is also made the Head of the State. Secondly I think that it is the President, who alone—I am aware that the Government decides, but let us respect the Constitution and the constitutional propriety to concede the right, the sole right of the President—it is the President alone who has the sole authority to make that appointment; and I would like to protest most emphatically against the light-hearted way in which the hon. Minister tried to deal with my interruptions when I asked him whether Mr. Chandulal Trivedi was the Governor-designate.

10 A.M.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: Was he ever serious?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: He is certainly serious sometimes when he puts us in jail.

Finally, although I was born in Andhra, I consider myself as a citizen of India and I have been a voter in more than four States. In spite of it, on this happy occasion when we are going to pass this Bill into an Act, I naturally feel an amount of pride that my birth-place and the State in which I was born, the area in which I was born and the language that I speak even today at home is at last going to get some prominence and some recognition and the great Andhra State for which the people of Andhra had aspired for the last 30 or 40 years is at last coming into being and I have no doubt whatever that in spite of the hardships

and handicaps that have been put by the Government of India on this new State, as an experiment, the Andhras will be able to conduct themselves in such a manner that they will be able to put the State on a firm foundation so that afterwards, within a few months perhaps, within a few years certainly, when this State becomes bigger, they will be able to make, as they have done on so many other occasions in history, their utmost contribution to the national well-being, the national culture and the national heritage of India that is our country.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Sir, while rising to speak.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have to be very brief.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I will be very brief, consistent with the fact that I am speaking on this Bill for the first time during a debate which has lasted for more than a week.

While rising to speak on the Andhra State Bill, I pay my respectful homage to the hallowed and sacred memory of that great patriot Potti Sriramulu, who laid down his life for a cause that he held dear—not that I am in favour of the solution of political problems by means of fasts unto death and hunger strikes, but in the words of the Chairman of the Council “Whether we agree or not, here is a man who made the supreme sacrifice of his life for the cause that he held dear”. So it is that element of supreme sacrifice of laying down one’s life that I very much admire. Sir, Gandhiji has been quoted most frequently by those who never practised what Gandhiji preached. Gandhiji said, “Boycott British goods”; no response. Gandhiji said, “Make a bonfire of foreign cloth”: no response. Gandhiji asked the students to come out of their schools and colleges: no response. Gandhiji said, “Make contraband salt”: no response. And yet Gandhi is quoted now by those in whose mouth it does not lie to quote him because it is just like the Devil quoting the Gospel. Gandhiji is said to have made the declaration

in 1921 that the States should be formed on a linguistic basis. Long before that announcement or declaration of 1921 was made, the Congress proclaimed on its establishment in 1885, which incidentally happens to be the year of my birth, that it was wedded to the unification, solidarity and integration of the country as a whole, and we witnessed an example of it each year when a search was made for the President of the Indian National Congress for the following year and the President was selected not from any particular State or Province or Pradesh but from all over the country. So the Congress stood always for an integrated and unified India. However, along with other friends, I wish the Andhra State all good luck and prosperity.

Now, Sir, let me mention five cardinal points and whatever I say subsequently will be based on them, and I had wished the hon. Home Minister to be present but unfortunately he is not here. I am not in favour of linguistic provinces but I am in favour of the formation of provinces on administrative and economic basis. If the cause of the linguistic provinces is served by that process, I have no objection. Sir, this Andhra Province which is a deficit province—some say, to the tune of Rs. 5 crores, some say it is 1½ crores—all the same it is a deficit province—after having had the luxury of being formed into a province, now requests the Centre to finance it. That is not to be. I am the custodian of the finances of all the States of the country and therefore I would not like this joint finance of the Government of India to be wasted on the luxury of the formation of a linguistic State. The Centre is to give no money to meet the deficits of the Andhra State. Number two is, Andhra should be the last of the linguistic states. No State should henceforward be formed on linguistic basis alone. The country as a whole should be divided into three parts—Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Dakshina Pradesh. That is all.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Purav?

SHRI H P SAKSENA Purav is Uttar Pradesh Purav is East Pakistan and Paschim is West Pakistan So let us not talk of that (*Interruptions*)

I refuse to be interrupted

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. Please go on.

SHRI H P SAKSENA Democracy in a country like India has to be made to fit in with the economy of the people We don't want top-heavy administration with the luxury of forming provinces at each and every space of 100 miles or 200 miles

It is not going to suit the economy of the country as a whole

Last of all, I want Government to announce its policy unequivocally and most unambiguously with regard to the formation of these linguistic States They should clearly say that the provinces henceforth will not be formed on a linguistic basis

Sir, much has been made of a sentence used by that astutest of politicians and one of the greatest statesmen of the day—Shri Chakravarti Rajagopalachari—that the formation of linguistic States is a tribal idea But I know that by this he has only meant that in the present world, in these modern days, it is not advisable, proper and wise to form States only on the linguistic basis May I know how many linguistic provinces were there in India in the time of Asoka? Was not the whole of India, from far off Afghanistan right up to Cape Comorin, one and the same? There were so many languages even in those days, but the provinces were not formed on any linguistic basis

I am not very sure up till now what the pronunciation of the word Andhra is—and the reporter will particularly note this down—whether the word used in Hindi will be

अंध्र (Andhra) or अंध्रा (Andhraa) or अध्र (Andhara). If it is to be the last, God save the mark As the poet saint Tulsidas has sung:

“बड़ो छोट काहू नहि माने

आप जाय और घाले घाने” ।

This is what he has said about those people who are so conceited that they do not listen to the advice of anybody He says, they do whatever they like Themselves they fall and in the process let others also go down. Now this State of Madras, this illustrious State which was up till now second to none in the matter of population except the State of Uttar Pradesh, is being dwarfed, it has been vivisected, parcelled and partitioned, without, as a result, any corresponding benefit to the State of Andhra. Andhra and Madras are both there. Instead of the Madras State remaining big, both the States have now become diminished Sir, I would be the last man to see my State parcelled out like that I agree with my friends of South India who point out to me that the languages in the South are very very different from one another and the difference is greater than what we find among the languages of North India There are so many languages spoken in Uttar Pradesh, for instance but the differences are very slight. But then the solution for this difference in the languages is, for the various people speaking one southern language, to learn the language of the other people, and not to come to blows One transparent result of the formation of this Andhra State is that while the Andhras and the Tamils were real brothers up till now, sons of the same father and mother, sons of Mother India, they have now become step-brothers, and if the discussion that has been

DR K N KATJU If they are sons of only one mother, how can they be step-brothers

SHRI H P SAKSENA Sir, here in this august House, I cannot give any concrete example, but if the hon. Home Minister would come outside with me, I could give him examples.

Well, that is a very unhealthy sign. If the discussion, the bitterness, the

bad blood, the sentiments and the feelings engendered in the discussion in this House is any index of what is going to follow, I am afraid, that this bitterness is not going to vanish very soon. The Andhra State, to my mind, has not been ushered in under happy auspices. Self-immolation, martyrdom, loot, arson, murders, destruction of property, relations strained, bitterness engendered, bad blood created, and all this among whom? Among those who had been living in amity, peace, concord and brotherly affection and friendliness for centuries and centuries together. It struck someone and he said, "Let me form a separate province." He carried on propaganda. It gained in tempo and momentum and the result was that the problem became so acute that even the Government of India which had made it definitely clear that they would never yield to this demand unless and until there was complete agreement between the Tamilians and the Andhras themselves—the Government of India in a moment of weakness, in December last yielded to that demand and the result is this deficit province, this still-born child of the imagination of some people who wanted to have a separate province for themselves.

PROF. G. RANGA: Good wishes coupled with epithets like "still-born child?"

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Sir, I am very apprehensive about these linguistic States and of their effect on my local patriotism. Goodness alone knows what might happen to my State which is the biggest in India. It has been luring the eyes in the past of so many expectants who wanted to cut out a piece of territory from this State and add it on to this State or that. Here among Mysore, Andhra and Madras, it has been a triangular fight. Similarly, Madhya Pradesh and Madhya Bharat may one day wake up and say, "Let me have some districts of Uttar Pradesh." I have already heard one hon. Member say that Uttar Pradesh is a very unwieldy State and so the operation is sought to be per-

formed and some pieces are to be parcelled out.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad): It will be good administratively.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Its administration is of the best.

Sir, have we forgotten the pangs and pains of the partition of Bengal in the year 1905? I am not talking of the partition that has taken place only recently in 1947. And may I also refer to the partition of India as a whole between India and Pakistan? These partitions are always bad. If a brother separates from a brother, it is painful, it is a sorrowful affair. Therefore, I advise and most prayerfully and sincerely advise that these States be not formed on the basis of language.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY (Orissa): Do you oppose the Bill?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I am supporting the Bill.

If I may say so, the country as a whole has to be taken into consideration. My hon. friend Dr. Kunzru pointed out the political difficulties and the financial difficulties that will arise in the process. We have already listened to them and I want the hon. the Home Minister, although he was not here when I gave my five cardinal points—I will repeat them for his benefit—to note that the Central Government is not to give a penny to the State of Andhra.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please do not repeat the same argument.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): He is repeating them for the benefit of the hon. Minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Mr. Saksena, please wind up.

DR. K. N. KATJU: My hon. friend has taken note of what you have said.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I would like to submit that this Bill for the formation of the Andhra State should be the last of such Bills and while doing that, I wish the Andhra people all good luck and no bitterness against the people of the residuary State of Madras.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, now that the Andhra State is about to be formed, it will not be out of place to make a few observations and I can assure you, Sir, that I shall be very brief.

There is no doubt in my mind that since we have formed one State on what may roughly be called the linguistic basis.....

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: That is so.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Although I do not say that it is the only basis, perhaps that is so. I am certain, Sir, that the situation is going to degenerate very soon and it is very likely that other similar States will be formed especially in the South of India sooner or later. If this process is going to be initiated very soon, as I suppose it is going to be on account of the appointment of the promised Commission, it seems to me that we ought to grow a little wiser by what happened in relation to the formation of the Andhra State. There is no doubt, Sir, that what has counted in the division of the Tamil Nad State and the Andhra State is not reason so much, not, I am sorry to say, mutual trust and goodwill, but rather mutual distrust, mutual recrimination and so on. Now, Sir, if that is going to be the basis of the formation of other similar States in this country, I humbly submit, Sir, that the sooner we drop the idea of forming these States the better it will be for this country. Let there be no misunderstanding about my position. I want to be quite clear and, at the very beginning, I want to assert certain propositions categorically so that there will be no misunderstanding whatever.

I am a Maharashtrian. Sir, if States are going to be formed and re-formed, I am one of those who think that a Greater Maharashtra should be formed with Bombay as one of the capitals at least.

PROF. G. RANGA: No, no.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: How many capitals will there be?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: There will be three, who knows? You know that negotiations are going on amongst the leading politicians in Maharashtra in this respect. Fortunately, Sir, I am not one of those politicians nor do I want to criticise those politicians in any way. There is one thing, Sir. If I am asked to say whether I am a Maharashtrian first or an Indian first, Sir, my answer to that question is unflinching and absolutely clear. I say that I am an Indian first, a Bharatiya first and a Maharashtrian afterwards.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: That is so with everybody.

PROF. G. RANGA: That is so.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: I am sure that when the Andhras work out their own destiny through the formation of their own Andhra State, those Andhra friends will be working on this principle and on no other principle. I am sure about that. I have known several Andhra friends and I am sure that when they asked for the Andhra State they were never guided by any mean motives of any kind. I have, therefore, no doubt whatever, that whatever the difficulties that may confront the Andhra people in the beginning, they are bound to get over these difficulties sooner or later and, therefore, all our good wishes are with them. This House and all the people of this country will surely shower all their goodwill and good wishes on the people of Andhra. There is no doubt about it at all. But, what I was going to say was a little different. If you begin to form these States on mutual suspicion and distrust then we have

to remember one thing and that is that this is going to lead us nowhere. You can build only a house of cards on the basis of mutual suspicion. Does anybody imagine, do the Maharashtrian friends imagine for instance that if they carry on negotiations on such a basis and that, if they succeed in getting a session of the Legislature for Nagpur, a High Court for Nagpur and all the rest, do they really imagine that this is going to solve their problem? I feel, Sir, that if the people of Maharashtra want Maharashtra, if the people of Karnataka want Karnataka, then they should have it unconditionally, without any kind of negotiations amongst themselves.

In this respect, Sir, I suggest and humbly suggest that theoretical considerations are the most practical considerations. We should never go by the wishes of this or that section of the people but we should take into consideration only very very general considerations, namely historical considerations

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Not political considerations?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY:considerations of culture, language, tradition and such other considerations. Sir, with regard to Maharashtra, there is no doubt whatever that if we do have Maharashtra, then that will represent more or less centripetal tendencies and not centrifugal tendencies, not tendencies of growth, of development, but of contraction, of smallness of mind. I will refer you, Sir, to facts of history.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Barlingay, I am afraid you are going far beyond the scope of the third reading. Creation of States on linguistic basis or the creation of Maharashtra is not before the House.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: I will be very brief, I assure you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have a long list of Members and I think we should close at least at 11-30 A.M.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: I will close, Sir, within two or three minutes. I will not waste the time of the House.

I will take this one instance, Sir. In the good old days—may I call them bad old days?—the Maharashtrians spread all over India. I am not saying this out of any false pride for Maharashtrians—to use a wrong phrase in this connection—I say every dog has had its day and every people in this country have had their day.

But then my difficulty is this. What will happen to those Maharashtrians, for instance, those who are in Baroda, those who are in Gwalior and those who are in Jhansi? I am told, Sir, that as eminent a man as the Premier of U.P., Shri G. B. Pant is a Maharashtrian. If we are guided by small-mindedness then what Dr. Ambedkar said the other day about communalism will have every justification. Dr. Ambedkar said the other day that he was very much afraid as to what would happen to the minorities in all these newly formed linguistic States. Likewise I am afraid as to what would happen to the various Maharashtrians who are spread over different States if those States are formed on a linguistic basis. They will be minorities and I am afraid that they might not be treated fairly. The other day in an otherwise most excellent speech one of my friends suggested, “we would rather go to hell than be where we are”. Sir, I would humbly suggest to my friend that if this process of giving hell to people begins, well, you never know how you will end.

Now what is the main reason for the demand for linguistic provinces? Why do we want linguistic provinces in a rough sense of the term—if I may say so with all respect? Why do we want them? It is because we want to be serious with two fundamental ideas, namely, the ideas of Federation and Democracy. It is because the language of administration and the language of

[Dr W S Barlingay]

the law courts ought to be the same as the language of the common people. That is the only consideration for forming what we roughly call linguistic provinces. There is no other ground whatsoever and as I said in the very beginning theoretical considerations in this respect are the most practical considerations.

Sir I only hope—and I have no doubt whatsoever, in this respect—that the Andhras when they work out their destiny will proceed only on broad principles and will not be led away by any species of narrow-mindedness.

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA We welcome this Bill as a partial, as a very partial realisation of the demand of the Andhra people because the Telugu-speaking areas in the Madras State only are being brought at present into the Andhra State. The Telangana and other Telugu-speaking areas in Mysore, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa are yet to come to Andhra to form our full-fledged Vishal Andhra State with Hyderabad as our capital. With a population of three crores and 25 lakhs and an area of one lakh and twenty thousand square miles the Andhra people will be sorry that the capital of their new State will not be the place which we all desire, namely, Vijayawada-Guntur, the economic, political and geographical centre of Andhra. They will be sorry that they are not getting their High Court. They will be sorry that some of their educational institutions will continue to be governed by the Madras University. They will be sorry that the administrative set up at the top will not be manned by Andhras or by people who know Telugu but will be manned by people who do not understand Telugu. They know that these things have come to exist due to the Machiavelian manoeuvres of the Congress Party backed by the Central Government.

PROF G RANGA Don't say 'of the Congress Party backed by' please

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA All right. They have come to exist due to the Machiavelian manoeuvres of the Central Government.

PROF G RANGA That is correct.

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA Thus they are carrying out their anti-people policies. They are creating and fanning differences and divisions between the Andhra people themselves on the one hand and between the Andhra people and the Tamilian and Kannada people on the other. The people have seen that it is only the Communist Party that stood steadfast on the people's side on all these issues.

The people will be watching with great apprehension the rule of the Congress Ministry, with its reactionary allies, that is going to be foisted on the new Andhra State. The people will watch them and see how they start to solve the problems of the Andhra people, the famine and flood situation on the unemployment problem, and how they are going to build up irrigation projects, how they will abolish unemployment and ensure jobs for the unemployed, how they will rehabilitate our cottage industries and how they are going to assure everyone of us education, medical help and security in our old age.

Dr Katju Shri Datar and other speakers on the Government side and some others on the Opposition benches tried to justify their stand and their attitude to exclude Communists even from their Advisory Committees even before the formation of the Andhra State by accusing us as disruptionists. We are not disruptionists. It is the Congress leaders that are disruptive. The Communists belonging to all the linguistic areas, whether they be in Tamil Nad or Andhra or Kannada-speaking area, arrive at a common understanding on all issues. It is the Congress leaders who have been quarrelling among themselves.

Sir another accusation by Dr Katju is that we are people who are determined to undermine the existing social order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have had enough of these recriminations.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I am just replying to what Dr. Katju said in the course of the debate. He said that we are determined to undermine the existing social order established by law. Sir, it is our inalienable right to work and undermine a social order based on exploitation. It is the greatest duty and task of every man and woman—there can be no higher and more moral duty—to undermine a system that stands on exploitation and substitute for it a system of people's democracy.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Your kind of democracy is different from ours.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: They say that our conception of democracy is different from theirs, and I am glad to say that at least once we agree here. Their brand, the Congress brand, of democracy is the rule of big landlords and big capitalists, suppressing vast millions of people, peasants, workers and middle classes. Our democracy is the rule of the people directed against any effort to perpetuate the landlord and capitalist exploitation and their rule. That is why we call our democracy people's democracy as against their democracy which is capitalist democracy. Their democracy stands on the continuation of exploiting classes and the exploited with the help of a bureaucracy recruited from the top, cut off from the people, not elected by the people nor subject to recall by the people. Our democracy stands for the abolition of classes by eliminating the exploiting system of landlordism and capitalism. Our democracy carries on its rule through elected representatives and all executive functionaries are elected by the people and subject to their recall. We won't have a big talking Parliament. We will have Parliament and Assemblies from the top to the village which will enact laws and which will execute them as well. We will have judges not appointed from the top but elected by the people.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is all this? It is more an election manifesto than a speech on the third reading of a Bill

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Because he mentioned all these things I.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is it any reason why you should indulge in all these things at this late stage? There are a number of Members still to speak.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I am finishing within 5 to 7 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But I think you must stop that peroration on democracy. It is quite irrelevant to the debate at this stage.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: As such in the very near future an overwhelming majority of our people except for a very insignificant number of capitalists and landlords will be supporting our party. Also when there are no classes there will be no parties to support any other party. How could there be different parties when there are no classes?

In the new democratic Andhra, the Vishal Andhra for which our people dream, for which they work, the landlords will not continue exploiting the peasants. The land will belong to the actual tillers. We have enough land to guarantee every tiller, enough land to feed his family. We have enough rivers to water all our fields and produce electricity. We will build our Godavari Valley schemes—the Majira, Ramagudam, Indravati, Setari and Polavaram projects. We will build Tungabhadra and Gudivata, Siddeswaram and Nandikonda projects in Krishna Valley. We will build Vasundhara, Nagavati and Sarida projects, and many other minor irrigation projects. We will have enough water and will be able to spare even for Tamil Nad.

We will link all our rivers and develop our ports. Our ships will sail from the sea up to Nagpur and Hyderabad. We will link up our cities by

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]
developing our roads and railways. We will build hydro-electric schemes and thermal stations to produce enough electricity to run our own industries and lighten the toil of men and women. Every house will have electric light.

We will build great industrial projects. We have enough coal and iron and enough non-ferrous metals. We will develop our own gold and diamond mines. We will make our agency highlands into summer health resorts. There will be no floods and famine; there will be no unemployment and there will be no exploitation. Everyone will be assured of a job and for everyone work will be lightened and instead of a toil as it is today, it will be made a pleasure.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN:
What a heaven?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Yes, you come and live there. We invite you.

Every child will be educated up to the highest standard. Every village will have a secondary school so that no child will have to walk for more than a mile from the house. There will be one college.....

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ (Madhya Pradesh): On a point of order, Sir, is this manifesto in the name of the Andhra Government?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is giving his idea of the Andhra State.

(Interruptions.)

Order. order.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: We will develop our own language and culture and we will carry our glorious past forward from the times of Asoka and Satavahanas and even earlier, from the great art of Ajanta, Amaravati and Nagarjunakunda, from our great literature of Nannayya, Tikkana and the folklore of Vamana and others.

But we know all this can be done in unity with the other nationalities liv-

ing in India and building a strong, united democratic Andhra. Andhra becomes stronger and prosperous as India becomes stronger and prosperous. Andhra will have its people's democratic regime only if we have a people's democracy governing the whole of India.

Sir, we will dream and we will work till we realise our dreams of Vishal Andhra Praja Raj established in the People's Democratic India. Sir, we repudiate the slander that the Communists wanted Vishal Andhra outside the Indian State. It is nothing but a slander. We Communists have been working and will continue to work for a people's democratic regime in India with people's regimes in various linguistic States. With these words, Sir, I welcome this Bill as only a partial realisation of our cherished goal and our cherished desires.

SHRI K. P. MADHAVAN NAIR (Travancore-Cochin): Sir, I rise to support the Bill. I welcome the Bill not only because I take it as a first step in the redistribution of provinces mainly on a linguistic basis, but I also welcome some of the important omissions in the Bill—I mean certain points about which much was made by Members of the Opposition. They say that the Bill is silent with respect to the location of the capital, with respect to the location of the High Court, the jurisdiction of the University and all that. These are really welcome features, for today the Bill seeks to leave all these to be decided by the will of the people of Andhra. Supposing these were fixed here, there would have been a legitimate criticism that the hands of the new Government have been tied. But today it is left to the people of Andhra; they can decide where their capital should be; they can decide where their High Court should be; they can decide about their university. In this connection, Sir, I wish to point out what happened at the time when two of our States, Travancore and Cochin, were integrated in the South. We in Cochin had our colleges affiliated to the Madras University. There was no necessity

for the Madras Government to introduce any Bill, but after the integration of the two States the Government of Travancore-Cochin decided that the colleges in the Cochin area should disaffiliate themselves from the Madras University and get affiliated to the Travancore University. There was no difficulty with regard to that. We had not to depend upon the sweet will and pleasure of the Madras Government to get any legislation passed there. I do not know what exactly the provisions of the Andhra University Act are, but so far as they in the Ceded Districts are concerned they will have, I hope, no difficulty, just as we have had no difficulty in getting ourselves affiliated to the Travancore University, to get the colleges in these districts disaffiliated from the Madras University and affiliated to the Andhra University. Therefore for the very reason which prompted the Opposition to condemn these omissions, I welcome the Bill.

I do not wish to raise any controversy at this stage but I think I should answer in a word or two the criticism of the opponents of the linguistic provinces in a very general way, especially because of the dictum laid down by my respected friend Mr. Saksena. He said that this should be the last in the series of the formation of the provinces; he said that no more province should be formed on a linguistic basis. Of course, with very great care and forethought perhaps this particular word "linguistic" is omitted from this Bill. I come from a place where the people want a province of their own. I do not think that anybody is particular that it should be purely on a linguistic basis. But whatever people might say, whether the word finds a place in this Bill or in the terms of reference to the Commission to be appointed hereafter, we all know what it means. The main consideration is linguism. Of course, there are other considerations too. Those are well-known and nobody will oppose them. While the question of reorganisation of the States is taken up, cultural and other important factors such as the

national security of India, defence, administrative advantages, financial stability, economic progress of each State as well as of the country as a whole have all to be taken into consideration. I do not think even the greatest advocate of linguistic States will say that his province should be formed without consideration of any of these factors. So we take the stand that the formation of a State mainly on a linguistic basis will not be opposed to that principle and that, as my friend knows, is the policy of the Indian National Congress. I do not at all agree that there has been any departure from that policy by Government and if anybody, who really is interested in the redistribution of provinces in this way, is propagating the idea that the Government is against it, I would only say that he will be playing into the hands of our opponents like Mr. Saksena who would not otherwise have come out in the open with such opposition to linguistic provinces, as from the year 1920 one of the fundamental and cardinal principles the Congress stuck to was the division of provinces on a linguistic basis.

Now, Sir, there was at least one point in what Dr. Ambedkar said which must have appealed to all people and which I say is correct. We have today 27 States in India and as many as 22 or 23 of them are really linguistic provinces and unfortunately it so happens that the opponents of linguistic provinces mainly come from those very provinces. And I may also say that in the interests of such people themselves it is necessary that the multi-lingual provinces in the South should be divided and linguistic provinces formed in their places. As a matter of fact the difficulty with regard to the spread of Hindi will be great in a multi-lingual province. In a State like Madras, there are people speaking Malayalam; there are people speaking Kanarese; there are people speaking Telugu and there are those who speak Tamil, and as my friend himself admitted, these languages are not like the seemingly many different languages in the other provinces. A man coming

[Shri K. P. Madhavan Nair.]
from the Malabar area does not understand the Kanarese, Telugu or Tamil language. One from the Canara District does not understand Malayalam, Telugu or Tamil and so on. So official correspondence has to be carried on in a language which is known in all the areas and the language that offers itself is the English language. Now, if the national language Hindi has to find a place there, it has to replace English and the best way of replacing English will be to divide the multi-lingual province into linguistic provinces so that each State can carry on its own correspondence in its own language, Malayalam, Kanarese, Tamil or Telugu, and adopt Hindi language for other purposes. If the Centre and friends from Hindi speaking States want to replace English by Hindi then I would submit to them that in their own interests they should not stand in the way of the formation of linguistic provinces.

Then, Sir, one important point was made out, at least was sought to be made out by the opponents of linguistic provinces that not a pie should be given from the Centre to assist the provinces to be formed hereafter. I think this is quite a wrong attitude. The Centre should, in my view, come to the help of all such newly formed States and assist them for their proper functioning. The States which are not very rich cannot but expect outside help in their initial stages at least. So we must take a broad view of things and go to the help of the new States if in distress, just as we have done at the time of famine or floods in any part of India. The surplus and more fortunate States then came to the rescue of the deficit and famine areas. If owing to some cause or other there are crop failures in one State then it is the duty not only of the Centre but also of the other States to go to the help of the affected State. In the common interest of the country as a whole, in the name of the unity of India, it is essential that the Centre lends a helping hand to the States in need.

Now, Sir, I wish to say a few words

to my Andhra friends. I can very well understand that at the time of formation of the province as is usually the case at the time of partition, there will be many disputes and so much of hostility between the two dividing sections. But fortunately that stage is now over; let us now settle down, let us now forget all the past, let us not try to rake up the old wrangles and let the parting be as very good friends. I think this will not only be in the interests of Andhra and Tamil Nad but in the interests of India as a whole and particularly in the interests of the provinces that are looking forward to be newly formed as a result of the redistribution of the provinces by the proposed High Power Commission. According to many of us formation of Andhra is the first step in the formation of the new States. Everybody now is only talking of a temporary capital for Andhra; it is clear that almost all of them are thinking in terms of a permanent capital and that capital will not be in the present Andhra area. So my Andhra friends instead of criticising one another should settle down to work together, let them co-operate in the common effort for the good of the Andhra people. Mr. Sundarayya has placed before us—whether you call it a manifesto or a proclamation—I was glad to hear him reading that—a programme for the development of Andhra. Let it not be the programme of any one party—let it be the democracy of Dr. Katju or Mr. Sanjeeva Reddy or Mr. Sundarayya but let everything be done in the interests of the Andhra country and for the Andhra people. Make others say that Andhras in the new State have co-operated with each other very well, that they worked very well together and that they have made their State a model for other linguistic states. Let Andhras living in other areas be attracted to the State by what the State does to its people. Let everyone say that the Andhra Province has done splendidly well. Let me also warn my friends, the Andhras, that if they do not co-operate and work properly for the common good it will be a perpetual worry not only to themselves

but to other States also. I shall just relate one incident that happened at the end of 1949. We had the J.V.P. Report and at least the Congress was committed to that and according to that the first in the series of linguistic provinces was to be Andhra. We in Kerala, were expecting that soon after the formation of the Andhra State we would without any great difficulty have our turn. Probably, Sir, we Kerala people, are less emotional and less sentimental and, perhaps, less quarrelsome than many others. We waited anxiously and eagerly, hoping that the Andhras would get their province towards the end of 1949 or by the 26th January 1950. We have in Kerala an organisation called the Aikyakerala Committee, a non-party organisation or an all-party organisation, with members from various groups and areas working for the formation of a Kerala Province, and we waited. Representatives of the organisation met the authorities of the Government of India late in 1949 and represented to them; "You are now including the Andhra Province in the Schedule to the Constitution and bringing it into existence on the 26th January; kindly include our province also; it means only a very small adjustment; there is no problem with regard to capital—we have more than one capital city, there is no question of location of the High Court. We have a High Court already; we have plenty, enough and more of officers both I.C.S. and I.A.S. It is only a question of a transfer of one district and a few more taluks from one province to another." Then, we were told for the first time, in confidence: "What are you talking? It is now settled that there is not going to be an Andhra State—not only on the 26th January 1950, but for some years after that also. The reason is the Andhras themselves do not now want it. Those who were fighting for it are not prepared to agree among themselves, so, the Andhras are not going to have a province now or for some time to come." Then our hopes vanished and we sadly returned home to bide our time calmly. The time

has now come for the Andhras, Sir, and I would request them to conduct their affairs in such a way as to make it easy for others to get their dues also. A Boundary Commission is soon to be set up and I hope it will solve all the outstanding issues. One word more, Sir. In the matter of Kerala Province we are not particular that it should be formed purely on a linguistic basis, we have not therefore called it a Malayalam Province. We do not want to leave off any one, we do not want those who have been living with us these many years to leave us, and we are prepared to take in all those who are willing to join us in addition to all those who talk Malayalam. But in regard to people who do not desire to be with us and who talk of imaginary "rebellions" the matter is different. I expect the High Power Commission to be appointed before the end of the year. The Commission will have to decide the question of redistribution of provinces as a whole. I wish the ground is prepared from now on for the Commission to do its job speedily and to the satisfaction of us all. Let us, particularly those of us who are interested in the formation of new provinces, therefore go to our areas and exert our best to evolve the greatest measure of agreement among the different sections of people to be put before the Commission. We will then achieve our end. Thank you Sir.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA:

श्री बी० के० पी० सिन्हा : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय मैं इस आन्ध्र विधेयक का समर्थन करता हूँ और इस विधेयक की बुनियाद पर जो आन्ध्र राज्य कायम होने जा रहा है उसका स्वागत करता हूँ। २५ साल से अधिक हुए, जब कांग्रेस ने एक छोटा बीज बोया था। वह बीज था भाषावार राज्यों को अपने विधान में मान्यता देना। आज वह बीज बड़े दरख्त के रूप में फल गया है, और उस का पहला फल यह आन्ध्र राज्य है। हमारे विरोधी दल के चन्द भाइयों ने यह गलतफहमी फैलाने की कोशिश की है कि

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha.]

यह भाषावार राज्य की मांग उनकी है और उन्हीं को आन्ध्र राज्य के कायम होने का श्रेय है, और यह कि कांग्रेस वाले तो हमेशा से इसमें अड़ंगा ही लगाते गये। मुझे उनकी यह दलील कार्ल मार्क्स की छोटी सी बात की याद दिलाती है। कार्ल मार्क्स ने अपने प्रतिपक्षियों के बारे में कहा था कि:

"They are falsifiers of history"

बे इतिहास को जब गढ़ा जाता है उस वक्त से उसे झूठ बनाने की कोशिश करते हैं। प्रतिपक्षियों की कुछ वैसी ही कोशिश इस मामले में रही है। परन्तु वह भूल जाते हैं कि कांग्रेस ने इस देश में भाषावार राज्य की रचना के विचार को फैलाकर इसे अपने विधान में जगह दी और आखिरी सबसे बड़ा त्याग इस राज्य के लिये जिसने किया वह, पोटी श्री रामूलू, एक कांग्रेसी ही थे। उन्होंने जो तरीका व जो रास्ता अपनाया वह हमारे कांग्रेस का, इस देश के पूज्य बापू जी का बताया था, और उसी रास्ते पर चलकर इस राष्ट्र की, इस राज्य की बुनियाद डाली गई। उसने कोई हिंसा की बातें नहीं कीं, उसने तोड़फोड़, लूटमार और उपद्रव की बातों का प्रचार नहीं किया, अर्थात् बापू ने जो अहिंसा और शांति का रास्ता कांग्रेस को बतलाया था उसी रास्ते पर चलकर इस राज्य की बुनियाद डाली गई। हमारी कांग्रेस ने इस विचारधारा को पैदा किया, इस राज्य के लिये सबसे बड़ी सैक्रीफाइस (sacrifice) हमारे एक कांग्रेसी ने की और आज एक कांग्रेसी सरकार ही इस राज्य को अमली तौर पर कायम कर रही है। इसलिये सारा श्रेय असली में हमको है और विरोधी दल वाले झूठ मूठ उस श्रेय को अपने ऊपर ले रहे हैं।

श्रीमन् में समझता हूँ कि यह भाषावार राज्य की भावना बड़ी तीव्र और मजबूत

भावना है। यह उसी प्रकार की भावना है जैसे कि आजादी की भावना होती है। इसके लिये आदमी हजारों त्याग, हजारों बलिदान करने के लिये तैयार होता है। यह एक तूफानी भावना है और जैसे तूफान को कोई नहीं रोक सकता वैसे ही इस भावना को कोई नहीं रोक सकता। और यह एक दिन अवश्य फूले फलेगी। मुझे इस सिलसिले में किंग कैन्यूट का किस्सा याद आता है। उसके दरबारियों ने उसे यह समझाया था कि तुम्हारा हुक्म परमात्मा भी मानता है और प्रकृति तुम्हारी सब इच्छाओं का पालन करती है। यदि तुम हुक्म करोगे तो समुद्र की लहरे रुक जायेगी और जमीन तक नहीं आयेंगी। परन्तु उसके हुक्म के बाबजूद लहरे जमीन पर आईं। तो जो आज यह समझते हैं कि भाषावार राज्यों का बनाना रोक देंगे, मैं समझता हूँ कि वे कैन्यूट के दरबारियों की तरह बातें करते हैं। तूफान की तरह जो कोई इस भावना के बीच आयेगा वह उखाड़ फेंका जायेगा। भाषावार राज्यों का कायम होना तो निश्चित है और इस पर व्यर्थ के विवादों का करना मैं अनर्गल प्रलाप समझता हूँ। जैसा कि मेरे दोस्त रेड्डी साहब ने कहा इन्हें आज कायम होना है और जल्द कायम होना है, नहीं तो देश की परिस्थिति बिगड़ती जायेगी और लोगों को इससे नाजायज फायदा उठाने का मौका मिल जायेगा। जनतंत्र में प्रत्येक राज्य की अपनी असेम्बली होगी ही। फर्ज कीजिये उस असेम्बली में चार-पांच भाषा बोलने वाले लोग हैं तो वहाँ का काम चलाना असंभव हो जायेगा। तो असेम्बलियों में अब हमें आपस में काम करना है तो यह जरूरी कि एक भाषा-भाषी लोग एक राज्य के अन्दर चले आये अन्यथा वेवेल की मीनार की तरह हो-हल्ला गुल-गपाड़ा होगा।

मुझे खुशी है कि इस विधेयक के सिल-सिले में हमारे गृह मंत्री ने यह ऐलान किया है कि वह सीमा-निर्धारण आयोग जल्द बनाने जा रहे हैं जो इन सब भाषावार राज्यों के मामलों को तय करेगा। लेकिन उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि कभी कभी अच्छी बातों की आड़ में बुरे बुरे काम भी हुआ करते हैं। फ्रांस में जब एक बड़ी राज्य-क्रांति हुई तो एक बहुत बड़े क्रांतिकारी नेता

SHRI C G K REDDY:

श्री सी० जी० के० रेड्डी नेत्री कह सकते हैं।

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA:

श्री बी० के० पी० सिन्हा . हा, नेत्री थी, मुझे नाम ठीक नहीं याद आ रहा, उसको भी जब लोग फांसी के तख्त पर ले जाने लगे तो उसने वहाँ सामने स्वतन्त्रता की मूर्ति को देख कर कहा था :

"O Liberty, what crimes they are committing in thy name!"

तो डर है कि कहीं ऐसा न हो कि भाषावार राज्य के नाम पर लोग लूट-खसोट मचाने लगे। जैसे ही सरकार ने इस बात का ऐलान किया, बहुत से ऐसे साधन सम्पन्न लोग हैं जिनके पास प्रचुर धन है और जो आवाज उठा सकते हैं, वे ऐसी जगहों के बारे में भी दावा पेश कर रहे हैं कि जिन पर स्वप्न में भी उनका दावा सही नहीं हो सकता है।

DR K. N. KATJU:

डा० के० एन० काटजू : यह तो आप कर रहे हैं।

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA:

श्री बी० के० पी० सिन्हा : नहीं, मैं केवल खतरा बतला रहा हूँ। वे उसी बुनियाद पर काम कर रहे हैं जिस बुनियाद

पर जर्मनी के एडोल्फ हिटलर काम कर चुके हैं। हिटलर कहता था :

"A lie oft repeated is a truth established".

"झूठ बाते कहते चले जाओ, फिर उसे सत्य के रूप में लोग मानने लगेंगे ही।" इन खतरनाक तत्वों से सीमा-निर्धारण आयोग को बचाना है। भाषावार राज्य तो ठीक है, लेकिन भाषावार राज्यों की आड़ में यह न हो कि लोग ऐसे क्षेत्रों को, जिन पर भाषा की बुनियाद पर उनका कोई दावा नहीं है, अपने क्षेत्र में मिला लेने की कोशिश करे और सरकार व सीमा-आयोग उनके प्रचारों से, उनके हल्ले से, उनके तोड़-फोड़ और हिंसात्मक कार्यवाहियों से प्रभावित होकर उनकी मांगों को कबूल कर ले।

दूसरा खतरा मैं यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर भाषावार राज्य तो बनने हैं, लेकिन किसकी भाषा की बुनियाद पर राज्य बनेंगे ? वहाँ की जनता जिस भाषा को बोलती है अथवा वहाँ का राज्य जिस भाषा को बोलता है ? यदि जनता की भाषा किसी क्षेत्र की भाषा मानी जाय तो कौन सी जनता ? सिर्फ गोरी और पीली चमड़ी वाली जनता अथवा काले रंग की भी जनता ? जायज तो यह है कि बहुसंख्यक जनता, चाहे वह किसी रंग की क्यों न हो, जिस भाषा को बोलती है वह उस क्षेत्र की भाषा मानी जाय।

11 A.M.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think you might leave all those things to the Boundary Commission.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I am simply saying that

DR. K. N. KATJU: He is referring to Orissa; he is referring to Bihar; and he is referring to so many other things.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Not at all.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are in the third reading stage. All these questions will be considered by the Boundary Commission. At this stage they are all irrelevant.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I am simply pointing out the dangers which may arise.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Sinha, the House has accepted the Andhra Bill. We are in the third reading stage. So it is no use going back to all these things.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Sir, I am simply.....

(Interruption.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I am winding up. I have taken less than five minutes so far.

हां, तो मैं कह रहा था कि कौन सी भाषा किसी क्षेत्र की समझी जायगी? वह भाषा जो लोग घरों में बोलते हैं, या पढ़े-लिखे लोग जिस भाषा का प्रयोग किताबों में करते हैं, लेखों में करते हैं। ऐसे बहुत से क्षेत्र हैं जहां लोग घरों में एक भाषा बोलते हैं, किताबों में और लेखों में दूसरी भाषा का प्रयोग करते हैं। मेरे बहुत से मित्र हैं, बहुत से सदस्य यहां हैं जो अंगरेजी में बोलते हैं, अंगरेजी में लिखते हैं, अंगरेजी ही में वे सारी कार्यवाही इस भवन के ही अन्दर नहीं इसके बाहर भी करते हैं, जब कि अंगरेजी उनकी भाषा नहीं है। उनकी भाषा तो वह है जो उनकी स्त्रियां, उनके छोटे बच्चे घरों में बोलते हैं। भाषा-वार प्रान्त के निर्माण में इस बात का भी खयाल करना होगा कि लिखी जाने वाली भाषा और विद्वज्जन की भाषा को भाषा न मानी जाय, जो भाषा लोग घरों में बोलते हैं, जिस भाषा को देहाती लोग समझ सकते हैं, उस भाषा को उस क्षेत्र की भाषा मानना

चाहिये। मैं इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ इस विधेयक का समर्थन करता हूं और मैं यह विश्वास रखता हूं कि हमारे गृह मंत्री जी जब सीमा-आयोग बनायेंगे, तो जिन खतरो की तरफ मैंने इशारा किया है उनका ध्यान सीमा-निर्धारण आयोग को दिलायेंगे। मैं देखता हूं कि सराईकेला और खरसांवा के बारे में शायद गृह मंत्री जी का व्यक्तिगत स्वार्थ मालूम होता है। चाहिये तो पुरानी बातों को भुला देना। मिनिस्टर को और जज को जैसा निरपेक्ष होना चाहिये, वे उसी निरपेक्षता से सराईकेला और खरसांवा के क्षेत्रों का फैसला करेंगे, ऐसी आशा की जाती है।

[For English translation, see Appendix V, Annexure No. 75.]

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ:

श्री आर० यू० अग्निभोज : उपसभापति महोदय, मेरा इस विधेयक पर बोलने का बिलकुल भी इरादा नहीं था। परन्तु जब इतना महत्वपूर्ण बिल इस सदन के सामने आया और उसमें नाना प्रकार के भाषण हुये तो उन्हें मैंने ध्यान से सुना। मुझे अत्यन्त दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि इस सदन में जो भाषण हुये उनमें मैंने केवल एक भावना पाई, और वह भावना, दुर्भाग्य से कहना पड़ता है, वही है जो सात-आठ साल पहले हिन्दुस्तान में मुसलिम लीग ने पैदा की थी। और वह इसलिये कि मुसलिम लीग धर्म और संस्कृति के नाम पर देश का बंटवारा चाहती थी। फर्क इतना है कि हमने केवल धर्म का नारा छोड़ कर भाषा का नारा पकड़ लिया है, और उसके पीछे वही भाव—संस्कृति, भाषा, प्लेबिसाइट (plebiscite) बंटवारा और उसके परिणामस्वरूप रिफ्यूजीज (refugees) का पैदा होना—काम कर रहे हैं। मैं जिस दिन से आन्ध्र

प्रान्त की घोषणा हुई उस दिन से यही देख रहा हूँ कि मद्रास और आन्ध्र के लोगों में आपस में वही भावना है कि "तुम अपना बिस्तर बांध कर अपने प्रान्त में जाओ," इसका अर्थ यह होगा कि अब तक पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान के ही शरणार्थी हैं, परन्तु यदि यही भावना जारी रही तो याद रखिये, हम भारतवर्ष को शरणार्थियों का देश (land of refugees) बना देंगे। काशमीर में जो प्लेबिसाइट की भावना है, वही प्लेबिसाइट की भावना, वही मतदान की भावना हम बलारी में देख रहे हैं। आखिर यह सब क्यों हो रहा है? आप स्मरण रखिये, भाषावार राष्ट्र और धार्मिक राष्ट्र का जमाना चला गया, पोलिटिकल साइंस (Political Science) में आज के दिन धर्म और भाषा का राज्य बनाने के लिये स्थान नहीं रह गया है, और यदि हम भाषा के नाम पर अलग स्टेट बनाने की बातें करते हैं तो हम अपने आप को उस असभ्य युग में ले जा रहे हैं जिसमें लोग केवल जाति, भाषा और धर्म के नाम पर अपने अपने फिर्के बना कर राज्य किया करते थे। मैं इस भवन से जो कि सम्पूर्ण भारतवर्ष का प्रतिनिधि है, पूछता हूँ कि क्या आपने भाषावार राष्ट्र स्थापित कर लिया है? राष्ट्र उस चीज का नाम है जहाँ पर नेतृत्व की भावना है। अभी आपने भाषा का राष्ट्र नहीं बनाया है और भाषा के प्रान्त बनाना चाहते हैं। मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करूँ कि ऐसी स्थिति न पैदा करें। इतिहास बताता है कि सम्राट अशोक ने एकछत्र राज्य बनाया था परन्तु बाद में लोगों ने अपने राष्ट्र के टुकड़े टुकड़े कर डाले। औरंगजेब एकछत्र सम्राट था और उसके कमजोर हो जाने के बाद राष्ट्र के टुकड़े टुकड़े हो गये थे। आज मैं यदि यह कहूँ और बहुत गर्व के साथ और विश्वास के साथ कहूँ कि देश में जवाहरलाल नेहरू सरीखे

नेता हमारे बीच में हैं, इसलिये यह राष्ट्र एक है, परन्तु आगे यदि हम और आप सरीखे भाषावार राज्य के बंटवारे वाले लोग ज्यादा पैदा हो गये, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह समय नजदीक होगा, जब महात्मा गांधी के त्याग और तपस्या द्वारा प्राप्त एक आजाद राष्ट्र को हम, उनके उत्तराधिकारी, टुकड़े टुकड़े कर देंगे। मैं आपसे निवेदन करूँ कि यह भाषावार प्रान्त की भावना पैदा क्यों हुई? जहाँ पर बाइलिगुवल (bilingual), ट्राइलिगुवल (trilingual) स्टेट्स हैं, दो या तीन भाषायें बोलने वाले लोग हैं, वहाँ जो किसी भाषा को बोलने वाले लोग बहुमत में हैं, वे लोग माइनोरिटी (minority) वाली दूसरी भाषाओं के लोगों पर अत्याचार करते हैं। नहीं तो कोई कारण नहीं था कि आन्ध्र के लोग मद्रास वालों से भाषावार आन्ध्र प्रान्त की मांग करते। हमारी सब बुराइयों की जड़ हमारी स्वार्थपरता है, यदि हमारा स्वार्थ नष्ट हो जाय तो हमें भाषावार प्रान्तों की स्थापना की कभी भी आवश्यकता न हो। ये लोग जो मेजोरिटी (majority) पर हैं, जो जाति के नाम पर हैं, जो धर्म के नाम पर या भाषा के नाम पर हैं, यह भूल जाते हैं और माइनोरिटीज को दबाने की कोशिश करते हैं। आपकी भाषावार प्रान्त रचना से देश की, जाति की और धर्म की उन्नति नहीं हो सकती। मेरे कम्यूनिस्ट (Communist) मित्र कहते हैं कि हम नये आन्ध्र राज्य में यह सब कुछ कर देंगे, आपके जो कम्यूनिस्ट टाइप आफ डाइमेंड (communist type of diamond) हैं, वे वहाँ हल निकालेंगे। आप तो भाषावार प्रान्त रचना इसलिये कर रहे हैं और इसीलिये उसको सपोर्ट (support) कर रहे हैं कि आपका कम्यूनिस्ट फोल्ड (fold) आंध्र में है और वहाँ आप एक दिन सत्ता

[Shri R. U. Agnibhoj.]

पाकर, आन्ध्र के ऊपर कब्जा करके, उस के बाद वह बीमारी जो उस देश में है उसे घर घर फैलायेंगे। आप भाषावार प्रान्त के नाम पर उसे सपोर्ट नहीं कर रहे हैं। मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करूँ कि यदि हमारे राष्ट्र ने यह भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना के लिये एक निर्णय ले लिया है कि आन्ध्र प्रान्त बनाना चाहिये और हमारे राष्ट्रपति ने यह घोषणा की है कि आन्ध्र प्रान्त एक एक्सपेरीमेन्टल (experimental) स्टेट होगा, यह अनुभव के लिये, प्रयोग के लिये, स्टेट बनाया गया है तो जब तक कि हमारा यह आन्ध्र प्रान्त नहीं बनाया जाता और जब तक हम, पाँच दस साल तक, इस प्रान्त की रचना और कार्य को और उसकी आर्थिक कठिनाई के बारे में पूरी जाँच और निर्णय नहीं कर लेते तब तक दूसरे भाषावार प्रान्तों की चर्चा करना मैं समझता हूँ और बहुत विश्वास से कहता हूँ कि देश के साथ विश्वासघात करना है। राष्ट्रपति जी ने जो भाषण दिया था उसमें उन्होंने प्रत्यक्ष रूप से इस की घोषणा कर दी थी। परन्तु उस के बाद भी हमारे देश के लोग और हमारे प्रान्तीय मंत्रिमण्डलों के लोग यहां वहां उछल कूद करते हैं, दौड़ धूप करते हैं। क्या उनको राष्ट्रपति की घोषणा का इस तरह से निरादर करना चाहिये? मैं तो कहूँगा कि यह राष्ट्रपति जी का अपमान है कि प्रान्तों के मंत्री तथा अन्य लोग दौड़ धूप करें। वे राष्ट्रपति जी की घोषणा के विरुद्ध आचरण कर रहे हैं। आज मेरे एक मित्र ने कहा कि एक राज्य में एक ही तरह की भाषा होनी चाहिये, वहां की असेम्बली में भी और वहां की काउन्सिल में भी। मैं अपने मित्र सिंहा साहब से पूछता हूँ कि पार्लियामेंट में कितनी भाषावार पार्लियामेंट आप बनायेंगे? तो इसलिये मैं आपसे प्रार्थना कर रहा हूँ कि आप यदि राष्ट्र की

एक पार्लियामेंट बनाना चाहते हैं तो उसमें एक ही राष्ट्रभाषा की पार्लियामेंट ही सकती है और जो लोग यह कहते हैं कि हमारे देश में हम लोग.....

PROF. G. RANGA: Are we to take up as much time to answer these arguments? I do not understand this business at all.

SRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ:

श्री आर० यू० अग्निभोज : तो मैं यह निवेदन करूँगा कि हमारा यह आन्ध्र स्टेट तो अब बन गया। हमारी केन्द्रीय सरकार ने और राष्ट्रपति जी ने इसकी घोषणा कर दी और मैं इस बिल का समर्थन अवश्य करता हूँ, परन्तु इसके साथ जब तक नये राज्य के विषय में हमको स्थायी रूप से और ठीक प्रकार से अनुभव न हो जाय, दूसरे प्रान्तों में भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना नहीं करनी चाहिये। इतना कहते हुए मैं आपसे यह कहूँगा कि भाषाओं का उद्देश्य लोगों को तोड़कर अलग कर देने का नहीं है, बल्कि यह है कि हम एक दूसरे के विचारों को समझ सकें। इसलिये भाषा के नाम से अलग होना केवल विरोधाभास का परिचायक है। भाषा को हमें एक दूसरे को जोड़ने का साधन बनाना चाहिये, तोड़ने का नहीं।

[For English translation, see Appendix V, Annexure No. 76.]

PROF. G. RANGA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I wish to congratulate the Government, the people of India, the Andhras themselves as well as myself and yourself on this very happy occasion that at long last, this Bill is going to be placed on the Statute Book.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us have only happy speeches.

PROF. G. RANGA:that we are now passing this Bill to bring the Andhra State into existence. As I

was hearing Mr. Sundarayya in the beginning I thought I was going to agree with him but later on he began to make it very difficult either for me or for others to agree with him by monopolizing the whole of his speech himself and not allowing us to share in the hopes that he has himself held out for the future of Andhras. I would like to endorse almost all those things that he has written in a poetic manner with the help evidently of some poet friend of his in regard to the future of Andhras but at the same time I would like him.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Perhaps he is himself a poet.

PROF. G. RANGA: But I would like him all the same to include us in the programme of his party and allow us all to be taken together and then say that all of us wish well of the Andhra in the directions in which as, he has himself suggested, that there would be progress and that there should be progress in the Andhra State. I say we all want people's democracy but there are interpretations of it and there is one of Dr. Katju, another of my hon. friend Mr. Sundarayya. There was a third one which was interpreted by Mahatma Gandhi and that was known as the Kisan Mazdoor Praja Raj and that is the Raj which he wished to have and which we should like to have in a truly democratic country where there will be scope for differences of opinion between the Party in opposition and the Party in power and I could never conceive of a time when it would be possible, even when all the classes are abolished, to have only one Party and anyone who differed from it is likely to be dispensed with or dismissed or sent away to other worlds.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: There is this practice in U.S.S.R.

PROF. G. RANGA: My hon. friend Mr. Agnibhoj has justified his name of being a fire-eater. He has set all of us on fire by talking against our concept of linguism and the concept

of linguistic provinces. I am not bothered whether you call it linguistic province or not as I had said earlier. It is most unfortunate that Sardar Patel died too soon and no other man with equally creative energy, dynamism and steadfast determination was forthcoming to be one of our national leaders. If there had been a national leader of that calibre amongst us to-day on the side of Government, surely there would not have been much trouble at all for him to create a Malayalee State or a Karnataka State because they are already there in embryonic stage. There is Mysore. They are prepared to have—all the Kanarose people—the Mysore Maharaja as the Raj Pramukh and Mysore or Bangalore as their Headquarters. Everything is there except a decision on the part of the Government of India. Something is wrong with the Government of India, that it does everything at the wrong moment. It fails to do the right thing at the right moment with the result that a Karnatak State is not in existence today. I defy anybody to make out a case against Karnataka. A case for Karnataka is there and there is no need for them to make out a case. It is obvious. All that has to be done by the Government of India is that only some wisdom should dawn on themselves. Then there is the Malayalee State. It is already there—the Travancore-Cochin State. Only one district of the Madras State has to be handed over to them. There is a little trouble in the Kasargode district as between the Kanarese and Malayalees. I am sure if they were to be given an assurance that if they only come to an agreement among themselves, the Malayalee State would be there, I am sure that that agreement also will be forthcoming. These two can be brought into existence without the aid of any Commission.

As regards Maharashtra, there is only one difficulty and that is about the Bombay City. If my hon. friends the Maharashtrais would only be good enough to allow Bombay City and its environments to be made into one separate State, the rest of it can all be brought into existence.....

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: No, no.

PROF. G. RANGA: Then, that is another matter. So far as my North Indian friends are concerned, I would like to caution them in regard to one matter.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Leave it to the High Power Commission.

PROF. G. RANGA: That is, for no fault of their own, but due to the fate of the whole of India, for over a century, North India has come to be bifurcated under foreign sway. Therefore they have not had an opportunity for developing a first-class literature of their own. They may say that Hindi has a wonderful literature but Hindi we know is only 500 years old as a literature whereas on the other hand Tamil literature is 2,000 years old, if not older.

AN. HON. MEMBER: What about Bengali?

PROF. G. RANGA: Bengalis have their own State. Therefore let them not grumble now. Kanarese language is 500 years old. I am talking about literature.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: At least 500 years.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is at least 2,000 years old. Take it from me.

PROF. G. RANGA: There is the Marathi language which is at least 300 or 400 years old. There is the Andhra literature which is at least 1,000 years old. These are literatures which we have and they are not our monopoly. The doyens of literature etc. of North India had migrated to the South as the invaders were coming from Himalayas and all these people came down to the South and contributed to these and all of us put together have been able to bring into existence these excellent literatures in the South and that is why we people are so very keen about it and we are so very proud of it. It is not a Party question it was the Congressmen themselves who gave birth to these movements,

who gave momentum and who gave inspiration. Even today—Mr. Sundarayya ought to be able to realise it—among the Congressmen themselves there is division in regard to this particular matter. It is a national question and in the South it is really a national and people's question. Therefore, all of us put together have got to use our wisdom as well as our statesmanship in order to help these people to have their own States—not as nationalities as Mr. Sundarayya would like them to think but as an integral part of the whole of this country. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru is a national leader, it is true. But that does not mean that Shri Jawaharlal Nehru is going to be allowed to impose his Urdu on the whole of India or his Hindi on the whole of India or that he is going to be allowed to make those people forget their own literature and their own language for bringing them together as far as it is practicable under the present circumstances and then be taken to be the vassals of a language which has yet to become a language.

Sir, I am very glad that this Andhra State is coming in now but I have already expressed my unhappiness on an earlier occasion in regard to the various aspects of it about which I thought the attitude of the Government was most unfortunate, and I sincerely hope that as soon as at least the Samyukta Karnataka comes into existence, it would be possible for the Karnataka people as well as the Telugus to come to some reasonable agreement in regard to Bellary town and a few contiguous villages so that they could be brought back again into Andhra. I have already told you, Sir, I stand by that demand and I will go on making that demand as long as it is democratically tenable.

Then as regards Madras city, although we are unhappy that we don't have it in Andhra, still it is going to be with us. We are not going to lose it. It is going to be still there. I am proud of the edifice of the Indian civilization that we have in the whole of South India, in Tamil Nad from

Rameshwaram right upto Conjeevaram and all those places are sacred not only to Tamilians, not only to the Andhras but to the whole of India. All of us will continue to be proud that these are there as monuments of Indian civilization, of what the Indian civilization had achieved at its best and at its mightiest stature. I have seen the Pyramids but I was not struck so much with their grandeur as I was with the architectural beauty of the Tanjore Temple or Kapaleswar Temple at Madras or of the Rameshwar temple itself. I have not a feeling that I have lost them and I don't want any Andhra or anybody else to feel that they are anywhere else except in India and it is in that manner that I hope all Andhras and all other Indians also will approach this problem of Andhra and approach the achievements and the riches and the folklore and literature of Andhra. If you will do it that way, then there would be no need for Andhras to be parochial-minded and thus create an opportunity for any disruptionist whether he derives his inspirations from the North of Vindhyas or north of Himalayas and for any disruptionist to play any mischief either with the loyalties of Andhra towards the whole of India or with the affection of the rest of India towards the needs and demands of Andhra.

SHRI RAMA RAO: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the time has come to pronounce the benediction and read the beatitudes. The tumult and the shouting has not died down, and probably will not, if only we examine, though not too closely, the anatomy of the Bill. The State has no capital, because there is no head, no legs, because it includes only those Telugu-speaking parts that are in Madras State; no spinal column, because there is no financial solvency. There is only the trunk. But miracles often occur and the body may become full and whole, if only the soul is alive. And behind it this Bill has the soul of a great people, a historic people; behind it, also, is the will of a noble nation to rise to the height of the occasion.

It is heartening to note that the Bill bears the signature and the goodwill of the greatest Indian of the day.

Sir, tribute is due to "Shri Katju Pantulu Garu". He is the architect of this Bill. If my people are going to raise a statue for him in Andhra, I shall contribute my humble mite. As the Home Minister he has piloted this measure, thereby, accepting a great responsibility; that is to say, he has undertaken, as a result of his devoted labours, to see that the Andhra State is stabilised. "Kind hearts are more than coronets, simple faith more than Norman blood," the poet has said. Dr. Katju has not only got with him the coronet of power, but he has also a very kind heart. We want to draw upon both of them. He has ample faith. I was very much moved by the analogy he drew the other day between the birth of Lord Krishna and the birth of the Andhra State, and the simultaneous rise in the waters of the Jumna and the waters of the Godavari.

Sir, it is always good to have young men with us. Shri Sundarayya occupies a distinguished position in this House and in the public life of Andhra. I was marvelling at his tenacity, the way he fought every inch of the ground. So also did my young friends, Shri Lanka Sundaram and Shri Raghuramaiah, in the Lower House. When I see these young men, I feel so heartened and I feel that the future of the Andhras is safe. Shri Sundarayya has painted a picture of a paradise to come in Andhra if his party is in power. People may laugh at it; but it is by idealism that Indian nationalism has been sustained throughout the ages and through all its trials and struggles. Let us hope that that paradise he describes will come. I am not a believer in the theory of reincarnation, but if I am to be born again, I should like to be born in that paradise of Shri Sundarayya.

Sir, we are glad to hear again and again that we were the progenitors of the linguistic movement in this country and once again the captaincy of that

[Shri Rama Rao.]

movement has come to us. Ours is the first to be formed as a linguistic State in free India. We, therefore, realise our responsibility. Political stability is the need of this moment in the new State. I have read an appeal in the papers that Prof. Ranga, Mr. Sanjiva Reddy and Shri Prakasam should come together to stabilise the State in the interest of the Andhra people and in the interest of the success of this experiment which we are launching. I would humbly add my small voice to this great appeal.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: You have not included Mr. Sundarayya.

SHRI RAMA RAO: He is not going to be in the Government. What is the use of my friend putting such a question?

Sir, Prof. Ranga is full of the tumult of the spirit but he has also tenacity of purpose. Mr. Sanjiva Reddy brings the aroma, the aura, and the authority of the Indian National Congress. And dear old Prakasam—well, he is a phenomenon; we cannot do without him. Let no one make any mistake about it. The leadership of the Andhra people has not been satisfactory in recent years and the Andhras will not forgive their leaders letting them down again at this time. If there is no political stability in the new State, there will be the President's rule and then will follow a general election. But I can make a prophecy; if an election is held, the present political pattern, as we see it today is not going to register any improvement. Would the Andhra leaders be then prepared for chaos and anarchy? They should realise their responsibility. If the coming of a province has been delayed so long, that is partly due to their own incompetent leadership.

I resent very strongly the extraordinary, unconvincing, unimpressive and irrelevant arguments advanced by friends like Shri Agnibhoj. I would say that they have no confidence in the future of their own country.

SHRI R. U. AGNIBHOJ: I have greater faith than even my hon. friend.

SHRI RAMA RAO: Then he is putting it in the wrong direction. The analogy of King Canute has been already quoted and I would say that that fate is going to overtake those who oppose the formation of linguistic States. I do not despair of the unity of my country. This process of re-integration will add greatly to that unity. So long as we have faith in the destiny of our country, so long as we all sing:

“सुजलाम् सुफलाम् मलयजशीतलाम्”

so long as democratic rule flourishes, doing justice between man and man and State and State, so long as we believe in our Constitution, which is federal in normalcy and unitary in emergency, so long as we believe that planning will bring about common economic interests, our country will never be lost. It will last for ever. Ye men of little faith, get out of the way, do not bother about what you do not understand.

Sir, India has become, in the moral sphere, the greatest power in the mid-half of the twentieth century, thanks to the excellent foreign policy of the Prime Minister. And every Indian, to whatever party or complexion he belongs, must remember that unity at home is the greatest asset for success abroad.

Sir, I am beholden to my friends here for giving their best wishes to the Andhra State. We know we are on trial. We know we have been given the leadership of this linguistic movement. I hope that the Andhras, leaders and masses alike, will remember these virtues of democracy, self-knowledge, self-control, and self-reverence, these alone lead to sovereign power. I very much liked the last part of the speech of Shri Sundarayya. May I put it in classical English: in essentials unity, in non-essentials

liberty, and in everything charity. Let the Andhras observe this maxim of conduct and it will not be long for them to grow to their full status. Let them imbibe the spirit of the Athenian statesman who, when asked to play on an instrument, said "I do not know to play on an instrument, but I know how to make a State great."

Sir, Vishal Andhra is coming with Hyderabad as its capital, which we shall rename as Sri Rama Nagar to perpetuate the memory of one of the greatest Andhras of all time. May I end this little contribution of mine to this great debate by reciting these lines which occur in the Andhra Anthem:

"Andhra Mata, Sri Sameta Akhila
Vidya Pavijata, Anupamapraputa
Mangalam, Mangalam."

DR. K. N. KATJU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, this great debate is now coming to an end. It started in the other place on the 13th August, and today it is the 12th September. It has lasted just one full month. I am glad that all this time has been taken over it in Parliament because it is not only here that we make speeches and consider various points of view; what we say here is heard elsewhere, is heard throughout the country, and I am glad indeed that the people in Andhradesh and people outside know what we have been doing. I rejoice, and I think, with me all of you rejoice, not only at the birth of the State but the manifestation of the love for unity of India. Everywhere, throughout these discussions no one has said one word about the so-called linguistic States being in any way opposed to the unity of India. On the other hand, while doubts had been raised the protagonists of the movement have asserted it over and over again that the unity of India—this great Union which is in existence—is emphatically necessary, is vital to the progress of India as a whole, and the argument has been that the establishment of States on the basis on which Andhradesh has now been established

will, if anything, further and strengthen that unity of India. That, to me personally, Sir, has been one of the most ennobling features in this great debate.

On such a contentious measure, I can easily imagine differences in points of view. Accustomed as I am to the very small sphere of partition of joint Hindu families, I know what questions arise relating to the ancestral house, relating to the different items of household properties. One member says, 'I want to have this because I am particularly attached to it' and the other says, 'Well, I should like to have something connected with my father or mother'. Well, here it is, an association of nearly 200 years breaking up, and that is a most intimate association you could imagine, administrative, political and, I imagine, social and economic; they are now parting and, therefore it is that questions arise about division of assets and liabilities and institutions and so on and so forth. They are all understandable and I must say, once again, that in this House we have had the discussions in a most dignified form. There has been no rancour, no malice, no harsh language used, and we have discussed these problems in a manner calculated to further not only the decision of the questions here but also further harmonious relations between the two people. I should also like to express my gratitude, for every question that was raised here, went to the root of a principle. We did not waste our time over minor details. May be that those details had been settled elsewhere after great and informal consideration but here we were concerned with vital principles.

My hon. friend Mr. Sundarayya expressed some sorrow and he said that there is no capital, there is no seat of the High Court and many questions have been left unsettled. I do not want to strike a note of discord here at this moment, but I say, once again, that all these are questions left to your decision; not to anybody else's, not to the President's decision, not

[Dr K. N. Katju.]

even left to Parliament. You are the masters of your own home now. You have your capital wherever you like; you have the seat of the High Court wherever you like; you have your High Court functioning from the 1st October; not even the 1st October, but the 1st March, any time. It is all up to you and we will just carry out your wishes. There will be no desire whatsoever to delay your wishes or not to comply with your wishes on one petty pretext or another. We will be entirely with you. The State having been established, this great Andhra State after so many conflicts, longing for so many years, do you mean to say that there would be anyone in the Central Government or anywhere else in India, who would not try his utmost to further your wishes to see that the State is well established, well founded, and that it makes the speediest progress imaginable? Every possible help will be forthcoming to you, within our power, within the power of the Central Government, constructive help and help by way of suggestions. I am not using the word advice, but help by way of suggestions, help by way of finance will be forthcoming, because it is a unit of India. The people are fine—I do not want to say anything against them—the people are fine; they have been gallant soldiers in the battle for freedom; they are temperamental, they are emotional, they are excitable but they are gallant soldiers and what they may have done in the past in order to further their ends, that very energy they will devote, I am sure, to the building up of their own home, to the building up of their own State and to the building up of India as a whole.

I should like one thing done. Let no one of us try to take the credit for the performance. I say so without any offence. It is due to the people; everybody struggled for it. They may have struggled in a misconceived way. There has been the great martyr who gave away his life. He thought he was following the Gandhian technique. All honour to him; all glory to him.

But please remember that the Congress gave birth to this movement. The Congress stuck to it. My hon. friend Mr. Sundarayya, I imagine, in his younger days was also a Congressman. My hon. friend, Mr. Ranga, was one of the pillars of the Congress. He still is—I mean an associate member. There it is; Mr. Reddy, every one of us. We may have divided our energies now in different directions. I believe all of us started as Congressmen, all of us were parties to the Resolution which we passed in the early days about this particular language business. We were all united then. There had been no difference of opinion on that point. I venture to say so. The late Sardar Patel and our other leaders may have pleaded for a postponement of consideration on the ground of priorities.

PROF. G. RANGA: That is so.

DR. K. N. KATJU: When you are considering these questions please don't forget what the condition of India was when Independence came in 1947. The foreign ruler was going away—as to how he went away is a matter of history—and Sardar Patel, with all these migrants coming from the Punjab, with enormous and warlike preparations and all that, the great leader that he was, great patriot that he was, may have thought and advised postponement of priorities. That is all. Do you mean to say that there is anyone who is less democratic than my hon. friend Mr. Sundarayya? We want to abide by the people's wishes. If we don't do that, we will be nowhere. Everyone of us comes here on adult franchise. We have to go to the people. You have been indirectly elected but you all owe allegiance to the people. Are there lunatics who would say that we are going to sit tight over it and we will not have these linguistic States or the redistribution of the country in spite of the people's will? We will be washed away. Maybe the conditions may be different in the democracy to which my hon. friend Mr. Sundarayya refers but in this democracy to which we are accustomed and under which we

are working, that is an impossible situation. Just as a passing thought I should like Mr. Sundarayya to imagine as to whether in his people's democracies there is any place for a Parliament which would be sitting practically eight months in the year, from day to day, and in which the Opposition would be voicing its opinion as to its utter disgust with the Government and the way we are trying to hit back, in our own way, in the more pleasing way, if I may say so. But, I am not going into these what you may call theoretical discussions.

What I am saying is that the people's voice will be heard, and will be heard and there is not the slightest desire on the part of anyone to ignore that great voice of the people.

My hon. friend Mr. Reddy said one thing which I would ask him to reconsider. He advanced a doctrine in the matter of the proposed Boundaries Commission and he advised the Government to make a public announcement that all the recommendations of this Commission shall be accepted so that we may all be bound by it and that the Government should try to give effect to those recommendations. Now the way he put it struck me as somewhat much too emphatic. In this Constitution of ours the supreme authority rests with Parliament—not with the Commission—not even with the Supreme Court as the decision of the Supreme Court prevails as long as Parliament does not interfere as it is open to Parliament to amend the very law on which a decision has been given. Now is it suggested that the Boundary Commission should be supreme, even over our Parliament? Further my hon. friend said, "Let the Government be bound by the decisions of that Commission." I can understand his saying that the Government should pay the utmost respect and give the greatest consideration to their recommendations which the Government does generally. We establish committees and commissions even in smaller matters, for example, for amendments of law and all sorts of

things. When we establish a Commission we go about collecting evidence, hearing witnesses and making reports. Everybody tries to give effect to the recommendations of the Commission and there is also an intense anxiety on the part of the Government to do what they recommend but then there is this Parliament which is supreme and the Government is responsible to Parliament. I personally thought, Sir,—and I am sure Mr. Reddy will agree with me—that the Union Government cannot abdicate its authority to anyone excepting Parliament.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: May I just interrupt and say that it is possible and I am sure it would be agreeable if a move like that were to come from the Government and put before Parliament and Parliament, for instance, can delegate its power and its authority to a Commission of this sort and agree that the Commission's decision would be final as otherwise *boundary disputes are bound to arise*.

DR. K. N. KATJU: At this late hour I have not the slightest intention even of suggesting that in making this suggestion and in giving this advice to Government Mr. Reddy had not the highest and purest motive. But it is a question of vital principle. Parliament cannot divide or share its responsibility with anyone. Suppose Government says, "We will act in accordance with this advice—because the thing is bound to come like Andhra—and bring into being the Karnatak State or the Maharashtra State", how will it avail because no State can be formed without Parliament having a voice in it. You have spent 30 or 31 days to discuss the Andhra Bill and similarly you will devote time to the Karnataka State Bill or the Maharashtra State Bill or the Bengal-Bihar Boundary Bill if and when they come.

Prof. G. RANGA: The North Indians are always complicating matters.

DR. K. N. KATJU: We as Government cannot put the rubber stamp on what the Boundary Commission says,

[Dr. K. N. Katju.]

but we have to share our responsibilities with Parliament and that is why we have come to Parliament. You may even call it a theoretical discussion because for all practical purposes there would be the utmost anxiety, as I said, to fall in with the advice of the Boundary Commission. But the constitutional position must never be forgotten.

Then, Sir, there is just one other point. There is an intense controversy between Northern India and Southern India. I do not appreciate it. It may be that at the present moment I cannot call myself a Southerner but then I am trying to remove that difficulty by adopting some particular site in the South as my own.

My hon. friend said just now something about literature and past literature.....

PROF. G. RANGA: What have you?

DR. K. N. KATJU: If my hon. friend had confined himself to the great contribution which has been made by the South to the development of Sanskrit literature I would bow down to him.

PROF. G. RANGA: I agree now.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Sanskrit literature as I have read in the books is not only metaphysical, devotional and poetical but it is also in the realm of astronomy, science, medicine and architecture. I got this information from a centenary celebration volume which we published to commemorate the birth anniversary of Ramkrishna Paramahansa and which was called, "Our Ancient Cultural Heritage." I agree with the observations made by some hon. Member that in Hindi it does not exist. I should like to know whether in Tamil, Telugu or Malayalam there is any literature worth the name, leaving aside poetry, lyrics, love verses and devotional literature in prose and poetry. Have you got any scientific literature?

PROF. G. RANGA: Kshetra Ganita.

DR. K. N. KATJU: If there be any I stand corrected. Prof. Ranga mentions something. All right, I concede that they have immense scientific literature, and that even the invention of the atom bomb is in their literature, and I also concede that the Constitution can be translated more easily in the Telugu language and that there are equivalent Telugu words even to denote the scientific expressions.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): Sanskrit literature is not your monopoly. It is ours also.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I want to share it. Now in the discussion of this matter and in the matter of linguistic States, language is of some importance. It is only during the last twenty years that there has been a tremendous upsurge and affection for one's own mother-tongue. Formerly it was all left to the poor villager. The mother-tongue was even called a dialect which the educated never spoke. We prided ourselves on the knowledge of English. Any mother would say, "Look at my son—how he says 'parrot' for 'tota' or 'sparrow' for 'chidiya'". It has been one of the gifts of Gandhiji to us that during the last 20 years even the educated people have become proud of their own mother-tongue and they want to talk in their own mother-tongue instead of in English. Now I do hope and pray earnestly that along with this affection for regional languages in which in the respective States business will be conducted in courts, offices, platforms, press, etc., there will also be an upsurge for the knowledge of one National language which will unite as I say, not only the educated people in the country but also the uneducated people so that the villager living in Rameswaram when he goes to Somnath in Saurashtra will be able to converse with the villager in Somnath in the National language and *vice versa*. That, I do hope, will not be forgotten.

Now, Sir, I have really nothing more to say. I have been thinking this

morning that while we started discussion in the other place on the 13th August, here the Bill came before you on a very auspicious day. My hon. friend Mr. Rama Rao referred to it. It was a day which 30 crores of Indians hold in great reverence the day of a great birth,—and today we are closing this discussion on a festival day—Ganesh Chauth. It is also held in great reverence and I always associate Ganesh Chauth with one of our greatest leaders—a man who really even before Gandhiji came and taught us how to sacrifice oneself for the sake of the country, Shri Bal Gangadhar Tilak. From my younger days Bal Gangadhar Tilak is associated in my mind with the resurgence of a new India, a free India and the great movement which he launched in Maharashtra on this very day. That is how this festival became known all round and the result of that was that the British functionaries of those days hated this day as something which was inimical to their very existence in India. Bal Gangadhar Tilak did not think in terms of States; he thought in terms of the freedom of India as a whole and he worked for it. I had, you had, most of us elder people,—we have had the good fortune and privilege of sitting at his feet and listening to his speeches in the Congress. He was a great man and, as I said, so long as my life lasts, for me this day will always be associated with Bal Gangadhar Tilak who fought for the resurgence of India. And it so

happens that this Bill will go out of this House while the clock will be striking 12 o'clock, mid-day, when the sun is at its zenith. On this great day we are witnessing the resurgence of a great *desh* for which the people have suffered. All our prayers and good wishes will go out to the people of Andhradesh. May they prosper; may their standard of living be high; may their needs be fully met; may their cultural standards be high and may they prove a source of strength not only to themselves but to the whole of this country. That is my wish. That is your wish. That is my prayer and that is your prayer and that is the prayer of all of us in United India. Jai Hind.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That the Bill to provide for the formation of the State of Andhra, the increasing of the area of the State of Mysore and the diminishing of the area of the State of Madras, and for matters connected therewith, as passed by the House of the People, be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

The Council adjourned till quarter past eight of the clock on Monday, the 14th September 1953.

COUNCIL OF STATES

Monday, 14th September 1953

The Council met at a quarter past eight of the clock in the morning, Mr. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

REPATRIATION OF COAL MINE LABOUR IN BIHAR

*296. SHRI M. VALIULLA: Will the Minister for LABOUR be pleased to state:

(a) the number of labourers repatriated from the coal mines in Bihar during the year 1952-53; and

(b) the reasons for their repatriation?

THE MINISTER FOR LABOUR (SHRI V. V. GIRI): (a) Presumably the reference is to labourers recruited through the Gorakhpur Labour Organisation. If so, the number of labourers repatriated is 1,977.

(b) The main reason for the repatriation of Gorakhpuri labourers was the expiry of their term of contract. In a few cases the labourers were repatriated on medical grounds or on the labourers' own request for premature repatriation.

SHRI M. VALIULLA: Were they given any passage money to go back to their homes?

SHRI V. V. GIRI: Yes.

SHRI M. VALIULLA: Were they given any compensation after the period was over?

SHRI V. V. GIRI: I do not think they were given any compensation. They come and work for 11 months and then go back.

SHRI M. VALIULLA: Is there any proposal to have a labour pool so that labour may be recruited and sent back, as is done in the case of military labour?

78 C.S.D.

SHRI V. V. GIRI: Nothing of the kind.

DIFFERENCE IN THE SCALES OF PAY OF MATRICULATES AND NON-MATRICULATES IN THE LOCO RUNNING STAFF

*297. SHRI M. VALIULLA: Will the Minister for RAILWAYS be pleased to state:

(a) whether representations have been received by Government from non-matriculates in the Loco Running Staff to the effect that although their service is of the same duration and on the same or similar trains as those of matriculates, yet there is a difference in the scales of pay;

(b) if so, what action Government have taken on these representations;

(c) how many persons have been affected adversely due to the difference in the scales of pay;

(d) when this differentiation was introduced; and

(e) whether such differentiation exists in other departments of the Railways?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS AND TRANSPORT (SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN): (a) Yes, Sir. Representations have been received.

(b) As the difference in the scale of pay of these staff is due to the method and purpose of their recruitment it is not intended to make any change.

(c) As there is no difference in the scale of pay of men recruited in identical circumstances and whose avenue of promotion is the same, nobody has been adversely affected.

(d) 1st January 1949.

(e) The position in the other departments is different. Matriculation is usually the minimum educational qualification prescribed for direct recruitment to the lowest grade of Class III and non-matriculates get no opportunity of direct recruitment to Class III posts in those departments.