

India will depend on the future plan of distribution of German reparations by the Inter-Allied Reparations Agency, Brussels.

(c) India has waived all claims to reparations from several former "belligerent nations"—Italy, Finland, Roumania, Bulgaria and Hungary—but she is entitled to retain the enemy property now vested in the Custodian of Enemy Property to the extent of her claims against the countries concerned.

Under the Indo-Japanese Peace Treaty, India has waived all reparation claims against that country which according to pre-partition claims amounted to about Rs. 2,800 crores.

#### REHABILITATION OF THE EARTHQUAKE SUFFERERS IN ASSAM

76. SHRI L. BOROOAH : Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state :

(a) whether Government are aware that a large number of tribals such as Mishmis, Abors and Miris were displaced from their homes in the North-East Frontier of Assam in the Assam earthquake of August 1950 ; and

(b) what steps do the Government propose to take for their rehabilitation ?

PRIME MINISTER (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU) : (a) Yes.

(b) The Government of India have already spent Rs. 6 lakhs during the two financial years 1950-51 and 1951-52, for the relief and rehabilitation of the people of the Abor Hills District and the Mising Hills District, effected by earthquake and floods in 1950. The 'Governor's Assam Earthquake Relief Fund' has also allotted a sum of Rs. 1,23,400 to be spent during the financial year 1952-53 on the development of agriculture in the affected areas. A Five Year Scheme (1951-56) for development of agriculture in these areas is being financed from the Governor's Assam Earthquake Relief Fund.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

##### REPORTS ON THE SUPPLY AND PRICES OF GOODS ACT, 1950.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS AND TRANSPORT (SHRI LAL BAHADUR) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a summary of the reports received from the State Government regarding the working of the Supply and Prices of Goods Act, 1950 for the year 1951-52. [See Appendix II, Annexure No. 15.]

#### FORMATION OF ANDHRA STATE

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will take up the Resolutions. The first is by Shri P. V. Narayana.

SHRI S BANERJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of information. On the 26th June I sent in a Resolution regarding the Constitution of India which runs as follows...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Banerjee, I don't think it is right for you to read the Resolution which has been disallowed. If you kindly see me, I shall explain the reason why it has been disallowed.

SHRI S. BANERJEE : Thank you, Sir.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA (Madras): Mr. Chairman, with your permission I beg to move the Resolution that stands in my name. The Resolution runs thus:

This Council is of opinion that Government should take speedy steps for the formation of an ANDHRA State from out of the existing territories of the State of Madras, giving it the status of a Part A State, and that a Bill for the purpose should be introduced by the Government, on the recommendation of the President, after ascertaining the view of the Madras State Legislature with respect to the proposal and to the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. Chairmen, no doubt the Resolution is very lengthy and it should not be misunderstood that it is a complicated one. It is a very simple one and I shall explain how. For constituting any new States or for changing boundaries of an existing State the provisions of Article 3 of the Constitution of India

should be invoked. It is only in accordance with the provision thereof that this Resolution had to be drafted in this lengthy manner. In effect my Resolution comes to this—a request to the Central Government to take the necessary steps to form a separate Andhra province from the territories of the Madras State.

My Resolution is the simplest of all Resolutions either moved or conceived in respect of linguistic States. It does not aim at either a Visala-Andhra or at the redistribution of the provinces on the basis of language and culture, in general. It is a simple Resolution for the formation of an Andhra Province and it is connected with the Government of Madras alone. O.7 a previous occasion you know, Sir, I tried to impress upon this House by means of a motion for papers on the subject on the eve of launching *Satyagraha* by Swami Sitaram; but my attempts were unsuccessful and I do not want now to go into those details.

There was, Sir, a debate in the Lower House in respect of a general Resolution on the redistribution of the States on linguistic and cultural affinities. But my Resolution is quite definite and simple. It aims at the formation of the province of Andhra alone.

I am grateful to the Prime Minister, for his attitude in this matter. Whatever his views may be in respect of the formation of other provinces in India, he was very sympathetic towards our move and he said that he had been always for it, and that he had no objection to the formation of an Andhra Province, provided there was a large measure of agreement amongst the parties concerned. He said the Partition Committee had decided almost all the questions, except one or two. Substantially it comes to one question—the question of to whom the city of Madras should go. Of late, no doubt, Sir, from Rayalaseema has come the lonely voice—a voice from the grave—of Shri Narasimha Reddy (*An hon. Member* : Why from the grave ?) who poses himself as the President of the so-called Rayalaseema Mihasabha, which I may say, is not a

representative body, but just a body consisting of a few opportunists. In any case, we need not waste much time as regards Rayalaseema forming part of the Andhra Province as it is an integral part of Andhra. I here plead only for the formation of a province consisting of Srikakulam, Vishakapatnam, East Godavari, West Godavari, Kistna, Guntur, Nellore, and Rayalaseema, i.e., Chittoor, Karnool, Cuddappa, Anantapur and three talukas of Bellary. As regards the city of Madras, I shall deal with it later.

Although I confine myself strictly to my Resolution I have to speak a few words in the general set up and give an idea of the proposed Visala-Andhra and also on redistribution of the entire country on the linguistic and cultural basis.

As regards the city of Madras there was a time when the Tamils had given up their claim to the city.

AN HON. MEMBER : When ?

Shri P. V. NARAYANA : My hon. friend there will have an opportunity later. In the year 1926, Sir Sankaran Nair accredited leader of South India, moved a Resolution on the floor of the Council of States at Delhi to the effect that the south of Madras should be formed or constituted into a separate, autonomous, rather an independent province. He also said that the city of Madras did not belong to the Tamils alone but to the Telugus and others also. At any rate he did not claim the city of Madras to be included within the province he was asking for. And even before 1926, at the Calcutta session of the Congress in 1917, it was decided to constitute the Telugu speaking area into a separate Andhra Provincial Congress Committee. Since 1918 the Andhra and Tamilnad Provincial Congress Committees have been functioning in the city of Madras. They have been exercising joint territorial jurisdiction or rather concurrent jurisdiction, and that is the case even today. And in the city you have the Andhra District Congress Committee and the Tamil District Congress Committee and they exercise

[Shri P. V. Narayana.J Concurrent territorial jurisdiction. So according even to the Congress practice it has been established that the Andhras and the Tamils have their interests in the City of Madras.

Again in 1924, the session of the Indian National Congress was held in the city of Madras, and there was surplus collection to the tune of Rs. 27,000. Both sides—Tamils and Andhras—claimed this sum and so it was deposited in a bank. Mahatma Gandhi, who was President of the Congress, appointed Dr. Rajendra Prasad our present President of India, as arbitrator and this sum was divided half and half, each getting about Rs. 13,500. Similarly in the matter of selection of candidates for the Central Legislature and also the Provincial Legislatures and other representative bodies it was only after joint deliberations of the two Congress Committees that the candidates were selected.

I may also state here that as everybody knows, most of the Mayors of the Madras Municipal Corporation were Telugus. To start with, the place called Madras was just a small village given as a gift or on lease to the East India Co. by the Andhra chief, son of Chinnappa Naik, chief of Chandragiri. From the very beginning the port officers, the *Dubhashis* and the staff in the schools were all Andhras. The schools taught English and Telugu and never Tamil in the initial stage. Even the seal of the East India Company had English on one side and Telugu on the other side. Thereafter when the South Indian Railway was built in the south sometime in 1853 or so, long before the railway came to the coastal districts of Andhra, many Tamils entered the city of Madras and settled down there to carry on business. But originally it was built by the Andhras. The artisans, the traders and all the rest of them were Andhras. Of late, no doubt, influential Tamils and merchants have come and settled down in the city. The harbour was constructed, further developments took place and as I said, wry influential Tamils settled down in the city. They have very great leadership. Of course, we

Andhras are not lacking in leaders, but there is no proper leadership. I have great respect for the Tamils. They are intelligent and they are also very clever, and they have determination and perseverance; and we are somewhat lacking in these things. We are a very emotional people. Unfortunately we speak so many things from the platform and issue press statements long before we actually do certain things. We shout about them from the house-top and the other party comes to know of our programme and forestalls us. That is what has happened. The Tamils in the initial stages never claimed the city of Madras. It is only now that they want it exclusively for themselves, and I confess I am unable to understand this claim of theirs.

My claim is very simple, Sir. According to the Prime Minister, besides one or two disputed items, there is substantial agreement over the Andhra question. What I ask the Government to do is, Sir, to constitute an Andhra Province leaving out the disputed areas. The Tamilians claim the Madras City exclusively for themselves we can do the same thing but we have not done so because we want to be very reasonable. We want to place before the House and before the Government what we sincerely feel. I say that we want this Government to form the Andhra Province with the areas that are under the jurisdiction of the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee, excluding the City of Madras and excluding any other area which either the Tamilian or anybody disputes. I come from the heart of Andhra that is East Godavari. If they object to East Godavari going to the Andhra Province, then let the Government exclude that area. Let them exclude all disputed areas and constitute a separate province with the undisputed areas. The question of the disputed area, including the City of Madras, may be referred either to arbitration or a Tribunal or a boundary commission to be set up by the Government of India and we would abide by the decision. If it is decided that the City of Madras should go to the Tamilians entirely,

or it should be kept as a common City for Tamilians and Andhras, or if it is decided that South of the Cooum should go to the Tamilians and the North to Andhras, we would agree. Even if it is decided to constitute the City of Madras into a separate Chief Commissioner's or a Lieut.-Governor's Province, we would agree. The Tamilians should also be prepared to abide by the decision if it goes in favour of the Andhras. The Tamilians claim that the City of Madras should be given to them exclusively: we could also claim exclusive right, but we want to be very reasonable and, as there is a dispute, we want this question to be decided by an impartial body. I really wonder why they object to it. If their case for the City of Madras is really strong, let it be decided by an impartial body. They cannot have all things for themselves; they must be honest and sincere. In a question in which they are involved they cannot decide things for themselves. The status of the city of Madras being the only question under dispute, Prime Minister Nehru should appoint a boundary commission if the parties cannot come to agreement in respect of arbitration or a tribunal. Panditji asks us to compose these differences amongst ourselves. Is it possible, unless the Prime Minister or one of his colleagues convenes a sort of a round table conference inviting all the parties, and advises or asks them to do things in a friendly way? Unless those steps are taken it is not possible for us to come to an agreement. We want to divide. When we want them to give our legitimate share they ask us to get away with one or two annas in the rupee. It is not just. We must be given our legitimate due of 7 annas or 8 annas to which we are entitled. The Secretariat is there, the accounts and the assets and liabilities are there. These other things can be settled by a boundary commission. Naturally, when the son goes to the father for partition, because he was not treated well, the father, finding the son weak and helpless, cannot ask him to take 4 annas and get out. The Tamilians are a very strong people. The leader of this house is

himself an influential Minister in the Central Cabinet. I wonder even if Panditji who knows the justness of our claim can displease him. The present Chief Minister of Madras, Mr. Raja-gopalachari, who served us as the first Governor-General and, later, also as Minister in the Central Cabinet here, is a very influential gentleman, Sir. Mr. Santhanam, the Lieut.-Governor and so many other influential people are there.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please talk about the Resolution.

SHRIV. P. NARAYANA : We are helpless, Sir. We are orphans and that is why I commend this to the sympathy of this House. That is my painful submission.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore) / I object, Sir. We are not orphans.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : That is because he comes from Mysore.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Another three minutes.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : We have also great leaders. You, the Vice-President of the Indian Republic, are an Andhra, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I told you to talk about the Resolution.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : But, he is in such a position he cannot talk and so we are unfortunate. We have lost a great supporter in him, Sir.

— MR. CHAIRMAN : You have no time now. You have only two minutes and you are talking about other things.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : The duty of the Central Government is to help and to come to the rescue of the weaker party and all those who are helpless. Strong people can look after themselves' Panditji said that he was for the formation of an Andhra Province. He very much liked it to be thimed. In view of this, I would request him not to take the same attitude that he took in respect of the Resolution in the

[Shri P. V. Narayana.] Lower House. There he said that the Resolution was not only unacceptable but objectionable also. He suggested that if a specific Resolution in respect of the formation of any South Indian State was placed before him he would certainly consider. I tell Panditji that this is the Resolution which he suggested on the 7th.

Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, who was the Chief Minister of Madras in 1938— he is also today the Chief Minister, Sir—spoke on the Resolution for a separate Andhra Province in these terms:

"Judged by everyone of these tests, including the latter portion, judged again or every one of these ideals »eparately and as a whole, the claim of the Andhras stands very good. There the use of common speech ts a strong and natural basis. As regards the other tests, viz., race, religion, economic interest, geographical contiguity and due balance between country and town, on all these points, there is no case for opposing the claim for leparate Andhra Province."

The only point now is the appointment of a boundary commission straightaway by the Central Government. Sir S. Radhakrishnan said, Sir , , .

MR. CHAIRMAN : No reference to me. Get along with the rest of the speech.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : Could you not forget, for a moment, that you are presiding ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Get along with ! the speech.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : Then, Sir, Glyn Barlow in his book *The City of Madras* has written that the "Great majority of the original Indian settlers were not Tamils but Telugus written down in the Company's records as 'Gentus'." The hereditary officers, the merchants, the *dubhashis*, the native agencies and contractors of the company, the Dharmakarthis of the temples were all Telugus. The seal of the mercantile community in one portion was in English as "Company Madras Merchants" and in Telugu as "Chenna Patnam Company Merchants" in the

other portion. Tamil was not seen anywhere. The early schools started were only imparting English and Telugu.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You may move the Resolution now. It is time.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : With these few words, Sir, I formally move the Resolution.

MR. C H A I R \* M A N : Resolution moved :

This Council is of opinion that Government should take speedy steps for the formation of an Andhra State from out of the existing territories of the State of Madras, giving it the status of a Part A state and that a Bill for the purpose should be introduced by the Government, on the recommendation of the President, after ascertaining the views of the Madras State Legislature with respect to the proposal and to the provisions of the Bill.

Notices of amendments have also been given. I would like those amendments to be moved so that the House, may discuss both the main Resolution and the amendments. I call upon Shri K. B. Lall to move his amendment.

SHRI K. B. LALL (Bihar) : I am not moving the amendment, but I shall speak on the subject later on.

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa) : Is he withdrawing it, Sir ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is no question of withdrawal. It has not been moved at all.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA (Madras) : Mr. Chairman, in supporting the Resolution moved by my friend, Shri Pydah Venkata Narayana, I wish to say a few words. We, the Andhra members from the South, are really fortunate for this Resolution has secured the first place in the ballot for non-official Resolutions and I hope in the same manner the great God may help us to get our Andhra State in the near future from this Government. It is long pending since 1916. I do not like to go into details and place the facts before this House of our difficulties in the Madras State. Generally, almost all our political parties in Andhra are unanimously agreed on the question of formation of an Andhra State except Madras City. Whenever the Andhra State question arises,

some interested individuals from Rayalaseema have been sending wires to this Government and to our leaders like Jawaharlalji and also to the leader of this House opposing the separation of Andhra.

9 a.m.

There is a moral force behind our request for a separate State of Andhra. The hon. the Prime Minister has understood it and has agreed to form an Andhra State; at the same time he is asking us that we and the Tamilians and others who are concerned in this matter should settle among ourselves and reach a measure of agreement first. It is a possible solution, Sh\*? Can they settle the matter—such a controversial matter—without any positive and constructive help from this Government? The old British Government also were saying like this when we were asking them for our independence which is our birthright. The public opinion in Andhra is also same on the attitude of our Government in this matter. When the British Government did not oblige us to our legitimate request for our independence we asked them to leave India and made them quit India. Now Sir, we are really sorry to hear the same unsympathetic words from the leader of this country Jawaharlalji to our request for an Andhra Province. He knows fully well how the Andhras have followed him and sacrificed for the country's freedom. This question is not started now; it was started in 1916 by our Andhra leaders like the late Deshbhaktha Konda Venkatappaiah, Nageswara Rao Pantulu and others.

Let me say, Sir, at this stage one thing. When the Simon Commission came to our parts of the Country in 1926, all parties, including those opposed to the Congress in Andhra, lined themselves up with the Congress at that time. The Orissa Province was created by Britishers because the Oriya people welcomed the Simon Commission. Now Sir, I would like to know from this Government what are the practical difficulties in forming an Andhra State at least on the lines of the

Resolution passed by the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee in November 1949. Where there is disagreement, like Madras and other matters, the Government can easily solve it by appointing an Arbitration Committee to enquire into the disputed matters. Our resolution also, Sir, is very moderate and simple and may be acceptable to all sections of the House. We are not asking for the province immediately.. We want our proposal to be accepted and that too after ascertaining the views of the Madras State Legislature with respect to the proposal and to the provisions of the Bill. As our leader, Pandit Jawaharlalji has agreed to form the Province, now at least he should sound and ask the Madras Provincial Legislature. So, it is my humble submission to this House and to our hon. Prime Minister to accept our request unanimously and let the people of Andhra Desa celebrate Andhra Day on the 9th of August next—the date on which we started the Quit India Movement against the British Government.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN (Madras) : Mr. Chairman, in rising to oppose this Resolution, I do not wish to speak as a Tamilian but as an Indian. As an Indian I feel that it is not in the interests of the country to get divided at this juncture. It is not proper for us to divert the attention of the people to the question of linguistic provinces or to the question of any other division^ It is of the utmost necessity for us to focus the attention of the people to more constructive things, to the development schemes that we are taking up, and to the unity of the country. In this matter I request the Government to make bold announcement saying that the Government is not prepared to think of the question of forming linguistic provinces or of the division of any State for at least some years to come, before they complete all the development schemes and build the country on a sound basis.

Coming to the specific question of an Andhra State, the mover of the Resolution said that the Prime Minister

[Shri G. Rajagopalan.] had promised to consider the question of the formation of an Andhra State favourably and that he was prepared to separate it from the general question of the formation of other linguistic states. But I am not prepared to look at that question from that point

of people in Tamilnad who speak Telugu, and for example, the Rajans of Rajapalayam, and the Reddiars of the South and North Arcot District. They are not Andhras, but they speak Telugu as their mother tongue. They speak it in their homes as Telugus, but they are not Andhras. That is why I say "Telugus" and not "Andhras". The Tamilian population was 4,11,823 in 1931. Unfortunately, the Government of India did not take the census on a linguistic basis in 1941 and 1951 so I am not able to give exact figures. But correspondingly the figures must be the same.

A reference was made to the last City Corporation election and the Joint Parliamentary Board for the selection of candidates for Madras Corporation, the Assembly and Parliament. In the last election in Madras City, for City Corporation the Tamilnad Congress Committee and the Andhra Congress Committee decided not to contest elections in the City. The elections in the City for the Corporation were contested on the basis whether the City should go to Tamilnad or to Andhra. I wish to tell the House that the Andhra got only one seat out of 50 seats in the City of Madras.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : Question.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN : Then, Sir, the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee, the Communist Party of India, and the Krishak Lok Party all have said that they would be prepared to have an Andhra State without the City of Madras. But who is claiming the City of Madras? The leader of the party to which the mover of the Resolution belongs—the Kisan Mazdoor Paraja Party—who stood in the City of Madras for the local assembly and forfeited his deposit because he claimed Madras City for Andhra Desa.

(Shri P. V. Narayana rose.)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, order. Other Members will have an opportunity of explaining the position.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN : I wish to state in this matter that the leader

of people in Tamilnad who speak Telugu, and for example, the Rajans of Rajapalayam, and the Reddiars of the South and North Arcot District. They are not Andhras, but they speak Telugu as their mother tongue. They speak it in their homes as Telugus, but they are not Andhras. That is why I say "Telugus" and not "Andhras". The Tamilian population was 4,11,823 in 1931. Unfortunately, the Government of India did not take the census on a linguistic basis in 1941 and 1951 so I am not able to give exact figures. But correspondingly the figures must be the same.

A reference was made to the last City Corporation election and the Joint Parliamentary Board for the selection of candidates for Madras Corporation, the Assembly and Parliament. In the last election in Madras City, for City Corporation the Tamilnad Congress Committee and the Andhra Congress Committee decided not to contest elections in the City. The elections in the City for the Corporation were contested on the basis whether the City should go to Tamilnad or to Andhra. I wish to tell the House that the Andhra got only one seat out of 50 seats in the City of Madras.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : Question.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN : Then, Sir, the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee, the Communist Party of India, and the Krishak Lok Party all have said that they would be prepared to have an Andhra State without the City of Madras. But who is claiming the City of Madras? The leader of the party to which the mover of the Resolution belongs—the Kisan Mazdoor Paraja Party—who stood in the City of Madras for the local assembly and forfeited his deposit because he claimed Madras City for Andhra Desa.

(Shri P. V. Narayana rose.)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, order. Other Members will have an opportunity of explaining the position.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN : I wish to state in this matter that the leader

of the Party was asked to stand somewhere in Andhra districts. He refused. He said : "I want to see the problem of the City of Madras solved. I want the City of Madras." Unfortunately, he forfeited his deposit. What I am trying to show is that though we do not want a division, though we do not want separation, our claim to that city is firm. We do not want to leave the City of Madras. If, however, the Government of India unfortunately decide to give a separate State and if they want to form an Andhra State, I would tell them that they cannot give Madras City to the Andhra State. It must be a non-Andhra city if it is decided to form an Andhra State, and it should go to the Tamil State when the redistribution of territories is made on a linguistic basis.

Why am I saying that the Government of India should make an announcement that they are not prepared to divide the Province on a linguistic basis ? This problem has been hanging fire in the country for a long time. Political parties are trying to exploit the innocent feelings of the masses for their own purposes. The Government should put an end to the problem. The leaders are not prepared to take the province. They want the problem to live, for them to live in politics. It is unfortunate that this problem should go on diverting the attention of the public so that the political leaders can have some backing in the country and can live.

With these words, I oppose this Resolution. I again request the Government of India that they should come forward with the announcement that they are not prepared to divide the country on a linguistic basis at least for ten years to come.

PROF. G. RANGA (Madras) : Mr. Chairman, I am glad my hon. friend from Tamilnad has spoken with refreshing frankness. He does not want the Andhra Province to be formed, not because he is opposed to the Andhra Province, but because it is not just at present in the interests of India.

That is a tenable point of view from his standpoint. But most unfortunately for him and for various others who may think like him, the Andhras have been brought up to think for the last 30 years that they should have their own province, they have had very good reasons. Some have been given by my hon. friend the mover of the Resolution. There are various others also. My hon. friend was referring to a number of eminent Tamilian statesmen and politicians and administrators. Well, for a very long time Andhras did not have their proper share, I suppose, of the plums and puddings. Now Andhras are also coming in for a number of hugs from the hon. the Prime Minister. Therefore, that alone cannot be the reason. But in spite of this distribution of sweets if Andhras are still keen about a separate province for themselves, there must be something special about it. One thing I have already mentioned. They have been asking for it for such a long time that it is impossible for them now to stop asking for it. That is a very practical political consideration. The next reason is that the masses cannot follow our proceedings, which they can if the legislature of an Andhra Province were to conduct its business in Telugu, and, similarly, if the whole of the Administration is carried on in Telugu. But then that brings me up against the prohibition placed by the hon. the Prime Minister that we should not think in terms of the formation of new provinces on a linguistic basis. I am not prepared to agree with him. If on other grounds also new provinces can be formed then it would be best to have provinces on a linguistic basis. That is one of the reasons why the Andhras are so very keen about having their own province. Thirdly, for a very long time we have been educated wrongly by our historians and our poets and other writers in the provinces. That is the difficulty today that the Government comes across in Bengal in the dispute between Bengal and Bihar, in Assam between Bengal and Assam, here in Hariana, and in various other provinces



[Prof. G Ranga], also. We have been under the impression that as in days of old we should be a conquering sort of people, and therefore, the more we can encroach upon the ground of others, the better it would be. And we have not yet begun to think on a mass scale that in our various States we people are only a part and parcel of the bigger whole—the Indian Union. We are still thinking in the old fashion. We are children as well as slaves of a wrong mentality. It is too difficult now for the Andhra leaders and Andhra politicians and political parties to go back to these people and say "Look here, we have been educated wrongly. Therefore give up your demand." It is not possible. It is not practical politics. I am not placing it on a much higher level because it has already been placed on that level by my hon. friend. This is my answer to my hon. friend who has just now spoken. Andhra Province there must be. It has got to be there. The Prime Minister also is now too tired of his own Nero's policy. Therefore he wants to create an Andhra Province. So far so good. But how is it to be formed ? Here is a formula. It is on the whole I think a non-controversial formula, it does not bring in the Madras city at all. My hon. friend has referred to a Resolution which was passed some time back in which it was stated quite clearly as per the terms of the Report of the Three-Man Committee that Andhra Province should be carved out with all these districts which are undisputably considered to be Andhra and without Madras city. So where is the difficulty then ? My friend has raised the issue and in the country also it is being raised that Madras city should go to the Andhras. And here is my friend who says that it should go only to the Tamilians. Sir, for some years I have been at great pains to convince my friends on this side of the Coom as well as friends on that side of the Coom that this Madras city problem should not be viewed in the same manner in which Danzig is being viewed in Europe. Have we not got Andhra schools in

Bombay or in Calcutta ? Are not the Corporations there giving us grants for our schools ? Do we not have Tamilians to teach our boys in their own mother-tongue ? Andhra friends can have their own teachers, their own culture, schools and various other things. Therefore we must begin to think in a different way in regard to Madras city as also about Calcutta—much less about Calcutta because there is not so much of difficulty or controversy—as also about Bombay. We want arbitration. My friend has referred to it. There was already an arbitration. There was the Dhar Commission. They made a recommendation, Sir, that Bombay should be a central city and also Madras should be a central city. It was most unfortunate that the Three-Man Committee wanted to please our Tamil friends. Therefore they told them "Let us not settle this problem just now. You have your province. You are so impatient. Have it without Madras city." So let us have it without Madras city. But where are these Andhras to have their capital for carrying on their development schemes and other things relating to the Administration. Now if the Andhra Province were to be created without Madras city, is that to be created straightaway or will they begin to organise and construct a new capital at a cost of 15 crores—may be 20 crores or may be 30 crores—of money which is very preciously needed for various development schemes as well as multi-purpose schemes.

Therefore, it is but reasonable, Sir, to maintain on the part of anyone—Andhra or a Tamilian or even a Malayali, that this Madras city should serve the purpose of both Andhras and Tamilians as also for Malayalis. My friend has given the figures of population I would like to ask : Do you want to go to war with each other ? You will find that there are Gujeratis, Malayalis and Kannadigas and Tamilians who have not yet made up their mind whether they would like to go into the battle of words or the battle of swords with the Tamilians as against Andhras and why do you want to put them into

this very unpleasant mess ? So it is best I think on the whole that we should begin to think just as they thought of the Osmania University being a centre for culture. So also some of our cities should be central cities administered by their own self-governing councils but responsible to the local Governor and that there should be a common Government for Tamilnad as well as Andhra. Let both the Governments have their headquarters in the Madras city and also the Government buildings there. Let them have a sort of a diplomatic enclave or whatever particular term you might possibly use, in the same manner in which in Geneva I.L.O. is functioning, having jurisdiction over its own territory; similarly in New York, the United Nations building. You can have it that way. In Simla you have got three Administrations there. You are having here only two. These are only passing thoughts. I would like my friends to think about all this. If it is possible it is best for us to have Madras city as a common city for all of us and all the four linguistic States. But if you want to break up this living city, living organisation, into two blood bits, it is for you to do it. If on the other hand you want to have your own way with the Andhras or the Tamilians, have it in whichever way you like. But it is we who have to give a decision on this matter. If you leave it to the Prime Minister how can the poor man give any sort of decision ? What sort of decision he gave over Gwalior or Indore the other day ? Therefore it is quite possible and let us have an agreement among ourselves.

Then, Sir, this Resolution will take a long time—nearly a year—for its implementation. It has got to come up here for consideration and has to pass through certain stages and then come down to the Madras Legislature and back again to this place. Therefore what I would suggest for immediate relief and for the satisfaction of the Andhra peoples and their sentiments is the achievement of administrative division. It was mooted 17 CSD

years ago. It was mooted by us also in some other spheres. It can be taken up even today. If that is taken up, financial difficulty can be overcome. Economy can also be achieved. Even today you have for every department two big heads, -the Joint Registrar and also the Registrar, the Joint Director of Agriculture and the Joint Director of Industries and so on. Instead of dividing between themselves, let high schools be for one man and the elementary schools for the other. You give the Telugu area to one man and non-Telugu area to the other. Let them administer like that. And so far as Andhra Province is concerned, let all the officers be Andhras themselves and in regard to finances also, let there be allocation as was the case in Berar and Mahakoshal. Well it was achieved there with much satisfaction. After all, much of the strength for this kind of demand for a separate Province derives its force from these two things. One is the educated middle class people's zeal for their proper share in the Administration in any particular Government. The next thing is a proper share in the allocation of funds that are at the disposal of any particular State. Now you satisfy these two things immediately within this one year and.....

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH : (Bihar) What about Ministership ?

PROF. G. RANGA : Yes I am coming to this Ministership also. There has not been much difficulty. I might tell you that in spite of the fact that these Tamilian friends and Andhras appear to be fighting among themselves, they have been getting on much better than could be expected. Who was the last Premier ? He was a Telugu in Tamilnad. His predecessor Ramaswami Reddiar was Telugu but settled in Tamilnad.

Take even an earlier period. The Raja of Panagal was an Andhra but the Tamils had him as their leader. He was accepted as such by my honourable friend and colleague, Mr. Ramaswamy Mudaliar. Take also Mr. Muniswami Naidu. He was an Andhra accepted by the Tamilians.

[Prof. G. Ranga.] Unfortunately political considerations have now crept in, but the time has now come when we should solve this question, by the co-operation of all.

Lastly, Sir, I might be permitted to draw attention to the fact that there are 5 million Telugu-speaking people in Tamilnad. They have been treated very well indeed by the Tamilians. Some of their outstanding personalities like Saint Tyagaraja are Andhras. \* Shri Tyagaraja has been hailed as a saint by the Tamilians themselves. There are more devotees of Tyagaraja in Tamilnad than in Andhra. Therefore there is much force in what the Prime Minister said, "You should try to come together." But they cannot come together by themselves because of these troubles. Sir, after the recent elections, another force, which is not interested in capturing power constitutionally, but which is interested in capturing political power both constitutionally and, if that fails, by violence also, that force has also come upon the scene. And so let us begin to review our propaganda. In the meanwhile, I hope that the hon. the Leader of the House would be good enough to say that he would lend his moral support to the Resolution which is really non-controversial.

SHRI RAMA RAO (Madras) : Mr. Chairman, there are some people who are more loyal to the King than the King himself. I find that my friend, Mr. Rajagopal, belongs to this category.

AN HON. MEMBER : Where is Mr. Rajagopal ?

SHRI RAMA RAO : Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has laid down very clearly the following points in the course of his speech in the other House. He is in favour of an Andhra Province. He does not expect 100% agreement, but he is confident, he is convinced, that 97% of the Andhras want an Andhra Province. If there is any overlapping of territories, that is, if there are any conflicting claims, the j i

matter will have to be settled by the people themselves. Otherwise he would be willing to lend a helping hand, but in any case Andhra is in a special category, even as South India is in a special category with regard to the linguistic question.

My friend Mr. Rajagopal wants the Prime Minister to forget this matter now and postpone it for another ten years. I feel that the Prime Minister of India knows something about the unity and security of this country, a little more than my young friend from Madras.

Sir, Shri Rajagopalachari has recently made two vital points. On the 30th April he said that if the linguistic question, and the disputes about the linguistic provinces were not settled, it would become more and more difficult to settle them in future. He also said that it was undesirable that persons should be thrown into each other's continued company against their will. He then threw out a useful hint at some method by which these difficulties could be got over. He dropped a very significant remark, on which my friend Prof. Ranga also has touched, about a sort of administrative division of the State of Madras. I think it would be perfectly feasible. Some scheme of this kind was put forth some years ago by Dr. Pattabhi in a different context. Dr. Pattabhi, who gave a clothing and a philosophy to the linguistic movement and raised it to a national level. We miss him here today very badly. I certainly miss his great inspiration.

Sir, this being the background, how can you postpone this question ? It has got to be settled one way or the other. I have lived the best part of my life outside the Madras State, and I am not interested in plunging into the quarrels of politicians there. I would only say that the quarrel over the city of Madras, whatever be the final decision about it, shall not stand in the way of the fulfilment of the aspirations of the Andhras cherished for the last forty years and more. Sir, I regret, I most sincerely regret, the inefficiency and ineptitude of Andhra

leadership, but cannot Tamil Nad do something to rectify it? I think that Tamil Nad can afford to be generous.

Speaking for myself, I am absolutely against Madras being the capital of Andhra. Sir, how can you think of France without Paris? How can you think of Germany without Berlin? And certainly how can you think of Italy without Rome with its wonderful layers of civilisation. The Andhras must have a really national capital. I pray that the city of Madras shall never belong to the Andhras. Our destinies are cast on the waters of the Krishna and the Godavari, perhaps even on the waters of the Musi. Sir, we shall be in Hyderabad within three years. No one can prevent it. The Prime Minister the other day offered only a tentative opinion about this State. It is not a permanent suggestion. I say, with every confidence, that sooner or later we are going to be I in Hyderabad. The Andhras, the I Karnatakas and the Maharashtrian are waiting on the edge of the grave of this dying kingdom.

I am asking my Tamil friends only to give the Andhras temporary accommodation in Madras for some time till we are able to find a permanent habitation elsewhere.

The question has been raised of the solvency of the Andhra State in this connection. Sir, recently I wrote to a friend of mine in the banking line in Madras, and I have also been following very closely the debates in the Madras Legislative Assembly and the Madras Legislative Council, where this question has been debated. Mr. V. Ramakrishna, a former I.C.S. officer, in the course of his speech there states that neither Andhra nor Tamil Nad would be solvent if they had separate governments outside the city. Sir, the sales tax is one of the very important sources of revenue to the Government, by which it gets about 15 crores of rupees—I speak subject to correction—and a good part of it is raised in the Madras City itself. Now, if Andhra and Tamil Nad continue to have their capitals in the Madras City

for a short while, they will not be faced with any financial problem. What is the difficulty in allowing the Andhras to live in Madras for a certain period on the definite stipulation that they should go elsewhere, whatever be the final decision about Madras, whatever be the settlement arrived at on an all-India level?

The question of Madras is not a fundamental difficulty. Instead of plunging into controversial arguments about disputed territories, I would \* rather say, "Leave it to the leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to decide." Let him appoint an Arbitration Commission or a mediation machinery. Let us all take 01" claims to th tt Commission or mscninery. j

Sir, there is another aspect of this question which requires a little elucidation, because there is an irrelevant mentality being projected into this question. So\*me of my friends here do not exactly understand what is happening in the South. I do not want them to be under the impression that if this Andhra demand or similar demands are conceded, it is going to disintegrate the country. If that were so, I would be the first man to oppose it. We Andhras have played a very conspicuous part in the freedom struggle. Our grievance is that even after the liberation struggle had been so successfully concluded, the solemn promise of our national leaders was not fulfilled. §

Years ago during my college days, when I saw Mahatma Gandhi in the house of the great publisher, Mr. G. A. Natesan, he said that there were two questions which did not admit of any argument. One, the medium of instruction in the mother tongue and the other, the division of India on a linguistic basis. He proved this faith of his by revising the Congress constitution and introducing the linguistic element into it. The Congress is still functioning on that basis. If the Congress has carried on to a triumphant conclusion the liberation struggle, I do not see any particular reason why on a similar linguistic basis the Administration cannot be carried on.

[ Shri Rama Rao. ] We are a parliamentary democracy, and what sort of parliamentary democracy is it when the Madras Legislative Assembly contains 375 Members of whom 200 do not understand one another ? It is a crying shame on democracy. How long are we going to allow this fraud on democracy ? It is impossible to have any honest or democratic Government, a government of the people, for the people and by the people when we have these heterogeneous provinces.

We are thinking a great deal about planning. How is it to be put into practice? It requires enormous sacrifices. It demands an austerity regime and many other allied things. All these will not be possible in the present heterogeneous provinces. You must speak in the language of the people, and the idiom, native to the heart of the people, which will not be possible so long as we have heterogeneous provinces.

Let me examine another aspect of this question. We are not going to tolerate the Rajpramukhs for long. They must go. How ? By promoting linguistic provinces. They will then be squeezed out. You need not amend the Constitution. They will be just thrown out.

Mr. Chairman, I would make one final appeal to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. The dominating ideal of our nation today is peace, universal peace. We want that India should play a vital role in the settlement of great international conflicts, and we are anxious that there should be a stable India. That stable India will not be possible unless the people have been given their elementary satisfactions, satisfaction of the mind, satisfaction of the heart, satisfaction of the soul. Are we afraid of upheavals as a result of the country's division on a language basis ? Having solved much bigger problems in our own generation, would it be difficult for us to solve this petty, local municipal problem of linguistic division. Are we, who have crossed seas and oceans, afraid of crossing rills and rivers ? We have solved the great

problems and we shall have to solve many more. India has been singularly fortunate in a generation of giants to solve her problems. They have got us liberty. It is necessary that this great problem of linguistic division should be solved. And who can solve it better than the Prime Minister of India ?

SHRI NARENDRA DEVA (Uttar Pradesh) :

Mr. Chairman, whenever Congress Government is approached to implement its own pledges and to honour its past commitments, we are told on all such occasions that either those old ideas have become stale, have gone out of date and have become reactionary or the formula has become unworkable or the idea cannot be implemented at the present time in view of the worsening world situation. I may tell you, Sir, that these ideas became a part and parcel of our political philosophy. We did not treat them as mere slogans. On the other hand we popularised them, we propagated those ideas and we also remodelled the Congress organization on that pattern and now when the time comes for the Congress Government to implement those ideas, we are told that days have changed, that the new situation demands that those ideas should not be implemented. So far as the present Resolution goes, it is quite simple, for it is not of a general nature. If it had been a general proposition, I could have realised the difficulty of Government in accepting it *in tota*. I do feel that language which is the visible symbol of the separate individuality of a people must be respected as far as possible. Certainly I would agree that language is not the only factor to be considered. The case of each province must be judged on its own merits and all other factors also should be taken into consideration. But so far as the province of Andhra goes, its case, in my opinion, is irrefutable and unanswerable and it has been accepted on all hands including our Prime Minister, who, though he has recently told us that he never felt very enthusiastic about these linguistic provinces, has told us that he would really be pleased if an

Andhra province were established. But he added that it was contingent on the fulfilment of one condition viz., that the parties to the dispute must come together and produce an agreed solution. In my opinion if an agreed solution is not forthcoming, it is due to the fact that the real contestants on both sides are within the Congress and they happen to occupy prominent positions and the Prime Minister is finding it practically impossible to bring them together for an amicable settlement. I am sorry to say that these provincial leaders who have been within the Congress for so many years and who have been parties to this Resolution are, in my humble judgment, accentuating these provincial differences and creating bad blood between one province and another. They are finding it difficult and impossible to rise above narrow provincialism, and they are not trained in the habit of looking at these questions from a broad national point of view. One of them—a stalwart from Maharashtra, who occupied a very prominent position in the Congress organisation told me many years ago and he told me with visible emotion that in case the city of Bombay was incorporated in the Gujrat province, he would resist it to the last. I am sorry to say that when prominent leaders in the Congress are of that mentality and are not prepared to give up their petty narrow provincial interests, I would say that no solution will be forthcoming and we should go out of the Congress for seeking a solution. My friend the Mover has suggested that the matters in dispute should be referred to a Tribunal and I would go a step further. If the parties to the dispute do not agree to the appointment of an impartial Tribunal, as a last resort we should go to the people and ascertain their wishes by taking a plebiscite. The Minister for Home Affairs and States has brought out a new argument and in my humble judgment, a strange argument to put forward. He says that in view of the worsening world situation nothing should be done or said which would divide the people and he has advised us not to raise new controversies and

to avoid all clashes and conflict of opinions. But I may be pardoned for saying that we are living in an epoch of stress and strain of national conflicts and even within the framework of each nation there are class conflicts and interprovincial conflicts. The world has lost its balance. It is seeking to achieve a new equilibrium and a new equilibrium, in my judgment, would not be achieved by maintaining the *status quo* but by going in for rapid and radical social changes. Some of the old pet political theories will have to be abandoned. Our concept of national sovereignty will have to be revised and everything will have to be done to remove those things which lead to conflicts between the people of one province and another. It has been said in the Lower House by some friend that if we want to achieve national unity it is necessary that we should not do anything which may increase and promote fissiparous tendencies in the country and he happens to hold the opinion that if the provinces are reconstituted on a linguistic basis, they will necessarily weaken national unity. I do not accept such an argument. In my humble opinion those people who are obsessed with an idea will never begin to think in national terms, so long as their elementary aspirations are not fulfilled. We ourselves are responsible for raising these hopes. We encouraged them to entertain the hope that when the proper time would come the provinces would be reconstituted and when the time has come for the Congress Government to redeem its own pledges, we are put off on one pretext or another. I would say that if we are to look at every problem of ours from a narrow legalistic point of view and if law and order are the sole considerations which should be brought to bear upon the consideration of every problem, there would neither be peace nor national unity nor progress in the country. But I find, Sir, that in certain other matters the Congress Government does not care if class conflict is fomented in the country. For instance in the matter of the abolition of zamindaries the Government did

[Shri Narendra Deva.] not give thought for a moment that as a result of this piece of legislation there would be class conflict in the countryside and it has already been put on the Statute Book. And this morning I learn from the papers that a deputation of the All India Womens Conference waited on the Law Minister and he gave them the assurance that it was not the intention of the Government to shelve the Hindu Code Bill. If that is true, I may say that there is no other piece of legislation in this country which has provoked so much religious passion and prejudice. Still Government is prepared to fulfil its promise and commitments in this respect. I see no reason why this longstanding commitment of ours, which stands to reason, which, if implemented, would satisfy the aspirations and emotions of certain people, should not be fulfilled. So long as their aspirations are not satisfied they will not settle down to business. They will always be thinking about it. They will always be agitating about it. Therefore, I think from all points of view and in the interest of domestic peace also, it is absolutely necessary that the question of the constitution of a separate Province of Andhra should be proceeded with. This proposition is quite a simple one and the progress of the nation cannot be held back by those who are accustomed to think on static lines. India is not England and England is no model for us. In any case, our conditions are quite different, and I think the only right solution for this particular problem is that the right of the Andhras to have a province of their own must be recognised and our Tamil friends would be acting wisely if they do recognise this humble claim of the Andhras. The main bone of contention is as regards the City of Madras. There are certain other minor disputes, but they can be settled by mutual adjustments. So far as the city of Madras is concerned, Sir, when we could agree on the partition of India in the interest of communal peace, I see no reason why, if no other solution is forthcoming for this problem, the city of Madras should not be partitioned?

With these few words, Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting the Resolution of the hon. Member Shri Venkata Narayana.

KAKASAHEB KALELKAR (Nominated)

: Sir, I do not think we remember that Mahatma Gandhi supported the idea of linguistic provinces. But Mahatma Gandhi did not suggest that India should be divided into separate linguistic states or kingdoms. The present difficulty arises because the leadership in this matter has been captured by persons who claim to have separate provincial cultures. I am indeed surprised to hear even Members in this House talk of an Andhra culture. I can understand if you talk of the Andhra language. I can understand you speaking of an Andhra literature; but I refuse to believe that there is a separate Andhra culture. The whole of India, with all its various races, religions and languages has but one composite culture; no doubt there are local peculiarities but there is no separate culture for separate regions. You can as well say that Delhi has a separate culture, that New Delhi has a separate culture, and even North Avenue has a separate culture and South Avenue another separate culture. At this rate I don't know where we are going. If cultures are to be divided according to religion, race or language, then I do not think we can live here as a human family. The provincialists who think that each province should be like a separate country and should be ruled as a separate kingdom, they have come to the forefront and it is they who are now championing this cause. That is why all this trouble has arisen. And the more we wait the more these provincialists will come to the fore. Therefore the sooner we have provinces wherever feasible according to the linguistic basis, the better for us. I know that when the provinces are formed on a linguistic basis, the leadership will go from the hands of these people and it will go to either the nationalists or the communalists. We should see to it that it should not fall into the hands of the communalists or those who exploit the communal feelings.

As regards the city of Madras, I am against the proposal of my friend Acharya Narendra Deva that the city may be partitioned. I am for keeping all these big cities separate, be it Calcutta, Madras or Bombay. These cities do not represent the best elements of our culture. They had better be left to themselves, and if they are allowed to shift for themselves they will know where they are. I used to tell my Maharashtra friends, "If you make of Bombay a bone of contention, nothing but bones will remain of Bombay." I want these big cities, wherever they are, to be separate and left to shift for themselves and then they will stop dominating the adjacent regions.

I would, however, want that the Administration should be conducted in the language of the people. I do not believe that any province has got a separate culture. It should not therefore be a cultural demand. The Andhras should have no ambition except that of serving their people and the whole of India and humanity. Why should they have a separate ambition of being Ministers in their own province ? But as I said, unless the Administration is in the language of the people it is not Swaraj at all. Today what is happening is that the English-knowing people, they may be a very big coterie—they are trying to have everything in their own hands. Swaraj has not percolated down to the masses. This can happen only if the Administration is conducted in the language of the people of the region. Only then will the people know what is happening around them and how they are being governed. Then will they know that strength and raise their heads. I know that division of the country into linguistic provinces is not going to endanger our unity or security. But even if it did, I would say that if the masses learn to raise their heads, that is a greater thing than unity. The real unity will come out of the unity of hearts of the people and that can come only when the Administration is carried on in the language of the people. If this important thing is forgotten and the provincial

leaders merely try to have separate kingdoms for themselves then woe unto us.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON (Bihar): Sir, as I listened to the Debate, I was reminded of the story of the milkmaid who while going to the market with the pot of milk on her head started thinking of the wonderful things she would buy from the sale proceeds of the milk and in that dream state allowed the milk to topple down and thus lost her milk and her pot. Similarly here we are discussing a thing which does not exist except in the imagination of the people in this House and perhaps a large number of people outside also. We have had a long discussion here about where the capital should go, whether the city of Madras should be divided between the Andhras and the Tamils or whether it should be jointly administered or kept as a separate State. And then we had also discussion as to what will happen to the Telugu speaking people in the other States. In fact, after a little while it becomes impossible for any one to think clearly about the subject because one does not know whether all the Andhras speak Telugu or whether all the Telugu speaking people are Andhras. The mover of the Resolution, of course, told us that this was a very simple Resolution, one designed to carve out an Andhra State out of the existing Madras State. Well, this is not the first instance in history where such a simple and innocent Resolution has spread all around like a cancer and destroyed the peace, stability and security of internal Administration. Of course, the mover of the Resolution also told us that his Resolution did not think in terms of a Greater Andhra State. But, it is bound to come for the simple reason that there are 10 million Telugu-speaking people in Hyderabad and, as one of the speakers has already pointed out, there are 5 million Telugu-speaking people in Tamil Nad and I may also point out that there are Telugu-speaking people in what is now called Madhya Pradesh and also in Orissa. If you think, Sir, that this Resolution



[Shrimati Lakshmi Menon.] is a simple and innocent one, I want to point out that it is not a simple or innocent one it is a Resolution which contains in it the seeds of disruption, the seeds of disunity, the seeds which, in the course of the next few years, if allowed to grow without any kind of obstruction, will destroy the internal stability of the State. For the rest, I am not concerned with the promises and pledges made by the Congress party or by our Prime Minister or by anybody. I am willing to concede that the Telugu-speaking people are a separate people, perhaps their culture is different and their language is different, but I refuse to concede that these are arguments which should be discussed now in the face of the great calamity which we are facing today. India has been free during the last four or five years but we have not done anything to make that freedom a living or warm reality. That freedom is still in the process of being implemented. Our young nation is still in the process of formation. Our internal economy is still in the process of being built up. Is it at such a time that the lovers of this country, people who claim to be patriotic, people who claim that they love to serve their country, to nourish this freedom into common nationhood, should bring forward a proposal that will ultimately destroy our freedom, and facilitate the growth of all those fissiparous tendencies which will completely destroy our integrity as a free nation?

Sir, it is, therefore, that I object— that I oppose- this Resolution and I oppose it not only because it is harmful and dangerous, but also because any division of this country, on a linguistic or any other basis, is not going to be of service to our country. I also like to point out that it is not a question of postponement or taking up this Resolution after some years when we are internally settled. The history of this country, Sir, you are aware, is full of these fissiparous tendencies. At no time in our history had we been a single united nation striving for a common end. We

have had invaders; we have had big kingdoms small kingdoms, divided kingdoms and we have had all sorts of kingdoms. Under the British, Sir, as a result of political expediency, perhaps, we had attained a certain measure of nationhood; it is a tender plant and a delicate plant. It is a young idea which demands our total effort to bring it into full and bright nationhood and any resolution of this nature which demands emotionally, and I should say irrationally, for the division of the country is wrong. It is unpatriotic; it is disloyal to the ideals of our country enshrined in our Constitution.

io a.m.

Sir, I do not want to go into full details about the difficulties which are envisaged in the Report of the Committee appointed by the Constituent Assembly about linguistic provinces but we have been told in that Report that such an Andhra State will have a deficit of nearly Rs. 651 lakhs and such a State will also be the beginning of a long series of divisions to follow. We will then have agitations for a Karnataka State, a Maharashtra State, a Kerala State, Urdu State, Hindi State, Bengali State, Behari State and so on. Sir the provincial or State autonomy has not produced a common national feeling. It has on the other hand accentuated provincial feeling, parochial feeling and to day it is much more difficult for a person belonging to one State to live in another State than it was ten years ago. Ten years ago it was much more difficult than what it was fifty years ago and if we encourage such proposals to divide the country further, mind you, it is not even on linguistic but inter-linguistic basis if I may say so, the difficulty will be, that within a few years, instead of nurturing a common love for the country, we will be hating each other in our effort to satisfy our petty canities, in our struggle to obtain the shies and loaves of office. During the course of the discussion, Sir, we have heard how the speakers were talking in terms of ministership, of membership of the legislatures and various other things which did not show a

great love for the country but showed rather the opposite. It is on these grounds, Sir, that I oppose this Resolution. I am glad that I am more royalist than the king himself. I am very proud of it, Sir, because the cause which I plead is not in the interest of any group or any State or any language. I plead that the people of this country might be so educated out of their narrow parochial thinking that they have been taught to believe as citizens of Andhra, or as citizens of Tamil Nad; so that they may believe that they are citizens not of any petty State or town, but of a country, a country which has to build up its own proud traditions so that we may live not only in our little parochial spheres but in the larger world, and be an example to the rest of the world as a people proud of their common achievements.

Sir, on this basis I oppose this Resolution and I would even appeal to the movers of the Resolution that it is most unfortunate that they should have brought this Resolution -at this moment in our country's history -when even a discussion of such problems goes to show that we are not united in our efforts for the common good. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Madras) : Mr. Chairman, the demand for linguistic provinces and, especially for Andhra has been there for the last 40 years. The Congress accepted it but when it comes to a question of putting it in practice, it repudiates it. Today I have heard amazing arguments about linguistic provinces and also, specially, of Andhra State. The demand for a linguistic state, I would remind the Members of the House, comes from the bottom of the hearts of the masses. They want their education to be in their own mother tongue. They want their Administration to be done in their own tongue, a tongue which they could understand. Without these two things there can be no democratic government and there *can* be no unity of the people also.

And here is that argument coming up which no less a person than the Premier himself again and again repeats and which has been echoed by people more loyal than the Premier himself that linguistic provinces means disintegration, and disruption of India just like Pakistan. I would humbly submit that it is a very wrong comparison—a totally wrong comparison. It is only to prejudice people's minds that these comparisons were ever brought at all. If that is so, why is it that the Congress for the last 30 years had been going on saying that there should be linguistic provinces ? We Andhras have never said that we should go away out of India; in fact, we are in the forefront of the nation's struggle. We all want a united India and we feel that a more unified India is possible by the formation of linguistic provinces and not by this kind of confused provinces that are there today. It is the Britishers and their stooges that divided India. We want the Congress Government, we want a national Government, we want a democratic Government to unify it on the basis of language so that in every part of India people could be taught in their own language and people could be administered in their own tongue. This simple demand they are trying to put as disintegration, disruption and division of India. Now, by refusing this demand for linguistic provinces and by postponing it on some excuse or other you are creating disunity and heartburning. If you do not satisfy this demand it will further worsen the situation and not unify the people.

Take, for instance, the question of the language itself. In India you have got different languages, each language being spoken by 30 million and 20 million people, such major languages which even India's Constitution has accepted. Now you want a common language to be developed—Hindi to be developed. The way Hindi is to be developed is not to suppress the provincial languages, is not to deny their rights to the different people in different parts of the country to be educated in their own tongue\*

[Shri P. Surdarayya.] Today that right is not there. In the Universities the language of the medium of instruction is not being taught; it is not the medium of instruction. On the top of it there is a proposal from Central Government that Osmania University which should have served the people of Hyderabad speaking three major languages and Urdu—instead of these languages being used as media of instruction—should have Hindi as the medium of instruction. You are trying to impose Hindi there. It is things like these that go on increasing the conflict. It is one thing to have a common language. But we want our language to be the medium of instruction in our Universities. It is only possible if we had our own province. In U.P. you introduced Hindi; in Madhya Pradesh you did that. Certainly you showed the way; it is the correct thing. You have got the opportunities to do it. Why can't you allow the same thing to us ? Why deny it ?

With regard to the Andhra State : why is there the feeling that justice is not being meted out to us, that our demands—our legitimate demands—are not being fulfilled? Take, for instance, the food question itself. Now the food grains from Andhra instead of first being diverted to the Rayalaseema districts which are very deficit districts, you take it somewhere else. Instead of these deficit districts being linked up with the other surplus districts, you link it up with Guntur or some other small district. It is this kind of thing that is creating more disunity and disruption.

Not only this; now, with regard to the projects also, there is a proposal that the Kistna-Pennar water should be taken—not to the dry famine areas of Rayalaseema; first you take it to Rayalaseema and whatever surplus is there, you take it anywhere else as you like—but you prepare to take the water first to Tsmil Nad. Now this is a strange thing; it is against international law; it is against any commonsense. This is a thing that is going to worsen the feelings.

Rajaji is the Chief Minister now and he was the Chief Minister of Madras in 1937. At that time when the Andhra Province demand was there it is said that he wrote a letter to the then Secretary of State that if Andhra State were to be created, blood will flow in the streets of Madras. This was said—it is not a rumour—it was said by no less a person—this fact was revealed to the public by no less a person—than the late Mr. E. Raghavendra Rao, and so far these papers have never been brought to light. Again today we hear that Rajaji has written a letter to the Prime Minister about the Andhra Province. When a question was asked in the Madras Legislative Assembly about the contents of this letter, he refused to divulge it on the ground that it was a private communication between the two Governments. We are not asking for it to be divulged merely because it is a private thing. But why should there be this secrecy ? If they really want to dispel the suspicion that Rajaji is sabotaging the Andhra State, why can't he say that this is what he has written ? Why can't the Congress Government take immediate steps to form the Andhra State within a reasonable period of time ?

#### THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI) : May I interrupt, Sir ? Is it the hon. Member's insinuation that Mr. Rajagopalachari is really opposed to the formation of the Andhra State? Does he forget what he has said in public on this question ?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I humbly submit that whatever the thing is, why allow this suspicion to be created? Suspicion is there.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : If hon. Members are intent upon suspecting every people, we cannot prevent it. I am only asking for facts.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : I do not want to go into these things. I would go on to my subject. Now, the Prime Minister says even with regard

to the Andhra State he would take steps only if there is unanimity of opinion. This resembles the old British imperialists saying, first you all unite and then come. How could there be unanimity of opinion when there are certain forces even in the Government which are bent upon creating disunity ?

Now, for instance, what business the Madras Ministry has to divide Andhra as Rayalaseema and Andhra in all respects regarding administrative affairs ? The Education Ministry has been divided like this. If you continue to do such things and at the same time ask that there should be unanimity of opinion, how can that be possible ? Madras city has been brought as a big item of controversy. Our Party—the Communist Party—for the last 15 years has taken its stand on this issue. We said that on the basis of facts that are available, the overwhelming majority of people in Madras are Tamilians, speaking Tamil. We did not go into the historical background, how it developed and so on. Today we are not demanding an Andhra Empire or any such thing. They are now outmoded things. What we are demanding is on the basis of the present population, of the language which we speak, so that we can have our State. So, Madras on the very basis on which we demand linguistic provinces must go to Tamil Nad. This was what we were saying from the beginning for the last 15 years and we stand by it. But if certain parties, if certain individuals in Andhra demand a Commissioner's Province or some other thing in Madras, why should that condition be made that unanimity of opinion should be there ? Why can't that question be referred to a plebiscite of the people, if the Congress Government itself cannot solve it ? Now this slogan of big cities being made as Commissioner's Provinces is most reactionary—a most undemocratic slogan. Why do you want to cut off the big cities from the background of their own hinterland, from the background of their own people ? And you want to create

artificial States. It is a very very reactionary idea. We are totally opposed to it. We want big cities to go along with their provinces whose majority speak the same language. We are totally opposed to this kind of thing. Though many people play with the idea of Commissioner's Provinces for big cities, the common people are totally opposed to it and they will fight it tooth and nail.

Now, Sir, the question of financial stability of Andhra is again and again brought up. In the Partition Committee that was set up in Madras Assembly in 1949, it was shown that it will not be more than a crore and with a little adjustment even that could be got over. Apart from these things, there is the question of capital : Where are you going to build the capital ?

*(Time bell rings.)*

In 1949 it failed because the Tamil leaders refused to allow the Andhras to have the capital even for four months. And that was taken as an excuse to deny us the Andhra Province. I would certainly say : If you want simply a solution of these things, do not plead this as an excuse. I say : from the linguistic provinces in such a way that all these artificial provinces will go. Make Hyderabad City the capital. Give Malabar to Kerala. It is not a new province; it is the same province. Follow some rational line. Then, take Karnatak. What is the difficulty ? Mysore State is already there. Attach the Kanarese speaking people to it. Where are the difficulties ? Instead of thinking of these simple solutions which the people want, the Congress Government puts forward one excuse or the other and refuses to form linguistic provinces. It is not merely the reply of the Prime Minister that they have no objection to linguistic provinces that will satisfy the people of India. What they want is how soon, how quickly, you are going to tackle the problem and satisfy the urgent desires [ of the people. I am afraid that if

[Shri P. Sundaraya.] you are not going to form an Andhra State, the Andhra people are not going to sleep over it. We have slept long over it ; we are not going to sleep over it any more. As my hon. friend Mr. Rama Rao said, no force can prevent us building our Visala Andhra Desa and having Hyderabad as our capital. I would certainly say that will happen within three years as Shri K. Rama Rao said.

*{Time bell rings.}*

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras) : Mr. Chairman, listening to the hon. mover of the Resolution I was reminded of the famous hero of Cervantes' novel, Don Quixote. Sir, like Don Quixote, my hon. friend imagined many things which do not exist. He imagined trouble with Tamilians. He imagined troubles and obstacles in the way of the formation of an Andhra Province. But, Sir, today nobody is against the formation of an Andhra Province. The Congress has reiterated time after time that it believes in the formation of an Andhra Province. The Prime Minister has also made it clear that the Andhra Province issue is altogether on a different footing from that of other linguistic provinces. The hon. the Leader -of the Communist Party made a reference to Shri Rajagopalachari and I am sorry that he has taken it into his head to make unfounded allegations which he cannot prove. He has tried to give out some information for which he has no basis or for which he has no documentary proof or any other proof. But I can tell the hon. Member that Shri Rajagopalachari on the floor of the House has openly stated that he is not against an Andhra Province. And today, who is against an Andhra Province ? If an Andhra Province has not become a reality, if it is only mirage, who is to blame ? I say with all the sincerity at my command and with all the vehemence at my command that if an Andhra Province has not materialised today, if an Andhra Province is not a reality I

today, it is the Andhras and Andhras, alone who are to blame for it, and nobody else. I make this allegation, and I am prepared to prove it. Andhras have been demanding a separate Province. Who has stood in their way? Not the Tamilians. I speak for the Tamilians. I voice the opinions of millions of Tamilians. We have no grudge against Andhras. We have been under the tyranny of the Andhras. I can say—I have to use strong words—for the past 30 years of democratic rule. I am prepared to substantiate it. Take the parliamentary rule in Madras. There have been eight or nine Premiers—Chief Ministers—out of whom five or six have been Andhras, and two Telugu-speaking Tamils, and one has been a Malayalee, and one—Dr. Subbarayan—and one only has been a Tamilian. There is a lot of cruelty : the majority of Tamilians have been denied the opportunity of becoming Prime Minister or Chief Minister of the State.

PRINCIPAL DEVAPRASAD GHOSH (West Bengal) : Just as England is ruled by Scotsmen.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN : I think I am misunderstood. In the previous constitution, before the Government of India Act came into force, the Madras Chief Minister was also called Prime Minister. So, there is nothing wrong in my mentioning the Prime Minister. During the last so many years attempts have been made to set up an Andhra State, but they have not succeeded. The Andhra issue has been hanging fire and agitation has been going on for so many years. Today we see that the agitation for an Andhra Province has gained momentum, not because they want it immediately, but because whenever Andhra has not got a Chief Minister this question gains momentum. When Mr. Praskasam was Chief Minister, that problem went into cold storage and it was not referred to at all. I am not making any allegation or saying that you must give up your claim, But what is it that stands in the way of an Andhra Province ?

Last year, you will all remember, arrangements were made by the Government of Madras in order to divide Madras into Andhra and Tamil. As a matter of fact, even the files were divided. Everything was settled. But at the last minute Mr. Prakasam wrote a minute of dissent and the whole thing fell through. What was the bone of contention ? There are two things that stand in the way of an Andhra Province. For one thing, Andhras are not agreed among themselves. I am sure of it. I have got reliable information that even here, the Andhra Members of Parliament wanted to wait on deputation on a very important Member of the Government and place before him their views with regard to the formation of an Andhra Province. But although the hon. Minister gave them appointment after appointment, the Members could not come to an agreement among themselves and so the appointment was never kept. If that is the fate of the Andhras themselves, if they cannot come to an agreement on what is to be placed before the Government, why should they blame the Tamilians, who have not only not opposed the formation of an Andhra Province, but have said that the Andhras can have a separate province if they wish it ? So, lack of agreement is one reason, and the Tamilians are not to blame.

Again, as regards Rayalaseema, it has been said : "Who are those people ? They are imposters calling themselves Rayalaseema people and trying to represent the people." Whether they are imposters or not the majority of the members of the Legislature representing Rayalaseema do not want to be included in Andhra. They have expressed their opinion. I am sure it will be better if before the Andhra Province is formulated the opinion of the people is ascertained by means of a referendum.

Next, I take the City of Madras. Madras is a Tamil City if you take the population. My hon. friend gave the House the figures and I am not going to weary the House by repeating them.

If the province has to have a headquarters, the headquarters must be in a contiguous area as its administrative unit. I ask the hon. Member whether there is a single Telugu village within 30 miles around Madras City. There is absolutely no village having more than 10 or 15 per cent. Telugu-speaking population within 30 miles of Madras City. Take the religious places. If you go to Madras, you will find all the temples represent Tamilian culture. This is evident in the great epics where all the places have been mentioned. If you go to Madras you will find common to the street names, the pettai names,—all the names in the City of Madras are only Tamil names, and there is not a single name which represents Telugu culture or area. So, culturally, socially, politically, economically and historically Madras City is Tamil and nobody can take it away from us. I am surprised to see my hon. friends clamour for the City of Madras. At the same time they say : Why not divide it ? Or why not have a common Government ? I think only King Solomon's wisdom can give judgment in this matter. It is said that two women went before King Solomon and claimed a child, and King Solomon found it very difficult to decide who was the real mother."\* of the child. Then he very politely and very judiciously made a very innocent proposal. "All right, I will cut the baby into two, and you can have half and the other woman can have half." Then the real mother said : "No, no. Do not cut the child. Please give the child to the other woman. Let the child at least live." But the imposter mother said : "All right, cut the child into two." Immediately King Solomon said : "The real mother is the one who offers to give the child to the other woman so that it will live." If the Andhras claim Madras City as their own, why should they claim partition ? Why agree to joint Administration ? Today I am surprised at Mr. Ranga's argument : "Why don't we remain in the City as common citizens ? Why don't you concede that ?"\* I am prepared to extend the argument and

[Shri T. S. Pattabiraman.] ask : "Why should we not remain as common and united citizens in the State of Madras itself if it is going to benefit all of us ? Let Madras City remain as a bilingual territory in the State of Madras." Madras State has run as a united State and why should it not do so now ? I think that hon. Members have not considered these aspects and other aspects too. Politically, all the parties have agreed that the City of Madras belongs to Tamil Nad. The Andhra Provincial Congress Committee, the Krishak Lok Praja Party and the Communist Party, have all conceded that, and I am sorry to say that people like Acharya Narendra Dev said that Madras must be cut into two. But his own spokesman of the Socialist Party, Dr. Menon, on the floor of the Madras Legislative Assembly openly declared that Madras City belongs to Tamil Nad. So, all the major political parties have conceded that Madras City belongs to Tamil Nad. Why should there be division of Madras City ?

I am sure, Sir, if you are really interested in the Province, forget these things. I am sorry to find that the question of a boundary commission has been raised. Where is the place for a boundary commission ? The boundary commission can only settle minor disputes but here you are asking for a major slice from the Tamilians. And very cleverly the learned mover of the Resolution said, Sir, "Why can't we have the river Cooum as our border ?" Sir, on the South of river Cooum there are only houses and the marina whereas on the North of Cooum lies the High Court, lies the harbour, in fact lies the industrial life of Madras city. That is why though it looks very simple and very harmless, it is a most harmful and most poisonous proposition that has been put forward, Sir. I would emphatically say "Let not the city of Madras become another East and West Berlin and let not river Cooum become another Danube." Sir, I oppose this Resolution not because I am opposed

to the principle but this Resolution is superfluous. The only thing is that you must have agreement. The Government is prepared to consider it and my friend who was a member of the Madras Legislature along with me during the previous term knows that the Madras Legislative Assembly has passed a Resolution and sent it to the Government of India asking for the formation of Andhra Province. So no fresh request to the Government is necessary. If the Andhras can only unite and come to the conclusion that for the present and for ever they leave all claims for the Madras city, they can get it. And more over, Sir, Tamilians have no space anywhere but on the other hand the Andhras can go anywhere they like. The Andhras can extend to Berhampore and Ganjam in Orissa and Telengana in Hyderabad. When we go to Pondicherry and Karaikal they are foreign pockets and we can't go there. When we go to Nagarcoil and Cape Comorin Travancore objects. We have no living space. So I appeal to them, Sir, to forget Madras City for the present and not to press for it. That is the only reasonable way out.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY (Orissa) : Sir, I welcome this Resolution because to my mind it is very simple and easily workable. It meets the argument put forward by the Home Minister in the other House opposing the Resolution on linguistic formation of provinces. He said this would disintegrate Indian unity. I want to say that by not conceding this demand you are encouraging forces of disintegration to make headway day by day. I have before me a proposal—a map—published in a Daily called "Visal Andhra" which is the mouthpiece of the Communist Party. There are, Sir, fantastic and mischievous proposals. It demands an Andhra empire so to say—not an Andhra Province. They are perhaps more interested in having these forces of disunity to grow in the country. They have therefore demanded in this map—it is published on the 22nd June—that an Andhra Province should be constituted by

taking-Telugu speaking portions of Madras, Telangana of Hyderabad, some portions of Madhya Pradesh including Bastar, a part of South Orissa and also a portion of Mysore. So if you do not accept this demand and the simple proposal that has been put forward here, this demand is bound to grow and fissiparous tendencies are bound to disintegrate the Indian unity and solidarity for which you are so very anxious today. Sir, I had to say only this much and I hope good sense will prevail upon this Government and it will accept this simple proposal that has been put forward. I have nothing more to add.

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR (Nominated) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, as I was sitting here today listening to the great speakers and great thinkers, I just closed my eyes. The same voices but the faces changed and the time changed too. It took me back 7 years to 1945—the same thoughts, same arguments, same words but different faces, perhaps different voices I heard. It pained me. I opened my eyes again and I wanted to close my eyes again because it hurt me again. History perhaps is going to repeat itself. How unfortunate it is that this great land of ours has not learnt anything from history. How unfortunate it is that the mighty children of this land have not learnt anything from history. Seven years back perhaps these great people were talking on this side of the subject and there were other misguided friends who have now gone beyond that Wall of Partition to the other side talking in the same tone in which my friends here are talking today. I am referring to the partition of India— I, as an actor and a playwright, had then produced a play called "Deewar" (tmx) "The Wall". There was a lot of hullabaloo about it and the local Muslim League Leaders of Bombay honoured me by visiting my House. The Vice President and the General Secretary said : "You are an artist. Why are you dabbling in politics ?" I said, "Sir, you are going to turn me out of Peshawar : and you are going to leave my unfortunate Muslim brethren "

here in the lurch with their roots uprooted from the soil." The Film industry in Punjab is ruined, and so is life in all form and aspects as the result of partition. We talked about the the permits. I said the poor Pathan who comes from Peshawar, works in Bombay ^ets ^ a letter from his town that his mother is ill. He goes in the train and reaches home within two days. But with the introduction of permit system which must follow after partition he will not be able to do that. By the time he can arrange for a permit, his mother would die. This has happened. Today again I had the same feeling. Why in these days of co-operative farming, in these days of one world we\_ have again started thinking of partitioning provinces on linguistic basis. Tomorrow we will think about the provinces based on dialects. The other daviour learned Prof. Dr. Mookerji said India has 500 languages and only 1 <o languages are developed languages. If we are acceding to this demand, tomorrow a demand will come about those 150 languages and then 500 languages. Like that there will be 500 provinces. I can't understand why this separatism ! Why this inferiority complex ! Why have we not been able to learn from history that this separatism is based on hatred and this hatred destroys ? Why can't the Andhras feel they are great people, mighty people ? I \_ have been to Andhara in 1950 in Kakinada, to preside over the Andhra Natya Parishad. I have lived among them. What lovable people they are. They are rich in everything, e.g., food, culture, talk, music, dances, drama, etc. Why should they feel inferior to anybody ? Their capital is not only Madras. Their capital is Delhi. Here is an Andhra sitting right in front of us. Why should they worry about going and shutting themselves up in the narrow domestic walls of a province ? I think those people who cannot straightaway fight in the open field of competition always hide behind and take shelter behind these linguistic provinces or the partitions based on religion and things like that. Our real



[ Shri Prithviraj Kapoor. ] religious leaders are still here in India, but they do not talk of partition nor did they ever do. The great Maulana is here. The great Khan is still in jail there. He did not believe in partition, and he still does not believe in it. He rather prefers to be in jail than give up his beliefs. The great Andhras, who have faith in their language and culture, they will never demand a separate province. I was rather pained to hear Prof. Ranga speaking the same language, the same words which some other people, whom we called disruptionists, were talking some years ago. He says, we have given the people this promise that we will have separate province and so we cannot go back. This is the same language which I heard when I was called into the Muslim League office in Bombay. I had a talk with them lasting for about five hours. After five hours, I asked them "Gentlemen, Don't you think, I deserve a cup of tea." They were not able to say anything about my play which was against separation-partition, they were not able to convince me, because the truth is that separation is bad-partition is bad. They told me, "Whatever the position against the division of India, we have promised the people of this country, our poor brethren, that they will have partition, and whether it is good or whether it is bad, there will be partition." When Prof. Ranga was talking I was taken aback, because he was talking the same language. "We have promised the people and so you must give them a separate province."

*{Shri C- G. K. Reddy rose to interrupt.}*

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR:

You had your time and now please let me go on. Here people are talking in the same strain, in the same notes. When the great Acharya said that Congress had given this promise, I was really amazed. Does it mean that the Congress cannot make mistakes? The Congress has made

mistakes. The Congress is not infallible. Even if the Congress had made this promise, I would request the Congress, I would request the Government, I would request the leaders: to be bold enough to say that it is bad for the country and must not be allowed to happen. Whatever is bad is bad, even if my father or grandfather may have favoured it. If it is bad, it is bad and we should be courageous enough to say that it is bad.

Why not take a lesson from our history and save the country from another havoc. You are talking of a Panjabi province and non-Panjabi province. You are talking of Telugu province, and similarly in Bombay, they are talking of a Maharashtra Province and a Gujarati province. I have always been pained to hear in Bombay the Marathis and Gujaratis talking about separation. I told them it was wrong, it would be ruinous for both of them. Both of them have got their own sweetness to contribute to the province as a whole, they have their own beautiful things, they have got their own mighty literatures. The Maharashtra literature, the Maharashtra poetry, history—they have got a beauty of their own. Similarly, in the case of Gujarati literature, it has its own beauty, it has its own culture, its own beautiful things. I told them that if they partitioned Bombay, Bombay would die. Similarly Madras would die, if it is partitioned. If you accept this principle, there will be 36 provinces in Bihar. No, we should not think of separation. We should think of co-operation. If this principle is taken to its logical conclusion, then the Railways will be carrying only the Ministers of our provinces, and there will be no other traffic on the Railways when there are so many provinces.

SHRI S. MAHANTY : Mr. Chairman, I have been very careful in listening to some of the arguments which have been advanced by my friends on the other side of the House and I was rather shocked to find that they had allowed their loyalty to outrun their discretion. Someone has said that

we must have one country, we must have one leader, we must have one language. Well, this is a very dangerous slogan. After all, States are created for the self-expression of the individual. Whatever may be your logic, whatever may be your views, language is the basis, the best medium of self-expression of the individual. Creation of States on linguistic basis has been repeatedly promised and you cannot now wriggle out of it. If you adduce the argument that India is a national whole, India is a cultural whole, then history will tell you that India was never a cultural whole, never a national whole. India, as it is today, has been the parting gift of the British to the Indians. India as one country is a parting gift of the British. Let us go back to the days of Ashoka. We find a brutal army, a mighty army, through sword and through fire, moulding various Nation-States into one country. Ashoka wanted to establish an empire. Because it was not based on the free volition of the people, because there was hatred behind it, because there was bloodshed behind it, that empire crumbled down. Take again the Mughul period. There was a great attempt to build an Indian empire but it failed. Then the British came and it is the India that the British created we are having today. Therefore however unpleasant it may be I must say that this India is not based on the volition of the people. You should not speak against all that you promised in the past merely because you feel that it will lead to the dismemberment of the country. Sir, the other day in the House of the People in the course of the debate on linguistic provinces, the Prime Minister was good enough to observe that though at this stage he was not prepared to have provinces on linguistic basis, yet he would be prepared to consider specific issues on their merits. What is the underlying principle, the basic pattern of philosophy behind that consideration? What is the basic principle underlying that consideration? The basic principle is that of having States on a linguistic basis. Even the last Congress Election Manifesto which was placed before the people promised this. Then what

17CSD

is the difficulty in giving wholehearted support to this resolution for creating a separate Andhra Province ? If you do not accede to it, well I believe the Andhras know how to have a State for themselves. It has often been told that virtues are the bastards of vices. Similar is the case with those who talk of patriotism. You scratch them and you will find rank provincialists. You scratch them and you find rank sectarians. It is a story of great betrayal. It is high time that you should at least fulfil those pledges. It is no good now wriggling out of it. This has another aspect also. It has been said that a boundary commission should be set up. Undoubtedly it should be set up to adjudicate the rival claims on certain areas and this brings me now to a very painful aspect of the question. Orissa was created in 1936. It was a truncated province and it was created by an order of the British Administrators, with the Oriya-speaking Ringb-hum as an outlying district. It was an entirely Oriya-speaking district over which the Oriyas had been staking their claims for quite a long time.

SHRI R. P. N. SINHA : (Bihar) On a point of order. Is any hon. Member entitled to bring in any controversial question on this simple Resolution about the formation of an Andhra Province ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Addressing Shri Mahanty) Make it relevant.

SHRI S. MAHANTY : After all politics is a highly controversial subject. In 1948 the Oriya speaking States of Seraikela and Khurswan.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Resolution is on the Andhra question. It has nothing to do with the formation of an Orissa State.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I think I am within the four corners of relevancy. I am simply proving how these khaddar-capped Congressmen have been betraying the Indian people with all their tomfooleries and how they have robbed not only the Andhras but the Oriyas and Bengalees also. As I told in the course of my speech on the General Budget, India today means U.P. plus Madras.

SHRI K. B. LALL : Are there ne Khaddarites in Bengal?

SHRI S. MAHANTY : Today you are talking in terms of humanity. I will bring a Resolution. You merge India into Asia, you merge with the entire world. Let there be one humanity. You cannot have both the cake and eat it. You cannot talk of humanity and talk of national sovereignty. It is a burning question and I crave the indulgence of the House to allow me to talk of Orissa.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Not on the Orissa problem. You may bring in another Resolution for that.

SHRI S. MAHANTY : I will read out the agreements in respect of the two States of Seraikela and Kurswan . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : I want you to confine your remarks to this question of Andhra State. If you want to introduce a separate thing, you may bring another Resolution which may be taken up some other day.

SHRI S. MAHANTY : I would bow to your ruling, Sir. But what I was telling was that I was not very particular about the Andhra Province because this demand is based on justice and equity. If you are going to disallow the Andhras of having a province they know how to snatch a province for their ownself. What I was trying to say was for my own province. I moved an amendment and it was disallowed. I thought this will afford me an opportunity to speak about Orissa. Now that you have ruled it out, I have nothing more to say.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

PROF. DINKAR (Bihar) :

**प्रोफेसर दिनकर (बिहार) :** श्रीमान्, इस देश के लोगों को कांग्रेस ने ही यह सलाह दी थी कि अंग्रेजों ने प्रान्तों का जो विभाजन किया है वह नकली है और उसको किसी भी लाजिक (logic) का बल नहीं है। अंग्रेजों ने जो ढाँचे बना दिये उनके बीच हम प्रायः १५० वर्षों से रहते आये हैं और १५० वर्ष तक किसी

खास ढाँचे के भीतर, किसी खास ढंग से जिन्दगी बिताते रहने के भी कुछ मानी होते हैं। मगर तब भी हम मानते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान के दक्खिनी हिस्से में दो-एक भाग ऐसे हैं जिनको अलग प्रान्त बना दिया जाना चाहिये। सच बात तो यह है कि आन्ध्र का केस (case) बड़ा ही मजबूत है और उसकी अवज्ञा करने से आन्ध्र-वासियों को निराशा होगी। जनता को निराश करना किसी भी सरकार के लिये अच्छा कार्य नहीं है। मेरे ख्याल में आन्ध्र के सम्बन्ध में कांग्रेस और सरकार किसी न किसी निश्चित निर्णय पर आ चुकी है। अगर आज कांग्रेस पार्टी या भारत सरकार इस ग़ैर सरकारी प्रस्ताव को बढ़ कर क़बूल नहीं कर लेती है तो इसका कारण यह नहीं है कि उसके दिल में आन्ध्रवासी जनता के लिये दर्द नहीं है। बल्कि इसका कारण यह है कि कांग्रेस इस नाजुक मामले के लिये आज की अपेक्षा कुछ अधिक अनुकूल समय चाहती है। देश में आज की अपेक्षा अधिक शीतल वातावरण चाहती है, जिससे उन उच्छेदकारी शक्तियों पर नियन्त्रण रखा जा सके, जिनका इस नाजुक मामले से पैदा होना अनिवार्य है।

श्रीमान, कांग्रेस की वर्तमान नीति के सम्बन्ध में जो दूसरी बात है, वह यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान के एकाध भाग में एकाध नये प्रान्त का बन जाना कोई बड़ी बात नहीं है। लेकिन अगर भाषा के आधार पर प्रान्तों के पुनः संगठन का प्रश्न देश ने सामूहिक रूप से स्वीकार कर लिया तो उससे यह देश बर्बाद हो जायगा। असल में बुड्ढे के मरने से अधिक हमें इस बात का भय है कि यमराज को हमारे घर का रास्ता मालूम हो जायगा और कांग्रेस की यह चिन्ता निराधार नहीं कही जा सकती क्योंकि इस देश में, शायद ही ऐसा कोई प्रान्त होगा जिसे भाषावार विभाजन को लेकर कोई मलाल नहीं हो। दक्खिन में भाषाओं की जो स्थिति है उनके सम्बन्ध में सदन के सामने सारी बातें रखी जा चुकी हैं।

मगर, भाषा को लेकर उत्तर भारत का भी कोई अच्छा हाल नहीं है। आसाम में जितने लोग आसामी बोलते हैं, लगभग उतने ही लोग बंगला भी बोलते हैं और इन दोनों वर्गों की संख्या से अधिक संख्या शायद उनकी है जो नागा या दूसरी आदिवासी जातियों के लोग हैं। बिहार के मुट्ठी भर बंगाली भाइयों को शायद हम मना भी लें, लेकिन भाषावार प्रान्तों का सिद्धान्त मान लेने पर झारखंड की मांग प्रबल हो उठेगी। दार्जिलिंग, दिनाजपुर तथा मालदह की हिन्दी भाषी जनता यह मांग करने लगेगी कि हमें बंगाल से निकाल कर बिहार में ले चलो। खुद बंगाल का अपना घर भी महकूज नहीं है, क्योंकि उत्तरी बंगाल के गुरखे एक अलग गुरखा प्रान्त का नारा बुलन्द कर रहे हैं। हिमाचल प्रदेश और पंजाब में हिन्दी, पंजाबी और डोगरी के झगड़े खड़े हो जायेंगे और जब कि सारा भारतवर्ष छोटे-छोटे दुर्बल प्रान्तों में बंट जायेगा तब बिहार, उत्तर प्रदेश, मध्य प्रदेश, मध्य भारत, राजस्थान और अधिकांश मध्य प्रदेश तथा हरियाने तक का दक्षिणी पंजाब, ये सारे भूभाग यानी लगभग आधा हिन्दुस्तान एक विशाल हिन्दी प्रदेश में समाहित हो जायगा।

सोचने की बात है इस तरह के अनईक्वेल (unequal) प्रान्तों को लेकर भारत में हम ऐसा राज्य कैसे चला सकेंगे, जिसमें सभी नागरिकों को विकास का बराबर अधिकार मिले, जिसमें सभी राज्यों के पास शिक्षा के लिये काफ़ी स्कालरशिप (scholarship) देने अथवा स्कूलों का प्रवन्ध करने की क्षमता हो और क्या उस समय की पार्लियामेंट (Parliament) में सभी राज्यों की आवाजें समानता के स्तर तक पहुंच सकेंगी और क्या वे हिन्दी प्रान्तों की प्रबलता के शिकार नहीं होंगे? इस प्रकार की स्थिति से प्रान्तों के बीच जो असन्तोष का जहर फैलेगा, उसका प्रभाव इस मुल्क पर किस रूप में पड़ेगा, यह भी सोच लेने की बात है।

श्रीमान्, इसके साथ ही साथ एक बात और है और वह यह है कि प्रत्येक भाषा-क्षेत्र को जब हम एक अलग प्रान्त बनाने की बात सोचते हैं तब कहीं हमारे भीतर यह भाव तो काम नहीं करता है कि भारत के प्रत्येक भाषा के बोलने वाले लोग एक अलग नेशनैलिटी (nationality) के लोग हैं और उन्हें आत्मनिर्णय अथवा सेल्फ डिटरमिनेशन (self-determination) का वही अधिकार मिलना चाहिये जो अधिकार हमने पाकिस्तान के लोगों को दिया और जिसे देकर हमने देख लिया कि नेशनैलिटी, कल्चर (culture) और भाषा के झगड़ों से बढ़ कर हिन्दुस्तान की तबाही के लिये दूसरी राह नहीं है। अफ़सोस की बात है कि भाषावार प्रान्त की मांग के नीचे छिपे हुए ज़हर को बहुत से ऐसे लोग नहीं देख पाते जो भावुकता के उभार में आकर यह मांग करते हैं और न इसे वे ही समझ पाते हैं जिन्होंने सारी जिन्दगी हिन्दुस्तान की एकता के लिये बलिदान कर दी और जो आज भी उस एकता की रक्षा के लिये अपना सर्वस्व न्योछावर कर सकते हैं। मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती कि जो लोग हिन्दुस्तान में एक नेशनैलिटी और एक कल्चर के हामी हैं, वे भी भाषावार प्रान्तों की मांग का समर्थन कैसे करते हैं। हंसी-हंसी में इस देश का बंटवारा हो गया और हंसी-हंसी में भाषावार प्रान्तों की भावना का जो प्रचार हो रहा है, वह किसी दिन ऐसी हालत भी पैदा कर सकता है कि प्रान्तों की जगह हम नेशनैलिटीज़ (nationalities) में बंट जायें और फ़ेडरेशन (federation) की जगह हमें कानफ़ेडरेसी (confederacy) का सहारा लेना पड़े।

श्रीमान्, संस्कृति की हर एक यूनिट (unit) निश्चित रूप से शासन की भी एक अलग यूनिट होती है, यह बात सभी अवस्थाओं में मानने योग्य नहीं है। शासन की यूनिट केवल भाषाभिमान को दुलारने

[Prof. Dinkar.]

के लिये नहीं बनाई जाती है। उसका काम भाषा, संस्कृति, शिक्षा और सम्पत्ति सब का विकास करना है। असल में, भाषावार प्रान्तों का आदर्श दर्शन के स्तर पर जितना अच्छा लगता है, व्यवहार में वह उतना अच्छा नहीं कहा जा सकता। यह समझना भी भूल है कि प्रान्तों के भाषावार विभाजन के बिना जनसत्ता का सम्यक् विकास नहीं हो सकता। अमेरिका (America) के ४८ राज्यों में से एक भी राज्य की रचना का आधार भाषा नहीं है। अत्यन्त विकसित देश स्विट्ज़रलैंड (Switzerland) में तीन भाषायें बोली जाती हैं, मगर भाषावार विभाजन की मांग वहां नहीं उठी। ६०० वर्ष के इस पुराने राज्य के इतिहास में हमने कभी नहीं सुना कि भाषा को लेकर वहां पर किसी प्रकार का विवाद उठा हो। श्रीमान्, अभी अभी मेरे एक मित्र योरोप (Europe) से आये थे। वह कह रहे थे कि इटली (Italy) की पार्लियामेंट ने जब ऐसे ही विषय पर भाषण देने के लिये बेनेडिक्टो क्रोसे को बुलाया तब क्रोसे ने अपने देश को भाषावार विभाजन के झमेले में न पड़ने की सलाह दी और कहा कि इससे तुम्हारे राष्ट्र की एकता को धक्का लगेगा। तो क्या भारतवर्ष ही ऐसा अभाग्य देश है जो आँख मूंद कर उस आग में कूद पड़ेगा, जिस आग से इटली, स्विट्ज़रलैंड और अमेरिका खौफ खाते हैं। मुझे यह देखकर भी हैरत होती है कि भाषावार प्रान्तों के पक्ष में जितने भी भाषण दिये जाते हैं, उनमें यह नहीं बताया जाता कि जिस प्रान्त में कई भाषाएं हैं, वहां के अल्पसंख्यकों की कौनसी तकलीफ है। लोग सिर्फ भाषावार प्रान्त की दुहाई देकर भाषण खत्म कर देते हैं, मानों यह अपने आप में ही महापुण्य का कार्य हो। असल में, कहीं भी किसी अल्पसंख्यक को कोई ऐसी तकलीफ नहीं है जो भाषावार विभाजन के बिना दूर नहीं की जा सकती हो। अल्पसंख्यक भाषा-भाषियों को किसी प्रान्त

में अगर कोई जायज शिकायत हो तो उसे दूर करना ही चाहिये और इसके लिये अगर कोई अतिरिक्त खर्च पड़ता हो, तो उस प्रान्त की सरकार को कोताही नहीं करनी चाहिये। फिर भी भाषा को लेकर भावुकता का जो उभार उठता है उसके प्रवाह में लोग बहे जा रहे हैं क्योंकि अक्ल का सामना अक्ल से किया जा सकता है, मगर भावुकता सिर्फ खुशामद से ही संतुष्ट होती है।

श्रीमान्, जब हमने एक नये हिन्दुस्तान के बनाने का कार्यक्रम शुरू कर लिया है तो भारत का कल्याण चाहने वाली तमाम पार्टियों को इस बात पर भी गौर कर लेना चाहिये कि भाषा-मोह का उन्माद लगाने वालों में आज सबसे आगे कौन है? निश्चय ही ये वे लोग हैं जो हिन्दुस्तान के अंग-अंग को कमजोर करके अपने मनसुबे के रथ को आगे बढ़ा ले जाने को बेकरार हैं। कांग्रेस की नीति में जो परिवर्तन हुआ है उससे भी सबसे बड़ा सदमा उन्हें ही पहुंचा है और कांग्रेस के नेताओं को अपनी प्रतिज्ञा को लेकर जो परेशानी हो रही है उस पर भी सबसे ज्यादा खुशी उन्हीं को है।

उलझा है पांव यार का जुल्फे दराज में,

लो, आप अपने दाम में सैयाद आ गया।

मगर, श्रीमान्, यह आशिक-माशूक का खेल नहीं, यह बहुत बड़े मुल्क की किस्मत का सवाल है। कांग्रेस ने जो वायदा किया था उसका उद्देश्य एक मजबूत और आजाद देश की रचना करना था। अगर आज उस उद्देश्य की पूर्ति के लिये कांग्रेस को अपनी प्रतिज्ञा तोड़ने की जरूरत है तो उसे यह प्रतिज्ञा तोड़नी ही चाहिये। कृष्ण का उद्देश्य पार्थ को विजयी बनाना है, अपनी सत्यवादिता का प्रचार करना नहीं और आज पांच हजार वर्षों के बाद भी हम कृष्ण की सत्यवादिता में सन्देह नहीं करते, क्योंकि उनका उद्देश्य पवित्र और महान् था।

श्रीमान्, वेश वह है जो रोगी की खुशामद नहीं, बल्कि उसके रोग का इलाज करे और पथ्य उसे उस समय दे जब रोगी उसे पचा सकता हो, उस समय नहीं जब वह उसके लिये हठ कर रहा हो।

जो लोग हिन्दुस्तान के इतिहास और भूगोल से वाकिफ हैं वे जानते होंगे कि हिन्दुस्तान का इतिहास भूगोल से बहुत प्रभावित है। मौर्यों ने पाटिलपुत्र से अफ़ग़ानिस्तान पर शासन करना चाहा, मगर यह शासन क्यादा दिनों तक नहीं चल सका। जब यूनानी आये तो उन्होंने अफ़ग़ानिस्तान में बैठ कर पंजाब पर शासन करना चाहा, मगर वे इस देश को अफ़ग़ानिस्तान से बांध कर नहीं रख सके। हमारे देश को पहाड़ों और समुद्रों ने जैसे बाहरी दुनिया से अलग कर रखा है, वैसे ही हमारे पहाड़ों और नदियों ने देश के भीतरी भागों को भी आपस में विभक्त कर दिया है, लेकिन इस विविधता और विभाजन के बावजूद हमारे देश में आंतरिक एकता रही है। एकता का यह भाव रामायण और महाभारत काल से ही चला आ रहा है और इस देश को एकछत्र शासन के अन्दर लाने की यहां बार-बार कोशिशें की जाती रही हैं। मगर इस प्रयत्न में पूरी सफलता हमें आज आकर मिली है। महाभारत काल से ही एकछत्र राज्य की स्थापना की कल्पना चलती रही है, यद्यपि उसको सफलता नहीं मिली। आज जो सफलता हमें मिली है उसका कारण यह है कि प्राकृतिक बाधाओं पर विज्ञान ने विजय पा ली है और आज स्थानों की दूरी भी कम हो गई है। आज यदि भारत के किसी कोने में अकाल पड़े तो दूसरे कोने से अनाज भेजा जा सकता है और अगर एक कोने में विद्रोह हो तो दिल्ली से सेना भेज कर हम उसे दबा सकते हैं। इस समय यदि भाषावार प्रान्त की जहरीली भावना को फैलने दिया गया तो मेरा अपना ख्याल है कि सिवाय इसके कि हम लज्ज कंफ़ेडरेसी

(loose confederacy) की कल्पना करें हमारे लिये कोई और चारा नहीं रह जायेगा। इसलिये जो देश के रक्षक हैं, जिन्होंने इसे आजादी दिलवाई है और जिन्हें इस देश की परम्परा पसंद है, उनसे मैं अनुरोध करूंगा कि वे ज़रा शान्त भाव से इस बात पर विचार करें और भावनाओं से परे होकर सोचें। भाषावार प्रान्त बड़ी खूबसूरत चीज़ है, सम्भव है दर्शन के स्तर पर वह और भी खूबसूरत लगे, लेकिन क्या आज की स्थिति में, भारत के वर्तमान वातावरण में, उसको लागू करना कोई अक्लमंदी है? मेरा इस सभा से इतना ही निवेदन है कि इस प्रश्न पर विचार करते समय भारत की एकता पर पूरी दृष्टि रखें।

[For English translation, see Appen-ix II, Annexure No. 16]

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I as a Telugu domiciled in a Tamil district, living within the borders of the Telugu area, would like to put forth my point of view on this important question of the formation of linguistic provinces and the creation of the Andhra Province. Sir, let not anyone in this House be under any disillusionment that all the Andhras or the Telugu-speaking public want this Andhra province. I for one, a Telugu settled in Tamil area, feel that this is most harmful to us the Telugus to have an Andhra State formed. For ages and for several centuries the Tamilians and the Telugus in the South have been living amicably. There is absolutely no hitch. Even now there is no hitch between them. But I am afraid with your slogan of separation of an Andhra Province, the Telugus there will be experiencing trouble and there will be hitch between the Telugus and Tamilians in the south. Because there is no hitch at present and because they are living amicably together, we have had great leaders like the ex-Chief Ministers of Madras— Shri Omandur Ramaswami Raddiar, then Shri Kumara-svami Raja and others being elected from Tamil areas, though these leaders are Telugus. There are about 10

Shri Rajagopal Naidu] to 25 per cent, or nearly 5 million Telugu speaking people in the Tamil areas and if all the Tamilians combined to vote down a Telugu man there will be absolutely no chance for a Telugu man to be elected from a Tamil area.

And then, do the people of Rayalaseema want a separate Andhra province ? I am yet to see any Member from Rayalaseema in this House or elsewhere get up and ask for a separate Andhra Province. It is only those from the coastal districts, the Circars, who want a separate Andhra Province. The Telugus in the South do not want any Andhra Province. Well, Sir, the figures showed 5 million Telugu speaking people in the South, 10 million in Hyderabad State and 20 million in the 11 Andhra districts. Now out of this, if I may say so with boldness, only about 10 million Andhras want a separate Province.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : No, Sir, the majority want it.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU : If the hon. Member reads the Dhar Committee Report it would clearly show that the majority of the M.LAs., from the Ceded Districts never wanted a separate Province. It is only because of it the Coastal Andhras stooped to conquer. They wanted to give certain concessions and said you can have either the capital or the High Court in the Ceded Districts. They have also given certain priority over:- irrigational schemes. The Ceded Districts people think that the Coastal Andhras will dominate over them, both politically and economically. The mover of this Resolution, Mr. Venkat Narayana was frank enough to confess that the Tamilians are more intelligent and I think we have to admit that they are clever also to a certain extent. I feel it is that thing that has made the mover of this Resolution to move this Resolution because he feels that the Tamilians will dominate over the Andhras. It is a vicious circle and, in the larger interests of the nation I stress that there should not be any formation of any linguistic provinces, much less the formation of an Andhra

Province. Our country is confronted with greater problems. We have got to consolidate our position. We have got to consolidate our position economically, because we are certainly weak economically. I feel that the horrors of partition are still there and a lot is still to be done in the process of rehabilitation. At this juncture, it is not possible and it is not conducive also, to form a separate Andhra Province.

Then, coming to the Madras City, historically, of course, the area where Madras City is located now certainly belonged to an Andhra King. But, as the mover has suggested, there are more Tamilians there. There are about 73% of Tamilians, according to the 1931 census and the Telugu speaking population is only 19%. How then can the Andhras claim Madras City for themselves ? I feel if a referendum is taken, a vote is taken, as to whom Madras City should go, certainly the verdict will be in favour of Madras City going to the Tamilians. That is why the mover was careful to say that an Andhra State be formed with the undisputed areas. Well, I put this question. How is it advantageous to have an Andhra State without Madras and how is it advantageous for the people of Rayalaseema ? If you form an Andhra State without the City of Madras, certainly you will be doing a great injustice to your own people. I also feel that if an Andhra State is to be formed, that State can have no claim for the City of Madras. I, for one, am a Telugu, settled in Tamilnad. I feel that Madras City should be with Tamilnad and not with Andhra because both culturally and socially, and economically also, Madras City will go only with a Tamil State and not with an Andhra State.

Lastly, Sir, I would suggest that this is not the time for the formation of an Andhra State. As I had already submitted, there are greater things to be done and this question may be taken up at leisure when everything else has been settled in our country. I would once again urge that the time is not opportune now for the formation of an Andhra State. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI D. D. ITALIA (Hyderabad) :

श्री डी० डी० इटेलिया (हैदराबाद) :

माननीय सभापति महोदय, मैं इस प्रस्ताव के खिलाफ बोलने के वास्ते खड़ा हुआ हूँ। इससे इस वक्त आंध्र प्रान्त कायम करने का सवाल ही नहीं है, बल्कि दूसरे भाषावार प्रान्तों के कायम होने का भी अन्देश है। लोग कहते हैं कि कांग्रेस ने वायदा किया था कि जल्द से जल्द भाषावार प्रान्त कायम होंगे, लेकिन इस वक्त कांग्रेस यह महसूस करती है कि ऐसा कदम उठाने में उसको बहुत दिक्कतें हैं और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह कहना कि इस वक्त भाषावार प्रान्त कायम करने का मौका नहीं है बिल्कुल वाजिब है। अलबत्ता जब वक्त आयेगा तब कायम होगा। भाषावार प्रान्त के कायम होने के माने यह है कि मुक्त के छोटे-छोटे टुकड़े कर दिये जायें। यह वक्त तो ऐसा है कि हम आपस में युनिटी (unity) कायम करें और उस तरफ ही अपने कदम को बढ़ावें। हमारे चन्द भाइयों ने कहा कि हैदराबाद को काट कर आधा बनाया जाय। मैं कहता हूँ कि हैदराबाद एक स्टेट (State) है, जिसका एरिया करीब ८४ हजार मील है और जिसमें एक करोड़ ८३ लाख आदमी रहते हैं। तो हैदराबाद ऐसी बड़ी स्टेट को सिर्फ इसलिये भाषावार बांटना ठीक नहीं है कि वहाँ हिन्दुस्तानी के अलावा तीन बड़ी बोली बोली जाती हैं, जैसे तेलगू, मराठी और कन्नड़ी। क्या आप यह ठीक समझते हैं कि हैदराबाद के तीन टुकड़े करके तीन छोटे-छोटे प्रान्त बनायें या ऊपर कही हुई भाषाओं को बोलने वाले प्रान्तों को ये टुकड़े देकर हैदराबाद को हिन्दुस्तान के नक्शे से हटा दें? क्या यह वाजिब होगा? मैं कहता हूँ कि हरिज नहीं। एक बड़े प्रान्त को ऐसे ही रखना जरूरी है। हिन्दुस्तान की तकसीम का क्या नतीजा हुआ, उसका हमें अनुभव है और हमें चाहिए कि उस अनुभव से लाभ उठावें और ज्यादा प्रान्त बनाने की कोशिश न करें। यही बेहतर होगा।

मेरा कहना है कि अगर आन्ध्र का भाषावार प्रान्त बनाया जाता है तो उसके बाद तामिलनाडु होगा, उसके बाद महाराष्ट्र और उसके बाद गुजरात और दूसरी दूसरी भाषाओं को बोलने वाले प्रान्त होंगे। अगर इस तरह से देश के टुकड़े कर दिये जायें तो मैं नहीं समझता कि हमारी एकानामिक (economic) हालत ऐसी है कि वह उसको बर्दाश्त कर सके और प्रान्त अपने पैरों पर खड़े हो सकें। आर्थिक दृष्टि और शासन की दृष्टि से इतने अधिक प्रान्तों का संभालना एक कठिन बात होगी। इसलिये मैं इस प्रस्ताव के बिल्कुल खिलाफ हूँ और चाहता हूँ कि इस पर जल्द गौर न किया जाये। जिस वक्त गौर करें तो मेरा यह भी कहना है कि उस वक्त यह जरूर किया जाय कि हैदराबाद को दूसरे प्रान्तों में न मिलाया जाय बल्कि उसको अपनी हालत में ही रखा जाय। इतना कहते हुए मैं इस प्रस्ताव की सख्त मुखालफत करता हूँ।

[For English translation, see Appendix II, Annexure No. 17]

Shri N. B. DESHMUKH (Hyderabad) :

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख (हैदराबाद) :  
जनाबे सदर, जो प्रस्ताव हाउस (House) के सामने है उसकी ताइद करने के लिये मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ क्योंकि हैदराबादी होने की हैसियत से, मैं महसूस करता हूँ कि हैदराबाद स्टेट (State) के लोगों को भाषावार प्रान्त के बनाने से क्या नतीजे भुगतने पड़े हैं। चूँकि हैदराबाद स्टेट मराठी, कन्नड और तेलगू तीन भाषाओं का एक स्टेट है इसलिये वहाँ के हुक्मरां मुस्तलिफ़ तरीकों से साम्राज्यवादी प्रयोग वहाँ पर करते आ रहे हैं। चूँकि वहाँ तीन मुस्तलिफ़ जबानें हैं इसलिये वहाँ किसी एक जबान में तालीम नहीं दी जा सकती है और इसलिये पहले पशियन का प्रयोग वहाँ किया गया और लोगों को उनकी जबान में तालीम देने का कोई इंतजाम किसी तरह का नहीं किया गया। उसके बाद जब



[Shri N. B. Deshmukh.]

अलीगढ़ मुस्लिम यूनिवर्सिटी (Aligarh Muslim University) कायम हो गई और यहां के लोग वहां पहुंचने लगे तो वहां मीडियम (medium) बदल कर उर्दू कर दिया गया। वहां की उस्मानिया यूनिवर्सिटी (Osmania University) ने यह कहते हुए कि वहां की मादरी ज़बान में इस वास्ते तालीम नहीं दे सकते कि बहुत मुस्तलिफ़ ज़बानें बोली जाती हैं। एक उर्दू मीडियम से शिक्षा देने वाली यूनिवर्सिटी कायम करदी और दुनिया से यह कहना शुरू कर दिया कि उस्मानिया यूनिवर्सिटी में लोगों की ज़बान में तालीम होती है हालांकि वहां के पांच फ़ीसदी लोगों की भी ज़बान उर्दू ज़बान नहीं थी। वहां उस्मानिया यूनिवर्सिटी में यह किया गया कि अरबी के लिये ५, ७ प्रोफ़ेसर्स (professors) रख दिये, पशियन के लिये पांच, सात प्रोफ़ेसर्स रख दिये, लेकिन मराठी, तेलगू और कन्नड़ ज़बानों के लिये एक एक प्रोफ़ेसर रखा और वह भी ऐसा प्रोफ़ेसर जो कि उसी यूनिवर्सिटी में किसी तरह तालीम पाये था। ऐसा इंतज़ाम वहां रहता था और इसका नतीजा यह होता था कि उस्मानिया यूनिवर्सिटी में जो शर्क़ जाता था वह न अंग्रेज़ी में कुछ अच्छी तालीम हासिल कर सकता था, न उर्दू में महारत हासिल कर सकता था और मराठी, तेलगू और कन्नड़ ज़बानों का हाल तो कुछ पूछना ही नहीं। जहां मराठी के बड़े बड़े कवि जैसे मुकुन्दराज वगैरह पैदा हुए, वहां आज कल ऐसी हालत है कि कोई किसी ज़बान में इनीशियेटिव (initiative) लेने वाला नहीं निकल सकता। इसकी वजह यह है कि सामाज्यवादी प्रयोग वहां चल रहा है। हम यह समझ रहे थे कि पुलिस ऐक्शन (police action) होने के साथ ही साथ हम उस्मानिया यूनिवर्सिटी को ऐसी यूनिवर्सिटी में तब्दील करा सकेंगे, जहां वहां के मुल्की लोगों की ज़बान के लिये कुछ कर सकें, लेकिन अफ़सोस है कि हम मुन रहे

हैं कि उस यूनिवर्सिटी को मध्यवर्ती सरकार हिन्दी का प्रयोग करने के लिये ले रही है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please speak on Andhra Province and not on Osmania University.

SHRI N. B. DESHMUKH :

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख : मैं वही कह रहा था कि जहां ज़बानवारी प्राविस नहीं बने हैं, वहां इस तरह के हालात पैदा हो जाते हैं कि वहां के लोगों को अपनी ज़बान में कोई तरक्की करने की गुंजाइश नहीं रहती। हमारे हैदराबाद स्टेट में जहां मराठी बोली जाती है वहां पर उर्दू या हिन्दी बोलने वाले सरकारी मुलाज़िम आते हैं, जिसका नतीजा यह होता है कि वहां के लोगों की जो मुश्किलत है उनको वे नहीं समझते हैं। वहां की ज़बान की हालत यह होती है कि वहां के लोग जो कुछ मदर (mother) के पेट से सीखते हैं, उसी हद तक उनकी ज़बान रह जाती है। इन हालात की तहत मैं अर्ज़ करूंगा कि जब तक ज़बानवारी प्राविस न हों, जब तक मुल्क की ज़बानवारी तकसीम न हो, उस वक़्त तक कोई इंसान अपनी तरक्की नहीं कर सकता।

यहां बहुत कुछ डिसकशन (discussion) इस किस्म का हो गया कि इससे अलग रहने की टेंडेंसी (tendency) बढ़ेगी, मगर मैं अर्ज़ करूंगा कि ऐसी कोई चीज़ नहीं है। अगर कोई यह कहे कि इंतज़ामी अग़राज के लिये किसी मुल्क की ज़िलेवार, ताल्लुकेवार या सूबेवार तकसीम करने से सेपरेटिज़्म (separatism) की टेंडेंसी (tendency) बढ़ जाती है, तो मैं इस चीज़ को मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ। इंतज़ामी अग़राज के लिये मुल्क की तकसीम करना ज़रूरी है। मैं अर्ज़ करूंगा कि बम्बई और हैदराबाद की तकसीम किस उसूल पर है। जब कोई उसूल नहीं है और इंतज़ामी मद्देनज़र से कुछ रुकावटें पैदा हो जाती हैं तो मैं अर्ज़ करूंगा कि सूबेवार

तकसीम लाजमी हो जाती है। हैदराबाद के लिये तो एक और ही शकल है कि वहां राजप्रमुख को रखा है जिसकी वजह से ज़बानवारी तकसीम यह लोग पसन्द नहीं करते। जो ज़बानवारी तकसीम पसन्द नहीं करते उसकी वजह यह है कि उनके इंटरेस्ट (interest) कुछ ऐसे हैं जो कि इससे बाकी नहीं रहते और इसी वजह से वे ज़बानवारी तकसीम की मुखालिफ़त करते हैं।

अगर एकनामिकल प्वाइंट आफ व्यू (economical point of view) से देखा जाय तो ज़बानवारी तकसीम से कोई डिफ़िकल्टी (difficulty) पैदा नहीं होती। यह ज़रूर है कि कुछ तकलीफ़ होगी, कुछ नुकसानात होंगे लेकिन वे नुकसानात ऐसे नहीं हैं जिनकी वजह से मुल्क को कुछ ज़्यादा सफ़र (suffer) करना पड़े बल्कि मुझे यकीन है कि अगर फ़ौरन पूरे मुल्क की ज़बानवारी तकसीम कर दी जाय तो यह जो सेपरेटिज़्म की मेन्टैलिटी (mentality) आज ज़बानवारी तकसीम को रोकने की वजह से बढ़ रही है वह यकीनन दूर हो जायगी। आज हम देख रहे हैं कि गुजराती या मराठी चीफ़ मिनिस्टर (Chief Minister) होने पर कितने झगड़े पैदा होते हैं। हैदराबाद में क्या हुआ? देखा कि बिन्दु साहब चीफ़ मिनिस्टर होकर आ रहे हैं तो झट से तेलगू ज़बान वालों ने सेंटर (centre) को यह तार कर दिया कि वहां पर तेलगू बोलने वाले ज़्यादा हैं इसलिये तेलगू चीफ़ मिनिस्टर होना चाहिये। इसी तरह से मुस्तलिफ़ चीज़ें हुआ करती हैं। तो मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि अगर ज़बानवारी तकसीम कर दी जाय तो जो यह कटुता बढ़ती जा रही है वह बहुत जल्दी ख़त्म हो जायेगी। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि ज़बानवारी तकसीम जितने दिनों तक टालते जायेंगे, उस वक़्त तक वह कटुता और ज़्यादा बढ़ती जायगी। इसलिये मैं इस रेज़ोल्यूशन (Resolution) की तार्ईद करता हूँ। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि इस रेज़ोल्यूशन को पास करके जल्दी से जल्दी

आंध्र प्रान्त बना लिया जाय और जो मुश्किलात आगे आने वाली हैं उनको दूर करने की कोशिश की जाय ताकि हर शख्स अपनी ज़बान में तरक्की कर सके। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि आंध्र की एक यूनिवर्सिटी बना कर वहां की ज़बान को तरक्की दी जाय। अगर कोई यह करे कि मुल्क की जितनी भाषायें हैं, जैसे अंग्रेज़ी और जो दूसरी ज़बानें हैं, उनको सीखे तो वह तरक्की नहीं कर सकता। दूसरी ज़बानें सीखना बुरा नहीं है लेकिन फिर भी अपनी ज़बान से ज़्यादा तरक्की हो सकती है।

यह भी कहा जाता है कि इससे एक नेशने-लिटी (nationality) के ख़यालात बदल जायेंगे। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि ऐसा कोई डर नहीं है। बंगाल, मद्रास और दूसरे प्राविसेज़ होने के बावजूद भी कोई इंडिया (India) के खिलाफ़ वशावत करने को तैयार नहीं हुआ है; तो यह कैसे हो सकता है कि ज़बानवारी प्राविसेज़ के होने के साथ ही वे अपनी एकता को भूल जायेंगे। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि यह सब भुलावा देने की बातें हैं, ये सब रूकावटें डालने की चीज़ें हैं। इस वास्ते मैं अदब से अर्ज करूंगा कि इस प्रस्ताव को, इस करारदाद को, मंज़ूर करके जल्द से जल्द आंध्र प्राविस (Andhra Province) बना दिया जाय।

[For English translation, see Appendix II, Annexur.: >Jo. 18.]

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : I shall make a submission, Sir. In view of the fact that many Bills have been blocked in the House of the People and we will not have very much work, would it be possible to allot another day for discussion of this Resolution because of its very nature it is very controversial and I am sure many other hon. Members present here would like to speak on the Resolution.

SHRI P.V. NARAYANA : I think the next non-official day allotted to Bills is the 21st and I am told there is no Bill coming up on that day. So will it

[ Shri P.V. Narayana. ]

be possible for Government, will it suit the convenience of Government if this Resolution is continued on the next non-official day for the Bills ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Whether that day could be allotted, it is for the Chairman to decide. Whether the discussion is to be continued or not, we will take the opinion of the Leader of the House.

THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL ( SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI ) : If hon. Members are interested in continuing this debate till the end of the day's proceedings, then this business will stand over, under the rules, for being taken up as the first item on the next non-official day for Resolutions, that is, the 21st. So, by virtue of the rules themselves this Resolution will come up for discussion, if it is not ended today, on the 21st. As to whether we should allot another whole day for a Resolution which has been participated in by so many hon. Members is a matter which we should decide only on the 21st.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : Not another whole day.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the Government has no objection to the debate being continued on the next day.....

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : No. objection.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It will be continued on the next day.

DR. A. R. MUDALIAR (Madras) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I find myself a little embarrassed, because on the first occasion that I have to speak in this august Assembly I am forced to take part in a Resolution which is controversial to some extent and regarding which a great emotionalism exists in some quarters. But I feel nonetheless that it is my duty to take part in this debate, if for no other purpose, at least to see that emotionalism is eschewed and cool, clear common sense is brought to bear on the consideration of this matter.

There are three aspects of this question which I should like to refer to: first, whether it is desirable or necessary to have linguistic provinces; second, whether the Resolution regarding the Andhra Province is justified, and if so, under what circumstances, under what conditions and how it may be implemented; and thirdly, whether it is not possible to consider this whole question purely from the administrative point of view, trying to readjust boundaries if administratively it is absolutely necessary, or even to divide States if administrative considerations make it necessary to have such a division. I am quite ready to admit, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that the provinces as they exist have not been the result of any logical thinking but have been created owing to a variety of circumstances, mostly historical, and very partially indeed having any logical consideration behind them. But I am equally bound to confess that when this agitation for linguistic provinces is raised, during all the speeches that I have heard today and during the many more statements and speeches that I have come across during the last 30 years, I have found no logic behind this contention. The only logic seems to be that somehow language is a binding force, that it cements people and other considerations divide them. My knowledge of the history of my own country and of countries elsewhere does not support this contention. It can easily be pointed out that a variety of languages can exist in a country so firmly cemented and so deeply united that not the greatest of the convulsions that took place in the world had any effect on that cemented country. I can also point out the considerations that have weighed in other countries where, though there was a common language, fissiparous tendencies did divide them and break up a common country into more than one divided unit. Therefore it seems to me as I wanted through all the statements that have been issued, that I could not come across any logical reason why on the basis of language alone divisions administrative units, should be formed. The only consideration that has been

placed before this House is that during the last 32 years the Congress Party has thought of linguistic provinces—at any rate in the Congress organisation representation has been given on the basis of language. Now, I wish to point out that when representation was given on the basis of language, I believe I am right in saying that, not much consideration was given to the prospect of those areas becoming administrative units. It began merely as a method of representation to the Congress gathering based on language. It was not at that time considered by anybody that it would be the basis for an administrative unit. Even if it was so, and even if, having once laid down the proposition, a sort of routine resolution has been passed time after time by the Congress Party regarding linguistic provinces, I venture to think that at the present time, when those who are in authority, Congressmen in power, have had the knowledge of Administration more precisely than they could have had in the past and know the difficulties of Administration more clearly than they ever visualised before, and have come across problems economic and social, which must have been comparatively at any rate not realised by them in the earlier days, there is no reason why they should not retrace their steps and have the courage to say: "This resolution was passed at a time when we had not had the whole picture before us, and now that we have all the considerations that ought to weigh in considering this question, it is not in the interests of the country to carry out this resolution." The great and honoured patriot Congressman and Leader of the Opposition in the House of the past, the revered father of our present Prime Minister, when once he was challenged that he was not consistent, made the famous reply: "Consistency is the virtue of an ass." It seems to me that merely sticking to a resolution because you have passed it in the past ignoring all the considerations that are now placed before you, all the facts that concern you from every corner, from every source, to stick to that resolution and have it adopted is neither wise nor politic, nor is it statesmanship.

This cry of linguistic provinces is growing apace. Maps are prepared, and elaborate plans are prepared. I will not recall the tragic history of the formation of such plans in the past and how it led from ideas to actions and from actions to grave evils. I do not want that to be repeated. I know that the temperature amongst certain linguistic areas is very high, and I would appeal to the leaders of the Government benches, to the Prime Minister in particular, to bring down that temperature, not by acceding to the demand, but by trying to reason out and make it impossible for that unrealistic claim to be acted upon. Otherwise there will be calamity in this country. It is not merely of events that are occurring elsewhere, of which some of us have a fairly clear idea; it is more of the domestic peace itself, of which we must have even more clear ideas, that I am thinking when I say that it will be absolutely calamitous if this agitation for separate linguistic provinces is allowed to grow. I would therefore appeal to every one on the Government benches. They are the leaders of opinion today, and I would appeal to those of them who are on this side, who have got leadership and who can sway vast masses of people—I would appeal to every one who has got the interest of the country at heart who derive their inspiration from what is good for this country and not what is good for any other country—I would appeal to all of them to join together and see that this climate of opinion regarding linguistic provinces is somehow brought down and that the people are made to realise the basic factors of the situation and how it would be absolutely catastrophic for this country if this agitation for linguistic provinces were to grow.

Now, Sir, let me turn my attention to the next point. I am a Tamilian, but I have got this advantage, or this disadvantage, that I was born in that area which I am proud to claim—Rayalaseema, in Kurnool district. I venture to think that that fact has some bearing on my consideration of the question. I know my Andhra brethren, at any rate those of

[Dr. A. R. Mudaliar.] Rayalaseema, very well indeed. As my hon. friend the mover of the Resolution said, they are a very sentimental people. I always felt that next to the Bengalis the Andhras are the most sentimental. I do not make this observation as a compliment: on the other hand they would improve their province, and they would improve the position of their countrymen, if a little less sentiment and a little more realism were to be combined. I have moved among both of them and I say it with all respect that if they were to be a little more realistic in the approach to any of these problems, they would have got what they wanted much earlier.

Now I am in an unenviable position. As a Tamilian I do not want to suggest that I am against the creation of an Andhra Province. As one who believes that the joint efforts of both Tamilians and Andhras have promoted what is now called the Madras State—one of the foremost States notwithstanding the claims that may be made by the United Provinces—I believe that that separation may perhaps weaken us both. But if they are determined to separate it, if they want to cut away .....

AN HON. MEMBER : Yes, we are determined.

DR. A. R. MUDALIAR : My friend's determination is not what counts with me. There are other people's opinions which I value much more and whose determination I would respect. If they are determined, I do not think any Tamilian would like to oppose. But let me say a word about the Tamilians. My friends, the Andhras would realise and admit that the Tamilian area has been much more cosmopolitan than the Andhra area and that whereas there are a very few non-Andhras in the six coastal districts which claim to be pure Andhras, there are millions, as my friend has pointed out, of Andhras—Telugu speaking people—who have migrated from Andhra area to the Tamilian districts. Let it be remembered to the credit of Tamilians that Malayalis from

ing areas, the Telugus from the Telugu speaking areas, the Kannadigas from the Canarese speaking areas have all found a habitation, have all been received with respect, have all been treated fairly and equally, as has been acknowledged today, in the Tamilian districts. There are today 5 million Telugu speaking people there. There the people who are doing the best business and are carrying on the largest amount of trade without any jealousy or envy on the part of anybody and they will acknowledge with gratitude that the Tamilian population has been most hospitable to them. There is a point in what I say. If at any time you want this Andhra Province to be created, for God's sake take care that there is no bitterness in the creation of this Andhra Province. My friend Mr. Rajagopalan was asking as to what will happen to the Andhras in these areas if something untoward were to happen. We have instances where things have come about in bitterness and the loss—the grievous loss—that we have suffered is still fresh in our memories. This creation of new provinces is a very ticklish matter. This is a different matter from the sort of division that took place five or six years ago.

I am more in agreement with what my friend Mr. Kapoor has stated that unless both the Administration and the people take care, unless they have their finger on the pulse of the people, unless they realise that bitterness is to be avoided as far as possible not merely in the division but in the manner of the division also, there is bound to be, if not on the same scale, on a lower scale, acute difficulties and sharp disadvantages to what may be considered an 'alien population'. I am one of those who firmly hope and believe and pray that the population in the Tamil districts, the Telugu speaking people will never be considered as alien. That is the danger that you have to guard against in the manner in which you accept this proposition, in the manner in which you carry out this proposition, in the manner in which you adjust the various mentalities of the two sets of people. Therein lies

wisdom so that it may never be said that these people will be treated as an alien people in these days when mass emotionalism can be roused at the slightest provocation by people who are not overscrupulous and there are some who are not overscrupulous in this regard, who want to feed on discontent, who want to have their say amidst those people who become absolutely discontented. There is a great deal of wisdom in trying to see that these divisions, if they do take place at all, take place in an atmosphere where everything is fairly sober, fairly calm and fairly clean.

And that leads me to this question that if an Andhra Province is to be created, how shall it be created ? It seems to me that in the first place both sides must be willing to accept what is reasonable, both sides must be willing to accept the proposition on a fair basis. A great deal has been said about the city of Madras. My friend the mover of the Resolution could only quote the authority of Mr. Glyn Barlow. I thought he was one of those who had discarded all British authorities on any point whatsoever. Go back to some further authority. There are temples roundabout the Chinglaput District and I have had a fair knowledge about these because I represented that district in the local Parliament on more than one occasion. These temples give a history as to who were there and who were the first settlers. On the North you find a temple called Theruppalavana. On the South there is a temple called Thirukkaligundrum. On the West there is a temple called Thir-uvalangadu. Within 30 miles of the Madras city there is a famous Tamil temple which has existed for over 1200 years, about which great poets have sung verses and you may take it that if the word ' Thiru ' is there, it is one of those about whom a great poet has sung verses. If there are these temples near Madras city, can my friend suggest that somehow or other by those Vimanas which used to fly in the air in the old days a few Andhras came and settled on the coastal belt of the city of Madras at that time r

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : What is the authority that they are Tamil temples ?

DR. A. R. MUDALIAR : The very name of the temple suggests that it is not only a Tamil temple but it is one of the most sacred Tamil temples.

Therefore the question of Madras has to be settled on its own merits. But my point was this that if this Andhra Province Resolution is to be adopted, care should be taken to see that the adjustments of boundary are such that they do not create any sort of injustice, any sort of bitterness because that will do no good to anybody. I said that I was against all linguistic provinces and I appeal to the Government and the leaders in Government to try to tone down this agitation of linguistic provinces so as to avoid it altogether.

There is one consideration on which even a division of the Province can be had. I would myself like the Andhra Province to be divided on administrative grounds and not on linguistic grounds. It will be more appropriate on administrative grounds to have smaller units and then Madras may be divided into two parts. One may be called Andhra and the other may be called Tamilnad or whatever other name may be given. And the reason for it is this : If it were done on administrative grounds, all these claims about Visala Andhra and other areas would not arise. I was shocked to hear that the State of Hyderabad would be trifurcated and that each piece should be given to a linguistic area.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : It will be done.

DR. A. R. MUDALIAR : I hope it will never be done. I hope Hyderabad would continue to have an integrated economy that it has had.

AN HON. MEMBER : It is beyond the scope of the Resolution.

DR. A. R. MUDALIAR : I hope it will never be done. It is not a question of a Ruler being there. We have

[Dr. A. R. Mudaliar.] nothing to do with it- The people there have had an integrated economy. They have lived together, they have been brought up together. This integrated economy some vandals want to destroy and create different economies. It will take ten generations before that integrated economy will once more evolve into a proper economy if this sort of vandalism were to prevail, and therefore I appeal to those in power not to countenance these ideas, not to be wavering in their views, not to suggest that much can be said on both sides but to be firm, to be clear, to be emphatic that they will not give any room to such ideas. Sir, I have done.

SHRI V. S. SARWATE (Madhya Bharat) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I belong neither to Tamil Nad nor to Andhra and therefore I can look at the question more dispassionately and with less vehemence. At the outset, I must say that I agree with the principles of the resolution. There is nothing wrong in the principle of linguistic provinces. If the Congress had resolved and assured the people that there would be a division of India on a linguistic basis, there was nothing wrong in it and the Congress need not resile from that position. This is not simply because of the point of view of consistency. Consistency may be or may not be a virtue on the part of a certain animal which we, in our arrogance say lacks wisdom or intelligence, but for other reasons. Certainly, if there is consistency and also wisdom, there is nothing wrong in being consistent. Moreover many a time consistency and wisdom go together. But here the question of consistency and inconsistency does not come in. The simple question is, whether or not to apply the principle of linguistic division. There is nothing abstruse about the principle. The simple principle is that if the Administration is carried on in a language which the people can understand, then they will better co-operate with the Administration. So, if the Administration of a province is carried on in the language of the people, of that province, certainly it is desirable. There-

fore, linguistic provinces are desirable. It must, however, be borne in mind that there are certain other considerations also which are equally important. So, it does not follow that because there is one language, therefore there must be a separate province. Those other considerations must also be taken into consideration. I shall presently come to those considerations but before I do so, I desire to touch upon certain, to my mind, unfounded fears about India being partitioned. The fear is that, if an Andhra State is created, there will be further partitioning of the country on the lines of the partition of India brought about by the Muslim League into Pakistan and Hindustan. Such a fear need not be entertained. Whereas the Muslim League wanted the new Pakistan areas to secede from the Union, the Andhra people do not want to secede from India.

AN HON. MEMBER : Quite right.

SHRI V. S. SARWATE : Similarly about the fear, and about which some rhetorical speeches were made that, if linguistic provinces were created, there will be hatred between one province and another, there are already fissiparous tendencies and so on. Consider West Bengal for instance. West Bengal speaks one language. Therefore from the linguistic test, it is an ideal province. Does it follow that because West Bengal has been formed on the linguistic principle, West Bengal ceases to be patriotic ? No, on the contrary Bengal is probably ahead of the other provinces, at least not behind them, from the point of view of patriotism. So if you have to oppose the formation of an Andhra province, you oppose it on some logical grounds. These are not logical grounds that if linguistic provinces are created, there will be fissiparous tendencies. What are the considerations that should be really borne in mind ? First, we should look at our Constitution. What does the Constitution say ? I would refer to Article 3 of the Constitution :

" Parliament may by law—

(a) form a new State by separation of territory from any State or by uniting two

or more States or parts of States or by uniting any territory to a part of any State:

\* \* \* \*

Provided that no Bill for the purpose shall be introduced in either House of Parliament except on the recommendation of the President and unless, where the proposal contained in the Bill affects the boundaries of any State or States specified in Part A or B of the First Schedule or names of any such State or States, the views of the Legislature of the State or, as the case may be, of each of the States both with respect to the proposal to introduce the Bill and with respect to the provisions thereof have been ascertained by the President."

What is meant by this Article is that when a Bill of this nature is to be brought before Parliament, there would be two necessary conditions precedent. One is that the President's approval is needed, and the second is that the President must be guided by the views of the Legislature concerned, i.e., in this case the Legislature of Madras. If a Bill for a separate Andhra Province is to be brought before Parliament, then the views of the Madras Legislature would have to be obtained by the President and then the President would consider whether or not to give his approval. Why is this provision included in the Constitution? Evidently, to my mind this appears to be the reason. If, after the Constitution is made, changes have to be made in the boundaries, they should be made only if the people concerned agree amongst themselves to separate. That is the principle of self-determination. I do not know what was behind the mind of the Prime Minister, but I believe that some such principle was in his mind when he said that the persons who claim an Andhra State and those who constitute Tamil Nad should come to an agreement and come with an agreed formula before the country and this Parliament. That stipulation is a desirable one in case of any Resolution of this nature brought before this House. We are not in a position to know—we do not belong to the South—whether the people who constitute the Madras State are prepared to separate

among themselves. You cannot separate brothers unless they are prepared to do so. The position is like this at present. The two brothers who have been living together for a long time, who under the Constitution have been asked to live together, having been declared to be of joint-family, they want to separate now. In the case of the present Resolution there should be some expression from the peoples concerned that they desire to separate and further they must give us the provisions of separation also. For instance, the question will arise as to the inclusion of Madras either in the newly created Andhra Province or otherwise. So the provisions of separation would be necessary. That is as far as the constitutional aspect is concerned. There are also certain other considerations to be considered in the present Resolution. When the Part E States were formed during the time of the Constituent Assembly the consideration before the eyes of those who were in charge of those States was whether the unit was viable i.e., whether the income was sufficient to meet the expenditure taking the modern efficiency standard. Secondly there should be traditional culture etc. I was surprised that an observation was made that in India there are no different cultures and it is difficult for me to reconcile myself with that observation. Take the instance of a northerner speaking Pushtu and a southerner speaking Malayalam. Certainly their cultures are different. All the colours of rainbow may eventually mingle into giving us white light but that does not mean that these colours are not separate. All the cultures in India may eventually combine and give us a composite culture of India but it does not mean that there are no different cultures. I go to the other extreme and say *prima facie* when a separate language is formed, it is because of certain characteristics of the people who speak that language and these characteristics give certain peculiarities of culture. Therefore, *prima facie* there are different languages and different cultures. It does not follow however that there should be as many separate provinces. Culture can not be



t Shri V. S. Sarwate.] the test for that, because it is so very intangible. On the basis of culture alone probably no province can be formed. The only tangible test is whether the province is a viable unit. At present there is one more factor which is weighing heavily and to which probably attention has not been drawn. At present provinces have been so arranged, as somebody correctly said, that they are historical accidents, that there are all sorts of varieties and diversities and the result is not satisfactory. I don't mean to make any reflection but I say for U. P. there are 89 Members and from other provinces there are comparatively very few. So in the consideration of questions before this Parliament this huge majority of one State sometimes precludes proper consideration of a question. Therefore the whole of India ought to be divided on certain principles which ought to be laid down by the Commission or be made its terms of reference, e.g., what should be the standard of viability, area, etc. So it is not possible to refer this question to a boundary commission unless we determine what are the factors which would go to make a separate State. With this I further submit that this Resolution cannot be considered unless we are in a position to know what are the views of the Madras Legislature.

12 noon.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have heard very big oratorical speeches on both sides of the House full of emotion and I have to submit a few points for your consideration on administrative grounds. It has been pointed out that the States are administrative units and we must so divide our country into States that such administrative units are efficient. I begin by saying that a uni-lingual State is better than a multi-lingual State in the matter of Administration. All land records, and primary and secondary education are carried on through the medium of regional languages. If there is a multi-lingual State and if officers have to be transferred from one

area to another, great difficulties occur. Take Madras; it has four principal languages—at least three principal languages and there is some population speaking Canarese. If the land records are kept in the regional languages and say, a Collector is transferred from a Telugu district to a Tamil district, he will find great difficulty unless and until there is translation from one language to the other. I know some Members on the other side say that it will add to the culture of our country if every man learns three or four languages. Often the example of Switzerland is advanced in this matter where three languages are spoken. There are certain peculiar difficulties in our country. We want to develop our Rashtrabhasha—Hindi and how can we expect that in a multilingual State an individual will learn two or three regional languages and will also learn Hindi and an international language like English? In the interests of education, it is necessary to have uni-lingual States so that the regional language and Hindi and English can be learnt by everybody. On this basis I find in South India there are four principal languages—four great Dravidian languages—Telugu, Tamil, Malayalam and Canarese and luckily for us there are four States—the Hyderabad State, the Madras State, the Mysore State and Travancore-Cochin. You will find that the composition of these four States is such that there is one regional language predominant in each one of them. For example, in Hyderabad Telugu is the predominant language though there are other regional languages also. Similarly in Travancore and Mysore there are Malayalam and Canarese languages. I submit that we can solve all this problem by readjustment of a few districts from one State to another. I don't say we should divide the whole country on a linguistic basis but if we find that on administrative grounds we can, by mere exchange of a few districts, solve the entire problem without upsetting our internal economy, without upsetting the efficiency of Administration or creating fissiparous tendencies, I don't see any objection to adopting such a policy. Take a concrete example. I will suggest that if the coastal districts—about

ton to twelve Telugu-speaking districts— of Madras are merged into Hyderabad State you in effect get the Telugu-speaking area. Of course, permission will have to be given to the two districts of Gulbarga and Raichur to join the Mysore State as they are mainly Canarese-speaking areas. Therefore, just by transferring two districts to Mysore and ten districts to Hyderabad State, you will get two separate units. Similarly two or three districts from the State of Madras can be transferred to Travancore-Cochin State to form a complete unit of the Malayalam-speaking people. In this way, I think, without creating antagonism, without creating fissiparous tendencies, we can create these four great States representing the four great linguistic units.

Some people have expressed the fear that these units will not be economic units. One Member suggested that these linguistic States will lead to economic chaos. I submit that the two great problems before the country are the problem of the removal of poverty and the problem of food, and I feel that this type of division, this transfer of a few districts to this State and that State is really going to improve matters both from the point of view of food production and the point of view of the removal of poverty. Therefore I would strongly recommend that in addition to the creation of Andhra Province by the redistribution of these districts, the formation of the four States that I have mentioned can also be considered. They can be created at once by one Resolution of the Central Government.

SHRI A. S. KHAN (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, after the strong and forceful speech of my hon. friend Dr. Ramaswamy Mudaliar, there was no need for me to speak, indeed for anybody to speak in opposition to the Resolution. But as it happens, he belongs to Tamil Nad and therefore most of his very strong arguments did not carry conviction with those who looked upon him as a partisan. I do not have the honour to belong to the Province of Madras ; and as you know, Sir, i7C of S

sometimes those who are sitting on the bank can see things around them more clearly than those who are struggling in the current. Therefore, I would like to put forward my own point of view on this question.

The mover of the Resolution referred with gratitude to the attitude of the Prime Minister in the other House when a similar Resolution was discussed there. He said that the Prime Minister was sympathetic. Well, if that is the attitude of the Government I hardly think there is any need for the Resolution to be pressed here. Government is willing to sympathise with the Andhra people in their aspirations ; but they have got certain difficulties before them. For instance there are differences of opinion about the city of Madras itself and they want these differences to be settled amicably between themselves. They are willing to have a new province of Andhra by consent, not through coercion. That is the position of the Government. I think the Andhra people should approach the Tamil people and try to settle matters with them. I can assure them that if they do not succeed even after making this approach—of course I am not speaking on behalf of the Government,—but commonsense indicates it—the Government will not allow a festering sore to continue ; they will step in at some stage or other.

Next I would like to say a few words on the general question of linguistic provinces. This question is not confined to Madras alone. Of course, the demands are not quite so loud as they are in Andhra ; but they are loud enough to be audible from other corners of India. And here I would like to say a few things and place a few points before the House. Apart from the point which has been mentioned by many people here that this kind of division of the States will encourage fissiparous tendencies in India there are other arguments also. If India is divided into smaller administrative units what will happen ? Each unit will have a governor, a legislature, ministers, deputy ministers,

[Shri A. S. Khan.]

parliamentary secretaries, heads of departments and all the full-fledged paraphernalia of a government. Then many of them would like to have their own universities and some would like to have even their own high courts. With this picture before us, will there be any money left for developments and the activities of the beneficent departments. These considerations are really very important and they should be borne in mind when dealing with this question.

In the U.P. we had a number of States roundabout on the border, like Gwalior, Bharatpur and others, and all the bad characters, all kinds of anti-social elements used to work just on the border areas, and whenever attempts were made from this side to apprehend them they used just to cross the border and get into the neighbouring State. They used to slip out like that and again come into U.P. through another State. Such difficulties are bound to arise if there are a number of small administrative units. Therefore the question of the creation of linguistic provinces should be considered from all these various points of view. As was ably said by Dr. Ramaswami Mudaliar, there is no real argument in saying that because the Congress had been in favour of division on linguistic basis, therefore these provinces should be created now. The Congress is now in charge of the Administration of the land and it must see things from the point of view of proper Administration.

After saying this much I would like to make one submission, namely, that by giving homilies or sermons or eloquent speeches we cannot satisfy those who want division on the basis of languages. Our homilies will not satisfy them. The Government will have to look into the matter very deeply. What is the reason behind this demand? Why do they want separate administrative units? If Government were to look deep into the question, they would find, as was expressed by many today, that the real reason behind this demand is a fear that their

language and culture are not getting a fair deal, that they will not get fair-play if they are to remain where they are. Therefore I would suggest for the consideration of the Government that where there are definitely demarcated areas where one dialect is spoken, the Government should build it up into a zone. They need not make it a separate unit, but the work say in the court, should be conducted in that dialect. Also in the schools, up to the primary or any other suitable standard, the instruction should be imparted in the mother tongue of the children. Everybody should be allowed to file a complaint in the court in his own language. As far as the legislature in the provinces is concerned, the agenda and other related papers should be printed in two or three languages, as the case may be. Where such zones cannot be demarcated definitely, I would suggest that the provinces should allow all the courts to accept all applications, statements, deeds, affidavits, etc., in any language of the province. In the legislatures the agenda, questions and answers and the whole proceedings should be printed in all the languages which are spoken in that province. I am sure if this is done it will kill this agitation for linguistic provinces; otherwise, it will remain and brood.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO (Orissa) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Indian Republic has adopted the motto of ancient wisdom 'सत्यमेव जयते नानृतम्' and yet when I look round and see the faces and hear the voices with my eyes open and not with my eyes shut, I am reminded of the saying of Bacon's "What is Truth"? asked jesting Pilate; but would not stay for an answer."

The speeches I have heard so far from the other side of the House contain very fine emotions—not sentiment, Sir, but emotion, because sentiment is organised emotion which is an indispensable factor in the growth of values in society and in the individual. Today, if we are going to abide by the maxim which should guide us, viz., <sup>^?T^</sup> \*\*\*& then

we must recognise the fact that the diversity of India is a fact and the philosophy contained in her unique contribution to world thought, namely, "Unity in Diversity" is an ideal which should be upheld as against the ruthless unification idea to which most of the Members on the other side seem to be dedicated. The Greek myth says that there was a robber called Pro crustean. This robber had an iron bed and all the victims that he used to seize, he used to put within this iron bed. If they were larger than the iron bed, then their legs and heads were cut off. If they were smaller than the iron bed, they were stretched i.e., their bodies were stretched until all the bones inside were broken. This is the Pro crustean bed of unitary India, of unitary nationalism which we have learnt from the foreigners and forgotten our own philosophy, viz., unity of India in her diversity which should be the main theme of our thought and our action. Now, it is upon the recognition of this fact that in my opinion the creation of the various states in India has come about. The various states have different languages and different cultural content ; language and culture are invariably related to each other and yet they are united in one whole that is India or Bharat. If, of course, you advocate a ruthless united India without this variety, without this development of individual genius of every province .....

PROF. DINKAR : No question of genius being disturbed.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO : But even if you wish that, you should proceed logically about it. Abolish the various States, abolish the differences throughout India and create a ruthless united State.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH : That time will come.

PROF. DINKAR : That will come if people are to be benefited by your advice.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO : But as it is, we are neither here nor there. ^e are merely hesitating between the

two and as such there can be no progress. It is from this point of view that I have stood up to support the idea of linguistic provinces because the creation of the Indian States itself has been devoid of any conscious principle and, in my opinion, as a humble student of sociology and anthropology that a criterion like language, which is the medium of culture, in any group, in any society and which is the invisible link that creates sympathy in a group that sympathy which Scott has so eloquently described :

"It is the secret sympathy, The silver link,  
the silken tie, Which heart to heart and  
mind to mind, In body and in soul, can  
bind."

This language, which is the fountain of that sympathy, this language, which is the medium of the culture of a group, should be made, in a broad sense, the principle on which the various provinces or States can be regrouped, can be made.

Now, Sir, it is very gratifying to see that the party in power today, has, again and again, repeated its faith in that principle, and, to all visible signs seems to be wedded to the principle of linguistic provinces. Our only fear is that that wedding, that marriage, may not be made a marriage of convenience only as has been unfortunately hinted at by many of the speakers today. Many of the speakers today here, said, "Yes, the Congress was pledged to a certain policy, to a certain scheme before it assumed power. Now that it has assumed power it can divorce itself from that policy and proceed on fresh lines to suit its new position and its new power." Therefore, I put it to the House, and through the House to the Government, that as a quick implementation of its promises of forming linguistic provinces in India, which I consider to be a sound policy, it should, as an experiment, as a first experiment, start with the Andhra Province. Let it be started and they can see how it flourishes, see how it progresses. If they find that it is successful, it is in consonance with the national aspirations, national unity and there are no fissiparous tendencies visible

[Shri P. C. Bhanj Deo ]  
thereafter, it is always in the dominant position of either following up that principle which is successful or discarding it after giving it a fair trial. I would like specially to mention the fact that if the Government, just for the sake of mere administrative efficiency can dismember any State—I am saying this, Sir, as a mere example—can pull out parts of Orissa and tag them on to Bihar and refuse to recognise the claims of areas in Bihar which should go to Bengal... (Interruption) why can't it, for much more efficiency, accept the principle of creating linguistic provinces of which the first, in my opinion, should be the Andhra State? With these words I close my speech. Thank you, Sir.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH (Bihar) :

خواجہ عنایت اللہ (بہار) :  
شریمان قیثی چھرمین صاحب! جس ریزولیشن (Resolution) کا اس ہاؤس (House) میں ذکر کیا جا رہا ہے اس پر کافی بحث ہو چکی ہے۔ اس میں ہماری حکومت کو اس بات کے لئے زور دیا گیا ہے کہ ہندوستان کی سرکار مدراس کے صوبہ کا دو حصوں میں بانٹ کر دو الگ پراونس (Province) بنانے میں جلدی کرے۔ جس میں آندھرا (Andhra) ایک ہو۔ سب سے پہلے ہاؤس کو میں یہ بتانا چاہتا ہوں کہ آج کا یہ ہاؤس وہ ہاؤس نہیں ہے جس میں ہم کچھ باتوں کو بیٹھ کر کے طے کر لیں اور اس کے بعد ریزولیشن پاس کر دیا جائے اور اس ریزولیشن کا کوئی اثر نہ ہو۔ بلکہ ہمارا پاس کیا ہوا آج کوئی بھی ریزولیشن یقیناً ایک طاقت رکھتا ہے اور اس پر ضرور عمل ہوگا۔ اس لئے کسی

نام کو جس کو ہم یہاں پر رکھتے ہیں اس کو ہمیں سوچ سمجھ کر اور پاس کرنا چاہیئے۔

ابھی تھوڑے ہی دنوں کی بات ہے ہماری اس بھارت سانا کے دھرم کے نام پر نہیں ٹکرتے ہو چکے ہیں۔ ان دنوں ٹکڑے کرنے والوں کے پاس ایسی سب دلیلیں تھیں ایسے زبردست دلائل موجود تھے کہ لوگوں کو ان کے سامنے جوابدہی کے لئے سرچٹا پڑتا تھا مگر اس تقسیم کا نتیجہ بھارت سفتان کو اس طرح سے بھگتلا پڑا یہ سب کے سامنے ہے۔ ابھی تک ان کے زخم بھرے نہیں ہیں اور ابھی تک ہمارے دلوں میں اس تقسیم کی چھین موجود ہے۔ ابھی ہم اسی تقسیم کی تکلیفوں اور مصیبتوں کو ہی نہ بھولتے تھے کہ ایک دوسری تقسیم کا۔ وال ہمارے سامنے ہو رہا ہے۔ وہ ہے بھاشا کے انوسار۔ لینگویج (language) کے انوسار تقسیم۔ اگرچہ یہ بات کہی جاتی ہے کہ یہ اس طرح تقسیم نہیں ہوگی۔ جب پاکستان کی مانگ پیش کی گئی تھی اور اس بھارت سانا کے ٹکڑے کرنے کی مانگ پیش کی گئی تھی تو اس وقت بھی یہی دلیل دی گئی تھی کہ وہاں کے رہنے والوں کو آرام ملیگا اور ان کو ہر قسم کی سہولتیں دی جائیں گی مگر نتیجہ ہم لوگوں کے سامنے ہے۔ ہم سب لوگوں نے دیکھا کہ کس طرح سے اس بھارت سانا کے ٹکڑے ہونے کے بعد دہلیس طرب کی چٹا کو کٹلی مصیبتوں کا سامنا کرنا پڑا جس کی مثال دنیا کی تواریخ میں نہیں

ملتی - میں یہ مانتا ہوں کہ کسی ایک مذہب کو پیار کرنا کسی ایک مذہب کو قائم رکھنا یا اپنے مذہب سے محبت کرنا کوئی بڑی چیز نہیں ہے مگر جب کوئی مذہب دوسرے مذہب کے خلاف نفرت پھیلاتا ہے اور ملامت کرتا ہے تو وہ ٹھیک نہیں ہے - اسی طرح سے دوسرے خیال میں اپنے صوبہ کی بہتری چاہنا کوئی بڑی چیز نہیں ہے مگر جب ہم یہ چاہیں کہ دوسرے صوبہ میں سے کچھ حصہ اٹھ کر لیں اور اس طرح کا جذبہ موجود ہو تو میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ہمارے لئے اور ہندوستان کے ہر فرد کے لئے یہ جذبہ قابل ملامت ہے اور ہم کو اس جذبہ کو اپنے من سے دور کرنے کی کوشش کرنی چاہیئے -

جو ریزولیشن آج ہمارے سامنے ہے اس کے اصولوں پر بندش کرنے سے پہلے میں یہ بتانا چاہتا ہوں اور ثابت کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ دنیا میں ہر کام خواہ وہ کتنا ہی اچھا کیوں نہ ہو اس کو لاگو کرنے کے لئے ایک موقع ملتا ہے اور ویسا ہی ماحول ہوتا ہے - ایک انسان کے لئے خوراک اچھی چیز ہے اور اس کو اپنی زندگی کو قائم رکھنے کے لئے اس کو کھانا ضروری ہوتا ہے مگر جب کوئی آدمی بیمار ہو جاتا ہے تو اس کو کپانے سے رک دیا جاتا ہے - مٹی اور جون کے مہینے میں تھلندی ہوا کا بلدوبست کیا جاتا ہے مگر وہی ہوا نومبر اور دسمبر کے مہینے میں اچھی نہیں لگتی اور اس سے لوگ بچنے کی

کوشش کرتے ہیں - ایک کسان اپنی فصل بھڑا کرنے کے لئے اور کھیتی کے لئے پانی چاہتا ہے اور پر ماتما سے دعا مانگتا ہے کہ وہ بارش کرے اور پانی بوسا دے - مگر جب اس کی کھیتی یک جاتی ہے اور کھدیان میں آناج آ جانا ہے تو وہ اس سے بوسات سے بچتا چاہتا ہے اور دعائیں کرتا ہے کہ کسی طرح پانی نہ برے - اس لئے اس پرستار پر غور کرنے سے پہلے ہمیں یہ سوچنا چاہیئے کہ آج ہندوستان کی کیا حالت ہے - آج ہمارے ہندوستان میں کتنی چیزوں کی کمی ہے - ہمیں بہت بھر کھانے کو نہیں ملتا - ہمارے پاس پہلے کے لئے کھانا نہیں ہے - دھلے کے لئے مکان نہیں ہے - ہماری تعلیم نہیں ہے - ہم جاہل ہیں - ہمارے پاس زندگی کی اہم ضروریات کی چیزوں کی بہت کمی ہے - تو آج سب سے پہلا کام جو ہمیں کرنا چاہیئے وہ یہ ہے کہ اس وقت دیس کو سب سے پہلے کس چیز کی ضرورت ہے - اس پر ہم سب لوگوں کو غور کرنا چاہیئے - جس طرح سے کچھ آدمی آپس میں مل کر ایک مکان بنا رہے ہوں اور ابھی ان کو مکان بنانے کے لئے ایڈلٹ پتھر چوڑا لڑی اور دوسری ضروری چیزوں کی ضرورت ہو اور یہ چیزیں ابھی بلکم بھی نہیں ہوئی ہوں - ان میں سے ایک بھائی بولے کہ ہم کو یہ سب کام چھوڑ دینا چاہیئے پہلے ہم کو کمروں کی سجاوٹ کے لئے آئیے اور اناریاں خریدنی چاہیئے اور یہ فیصاہ کرنا چاہیئے کہ ان کی لکڑی کس طرح کی ہونی چاہیئے تو اس طرح ہمیں پہا

[Khawaja Inait Ullah]

یہ دیکھنا ہوگا کہ بدلیا سی چیز کیا ہے اور یہ ہے اسی کو فراہم کرنے کی کوشش کرنی چاہئے۔ نہ کہ غیر ضروری۔

آج ہم بھارت میں آزادی کی آزادی کا مسئلہ بنا رہے ہیں۔ اسلئے اس وقت ہم کو ایڈٹ چونا پتھر وغیرہ چیزوں کی ضرورت ہوگی۔ اس ضروری کام سے فارغ ہو کر اگر ضرورت پڑی تو ہم بھارت کو ایسے حلقوں یعنی (zones) میں تقسیم کر سکتے ہیں جن حلقوں میں نہ کوئی بھاری ہوگا نہ ہلکائی، نہ مدراسی نہ پنجابی اور نہ کشمیری بلکہ سب ہندوستانی ہونگے۔ انکی گھریلو بھاشا کچھ بھی ہو مگر ملکی بھاشا ہندوستانی ہوگی۔ انکا ذاتی مذہب کچھ بھی ہو مگر سیاسی مذہب ہندوستانی ہوگا۔ اس لئے میرے خیال میں آج ان معاملات پر غور کرنا پروقت کی شہنائی ہے۔ حکومت اور دیس کا وقت اور روپیہ برباد کرنا ہے۔ ان سب باتوں کو سوچنا چاہئے اور کوئی صحیح راستہ نکالنا چاہئے۔ اب میں دیس کا بھاشا کے انوسار بقوارے کے اصول پر آنا ہوں۔

میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ہندوستان کا بقوارہ بھاشا کے آدھار پر ہونا ناممکن ہے کیونکہ اس میں تین سو سے بھی زیادہ بولیاں بولی جاتی ہیں۔ کانگریس نے کہا ہے اور کانگریس نے وعدہ کیا تھا کہ ہندوستان کو الگ الگ پروانس میں بانٹا جائیگا۔ لیکن میں نہیں سمجھتا کہ ہمارے دوستوں کو یہ معلوم نہیں ہے۔ اس لئے میں ان کو یہ یاد دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ کانگریس

نے جب اس طرح کا وعدہ کیا تھا تو اس میں یہ الفاظ تھے وہ ایز فار ایز پاسبل (as far as possible) تو وہ ان الفاظوں کو کیوں بھول جاتے ہیں۔ وہ ایز فار ایز پاسبل کے کیا یہ معنی نہیں ہیں کہ جہاں تک ممکن ہوگا تو ممکن کا سوال اس پر پیدا ہوتا ہے۔ اس وقت دیس کی اس طرح کی حالت ہے کہ کسی طرح کے پروانس بنانا مناسب نہیں ہے۔ اگر ہم ایسا کریں گے تو اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوگا جو ہندوستان دنیا کی نظروں میں اونچا ہوتا جاتا ہے اور جب بہت جلد دنیا کی بڑی سلطنتوں میں ایک بلڈے جا رہا ہے وہ اس منزل سے گر جائیگا۔

ابھی میرے ایک دوست نے یہ فرمایا تھا کہ کانگریس نے پرامس (promise) کیا ہے کہ وہ آزادی حاصل ہونے کے بعد ہندوستان کے صوبوں کی ازسرنو تشکیل کرے گی تو میں یہ کہتا چاہتا ہوں کہ پولیٹیکس (poli-tics) میں جو بھی انسان کسی طرح کا وعدہ کرتا ہے تو اس وقت کی حالت کو دیکھ کر وعدہ کرتا ہے۔ مگر آج ملک کی حالت اس طرح کی نہیں ہے کہ اس وعدہ کو پورا کیا جاسکے۔ اس چیز کو پورا کرنے کے لئے ہم کو اس ملک کی ویسی ہی فضا ہموار کرنی پڑیگی۔

ملک کے قومی حالات بدلتے رہتے ہیں۔ اعتراض کیا گیا ہے کہ کچھ صوبوں میں وہ اقلیت جن کی بھاشا

دوسری ہے۔ ان کے بچوں کی تعلیم کا کوئی انتظام نہیں ہے نہ ان کو اپنے بچوں کے لئے کوئی تعلیمی سہولت ملتی ہے۔ لوگ اعتراض کرنا آسان سمجھتے ہیں لیکن حقیقی باتوں پر غور نہیں کرتے کہ ہر ایک بات کے لئے کتنی دشواریاں ہیں نہ وہ خود کو پاتے ہیں نہ دوسروں کو کرنے کا موقع دیتے ہیں۔ کہا گیا ہے کہ وہ اپنے بچوں کو پڑھا نہیں پاتے ہیں۔ وہ اپنی زبان کو ترقی نہیں دے سکتے ہیں۔ مجھے تعجب ہوتا ہے ایسے اعتراض کرنے والوں پر۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ وہ صرف اعتراض کرنے کی غرض سے ہی اعتراض کرتے ہیں۔ یا واقفیت حاصل نہیں کرتے ہیں یا واقفیت حاصل کرنے کی کوشش ہی نہیں کرتے ہیں۔ ہمارے کانستٹی ٹیوشن (Constitution) کا سیکشن (section) ۳۰ (۱) اور (۲) صاف بتاتا ہے کہ :

"The minorities shall have the right to establish educational institutions of their choice.....etc."

کہاں جھگڑا باقی رہ جاتا ہے۔ اگر مدارس میں چار زبانیں بولی جاتی ہیں اور چار طرح کے لوگ الگ جگہوں میں رہتے ہیں تو ان کو تو ہمارا کانستٹی ٹیوشن اجازت دیتا ہے کہ اپنی زبان کا اسکول جاری رکھیں۔ یہاں تک نہیں بلکہ گورنمنٹ (Government) کو حکم دیتا ہے کہ ان کو ایڈ (aid) دیں۔ ہمارے یہاں بہار میں کوئی جھگڑا نہیں ہے۔ ہمارے یہاں کوئی ہنگامی مسئلہ نہیں کرتے ہیں کہ وہ اپنے

اسکول میں ہنگامی نہیں پڑھ سکتے۔ وہ اپنے اسکول میں ہنگامی بھی پڑھتے ہیں ہندی بھی پڑھتے ہیں اور ہمارے یہاں آکر اسکولوں میں ماسٹری بھی کرتے ہیں۔ کورٹ میں جج بھی بنتے ہیں۔ میں تو نہیں سمجھتا کہ بہار کے رہنے والے ہنگامیوں کو ایسی کوئی تکلیف محسوس ہوئی ہے کہ ان کے بچے ہنگامی نہیں پڑھ سکتے ہیں۔ اسی طرح اور صوبوں میں بھی ہے۔ ہاں اگر کسی صوبے میں ایسی کوئی مشکل ہے تو میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ان مشکلات کو دور کیا جائے اور اس کے لئے ہمارا کانستٹی ٹیوشن اجازت دیتا ہے کہ ہم اس استھیت (State) کو مجبور کریں۔ ہمارے کانستٹی ٹیوشن کے سیکشن ۳۰ کے ماتحت ہم کو اجازت ہے کہ ہم اپنے بچوں کو پڑھانے کے لئے اپنی خاص زبان میں اسکول کھولیں اور اگر کئی زبانیں ہوں تو اس کے لئے بھی اپنے انسٹیٹیوشنس (institutions) کھول سکیں۔ اور ان انسٹیٹیوشنس کو استھیت گورنمنٹ (State Government) کو پوری مدد دینی ہوگی اور اگر نہیں دیتی ہے تو ہم لوگ یہاں سنٹر (Centre) میں اس پر غور کر سکتے ہیں اور اس کی شکایت سننے کے بعد حکومت پر زور ڈال سکتے ہیں اور پوچھ سکتے ہیں کہ ایسا کیوں کیا جا رہا ہے؟

ہمارے ایک دوست نے ایک بڑی مزیدار کہانی سنا دی کہ ایک آدمی



[Khawaja Inait Ullah.]

تھا اس نے پاس ایک لوہے کی چارپائی رکھی تھی اگر کوئی لمبا ہوتا تھا تو سر کات دیتا تھا اور اگر کوئی چھوٹا ہوتا تھا تو اس کو کھینچ کر بڑا بنا دیتا تھا اور چارپائی کے برابر کر دیتا تھا۔ میں کہتا ہوں میرے دوست ایک چیز کہنا بھول گئے کہ اگر وہ برابر ہوتا تھا تو اس سے یہ کہتا تھا کہ وہ برابر کہوں ہو گیا۔ میرے دوست کی حالت وہی ہے کہ اگر کوئی چیز خراب ہے تب تو وہ خراب ہے ہی۔ کم ہے تو بھی کوئی بات نہیں لیکن اگر کوئی صحیح بات کہی جائے تب بھی اس کو غلط کہنے کی کوشش کرتے ہیں۔ میں کہتا ہوں کہ آئندہ جب ایسی کہانیاں سنایا کریں تو یہ بھی بڑھا دیا کریں کہ وہ برابر کیوں ہوا اور اعتراض کرنے کے لئے یہ کہہ دیا کریں کہ وہ لمبا ہو گیا یا چوڑا ہو گیا۔ بہرحال ہماری پوزیشن اسی طرح کی ہے چونکہ ایسی کہانی لے کر بیٹھے ہیں کہ اگر ہم صحیح بھی کرتے ہیں تو اسے غلط کہتے ہیں۔ غلط جو کرتے ہیں تو اس کے لئے تو کچھ کہنا ہی نہیں ہے۔ جو ہم غلط کرتے ہیں اس کو ہم ماننے کے لئے توڑ ہیں اور اپنے دوست کی صلاح سے فائدہ اٹھانے کی کوشش کرتے ہیں۔ لیکن جب ہم صحیح کام کرتے ہیں تب بھی اس کو غلط بنانا یہ بات میری سمجھ میں نہیں آتی۔

ان الفاظ کے ساتھ میں اس ریزولوشن کی بڑی زبردست مخالفت کرتا ہوں

اور بہت زور کے ساتھ مخالفت کرتا ہوں۔ جس طرح ایک دوست نے کہا تھا کہ ہو کر رہے گا تو میں اسی طرح زور سے کہوں گا کہ یہ کبھی نہیں ہو گا اور کبھی نہیں ہو کر رہیگا۔

[For English translation, see Appendix II, Annexure No. 19.]

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM (Madras) : Sir, the Resolution before us is simple and straight in form. The Resolution is not asking for anything big. The Resolution is asking this House to see that an Andhra State is formed in consonance with the Articles of the Constitution of India. This is not a new demand. It is not a new thing that is coming before us and before the people of the country. This request for an Andhra State has a history of 40 years.

One hon. Member just now mentioned that he does not see any logic in this demand or in this request of the Andhra people for having an Andhra State in order to develop their natural resources for the interests of the people there. He might not have seen the logic nor understood properly the national feelings of the people in Andhra, though he was born in those parts. At the same time he extended his logic in such a way as to say that this cannot be done. I have to remind that hon. Member that in spite of him history moved, that in spite of all his logic people created history in our country. So, the people of Andhra and the people of our country will create history, and it will not stop for individuals of that type.

I have to mention only one point. Here is a Resolution which asks for the implementation of the decisions of the Congress, which asks for the implementation of the election pledges which they gave in 1936 and which they gave in 1946 and which they gave even in 1951. This Resolution asks you to implement your own pledges. It is not an arrangement for gatherings of the Congress Party. It is not so simple as

one friend put it. Perhaps he was away from the Congress in those days and he was not supporting the Congress, and he was going against the stream of national feelings in the country. I do not grudge him, because he understands only that. The national aspirations of the Andhra people have come with the national movement of the country. This urge for a national State of Andhra is born with the national movement of our country. You should not forget that. Every time our leaders promised that this would be considered immediately after Independence. Now, after so many things have happened, we are asking you to implement those pledges. And now we hear the argument that whatever may be the pledges, they should be put down. You cannot put down the national aspirations of the people. History has taught us that no amount of repression, no amount of force will stop the march forward. History will march forward. I ask you to take this as a warning of history. The pledge is so simple: the formation of an Andhra State. We are not asking you for an Andhra empire. We are not asking you for territories over which we have no claim. We are only asking for undisputed areas, that is, the 12 districts in Madras State, to be constituted as a separate State, and that State to be managed in the interests of the people.

One friend from the other side said : "Postpone it for 10 years. We are living together as brothers." We are living as brothers, no doubt, but how ? The waters of the Krishna and Pennar are to be taken away from us in the name of brothers. That is not sympathy of one brother towards another brother. Electrical power is not developed in Andhra area. Things are done at the expense of the Andhra people. It is not the feeling of brother for brother. We have natural resources. For instance we have got iron, we have got manganese, we have got mica. We have got everything. But the resources are not tapped. They are not used for the benefit of the people there.

17 C of S

Another friend in his argument said that for the sake of community projects, for the sake of the arrangements they are going to make, we must not put forward this claim. Even in the Five Year Plan, what are you going to provide for the Andhra people? If you read the Five Year Plan, you find no mention there. Again, if you consider the difficulties of Andhras, from the ordinary worker down to the capitalist, they have no employment, because the railway will not give a wagon and the jute mill in Ellore has *W* starve. If an ordinary peasant has to export his jaggery to some place, he cannot do it because there is no wagon. He cannot move his goods promptly. You divided Andhra administratively into three parts, and now you say; Wait for 10 years. I say: this is not the argument of a sympathetic person ; this is the argument of a person who wants to exploit the interests of the Andhra people for his own benefit. This is an argument for not bringing unity; this is an argument to disrupt unity. This is an argument for not safeguarding the security of the country ; this is an argument not for a cultural unification of the country, but this is an argument against the people, against their interests, against the common man's interests.

I come to another point. The argument is that there is no unity among Andhra people. There is unity. What do you mean by "unity"? I ask you this simple question. All the political parties have agreed. The Provincial Congress Committee adopted a resolution. The Socialist Party have expressed themselves in favour of Andhra State immediately. In the House and outside also they made statements to this effect. The Communist Party categorically came forward with a statement that for the last 15 years they have been stating that Madras City belongs to the Tamilians and they are against making it a separate province—a Commissioner's Province—that it forms part of Tamil Nad. We are asking for an Andhra Province on two principles. We are not asking for a State on language

[Shri K. L. Narasimham.] basis alone. Language is one thing. There are other factors also which were taken into account, and we agree that Madras City goes to Tamil Nad. Let us go to the plebiscite. So there is a democratic principle of settling these things. We are asking you to do it democratically. Ask the opinion of the people and do it. So do it in a democratic form and thus create a happy feeling between all the people of the State. I myself have no complaint against the Tamilian people in general. I have no complaint against any Tamilian. I have no complaint against the people residing in any other part of the country. On the other hand I want to live in a united India and united democratic India on the basis of national aspirations. National aspiration is the principle. You asked the people to join, the national movement. You roused the enthusiasm of the masses and many youngsters joined you in the national movement and laid down their lives. But if you give a new definition to patriotism, then it is a different matter. Patriotism does not mean one country, one leader and one party. If you define patriotism in a different way, I humbly submit that you are not talking anything patriotic. You are talking something alien to patriotism.

I am now coming to another point. There is an argument advanced by our Prime Minister. He says "I am for the Andhra State. 97 per cent, are for the Andhra Province." He agreed to the creation of Andhra State, but said that there are people in Rayalaseema who are against it. The recent elections proved that the people of Rayalaseema are for the Andhra Province. But the people of Rayalaseema have got their own apprehensions and doubts. It was in the Sri Bagh Pact where the representatives of Rayalaseema and others settled that thing.

Then again the Prime Minister says "I agree with this principle but I cannot implement it now." We

really do not understand that line of argument. Our Prime Minister says that the demand for an Andhra Province is urgent but that he cannot give it now, because there are difficulties. We do not understand what the difficulties are. Perhaps he is thinking that if a separate State is created immediately something bad will happen. But I can assure him there will be no difficulty. On the other hand the Government will be strengthening the national unity and improving the cultural life and safeguarding the interests of the country in general.

The Prime Minister has said that we should wait for some time. But what are the conditions in Andhra today? Swami Sitaram who was one of the founders of the Congress movement in Andhra and who followed Mahatma Gandhiji and who was one of the national patriots of that area, is leading batches after batches, moving forward asking the people to talk in Telugu and also the Administration is carried on in that local language. There is a movement going on and there are meetings and demonstrations. The entire Andhra people are moving. So when the entire people (Andhras) are in action, you come and say "No, we can't do it. We will put down this movement." I can only say that you can't put down this demand in this way. History has established that the national aspirations of any section of people cannot be put down and so also you cannot put down this demand. It will march forward. That means we have to reshape our country on a scientific, rational and national principles. That alone should be our aim.

Financial stability is also one of the arguments advanced against the creation of this Andhra State. I have to say that Andhra State will be financially more sound than even most of the existing States. If you take the existing States, I am sure the Andhra State will be financially more sound than a majority of the States. It will not be a deficit State. If you take the natural resources and man

them and if you have your own projects there for instance Nankida Project, Rampadasagar Project, Siddeswaram and Gandikota Projects and all these things, you can increase the irrigational facilities there. That means you will increase the production of foodstuffs and you will increase the national wealth.

So I conclude my submission with one more request, and that is that this Resolution is quite simple and it is not a complicated thing. As one hon. Member suggested there is no implication here and in this form I think you can accept this Resolution. I want everyone of you to accept: this Resolution unanimously. I submit that you must take this question immediately and see that we constitute separate States on a linguistic basis.

With these words, Sir, I request this House to adopt this Resolution unanimously.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): There are only five minutes left and I will not be able to finish.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You can continue your speech later. You can begin.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY : It is my painful duty to oppose this Resolution. I say a painful duty because I am an Andhra, I am a Telugu-speaking man, though living in a Kannada territory. To oppose people who speak my tongue is a matter which certainly gives pain. But it is my duty.

SHRI C G. K. REDDY : Political duty.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY : Not political duty, as my friend says. It is the duty of every patriot who loves this great country of ours not to press for linguistic provinces not only at this stage but at any time. Sir, the hon'ble mover of this Resolution has made

it appear to be a very simple one. In language it is quite simple, but this Resolution is bound to give rise to numerous complications. This Resolution takes it for granted that States must be formed on a linguistic basis, an Andhra State must be formed composing of Andhras only. Well, Sir, it is very unfortunate that in this country different groups and the Congress too came to adopt this principle of formation of linguistic provinces before they could examine this problem in all its bearings.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : Today you can say that.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Historical reasons prevented the people concerned from giving this problem a searching examination. In the past, Sir, when this question first came to be mooted, we had a foreign administration here and we wanted to pick as many holes in this foreign administration as possible in order to discredit the alien Government. It was quite natural and because of the illogical constitution of provinces in India owing to historical reasons, the Congress and all patriots adopted this issue as one of the points with which to blame the Government. Any stick was good enough to beat the alien Government with. *(Interruptions.)* Let not my friends interrupt me. I did not interrupt them when they were speaking. Well, Sir, the Congress, it is true, conceded this question, this principle of the formation of linguistic provinces. When the Congress Committee examined this matter, they did not examine all the pros and cons. That Committee consisting of patriots of the highest order in this country gave a report and they say in their report.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The debate will be continued on 21st July 1952, the next non-official day for Resolutions. We have received some messages which the Secretary will read out.