DISCUSSION ON RESOLUTION REFORMATION OF ANDHRA STATE—*continued.*

MR. CHAIRMAN : We have now to pass on to the Resolutions. The Resolution moved by Shri Pydah Venkata Narayana on the 16th July :

> 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.

Let us now take up this Resolution. If you speedily conclude the debate, you may go forward to the consideration of another Resolution that is also fixed for today. Mr. Govinda Reddy was having the floor of the House and he will continue.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to remove an impression that seems to have got round from one or two observations which I had made the other day before we broke up. Some hon. Members of this House and of the other House and some other friends have questioned me, some very rudely too, whether I am opposed to Andhra interests. I wish to make it perfectly clear that I am not opposed to the interests of any linguistic group or, for that matter, of any group of people. Nobody would like to see any people in any corner of this great land suffer on account of a wrong territorial adjustment or for want of a proper territorial adjustment. But, Sir, at the same time, it is the duty of everyone to see that by changing any territorial adjustment we would not be introducing an element of discord, an element of disunity, an element of opposition in so doing. If we concede this Resolution, Sir, it necessarily means that this House and the Government are committed to the principle of forming linguistic provinces. If Andhras' claims are conceded today necessarily Karnatakas' claims are also to be conceded. The people of Karnataka, Sir, are also suffering just as the Andhras are suffering from a handicap of this kind. If a Karnataka province is to be conceded, you must necessarily concede the claims of Maharashtra and so on, *ad infinitum*, as the hon. Mrs. Lakshmi Menon was enumerating the other day. So, it means that we will be a party to subjecting India to a major operation as the claims of every language have to be considered and accommodated. Well, Sir, I very much doubt whether it is wise to do it.

With regard to this Resolution, neither the hon. the mover of the Resolution nor any supporter of this Resolution has dwelt upon whether this principle is right or wrong. The question is before the country admittedly for over two decades and so much of discussion has taken place in several legislatures, on the floor of Parliament and also in public, both on the platform and in newspapers. The Government, it cannot be denied, Sir, have given very earnest consideration to this question. The Dhar Committee, which was appointed to go into this question at great length, have given a report and they have advanced in that report very weighty considerations and to me, Sir, they carry conviction and I believe they should carry conviction to anybody. Well, Sir, they have no doubt in believing that this principle of forming linguistic provinces is basically wrong and they also say that the demand for formation of linguistic provinces is open to serious challenge. They say that it involves the recognition of the principle of Government of a province of linguistic Group, which is basically and wholly wrong. Homogeneity is available within certain limits but only at the cost of creating fresh minorities' problems. "Further", Sir, they say "it would bring into existence provinces with a sub-national bias. The motive behind the demand is open to serious objection. Homogeneity of language alone cannot be a decisive factor, even an important factor. India is yet to become a Nation. It cannot afford to add to its anxieties, the heat, controversy and bitterness which demarcation of boundaries and capital cities

[Shri Govinda Reddy.]

involve." Well, Sir, in another place they say "the principle underlying the separation would be as dangerous in its application to the rest of India"—that is they were considering this in relation to Andhra which has a proper bearing on this Resolution. They say "the principle underlying the separation would be so dangerous in its application to the rest of India that the strongest advocates of linguistic provinces have been compelled not to base their demand on this ground." They further say "it will set the ball rolling for the disintegration of this young country" and add that this "enquiry has in some ways been an eye-opener to us. We were horrified to see how thin was the ice on which we were skating." This means, no doubt, that the Committee were convinced that this principle was utterly wrong or, at any rate, it was dangerous to the unity of India.

The other Committee, Sir, which was appointed to go into this question by the Indian National Congress, the JVP Committee, have also gone into this question at length. With regard to both these committees nobody can question the competency of the members or the motives of the members. If the members were inclined to any side at all they were, I must say without fear of any contradiction, in favour of the claims for linguistic provinces. The Dhar Committee had been very sympathetic. They had admitted, in more than one place, that the Andhras were suffering from handicaps, that their claims had to be met in some way, and that there might be other language groups also which were suffering from handicaps owing to a wrong territorial adjustment. They have viewed this question with sympathy but they have kept over and above everything, a sense of national unity to see whether it would contribute to the promotion of this sense of national unity.

I find, Sir, after examining the whole position, they say the British Government whether rightly or wrongly made some arrangement and that arrangement rought in heterogeneous elements together. Although we did not like it in the beginning, it has made us feel that different elements can come together and that India is a country and not a territorial group, is an independent entity. They say, Sir, that these heterogeneous elements being united in one unit must be encouraged and must not be disturbed. The JVP Report gave earnest consideration to the conceding by the Congress and the Government of the principle of forming linguistic states, to what is made so much of by some hon. Members of this House. In the JVP Report they say, Sir, that although it is true that the Congress did concede this demand, they conceded this demand when they were not in a position to appreciate this question in all its bearings. I will quote the relevant portions from the Report. At that time, they say, Sir, it was not faced with the practical application of this principle and hence it did not consider all the implications and consequences that arose from the practical application of this principle. Even the Dhar Committee, having given consideration to this aspect, says that although the Congress had conceded this demand, the Congress was relieved of all its obligations owing to the admission of this demand because circumstances had completely changed. The JVP Report further says that linguistic homogeneity is not at all attainable. They say that they have no doubt that it is impossible to form linguistic provinces— at least it is impossible to make clear demarcation of boundaries. They say, Sir, that even a brake or check placed on this onward movement, i.e., the movement of consolidation of India, is likely to lead to a sliding back and injury to the national interests and they say that "it is incumbent upon us, therefore, to view the problem of linguistic provinces in the context of today." This context demands, above everything, the consolidation of India and her freedom.

(*Time bell rings.*)

Since the time is up, I will conclude shortly. Therefore, the Government should not commit itself to the principle of formation of linguistic provinces.

On the other hand, I would humbly suggest to the Government that they can commit themselves to a rearrangement of some of the provinces, they can form new provinces, but not on the language basis. They can, for instance, subdivide Madras into North Madras and South Madras, or call North Madras, if my Andhra friends have no objection, as *thira* Pradesh, because it is coastal district. Having formed these new States, they can fix up their regional languages. For instance, they can fix Telugu as regional language for North Madras. If Bombay State comes to be subdivided, if this State has to be subdivided, as my friend Shri Ramaswami Mudaliar was telling the other day, we cannot split up that State only north- and south-wise, but we will have to split it up east- and west-wise and if that is so, for South Bombay the regional language can be fixed by the Government of India as Kannada. Well, Sir, such an arrangement would be meeting the cases of all language interests and at the same time avoiding the danger that may flow from these linguistic states. Otherwise, Sir, if anyone has any secret motive that the unity of India should be disintegrated, that will be accomplished if Government should concede this principle of linguistic provinces. With these remarks I wholly oppose this Resolution.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI (Nominated) : Sir, this Resolution deals with a very important subject and I am glad that there is a full debate on it. We are all aware that this phrase 'linguistic provinces' has become rather red-hot and there is much passion when we discuss this subject, but I am glad that in this House, on the whole, there has not been much heat developed but some light thrown on it. At the same time, Sir, you might have observed that when most hon. Members talk on this subject, we almost know what they are going to say. People from Andhra talk in one language, that is to say, that there must be division on linguistic basis. My friend, Prof. Ranga, made a very fine speech the other day and I listened to it attentively, but I knew what he was going to say. My friend Mr. Mudaliar made a brilliant speech which it was my privilege to hear, but I knew what he was going to say. May I plead, Sir, that on such subjects which are all-India subjects in which all of us are interested, especially in this House which is called the Upper House, which is the Council of States, such subjects must be discussed in a very cool manner and the opinion of those who are not interested parties, who are third parties, who are other parties, should carry more weight than the opinion of those who are interested in the issue ?

Sir, I think, on the whole, most of the Members here agree that provinces may be divided, but not exclusively—even mainly—on a linguistic basis. I rather think that not only language, but administrative convenience also is a very important consideration. A new Administration is bound to be costly. Each new State will have an Assembly, Parliamentary Secretaries, Ministers, perhaps a Governor and what not. It becomes a very expensive administration. Ours is a poor country and we must consider this financial aspect well. We must also see whether the State will be self-sufficient. Will it stand on its own legs economically ? These are very important considerations which have to be taken into account when we form new States. Language is not the only or chief consideration. May I proceed further and say that language if it is a cohesive force can also be a disruptive force and in the history of nations language has more often divided than consolidated? May I suggest, Sir, that before we divide Andhra or any other State, we should pay attention to this fact that in India in the past no State was divided on a language basis ? This is a new fad, a new slogan. Remember that if we divide one State on a linguistic basis, a chain of reactions may be set in motion. Already our friends are talking of a separate Karnataka, separate Malabar, separate Kutch and what not. Already we have 24 States, A, B and C at present; shall we now have 40 States with a babel of many languages? Already we in India have far too many languages. So before we start on this

[Prof. N. R. Malkani.]

path, let us beware. Our hon. friends in Andhra have to consider this matter that if Andhra is separated, what will happen to the five million Andhras in Tamil Nad? My friend Mr. Mudaliar said there were five million Andhras in Tamil Nad. They will be in a minority, a very small minority, a neglected minority. They will create a problem. Do we want to convert our own people, our own brethren into minorities ? They are bound to be treated as minorities.

Sir, I am a Sindhi and a refugee and I know what provincialism means. We are suffering today because of provincialism. If anybody asks me, "Who are you", I say I am an Indian. When they ask: "Which province do you come from", I say I come from nowhere. I have no province at all because I talk in a language which nobody understands. Even if I talk in Hindi—and I can talk Hindi fairly well—my friend says, "There is a Sindhian tone in it. Your pronunciation is different ; you are not quite like ourselves. Your throat is not quite like my own throat !" Sir, are we going to distinguish provinces by the sounds of their throats and say : "Your language is different ; my language is different ?" It is a dangerous principle and I warn the House against its acceptance.

Take the case of countries outside. Have they got linguistic provinces ? Take a country like China : has it been divided on a linguistic basis ? Take Russia. My Communist friends always support linguistic provinces. I have here a list in which there are six groups of languages. Each group contains 6 to 31 branches or *shakhas*. The total number of languages comes to 75. Perhaps it will refresh you if I tell you that there are in Russia, Slavonic languages with six groups ; Teutonic with 3 groups ; Indo-European with 9 ; Finno-Ugrie with 14 ; Tartar-Turkish with 13 ; and Caucasian with 31 ; total 76. They have got 76 languages. And because they have got 76 languages, have they got 76 provinces ? Not at all. They are concentrating on one language only—White Russian—in the whole of Russia. China has no language question in that sense. Are we going to lead the world in these things and cut nations up into fragments ? It is wrong in principle.

I would suggest that before we make a decision, we must take first things first and second things second. And which are the first things today ? You have got Part A States, Part B States and Part C States. Why don't you merge Part C States into Part A and B States ? Why don't you equalise Part A and Part B States so that there are no distinctions and no discriminations ? Why don't we concentrate on these essential things ? Why do we concentrate on these subsidiary things ? Why are we intent on breaking up India into fragments ? If you really think that India must be united, that India must be stable, that India must be strong, we must think of uniting those States which are small, which are discriminated against. Let them be made into one whole. I would therefore with all humility plead before the High Command: let there be no more talk of linguistic provinces. They must size up the situation and rise to the occasion and say that if they do divide the country, they will weigh all the considerations and all the reasons before they divide it, otherwise they will not move in the matter.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras) : Sir, my predecessor has shown more heat than reason. We are discussing a matter of urgent importance regarding the people as a whole. My approach to this problem is not based on irrationalism, sentimentalism or any kind of parochialism. What is it that this country is having today ? This country is having a Sovereign Democratic Republic. Each one of the 300 million odd citizens is sovereign. When a child is born in my house, I do not teach him in the English language. The child picks up my home language. Similarly whenever a man or a woman is born, he or she is taught and brought up in the language which is spoken by the people concerned. Now, all

this heat about this linguistic division is not germane to the issue to the masses of this country wanting to have a Government based on the language in which they are brought up. That is the crux of the problem. If on account of sentimentalism and irrationalism these people forget the basic desire like the urge for food, the urge for clothing, the urge for fresh air, it is because they are blind to the urge for a Government based on the language of the people.

9 a.m.

Sir, I wish to show you how in every part of the world the countries are governed by the spoken language of the people. This talk about dividing this country is nonsense. There is no division of the country in any way whatsoever. It is not a question of dividing this country like Hindustan and Pakistan. It is not a question of dividing this country like Kashmiristan and Hindustan. This country is a unitary force governed by a Constitution which has guaranteed to every citizen of this country the fundamental right to live and to exist wherever he is. It is that kind of urge that is responsible for the demand for an administrative division of this country based upon the spoken language of a majority of the people. That is the crux of the problem.

Now, Sir, I wish to analyse and to tear to pieces the argument opposed to the division of the country. When I speak of division, I must make it very clear here that it is not division on the basis of Pakistan and Hindustan. Let me make this national interest very clear. What is a Government ? What is a Nation ? A nation consists of individuals. And individuals form into groups. If you do not take the interests of these groups of individuals into account, the nation ceases to exist. It cannot survive on the basis of one unit exploiting the others, talking in the name of national interest, creating disruption and disunity among the weaker sections of the people while creating what may be called a monstrous, integrated economy. That is not the real national interest of our country. What is it that we want to have ? We will have administrative units in which people will be associated with the Government. You have given them the right to vote and shape the destiny of the country. All of us represent those elements of humanity who never knew what was political life but who now have only this fundamental right of a vote which we have got today. In spite of various languages, 90 per cent. of the people in this country today are illiterate and do not know how to read and write. What is our fundamental responsibility ? It is to raise them through education in their spoken language which they have been using all these years. Are we to annihilate languages altogether ? I can understand Professor Malkani's statement if you do away with all kinds of languages and have only one language—English, or Esperanto, or Hindi. But that is not the case. The majority of the people, bound into different territorial units, have their own languages, their ancient cultures and their traditions, which they all cherish. If you meet a Tamilian in Moscow today, you will greet him and shake hands with him, because he speaks Tamil. You should read Professor Laski's book on the National Language of Britain. The Englishman, after he has swindled the world wholesale, when he goes back to England and steps down the gangway and sees his country man lifting his *samans*, feels oneness with him. He shakes him by the hand and says, "Hello, Johnny, how are you getting on ?" This is what is expressed by leading writers in the English language. Therefore the importance of language cannot be minimised by a really sensible man who has understood what language is. Therefore, it is a question which we have to look at from the bottom and not from the top. If you do not want to do anything, appoint committees and get their opinions. "Here is an expert committee which will go into the details". It will create conflicting opinions and will never do what is really meant to be done. If you do not want to get a thing done, appoint committees and more committees—Dhar Committee, Bhore Committee, Kher Committee, and so on and so

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]

forth. They will tour the country, they will produce their reports. And it is easy for us to come with these documented reports and quote extensively from them. Therefore, Sir, that is not the way in which a language should to be shunted. On the other hand it must be encouraged and every citizen in this country has a right to develop his tradition, his culture, his talent, his life on the basis of the language which he speaks.

Therefore, what I am suggesting, Sir, is this. Leave all heat out of this turmoil, bring people together. You specifically know that a majority of the population speak a particular language in a particular area. Divide them in administrative units and give them the Government that they want. That is their demand. All of us, the entire House of the People, the entire Council of States, the entire Legislative Assemblies represent that humanity. Instead of all of us sitting together, if certain people want to sit in another place and carry on their own local administration, it is perfectly justified. By that the integrity of India, the union of India, the India as a Sovereign Democratic Republic, is never broken.

Now, Sir, the second most important point with regard to this is about the people of different languages becoming minorities in those linguistic areas. It is nonsense. Today, Sir, in Madras city there is a place called Sowkarpet. What is that Sowkarpet in Madras? Where is the question of Sowkarpet coming in here ? Do you mean to say that whatever may be the fate of Madras State or whatever may be the fate of any linguistic State, such people are shunted out of their place ? No. Take for instance Delhi. We have got Madrasis in Delhi. We have got Punjabis in Delhi. We have got Bengalis in Delhi. But Delhi is Delhi. It would amount to a part of Delhi being attached to a part of Andhra or a Tamil Nad province, if I take it in that sense. That is one position. There is one decent provision in the Constitution that a citizen in this country has a right to live anywhere in the Indian Union, carry on his avocation peacefully and conduct his life without being a nuisance to his fellow citizens. So that is not the point at issue. Therefore I would earnestly request the Government to say categorically whether they stand by a linguistic division of this place for administrative convenience. You have got the railways. You have created the zonal system for administrative convenience. We have brought about various other reforms by which you want to integrate or disintegrate. Therefore with an overall position of unity in this country with the Centre looking after everybody in every State is this country divided on the basis of language for administrative purposes ? It is only a real division in boundary and it is not in a way a division of the country. To call this a division is a misnomer. Therefore, Sir, I would honestly and seriously plead that the Government must come out with their policy with regard to the question of Andhra province and with regard to the administrative units being divided on a linguistic basis and say whether they are prepared to accept this or not.

Again we find that Pandit Nehru stands too much committed to this Andhra question. If they were not having a definite policy, he should not have said that he was for an Andhra province. Having said that, he has no right to go back upon it now. Therefore, I would say in all seriousness that the Government must decide its policy with regard to this demand for linguistic division of the States and act accordingly. Thank you very much, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I think I will have to prescribe a time limit of 10 minutes because there are several Members who wish to speak.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras) : Sir, it would be better if a few speakers speak and they should be given more time because they are interested in this matter. Otherwise everybody will speak a few sentences and finish.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have nearly 20 speakers and I do not think it would be possible for us to conclude the discussion unless I prescribe a time limit. Now Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh) : Sir, I would not have liked to speak on this subject because much has been said, but for two or three reasons I would like to speak. 'A promise has been made' is the remark made by several speakers here. It has been said that as the promise to form this province has been given, the Government should consider this question. Now there is no room for going back on that promise. In this respect, Sir, I would like that we should consider the history of this promise. Nobody has referred to the history of the promise and if for that reason on the principle of—

"सकृद अंशो निपतति: सकृत्कन्या
प्रदीयते ।
सकृदाह ददानीति भिण्येतानि सकृत्सताम ।"

a man says 'I will give only once', then he must keep his word. We should agree to that. But in the interest of the unity of the country as has been pointed out by so many speakers, I would appeal to the Andhrites that they should say "We have accepted this Province but we again make a gift of it to you to avoid a splitting up of this country" because once the Andhras ask for this Province, question of Maharashtra is bound to come in and like that there will be so many provinces which will lead us again to the old history of India being repeated. Does it mean, Sir, as an argument that because India was always divided in the old days it should again be divided ? Does it on the other hand not give us a warning that because India was divided in ancient times we should take a lesson from that and see that the unity of the country is preserved by every means at our disposal ? I would not like to make any imputations but if we were to look into the move for forming linguistic provinces in various places one really suspects, as was mentioned by one person, that this is an attempt by various leaders to carve a niche for themselves in those provinces. I think this guess may be ungenerous but it would perhaps in a way be justified. Some Members also who have preceded me have said that. However, I would leave that point at that, Sir.

Another mention was made by an eminent speaker here that because Government has given its word that the Hindu Code would be supported, this should be supported. I feel that is hardly an argument, Sir, the Hindu Code,—it was also mentioned by that speaker—has been opposed by very many people in the country. Well, on the strength of the census of the people whose views really matter, I do not think this would be justified. But we would be coming to that later.

I would like to mention now the suggestion that I should like to make, because practically everything that was necessary to be said has been said on this point. So I would appeal to those people who are anxious that the language element should be considered and think that it is a most vital element in the making of our provinces, that when the time comes for the change of our Constitution—and it will come in the light of the experience gained—India should and will have to be divided if we have to look to the interests of the people. Then India could be divided into so many districts and so many divisions with one Government at the Centre. That would ultimately do away with the necessity of so many Legislatures and so many High Courts and other things. We could do with only 4 or 5 High Courts. Universities naturally could be there for different divisions but one University would provide for various languages. But all these things could come in the course of another 10 or 15 years. That would preserve the unity of the country. I would again repeat that and that is why I have said that the Andhras should say that though the promise has not been fulfilled they would on this ground be prepared to wait until the country is in a positionto change

[Dr Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]

the constitution and divide the country on a linguistic basis. I will not take any more time of the House.

SHRI S. BANERJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have listened with great attention to the speeches which have been delivered so far, but I must say that I stand unconvinced by the remarks made by the Members who opposed the resolution. I rise therefore to support the Resolution which has been so ably moved by my esteemed colleague, Shri Venkata Narayana. As I do so, the past rises before me as in a dream and the present sits upon me as a nightmare. When under the inspiring, magnetic, dynamic and undisputed leadership of Mahatma Gandhi now called the Father of the Nation, the Congress in 1920 assumed a new form and content, the first thing that Gandhiji did was to incorporate in the Congress Constitution the principle of the formation of linguistic provinces. Not only that, he translated that principle into practice and constituted the Congress provinces on that basis. Since then, the Congress has not resiled from that position and has consistently advocated and proclaimed it from the house-tops. The other day, no less a person than Dr. Ramaswami Mudaliar, quoting from a still greater person, the late Pandit Motilal Nehru, characterised this consistency as the virtue of an ass. If, Sir, consistency be the virtue of an ass, inconsistency is the virtue of a knave. If one is found to be consistent and inconsistent in different periods of one's life, the conclusion is irresistible that that one is both a fool and a knave. I for one would prefer a fool to a knave because the fool is incapable of doing any mischief while the knave is abundantly capable of doing it.

Sir, in all the election manifestoes of the Congress from 1937 onwards including that of the last general election, the formation of linguistic provinces was one of the main planks in its platform and when in 1937 the Congress came to power in certain provinces, the question was again raised. The Working Committee passed a sympathetic resolution in which the question of Bengal was specifically mentioned. It was mooted in Bihar also where it met with a sympathetic response but nothing tangible was done.

The Resolution, Sir, before us is a very simple one. It is only a corollary of the principle enunciated by the Congress and it suggests the various processes according to Article 3 of the Constitution through which one has to pass for the creation of provinces on a linguistic basis. It is said, Sir, that the time is not opportune in view of the worsening world situation. It is said further that it will encourage fissiparous tendencies when the supreme need of the hour is unity. Yes, Sir, unity. We also want unity, unity not regimentated and imposed by the Government from above but unity created by the urge of the people from below, unity in diversity. Sir, the reasons advanced by those who have opposed the Resolution are flimsy. They are merely lame excuses to shelve, a problem which needs immediate solution. Sir, it is a tragedy, it is a perversion of things that when the Congress had the will, it had not the power and when now it has power, it has not the will to exercise it here and now. In our lives, what do we generally do? We balance inconveniences; we give and take. We remit certain rights so that we may enjoy others and we choose rather to be happy citizens than subtle disputants. I realise, Sir, that men are every now and then, by the very complexity of human affairs, put into strange situations, but justice is the same, let the judge be in which situation he will. Let it not be said, so far as this particular matter is concerned, that the Congress and the Congress Government were weighed in the balance and found wanting. Let it not be said that the Congress has been guilty of breaking solemn pledges and promises, promises uttered to the ear only to be broken to the heart. Let the Congress rise to the occasion, take courage in both hands and redeem the promises

so often made and fulfil the pledges so often given by it. Let the implementation of this Resolution be the first step towards the speedy and progressive fulfilment of the formation of provinces on a linguistic basis.

Before I conclude, Sir, I will make a passing reference to that part of India which I have the honour and privilege to represent here, I mean West Bengal. Sir, after the annulment of the partition of Bengal of 1905 and its consequent re-partition in 1911, Bengal lost some portions of its Bengali-speaking areas to Bihar. This fresh injustice to Bengal was stoutly opposed by the then leaders of Bihar and they were determined to see that justice was done by getting the Bengali-speaking areas formerly belonging to Bengal transferred to her. The case for Bengal was just, convincing and unassailable and the British Government could not brush aside the justness of her claims. It only shelved it from time to time till it was put in cold storage.

SHRI K. B. LALL (Bihar) : Can he discuss that question now ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Unless it is related to this Resolution, it is all irrelevant.

SHRI S. BANERJEE : If it was just and unassailable in 1912, how much more so is the case of Bengal at the present time ? The area of West Bengal has shrunk to one-third of the size of united Bengal. A continuous influx of uprooted humanity from East Pakistan coming there to the tune of much more than ¼ crore is putting a pressure upon her which is becoming impossible to bear. Bengal, Sir, deserves the sympathy and consideration of the people of the whole of India.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You cannot discuss about Bengal on this Resolution.

SHRI S. BANERJEE : I am not discussing it, I am making only a passing reference to it. I come back to Andhra, Sir. Andhra deserves a separate province equally with Bengal which needs her boundaries to be extended. Bengal requires a living space, Lebensraum as the Germans call it. Even Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister, had to admit the justness of the claims of Andhra and Bengal the other day in the House of the People. Let us then sit round the table and take counsel not of prejudice, not of party spirit, not of ignominious pride of a fatal prestige but of history, reason, justice, the signs of the most portentious time and save the afflicted parts of India, Andhra and Bengal, from the calamity which may sweep away all the right heritage of so many ages of past wisdom and glory. The danger is terrible. The time is short. Let us take time by the forelock and try to avert the danger. Thank you.

SHRI TAJAMUL HUSAIN (Bihar) : Mr. Chairman, if India is going to be divided on a linguistic basis, then I am afraid you must come to the logical conclusion and divide India into groups of all the languages which are different from one another. In that case there will be hundreds of States—I cannot give you the exact number, you know better than I do and many Members also know. I can tell you about my own State of Bihar in which at least half a dozen different languages are spoken. One group does not understand the language of the other group.

Now, Bihar, for administrative purposes, has been divided into 4 Commissionaries—that means 4 Divisions. Take one Division—Chota Nagpur which is under one Commissioner. In that four languages are spoken. There are Behari Members present here and I want them to help me in this matter if I go wrong. In Chota Nagpur which is called Jharkhand there is a language called Hoes. There is another called Mundas. There are, I know, four different languages and each is in a compact area. For instance in Singbhum two languages are spoken. One group does not understand the language of the other group. Take Tirhut. The Maithilian language spoken there cannot be understood by the people in Saran. Bhojpuri is spoken in Shahbad and Saran. (*Interruptions.*)

SHRI S. VENKATARAMAN (Madras) : Sir, how is this relevant to the discussion?

MR. CHAIRMAN : He is trying to make out that if we want to distribute provinces on linguistic basis, such complications are bound to arise.

SHRI TAJAMUL HUSAIN : I will ignore the interruption and I will not give in. Take the case of the United Kingdom. In England English is spoken. The Welsh speak a language in Wales which is quite different from English. Of course I cannot understand a word of Welsh. I hope a time will come when everyone will know Hindi as the Welsh know the English language. Why are they afraid of learning Hindi specially in Andhra ? Take Belgium. The people there speak Flemish and French and many other languages but there are no autonomous States with a Centre. If we go on dividing India on the basis of the different languages, financially it will never be a sound proposition. We have to do many things and we have to have education, we have to feed the people etc. Where is the money to come from if we are going to have different provinces ?

We were very unfortunate in that some people in this country started the movement of separation. Ultimately India was cut into two—Pakistan and India. If we start this division on the basis of language, a time may come when there may be a demand for secession. They may say 'You have given us an autonomous State but I am not satisfied and on account of language I want separation from you'. This is the danger

Then there are foreign pockets in India—specially I am talking of Goa. Portugal does not want to part with Goa. It is part and parcel of India. They now call it a province and they say it is part of Portugal now. If we accept the principle and on the basis of that divide the States on linguistic basis then they can say that the people of India have accepted the principle of dividing the country and giving autonomy to a State on the ground of language. So Goa being inhabited by people who don't speak any of the Indian languages—they speak the Portuguese language—and as it is also a part of Portugal, it should be an independent country.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore) : Where do they speak Portuguese ?

(MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.)

SHRI K. S. HEGDE : The hon. Member is wrongly informed. They do not speak Portuguese, they speak Konkani.

SHRI TAJAMUL HUSAIN : As we Indians speak a sort of English, and as English is being spoken everywhere in India, the Goanese people speak Portuguese and it is more or less their mother tongue. This is so especially when it is part and parcel of and a province of Portugal. Can any of my hon. friends enlighten me on whether that language is spoken in any other part of India ?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE : Yes, in North and South Kanara and also in Kolaba.

SHRI TAJAMUL HUSAIN : I am grateful to my hon. friend for that information, but I maintain that they speak Portuguese generally, just as we speak English.

And if there is to be a war—and there is bound to be a world war.....

AN HON. MEMBER : Why ?

SHRI TAJAMUL HUSAIN : There is no question of why here. Before Wilhelm II, the German Kaiser, started war people asked "Why" ? Similarly before Hitler began they asked "Why" ? Before Truman and Stalin may start a war we may be asking, "Why" ? After all we have eyes to see and we can see what is happening around us. We have a mind and intelligence to understand what is going to happen. There is to be a world-war on a large scale and India is going to be in it. But

even assuming that we cannot be definite that there will be a world war, we are certain that there are apprehensions of such a war coming up. And if there is to be a war, and if that part of India still remains under a foreign power, it may become an important base for our enemy and that will certainly be dangerous to India.

Therefore, I say the country should not be divided into linguistic areas. It should not be divided on a linguistic basis. Before the last partition, India had only nine provinces and now we have more than nine States. Well, I do not believe in having so many pieces. I want one Central Government with all the powers. I do not want so many autonomous bits. Look at the enormous sums of money, crores and crores of rupees that we have been wasting here ! Here is the Council of States and there is the House of the People and the various Assemblies. Frankly, I am not a great believer in democracy of the British type. Instead of spending such huge sums of money, would it not be better if all the people elected some two or three persons to run the government for the whole country? All this money could be saved and spent on more useful purposes.

Therefore, for all these reasons I do not want any more partitioning of India. No more of such partitionings and making so many autonomous bits which may claim complete independence later on. We have had enough of such partitionings. So I oppose this Resolution.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I rise to make a few observations on this very vital, and, I regret to say, somewhat provocative subject. I feel reluctant because as one who does not come from the South, I cannot possibly have the emotional zeal and fervour with which many of the speeches made on both sides were marked. But I have ventured to get up in the hope that what I lack in emotion and intensity might at least be partially made up by a certain degree of detachment, but certainly not indifference.

As I was listening to the speeches the other day and today, I felt that there was a tendency to indulge in some extremist points of view. No doubt, there was a definite ring of sincerity; but I think certain statements were made which did not, in my humble opinion, add much to a constructive discussion. What we need first and foremost is a congenial atmosphere in which ideas could be exchanged dispassionately and objectively in the hope that after the free and fair play of ideas some tangible workable and feasible proposition might emerge which would reconcile differences and meet the legitimate and indigenous demands of the local population, group or area, at the same time, meeting the larger demands of India.

It was said on this side that people who are making this demand at this juncture are doing a great disservice to India and they might be dubbed as unpatriotic. I do not think that that is a fair charge to make. I do not believe that patriotism is the exclusive monopoly of any group, province or political party. Whatever might have been the situation in the past, today we are all citizens of this great free Republic, and I think all of us are primarily concerned with one thing and that is—how to preserve the unity that we have, and how to promote it and foster it.

From the other side, the mover of the Resolution laid great stress upon the cultural aspect of the proposition—the demand for a separate province for the Andhra people. I for one believe that language is a great and dynamic force. But that is not the only consideration, and I was somewhat amused to see that the Members of the Opposition hardly made any case in terms of the economic considerations. For people who are wedded to the doctrine of economic determination of history and who generally explain all the institutions in terms of economics, when I found that in this particular issue of an Andhra province, they have not debated the subject on the economic plane, I was amused. Prof. Ranga said that they were unfortunately very simple, emotional folk and there is a tendency on the part of some people to recapture

[Dr. Anup Singh.]

their past and some time even to spread out. That may be a psychological reality. But that certainly is a very poor justification for the creation of a separate province. I am sure all of us know that there are other elements in this country who can also try to recapture their past. But are we going to permit any such groups to divide and break up the unity of India?

PROF. G. RANGA (Madras) : Sir, on a point of personal explanation. I never said that as an argument in favour of an Andhra Province. My friend has evidently heard me wrong.

DR. ANUP SINGH : And then, Sir, a great deal has been said about the promise that the Indian National Congress had made years back and under different circumstances, and it is argued that the Congress should not now break its promise. My answer is that it is not a question of breaking any promise. The question now to be decided is whether under the present conditions, in the light of present economic considerations, the need for political unity, in the light of the existing international situation and our precarious relationship with our next door neighbour, whether any demand which may tend even remotely to jeopardise India's unity is advisable. Our hon. friend and distinguished legislator here—DR. A. Ramaswami Mudaliar—said "Consistency is the virtue of an ass," and when he made that remark I was reminded of a politician who was in the habit of evading every issue, and finally in sheer exasperation, one from the audience, when the politician was addressing a meeting, got up and asked : "Mr. so and so, I am going to pin you down where you will have to give a categorical statement of 'yes' or 'no'. The question is very simple. How many must two and two make?" The great man pondered over the problem and said 'In my mature judgement it is not enough to make five'. I am not sure that it is intended that our great Congress and the great political party should be put in that category. The problem today is one of unity and, Sir, it has been suggested that India has cultural unity. There is no doubt about it. Cultural unity was achieved, but I do feel, Sir, and I am sure Members of this House will agree with me that that cultural unity has not been enough to preserve us as a nation. We lacked the cohesion which should come from geographic, economic and political considerations. We were the object and prey of every free-booter who made India almost a place of picnic. In my view, we do not want to repeat that again. We need today—certainly besides cultural unity which, of course, is the binding force—a certain sense of belonging to India, a certain sense that we are citizens of a great country.

As to the Congress position, Sir, I do not claim to know what exactly is the official position now. I have heard the Prime Minister say on more than one occasion that the Andhra question can be considered on its own merits as a special problem, without raising the demand for other linguistic groups. He has always stipulated that it is up to the people of those provinces and those areas to come to certain agreement. With due respect to the Prime Minister, I think that that would not be enough. If you feel that the Andhra problem is a separate one and could be considered on its own merits, then I think the Government should be called upon to take an initiative and set up the machinery whereby the opinions of people can be assessed and judged. But, under no circumstances would I, for one, concede the idea of a linguistic division of India unless it would be linked up with the question of the administrative set up. One Member from the opposition side said even Ashoka and Akbar tried to superimpose a kind of United India but they failed. I submit, Sir, that the situation today is not the same. Today, with the new communications system, the transportation and administrative machinery, it is far easy and possible for any Government at the Centre to spread over and superimpose and run a country of the area of India, China or Russia. So, if Ashoka and Akbar failed to weave India together as a political pattern, economic pattern, as a geographic pattern, that does not mean that it is

not possible now. (*Time bell rings.*) Finally, Sir, I plead that the case should be judged on its own merits without mixing it up, in any way, with the demand for the linguistic vivisection of India.

SHRI T.V. KAMALASWAMY (Madras) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I should like to say only a few words about the formation of the Andhra Province. Two years back, Sir, Members know, there was almost 95% agreement about the formation of the Andhra Province and both the Tamilians and Andhras had agreed to the carving out of an Andhra Province on the basis of the J.V.P. report. Unfortunately, at the last minute a hitch arose about the position of Madras City. It was originally understood that the Andhra Province could be formed without Madras City and that Madras City will continue to be the capital of the residuary Madras Presidency. Well, Sir, high hopes were given to the people of both areas that their cherished desire of having provinces of their own was about to bear fruit. Due to this unexpected hitch about the status of Madras City, the talks were suddenly dropped. Is it right, Sir, that the Government should allow the activities of a few politicians to go to that level of making Government forget the larger interests of the common people? Sir, as a consequence of this debacle various language groups all over India have been encouraged to put forth greatly exaggerated and thoroughly unsustainable claims based on the flimsiest of grounds. As a result of this, where there was formerly peace, goodwill and tolerance among all the groups in any multilingual State, there is now acrimonious quarrel; there is discord and bitterness.

Sir, in this position, the Government of India seem to be utterly forgetful of its own responsibility. Not only the Government but also the Congress Party, which is the ruling party. Sir, a long time ago when the Congress raised the cry of linguistic States it did not know that it was sowing the wind, and now it is reaping the whirlwind. The question of forming linguistic provinces is not so complicated or so difficult a proposition. I will commend to the Members of this House only the example of the then British Government who wanted to carve out the Orissa Province. They did not make any fetish of it. They merely took our 3 or 4 districts from Bengal and one from the Madras Presidency and forthwith formed the Province of Orissa The decisions arrived at then by the British Government have still today not been challenged by any section of the province. This notable example of the Britisher could very well have been followed by our own national Government. Why is it that they do not do it? They find themselves in a dilemma and if the principle of linguistic provinces is applied on a strict and rigorous basis too much of quarrel, too much of discord all over the country would be the result. Therefore, they could not come to any decision and not only do they suffer from indecision but they also lack the courage to implement their own decision. Many other say that they lack sincerity also. Sir, the sudden dropping of the proposal for an Andhra State has led to a sense of frustration in the minds of the Andhras.

Sir, I differ from the mover of the Resolution only on one point and that is the speedy formation of that Province. In the present condition of the country in the present mood of the country it is not opportune. The recent general elections based on adult franchise have shown that communalism and fanaticism are rampant in this country on a vast scale. This has been accepted not only by members of the Opposition but also by the Congress Party itself. In the present circumstances, it will be very dangerous to accentuate this mood and to divide the country on a linguistic basis, but that does not mean that I, or the Tamilians, are opposed to the Andhra Province. In fact, Sir, we are likely to be misunderstood because we have not preferred a claim for a Tamil Province. The mover of the Resolution has been very conciliatory in the wording of the Resolution. They merely want an Andhra Province ; they do not bring in Madras city or any other disputed points. Therefore I should like to support the Resolution but I would only say that the time

[Shri T. V. Kamalaswamy.]

not opportune for that, but the Government of India may make an announcement that in future the country is not going to be divided on linguistic basis but it is going to be divided only on an administrative basis taking into consideration, as in the case of the Orissa Province, the convenience of forming a Province and the language interests.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, there is a good deal of sentiment attaching to this Resolution. In fact, when we go through the Dhar Committee's Report, we find that the Committee says that one of the important witnesses that appeared before it admitted that there was so much passion associated with the subject that he was incapable of reasoning. That is equally true today. I know good, honest and patriotic men who have got their reason clouded with such passion that they are today—unable to look beyond their noses, but we in this House represent a very great country and a very great nation. We shall not allow our reason to be blinded. The only test by which we shall judge the subject is how far it is going to contribute to the unity of the nation and to the prosperity of this country. That shall be our only test. It is undoubtedly true, Sir, that the Congress in the past has backed up this demand. As early as 1921, they created linguistic provinces within their own organisational set up. Again, the Nehru Report in 1928 recommended the formation of linguistic provinces. Time and again this was mentioned in the Congress election manifestoes and public opinion was called for and obtained on this issue. In fact, as late as 27th November 1947 the Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru, made a statement on the floor of the Constituent Assembly wherein he said that in principle his Government accepted the principle of forming linguistic provinces.

10 a.m.

It is undoubtedly true that from many platforms the Congress has said time and again that it is going to implement this demand made by several of its supporters. This demand has percolated into the masses. It is undeniable that today there is a large body of public opinion in this country which favours the formation of linguistic provinces. There are patriotic men who have been brought up and nurtured in this belief and who today are demanding the fulfilment of the past promises as they consider it to be the rightful solution of the Indian administrative problem. Again, Sir, it has been argued very effectively that for educational development of a country, the division of the country on a linguistic basis is necessary, because it is said by the protoganists of linguistic division that it will take a good deal of time to learn the three R's and that there will be no time to learn the subjects as such. It has been urged that on administrative grounds it is necessary to form linguistic provinces. Of course there was a time, Sir, when in Madras for every appointment of a peon, they wanted a Tamil peon and an Andhra peon to be appointed; and for every retrenchment, they wanted an Andhra to be retrenched as well as a Tamil, so that there could be balance. It had always to be even in numbers; odd numbers were not allowed. It is natural when a politically strong people have got hold of power, the minority—the language minority—generally goes to the wall. All this is true. Today a new factor is encouraging this linguistic movement. My Hindi friends must pardon me for saying that. A new type of Hindi imperialism which has started in the North is today inspiring and sustaining this movement for linguistic provinces. Sir, we are all very anxious that we should have a national language just as any other nation. We are all at one with our friends in adopting Hindi as the national language. We all voted with them in the Constituent Assembly for adopting Hindi as the national language. But groups have been started in the North to coerce people in the South to learn Hindi within a very short time. Some members of this House and of the other House have formed a Committee and decided that they should speak only in Hindi; they should put questions only in Hindi What is the provocation and what has been the reaction, Sir? Swami Sitaram in the far South, immediately issued

mandate to the Telugu members of the Madras Assembly: "You shall only speak in Telugu, put questions only in Telugu and the Ministers shall reply in Telugu. And if they do not reply in Telugu, come out of the Assembly." Now, what is the fate of the poor Ministers in Delhi as well as in Madras? It is too late for them to learn either Telugu or Hindi. For many of them, it is not possible at all. It is no good rubbing the wrong way and repeatedly telling us that we do not know Hindi and we are as a class inferior to them. We do not want to be treated as political untouchables. I for one, Sir, have been, right from the beginning, maintaining that Hindi is the only language we can have, but the mistake is that the persons who are interested get very vehement about it. The result is there is reaction immediately. I do not know if members are aware that in the South there is a leader called Ramaswami Naicker who is leading a movement against Hindi as well as against North. He says "North is North, South is South and the twain shall never meet" and our friends in the North are aiding, abetting, encouraging and inspiring him and giving him enough provocation to extend his movement. I say, why not leave it to us? We shall carry the torch of Hindi in the South. After all, Hindi is not your private property ; it is the language of the nation. So I say if the linguistic movement is being sustained, it is because of the Hindi imperialists in the North. My friends are sorry when I use the word "imperialism". I am very anxious about Hindi being known by everybody, but there are limitations. If you ask me to study Hindi in the course of a year, you are mistaken. I can't do it but my children having started it in their early years have gone far ahead of me. Age has got its own limitations. You must realise the situation and act up to it.

Now, proceeding to the subject, Sir, it is no good saying that in the past the Congress has approved this demand. It approved this demand in an over-all manner. It had no occasion to consider it in detail. The economic and financial implications, or even the administrative implications, have never been considered by the Congress in the past. Immediately after we achieved independence, the Dhar Committee was appointed. The Committee consisted of very eminent men, and its Chairman was a retired Judge of the Allahabad High Court. They toured the whole country. They heard witnesses. They collected data. And they came to the conclusion that the time is not opportune for redrawing the boundaries of our States. In foreign democratic countries they attach a good deal of importance to reports of this nature because the reports speak for themselves. But we in this country are so much prejudiced that we are not willing even to look at reports which are not in consonance with our own cherished ideas or pet prejudices. After the Dhar Committee had submitted its report, the Jaipur Congress appointed a committee consisting of very eminent men, the very men who had agitated for linguistic provinces in the old days, the very men who have been the heart, soul and conscience of the Congress. Although the Congress had repeatedly said that they were going to form linguistic provinces, these eminent men went into the question and came to the conclusion that the Congress should not form linguistic provinces as such, but they made an exception in the case of Andhra and laid down certain conditions. Ordinarily we should accept those conclusions and we should abide by them. But we are not satisfied and we still agitate.

But let us see whether it is a practical proposition to have linguistic provinces today. Of course the idea of a Linguistic State is attractive. As an idea, it is a beautiful one. But it is destructive in its application. My hon. friend Mr. Ranga wants to interrupt me. I have got very great respect for him.

PROF. G. RANGA: I am not interrupting.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I have very great respect for my hon. friend though in following his argument I have

[Shri K. S. Hegde.]

always found considerable difficulty. As a general conception, it is very easy to think of having linguistic provinces. It is not very difficult to say that tomorrow you should split the country into linguistic groups—Telugu area, Tamil area, Malayali area, Kannada area, and so on. But the difficulty comes when we proceed to details. Now, in this matter, you will remember that the J.V.P. report was clear on the point that when Andhra Province came into being, Madras City should not go to Andhra. Now, our friends from Andhra, many of them any way, at least those of the Congress persuasion agreed to it. And I suppose my hon. friend Mr. Ranga did not differ, and the others too agreed to leave Madras City out of the picture.

PROF. G. RANGA : Even today.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE : Even today. I am glad my hon. friend Mr. Ranga agrees to that proposition. But he does not know that his other collaborators, Mr. Prakasam and Mr. Sambumurthy, have gone back on their pledged word.

What I wish to point out is that there was some dispute about territories, some dispute as regards Madras City, some dispute about the location of headquarters, some dispute as regards division of assets, and so on. Now, that is not all. When our friends who claim Andhra on a linguistic basis, when they go to Madras, they have a different story. They say: "Madras belongs to Andhra. We have a claim over it. Important Andhra personalities are in Madras. An Andhra King gave it to the East India Co. So we have claim over it".

(Time bell rings.)

This being an important subject, I shall be grateful if you can give me about five minutes more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There are 15 more speakers.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE : Sir, it looks as though I have been supporting this Resolution. I am opposing it. I have just talked about what could be said in favour of the Resolution, and I am now coming to the arguments that can be advanced against the Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Only two minutes more.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: What happened then ? On every point there was dispute. That is not all. There is the claim of the Andhras on Madras City on the ground that it is a Telugu City. Telugus living there number less than 25 per cent. Of course a lot of money has been spent in Madras. Over Rs. 200 crores have been spent there. It will be improper for Andhras to leave the Madras City. They will have to live along with others. That is the only way in which this problem can be solved. You will remember the O' Donell Commission's Report. That Commission decided that Ganjam, Koraput and Parlekimedi were to go to Orissa. But at every stage there was bitterness and there was opposition from my friends from Andhra. Rightly or wrongly—my hon. friend Mr. Ranga will say rightly—the Andhras claimed those districts for themselves. But Andhras living in those districts—rightly or wrongly—felt that they were neglected. Similarly, there have been disputes about Bellary, about Salem and so on and so forth. It is not very easy to divide the territories into linguistic units. We know what the result of such division in such circumstances is going to be. Will the Rayalaseema people accept this Resolution ? Will the Oriyas accept this Resolution ? The three man Committee—the J.V.P. Committee—submitted its report and the Andhras said they would abide by it. Are they agreed on that today ? I am asking that question in all sincerity. They say : "It is too early to settle details. We have no boundary commission. We have no arbitrator." It is just a pretence and nothing more.

Sir, there is a great deal of vehemence associated with the question, and we are today placing our provinces much above India itself. In fact, one hon. Member belonging to the Communist Party said : "Either give it, or we will take it." We know his language. We

live close to him. We on this side are willing to accept the challenge so far as this question is concerned. But may I tell him that enmity breeds enmity and multiplies itself? Creating enmity and harted is not the way to solve this problem. They must persuade the people to their view. Let them respect the majority view.

I wish to close with one word more. If you are going to redraw the boundaries of the States, let it mainly be on the basis of administrative convenience, financial stability and economic prospects ; and along with these certainly take into consideration also the linguistic factors. But the time is neither ripe, nor is this an opportune moment for redrawing the boundaries of India.

SHRI INDRA VIDYAVACHASPATI (Uttar Pradesh) :

श्री इन्द्र विद्यावाचस्पति (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे आज जो निवेदन करना है वह अपने आंध्र के भाइयों से निवेदन करना है । शायद यहस झाजायकि अगर आंध्र के भाइयों से निवेदन करना है तो मुझे अंग्रेजी में निवेदन करना चाहिये । परन्तु मेरा लम्बा अनुभव यह है कि यदि ठीक अच्छी हिन्दी में कहा जाय तो देश का हर पढ़ा लिखा व्यक्ति उसको समझता है । मद्रासियों में मेरे मित्र हैं, मेरे लेखों को पढ़ने वाले हैं, मेरे कहे को सुनने और समझने वाले हैं । मुझे बहुत कम ऐसे मद्रासी भाई मिले हैं जो मेरी बात को हिन्दी में न समझें । इसलिये मुझे पूरी आशा है कि जो निवेदन मैं आपके द्वारा अपने आंध्र के भाइयों से करूंगा उसे वे समझेंगे ।

इसके पहले कि मैं दूसरी किसी बात पर आऊं, बहुत थोड़े में अपने एक भाई की शंका का निवारण करना चाहता हूं । अभी जो सदस्य बोल चुके हैं उनकी बहुत सी बातों से सहमत होते हुए भी एक आक्षेप का थोड़ा सा उत्तर देना है । उन्होंने कहा कि उत्तर भारत के कुछ आदमियों ने हिन्दी सभा बनाई है और उस सभा का उद्देश्य यह रखा है कि हिन्दी में सब बोलें और हिन्दी में प्रश्न किये जायें और प्रश्नों के जवाब दिये जायें । जहां तक मैं समझा उनका यह आक्षेप था कि किसी तरह की जबरदस्ती दक्षिण के भाइयों पर की जाती है। मैं उस सभा का एक सदस्य हूं और एक अधिकारी भी हूं । मैं अधिकारपूर्वक आपसे यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि न उस सभा का यह उद्देश्य है और न किसी उत्तर भारत के व्यक्ति की यह इच्छा है कि हिन्दी भाषा किसी भी प्रवासी के ऊपर जबरदस्ती थोपी जाय, जबरदस्ती डाली जाय । हमारे राष्ट्र ने हिन्दी को अपनी राष्ट्रभाषा स्वीकार किया है । वह सदस्य भी कह रहे थे कि हम भी इस बात को मानते हैं । तो जो लोग इस कार्य के लिये कोई प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं उनकी केवल इतनी इच्छा है कि जहां अंग्रेजी का प्रवेश है वहां हिन्दी का भी प्रवेश होवे । वह तो इतना ही कहते हैं कि संसद् में, पार्लियामेंट में हिन्दी में प्रश्न किये जा सकें, हिन्दी में व्याख्यान किये जा सकें और इनके उत्तर भी हिन्दी में दिये जा सकें । इतनी ही उनकी मांग है और उनकी यह मांग कोई जबरदस्ती की नहीं है । इसका मैं एक बड़ा भारी प्रमाण देता हूं । आज तक अंग्रेजी बोलने पर क्या कोई हिन्दी वाला संसद् से उठ कर गया, किसी ने वाक आउट किया कि साहब आप अंग्रेजी में बोलते हैं इसलिये वाकआउट करते हैं ? लेकिन मेरे भाई याद करें कि बहुत से भाई ऐसे भी हैं जो हिन्दी में व्याख्यान होने पर उठ कर चले जाते हैं । जबरदस्ती किधर से है ? मैं किसी को दोष नहीं देता, मैं केवल इतना कह देना चाहता हूं कि हिन्दी वाले मूर्ख होंगे यदि वे जबरदस्ती हिन्दी थोपें । जब हमारा संविधान कहता है कि हिन्दी राष्ट्र-भाषा है तो अगर कोई आदमी हिन्दी को किसी पर थोपने का यत्न करता है तो वह हिमाकत करता है । कोई हिन्दी वाला किसी पर हिन्दी थोपना नहीं चाहेगा । हिन्दी तो आवेगी, आज नहीं तो कल, कल नहीं तो परसों। मेरे

[Shri Indra Vidyavachaspati.]

बहुत से मद्रासी भाई हैं जो हिन्दी पढ़ रहे हैं। मुझे भली प्रकार मालूम है कि हमारे मद्रासी भाई इसको बुरा नही समझते। मेरे बहुत से मित्र हैं जो पढ़ रहे है। गोपालन साहब हैं, जो कि विरोधी दल के लीडर हैं, वह हिन्दी पढ़ रहे हैं। मेरे एक मित्र शंकरन है वह मुझ से रोज़ कहते है कि अब मैंने इतना पढ़ लिया, इतना और पढ़ लिया, इतना और पढ़ लिया। हज़ारों भाई हिन्दी पढ़ रहे हैं। तो मैंने निवेदन किया कि कोई हिन्दी ज़बरदस्ती लादना नही चाहता।

अब मै मुख्य बात पर आता हूं। आंध्र प्राविंस के बारे में जो सब से बड़ी युक्ति दी जाती है वह यह कि क्या कांग्रेस अपने वायदे से पीछे जायगी। इसकी मैं बहुत थोड़े में व्याख्या करूंगा, एक कांग्रेस मैन की हैसियत से। मै यह नहीं कहता कि वायदा आदमी नहीं करता लेकिन एक बात कहूंगा कि जब कोई आदमी अपने भाव को प्रदर्शित करता है तो उसका भाव यह रहता है कि यदि ऐसा हो जाय तो अच्छा है। अगर हम कहीं जाते हैं तो कहते है कि एक लाख इसके लिये भी देंगे और एक लाख यहां भी देंगे और तरह तरह की घोषणायें करते हैं लेकिन घर पर आ कर जब थैली को खाली पाते हैं तो कहते हैं कि इतना तो देना सम्भव नही है। इसी तरह से यहां भी राजनैतिक परिस्थिति को देखना पड़ता है। आज परिस्थिति क्या है ? मुझे अपने आंध्र के भाइयों से कहना है और जिनमें कि हमारे बड़े सम्मानित और प्रतिष्ठित नेता और पुराने मित्र प्रोफेसर रंगा भी है कि ज़रा सोचिये कि अगर इस समय आंध्र प्रान्त के दावे को मान लिया जाय और उसको भाषा के कारण अलग किया जाय तो उसका परिणाम क्या होगा ? इतना समय तो नहीं है लेकिन दो तीन प्रान्तों की बात बताता हूं। अगर भाषा के कारण प्रान्तों को तोड़ा या जोड़ा जाय तो उसका परिणाम क्या होगा ? पंजाब से शुरू कीजिये। पंजाब में एक हिस्सा है जहां पंजाबी बोली जाती है, दूसरा हिस्सा हरियाना का है जहां हिन्दी बोली जाती है। तो पंजाब के आप दो टुकड़े कीजिये। फिर आगे चलिये उत्तर प्रदेश में। उत्तर प्रदेश में कुछ हिस्सा पंजाब में आयेगा और कुछ निकल जायेगा। यह हो सकता है कि कल को ब्रज-भाषा के लोग यह कहें कि यह जो बृजभाषा का हिस्सा है उसको भी कनेक्ट (connect) कर लीजिये क्योंकि यहां आलरेडी (already) हिन्दी है। अगर भाषा के आधार पर जोड़ तोड़ की जाय तो उत्तर प्रदेश के बहुत से हिस्सों को बिहार में मिला देना पड़ेगा और थोड़े से को मध्यप्रदेश में। यदि भाषा के आधार पर प्रान्त बनायेंगे तो कई प्रान्त इतने बड़े बन जायेंगे कि आप उनको संभाल नहीं सकेंगे और कई प्रान्त इतने छोटे हो जायेंगे कि उनका प्रबन्ध करना मुश्किल हो जायेगा और उनका खर्च नहीं उठा सकेंगे। हमारा प्रयत्न तो यह होना चाहिये कि हम देश में एकता को पैदा करें। इस समय जो प्रान्त है वे भी बहुत अधिक हैं, छोटे छोटे प्रान्त है, "सी" श्रेणी के प्रान्त हैं। एक तरफ तो विचार यह हो रहा है कि उनको बड़े प्रान्तों में मिला दिया जाय ताकि प्रबन्ध की सहूलियत हो और एकता भी पैदा हो और दूसरी तरफ एकता को तोड़ने वाली बात करते है तो यह कैसे उचित हो सकता है ? इसका कहीं अन्त नहीं है। अलग करने की भावना पैदा करना बहुत आसान है। विशेष रूप से हमारे देश में यह रोग पुराना है कि हम भिन्नता की तरफ जाते हैं और जब मिलाने के लिये कोई बात शुरू करते हैं तो बीच में बाधायें आ जाती है।

आप इस बात को सोच कर देखिये कि अशोक ने साम्राज्य स्थापित किया, अकबर ने किया और अंग्रेज़ों ने किया। लेकिन क्या चीज़ हुई ? चीज़ यह हुई कि भिन्नता ने हमें मार दिया। मेरा आंध्र भाइयों से कहना

है कि अगर आप इस बात को लेकर भिन्नता पैदा करेंगे तो भविष्य में इस बात का कोई अन्त नहीं होगा । इसलिये मैं आपसे कहता हूं कि आप लोग अपनी इच्छाओं को प्रकट कर दें और इन सब बातों के करने के बाद क्या ही सुन्दर हो यदि अन्त में हमारे आंध्र भाई उठकर कह दें कि इस समय इस बात के लिये उचित अवसर नहीं है, इस समय देश की अवस्था को देखते हुए, उसकी जरूरत को देखते हुए इस तरह की मांग करना उचित नहीं है । मेरे दूसरे भाइयों ने जो बातें इस बारे में यहां पर कहीं वह देश के हित के लिये कहीं । आज हमने अपने देश के विभाजन का नतीजा देख लिया है । पाकिस्तान बनने पर क्या नतीजा हुआ है यह सब को मालूम ही है करोड़ों घर बरबाद हो गये और किस किस प्रकार की क्षति हुई, यह सब बातें आप सब लोग जानते है । अगर हम इस भिन्नता के रास्ते पर फिर चलते है तो न मालूम क्या क्या आगे होगा, कितनों के घर बरबाद होंगे, कितने आदमियों को अपना देश छोड़ कर जाना होगा, उत्पात होंगे । इसलिये मेरी प्रार्थना यह है कि इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करना ही नहीं चाहिये । इस समय आंध्रवासियों के लिये यही शोभा देता है कि वह इस प्रस्ताव को इस समय देश की एकता के लिये वापस लेने की कृपा करें ।

[For English translation, *see* Appendix II, Annexure No. 27.]

SHRI B. V. KAKKILAYA (Madras): Sir, I rise to support the Resolution for the formation of an Andhra Province. I do so not because I feel that the problem of Andhra is based on a special footing as the Prime Minister declared. I support the formation of the Andhra Province because I come from a Province where also the people suffer from the same disadvantages and the same difficulties as the Andhra people are suffering from today. My province, i.e. Karnataka, is cut into pieces. One or two pieces are in Madras where we are a minority. Some four or five districts are added on to Bombay where again we are a minority. One piece is in Hyderabad State where again we are a minority and there is Coorg which is a small unit, which cannot sustain itself, which is not self-sufficient and which cannot run its administration efficiently with the resources that it has. There is Mysore which of course is industrially and agriculturally advancing. Now if the Karnataka province is formed, if all these various parts of Karnataka are brought together, certainly Karnataka would be self-sufficient. It would materially progress. It would culturally advance and it will have all the advantages of a good Province.

But now here we hear that the formation of the linguistic provinces or formation of the Andhra Province or the Karnataka Province or any other Province for that matter will be detrimental to the unity of India. I do not understand how it will be detrimental to the unity of India. Some hon. Members here even went to the extent of saying that they are indebted to the British rulers for having brought about the unity of India that we are having today. Yes, if we continue as we are today, if we continue the present set-up of the country, certainly we will become more and more indebted not only to the British imperialists but also to the American imperialists. Let us see how the British imperialists ruled here. Now we see that in India there is a bureaucratic superstructure which appears to be a united Administration of the whole country. But it is only a semblance of unity and not real unity. What is at the bottom of it ? At the bottom of it we see that everything—every nationality—people speaking every language in India are divided, are divided artificially, are divided into small bits here and there and these divisions have obstructed them in developing their economic resources, their natural resources, their industries, their agriculture, their culture, their language and their education. In every aspect of life their advancement is obstructed. Not only the present division of these linguistic units, the cutting into pieces obstructs the development of these

[Shri B. V. Kakkilaya.]

nationalities, but also the manner these pieces are put together in an artificial way. The present States are formed by the conglomeration of all these various pieces put together. Now for example take the Bombay State. There are people speaking four or five languages in that State put together and these people are always quarrelling against one another. The same is the case with Madras. They think that the interests of Tamilians are being submerged by the people who speak Telugu and *vice versa*. Thus these disputes are going on between different people in different States.

If we really want a united India, an India which is really united from the bottom to the top and not an India which is full of disruptive forces bickering and internal struggle, then India must be divided into provinces on a linguistic basis into States based on the language and culture of the people. We do not mean to say that States must be formed entirely on the basis of language. Certainly not. Language, culture, economic stability, administrative convenience, all these things must be taken into consideration. But even taking all these things into consideration, nothing can be said against the immediate formation of the Andhra province, or the immediate formation of the Karnataka province or the immediate formation of the Kerala province, or for that matter any other linguistic province in India, because the provinces are already there. Taking Karnataka for instance Mysore State is there, and the other parts of Karnataka in the Madras and Bombay States can be incorporated with it. We have a capital there ; the administrative machinery is there. We can certainly have a Karnataka province. Similarly, an Andhra State can be formed, and a Kerala State can be formed. All the objections, all the difficulties mentioned are merely excuses to put off this demand for the formation of linguistic provinces. Many of the Members who have spoken on this subject on the floor of this House have spoken in two voices. They supported the Resolution and at the same time they opposed the Resolution. There is inconsistency in what they say. The Congress, before it came into power, supported the formation of linguistic provinces but after it came to power, it is opposing the formation of linguistic provinces. Our learned friend, Dr. Ramaswami Mudaliar, said that consistency is the virtue of an ass ; perhaps it is to prove that they are not what they really are that these friends show inconsistency so much. Because of these supposed difficulties, how can we refuse to meet this demand which is made throughout the country ? Today, the Andhra province, the Kerala province, the Karnataka province, all these provinces can be formed without any difficulty. They will certainly be self-sufficient. Administration can be run very efficiently in all these States. There are so many States in India today which are smaller in size, smaller in population and smaller in natural resources and other facilities. Sir, the creation of these States does not mean the disintegration of India. On the other hand, today we are not having just one Central Government, administering the whole country. We are having so many States in India, and where is the harm in readjusting the boundaries of these provinces and forming States on the basis of the language, culture and traditions of the people ? Sir, I support this Resolution wholeheartedly because I feel it is in the interest of the unity of India and the material and cultural advancement of the various peoples inhabiting India.

SHRI R. P. N. SINHA (Bihar) : We have had sufficient debate on this Resolution. We are not having any new arguments for or against. Now I move for closure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No, Sir.

SHRI BASAPPA SHETTY (Mysore): Sir, as regards the formation of linguistic provinces, the Congress have accepted this principle and stood by this principle since 1920 and have reiterated the same through official resolutions and election manifestoes. Sir, immediately after the election manifesto was adopted by the All-India Congress

Committee (A.-I.C.C.) in Bangalore, all the important representatives of the various Provincial Congress Committees met in Bangalore and passed a resolution. That resolution reads as follows :

" This meeting of representatives of Andhra, Maharashtra, Tamil Nad, Vidarbha, Karnataka, including the Presidents of Vidarbha, Karnataka, Nagpur and Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committees, is gratified to note the inclusion in the Congress Election Manifesto a reference to some practical steps that should be taken in order to implement the formation of linguistic provinces in the South and West of India.

This meeting feels that to reassure the vast body of people in the concerned areas about the earnestness of the Government's intention a definite step should be taken to pave the way for the early formation of such provinces. Such a step should be the early appointment of a Boundary Commission as contemplated in the Congress Election Manifesto.

Further, this meeting expresses the hope that the people concerned would put forth every endeavour in arriving at broad and general agreement in respect of boundaries and other important matters connected with this problem."

After this resolution was passed, this matter was again brought before the Congress Working Committee on 12th August 1951 and the Working Committee passed a resolution. That resolution reads as follows :

" The Congress in its election manifesto adopted at Bangalore has reiterated its adherence to the principle of the formation of linguistic provinces, regard being had also to other considerations such as economic, administrative and financial. The Working Committee feel that there is a general agreement on this subject among the concerned parties in South India in view of the fact that Pradesh Congress Committees of Tamil Nad, Kerala, Karnatak a Andhra and Maharashtra have already expressed themselves in favour of such provinces.

The Working Committee are therefore of opinion that when the Government of India are satisfied that necessary agreement exists, they should take requisite steps to implement this demand and to appoint a Boundary Commission as early as possible."

In this connection, I should like to refer to the fact that some of the Members of this House when they opposed the Resolution, talked as if the Congress when it passed the resolution I have referred to, did not have full insight into economic, political and administrative problems. That statement amounts to an insinuation against the leaders. Our leaders are broadminded, eminent statesmen. Leaders like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Mr. Tandon and Dr. Pattabhi Seetaramayya had thought over the matter deeply before they passed that resolution in favour of the formation of linguistic provinces. Sir, that resolution was passed only in the year 1951.

PROF. G. RANGA : After five years of administrative experience.

SHRI BASAPPA SHETTY : So, some of the speeches delivered by some hon. Members of this House are irrelevant and baseless. Some hon. Members said that, if the Government of India allows this agitation to continue, it will be calamitous for the country, because it will lead to disruption, disunion, dissatisfaction and all that. I tell them that there will be nothing of the kind. Nothing serious would happen if the country is divided into linguistic provinces. We, the Andhras, the Keralas and the Karnatakas, took a prominent part in our freedom struggle and the *Satyagraha* movement. We all put up a united front. And we will certainly unite again if there is any outside invasion. If there is a war, we will certainly defend our country. So, the fears of some of our hon. friends are entirely baseless and imaginary. I am sure they will agree that the formation of linguistic provinces is important and essential in the interests of democracy and economic development.

We are not asking for partition because we would like to live in one province with our own language. We are tied together by our common culture, common heritage and common language. Therefore our economic interests are identical. Therefore we want to have our linguistic province. It is quite easy to form a linguistic province in South India. It is easy to form the Andhra and Karnatak provinces. The Mysore Congress have agreed to form a Karnatak province. Even the Mysore Cabinet, I learn, have passed a resolution in favour of the formation of Karnatak. Now Government should come to our rescue and take immediate steps to form the linguistic provinces. I know that disputes would arise as regards the

[Shri Basappa Shetty.]

demarcation of boundaries and that there would be hurdles in the way of the formation of provinces. Opinions are bound to differ over details. It is but natural. If a Boundary Commission is appointed, I am sure they would settle all these problems and do the needful in the interests of the country. I am sure the multi-lingual provinces are responsible for the growing feelings of bitterness, mutual distrust, frustration and all that. Take the case of Bihar and Orissa ; when they were kept together, they suffered. After separation they are carrying on administration very successfully. No Government can ignore the popular wishes of the people and suppress their wishes. It is very long since they assured the country that they would create linguistic provinces and now people have waited with patience for too long to achieve their cherished desire of securing linguistic provinces and I appeal to our leader Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to put an end to this evasive policy and see that tangible steps are taken to form linguistic provinces as early as possible. The longer the delay the greater is the danger. Therefore I appeal to Government once again to consider this question favourably and do the needful as early as possible.

Language alone is not so important. There are othe rfactors—administrative convenience, geographical contiguity and economic interests. These are to be considered deeply and necessary action taken in the matter. I was surprised to hear some of the speeches made by some Congressmen. The Congress have accepted this principle and I am astonished to see that our Congress friends on the floor of the House are opposing this very principle. But they may oppose the Resolution but not the principle. We support the principle involved in the Resolution and I request the Government to take the question into consideration and think over the matter deeply and see that tangible steps are taken to implement the assurances given by them in the past.

SHRI K. B. LALL : Sir, I rise to oppose this Resolution not because intrinsically the Resolution is bad or the sentiments contained therein are bad but because the time for bringing in such a Resolution is not opportune. I will mention that the very fact that so much heat has been generated by this in this cool House is evidence of what it will create in the country outside if this thing is taken up at this moment. For one strip of land people may come to blows. It is rightly said that it is not a division like Pakistan and Hindustan. It is quite true but it is after all a division in which people will be very much interested and affected. For one small strip of land people may threaten just as they are threatening today to take life and give life for that. Can't you visualize this position if you talk of this at the present moment ? That is my only objection. Otherwise I don't think that intrinsically the Resolution is bad or even the Government is opposed or our leaders are opposed to it.

With all respect for my friend Shri Mudaliar when he said the other day that consistency is the virtue of an ass, I suppose he never meant that there is this virtue in our Government or in the leaders who accepted the principle at one time about the division. As a matter of fact this linguistic provinces principle was carved out by the Father of the Nation. It was he who gave this principle to the country and the Congress adopted it. At no time has the Congress resiled from this position and even as late as a few days back our leader Panditji also reiterated that there is strength in this demand and nobody disputes that and even the Congress has not passed any resolution going against its past promises. So wherein lies the question of inconsistency in the Congress ? There is no inconsistency. So I say with all respect for my friend Mr. Mudaliar that perhaps he did not depict the situation correctly when he said that consistency is the virtue of an ass and implied—as many friends implied thereby—that perhaps this inconsistency has come upon the Government. So I say in all fairness that there is no inconsistency, there is no resiling from the position that the Congress took. The Congress has not by any resolution gone back upon its promise

nor have the leaders gone back upon the promise of giving linguistic provinces. So, this question does not arise. There is only the question of opportune moment. This is not an opportune moment when all our energies should have been harnessed for bringing the country to unite together and to maintain its position that has been created in the world today. Even the European countries, even America has come to respect our country. It may be due to our talented leader that our position has risen so high in the world and we are required to maintain that position. If we fritter away our energies in boundary disputes or in division of particular districts, the attention of the whole country will be diverted to that and a new phenomenon will arise, just like the one we had after the formation of Pakistan and India. We have not yet recovered from that shock. Now we are preparing for another shock. Questions have been raised about Bengal and Bihar. I would rather not speak about that and rake up anything about that but my friends should have understood why such things arose. Wherein lies the sting—this is the only point I wish to suggest. Wherein lies the sting and how has it come about in the country ? Mahatma Gandhi wanted to bring homogeneity by having convenient provinces. When we were engaged in a fight with the British we wanted cohesion, we wanted strength and in order to give strength we required the provinces on linguistic basis but today when we require our energies and attention on other fronts, if we engage on this, our energies will be frittered away. It is from that point of view that I say we should not take this up now. Of course I don't want to mince matters. There is a proverb in Hindi as follows :

खिचड़ी खात मजा लागत बा
तसला माजत जान जात बा

It means, it is very tasty to eat *kichri* but when you are required to cleanse the utensil, then it takes away your life. My friends refer to the Bengal and Bihar question. I ask them when the whole of Bihar was in the stomach of Bengal and when even Orissa and Assam were with Bengal, how did these people get the idea of getting away from Bengal ? Even recently only a few years back the Bengalees resolved at the Nikhil Bang Sahitya Sammelan of Bihar and they resolved at Patna that no Bengali in Bihar should speak in Bihari. You can understand these.

SHRI R. P. N. SINHA : Prof. Banerjee did not raise these questions with any seriousness. Why is he raising these controversial matters ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please address the Chair.

SHRI K. B. LALL : Yes, Sir, I will, I am not bringing in this question of Bengal and Bihar here, but since it was referred to previously I referred to it here just to show where the sting lies in such demands for linguistic provinces. Actually the sting lies in the misbehaviour of some sections of the people. If all people behave properly, then there will be no question of an Andhra and a Tamil province. We cannot divide an area because of the misbehaviour of one against the other. That misbehaviour should be avoided. And this can be done without separation. There is no question of predominance or overlording by the Tamils over the Andhras or by the Andhras over the Tamils. To us in the North they are all one and the same. Whether Tamils or Telugus, they are all Madrassis for us in the North. In fact, some of us cannot find out easily who is a Tamil and who is an Andhra in this House. It requires some intelligence to find that out, from their manners or tongues. It would have been much better if they had all been called "Madrassis" instead of "Tamils" and "Telugus."

As I said, there is a sting and that is in the misbehaviour of some people and I even suggested once in a resolution before the Assembly that there should be proper and proportional representation in the services and other places. Such an arrangement will kill all the animosity among the people. But interested people did not like that and so they said I was talking "provincialism". Sir, it is easy to say, "Don't talk pro-

[Shri K. B. Lall.]

vincialism" when it benefits you to say so. You talk big and long when it benefits you, but when it affects you the other way, you come to realities as they are now doing in Bengal, where they are weeping over what they did in the past.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal) : Bihar is doing the same.

SHRI K. B. LALL : How is Biha doing the same ? Because Bengal was cut up into two.....

(*Time bell rings.*)

Sir, have I finished my ten minutes ? I will finish in a minute. Because Bengal was cut up into two, they have lost their territory to Pakistan and so they are weeping and, of course, everybody must sympathise with them in this respect. Similar is the case of the Punjab too. But this is of your own making. Let us try to adjust ourselves to the circumstances in which we find ourselves and not try in a haphazard manner to bring about a change. That way you ruin the country. Our greatest need today is to strengthen the country.

As regards Bihar I may say that Bihar has not acted wrongly towards any province. In fact the allegation that Bihar has taken up certain portions of Bengal is totally baseless and untrue as will be proved if any commission or committee is set up to go into this question. As a matter of fact it will be found that Bihar has been very liberal in the matter of giving territories. Darjeeling which at one time formed part of the Bhagalpur Division has gone to Bengal. In fact Bihar has treated others liberally and it will treat them liberally.

I will conclude by just saying that the interests of the country as a whole should be the uppermost consideration in our minds and not petty provincialism.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Before I commence to give my reasons for supporting the Resolution, I would say that a considerable amount of time and words have been wasted especially from the Opposition by charging the Congress Party with going back on their pledges. Unfortunately, Sir, or fortunately, I am one of those who are convinced that the Congress Party never keeps its promises. So why should we go on talking about it? Therefore without reminding Government to keep its promises, I would go into the basic principles which are involved in this question.

I find, Sir, that this controversy has been vitiated by many considerations which should not have been brought in at all into this question. There is a considerable amount of communal considerations brought to bear in this controversy, and there are political considerations also. I find, Sir, when the idea of a linguistic province is put out, then immediately the supporters and those who oppose it could be termed as belonging to one community or the other. So also in regard to the political considerations. We find that one particular brand of politicians supports it and another brand opposes it. I would earnestly submit to this House that we should consider this issue by putting away communal considerations and political consideration, and try to understand the issue as it is, and also try to see if the Resolution as it stands deserves our support or not.

There have been very eminent speakers who have opposed this Resolution. Among them is our hon. friend Dr. Ramaswami Mudaliar. I think that he has said something which the Congress wanted to say, but did not have the courage to say. They have found in our friend Dr. Ramaswamy Mudaliar a courageous exponent of certain ideas which the Treasury Benches would like to put before the House but dare not because of fear of their constituencies. Since Dr. Mudaliar is in the very fortunate position of not having any connection with the people at large, he could afford to say things which the Congress cannot afford to say. While he was opposing this Resolution, he said something about "emotion". "Letus not have emotion. Let us be logical

Let us be intellectual. Let us bring our minds to bear on this Resolution." Naturally I would not expect those who do not understand emotion to appreciate emotional values that move the people and the country. After all, when we were in the midst of the struggle for freedom, was it the intellectual motive that made us struggle for freedom? No, it was the emotional motive ; and I certainly would say that Mr. Mudaliar would not understand what emotion is because he has never been connected with the freedom movement. I would say emotion is one of the greatest motive forces of civilisation and we cannot afford to neglect it. And we who are in contact with the people and who can feel the pulse of the people and who represent the people know to what extent, emotion moves the people; and unless we take into account the emotional forces we will not be representing them or serving them.

There were one or two other arguments which were trotted out. They said that the unity of India is in danger and that there would be a considerable amount of disintegration. I would categorically say on my behalf and on behalf of my Party that we are second to none in fighting for the unity of India, for the integrity of India and defending it whenever it is in danger. But I would not like to take that as a basis of my opposition or support to this Resolution. I am aware, Sir, that there are forces in this country which support the cutting up of the country into several autonomous States in the hope that the unity and integrity of India could be placed in danger and those forces could win. When I support this Resolution, I am perfectly aware that in this country today, there are forces which are trying to take advantage of this linguistic question and demanding the immediate cutting up of India in the hope that India would ultimately be weakened; but, I do not, when supporting this Resolution, go against my conception that such forces ought to be opposed. I do feel that where the security of India is concerned, we should see that our unity is not weakened. For instance, if this linguistic question is stretched too far e.g., to the border states like Punjab, I would say that linguistic considerations are not the only considerations. I would oppose that with every nerve at my command just as equally as I support this Resolution. I would, in fact, support that East Punjab, the border State, should be made bigger; but, that does not mean that there is no case for linguistic provinces if the States could be redivided on the basis of language.

Now, it is rather unfortunate that our hon. friend Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliar said that there is no principle involved; he said after all, language is a very subsidiary thing and it does not play a big role in the life of the people or the life of the country. I had always disagreed and opposed my friend Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliar but I have always had the greatest respect for his intellectual capacities and his logical debates. I find that when he trotted out this argument, he was particularly ill-informed. I thought he would have traced the history of the agitation for linguistic provinces ; I thought he would have been informed about the reasons why the whole country, almost, agreed on the principle of linguistic provinces. Now, language, Sir, is the only thing that makes it possible for people to contact each other and, through contact, we get more civilised. Every activity can only be possible through the medium of the spoken word which is nothing but language. Now, if language plays such a dominant role in the lives of the people, then naturally, we expect that that factor should be taken into consideration when we think of administration.

11 a.m.

If you take a place like Madras State, Sir, you will find that the people in one part of the State, Andhra for instance, do not speak Tamil. The people do not speak English and they certainly will not speak Hindi for some years to come. In what manner are we going to give them a good administration, a good democratic Government? We can do it only if it is possible for those people to take part

[Shri C. G. K. Reddy.]
in the administrative set up of that State, of that area in their own language. It should be possible for them to speak to the officials, to the highest in the land, in their own language. Is that possible today? It is not possible. The officials of the Tamil Nad part of Madras State are transferred because they are officials of the whole of Madras State. The people of the Andhra part are unable to approach them because of the difficulty of language and when this big impediment is in front of them, naturally they are unable to get the benefit of good administration. Similarly, if you take educational institutions or anything else, it must be possible for the State to give adequate facilities for the development of the language of that particular region which would not be possible under the present set up. That is a good enough case for the linguistic provinces. I would go further and answer the charge that we would be creating more and more States and more and more Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries and Deputy Ministers, etc. I am not interested because I am not of the Congress Party so that I could give more employment. I am not in the least interested to make more Ministers, but I do say that it is a misstatement of facts to say that more States would be created if this principle of linguistic division is accepted.

Now, in the Fourth Schedule, Sir, we have the States enumerated.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Time is up, Mr. Reddy.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : I will finish in a minute, Sir. You will find that there are 28 States according to our Constitution which are existing today. If you were to concede this principle of redividing India into linguistic provinces—linguistic provinces does not mean provinces based on dialects and sub-groups of languages but can only mean fully developed and full blown languages—you will have only fifteen because there are only 15 such languages. We would have 15 States instead of 28 as you have here, which have been created not on any principle but just by accident and many other considerations, considerations other than real administrative facility for the people concerned. Therefore, this is a good enough reason —good enough argument—to explode the theory that first of all, we are cutting up the country, secondly, that we are creating more provinces and, therefore, (*Time bell rings*)—I will finish in a minute, Sir—increasing the administrative expenditure. Therefore, I should like to suggest that there is no case whatever to oppose this Resolution, but that there is every case for supporting it. It is for the good of the people of the country. The very objective with which some of our hon. friends have opposed it, e.g., disintegration, disunity, conflicts and all that will be increased if you do not concede the demand. By conceding it you will be taking away much of the heat and much of the conflict and we can live peacefully and for the better development of our whole country.

SHRI O. SOBHANI (Hyderabad) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, although my sympathies are with my Andhra friends I cannot see my way to support this Resolution on several grounds. The hon. mover has said that this demand is 42 years old. Sir, a political demand is not like wine which matures with age. On the contrary, Sir, a demand which may have been justified in 1916 when we were under alien rule may be completely out of date when India is a sovereign Republic. There is one more reason, Sir, why I cannot agree with this demand and that is that if we concede it now, we cannot, with any justification, refuse similar demands coming from other provinces. Dividing India into linguistic provinces, whether they are 28 or 30 or whatever the number, I submit, Sir, will not be in the best interests of the country. I am afraid we shall end up by complete Balkanisation of India. I have listened with very great attention to the arguments advanced by the supporters of this Resolution. One of the gentlemen, in support, referred to the fact that Andhra industries are not develop-

ed, that river projects are not attended to, that the railway system has been divided into three zones. If that is so, Sir, I say that the demand is not so much a sentimental one but it is based on economic grounds. If that is so, Sir, I would appeal to our Prime Minister and to the great statesman of the South, Shri Rajagopalachari, to consider how the demand on economic grounds can be met and how far we can go to satisfy our Andhra friends. I would also appeal to my very old friend, Shri Prakasam, and to others to meet our Prime Minister and Shri Rajagopalachari in a constructive mood and to find out a solution other than separation. Sir, the bitter experience of dividing the country has taught us that division cannot be a good solution. If, unfortunately, Andhra is separated from Madras, it may be that our friends themselves may find that the separation is not a good solution because they may not have sufficient funds to develop their industries, their river projects and so on.

I am afraid, Sir, that as far as Andhras living in other provinces are concerned, this separation may not be to their interests. I therefore make this appeal in all earnestness and I hope some constructive solution may be found. In conclusion, Sir, there is one word that I have to say to my friends on this side ; pray, do not talk of downright opposition or tooth and nail opposition. Try to understand the difficulties of our friends and I would appeal to my Congress friends here to appease our Andhra friends. After all they were with us in our struggle for freedom. They are our friends ; they are our brethren. They are not aliens; they are not our enemies. Therefore, Sir, I appeal to all concerned to consider this problem dispassionately and to find out a solution—not necessarily by dividing.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I thank you for your kindness in having given me an opportunity for the first time to open my mouth in this House. I am also thankful to you for having got this opportunity to express my opinion on a subject which has been engaging the attention of this House as well as the other House for several days. My only regret is this that I do not have the sweetness of tongue which my other friends have. Particularly, my friend Shri Bhupesh Gupta is very often able to catch the eye of the Speaker because of his sweet tongue.

On the subject of this Resolution, Sir, my stand is that I am constrained to oppose this Resolution on no other ground than that it is inexpedient at this time to force this problem on the attention of the Government. Most of the arguments for and against the Resolution that have been going on, are against the very principle of this Resolution. The formation of an Andhra State has been conceded not only in principle but also in the justness of the demand by the Government of the day. The Prime Minister in his declarations has very often said that he is not against the formation of the Andhra State. He has also said that this subject is engaging their serious attention and at the earliest convenience they will be able to carve out a State called Andhra State. Therefore, Sir, the Resolution is unnecessary at this stage. The only hurdles are as my hon. friend Shri Mudaliar pointed out, about the administrative difficulties as well as the economic considerations which prevent the formation of that State at this time. My friends who are supporting this Resolution have very often gone out of their way to condemn the "Hindi Imperialism" and all sorts of imperialisms. Nobody from the Hindi-speaking area opposes the demand of the Andhras on the ground that they are demanding something which is unjust. The justness of the cause having been admitted and the demand for implementing the Resolution being there, there is no question of its being talked out in the House nor is there any insincerity on the part of the Government in implementing this Resolution. The considerations which prevent an Andhra province being carved out are entirely different. The question is when there are other problems for which our hon. friends on

[Shri B. B. Sharma.]

the opposite side are very insistent on demanding a solution, e.g., food problem, the problem of efficiency in administration, the problem of development of industries, when there are all these problems which are facing the country, placed as we are in the situation in which we find ourselves today, is it desirable at this stage to press for a point which can be easily taken up later on? That is the point which I want to emphasise. It is undesirable to emphasise a point of division while the point that has to be emphasised is one of cohesion. The formation of Andhra as a State having been conceded, the only consideration is of time. The time being inopportune, Government wants some breathing time to think out this problem in all its implications before carving out the State.

One of our friends has unnecessarily brought out the point of Hindi domination. Now Hindi has been willingly accepted by all the parties concerned. People have accepted at the time of drawing up the Constitution that Hindi shall be our national language. If that is so, it is not an imposition on the part of the Hindi-speaking people on the people of the South. If you take that as an imposition on the South, why then the whole of India is dominated by the South so far as religion is concerned. Shri Shankaracharya, Madhwacharya, Ramanujacharya and Ballavacharya have all hailed from the South. Can we say there is religious imposition from the South on the Northern people? There is no other religious sect in India which can be said to be coming from the North; whether it is Shaivism, whether it is Vaishnavism, Shaktism or any philosophy, they all hail from the South. It is not an imposition. We accept it with grace; not only with grace, but we are thankful to the South for all that. (*Time bell rings.*) Therefore Hindi having been accepted by our friends from the South, it is not at all an imposition and their complaint on that ground does not stand.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Imbichibava wishes to speak in Malayalam. I will allow him to speak in Malayalam.

(*Shri E. K. Imbichibava addressed the Council in Malayalam. After the hon. Member had spoken for some time*) . . . .

THE MINISTER OF STATE FOR FINANCE (SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI): On a point of order. Does the Chair know the language, so that the relevancy or otherwise of the hon. Member's remarks can be judged?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have allowed him to speak in Malayalam.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: I wanted to know if the Chair is able to follow the hon. Member's speech.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. I am sorry I cannot follow it.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: Then, how is its relevancy or otherwise to be judged by the Chair?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have got a copy of the speech in English.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (*in Malayalam*): Let the hon. Member go on talking. Let him not be interrupted.

[*Following is a translation of the speech delivered in Malayalam by Shri E. K. Imbichibava.*]

SHRI E. K. IMBICHIBAVA (Madras): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thank you for allowing me to speak in my mother tongue on an occasion when we have before us a non-official Resolution demanding linguistic provinces. Had I known English or Hindi sufficiently, I would, certainly, have spoken in either of these languages so that I could make myself sufficiently understood by the majority of this House. I am speaking in Malayalam only because I am not able to speak in Hindi or English. When I speak in my own language, necessary arrangements should have been made for

simultaneous translation in different languages, so that the Members of this House could discharge their responsibilities to their fullest. I myself would have been able to discharge my duties to my constituency had such arrangements been made. I humbly request, Sir, that you may give necessary attention to this most democratic demand of mine.

I stand here to support the Resolution for linguistic provinces. Many might have expected that in the place of this non-official Resolution, an official one would have been moved. I need not tell you why. The party in power today—I mean the Congress, Sir—has done propaganda for linguistic provinces from one end of the country to the other. In the 1946 Election Manifesto, as well as in the 1951 Election Manifesto, and on many other occasions, the Congress has promised in unequivocal terms that it would grant linguistic provinces. And this has, certainly, not only inspired the people, but also helped the Congress to occupy the position that it does today. The party that has done such propaganda, after having been in power for the last four or five years, not only has not granted this demand of the people, but is also now trying to defeat this non-official Resolution by its brute majority.

I am not surprised at the fact that this brute majority had defeated a similar Resolution in the Lower House, but I am sure this is going to confuse, confound and antagonise a large majority of the people in the provinces.

Language, Sir, is a great lever to civilization and culture. The Congress once had recognised this fact. The present States are a conglomeration of more than one language and culture, artificially created. They are primarily a creation of British Imperialism to prevent the growth of our national movement. That explains why the Congress organised itself on the basis of language units for fighting British Imperialism. Even today it is these linguistic units that continue to function under the Congress. This clearly shows that language gives the greatest impetus for unity and progress and commands the greatest mobilising power. But, the party that is in power has come forward today with all kinds of arguments against these very principles. This, surely, is not motivated by any high ideal, but by some narrow interest and lust for power. Sir, if you closely examine the arguments advanced by the party in power today you will understand that the position that I hold is perfectly right. The main argument advanced by them today is that the inauguration of linguistic provinces would disrupt the existing unity of India. They do not say how this disruption and disunity would arise. At least, I fail, Sir, to understand the substance of this argument. Neither the Resolution before the House, nor the section that supports the Resolution demands the secession of the States from India. We visualise the same relationship to exist between future linguistic States and the Centre, as that existing today between the States and the Centre. I for one would argue that perfect unity and co-operation between the States and the Centre would exist only if the right of secession too is granted to the States ; but I do not press this here today because I am afraid that the section who opposes even this Resolution in this shape today will not be able to understand the higher and more democratic phase of linguistic provinces with full rights of national self-determination. Therefore, I would consider only the arguments about disruption and disunity.

Sir, the second argument advanced against linguistic provinces is that there would be boundary disputes, which would create discord and discontent among the people. In fact, this is not a problem that crops up when the boundary question is taken up. It is one that exists today, here and now. The demand of the Tamil speaking areas of South Travancore that they should be allowed to join the adjacent Tamil areas of the Madras State is not an overnight one. It is years old, it has been there for decades

[Shri E. K. Imbichibava.]

together. The demand of the Andhras for their own State is almost as old as the Congress, if not older. So is the case with the demand for Aikya Kerala, or for Aikya Karnataka. These problems and disputes are a reality today and remain a question mark before the Government, and I say, Sir, the way out is also there. If the Government thinks that the solution to this problem is not an easy one, I would suggest that you should be prepared to leave this tough problem for the people to solve. I would ask the Prime Minister whether he is prepared to take a plebiscite on this issue. I am sure, it is not a new thing for Panditji. For, he was the strongest and the stoutest advocate of this plebiscite in India. It is wrong and dangerous to try to deny such a just and democratic right of the people by advancing lame excuses. I would say that this is just like trying to prevent the rising sun by the palm of your hand. Let not the party in power be under the illusion that a few representatives of theirs sitting comfortably within the four walls of this House can veto the powerful demand of the millions and millions of India who shall not rest till the demand is achieved. May I remind the Prime Minister here that when this question came up before the Lower House, it was not the Communists and Leftists alone who supported it, but a large number of people in his own camp expressed their sentiments in support of this ? This only shows that they are voicing the demand of the people of their own constituencies. Though they were not allowed to vote for the Resolution by the party that is in power today, one could read between the lines and understand the position.

Sir, I support this Resolution demanding the formation of Andhra province. I support it not only because it is a just demand, but also because it would bring in its wake an Aikya Kerala also.

I again thank you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity to speak in my own tongue and I hope, Sir, that my suggestion to render simultaneous translation of speeches in different languages would be favourably considered.

SHRI B. P. AGARWAL (West Bengal) : Sir, we have found this speech very interesting so far as we could see from the gestures. Let us know whether he was speaking for or against the Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He was speaking for it.

SHRI KARTAR SINGH (PEPSU) : I want to speak against the Resolution. There is no special case for the formation of Andhra province. At any rate this is not the opportune time for doing the same. We all know that with regard to the formation of linguistic provinces a commission was set up and a report was issued by the same. I have carefully gone through that report and we have to see in the light of that report how far there is a case for the creation of this province. We have seen, Sir, that the Telugu language is spoken in about 24 districts. By 24 districts I mean 11 districts of North Madras, 8 districts of Hyderabad, 1 district of Mysore, 1 district of Orissa and 6 districts in portions. Those portions I take as three districts. Now we have to see that the Andhra province that is going to be formed will consist of how many districts. According to that report we find that if it is created out of the present Madras State then it will have only 11 districts and then we have to see how far it is going to be in the interests of the Andhra people themselves if the Andhra State is formed.

My submission is that after the Dhar Commission's Report we have another report in 1949 and that is the Three-Man Committee report which is known as J.V.P. Report. The J.V.P. Report is based on the Dhar Commission's Report. But in certain matters it has drawn wrong assumptions from the report of the Dhar Commission. Now my submission is that with regard to the formation of

the Andhra province we find that out of these 11 districts 5 districts are coastal districts and the other as we know are Rayalaseema districts. It is divided into two. That is, five coastal districts and the five districts of Rayalaseema. In the Report as it is, we find that at more than five places it is mentioned that Rayalaseema people are opposed to the formation of the Andhra province. At more than four or five places it is so found. But we are also told in the summary that some time in the year 1937 we had Shri Bagh Pact and in that Pact we find that it was given that the Rayalaseema people will have an equal number of seats as the coastal people. That was rather the main clause in that Pact and the Rayalaseema people would not agree to the formation of this Andhra province unless it was guaranteed in the terms of the Shri Bagh Pact. So we find that the Rayalaseema people are against the formation of an Andhra province unless the terms embodied in the Shri Bagh Pact were guaranteed to them. Now we have to see how far we can guarantee the terms of that Pact to the people of Rayalaseema. The most important terms of that Pact which was really the backbone of that Pact was that Rayalaseema people will have equal number of seats. Now we have to see in the light of the Constitution of India whether that guarantee can be given to those people. My submission is 'no'. The Constitution of India does not give any safeguard to any particular area of the country. It is not in favour of weightage being given on any ground to any particular area. The term of the Pact was that the five districts of Rayalaseema would have the same number of seats as the five coastal districts and that Report was issued in the month of December 1948 and then the Three-Man Committee Report is of 1st April 1949. But we passed the Constitution on the 26th January 1950. The Constitution definitely provides that the number of seats could be fixed for a State and representation and ratio of a constituency in a State shall be according to its population. That is a recognised principle throughout India, that the number of seats would be on a population basis. So giving of an equal number of seats has become void of the Constitution and the only guarantee that we can give to the Rayalaseema people would be that the terms of the Shri Bagh Pact would not be guaranteed. The Report says that if the statutory guarantee is not granted to Rayalaseema people, their consent would be wanting.

So my submission is that when out of the 11 districts that are going to form the Andhra province if the guarantee cannot be given to five or six districts, then only coastal districts remain which have to form the Andhra province. So it will be seen that a wrong assumption has been made in the Three-Man Committee Report that there is a large measure of agreement among the people who are going to form the Andhra province. My submission on the other hand is that out of these 11 districts the people of six districts are divided in their opinion and only the coastal districts are there where there is a measure of agreement among those people. So it will be seen that the present is not the opportune time for the formation of the Andhra State and there is no measure of agreement between the people for the formation of that State. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI K. NARAYANAPPA (Hyderabad) :

श्री के० नारायणप्पा (हैदराबाद) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस हाउस के सामने प्रान्तवारी के मुताल्लिक मुझे कुछ अपने सुझाव देने हैं। आनरेबिल मेम्बर श्री वेंकट नारायणा के रेज़ोल्यूशन को अपने सामने रखते हुये मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि आंध्र स्टेट बगैर मद्रास सिटी के बने तो क्या आंध्र के नेतागण इस सुझाव का स्वागत करेंगे। मुझे शक है। रोज़ाना सुना जाता है या बोला जाता है कि आंध्र स्टेट बगैर मद्रास सिटी के मंज़ूर नहीं है। प्रान्तवारी के मुताल्लिक न कांग्रेस खिलाफ है और न गवर्नमेंट लेकिन किया जाय कब, यह एक बहुत

[Shri K. Narayanappa.]

बड़ा सवाल है। प्रान्तवारी के बारे में जयपुर कांग्रेस ने एक कमेटी बनाई थी, जिसमें हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ज्वाहरलाल जी, स्वर्गवासी सरदार पटेल और पट्टाभि सीतारमैय्या थे और इन लोगों ने इस मसले के ऊपर पूरी सहानुभूति के साथ सोच विचार करके अपने खयालात को देश के सामने १९४८ में रखा। १९४८ की रिपोर्ट अभी भी लागू हो सकती है यदि तेलगू लोग अपनी आपस की भावना को खत्म करके एक सही समझौते पर आयें और मैं समझता हूं कि ऐसी हालत में सरकार एक बाउंडरी कमीशन बनाने में देरी नहीं करेगी। यह आंध्र के नेता लोगों के ध्यान में है कि अगर आंध्र प्रान्त उनको जल्दी ही हासिल करना है तो उनको इस रिपोर्ट को आदर्श बनाना होगा, इसको जल्दी से जल्दी मान लेना होगा। उसमें साफ कहा गया है कि अगर कोई भाषावार प्रान्त बने तो पूरे देश की हालत को देख कर अपने प्रान्त के लिये कोशिश करना होगा।

मैं यह अपील किये बगैर नही रह सकता कि भाषावार प्रान्त बनाने में वक्त लगेगा और उसके लिये हमें गवर्नमेंट को इस मसले को हल करने के लिये समय देना पड़ेगा। मैं उन लोगों में नहीं हूं जो कि प्रान्तवारी के मुताल्लिक उपवास करें, शोर मचायें। मेरे विचार में प्रान्तवारी देश के लिये हितकर नहीं है क्योंकि इससे हमारे बीच में मित्रत्व नहीं हो सकती बल्कि विघटन ही होता है। इसलिये इस प्रश्न को समय के तकाजे के साथ मिल कर सुलझाना चाहिये। मैं हैदराबादी हूं। प्रान्तवारी के मुताल्लिक यह फिक्र है कि हैदराबाद का भी सवाल है। हैदराबाद के टुकड़े होने से क्या हमारी माअसी और एकतसादी मुश्किलात दूर हो जायेंगी ? मैं देश के टुकड़े नहीं करना चाहता हूं। इससे भी बड़ी मुश्किलात पैदा हो जायेंगी। आप जानते हैं कि पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान के बटवारे से क्या क्या मुसीबतें आई। इससे ज्यादा इस बारे में कहना मैं ठीक नहीं समझता। मैं प्रान्तवारी के मुताल्लिक जो नेतागण हैं उन से यह कहे बगैर नहीं रह सकता कि इस समय इस के लिये अच्छी परिस्थिति नहीं है। हैदराबाद में तीन हुकूमतें थीं, अंग्रेजों की, निजाम की और जागीरदारों और ताल्लुकेदारों की लेकिन इस वक्त हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने बड़ी मेहरबानी की है और काम चल रहा है। हमारे ऊपर बहुत मुसीबतें आई ह और अगर इस वक्त फिर प्रान्तवारी के झगड़े में फंसा देंगे तो हैदराबाद के लोग बड़ी ही मुश्किल में पड़ जायेंगे। इसलिये मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि इस वक्त समय नहीं है और जब समय हो तब आंध्र प्रान्त को बनाया जाय, जब अच्छा समय हो जायगा तो यह अपने आप हो जायगा।

दूसरे हमारे सामने हैदराबाद यूनिवर्सिटी का प्रश्न उठ रहा है। उसमानिया यूनिवर्सिटी का जो नाम है उससे लोगों को कुछ एतराज है। मैं समझता हूं कि हैदराबाद यूनिवर्सिटी नाम रखने में कोई हर्ज नही है। यह सुझाव मेरा हाउस के समाने है।

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA : (Madras) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, the hon. Member is speaking about Hyderabad University and some things which have nothing to do with the Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please speak about the Resolution.

SHRI K. NARAYANAPPA :

श्री के० नारायणप्पा : हैदराबाद के बारे में मुझे यही कहना है कि हैदराबाद का सवाल बहुत अहम है। आंध्र ८, कर्नाटक ३ और महाराष्ट्र ५, इस तरह से जिले की बटवारी करने की नौबत आ रही है लेकिन हम लोगों का जो केस है वह मैं जनता के सामने रखना चाहता हूं। इस केस को साफ करने के लिये समय नहीं है और इस में बहुत समय

लगेगा लेकिन यूनिवर्सिटी का सिलसिला जारी रखते हुये मैं हाउस से और चैयरमैन से प्रार्थना करता हूं कि यूनिवर्सिटी का नाम हैदराबाद रखा जाय ।

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA : Again he is raising the same point of Hyderabad University.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please speak about the Resolution. Let him proceed.

SHRI K. NARAYANAPPA :

श्री के० नारायणप्पा : हाउस से मैं यही कहना चाहता हूं कि प्रांविंशियलिज्म (provincialism) के बारे में ज्यादा ज़ोर न देते हुए जो तीनों की रिपोर्ट है उस पर हम अच्छी तरह से गौर करें और विचार करें और गवर्नमेंट का साथ दें । इससे हमारा और हमारी सरकार का हाथ मज़बूत होगा । इसलिये मैं श्री वेंकट नारायणा से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वह अपने रेज़ोल्युशन पर फिर से विचार करें और जनता के सामने उसको रखें और अपने प्रान्त के लोगों को समझायें कि वक्त का तकाज़ा यह है । मेरी उन से प्रार्थना है कि उपवास करके, सत्याग्रह करके या शोर मचा करके कुछ नहीं करना चाहिये बल्कि शांति से इस मसले को हल करना चाहिये । मैं इतना ही कह कर खत्म करता हूं ।

[For English translation, *see* Appendix II, Annexure No. 28.]

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU) : MR. Deputy Chairman, I venture to intervene in this debate though with a great deal of diffidence because there has been so much argument on this subject that no one can say anything new or worth while. In fact, I find that in this matter as in other matters we debate them so much that perhaps we forget what the matter is, what the basic matter is, what we are asking, and we all get lost in this flow of words.

Now, this Resolution talks about the Government taking speedy steps regarding the formation of an Andhra province. May I point out that this Resolution is rather out of date? We took speedy steps two and a half years back and more. It is not a question of taking them now. In regard to this Andhra province, this Government, or the one that preceded it, took speedy steps two years and eight or nine months ago, in the year 1949, October, November or thereabouts. We decided to have it and we took every step that we could take. We referred the matter to the Madras State Assembly. That is what the Resolution wants us to do We appointed a Partition Committee. We did everything. What more could we do ? Why did we not succeed ? Something happened, something came in the way. We took the speedy steps asked for by the Resolution but something came in the way, in Madras or round about. We wanted to do it not only in words but, I submit, in action. The previous Government showed that they wanted to do it but something came in the way, some difficulties came in the way and other things happened. The new Constitution came into effect. Our object then was to begin this change before the new Constitution came into effect and in the new Constitution to put Andhra as a separate province, but it could not be done. But that does not matter. It can be done later. There is no essential difficulty about it, but the point that this House has to consider is this, that there is no difficulty, no obstruction or lack of goodwill in the mind of the Government on this or any other like matter. Some of us may give greater emphasis to it ; others may give less emphasis to it. It is a matter, if you like, of emphasis or priorities. I do think that every subject in India should be viewed from the point of view of, I may call, priorities or what is the most important thing for us to do, even though it is difficult to say what is the most important thing. One may say it is the economic problem; undoubtedly it is. You may call it

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

the food problem, you may call it, politically speaking, the problem of the consolidation of India. All these are very important. They go together really, and every question should be viewed in that light and having viewed it, one may say this is good and should be given effect to immediately or it is good but it should be given effect to day after tomorrow or the next year. It all depends on how one relates to the relative priorities and the emphasis one gives to the various immediate demands of the situation.

But again, if I may repeat, so far as our Government is concerned, we not only made our position in regard to the linguistic provinces clear on several occasions but in this particular matter of the Andhra Province, we actually went ahead and took some steps to give effect to it, but there was lack of agreement among the various major interests concerned. One should not expect agreement about everything—it will be an impossible thing to expect—but one does expect in a matter of this kind a large measure of agreement, because the alternative is that if we take some steps which involve some measure of compulsion or coercion, well, I submit we have failed; whether we have got it or not, we have failed because the coercion, the compulsion, used will not only come in the way of the future progress of the new province or the old one but even the process of the formation of the new province will be delayed. That will be obstructed because you are doing it against the will of a large number of people, the important interests, and inevitably there will be obstruction about so many things even after you decide that it should be done, because it should always be remembered that this business of formation of new provinces and dividing up existing provinces is a complicated business. I accept it. For me, I don't want any other argument. One argument is quite adequate for me that the people of Andhra want it and I can understand their wanting it and if I may say so with all respect, they want it not so much because of the language but because,—whether they are right or wrong I don't say—because they have a feeling that they don't get a square deal otherwise. It may be true or may not be true.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : These are the real conditions there.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : I say they want it and that is sufficient for me. Some people say 'Go and take a plebiscite'. I accept the fact that the people of Andhra want it and there the matter ends.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : Does it apply to other linguistic areas or does it apply only to Andhra ?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : I am speaking about Andhra. You cannot obviously apply it to every area. Even in regard to Andhra, if you ask me about Rayalaseema, it is very difficult to say. It will be difficult to give a straight answer. My general feeling is that the people of Andhra want it and we are generally in favour of it. There is no question of consulting them as to whether they want it or not. But what I was submitting was that the process of formation, with the best will in the world, is a somewhat complicated one. The process of division, the process of dividing so many things, whether it is from the financial point of view, administrative or any other point of view, apart from some other major points of view, with consent, with agreement and with goodwill, is a complicated business. It takes a little time. But if that consent is not freely obtainable from both sides, and goodwill is lacking, that process becomes still more complicated, delaying and creates more and more bitterness. In fact one does not quite know what ultimately it leads to in point of time or in point of results. Therefore I do submit that whenever we take such a step, apart from other considerations, it is of the first importance that there should be this large measure of agreement between the parties concerned. The parties concerned—I do no mean that the Governmenof India

it is the other parties concerned—should agree on a clearly thought out process about it. For instance, supposing we give a general consent, then we try to think it out and in thinking it out we have to decide about the finances involved, the results, etc. Let us think it out. One thing would be unfortunate if you take one or two steps and then get held up because we have not thought about the third or fourth step. If we start a new province and thereby give a great deal of satisfaction—psychological, sentimental and practical satisfaction—to a large number of people, well and good. I am all for it. But that psychological and sentimental satisfaction, if it comes up a little later against difficulties, against financial, economic and other difficulties, then you solve one problem and you face another and a more difficult problem. What I am suggesting is that all these matters are not matters of just a Resolution but of clear working out, thinking and by general consent doing it. The only thing is : Can you really go ahead ? Otherwise you will be held up at every step by obstruction from groups, etc.

For my part I think the most important thing for India today is economic resources. Our resources are limited. We try to make the best of it. We try to have certain priorities. Now if we indulge in large-scale divisions and partitions and redistribution of India, administrative and otherwise, let us have it by all means if people desire it because people's psychology is important but let us remember that each such process is a costly process. It is a delaying process—delaying in the sense that you have to delay other projects and apart from the ultimate cost of it, I may say whether it involves more expenditure or not, it is a process which is itself so costly and it must involve delay. Those economic projects, etc., those development projects etc., to which we want to give first place—these will be delayed. These are the various considerations which I put before this House not to raise any objection to such a demand.

I have already indicated that so far as Government is concerned, we are not prepared to accept, as the Resolution in the other House demanded, a general redistribution of the whole of India into a large number of new provinces. Logically that might be justified because the present provinces and States are not quite logical. They have grown historically and administratively and in various ways. But, if I may say so, this business of talking logically is about the most illogical thing I know of, as if you might talk logically and say you take off a man's nose because logically his nose should be of a particular pattern or that his body is not as good as it should be and therefore you cut off one chunk and put it somewhere else. One cannot deal with historical developments which involve all manner of things in this way. I don't say you should keep them like this but what I ventured to say in the other House was this, that if you ask us to take the whole of India and cut the country into new provinces, it is plain to me that that means doing nothing for the next ten years or so except just arguing and quarrelling and appointing Commissions and meanwhile of course the persons who argue and who quarrel and the Commissions who function will probably be swept away by other events. Therefore any such proposition of cutting up the whole of India we cannot possibly accept, as nobody could accept it, I submit. But it is a completely different proposition to take up a particular proposal—I can understand that—examine the proposal and give effect to it if you can give effect to it. Therefore, in regard to this particular proposal let us take the present position about Andhra Province. We are entirely agreeable to give effect to it subject to this that it should be done with as large a measure of agreement as possible. Now everybody knows that our friends, the Tamils, are not opposed to the formation of an Andhra Province. I have no doubt that many people have said so here. Naturally they will not want this argument to continue. But then we come back to the argument being limited to cer-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

tain specific points, whether it relates to the city of Madras or Rayalaseema or any other place. Now the city of Madras is not something which can be disposed of by tossing for it. One has to decide about it by agreement.

I cannot see myself how the Central Government here can impose its will on either party in this matter, and compel a decision. Nor do I see how we can appoint somebody, a Supreme Court Judge or somebody else, to decide the question. This is not a high judicial matter for decision by a high judicial authority. It is a matter which has to be decided on practical grounds, having regard to the wishes of the people concerned. Therefore we come back to this position. As I have said, those who want the Andhra Province get it, so far as we are concerned, without the least delay, provided they get over this hurdle which has stuck up before us on several occasions and which practically stopped the actual formation of the Andhra Province two and a half years ago.

PROF. G. RANGA : If I may interrupt for a moment, Sir. I submit that it is only this delay which has come about that is creating more and more complications about the city of Madras. Otherwise those who really wanted an Andhra Province were prepared to accept the recommendation made by my hon. friend and two of his colleagues —the Three Man Committee—that the Andhra Province may be created, without the city of Madras.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : I accept what my hon. friend has said. But the fact remains that some important representative people voicing the Andhra claim did not accept that decision. Should we have ignored their voice and gone ahead ? But how that was possible it is difficult for me to say. And we were rather in a hurry as we had to complete the Constitution in another two months' time. We consider that this question—whether it be the Andhra question or some other question—should be examined. Let us examine it calmly. There is no conflict about it, we have only to find a way. Let no one imagine that we want to come in the way. But we do not want to take a step which will lead the Central Government and the State Governments concerned, into all kinds of difficulties, without working it out carefully on their general consent. And so, this Resolution, if I may say so, is first of all, as I said, completely out of date. We had this some two years ago. Secondly, in the form it is, asking as it does for something immediately, it forgets that certain prerequisites, that certain things, have to happen before that. I am not suggesting that we as a Government should remain passive spectators, waiting for things to happen. I am prepared to help things to happen, and I am prepared to use, well, such good offices as I have, to that end. But ultimately I cannot decide without the good-will of the others who are concerned. Therefore, I submit, Sir, that the passing of this particular Resolution as it is at present, would not be helpful at all.

12 noon.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Sir, on a point of information. I think the Prime Minister talked about Rayalaseema. I should like to know from the Prime Minister whether he had examined the credentials of the delegation that met him some time in late 1949, and whether he is satisfied that they were truly representative of Rayalaseema, and that the real public feeling in Rayalaseema was truly expressed through that delegation ?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : The Prime Minister said that they were agreeable to the formation of the Andhra Province, but that something came up in the way, but what that something was, he has not divulged to the House. We would like to know what that something was.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : Sir, the Prime Minister said the parties concerned could not come to an agreement. But may I know what steps the Government have taken so as to reduce the difference between the parties concerned ? It is two years since this decision was reached and I do not think

the Government have taken any steps so far in this direction, nor have they moved at all in this matter. On the other hand, as a result of several statements made on Rayalaseema and other things, the gap has been made wider. Will any such step be taken even now or are we to wait for this general agreement till Doomsday ? Why does not the Prime Minister take steps to convene a round table conference or something like that, inviting all the parties concerned to see if something could not be done to solve this problem ? My Resolution does not ask for the establishment of the Andhra Province here and now. Regarding the city of Madras you have to get the opinions of various people. You have to do other preliminaries also. But unless this Resolution of mine is adopted, the Government cannot start the process and go ahead.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad) : The Prime Minister said he accepted the formation of an Andhra Province. Will he also accept the request of the Telangana people to add their area to the proposed Andhra Province ?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : No, Sir; absolutely no.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE : Why not, Sir ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : According to the Government, how long will it take to form the Andhra Province from now ? Will it happen within a year ? What steps will Government take now ?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : It is not for me to take any steps. An hon. Member suggested the calling of a round table conference. But a round table conference by itself does not necessarily help us. But I am continually in correspondence with people to see what can be done. That is the way to prepare the ground. There is no use issuing public statements and things of that sort.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : Will you please place the correspondence on the Table of the House ?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : The hon. Member seems to have very strange ideas as to how the work is to be done.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Sir, I asked something about the delegation from Rayalaseema which met the Prime Minister late in 1949, and about the credentials of those who composed that delegation.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : I am not raising the question of Rayalaseema here. I accept what my hon. friend says. There are Members in the other House and elsewhere and he can discuss this matter with them. I am not talking about 1949, but of 1952 ; in the month of May or June, when they spoke on this subject, there were some who spoke on this side and some on the other. It showed how the people of Rayalaseema and round about feel about it. I do not wish the hon. Members to feel that I am raising the question of Rayalaseema. I accept whatever the people may say.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : When will the formation of an Andhra Province take place ? In one year or in how many years ?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : I couldn't say.

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal) : I listened to the Prime Minister's speech and he pointed to the bone of contention about the city of Madras. But I could not find out what his views are regarding this city. We, on our part, have said that Madras should belong to the Tamils and we would like to know if the Prime Minister, with his understanding of history, shares our view. If so, it would be for the Prime Minister, who is a man of very great influence and can weild public opinion, to exert that influence and bring about a settlement of this dispute. It would be much easier if such an eminent leader came into the picture with a view to helping in a concrete manner towards the solution of the problem that is facing us.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : The hon. Member has, no doubt, read the report of which I was also a signatory, three years ago, called the Three-Member Committee's Report, and something is said there about the city of Madras. I do not remember exactly what it is. In any event, surely the hon. Member would realise that if I start expressing my opinions in regard to matters of controversy, then I lose some part of the influence I possess !

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : If the future status of Madras is to be referred for decision to a.....

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : If the Andhra people agree to have an Andhra Province minus the city of Madras, will the Prime Minister say "Yes" to their demand immediately ?

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : All disputed items such as the city of Madras etc. should be left for decision by an arbitrator or a boundary commission.

SHRI M. MANJURAN (Travancore-Cochin) : I have been wondering as to what objection there could be to the formation of linguistic provinces, because, as far as I remember, history has always taught us that the formation of linguistic States is the "norm" of Capitalist period. It has been a historical process in Europe that States were formed linguistically and for all that has been said of the economic advancement and material prosperity, I am of the opinion that linguistic States are essential. We have been talking of sentimental things ; we have been condemning it on emotional grounds, but, there is nothing of sentiment ; there is nothing of emotion in the matter. The whole affair is that the Congress administration itself has pleaded inability to develop the material prosperity of this country due to the illogical division of the States. Even Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliar who has said that there was no need for linguistic provinces, said that it was a historical mistake committed by the Britishers in that they divided the Provinces as they stand at present. That fact has to be admitted. We have been accusing the British of the perpetuation of the native States as feudal pockets. We have been accusing the British people of so many things and also of the division of the provinces, but, given the authority to set things right we still continue to argue that what the Britisher did should continue. The time factor has been very much made out. There is no time factor for doing good things. As a matter of fact, the State I come from is not going to be dismembered out of India if the District of Malabar, which is contiguous to Travancore-Cochin, is added to Travancore-Cochin. It is not going to create boundary troubles ; it is only going to unite the people who are talking the same language and create more administrative convenience for the province to function. It is not correct to say that administrative dismemberment will result if contiguous territories speaking the same language are formed into separate States in the whole of India. The demand for an Andhra Province minus the City of Madras and minus all controversial areas is not a big thing for the Congress administration to concede. It should not be opposed. It had been the policy, we are reminded, of Mr. Amery when he was talking of Indian independence always to say that there was no unity among Indians. The maximum agreement is there with regard to Andhra, that there should be a province of the people talking Telegu. Even in my own State, there has been agitation going on for the formation of a linguistic State. The Congress leaders there even promised that they would implement it ; the latest election manifesto contained that. With all that, arguments can be advanced this way or that.

What I feel most is that the economic prosperity of these Nations has been retarded by the suffocating principles brought forward by an administration at the Centre which does not realise the problems in other parts of the country. We have got our own problems. In our own State, the Congress at the Centre has sanctioned a minority Government to function. These are things which we could our selves settle democratically. What most object to is the Centre's exertin

greater and undue influence than they should in the States. That is retarding the progress of the people. The historic process of the democratic march of the people alone can safeguard against all the individualistic, sentimental arguments advanced by the protagonists of Hindi. When we come to the Central Ministry we find there is great disproportion. A certain State dominates there. We want equality of nations. We want the equality of nations to be imprinted in our Constitution which is not there now. What exactly we want is a large measure of self determination for the States by which we can economically progress and politically advance. There are so many things I want to say. We have got a port in Cochin. If I remember, more than 30 years ago a plan was made for the progress of this port in four stages. It came to a particular stage when the Congress Government came out and said that it is the port at Vizagapatam that should be developed for so many reasons and disbanded thousands of workers at Cochin Port. We do not know why it happend. Left to us, we would have developed our port. We would have developed our industries and everything in the manner that we wanted to. The present Congress Government at the Centre is interfering with the proper administration of the States everywhere. That is my view and the view of a lot of other people here. All the people from Andhra have spoken for Andhra Province but the Congress want them not to vote for it. Mr. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar who spoke very eloquently in the Lower House for the Andhra Province, voted against it. There are Members in this House also who are going to vote against this, in spite of their wanting the State. It is sentiment ; it is emotion ; it is logic and it is everything.

The Prime Minister was speaking about cutting the nose and putting the eyes. There is no 'nose cutting' business in logic. So far as I remember it is some paradoxical argument which we cannot understand. We stand for linguistic States because it leads to unity from the bottom. We are against multi-lingual States because it leads to discord, because we cannot advance economically in the manner in which we want to advance owing to disunity Every time there has been discord in the formation of Ministry in Madras ; there has been a lot of trouble and eminent leaders like Mr. Prakasam have left the Congress because the Tamil people were dominant in Madras. These things are realistically present before us and we feel that we should bring these out before the people because the Congress Government at the Centre is conducting itself in an undemocratic manner, and exerting its influence in all the States whenever it likes. We know that the retardation of economic prosperity is definitely due to this interference of distant people in our home affairs.

They were also talking about administrative convenience. In the Province of Madras there are four languages today. All people do not understand when the Chief Minister of Madras talks. (*Time bell rings.*) If any news has to be published, it has to be published in four different languages. Is administration convenient by publishing a thing in four languages or publishing it in one language ? Unity of language is essential for the final victory of commodity production, for capture of the home markets for sale of commodities, for the successful completion of the bourgeois democratic revolution. People might be sentimental ; people might be emotional, but there is great logic behind their desire for the formation of linguistic States. There are great men who are highly educated ; there are others who are not. Both may go wrong. History has also repeated that great men blunder. We cannot say that they will not. But, it is the desire of the majority of the people that should be taken into consideration, it should be the will of the people that should triumph in such matters.

The majority of Andhras want a province of their own. The majority of our own people in my State want a province of their own. (*Time bell rings*). There is no reason, there is no

[Shir M. Manjuran.]

strength, there is no force that will prevail over it. And we are sure, if not given, it shall be taken.

THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL (SHRI N. Gopalaswami) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, my task has been rendered easier by the fact that the Prime Minister was able to be here and address the House on this Resolution. We have had, Sir, a plethora of speeches on this Resolution. We have had a plethora of arguments as well and it is difficult to see what contribution one could make to this literature that has been built up during the last two days. So I find myself in a difficult position as to what new things I could say on a Resolution of this sort.

So far as the demand for an Andhra State is concerned, I have almost grown with it. I know when it was first initiated and I am quite aware of the history of the movement in favour of it. Latterly the thing was made a much larger question and linguistic division of India was put up as a general proposition. The Indian National Congress blessed it ; not only blessed it, but I think adopted that linguistic division in its own party organisation. Now, Sir, I am a man who has been brought up in a school of objectivity and it is not easy for me to agree to a wholesale revision of this vast country into a new set of States with boundaries different from those of the States that now exist. I believe all people, even the members of the organisation which blessed this general principle of linguistic division—have now come to realise that it is not quite wise, being in power themselves, to agree to the proposition that there should be a wholesale division of India into linguistic States. It will mean a considerable amount of political and administrative confusion. We cannot attempt it in any case all at once. So it is that Government now are prepared only to consider particular propositions for the establishment of a new linguistic State by cutting up one or two States that may exist. Now the position of the Government with regard to an Andhra State is clear. It is convinced that there is a general demand in Andhra Desha for an Andhra State. It is certainly prepared to forward this particular wish of the people of the Andhra Desha in general to the extent it possibly can and that is why the Prime Minister made it clear to you that he is all in favour of establishing an Andhra State. It all depends as to whether the time has arrived for establishing it, whether the difficulties which stand in the way of the establishment of an Andhra State have been removed or could be removed.

Now, it is a patent fact that those difficulties do exist. Let me mention one or two. Take, for instance, the extent of the new Andhra State that is proposed. I know a good many of my friends on the opposite side—particularly the Communist group—do want Vishala Andhra rather than the mere Andhra for which all the investigation that has proceeded hitherto has been made. Now, that is a proposition to which Government are not prepared to subscribe at the present moment. Vishala Andhra, from the stand point of Government's policy, is ruled out altogether if it means the tagging of Telangana in the Hyderabad State to the rest of the Andhra area in the Madras State. That is one point.

There is the other point with regard to Rayalaseema. Well, Government are quite prepared to accept an Andhra State which will include Rayalaseema if they could be satisfied that the general opinion in Rayalaseema—the overwhelming majority opinion is in favour of such inclusion. It is a fact that till a few years ago, at any rate, during the earlier years of this Andhra movement, Rayalaseema made common cause with the coastal Andhra districts so far as this question was concerned. But I believe latterly opinion has been growing amongst the people of Rayalaseema and they have begun to doubt whether it is after all wise from their point of view to throw in their lot with the coastal Andhra districts in the State or whether it would not be better for them to remain where they are with the rest of the Madras State. While Government as such can give no finding on this question it is a matter on which agreement

has to be reached between the people of Rayalaseema and the rest of the Andhra Desha in Madras State.

There is of course the other chief difficulty about Madras city. It is true that at one stage a proposal was made that the Andhra State might be established without Madras city. But we soon found that it evoked an amount of opposition which we were not in a position to ignore and therefore it was that this proposal was allowed to slide.

Now, the main thing that I wish to put before the House without taking too much of its time is this. Government are in sympathy with the demand for an Andhra State. Government are prepared to do everything possible to establish the preliminary agreements that are necessary before they could take concrete action. The Prime Minister has assured you that he would be prepared to use his good offices for the purpose of reaching this kind of agreement on both the main issues that now stand in the way. There are of course other issues. There may be little boundary disputes and things of that kind which could be settled by boundary commissions or other machinery that we may set up in the future. But, so far as these two main issues are concerned, agreement has to be brought about between the people of the two areas—amongst the Andhras themselves and between the Andhras and Tamils. The Tamils are very insistent that Madras city should be with them and with them alone. I do not think it has been claimed on behalf of the Andhras that Madras city should be with them and them alone. They have been trying to evolve a formula by which they could retain such of those interests and influences as they now have in Madras so that Madras is not altogether lost to the new Andhra State.

But these are matters which have got to be evolved in the concrete and settled by agreement between the parties concerned. What does this Resolution want us to do ? It has practically incorporated the language of Article 3 of the Constitution. What it suggests is that speedy steps should be taken for the formation of an Andhra 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. I want hon. Members to realise what this implies. We cannot put a proposition to the Madras Legislature unless we ourselves have been enabled by the people concerned to make up our minds as to what the proposal should be.

Now, there are the two main difficulties to which I have referred. Those difficulties exist, and if the Government cannot arrive at a decision upon those difficulties, unless agreement is reached between the parties concerned there is no definite proposal which we can send to the Madras Legislature for the expression of its opinion on it. Not only should we send the proposal to the Madras Legislature, but according to Article 3 we have also to refer to that Legislature the provisions of the Bill which is proposed to be introduced. These are stages which we can reach only after these preliminary agreements have been reached. That is why the Government, while in sympathy with the establishment of an Andhra State as early as possible, must oppose this particular Resolution. We must decline to take the steps that are suggested in this Resolution until and unless these negotiations between the parties have taken place and we get a report of an agreement which would be generally acceptable throughout the area which is to form the jurisdiction of the Andhra State. I do not think I need say more on this Resolution except that in its present form the Government are unable to accept it.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : May I ask how many years the Government expects it will take for the agreement to come about ?

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : If the hon. Member could tell me how many years it would take for the people to come to an agreement, I can give him an answer.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : Is the Government going to see that an agreement is brought about, and how many years will it take ?

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : The Government's attitude in this matter is that the people who differ on the main issues should themselves agree, and if our good offices will help them to reach an agreement, we shall certainly be only too pleased to place them at their disposal.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : Mr. Deputy Chairman, whenever we request the Government to form linguistic provinces, or to form a particular province, they talk of division, as if the country was divided into different countries. They give the analogy of Pakistan and Burma.....

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : I did not give the analogy.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : The hon. the Leader's followers did.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : The Prime Minister the other day said—and I have gone through the Reporters' record—on the Resolution.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The Prime Minister made a speech today, but he did not refer to it.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : Not here, but.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He made a speech in this House in connection with this Resolution.

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM : May I ask.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : No. Order, order.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : The Prime Minister referred to the speech he had made in the other House, and in that speech he gave the analogy.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The speech which he made in this House on this Resolution is relevant.

SHRI S. VENKATARAMAN : Is it not a fact that the Prime Minister's speech in the other House was with reference to another Resolution that came before that House, and that it has nothing to do with the Resolution which the mover has moved in this House ?

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : He also referred to international and internal crises and to settling down after independence and so on.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member is again repeating the same argument. The Prime Minister made a speech in connection with this particular Resolution. So, whatever he may have said in a speech which he might have made on the other Resolution is not relevant.

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM : On a point of information. The Hon. Leader of the Council.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am sorry. The hon. Member is too late.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : Sir, though I feel I am entitled to refer to the speeches made on another platform or in another House, as you have ruled that I should not refer to them, I will abide by your ruling.

Sir, the hon. the Prime Minister also referred to the question of Rayalaseema. Before independence was achieved, they said : "Let us first get independence. We will then divide the entire country on the basis of language and culture." And after independence was achieved, what do they say ? They talk of international crisis, internal crisis, and so on. When the Resolution on this subject was moved in the other House, what did they say "No, this is a vague and sweeping Resolution. Bring a specific resolution." And when a specific resolution is brought here, the Government say : "No, we are not going to consider it. We will oppose it, because there is no agreement." That is what the Hon. the

Leader of the Council has kindly said. About two years back, the Rayalaseema people had all united and put forward a united demand. Then the Government did not take any steps. They went on manipulating and creating all sorts of troubles between the parties.....

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : Does the hon. Member suggest that we went on creating those troubles ?

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA: The Governments and the Congress—the party which is holding the reins of power here and at Madras. I do not know whether the hon. Leader belongs to the Congress Party or not. I will give an instance. In the year 1937, when Shri Rajagopalachari was the Chief Minister, he did not offer even one seat to Rayalaseema in the Cabinet. And now he has given four— in order to divide and rule, in order to set up one against the other. In this way they have manipulated and made the differences wider.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : What is the strength of the parties in Rayalaseema and in the coastal districts ?

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : Consider the strength of the seats which the Constitution provides for. Representation was given according to population, and that representation the Government should give in the Cabinet as well. The coastal districts have more seats than Rayalaseema. But we have no quarrel with them ; let Rayalaseema take all the Ministers, even then we agree. But these methods expose the Congress manipulations.

SHRI S. VENKATARAMAN : Does the hon. Member mean to suggest that Shri Rajagopalachari should have selected members from other parties as members of his Cabinet?

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : As a matter of fact he did and, after all, he wanted six Ministers. He wanted not more than six.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE : On a point of order. Can the hon. Member discuss the formation of Cabinets in other States ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He is referring to the strength of Andhra members.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : Sir, the Congress Constitution itself speaks of linguistic provinces. The Congress itself is organised on that basis. The latest election manifesto of the Congress speaks of linguistic provinces. Dr. Ramaswami Mudaliar said that when the Congress promised that, it had had no experience of running the administration of the country. Why should they agree even now, after they have gained experience of government ? Sir, it was only in 1951 that the A.I.C.C. at Bangalore passed a resolution to that effect. They then had had four years' experience of government. They passed that resolution at that stage. I do not know what happened between 1951 and 1952 to make them go back on it. I have to reply to the point made by Dr. Ramaswami Mudaliar. After having had experience of several years they have still stuck to the resolution. They did not change the Constitution, and they did not change their election manifesto. All these factors—cultural affinity, linguistic affinity—would be considered ; and apart from that, other considerations would also be taken into account, such as self-sufficiency.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND : Sir, may I know who is going to make the reply ? Is the Leader of the Council making the reply, or the hon. mover of the Resolution ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The hon. mover has got the right to reply. He is replying to the debate.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : And apart from the linguistic and cultural affinities, of course, Sir, self-sufficiency, finance, economy, contiguity of area, administrative convenience, scope for development and expansion of natural potential resources, population, physical and geographical aspect, customs and traditions—all

[Shri P. V. Narayana.]

these things are to be taken into consideration and I may tell you, Sir, that Andhra satisfies all these requirements. So there is no reason why it should be delayed.

When there are differences among the people, the Prime Minister tells us "Compose your differences first and then the question will be considered." But at the same time if there are no differences, the Prime Minister will say: "Oh, there are no differences at all. Then why do you at all want the creation of a separate Andhra Province ?" So if there are differences, the difficulty is there. Even if there are no differences, then also the difficulty is there. It is just like the British people who used to say that because there were differences among the people of India, they could not be given independence. But in view of the international situation when the British Government were determined to quit India, they got all the Leaders together, took pains and brought about the required agreement and Independence was granted. In this way if the Prime Minister, who is a great leader of India, convenes a meeting or a conference of all the parties concerned, I am sure that it is not very difficult to arrive at an agreement. The Prime Minister said that he had been in touch with several people in Andhra. I may tell him that he has been in touch with only the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee people and none else. The Congress Leaders in Andhra have forfeited the confidence of the people in Andhra Desha. The President, and other office bearers and the members of the Working Committee were all defeated in the elections. Not even one Andhra Minister was elected to the legislature. So the Prime Minister has not consulted the proper persons.

Swami Sitaram, the veteran leader of the Andhra movement, has launched satyagraha. Before that it was found difficult for the Prime Minister to give an interview to him. Ultimately of course the Prime Minister interviewed him. That was very kind of him. That is a different matter altogether. If the Central Government has a mind, they can consider it.

Then Dr. Ramaswamy Mudaliar, the learned hon. Member of this House, was speaking about the claim of Tamilians over the city of Madras. He said round about 30 miles from Madras city there were Tamilian temples. But I will ask him whether Chennapatnam which is the original name of the city of Madras is Tamilian. Is that name Tamilian or Telugu ; Chennapatnam is cent per cent a Telugu name.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: We have gone up to Himalayan Province.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : Let this question be referred to a boundary commission or arbitration. Let an impartial body decide this question of areas which are in dispute.

Sir, this demand for an Andhra Province has been going on for the last 40 years. Then we were told by the Congress leaders who are the present rulers not to have any diversion from the national fight and when we got independence, we could have this Andhra Province. That was the reason why we did not press this question and we made great sacrifices. The Andhras' properties were sold away in our fight for independence and they were killed and lathi-charged. They were put into jails and today this is the prize for them. They are not being given what they were promised then. Provinces like Orissa and Sind with very much less resources were created whereas Andhra was not, because Andhra efficiently boycotted the Simon Commission in the interest of National fight. Andhra has very mighty rivers. It is a surplus area. Andhra area is about 70,000 sq. miles. It is very rich in natural resources. It has most fertile land. Out of a total of one crore of acres under paddy that is grown in the Madras State, Andhra alone counts for 47,00,000 acres. About fifty per cent. of other foodgrains and seventy per cent. of

tobacco are cultivated on the Andhra land. And as a Province we shall be quite self-sufficient. We shall not need any special subvention from the Central Government. Now we are being continuously exploited by the other people as we are in a minority. We cannot improve our literature. We cannot improve our industry and agriculture. We have a mighty river Krishna. There is the Nandakonda project. If that is implemented, the people of Andhra can get the benefit of that. Strangely enough, they are planning to take away the water to South of Madras by implementing Krishna—Pennar Scheme. But how is it possible to develop ourselves now ? It is a life and death question. Let us therefore place our respective claims before a tribunal or a boundary commission and let it decide all these things. It has been said by the Leader of the House that we are not claiming Madras exclusively for ourselves. Let all these things be decided by arbitration, before which we can place our respective claims. Let this question be decided by the Prime Minister himself or by Acharya Vinobha Bhave or by Dr. Rajendra Prasad. We have absolutely no objection to that, Sir.

And one more thing, Sir, and that is a very important thing. We see in the papers that the Congress Members of this House are going to vote against the Resolution. But several Members of the Congress have supported the Resolution. It is very strange that Members supporting this Resolution will be voting against it. That is against their very conscience. On the face of it that looks very ridiculous and degrading.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : That is a misfortune.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA: I should say this is worse than even autocracy. It is an atrocious thing. Members are not being allowed the freedom to vote in any way they like. The hon. Members have spoken in favour of this Resolution and if they are going to vote against it, I wonder what their constituencies will be thinking about them!

It is a terrible thing that under the Congress regime we are experiencing such practices. I feel that Pandit Nehruji is afraid of the formation of linguistic provinces. He feels that if this demand is conceded, demands for Uttar Khand in Bengal, Sikhistan in Punjab, Maha Gujarat, Vishala Andhra, United Karnataka, Samyukta Maharashtra and so many other demands will crop up.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY : The Prime Minister is not against the Resolution. The Prime Minister has conceded it.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : Conceded it in principle. I owe a certain amount to a certain man. I always say, " I will pay ", " I will pay", but I never pay. What do you mean by his having conceded it ? We want it now. Do you mean to say that this Government is always going to sit here ? Because they are here now, we are approaching them. This demand has been before them for the last five years. Shri H. D. Rajah, though he does not belong to Andhra, has supported the demand that an Andhra State should be formed. In broad outline, he has supported it. Mr. K. Rama Rao who is a very senior member of the Congress Party and so many other Congress members have supported the Resolution, as strongly as if they were seconders of the resolution. When such is the case, why should not the members be allowed the freedom to vote as their conscience dictates ? Instead of that, they are not being given any freedom. I hope they will disobey the mandate of the Congress High Command and vote for the Resolution—I mean without any outside intervention.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh) : Why not withdraw the Resolution with grace ?

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : When so many members of the Congress Party have supported the Resolution you ask me to withdraw the Resolution with grace. If there is any grace on the part of the Government, they should accept the Resolution in view of the statement in the other House.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: They say it is an antediluvian Resolution.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : I might tell you that this Andhra movement has gained momentum and it may be that now conservative leader, the champion of Andhra cause Swami Sitaram, with Shri Ramalinga Reddy, M. Narayanarao, O. Subbatata Raju, Dr. A. S. Chalapatarao, N. V. Chalapate, P. Subbarao, my humble self and a host of others, is leading the movement. If Government will not help us at this stage, I am sure the movement will get into the hands of the revolutionaries and it may well be that this Government cannot put it down, because it is not a foreign Government. This Government cannot shoot people wholesale as the British Government used to do. I would request the Government to concede this while the movement is still under the leadership of conservative people. I request the Government to declare the Andhra Province immediately and to refer the disputed territories like the Madras City to an impartial body. I appeal to the Government once again to accept the Resolution and alternatively I request the Members to vote in favour of the Resolution.

PROF. G. RANGA : In view of the assurance from the hon. the Prime Minister and the Leader of the House that they would try to use their good offices to help our people in the South to come to the maximum possible degree of agreement, it would be proper, it would be only in the fitness of things, that my hon. friend must be gracious enough to withdraw the Resolution.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : In view of the statement made by the Prime Minister, in the fitness of things the Leader of the House should graciously accept the Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I will put the Resolution to the vote. The question is :

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.

The House divided :

12.45 p.m.

AYES—26

Abdul Razak, Shri.
Banerjee, Shri S.
Bhanj Deo, Shri P. C.
Deshmukh, Shri N. B.
Dhange, Shri V. K.
Dhillon, Shri G. S.
Dwivedy, Shri S.
George, Shri K. C.
Ghose, Shri B. C.
Ghosh, Principal Devaprasad.
Gupta, Shri B.
Imbichibava.
Kakkilaya, Shri B. V.
Kishen Chand, Shri.
Mahanty, Shri S.
Manjuran, Shri M.
Mazumdar, Shri S. N.
Misra, Shri C. G.
Narasimham, Shri K. L.
Narayana, Shri P. V.
Ranawat, Shri M. S.
Rath, Shri B.
Raut, Shri R. B.
Reddy, Shri C. G. K.
Sundarayya, Shri P.
Suryanarayana, Shri K.

NOES—114

Abdul Shakoor, Molana.
Abid Ali, Shri.
Agarwal, Shri B. P.
Agrawal, Shri A. N.
Agrawal, Shri J. P.
Ahmad Hussain, Kazi.
Aizaz Rasul, Begam.
Akhtar Hussain, Shri.
Alva, Shrimati Violet.
Amolakh Chand, Shri.
Anant Ram, Pandit.
Barlingay, Dr. W. S.
Beed, Shri I. B.
Bhuyan, Dr. S. K.

Bisht, Shri J. S.
Biswasroy, Shri R.
Borooah, Shri L.
Budh Singh, Sardar.
Chandravati Lakhanpal, Shrimati.
Chauhan, Shri N. S.
Das, Shri Jagannath.
Dave, Shri S. P.
Deogirikar, Shri T. R.
Deshmukh, Shri R. M.
Dinkar, Prof.
Doogar, Shri R. S.
Dube, Dr. R. P.
Dube, Pandit S.
Faruqi, Maulana M.
Gilder, Dr. M. D. D.
Gopal, Shri V. G.
Gopalaswami, Shri N.
Hathi, Shri J. L.
Hedge, Shri K. S.
Hemrom, Shri S. M.
Hensman, Shrimati Mona.
Italia, Shri D. D.
Jafar Imam, Shri.
Jain, Shri S. P.
Jalali, Aga S. M.
Kapoor, Shri J. R.
Karayalar, Shri S. C.
Kaushal, Shri J. N.
Keshvanand, Swami.
Khan, Shri A. S.
Khan, Shri P. M.
Khan, Shri Samiullah.
Kishori Ram, Shri.
Lakshmi Menon, Shrimati.
Lal Bahadur, Shri.
Lall, Shri K. B.
Lilavati Munshi, Shrimati.
Madhavan Nair, Shri K. P.
Majumdar, Shri S. C.
Malkani, Prof. N. R.
Maya Devi Chettry, Shrimati.
Misra, Shri S. D.
Mitra, Dr. P. C.
Mookerji, Dr. Radha Kumud.
Mudaliar, Dr. A. R.
Majumdar, Shri M. R.
Mukerjee, Shri B. K.
Nagoke, Jathedar, U. S.
Narayan, Shri D.
Narayana, Shri P. V.
Narayanappa, Shri K.
Nihal Singh, Shri.
Onkar Nath, Shri.
Pande, Shri T.
Parikh, Shri C. P.
Pattabiraman, Shri T. S.
Pawar, Shri D. Y.
Pheruman, Sardar D. S.
Pillai, Shri C. N.
Podar, Shri R. A.
Prasad, Shri Behron.
Puri, Shri M. L.
Pushpalata Das, Shrimati.
Pustake, Shri T. D.
Raghu Vira, Dr.
Rahmath Ullah, Shri.
Rajagopalan, Shri G.
Rao, Shri Venkat.
Rao, Shri Rama.
Ray, Shri S. P.
Reddy, Shri Channa.
Reddy, Shri Govinda.
Saksena, Shri H. P.
Sambhu Prasad, Shri.
Sarwate, Shri V. S.
Savitry Nigam, Shrimati.
Seeta Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati.
Shah, Shri M. C.
Sharda Bhargava, Shrimati.
Sharma, Shri B. B.
Shetty, Shri Basappa.
Shoila Bala Das, Shrimati.
Singh, Babu Gopinath.
Singh, Shri Kartar.
Singh, Shri R. K.
Sinha, Shri R. B.
Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap.
Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
Sobhani, Shri O.
Surendra Ram, Shri V. M.
Tamta, Shri R. P.
Tankha, Pandit S. S. N.
Tayyebulla, Maulana M.
Thakur Das, Shri.
Thanhlira, Shri R.
Thimmabobi, Shri L. H.
Vaidya, Shri K. D.
Valiulla, Shri M.
Venkataraman, Shri S.

The motion was negatived.

The Council then adjourned till a quarter past eight of the clock on Tuesday, the 22nd July 1952.