

wanted to know from the hon. Minister if per chance the hon. Member had set out any reasons for his resigning, in the letter addressed to him, on which the motion is based, and, if so, that information might be given. I am not going to allow Prof. Mathew here to tell us the reason why he resigned and the other Members here to ask him why he resigned.

ANDHRA STATE BILL—Contd.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): May I know, Sir, when the general discussion on this will conclude?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have already fixed seven days exclusive of the half day on Friday. I originally thought that three days would be enough for the general consideration and then four days might be spent on the clause-by-clause consideration and the last day for winding up the debate, that is the third reading. I have got a list of names of Members who want to speak. I have been giving preference to Andhra Members, then to Tamil Nad Members, then to Mysore Members, then to Hyderabad Members and then to other Members also.

An Hon. Member: Malabar Members?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Malabar Members also want to speak because they are in the residuary State. Therefore, if the House wants that we should have general discussion tomorrow also, then after the general discussion the clause-by-clause discussion will be reduced to two days instead of three days. After the hon. Members have discussed almost every matter in the general discussion, the same arguments will not be repeated and the matter may be put before the House. May I know how many Members want to speak?

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would say that instead of finishing the general discussion today, I will call upon the hon. Home Minister to reply to the

general debate tomorrow at about 12-15.

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): Very good, Sir.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): I may bring it to your notice, Sir, that Members from other States also wish to participate in the discussion.

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal—West Cuttack): Sir, proposals have been made in this for adding to Orissa parts from Andhra. Orissa Members want to take part in it. On the previous occasion they were not allowed. I urge upon you, Sir, that Orissa Members should be given an opportunity.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will try to call all hon. Members who are really affected or, at any rate, believe they are affected by this Andhra Bill.

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes): The Bill has been under discussion for the past three days. A number of Tamil Nad Members have not been called upon to speak. We have got our own grievances to give expression to and I do hope more chance will be given to Tamil Nad Members.

Shri C. R. Chowdary (Narasaraopet): As a result of bitter, hard and strenuous struggle, we will have now a truncated Andhra State as per the provisions of this Bill. The Bill is defective in content and form. A casual reading of the Objects and Reasons stated in the Bill discloses that the Bill is brought before the House as any other measure is brought, warranted to meet situations. It is not because it is a first step in furtherance of the recognised principle to adjust the existing States on a linguistic basis.

As a matter of fact, though in theory the Centre is agreeable to adjustments of existing States on the language basis, in practice it is against it for its own reasons, which everybody knows well. The situation that developed in Andhra last year.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member will kindly resume his seat. There is a lot of noise. The hon. Member must be heard by others. Let us see how long they will take to settle down. I have got here four amplifiers and even the least noise that is made is magnified four times.

Shri C. R. Chowdary: The situation that developed in Andhra last year brooked no further delay and forced the present Great Moghuls of Delhi to act at once to form the Andhra State. It was the manifestation of the will of the people of Andhra in concrete form that presented itself to the rulers of the country. There was no way out except to concede the formation of Andhra State.

What is it that this Bill gives to the Andhras? Is it the Visala Andhra which is the demand of the Andhras? No, Sir. Large portions of Andhra territories alongside the Andhra boundary are left in various adjoining States. That means the struggle for realisation of their noble objective is not yet over and they have to fight for some more time to come. You may rest assured that no Andhra will sit idle at rest till the Visala Andhra is formed. This is an age of the people and nobody, however powerful he or she may be, can afford to ignore them and their voice.

For the reasons stated above, I support this Bill with a feeling of frustration for the time being, but hopeful of achieving the objective in no far distant future.

Broadly speaking there are four or five matters which are of utmost importance for consideration of this House. Number one is the boundary. This is a matter which shall be decided precisely without scope for dispute between the parties concerned. The large chunks of Andhra territories that are situated in the border districts of the State of residuary Madras, that is, Chingleput, Salem, North Arcot and the Tamil territory situated in the district of Chittoor and likewise, the large territories of Andhra in Mysore

State, that is, Kolar, Chitaldrug, Tumkur and the Kannadiga parts in Bellary district shall be adjusted and boundary fixed by mutual agreement, or appointment of a commission or commissions with warrants of appropriate references based on principles of democracy and fair play. Where the situation is such that it cannot be resolved otherwise, a plebiscite may be held.

The Bill, as it stands contains no provision on this aspect. We are left with mere statements and assurances from time to time made by the Leader of the House and the hon. Minister of States. We had enough of these promises. Very recently it was stated by the Leader of the House on the floor of this House that the appointment of boundary commission is a matter for the States concerned, and not of the Centre. This is in conflict with a prior statement made by the Leader of the House himself. I am unable to understand the implications of this statement, and would appreciate a clear statement as to whether it is the duty of the Centre or whether it is the duty of the States concerned to take the necessary steps to settle the boundaries between the States that are fighting for the disputed areas.

So far as the States of residuary Madras and Andhra are concerned, they are agreeable to settle the matter either by mutual agreement or on appointment of a boundary commission. This has been indicated by the Madras Legislature in its resolution, dated the 18th July 1953 moved by Shri T. N. Venkatasubba Reddy. In the interests of the States concerned and the country at large the Home Minister may be pleased to take such steps that may be deemed necessary for the appointment of a boundary commission or commissions within a year of the appointed day failing which the consequences will be grave, serious and disastrous.

The Mysore and Andhra boundary is also likewise fraught with explosive points and it requires immediate settlement. The Bill fails to provide clauses to settle the boundaries. It

looks as though the intent of the Government is to allow the parties to fight and quarrel so that they may approach the Centre on bended knees for settlement. This is not the proper approach to the subject. It should be correct and that too without further delay.

The second matter for consideration is the apportionment of assets and liabilities of the Madras State among the residuary State, Andhra and Mysore. Popular demand in this respect is to effect the division of assets and liabilities on the basis of population on the recommendations of an expert committee to be presided over by a Judge of the Supreme Court. This sentiment of the people found expression in the amendment, dated the 24th July 1953 moved by Shri T. Vishwanathan, the Deputy Leader of the P. S. Party in the Madras Legislature. Again the same story repeats itself. The idea of the Centre is to allow the parties to quarrel first and then approach them on bended knees for settlement. The Andhras do not believe that the apportionment of assets and liabilities in accordance with the directions and principle laid down in the Seventh Schedule would result in fair and equitable settlement. Then there is no other way out than to get the matter settled by an expert committee. This will not come in the way of the steps to be taken for the formation of the Andhra State on the appointed day. This method alone will enable the parties to part as friends. The existing provisions of this Bill will give scope for strife and discord.

The other point that merits consideration is the provision about services. We are in entire agreement with the provision relating to the services contained in the Bill.

Number four is the Tungabhadra project. This project is now a three-State project. The moneys that are spent for construction of this project, either on revenue account or on public debt account shall be borne by the State of Mysore in proportion to the benefits it derives. The entrance of

Mysore on the scene is strange and mysterious. On what recognised principle Mysore came into the picture, the Bill is silent. Equally strange are the demands that have been made by the Mysore State authorities. We are glad to find that no effect is given to them in this Bill. Fairness and decency expect that when Mysore is anxious to receive the Kannadiga portions of the Madras State, it shall give away the Andhra portions to the Andhra State. Having miserably failed in this respect it does not like to keep quite but prefers to put forth all sorts of unreasonable and unsustainable claims with a view to exploit the situation to its maximum advantage and benefit. With this attitude of Mysore, is it possible to expect settlement on the issue of the Tungabhadra project as contemplated in the Bill? The chances are remote. Once again the old story repeats itself. The Centre expects settlement among the parties first, failing which they expect us to approach them for advice and settlement. This shall be prevented. The only way to prevent this is to create a board consisting of representatives of the States concerned to be presided over by a representative of the Centre to manage, administer, and develop the project without change of the original character and purpose. The vague provisions in the Bill fail to satisfy the Andhras. Failing this the project would prove to be a colossal waste not only to the Andhras, but also to the Mysoreans and the Hydrabadis as also to the nation at large.

Then, I would like to say a word about the capital and its location. Nobody can deny the fact that power to decide this issue is with the Andhra Legislature. Nobody can fetter the discretion or take away that power from it. The expediency of the situation warranted to direct, the Speaker of the Madras Assembly to convene the conference of the Andhra legislators for the purpose of deciding a place for location of temporary capital. The word "temporary" raises a question of doubt. Would it mean that the place to be named shall be the temporary capital of Andhra till Vishal Andhra

[Shri C. R. Chowdary]

is formed with Hyderabad as its capital or would it mean that it would be a temporary capital till after the legislature of Andhra decides by way of regular motion at its meeting? I wish to have a categorical reply to the question. The people—even those who are alleged to have voted in the Conference of May and June—are sufficiently confused on this issue. Naturally, it cannot be otherwise because the voting was conducted on most questionable lines. The votes were made to be cast at the behest of leaders who were behind the scenes by arrangement of power and position in Andhra as if it is their patrimony to deal with it.

The decision taken in the Conference has already caused incalculable mischief in Andhra resulting in division on regional and communal basis. The capital issue has already assumed political colour. But when the people were informed of the same, they were taken by surprise and reacted at once, to know the cause and basis for such a decision. The Public disapproval of the decision is reflected in the resolution passed in July by the Madras-Andhra Legislature. The intrigue and conspiracy is, once again broken and smashed.

We are glad to note that the Bill keeps open the question of location of Andhra capital for decision by the Andhra Legislature. Now, the Andhra capital issue is before the people. No one legislator dare now wag his tail on this issue for his personal gains, if he desires to go again to the people. It is just and reasonable to take such steps as may be necessary to convene a Conference of the Andhra legislators and decide the issue before the appointed day, failing which, the consequences may cost very much to the Andhra State and the country in general. The location of the capital should be above board. The consensus of opinion of the Andhra public must be respected and given effect to. The State of Andhra, as could be visualised, has to face many a political and economic problem.

It is strange to note that it is the desire of the Leader of the House, to gain experience, through the experiment of this State as to whether or not to adjust the States on linguistic basis. I or anybody else could attach importance to this statement if the Andhra State is formed on the basis of adjustment of States on linguistic basis, then to speak of experience for future action on the same principle would sound well. But how can this be an experiment for future action? Let me assure the House and the people that Andhra would serve well to delay the cherished desires of those people who are divided and oppressed by the denial of States of their own. That is the principle on which this Bill is drafted and placed before this House, with no modification or alteration, or addition, to the Bill submitted to Madras and Mysore Assemblies except in some minor matters of detail.

Shri B. Das (Jaipur-Keonjhar): I feel gratified that I am participating in the debate which will usher in the new Andhra State. The appointed day for this purpose previously was to be 26th January 1950 but thanks to the difficulties and troubles amongst Andhra leaders today we can see that the appointed day shall have to be 1st October 1953. Yet one hears the criticism from certain discontented Andhra leaders that there is no use having the appointed day as 1st October 1953. It can be postponed. I refer to my old friend Prof. Ranga who made such speeches recently at certain places. It was Prof. Ranga and my own revered friend Mr. Prakasam who did not accept the Andhra State on 26th January 1950. Had they accepted it, the Constituent Assembly which postponed its deliberations for days and days in November, 1949 would have gladly incorporated the Andhra State in the Constitution.

In 1932-33, I accepted the Orissa State only with six districts. Later it became 13 districts and it may become more districts if the boundary commission for all India comes into existence.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Your appetite is great.

Shri B. Das: My appetite is not greater than my friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram's. When Andhra State is carved out, Andhras will be my happy Southern neighbours. Let us not think of others' beautiful wives others' beautiful possessions. Let us create Andhra State first. That is my advice to my numerous Andhra friends in this House and all throughout India.

My friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram is not satisfied with the distribution of assets and liabilities. I am one of those who never doubt the India Government officials' honesty and sincerity in the matter of distribution of assets or liabilities.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri (Azamgarh Distt.—East cum Ballia Distt.—West): What about Madras Government?

Shri B. Das: I will come to that later. When Sind and Orissa were separated, we relied on Central Government officials of the time. They allocated the assets and liabilities and we accepted the allocation. We never regretted. It is like two brothers parting company. Sind was the younger or smaller brother of Bombay, and Orissa was the younger brother of Bihar. We did not murmur over a lakh of rupees or crore of rupees. We wanted to part company as friends, and no Bihari will dare say that the Oriyas had ever differed from the Biharis in small matters, assets and so on.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): You got Jagannath and everything.

Shri B. Das: We had confidence in God. And I would advise my friends to have confidence in God, in Lord Jagannath, and also in Minister Giri. He is born in Orissa. His sister has been a representative in the Orissa Assembly until last year, Shri Giri is a much loved friend of Orissa, is an Andhra leader and has a house in Madras city

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Riding three horses at the same time.

Shri B. Das: I was pleased when my friend the Finance Minister stated yesterday that the Comptroller and Auditor-General is there to see that there would be proper distribution of assets and liabilities. My eminent economist friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram forgets that the Comptroller and Auditor-General is there to see that there is justice, that Madras City does not get into the brain of the Madras Government officials as it has gone into the brains of some of the Andhra leaders. Why are you afraid of a heterogeneous city or heterogeneous system of Government that exists in Madras? When we part as friends let us part as the best of friends. I did not like the jeering or the speech that my hon. friend Mr. Venkataraman made. When two brothers are parting, the elder brother who has much wealth need not sneer at the younger brother. In the speech of most of the Tamilian Members that have spoken I felt a tone of that feeling that "we are rich, we are wealthy, let the little brother go and beg from the Government of India."

I am grateful to Dr. Katju for one thing. He has governed Orissa and he has known the poor people's difficulties. He announced: Whatever be the deficit of Andhra in the matter of undevelopment, let them put their difficulties before the Government of India. The Andhras are rich in culture, in national development and in thought of peace and harmony. Let them work out their plans. Let them put them, not so much before the Planning Commission—let it be before the Planning Commission— but before the Government of India. And it is the primary duty of the Government of India to see that proper development of Andhra State is their first concern. And I do hope that the Planning Commission will give it the first priority so that the Andhra State can rise equal to any other State—as I also feel that Orissa State should rise equal to every other State in India.

Incidentally I may give one word of advice to the hon. Home Minister. If he can see his way to drop all the C Class States, the little brats that

[Shri B. Das]

move round him always pull his cloths and give him worries—I am talking of the ten C Class State—if my friend can drop them and push them into the neighbouring States, lots of money will be saved and that money can go to the development of great States like Andhra and other States. I do not at present—this is not the occasion for me to—plead for Orissa. I will plead at the right moment. When I say right moment I mean this. A small boundary commission may come for settling things in connection with the formation of the Andhra State. I am not concerned with it. When in the Constituent Assembly we adopted article 3 of the Constitution, from that day I have buried my hatchet. I have not asked for one bit of ground for Orissa, because India's independent and sovereign status, peace and happiness require that the hornets' nest of linguistic adjustment should not be stirred under article 3. But if in the wisdom of the present Government, my Government—because I am a participant and a lieutenant of the Government—if they feel the time has come to appoint a commission to go into this whole question of linguistic redistribution of States—I hope they will think ten times before doing it, there will be enough trouble over us—then of course I will be again an old warrior, I will fight for what is Orissa's due, if I am alive. I have been ill for the last six months and I am glad that my first speech in this House after five or six months is on the Andhra Bill, on the unity and harmony of India and not on disunity.

I have heard the speeches made here. I am sorry I heard those statements. Younger people have younger sentiments. Older people want harmony, peace, friendliness, unity.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): You want a static world.

Shri B. Das: My friend, if he comes to my age, and is alive—I knew his grandfather, the late **Shri Bhupendra Nath Basu**, he was a friend of mine—my very young friend will find that the

so-called static world is the continuity of the world and not the flashy language that we occasionally hear on the floor of this House and that leads us nowhere.

I do appeal to my Andhra friends: let us have respect over constitutional procedure. Unfortunately, except you, Sir, there are very few present here who participated in the framing of the Constitution. And we did it only on 26th January, 1950.

[**SARDAR HUKAM SINGH** in the Chair]

So let us follow the Constitution and look to the harmony of the country. Let us not, before the ink is dry from the paper on which we have signed the Constitution, try to criticise it.

I am a lover of the Andhra culture. The Andhras were and are great people, a great nation. A nation does not become great merely by the number of people. They become great by their culture, by their contribution to the civilisation, of their own and of India and to the civilisation of the world. I have supported these forty years the formation of the Andhra State. I was then fighting for the creation of Orissa State. Our agitation was a little bit longer than the Andhra people's. I believe theirs is a great culture. It is one of those products of the ancient Sanskrit culture in South India, Sanskrit Culture and ancient Sanskrit principles. My hon. friends who think that by numbers they can attain a higher culture, are wrong. Let them be united to think in their own language and culture and contribute to the art, music and culture and to the development of science, economic and social harmony, at the same time, for the united progressive development of India. If anybody in this House thinks that if Andhra State is not created there will be war, thinks on wrong lines and in wrong terms. I may remind at least **Dr. Lanka Sundaram** a student of the League of Nations, that the League of Nations could not solve any minority problem. They went up to 20 per cent. inclusion of minorities in a State; but they could not solve even in one European country the:

minority problem. In India, there will always be minorities. This Parliament is the League of Nations of India. It is very difficult, unless there is mutual confidence, to solve any problem.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: We want justice more than confidence.

Shri B. Das: Justice, we all shall have. With our combined knowledge and combined effort, there will be justice. I would only suggest this. This is not the occasion for discussing any boundary adjustment. This is an occasion to give a hearty send off to our Andhra brethren to have their State. Let us now talk henceforth in that spirit. Let us wish the Andhras well. If they can get a slice from anywhere, even from Orissa, let us discuss that after three or five years, after that State is established well.

Shri Jaipal Singh: (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I thank you for enabling me to give vent to the feelings of the jungles in regard to this question of creation of provinces.

I join the army of people who are thoroughly disappointed with Dr. Katju. I had hoped that he would have taken advantage of this Bill to propound the pattern that would be adopted in the future in regard to the question of re-alignment of States. That he has not done, deliberately.

Dr. Katju: That is right.

Shri Jaipal Singh: His calculated silence on the subject is damnable; I condemn it. While I do not want to stand in the way of the formation of the Andhra State, I regret its formation on a purely linguistic basis. I oppose it. I feel that if you are going to form provinces purely on the ground of languages, there shall be only 14 provinces in this country. According to the Constitution, there are only 14 languages on the list. One of them is Urdu. When is Dr. Katju going to introduce a Bill for the formation of an Urdu State? When is my hon. friend Seth Govind Das going to compel the Government to introduce a Bill for the formation of a Sanskrit State? All over the country, this question of language is, as it were, dividing one group

from another. I am totally opposed to the formation of States purely on grounds of language. Language may be a very important factor. But, people who talk of language being the most important factor forget what will happen to themselves. Only yesterday Mr. Chatterjee bemoaned the non-fulfilment of what Mr. C. R. Das and Pandit Motilal Nehru had said. He was turning his thoughts to robbing of territory from my great province of Bihar. I am sorry he is not here. I would like to ask him, what is going to happen to Darjeeling. Is that not a Bihari speaking area? Will the people of West Bengal stand by their word and give every inch of territory where Bengali is not spoken? We have become, unfortunately, a very dishonest people in regard to the question of the census. Ever since 1911, when for the first time a certain amount of militancy entered the census, which otherwise would have been a reservoir of most valuable information, the census figures in regard to languages have been vitiated right and left. Let the Andhra State take a census of the City of Madras. You will find immediately that the City of Madras has to go to the Andhras. On the other hand, if you get the residuary State of Madras to take the census, the picture is the other way round. Today you go to Manbhum. Everything has become Hindi-speaking overnight! Some such picture is the order of the day. On the ground of forming provinces on language, I oppose the Bill wholeheartedly. I do not want to stand in the way of the formation of the Andhra State. But, let the Andhra State be an administrative State. Whatever we do in the future, let it be on administrative grounds, which would include language, history, geography, strategy and a host of other things, which would go to make this country stronger and greater: not because there is a parochial group which wants an island for its satrapy. If I had my own way, I would abolish all the provinces and the straws, tin gods, that are occupying Government Houses, costing the country a great deal of money. Instead of uniting this country, this language

[Shri Jaipal Singh]

business is splitting up the country and making it weaker and weaker. I am all for Maha Bharat. We have been hearing of Vishal Andhra; you hear Maharashtra from Mr. Gadgil; you hear from Mr. Tulsidas Kilachand of Maha Gujerat; you hear from Seth Govind Das of Maha Koshal; I demand Maha Jharkhand.

10 A.M.

Shri Gadgil: You are on a par with us

Shri Jaipal Singh: I am glad that the Father of the House has just preceded me. There is no doubt whatever that if he and I had been together when he was trying to get Orissa, the whole history of India would have been different. I would have claimed from Chattisgarh right to the sea coast as one province. Today, let us think of strategy also. My hon young friends ask, why do you not plead for the re-union of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. I would ask my hon. friend Dr. Katju this. He knows Orissa very well. I think he knows West Bengal also. He certainly let Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee know that. I think he has travelled in Bihar also. I would ask him to examine this question whether the demand of these young friends is worth consideration or not

I said that I stood for administrative provinces. In that I include, as I say, matters of strategy. We cannot let language interfere in the matter of our frontier provinces. Supposing you go on the basis of language only. What is going to happen to the State of Assam? Different languages are spoken in each one of these hills. If you want a province merely on the basis of language, I say, no. There may be other considerations for the creation of a province. In this connection I would like to read to you a portion of the presidential address given at the 5th annual general meeting of the Coal Consumers Association of India. I do hope my hon. friend will listen to this and then go to sleep. The president said:

"Since 1947, both the Engineering Association of India and the Coal Consumers Association of India have been urging upon the Government, in order to have better land and air defence in war and for better administration in peace, the formation of a separate industrial province under the Centre, comprising the two great coal fields and steel works of Bihar and Bengal together with their subsidiaries and the Government projects of Chittaranjan Locomotive Works, Sindri Fertiliser Factory, Bokaro and Damodar Valley Power-stations, etc...."

In other words, carve out an industrial province and the name of this industrial province is Jharkhand.

Shri Gadgil: The cat is out of the bag.

Dr. Katju: Coal province?

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri A. C. Guba): I think the hon. Member will allow the whole of West Bengal to be co-opted into this new province.

Shri Jaipal Singh: If the hon. Minister says that I want a coal province, he is talking the language of *kalapani*. If he wants a *kala* province, he will have to go to *kalapani*.

There is a certain amount of dispute about capitals being in the same State. I find that as things are at present there are two States that have their capitals in the same place, Simla. There is the Punjab and the Himachal Pradesh.

An Hon. Member: Punjab may be moving to Chandigarh.

Shri Jaipal Singh: That is all right. At the present moment they are still at Simla. Well, as I have said earlier, I am very disturbed at the turn the Government of the day has given to this question of re-alignment of provinces. I do hope they will lose no time in assuring the country as to

what they intend to do about other people who are crying for States. I do hope that at the third reading of the Bill either the Leader of the House or my hon. friend there will give some picture, which will assure us all not only here but outside—the country at large—that this is the pattern that the Government is going to follow in the consideration of the creation of new provinces; otherwise, it might become a very unhappy scene and many of us may have to resort to the same unfortunate and sorry technique that my friends from Andhra followed to which the Government of the day had to surrender. We would much rather that the development of new States should follow a constitutional fight and not the technique that has been followed. I think it is a very sorry state of affairs in this country, particularly at the present moment, for the Government of the day has not got the courage to place before the country that it stands for certain fundamental principles in regard to the formation of a new State.

With these few remarks I give my blessings to my hon. friends from truncated Andhra. I give them support because I shall need theirs when my turn comes. So, it is not a matter of courtesy when I give my blessings. As my hon. friend Mr. Das said, we are not parting. We are only building two different houses but we still belong to the same family and I shall certainly not be sorry if later on they expand their house and improve it in order to live more comfortably.

Shri Gadgil: I have listened to the very forceful speech of my old friend, who stands for Jharkhand. I was almost converted to his line of argument when he mentioned Maha Bharat, but when he stated later that he stood for Maha Jharkhand, I immediately recovered my balance.

Yesterday, Shri Kripalani made a speech. Now, there are certain cate-

gories of human beings with respect to whose actions it is very difficult to divine or define their exact motives. Those categories are geniuses and lunatics. Undoubtedly Acharya Kripalani belongs to the former group. So far as I remember he still considers the Mahatma as his spiritual and political guru. The first resolution about the formation of linguistic provinces was passed in 1922 when Mahatma Gandhi sponsored it. From that time till yesterday Acharya Kripalani who had been the Secretary of the great Congress organisation, its President and a member of the Congress Working Committee never spoke one word against this. Not only this but it is possible for me to dig out some of his past utterances to show that he was in favour of it. Not only this but the manifesto of the Praja Party shows that formation of linguistic provinces is one of its pet children. Even the combined Praja Socialist Party has not yet denounced the formation of linguistic provinces. On the other hand, wherever it is a question of winning the election they have gone out of their way and emphasized it. This resolution was passed in 1922 and during the last 30 years it has become part and parcel of our political life and conduct. It would be a tragedy of no small scale if we reverse the whole thing now and tell the people: "No linguistic provinces; you must continue to remain in the present state of affairs, however absurd that may be."

I am glad to note that the attitude of the Government has changed from the negative to the positive. Some time ago the Government and the great Congress organization took a very negative attitude that if all the interests agreed then the formation of a particular State was possible. Now the Government has taken a positive attitude that it will be Government's responsibility to bring about as much agreement as possible between the conflicting interests and with that view the Government has

[Shri Gadgil]

announced the appointment of a high power commission. That commission will undoubtedly enquire into this and the scope of that commission will be not only that language will be taken into consideration but other matters as well, like the security of this great country, economic viability and so on and so forth.

I would like to define certain conditions at the preliminary stage before any step is taken for the formation of a province. One would be minimum territory; the second would be minimum population and the third would be minimum resources. This is necessary in order not to overdo a good thing. If you have so many languages and dialects and if every region, however small it may be, claims a separate State, we must prevent it in the highest interest of the country. Yesterday, it was stated that this whole thing is anti-national, disruptive and destructive of the great unity of Maha Bharat. If during the struggle for freedom this cry of linguistic provinces was necessary to rally round under one banner all the people speaking different languages, it is a greater necessity today when we are trying to turn our freedom into an instrument of prosperity and progress. I am of the view that no Government can secure full-hearted and full-throated co-operation from the people unless what they have held as very important during the last thirty years is considered and that is exactly what the Government have decided to do by agreeing to appoint a sort of re-organisation commission. We are under a federal Constitution. What are the political assumptions behind this Constitution? The moment you say that this is a federal Constitution, it presupposes certain things such as that it has a vast territory; that you have to administer it and it is necessary in the interest of efficiency of the administration that there should be component areas called States and without that it is not possi-

ble to run a big country like this under one unitary system of Government. Secondly, a federal Constitution assumes that there are regional interests, provincial interests, geographical interests, historical interests and apparently there are conflicts between many of them and hence it is the function of a federal Constitution to evolve a Constitution, make provisions so that there will be co-ordination and a central directing authority. It is on these assumptions that our federal Constitution has been based, and there has been a proper division of power, a proper division of resources and all those things which are of central importance and which must remain controlled and manipulated by the central authority have been left in the hands of the Central Government. So far as questions of security, questions of communications, questions of commerce, questions of overall economic policy are concerned, they are eminently matters within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Centre. It is nobody's case, it is not the argument of those who are asking for Andhra, those who are asking for Maharashtra, Maha Gujerat and Maha Koshal or any Maha province, that those things which are reserved by the Constitution for the Central Government should be given over to them, either to manage better or to mismanage. It is on those assumptions as embodied in the Constitution having been accepted that the claims are made in the interests of better efficiency. It is not a question that if the Andhra experiment fails, this will be given up. As I understand the Government's policy, it has nothing to do with the success or otherwise of Andhra. The Government have, and very wisely, decided to reorganize the States because that was Question No. 2. Question No. 1 was attainment of Freedom and unity, and Question No. 2 to organise and order the State in such a manner as to give maximum satisfaction to those local instincts of patriotism, local interests, so that maximum satisfaction and co-opera-

tion may be available in the sphere of nation-building activities.

Now, the situation has certain implications. If Andhra as it is today is not sufficient or is not viable, it is no case for scrapping it. It is a clear case for doing what is logical, viz., the division and disintegration of Hyderabad. I have never seen such a political monstrosity as the constitution of Hyderabad today. It is there today because of the *zulum* and force used by the dynasty that was ruling there. The present Nizam is responsible morally and constitutionally for all the atrocities that have been done by the *Razakars*. You have given an assurance to the public of Hyderabad that they will be given an opportunity to decide their political set-up. You must fulfil that promise. And when that promise is fulfilled, those areas which speak Telugu will go to Andhra, those that speak Marathi will go to Maharashtra, those that speak Kannada will go to Kannada. I ask my Andhra friends that their new slogan shall be "To Hyderabad *via* Kurnool". Kurnool should be the spring board for further action which is perfectly legitimate, and the lines of progress are implicit in the present situation itself. Obviously every established situation has a host of vested interests. Now, it is the duty of every progressive Government.....

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Progressive Government? Not Congress Government?

Shri Gadgil: You know in your heart of hearts that it is a progressive Government.

Mr. Chairman: I would request hon. Members to see that there is less of noise.

Shri Gadgil: He is a member of the Unpleasant and Worried Party.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member might continue his argument.

Shri Gadgil: The point is that it is the duty of every progressive Govern-

ment to anticipate public feeling, and not to look as if they have been driven to something which they never wanted, which they detested, and which they opposed and delayed. Somehow or other that impression is there in connection with the formation of the present Andhra. I do not believe in hunger strikes or anger strokes either. But within the Constitution every citizen has a right to challenge the wisdom that is evidenced by the established situation and to show to the Government that there is a better way. I, therefore, very respectfully submit that all these matters are now beyond dispute. The major premise has already been voted when the Government accepted the desirability of appointing a commission for re-organization of provinces. Let us, therefore, not worry about these things. The great Acharya might influence his Party, although that Party and every Party in this country is committed to the formation of States on principles of language generally.

Dr. Katju: Not Mr. Jaipal Singh.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I am against language.

Shri Gadgil: The very fact that he has asked for Jharkhand shows that he is for it. I am reminded of a story. When I ask a man "Why don't you take tea?", he says "I don't want it. It is not tea." I ask: "Then what is it?" He says: "It is milk, sugar and a spoonful of tea, and not tea." So, this is Jharkhand. The language that is spoken by the area that will be covered by Jharkhand will be mainly the language which my hon. friend speaks. The political language which he speaks today is different, and he is more diplomatic and more clever than I ever thought.

What I want to say is this, that without touching the powers which are reserved for the Centre under the Constitution such as security transport, commerce, economic policy and so on, statesmanship lies in working out a pattern of our State internally

[Shri Gadgil]

in such a manner as to give maximum satisfaction to those people who are anxious to have a reorganization of States on these lines. I know no problem is without difficulty. What about Bombay, this and that? Our great Prime Minister is committed to solve all problems, national and international, by peaceful methods of conciliation, adjustment and compromise, and we are all appreciative of that policy because so far it has given very good dividends.

Shri B. Das: What about Bombay City and Maharashtra?

Shri Gadgil: We will deal with the whole thing in a constitutional, peaceful way. Between us and Gujeratis there will be nothing but co-operation. They are moneyed people. We are without it. We will co-operate and divide equally. There will not be any violence. I can assure you that when we part company, we will part as better friends and better citizens.

So, in respect of the claim for a re-organization of provinces mainly on linguistic lines without disregard to some of those considerations as security of the State, economic viability and other matters, it is possible to move slowly, to move cautiously, but to move and not to mark time, because marking time in politics is the most dangerous thing. I hope what has happened in the past must have brought that to the conviction of most of us. Let us, therefore, hope that the Government will move with courage, that the Government will fully realize what is implicit in the situation, and will deal fairly and squarely with every interest which has been clamouring for re-organization of provinces for the last thirty years. Now, after 32 years, to reverse the whole thing is bound to be a tragedy on a no small scale.

With these words, I support the motion.

Shri Chattopadhyaya (Vijayavada): Because you have some imagination,

you can well realise at what a disadvantage a speaker is placed at the closing time, the tail-end of a debate during which all the points have been exhausted, and along with the points, both the speakers and the listeners as well.

I rise to speak not on linguism, but on limpism; not on linguistic States, but of a limping State brought about by a Government which supports that limping State with lame excuses, and turns a deaf ear to reason, and is gifted with many a blind spot in the eye.

This Bill is of great importance and urgency, in the sense that it marks the beginning of a new era in our country. Forty years of bitter struggle, of obstinate struggle, and the reiteration without any fatigue for an Andhra State by the Andhras, the obstinate will of the Andhra people culminating in Potti Sriramulu, great symbol of sacrifice, hastened the formation of this Andhra State. This Andhra State has not come into being with grace on the part of the Government. But it has been wrenched from unwilling hands, as indeed, all other States shall be wrenched in the future, if the Government do not give them with grace.

It may be pertinent, if not somewhat impertinent, to ask me why I, a non-Andhra, a Bengali, am so interested in standing up for the Andhra State. I should like to remind the House that I was born in Telengana, that I heard the beautiful Telugu language round my cradle, that I have been looked after by a Telugu nurse; heard folk songs from her; my imagination has often and often been fired by the great folk literature of its people. I am a Telengana person by birth, but by conviction, I am certainly an Indian. And as an Indian, I rise to speak on this Bill which is destined to have very far-reaching effects in the reorientation of this country.

Now, why do I stand up for this Bill as an Indian? It is chiefly because I

believe, and quite honestly too, as a realist—a poet can be a realist, in fact he should be, if he is to be a true poet—and I am convinced that this is not disintegration without a purpose. It is a disintegration with the express purpose of bringing about, in the history of India for the first time, a real solid unity which will outlast centuries.

What is all this glib talk about the unity of India? Is there any such thing? What is all this glib talk about the culture of India being one? Is there any reality in this statement? I say there is none. If you travel throughout the length and breadth of India, from north to south, and from east to west, you will find a variety of cultures that is amazing. Each province is peculiar by itself; it has its own genius, it has its own attitude towards life, its own behaviour, its own customs; it has its own food; it has its own way of thinking, and it has its own air to breathe: and as such, I say that every State in this country has an absolute sacred right to have full opportunity for self-determination; for it is only then that India shall become the great big festival of various cultures at their highest development, which will be a pride and contribution to the countries of the world and to international culture.

We must remember that it is no use trying to put spokes in the wheel of a great big logic, which is the movement that has come to stay. This logic which this formation of the Andhra State has released, is a logic similar to the great big dashing waves at the feet of King Canute. Not all the Cabinet Canutes can dare to put those waves back. The waves will not succumb to the Cabinet Canutes; the Cabinet Canutes shall have to succumb to the dashing waves, in the end.

It was somewhat amusing, if not wholly amazing, to listen yesterday to some of the statements made by no less a hard-boiled, heart-steel, headstrong politician than Shri Kripa-

lani. I wondered whether the statement that he made, namely that the talk of linguistic States signifies political neurosis, was not itself full of neurosis. He tripped a couple of very strange unfounded statements off his tongue, which I must say, does rattle off very well. He said with the confidence and certainty of a Sphinx, that even during the period of famine, the people clean forgot their starving, and clamoured for linguistic States, leaving the people to starve and die. That was not the exact way he put it; this is only the gist of what he said. I say with all respect to Shri Kripalani, though not with respect for the statement, that had he worn a hat, we might have suggested that he spoke through it! During the hideous famine time, in Rayalaseema, I might remind him that all the parties in the Circars contributed richly towards the famine-stricken areas. On what grounds, then, can he make the allegation that people forgot their famine-stricken people in famine-stricken areas and talked of nothing but linguistic States?

Now, let me turn to the Deputy Minister who spoke with "all" vehemence to "all" of us yesterday. He accused Members on both sides of the House—on his side as well as ours—of undignified and unparliamentary language. While hearing him, I wondered whether his own criticism was not rather undignified and unparliamentary. To me, at least, it sounded as if it might become the voice very soon of a Cabinet Minister! It had all the qualities of one, especially, the quality of protesting strongest, where the case was weakest.

Bellary makes him bellicose. It is his weak point—or shall we say, strong point? So many speakers from all sides of the House demanded a re-opening of the Bellary issue; for, as we know, Shri Misra's recommendation leaves us only with an interim measure, and there is full scope for reopening this burning question, this urgent question, and this most impor-

[Shri Chattopadhyaya]

tant question, which is going to affect in the long run, the several people who live in Bellary itself. I do not know whether it has been brought to the notice of this House that in Bellary taluk, including the town, the majority of people residing there, are Muslims, a majority of Muslims who have settled down in Bellary for generations and lived there long before the Home Minister or the Deputy Home Minister and all of us here were thinking of coming into our mothers' wombs! As such, you cannot call it a floating population; it is a very rooted population. And, therefore, their decision shall matter in the decision of Bellary—whether it is going to Karnatak or to Andhra. Without this, it is a farce, a travesty of justice. I say, therefore, that it is on this one ground that a plebiscite is most essential, and why? If you do not have this plebiscite and decide the burning question of Bellary now and now alone, you will find that Bellary shall be a cancer in the minds of the people, always festering. I give this as a piece of information which ought to make people think and decide. The Government should decide that this is a very sane thing and the reopening of this question is equally sane.

Now, a few words about a subject which seems to have become the stomach-ache of the Tamils, the heart-ache of the Andhras and the head-ache of Parliament—I refer to the subject of assets and liabilities. So much has been talked about it with so little opportunity given to hope. I do not know why you call it 'assets and liabilities' at all. Why not just call it 'liabilities'? That would be much more truthful. Now, one cannot but have been struck by the vividness and the precision of the financial implications of the matter as presented by our very sensitive Finance Minister, Shri Deshmukh. It seems to me that he has inadvertently wounded the Andhras who are equally sensitive, and who swear they love

Tamils more than they love any other people. When the Andhra State steps out of the composite province, they wish all success, naturally, all joy and all triumph to the Tamils. Well, the Finance Minister has defined the residuary province as a corpse; that was not exactly the word he used, but it was suggested by implication. What did the Finance Minister say? He said we should not have a *post mortem* examination. When he has referred to the birth of the new Andhra State, we must logically conclude that the 'mortis' shall be the residuary province. While, therefore, I profess to represent Andhras, I have to record my most emphatic protest on behalf of the Tamils for an insult unwittingly hurled at them! It is no wonder that the dark-spectacled gentleman in Madras State did his utmost to postpone this evil and unfortunate day of *post mortem*.

But let me tell the Finance Minister that we welcome his statement, notwithstanding; namely, that we must not dig up the past. We shall not dig up the past. Digging up the past means digging up a soil that is very different from the soil of the Finance Minister's garden. The soil of the Finance Minister's garden yields roses, but this soil of the past would yield only thorns. So, let us not do it. We agree to this. But then, at the same time, in the same breath, the Finance Minister suggested that the Andhras should shoulder the liabilities, the ugly legacy of the past. How can you reconcile these two? If you take up and rake up the past, then it entails precise examination, evaluation and calculation. You cannot shirk it; or else, give it up; give up all talk of the past. And then the Andhras will be willing, I am sure, to let the dead past bury its dead. They will start afresh from scratch and with the great, wonderful things they have in Andhra waiting to be moulded into destiny, their wonderful minerals—coal, which is more precious than gold, mica, manganese etc.—rivers, wonderful rivers—their own literature, their

own minds—they have got a vast field of scope for remoulding their destiny. If only the Andhra State had been in existence some years ago, you would not have found, for instance, the Godavari today swallowing up huge tracts of land and wiping out villages. One anicut for a great big river that grows restive—is it not ridiculous on the face of it? Well, the Andhra State has come and with it, I hope, the 'Vishal Andhra' will also come. As far as I know, Vishal Andhra is a logical conclusion of the Andhra State—the disintegration, if I judge aright, of Hyderabad. I am a Hyderabad and I have mixed a lot with Hyderabadis recently. I am convinced that the disintegration has already started in the hearts of the people there. So, you cannot stop the disintegration of a mere piece of land. It starts in the heart and it goes outwards. It would have been graceful had this whole big area been marked off and given to the Andhras. But it has not been done. Of course, I agree with Kaka who said: 'Through Kurnool to Hyderabad'. I would just amend it and say: 'Through Vijayawada to Hyderabad'. Vijayawada is the heart-centre of Andhra and from there the blood could flow and course through the veins towards the new boundaries.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar (Tiruppur): We have heard very interesting speeches this morning. The test of our statesmanship is in the moulding of these provinces with the utmost satisfaction and sympathy for the people concerned. We have heard speeches about the division of assets and allotment of debts. Of course, it seems as if we are facing a partition like Pakistan. After all, we are in India and I appeal for a generous approach to this problem so that all the States concerned and all the people concerned will part with the maximum understanding and sympathy for each other. This matter is not only one for the three States concerned, Madras, the new State of Andhra and Mysore and if I make an appeal as one who was associated with Andhra, it is also as

a matter of understanding that should obtain between the people of Rayalaseema and the Circars. I know as one who was concerned with them in the immediate past, that the people of Rayalaseema did not like to have an Andhra State and did not like to go to an Andhra State. Their affinities were with Madras and they wanted to be with Madras, if possible. In fact, when I had an occasion to summon the representatives of the Rayalaseema area for a conference and requested them that the colleges in the Rayalaseema area might be affiliated to Andhra University and not to Madras University—as it is obtaining today—all together without a single exception opposed that idea and said that they would rather be with Madras University than with Andhra University. And now some friends came and told me: 'We hope it is a matter of course that we should go to Andhra University'. They should, of course.

But the point, therefore, is—and I would appeal to my Circar friends in this connection—that they should treat the Rayalaseema people with sympathy and with understanding. They have a fear, and that fear has been voiced in many quarters—by the way in which it has been expressed—that this matter of capital, the temporary capital of Andhra, will be disturbed. If it is a matter of numerical majority, it is sure to be disturbed. There is no doubt about it. If it is a matter of respecting past undertakings and if it is a matter of taking the whole five districts with you, then, Kurnool is after all a temporary capital. I am absolutely sure and most of our Members who know about this are sure that Hyderabad is coming to them and none can stop it. It is a matter of time; it is a matter of a few years and I do not think we have to wait for five years from this day. It is a matter of less than five years and the question is whether they wish to wait and have Hyderabad as capital or today they are going to be divided amongst themselves over this matter of capital and cause wounds which need not be caused.

[Shri T. S. A. Chettiar]

I am not one of those people who need take sides in this matter. Personally, and speaking for my State, we need not be concerned about this matter. But, what makes me speak today in this strain is the welfare of the Andhras. I know them. They are good people; they are great people: they are men and women of courage and strength; they have great resources. Today there is water difficulty everywhere. I do not know how many are aware that it is only eight per cent. of the Godavari water that is being utilised for irrigation today. It is only about the same percentage of Krishna water that is being used today. Whereas Cauvery has been utilised to the maximum benefit and more than half of it has been used even in Chola times. The water resources of Andhra are tremendous. They can make a garden of all the villages and the districts of Andhra. They have immense mineral resources. They will pardon me if I say they lack unity, the unity of leadership. They will pardon me if I am frank, because I am interested in them. Today what they want is tremendous unity and that will give them strength to get over all odds and that is what is unfortunately lacking. I appeal to the Members of all political parties, I appeal to all friends in the Circars and in the Rayalaseema area and I appeal to all people who are interested in the welfare of this State which we are inaugurating today, for God's sake, for the sake of these great people, please have unity. Unity is created not by verbose statements but by the art of giving up certain things so that there can be unity. So, I appeal to my Andhra friends, it is mainly their job and they have our good wishes certainly. They have our co-operation to the extent to which we can go and I am one of those people who do not want to be haggling over some of these financial terms. It does not matter to me personally and a few lakhs of rupees, even a crore or two of rupees this side or that side should not matter to a great people like ours. But, I would only appeal to them, that given the unity, given the strength

they can rise to great heights and I am sure and I hope and pray they will.

Let me come to a few points. I am very sorry that references were made in some of the speeches to some of the Ministers of the Madras State area. One friend—I do not want to mention names here—referred to the Finance Minister and said that certain conditions were due to the mal-administration of that Minister. In another speech a reference was made to another Minister and it was said that wrongs were done in his department. I was pained to hear such references made to people who are not in this House and who cannot speak for themselves. As one who was a part of them at that time. I must say in fairness to those people and in fairness to all those who were associated with the Government then, that whenever schemes were framed, we knew the feelings of the people in the various districts—not only between Tamil Nad, Andhra and Malabar but as amongst the people of the various districts themselves. There was a feeling that some districts were not being treated properly and that certain districts were getting more. So we made it a rule—not only in the case of revenue expenditure but in the case of every expenditure—that expenditure was distributed according to the population of the various areas and to see that, as far as feasible, the various districts got the benefits of these expenditures. My hon. friend, Shri O. P. Ramaswamy Reddiar tried hard so that we should not only be impartial but we must show to the various interests concerned that we were impartial. When the Ramapadasagar project was taken up we thought it our duty to take up the Tungabhadra project also. Not only that; we went a step further and fought if we could not make that great dream of Andhra true that is the Ramapadasagar. We strove our best. We were not able to do it because the Centre whittled it down. Uncharitable statements were made in the Andhra papers that it was not started because we were not sufficiently warm-hearted.

Then we had to come out with a categorical statement that it was stopped on technical grounds by the Central Government.

It is true that we had a large accumulated revenue-surplus, about Rs. 38 crores. It is also true that today what we are going to divide is not a revenue surplus that we have—it is unfortunately true—but only loans. We are dividing only liabilities. We do not have a cash surplus with us. It is unfortunately true. But what has happened to all those amounts. The budgets of the last five or six years are not secret; they are Government documents. There were Rs. four or five crores which were set apart for cottage industries; some crores were set apart for Harijan uplift, some crores for Village Development Fund and a substantial amount was spent for the Tungabhadra project. Besides these funds that were set apart, large amounts were also spent to meet revenue deficits due to prohibition. All these items are those the benefit of which was reaped by the whole of Madras State including Andhra, including Tamil Nad, including Ma'abar and including even that bit of territory that is now going to the Mysore State. So, let me disabuse my friends of a wrong idea. When we part, let us part as friends and not by giving abuses. The Andhra Ministers who were with us brought to bear with a full conscience the benefits which their areas should give to the general administration of the country. I am not prepared to say that if a Tamilian used to be the Chief Minister some things happened differently than when an Andhra used to be the Chief Minister. Nothing of the sort. I am one of those who believe that those who take responsibility in this country can rise to heights and be impartial even to the disadvantage of their own people concerned. The people who were in charge of the affairs were also men who might have committed mistakes. Everybody does it. They might have committed mistakes of indiscretion but about their *bona fides*, I must say on the floor of this House, nothing wrong should be said.

Now, I would like to tackle one or two points that have been raised by Members of this House. Most of the Members from the Andhra area have raised two points and they are important points.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA *in the Chair*]

One is for the appointment of a Financial commission. The second is about the Tungabhadra project. Many friends have raised the point that a financial commission should be appointed to go into the assets and liabilities of the existing State. May I ask a question? What are the limits to which this commission is to go. Is the period for this commission since 1947 when we became independent? Or, is it 1935 when the Reforms were inaugurated. Or, there may even be some people who would like to say that we should go back to the year 1858 when the Madras State was formed. This problem, therefore, bristles with difficulties. I do not wish to quote statistics, but it has been admitted that the income from the Andhra area has been less than what it has been from the Madras area. May be in certain respects that area may have produced more. If we go into statistics ranging over a long period, it would only create bickerings, with no finality about them, and the result would again be that we would have to go to the President and settle the matter. I think the principles enunciated in the Bill are acceptable to this House, because they are based on the population, and population basis is something steady to go upon. I should think that we should not and we need not make any change in that behalf.

In this connection I would like to draw your attention to clause 51 of the Bill which deals with the power of the President to order allocation or adjustment in certain cases. This provision comes into operation when we are not able to come to an agreement. I hope good sense will prevail and that we will be able to exercise a measure of give and take so that there will not be any necessity for the President to

[Shri T. S. A. Chettiar]

interfere in this matter. But I would like the hon. Home Minister to make it clear that the President when he wants to give a decision on that matter will follow the principles enunciated in this very Bill. There has been a fear expressed in certain quarters, as it has not been qualified in that manner, that the President may follow different principles, from the ones agreed to by this House. I hope that is not the intention and that the President will follow only those principles which are explained and incorporated in the Bill. That may be made clear.

Then, the second question is about the boundary commission. We would be thankful to the hon. Home Minister for a statement that he will make a provision under this Bill itself for the appointment of a boundary commission, because the statement of the Prime Minister over this matter contained a reference to the boundary commission. But we are told by legal authorities that whatever happens, whether we incorporate it in this Bill or not, when a change of territory takes place an amendment to the Constitution will be necessary. When that is so, incorporation by an executive order is as good, because later on there should be an amendment to the Constitution. Perhaps that may be a less cumbersome way of dealing with the problem.

I would like to assure this House and my friends that there is no intention on our part—and I hope on their part as well—to keep any people against their wish in our territory. If any Andhra people, who are in admittedly Tamil areas, wish to go to the Andhra State, by all means let them go. It will be a liability on us to keep them against their will and we would give them a very nice, affectionate send-off, so that we may be friends all the while.

An Hon. Member: You want to send them away?

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: We do not want to send anybody away. There

are thirty-five lakhs of Andhra people in Tamil Nad and most of the people to whom we have given high positions—Shri Kumaraswamy Raja, Shri Ramaswami Reddiar—are Telugu-speaking.

An Hon. Member: Why should they go?

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: They will not that is our strength. If they want to, we shall not resist them. They know how nicely we treat them.

11 A.M.

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): They have served you too.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: Then there is one Tungabhadra. In this matter my sympathies are entirely with my Andhra friends for this very good reason. They have been with us; they have been looking forward to the Tungabhadra project. But somebody comes yesterday; he did not even know that he will get it. But he wants to pounce upon it and get the best out of it.

Shri Nijalingappa (Chitaldrug): I take exception to it.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: I am sure my hon. friend Mr. Nijalingappa protests too much. He will certainly take exception to it. The point is Tungabhadra must be safeguarded. That area for which the dam is intended and which is supposed to get the benefit out of Tungabhadra must be entirely safeguarded and in the management of the dam, though the area goes to Mysore, a proper share must be given to the Madras State. I understand that this is a matter over which there was a discussion between the Finance Minister and the Home Minister and they point out that sub-clause (5) of clause 66 provides for this.

I have nothing more to say, except that I wish very well of my Andhra friends and wish the Andhra State all prosperity.

Shri T. Subrahmanyam (Bellary): The formation of the Andhra State is

a great historical event and on this occasion I sincerely offer my congratulations to my Andhra friends in that a good beginning has been made in the redistribution of our great country on linguistic basis.

The Andhra State is to be formed at present out of the Telugu-speaking areas of Madras State and this was determined on the basis of census reports. Mr. Justice Wanchoo was appointed to determine, on financial and other considerations, the formation of the Andhra State and he took the census figures as the basis of his conclusion for the area to be constituted therein. He determined that eleven districts and three talukas of the Bellary district should be formed into an Andhra State. He came to this conclusion in a definite and decisive manner on the basis of census reports. Unfortunately, I have been hearing—just now one of the speakers said it—that these census reports have been vitiated. I wish to observe that the census reports must occupy the basis on which we shall decide the boundaries of these areas. The officers who were responsible for the compilation of these census figures are not here to defend themselves and I must protest against the statement that the census figures are vitiated. I can say for certain that all these census figures—it may be of any region, it may be of Bellary, or of Chittoor—are correct and we must proceed on their basis. They should be the only basis to form our conclusions about the linguistic composition of any particular State. In Bellary taluk, which has been very much debated on and which has come for mention on several occasions in this House, the census officers took very great care to arrive at correct figures. When some complaints were made by the groups of Kannadigas and Andhras, an enquiry was made and it was found that these complaints were groundless and afterwards instructions were given that in future complaints should be made to the *tahsildars* in the rural areas and to the municipal commissioners in municipal areas and that Government would inquire into that. The Collector wrote to the effect that

no complaints were received. Therefore, I say that we have no other basis to determine the linguistic composition of any particular area except to proceed on this basis which is the only correct basis. I would stand by it. Whether it is Bellary area or any other area we must do it in a consistent manner.

Now I come to Justice Wanchoo's Report. He came to the same conclusion that Bellary Taluk is a predominantly Kannada Taluk and this recommendation was decisive and definite with regard to this. Then Justice Misra was sent. He made enquiries. He took extraordinary pains and very great care to see that the figures which were brought to him were duly checked by the census officers of the Madras State. He considered it from the point of view of the taluk, of the *firka*, and of the villages. He took very great care. After a full and searching enquiry he came to the decisive conclusion that Bellary taluk should go to Mysore. Therefore, he has done nothing extraordinary. That was already decided upon.

The *District Gazetteer* and the *Imperial Gazetteer* mention it. The Government of India decided after carefully considering the Report of Justice Misra, that Bellary Taluk, along with other six Kannada taluks, should go to Mysore and the Prime Minister was pleased to state that the decision is absolutely correct. I feel that this question should not be allowed to be re-opened again.

A reference was made that the boundary commission would be appointed. I hope that with regard to the three taluks and other areas about which the boundary disputes have to be decided, the boundary commission would be appointed soon. I definitely suggest that the Central Government should take the initiative in this matter and should take the assistance of the representatives of the concerned States.

We realise that the division of the States on linguistic and other basis is after all for administrative convenience. In doing this there are very

[Shri T. Subrahmanyam]

definite limitations under the Constitution. These limitations should be observed in our mental consciousness also. We should feel that the transfer of one area to another area should not create friction, passion, bitterness and hostility or hatred. These are absolutely out of place in the present context.

Two months ago I went to Hardwar with some of my friends. A young friend of mine amongst them—I do not want to name the province he came from lest it might create vibrations of unpleasantness—said, “I wish that Hardwar with its Ganga were in my province, in my linguistic province”. I immediately told him, “What a limited outlook you have got! Ganga is yours, Himalayas are yours and Hardwar is yours. You are part of India. You should not put a mental barrier between this or that province. Hardwar with its purities is your own.” Now, there is this risk that with the division of India on linguistic basis, friction, controversy, hatred may be roused in some quarters. I would here utter a warning about the existence of this danger, which might undermine national solidarity if not controlled, and the Members of this House have a special responsibility in this matter to totally discourage these things in our country.

Then, I come to the Tungabhadra project. Some of my friends have mentioned it and have gone so far as to say that Tungabhadra project is the result of Andhra agitation; it is an Andhra achievement and should be utilised for Andhra benefit. The project was taken up as a long-term famine relief measure and the first engineer who planned it was Sir Arthur Cotton. He was responsible for the Godavari anicut and the Coleroon irrigation system in the South. That particular region benefited by the project is subject to frequent visitation of famines and people who speak Kannada and who speak Telugu are both in that area. It was meant as a famine relief measure for that area.

One of my friends has said that the Kannadigas were opposed to the taking up of this project. It is absolutely incorrect. If they suggested anything it was that a bigger project of the Tungabhadra should be taken up which would irrigate more area not only in Bellary district but also in Anantapur and Kurnool areas. It is today the biggest reservoir in South India with a water spread of 133 square miles and submerging 65 villages. Recently just 20 days back I had gone there and I saw that many villages were submerged under water. Several big villages have been affected. The villagers had to sacrifice their lands and homes, and undergo many difficulties. They are Kannadigas. I am not saying this just to draw a differentiation or discrimination. But I resent the talk that the benefit should be the monopoly of one side. That is absolutely out of place and opposed to the realities of the situation. We are proud of the people who built this great reservoir. The engineers who took part in its construction came from Tamil Nad, Malabar, from Andhra, Karnataka and Maharashtra. Therefore, it has been the work of all. I saw the colony of labourers coming from Visakhapatnam, speaking Telugu. There was another colony of labourers who came from Tamil Nad. The contractors came from throughout India and the Central Government gave the machinery and equipment and the financial assistance. Therefore, under these circumstances, to try to monopolise all these achievements as belonging to this particular linguistic group or that linguistic group is, I should say, absolutely opposed to the realities of the situation.

I say that the people of Mysore and Andhra can sit together and then share the waters. It is a very big reservoir. There should be no narrowness in deciding these matters.

I want to mention one thing. Clause 41 of the Bill seeks to confer jurisdiction on the High Court of Mysore in relation to the territories sought to be added to that State by sub-clause (1)

of clause 4. A provision has been made for the transfer of proceedings now pending before the Madras High Court to be transferred to the Mysore High Court having regard to the accrual of cause of action, or other circumstances. The Chief Justice of Madras High Court is authorised to do it and the Advocates who have been appearing in such cases are authorised to appear from 1st October before the Mysore High Court in respect of transferred cases. While there is this provision, I feel that there should be a provision to enable advocates of the transferred territory to become automatically accredited to the Mysore High Court without payment of any extra fee. That is an important point. It affects a large number of people who are there. Therefore, I feel that a suitable amendment should be brought about for this purpose.

And then under clause 60 and the Ninth Schedule, some rights have been given to the Andhra friends to have some reservation in some institutions. Mysore is a well developed State. I take this opportunity of expressing our sense of gratitude to Mysore friends, who have extended to us, people of the transferred area, a cordial welcome. I am very grateful for that. I feel with respect to such of those institutions as are not to be found in Mysore State, people of the transferred area should have similar rights as are reserved to the Andhra friends.

I wish well of the Andhra State. I am sincere when I say that. Let it grow into a strong, prosperous and happy province. And I appeal to all friends to extend their fullest co-operation and goodwill to this new State that is to be formed.

Shri Muniswamy (Tindivanam): On behalf of the Tamilians we congratulate our Andhra friends on the achievement of their Andhra State. The Andhra child is born after forty years of strenuous work. I wish all prosperity to them and let them achieve everything that they expect by the formation of this new State.

At the very outset I should like to point out that on this holy occasion some of the Andhra friends have expressed something of their bad treatment by the Tamilians. I should like to ask them a simple question about Madras City. Hon. Members like **Shri Raghuramaiah** and others have pointed out that they have lost Madras City and also Bellary. I ask them how could they 'lose' a place which was not in their possession. You can talk of somebody losing something when he is in possession of it. If somebody is having a pen in his pocket and after a few minutes he walks away, is it correct to say "we have lost the pen"? This is simple logic. This is how they say that we Tamilians have been giving them very bad treatment. I am sorry, Sir.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): When they are in joint possession?

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): The logic is not quite correct.

Shri Muniswamy: I appreciate the interruption of Mr. Murthy who has pointed out correctly that they will get Madras City after a hundred years.

Shri B. S. Murthy: Thank you.

Shri Muniswamy: I wish they get Delhi also after five hundred years!

Shri Raghuramaiah said that some places in Salem district, some places in Chingleput district and some places in North Arcot district must come to Andhra State. I should like to ask him, with due respect: is there any meaning in saying that some parts of North Arcot, Salem and Chingleput, which are out and out Tamil areas, should come to Andhra State? There are some villages in Pondicherry where the people speak Telugu. Let them go and take Pondicherry. I have no objection. Therefore, I must first meet that charge.

Let me ask another question. How many members have they got in the Madras Corporation? The Madras Corporation represents the whole of Madras City and consists of sixty or seventy Councillors. How many are

[Shri Muniswamy]

Andhras? What is this? I do not understand. They are unnecessarily blaming the Tamilians, because Tamilians are ignored. Twenty or thirty hon. Members took part in this debate and only three or four Tamilians have been given chance. See how the Central Government treat us— simply because Tamilians are keeping quiet.

Mr. Chairman: The Government has got nothing to do with giving chance to hon. Members in the Debate in the House.

Shri Muniswamy: This is only a by-the-way reference, Sir.

One of the hon. Members from Andhra says that Shri Rajagopalachari is a Duryodana. It was rightly pointed out by the Deputy Home Minister yesterday that it is not fair to call Shri Rajagopalachari as a Duryodana or a Sakuni. He is a Tamilian. We are all Tamilians. We can call him by any name. We have got a right. How can we allow an Andhra (*Interruptions.*) I was very much pained that a non-Tamilian, who has no right to call him like that, should have done so.

Then about compensation. It has been pointed out by Shri Natesan and Shri Venkataraman. That has been dropped correctly by the Madras Legislature. But it has been included here. We have to pay rupees two crores and odd. I do not understand. Why should Tamilians pay rupees two crores and odd? Who asked for the Andhra State? The Andhras. Who accepted it? The Central Government. Let them pay it from their pocket. Tamilians have nothing to do with this business. Let the Central Government pay it because they have accepted the formation of the Andhra State. We, Tamilians, never bargained or did anything in connection with its formation. Of course, our Partition Committee has accepted for the payment of rupees one crore, if I am correct. But I do not understand why the Tamilians should be placed in that difficult position. Tanjore, Ramnad and other districts have suffered

a lot during the recent cyclone. Because we Tamilians never wanted to make a fuss of all this, does it mean that we are all happy? We have a lot of things to complain.

And then a word about the boundary commission. We learn that it is under the contemplation of the Central Government to appoint a boundary commission. In Chittoor there are still disputes going on. As a matter of fact I can assure you there are some taluks which are predominated by Tamilians. When I had been to Chittoor district I had occasion to visit some of the villages where many of the Tamilians are entered as 'Andhras' in the Voters' List. The son of a Tamilian who came from Tanjore but who happened to settle in Chittoor, Ramaswami Pillai, is put as an Andhra in the Voters' List. That is how they count the numbers. Therefore, I should request that a boundary commission should be appointed at the proper time. It is not as if it will create unnecessary trouble once again. There are many places like that, especially in Chittoor, Kuthur, Tiruttani and other places, which consist of predominantly Tamil-speaking people. Even now if you go to the Government offices in Chittoor district, you will see still they are having "N.A." blocks and "N.A." written in milestones. It was once part of North Arcot district. Simply because we Tamilians are broad-minded and keep quiet and are not troublesome and mischievous people, does it mean that you can take away everything from us?

I want this Bill to be expedited. I oppose the motion for reference to the Select Committee by my hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram. Many of the clauses which were included by the Madras Legislature have been dropped here. With regard to the High Court, on behalf of the Tamilians, I am prepared to say that it may go at any time and I request that as per recom-

mendation of the Madras Legislature, a separate High Court may be set up for the Andhra State from 1st June 1954.

About the Tungabhadra project, my hon. friend Mr. Subrahmanyam correctly pointed out that we sent our engineers, we sent out our superintendents; our men, our labour have contributed to the Tungabhadra project. We can never forget that. But, instead of being grateful to the Tamilians for having done so much to you, you come now and say that the Tamilians have been unfair and that they have given bad treatment.

Regarding the name of the province. I should like to ask with all caution, why do you not call the residuary State of Madras as Tamil Nad? I can quote from the speech of Shri Sankaran Nair in the Council of State in 1926, on 15th March 1926 the late Mr. Sankaran Nair moved a resolution in the Council of State that the Tamil speaking districts of the province of Madras should be constituted into an autonomous Tamil province. He wanted transfer of power to that autonomous Tamil province over a vast field of legislation, administration, including posts and telegraphs, defence, etc. This was the resolution moved as early as 1926. But, this was negatived on the ground that there was no support of public opinion. But, I can tell them, this was in 1926; today we are in 1953. You have got every support for this in Tamil Nad. Why do you not call it Tamil Nad? Of course, here and there, there may be some people like the Malabar people, some Andhras and some Kannada people who may object to it.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Muniswamy: I would like to tell them this. They may not accept my word if I say now that Telugu, Malayalam, Kannada were all the offsprings of the Tamil language. The saying goes:

kannadamum the lungum kavin mala-
yalamum tuluvum on uthirathirir
dhu ezhundadhu

All these languages belong to Tamil. This saying is 3000 years old. That is why our Finance Minister often quotes from Tiruvalluvar. Yesterday, I was very glad to see our Finance Minister quoting from Kural. Even at the very beginning he pointed out very rightly, *Tamarahi tarrunandar*, which means that people who part with certain reasons may once again join without telling the reasons. I hope such a thing may happen in the case of my Andhra friends also. If at all there is any difference between Andhras, or Malayalees or Kannadigas, there is a common culture, there is a common root for all these languages, let them call it by the name Dravida Nadu. The very mention of the word is like castor oil to some friends. I am not a Member of any party or movement, I tell you plainly. Every day, we sing the National Song. You say Sindu, Maharashtra, Gujerat and Dravida. Suppose a man asks where is Gujerat, you point out here it is; if you are asked, where is Bengal, you point out here it is; if you are asked where is Maharashtra, you point out here it is. But where is Dravida Nadu? It is in the song. Therefore, I humbly submit that instead of calling the province as residuary Madras State, you may well call it Tamil Nad or by another suitable name as you please.

Regarding the appointment of the expert committee, yesterday, the hon. Finance Minister pointed out that it will be unnecessary at present. I am not able to understand how he forgot to mention anything about the recommendations of the Finance Commission. That was appointed by the Government of India. They went into the matter. Regarding the allocation of funds, they said that 20 per cent. should go according to collection and 80 per cent. according to population, I do not know what difficulty there is in following this. I am not able to understand for a moment why he forgot to mention about this recommendation of the Finance Commission. On

[Shri Muniswamy]

behalf of the Tamilians, I request that this may be followed in the years to come.

I should like to submit one thing about the capital of Andhra. We Tamilians are all friends of the Andhras and Rayalaseema. The recommendation of the Central Government is that Kurnool should be the capital of Andhra. I say that it is my individual wish that Kurnool should be the capital because we must honour the Rayalaseema people. They can choose whomsoever they like as their leader. I feel very sorry that the Andhras are still having troubles amongst themselves. We Tamilians are always generous-hearted and we are ready to go to their help. If they want some Tamilians as arbitrators, we are ready to help them.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: There cats and the monkey?

Shri Muniswamy: Let them not quarrel amongst themselves saying, we have lost Madras, we have lost Bellary. If they do not settle among themselves as early as possible, they may do something more. So, in the interests of the Andhra people, I request them to have Kurnool as their capital. Of course, they may elect Mr. Prakasam or anybody as their leader.

Shri Damodara Menon (Kozhikode): I welcome this Bill wholeheartedly. There appears to be some misapprehension in the minds of some people both inside and outside this House regarding the concept of a linguistic State. Today, Mr. Gadgil made a very brilliant speech in which he explained the meaning of linguistic States. He also made it very clear that this idea of redistribution of States will not work for the disunity of India, but will eventually be a very binding force. While agreeing with Mr. Gadgil in most of his views, I cannot agree with him when he made some uncomplimentary remarks about my leader Acharya Kripalani. I am afraid he

has not understood the key note of the speech of Acharya Kripalani.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): How can he criticise if he has understood?

Shri Damodara Menon: His criticism revealed a partial understanding and a misunderstanding. Acharya Kripalani made it very clear that today it is imperative that the Government should immediately take up the question of the redistribution of the States of India on mainly linguistic basis. He was only pointing out the danger of linguistic fanaticism which may be generated in some places, and that if it so happens, it will be really unfortunate for the unity of India. In saying that, of course, he was pointing out a danger spot. But, he supported the idea generally.

We are today citizens of a democratic State. Democracy means Government of the people, for the people, and by the people. In a democratic State, the people must be able to participate intelligently and consciously in the activities of the Government. They can do that only if governmental activities are conducted in a language that is understood by a majority of them. It is because of this that the Congress accepted the idea of linguistic division of India a long time ago and Mahatma Gandhi blessed it. Today, if there has been a lot of bickering, misunderstanding and also recrimination on this issue, it is merely because Government have been hesitant and to some extent opposed to the speedy solution of this problem. They have been trying to create difficulties at every stage. We know the sad history of the Andhra agitation and the sufferings that these people had to undergo on a question which was accepted by the country as a whole and by the Government also. The Dhar Commission was appointed. The Jaipur Congress appointed a Linguistic Provinces Committee which submitted a report. All of them said that the Andhra State must be formed

as early as possible. Yet, in the forming of the State, Government have been creating difficulties in the way of the people who passionately desire that their State must be constituted. A valuable life was lost in the cause of the formation of Andhra State. I would appeal to the Government not to repeat this sorry episode again and again. They must immediately take up this question and solve it so that hereafter people's minds may be diverted to the problems of reconstruction of India and also to governmental activities.

My hon. friend, who spoke before me, made a suggestion. He said: "Why not we call the residuary State of Madras Tamil Nad immediately?" I am all in agreement with the suggestion. What I would further wish him to consider, and also the House and the Home Minister, is that in doing so let us take out from the Madras State—especially from the West Coast—those areas which naturally form part of Kerala State and add them on to Travancore-Cochin, thereby creating a Kerala State immediately. This problem of Kerala has been before the country and has been accepted by the Linguistic Provinces Committee appointed by the Jaipur Congress. They saw a difficulty then. That was the problem of the Indian States. They said until the problem of Indian States was solved it would be difficult for us to create a Kannada State as also a Kerala State. I hope that that problem is almost decided and settled. If it is not settled, I cannot understand how then taluks in the Bellary district were conceded to Mysore. At the time the Linguistic Provinces Committee appointed by the Jaipur Congress submitted its report, it was specifically mentioned that as things stood it was not possible for any area belonging to the old British Indian territory to be conceded to the territory of an old Indian State. That was the principle accepted and enunciated by the Government at that time. Today, they have given up that idea. They have given a portion of the territory belonging to an old British Indian State to the Mysore State, which is an old Indian State. They found no difficulty

in doing that now. Hence, I am appealing to the hon. Home Minister to see that those areas of the Madras State which must properly belong to the Kerala State must now be added on to the Travancore-Cochin State so that a new State can come into being.

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): Will the hon. Member give up the Tamil areas of Travancore-Cochin?

Shri Damodara Menon: There is no question of giving up or taking up. I would request my hon. friend, Mr. Venkataraman, to listen to my arguments patiently. I am one of those who believe that it is wrong and suicidal to carry the idea of linguism to a fanatical extent. There are other considerations, which must weigh with the Government and the people of India when they carve out a new State. They should give predominance to the language. The majority of a particular area must speak one language and must be capable of understanding the proceedings of the Government. That is a fundamental question. There are also other considerations

Shri Nesanony (Nagercoil): What about the demand of the Tamilians?

Shri Damodara Menon: I am coming to that. I shall read a few sentences from the report of the Linguistic Provinces Committee appointed by the Jaipur Congress:

"It must be remembered that it is impossible to have clear and rigid demarcations of linguistic areas. However definite such an area might be, it flows into another linguistic area and when the two may meet, there is a mixed bilingual area."

The Dhar Commission in their report say:

"In any rational and scientific planning that may take place in regard to the provinces of India in the future, homogeneity of language alone cannot be a decisive factor. Administrative convenience, history, geography, economic, cultural and many other considera-

[Shri Damodara Menon]

tions will have to be given due weight."

I am placing this before the House so that it might not be misled into thinking that language alone is the main consideration. There are other considerations when a dispute arises regarding a particular area. These considerations will have to be looked into. I am against the idea of having any kind of referendum to decide the boundaries of Indian States. There is no necessity for doing that because referendum cannot meet all the vital issues. Therefore, it will have to be decided by an impartial boundary commission. My hon. friend has raised the issue of Tamil *taluks* of the South. It is only natural that in the conditions prevailing in India there would be disputes regarding the boundary and territory that is being carved out. These disputes can be gone into impartially by a commission, which will probe into all these factors. I hope that will satisfy my hon. friend who interrupted me a few minutes before.

Now let us accept this fact that there is necessity for a Kerala State. Kerala is a compact area, geographically and economically. Today the Travancore-Cochin State has come into existence. When the merger of Travancore and Cochin took place, we understood it as a first step towards the formation of Kerala State. Then there were technical difficulties raised and we, of course, were as patient as our Tamil friends. We expected the Government of India to respond to our claim at the proper time and I hope that the time has now come and they will take immediate steps to see that the Kerala State is formed.

Whenever this question of redistribution of States on linguistic basis is raised on the floor of this House, whenever a criticism is made, or a derogatory remark is made about this idea, I find many of our friends hailing from North India, especially from the Hindi area, applauding. I want them to exercise their imagination when people

make this claim for redistribution of provinces. In North India, especially in those areas which are predominantly Hindi speaking, this problem has no reference at all. If any redistribution of States should take place, it must be on a different basis. We cannot think of U. P., Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and other areas all combined into one large unit because they are speaking the Hindi language. I am personally of the view that Uttar Pradesh which is like a leviathan covering a large portion of India, must be divided into two or three States for administrative purposes. It is very necessary for us to do so because democracy can function effectively in smaller units. With 6½ crores of population, that State surely must be divided, but the considerations that must go in determining the boundaries of that State will not be linguistic. They will be administrative and economic.

These North Indian friends who hail from Hindi-speaking areas have also another advantage. The language of their particular State can be Hindi. The language of the Indian Union is also Hindi. Therefore, for the common people of those areas, linguism is no difficulty. They can understand what is happening in Parliament of India as also what is happening in their own Government, because Hindi is their mother tongue. But not so in the case of people who speak other languages. Especially in composite provinces where several languages are spoken, people must learn not only their mother tongue, but also perforce, as patriotic citizens of India, Hindi. If you compel them to learn a third language besides their own mother tongue for the purpose of understanding their own State affairs, that will be too much. If too many hurdles are placed on these people, it will be very hard, and it will be really a ground and a reason for disruption and not unity. That is why I make an appeal to my friends who hail from the Hindi areas of North India to show a little more charity when they consider this problem.

I have not spoken on the provisions of the Bill yet. The contentious

matter regarding this Bill is Bellary. the division of Bellary district, as also the division of assets and liabilities. Regarding the division of Bellary district, I was first of the view that the Misra report must be accepted *in toto*. But hearing the debate here, I feel that there is some room for revision. It will be wrong on the part of Government to allow this agitation to continue for an indefinite length of time. It is very evident that the Andhra people feel that it is wrong, especially since the headworks of the Tungabhadra project are situated in the taluks which are now being ceded to Mysore State. In these matters a further enquiry is welcome, but I would oppose any idea of a referendum. There is no necessity for a referendum at all. There was one report which suggested that the whole of Bellary must go to Andhra for the present. That was Justice Wanchoo's report. The recommendations of Justice Misra upset that view and the Government seems to have been convinced of the reasonableness of the latter, that is, the recommendations of Justice Misra. As we find so much agitation on this issue, it would be a right procedure for the Government to go into this question and to appoint another commission or committee to determine the boundary of Andhra State in Bellary district.

Regarding the division of assets and liabilities, as I belong to the residuary State of Madras, I am conscious of the fact that if the assets and liabilities are not properly divided, it would affect me also. But I have yesterday heard the speech of the Finance Minister, and I am convinced that the present principle on which this division has taken place is acceptable and is just. I would appeal to the Tamil Members of this House not to create any difficulty.

Shri Venkataraman: They did not. They have accepted.

Shri Damodara Menon: I am glad my hon. friend Mr. Venkataraman says that. Let us accept it without any bickering or without any claim for a further amount. Really, regarding the division of Central excises, and also Central income-tax and road fund, the

residuary State stands to lose. If you calculate it on the basis of population, it will be a loss really to the residuary State. But let us not consider this small loss as a grave one. Let us be charitable and also generous to the Andhra friends who are trying to create a new State, and let us not deny them what the Central Government now has found it necessary to give them—that is, in regard to the Rs. 230 lakhs which they are to be given for their capital.

Therefore, as a Member of the residuary State, I welcome this measure, and accept the principles of the division of assets and liabilities as embodied in the Seventh Schedule.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Rajagopala Rao.

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): May I raise a point of order?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: May I know whether these linguistic provinces are formed only for men, and whether the views of the other sex will be taken into consideration?

Mr. Chairman: I have called Shri Rajagopala Rao.

Shri Rajagopala Rao (Srikakulam): It is an irony of fate that we, who had so enthusiastically cheered the Prime Minister's announcement on the formation of Andhra State only eight months ago, should today react with mixed feelings to a legislation based on that announcement. But the fault is not ours. Without in any way doubting the *bona fides* of the Government's intentions, I must say that the hopes raised in many an Andhra bosom at the time of the appointment of the Wanchoo Commission have today become dupes.

The Government appointed Mr. Justice Wanchoo to consider and report on the financial and other implications of their decision to form a separate Andhra State, and the Chief Justice of the Rajasthan High Court, after a painstaking and thorough inquiry, presented a brilliant report which is perhaps unsurpassed in its grasp of the subject and comprehensiveness of

[Shri Rajagopala Rao]

treatment. There was no aspect of the Andhra question which Mr. Justice Wanchoo did not go into, and submit to his most objective and expert scrutiny. Yet the fruit of his labours is treated with scant respect by the Government which gave him the assignment.

Take the question of the temporary capital, for instance. For reasons known only to themselves, Justice Wanchoo's sound suggestion that the temporary capital of Andhra should be located in Madras for a period of three to five years was not palatable to the Government. The Union Government could persuade the Punjab to allow Himachal Pradesh to share its capital, not temporarily but perhaps for ever, but could not ask the residuary State of Madras to keep the Andhra capital in a city in whose development Andhra money, genius and effort played no mean part.

The alternative suggested by Mr. Justice Wanchoo was Visakhapatnam-Waltair, "the one place in Andhra Desa to which all the officers and offices can be shifted", to quote from Wanchoo report. If the Government had accepted this suggestion, the capital question would not have been in the forefront as it is today. Perhaps, like the British Government, during the days of our subjection, some enemies of Andhra derive a kind of vicarious pleasure seeing us quarrel among ourselves on a small matter, like the location of the temporary capital. The new Government of the State to be born will have to grapple with not only the many problems of an economic and political nature, but also this complicated and tricky question of location of the temporary capital, which is giving rise to regional and parochial feelings among Andhras. Is it the punishment meted out to us for asking a separate State?

Even now, it is not too late. Instead of allowing the Andhra legislators to wrangle and break their heads on this question and instead of suicidally diverting people's attention to such a

trivial matter at a time when greater issues are at stake, it will be better if the President decides the temporary capital, in accordance with the recommendation of Justice Wanchoo. The people and their representatives in the Legislature can choose the permanent capital at a centrally situated place, and in accordance with the provisions of the Sri Bagh Pact which really applies only to the permanent capital.

Justice Wanchoo also favoured the setting up of a boundary commission to decide finally the future of the disputed areas. Though the Prime Minister has often stated that such a commission will be set up, the Bill makes no reference to it. Nor does it indicate the scope of the such a commission. For instance, two of our Andhra districts, Koraput and Ganjam, were merged with Orissa by the British rulers who were cross with us for the hot reception we gave to the Simon Commission. It is an injustice which it is the duty of the Government of free India to rectify. Dr. Katju's definition of the scope of the boundary commission is totally unsatisfactory, and defeats the very purpose of a real boundary commission.

According to the Government of India, what is sauce for the goose does not seem to be sauce for the gander. They set their face firmly against the temporary location of the capital in Madras City, but the High Court has to remain there. It is a highly untenable proposition. The new State must have a High Court of its own within its own territory and Guntur will be highly suitable for that purpose. Constitutionally also, the retention of the High Court in Madras will lead to an anomalous situation. According to Article 232 (a) of our Constitution, the appointment of the Judges of the High Court has to be made on the recommendation of the Governor of the State in which the High Court is situated. In other words, the Judges of the Andhra High Court will be appointed on the advice of the Governor of Madras. I do not see any reason why it should be so.

Then there is the question of the constitution of the State Public Service Commission. The tone of administration depends on the calibre and character of the persons manning it. It is, therefore, necessary that the greatest care should be taken in the selection of administrative staff, and merit should be the only criterion of choice. In the present day atmosphere, surcharged with group, caste and other rivalries, political considerations may colour and corrupt the choice of the members of the Public Service Commission. I trust the Government will see to it that such elements and such consideration will have no play in the matter.

This leads us to the larger question of Ministry-making. The last elections have caused such a confusing picture in Andhra, that, if it is not checked in time, politics in Andhra may bid fair to run on French lines. No single party has the necessary parliamentary strength to form a stable Government, on its own. In this atmosphere, coalitions will only be euphemistic terms for shameless horse trading. It will be a very unhealthy beginning for a new State. I, therefore, request the Government to hold fresh elections in Andhra, whatever be their outcome so far as the Congress is concerned. That will be the only practical solution that we can adopt in the circumstances.

In respect of division of assets and liabilities, between the new State and the residuary State, Justice Wanchoo, in his report, has collected and given revealing material in the characteristically objective style of a judge. A commission of experts should now be set up to go into the matter, and arrive at impartial findings. Disputes arising out of the division of assets and liabilities can be referred to the Supreme Court for final decisions. This need not delay the inauguration of the new State, as it is feared in some quarters. The commission can go into the matter and report; and the representatives of the two States, the Andhra and the Madras States, can sit together and work out an equitable basis of division of assets and liabilities on the lines of that report.

As Justice Wanchoo has pointed out, crores of rupees from the reserve fund were spent away during the last four or five years, on day-to-day administrative matters. The argument that in Andhra, Shri Gopala Reddi, was the Finance Minister of Madras at the time, does not weaken our case. Just as several Indians were instruments of British policy in this country, Mr. Gopala Reddi was an instrument of a policy which went against the Andhra cause. Why should the Andhra State suffer for the acts of commission and omission of a single individual?

12 Noon

Then there are Central grants for irrigation works in the State, both on a subsidy basis and on a half-loan-half-grant basis. The works in the Andhra districts went by default in respect of allotment of these grants. The Government of Madras themselves have admitted this. We are not here concerned with the reasons for such a development. We are only interested in the ultimate result, which is backwardness and lack of irrigation facilities in Andhra. The fact that the Andhra contribution to the total revenues of the State is small is also due to the backwardness and undeveloped state of the Andhra districts. The Centre should now, therefore, extend facilities by way of grants and subsidies to the new State, so as to enable it to make up the loss it has so far sustained. Mr. Justice Wanchoo has recommended that the new State should receive Rs. 230.4 lakhs in order to compensate it for buildings in Madras City, which are being used for all State purposes. And the Government have duly accepted his suggestion in this case. But on any reckoning, it is a niggardly way of compensating a great loss. I cannot understand the argument of some hon. Members that no compensation should be paid to the Andhra State, because the Andhras wanted to get out of the Madras State, by themselves. How would we have reacted, if the British Government had said that since India was, of her own accord, going out of the empire, her sterling assets should

[Shri Rajagopala Rao]

be liquidated. The commission of experts should go into this matter also and consider the necessity of raising that figure. As our leader, Shri Ramachandra Reddi has suggested, this committee should be headed by Shri Chandulal Trivedi.

In the matter of division of services, Mr. Justice Wanchoo has again recommended the establishment of a commission to decide the matter. But with an experienced and considerate officer like Shri Chandulal Trivedi, who brought order to Punjab, at the helm of affairs, a commission is perhaps superfluous in this respect. In this connection, I must express my profound gratitude to the Government of India for having spared such an able civilian as Shri Trivedi to us, and I trust that his services will be available to the new State, in the first phase of its reconstruction.

Another very significant lacuna in the Bill is the failure to provide for the affiliation of the colleges in the Rayalaseema area, to the University of Andhra. I trust this defect will be rectified even at this stage. Again, as suggested by Mr. Justice Wanchoo, educational facilities should be available for Andhras in the residuary State for at least a period of five years. The selection of students for the seats thus reserved, should be made by the new State. I know, when once the new State springs into being, our brethren in the residuary State will be large-hearted enough to forget the bitterness of separation and help us in all possible ways. Still, it will be prudent to provide for the reservation of seats, and also for the mode of selection, in this Bill itself.

I also request the Ministry of Education to open a few of the centrally run technical training and educational centres in the Andhra area. In addition to leading to the sound principle of decentralisation being implemented, it will also help our boys in having technical training, which the new State cannot provide immediately.

Before I resume my seat, I would fervently appeal to the future rulers of Andhra, to whichever party they may belong, to bear in mind the valuable suggestions of Justice Wanchoo in regard to the several problems with which the new State will be confronted. For instance, the Andhra State will be launched with a deficit in the budget, which, as Mr. Justice Wanchoo has pointed out, can be made up, by not pursuing the prohibition policy. However laudable the idea of temperance may be, a poor State like ours cannot afford to have prohibition at the present moment. We all know the value and nobleness of Mahatma Gandhi's ideal of non-violence, but we have not done away with the police and the military on that account. Why? Because we cannot afford the risk. Similarly, we have to allow material progress to take precedence over moral uplift, however desirable the latter may be.

Let us launch on our new venture with a clean slate, as Justice Wanchoo has suggested, with no inhibitions, and with no false sense of prestige. Once we are able to build up the State, we shall not lose sight of the moral aspect.

Shri Basappa (Tumkur): I would not have spoken on this occasion, but for the fact that several hon. Members have made references to Mysore, and my hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram has included my name in the list of Members of the Select Committee which he wants to have. Of course it may give an indication that I gave my consent. Therefore, I stand in this House to say that I have not given any such consent, nor am I willing to go to that Select Committee, because this Bill has been fully considered in the Madras Legislative Assembly and also in the Mysore Legislative Assembly and therefore, no purpose will be served if this Bill is referred to a Select Committee. It will only cause unnecessary delay and, therefore, I say that there is no necessity to send it to a Select Committee.

Coming to the Andhra State Bill, I must say I have heard with rapt attention equally vehement arguments on both sides regarding the question of linguistic provinces. Of course, I just heard Mr. Damodara Menon coming to the aid of Acharya Kripalani and saying that what he meant was something else. If I understood Acharya Kripalani well, I think he meant that linguistic States at the present juncture would be a hindrance and would lead to disruption, disunity and all that.

Acharya Kripalani: May I correct? I said that it was inevitable. Having once said that there should be linguistic provinces, it is inevitable, and not to have them would be disastrous.

Shri Basappa: I am glad, that Acharya Kripalani has made the position more clear.

I take it that in the formation of linguistic provinces, not only language but also other considerations will be taken into account. Then linguistic States would be a welcome feature in this country. If I only refer to the President's address made to this House on the 11th February 1953, he said on the question of linguistic provinces that we have to take into consideration so many factors. Of course, he says language forms an important factor, but at the same time, other factors will have to be taken into consideration—the unity of India, the administrative and the financial aspects of it and so on. Keeping in view all these facts, he goes on to say that nothing should come in the way of our reorganising the States on these lines. So taking that as an authoritative statement, I should say that the reorganisation of State is quite necessary in this country on this basis. We see in India so many different classes of States—A class States, B class States and C class States.

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): Also D class.

Shri Basappa: Our revered Acharya Kripalani was asking what was the

meaning of having the same paraphernalia of administration for all the States in India, big as well as small. Therefore, I say that this distinction of A, B and C class States must ultimately go in this country.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: Very good.

Shri Basappa: A step has been taken in the right direction in this Bill to see that this distinction between A, B and C States is diminished to some extent. Because when certain portions of Bellary are given to Mysore, a B State, I say it is a step in the right direction to make no discrimination between A and B States.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): It does not become an A State by that.

Shri Basappa: Whether it becomes A or B State, the main point is that the size and the population, and everything else of the States in India must, more or less, be the same. Unless that is done, if we have very big States and if we have very small States, it will lead to all sorts of trouble. That is the point I wish to emphasise in this House.

Then there is a feeling in some quarters of the House that after all asking for linguistic provinces is something to be abhorred or something to be ashamed of. I do not see there is anything to be ashamed of in this. Linguism, of course, everybody decries, but linguistic States are a welcome feature and unless that is done, I think the desire of the people of this country will not be satisfied. Therefore, I say, even though there is a bitter feeling, as we saw here among the Tamil people and the Andhra people to some extent, it is only a passing phase. I may say that we fight in this House many a royal battle to win our points, and that is the spirit in which this question has been discussed here. I see my friends, Mr. P. Natesan and Mr. Raghuramaiah going together, talking together and exchanging their views on these points elsewhere in a friendly way. It does not mean that when we fight a royal

[Shri Basappa]

battle, there should be bitterness at all times. My friend, Mr. Kelappan, said the other day that because he saw bitter feelings, he had given up the idea of linguistic States. I think if an hon. Member gives up an idea so soon, it is no good at all. Linguistic States are based on firmer grounds.

Then I congratulate the Government on bringing forward this Bill. Though it is a little late, still, better late than never is a good proposition and I say that the Government has done very well in bringing forward this Bill. This Andhra State Bill is an indication and it has got very many potentialities also. I therefore welcome this Bill. I may say it has practically given birth to twins, because the Andhra State is already born and the Karnataka State is yet to come. Therefore, I wish everyone should give a helping hand in solving this problem before it is too late in the day.

I also wish to point out that when solving these difficult problems, there are complicated questions like division of assets and liabilities and so many other things. We have to go in a slow and reasonable way. One of my friends here has reiterated the stand that there should be a plebiscite, and the boundary commission that is going to be set up should examine the question of Bellary also. When my friend, Mr. Tekur Subrahmanyam spoke today, I thought that there was an end of the matter, because he is a man who can authoritatively speak as he comes from that very area of Bellary. He is an Andhra. Mr. Justice Misra has paid a high compliment to him that though he is an Andhra, he is fighting for justice. He has said that this is a thing that should go to Karnatak. I therefore say that that must stop all further discussion in the matter. And Justice Misra has very ably argued the case. Of course, at one particular juncture he may have said that nothing short of a plebiscite can decide this question. But he has come to a conclusion on the definite material placed before him. Here is

the report of Mr. Justice Misra. He gives facts and figures:

"Deducting the above figure from the total, the principal linguistic composition of the taluk works out as follows:

Kannadiga	52.52 per cent.
Telugu	25.29 "
Others	22.19 "

The above figures show an overwhelming predominance of Kannadiga population in Bellary taluk. So far, therefore, as the language composition is concerned, I am clear that the Kannadigas have an absolute majority in the taluk."

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: What about Bellary city?

Shri Lakshmayya (Anantapur): The figures given are questionable. Both parties doubt their genuineness.

Shri Basappa: Though the Kannadigas are, roughly speaking, about 16,000 or 17,000 and the Telugu-speaking people are about 23,000 in population—a difference of a few thousands—he has explained in a very fine manner why that is so. (*Interruption.*) Please let me proceed. He has spoken about the Muslim population also, which was made much of. I have here a copy of the resolution passed by the Muslims of Bellary under the presidentship of Janab Khaji Gulam Mohamed Sahib, Khaji of Bellary:

"The Muslims of Bellary view with great concern the non-inclusion of Bellary taluk along with the six talukas of Bellary in Mysore. Muslims are solidly supporting the Kannadigas and the inclusion of Bellary taluk in Mysore. Therefore, this meeting of the Muslims of Bellary resolve and earnestly request the Prime Minister of India to include Bellary taluk in Mysore forthwith."

I know this gentleman had come to our leader, met him and had a discussion with him. He has made it quite clear that the Muslims are also

behind the Kannadigas to join with Mysore. Even when this question was opened here, our leader had firmly said that Mr. Justice Misra's award was correct and they could not go against it. The Government has decided in favour of that and if the question is reopened, it will lead to unnecessary trouble and unnecessary bitterness.

With regard to Mysore, I must say that a large number of friends have made certain accusations which are very unjust and uncharitable. As our hon. friend, the Deputy Minister himself said, Mysore did not come forward and ask for these taluks to be given to her. Because when according to the fundamental and declared policy of the Government the Government of India were re-arranging the boundaries, at that time, the Central Government must naturally give these to Mysore. To say that Mysore grabs more land is uncharitable. My friend Mr. Raghavachari is not here. I thought I should respect his age but I think otherwise now, because he has compared Mysore with a certain story he wanted to narrate. He narrated the story of the two cats and the monkey, wherein the monkey got the major share when the cats were quarrelling. That is a very uncharitable statement about Mysore. Mysore never came forward. After all, what has Mysore done? When the present Production Minister was the Leader of the Congress Party in the Constituent Assembly of Mysore, the Constituent Assembly passed a resolution to the effect that the neighbouring areas which were desirous of joining Mysore could come and join Mysore. On that policy our present Chief Minister, Mr. K. Hanumanthaiah has acted; and when the Government of India came forward and offered these areas he has accepted them. What is wrong? After all they are Kannadigas and the Kannadiga agitation is there for the last 30 years or more. If the Andhras have fought for their own State, the Kannadigas have also been fighting for their State. It is after all very easy to have a Karnataka State. The capital is already there. What is needed is only

the adjustment of certain territories, Karnataka territories under different administrations, three districts in Hyderabad, three in Bombay, nine in Mysore and two districts in the Madras State. In this way, Karnataka is torn and kept in different administrations. If all these are brought together—there may be a little adjustment of boundaries—it will be a viable State which will contribute to the unity of India on a really linguistic basis. I cannot understand how the unity of India will be destroyed by the re-arrangement on the linguistic basis. The resolutions are there; all the parties are agreed on the matter. The Constituent Assembly of Mysore has passed a resolution; the Mysore Congress Party has passed a resolution. The Chief Minister of Mysore has said that they were not consulted in the matter, and they are never against any such adjoining areas joining the State. First of all there was some fear that Mysore was going to be merged with some other State but that has been made clear. It is now a question of adding to Mysore and there is no trouble at all and it can easily be done.

Another point which I want to say in this connection is this. Some are speaking of Vishal Andhra. Unless the Hyderabad question is solved and it is disintegrated, the question of Vishal Andhra or Vishal Maharashtra or Vishal Karnataka cannot come into existence. It is too much at this stage to talk in that strain. Still the Andhra Bill has got great potentialities. I welcome this Bill in that spirit also. The Government is going to appoint a high-power commission and the whole question of the reorganisation of the States will be considered. Therefore, I say that this is a fine opportune time to build up these linguistic States in India which will contribute to the welfare of India.

Shri S. V. L. Narasimham (Guntur): I pay my homage to that great martyr son of India.....

Shri C. R. Narasimham (Krishnagiri): May I know which Narasim-

[Shri C. R. Narasimham]

ham you have called. There are two Narasimhams.

Mr. Chairman: I called Mr. Narasimham and he has stood up and begun.

An Hon. Member: He is also Narasimham.

Shri S. V. L. Narasimham: I pay my homage to that great martyr son of India whose act of self-immolation in the cause of the Andhra State has no parallel in the history of not only India but of mankind. Sriramulu is a household name in Andhra. There have been expressions of opinion by hon. Members of this House that fasts or hunger-strikes for political purposes ought to be deprecated. I respectfully submit it is clear from the statements of the late lamented Sriramulu that his fast unto death was never meant for the purpose of embarrassing the Government of India. The Government of India from time to time was proclaiming to the country that there must be an agreement among the parties concerned in the composite State of Madras on broad principles to enable the Centre to move in the direction of the formation of the Andhra State. It was a fact that there have been differences of view amongst the leaders of the people in the composite State. They were warring against one another and Sriramulu took upon himself the responsibility of creating a psychological atmosphere. He wanted to impress on these warring elements the necessity of composing their differences so that ultimately the desires of the people of Andhra may be achieved. If this is understood to be the motive and object of Sriramulu, I respectfully submit that all the insinuations made against him are highly unwarranted.

The hon. Home Minister in the course of his speech has expressed his hope, his devout hope that the Andhra State shall prosper and the sponsors of the move shall fulfil the desires and aspirations of the people cherished for so many years past. I

am happy that we Andhras, we the representatives of the Andhra people shall easily fulfil that hope. I ask the hon. Home Minister to take immediate steps for the formation of Vishal Andhra which has been the aspiration of the Andhras. I ask the hon. Finance Minister to give to the Andhra State what the Centre has been collecting from our Andhra area by way of excise duty on tobacco. I ask the hon. Minister of Planning to just refer to his Five Year Plan and score off the question mark which has been entered against the river Krishna and substitute the projects of Nandikonda, Siddheswaram, Pulichintala and Gandiketa. If these steps are taken by the Central Government I may assure the whole House that Vishal Andhra shall be a model State. Just as this enactment is going to compel an amendment in the entry in the Schedules—Assam which has got the first place will now get the second place and Andhra the first—I may respectfully submit that Andhra shall also lead the whole of India.

Then again, the hon. Home Minister has also stated that this will result in the association of two centuries being snapped. I regret the statement. What all this Bill does is to remove the artificiality and the unnaturalness on which the association of the past two centuries is based. This unnaturalness and artificiality has given room for strife and discontent in the minds of the Andhras. Today by enacting this legislation the basis for a lasting and real association is created. What is that? It is goodwill and amity. I am sure the House is aware, whether we are Andhras or whether we are Tamilians or Kannadigas or Malayalees, all of us are conscious of the fact that we are Indians first and Indians last. That consciousness continues and will continue this association.

My hon. friends from Rayalaseema have made distressing speeches. It looks as if they were indicting the

people of the Circars. May I in all humility ask them to search their hearts and answer me? I do agree that there has been the Shri Bagh Pact. It was conceived in proper perspective. I cannot help saying that this Pact was based on an assumption that there have been some suspicions and apprehensions in the minds of the people of Rayalaseema about the just intentions of the people of the Circars. I ask in all humility my hon. friends from Rayalaseema: what is it that the people of Circars have done that warrants such suspicions about them in their minds? I am sure they will not be in a position to give any answer.

Suppose today I ask them some more questions? I particularly draw the attention of the House to the expression made by my hon. friend Mr Seshagiri Rao. He used expressions like "political gamble", "speculation", etc., etc. He also said that there is an agitation for shifting the capital from Kurnool to Vijayavada or Guntur. Let him understand why this agitation is there. Do Rayalaseema and the Circars constitute the Andhra State or not? Are the people of Rayalaseema distinct from the people of the Circars? Let it be understood clearly that the welfare and prosperity of Andhra State shall be the welfare and prosperity of both the people of Rayalaseema and the Circars. The situation in the Andhra area is such that everybody in the Andhra State is convinced that without industrial and agricultural development the State cannot prosper. The Circarites, the people of the Circars, know full well that with a view to industrial development, they have necessarily to depend on the area of Rayalaseema. I am sure my hon. friends of Rayalaseema also agree with me that for the purpose of satisfying their needs of food they have to depend on the Circars. If this interdependence of the Circarites and the Rayalaseemites cannot be a compelling factor for the two to work together for the benefit of Andhra State, I wonder as to how

any safeguards, even if they are provided in this Bill, shall serve as a guarantee by way of protecting their interests. I appeal to my hon. friends of Rayalaseema to consider this question in that light.

It is the desire of the Andhra people that all educational institutions within the territory of Andhra shall from the appointed day be affiliated to the Andhra University. Educational institutions in Rayalaseema are today affiliated to the Madras University. Steps have necessarily to be taken for the disaffiliation of the institutions in Rayalaseema from the Madras University and for their affiliation to the Andhra University. I do understand the difficulty that will be caused to the students of Rayalaseema when this is to take place in the midst of the educational year. So, I would suggest that some suitable safeguards must also be provided. I am conscious of the fact that university education is the exclusive function of the respective State Legislatures themselves. But I would respectfully submit to the House that this question involves an inter-university question, a question of two universities, which exercise their respective jurisdictions within particular States and as such I feel it proper that this House itself will take some measures in that direction.

Reference has been made to justice Misra's report. It is indeed true that some aspersions have also been cast. I entirely dissociate myself from any aspersions made on Justice Misra, in regard to his integrity or any such thing, but let me respectfully submit that this idea of a plebiscite is not something foreign to Misra's report. I may venture to assert before this House that this question of plebiscite so far as the Bellary question is concerned, has been conceived and has been mentioned by Justice Misra himself. So on the ground that it has been the creation of Justice Misra himself, I urge the House to take the question of plebiscite. I have to submit another aspect also. It may be

[Shri S. V. L. Narasimham] noted that the Andhras never claimed the question, but dealt with the problem was strictly confined to a few taluks. Mr. Justice Misra did not take into consideration this aspect of the entire district of Bellary. Their lem as though it pertains to the whole district.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): Question.

Shri S. V. L. Narasimham: My hon. friend Mr. Gurupadaswamy questions me and asks me to consider their claims also. I am one of those who believe that the Central Government has done the right thing in allotting the Kannada parts of the Madras State to Mysore State. I also assure my hon. friend Mr. Gurupadaswamy that if there is any difference of view or if there are any claims and counter-claims, we can sit together and settle the matter by ourselves. There is absolutely no need for Mr. Muniswamy of Tamil Nad to come and be an arbitrator for us.

The question of territory in other words is a question of boundaries. The House may note that by the statement of 19th December 1952 the hon. the Prime Minister has announced that the Government has decided to form the Andhra State with the Telugu areas within the Madras State. Mr. Justice Wanchoo has investigated into the matter and a perusal of the report clearly convinces anybody that the territory as recommended by him only constitutes the undisputed Telugu area and not the entire Telugu area. If these two statements have to be viewed together, then how is it that we have to finally settle the question of boundary between the Andhra State and the residuary Madras State? For that even the Madras Legislature has resolved that a boundary commission has to be appointed. I am fully conscious of the fact that this does not strictly confine itself only to the dispute between Andhra and the residuary Madras State. It

extends to all disputes with regard to claims and counter-claims by Andhra State or other States concerning Andhra, Orissa, Mysore, Madhya Pradesh, Madras and the Hyderabad State. It has been said that if it is a question of transferring one village from one State to another State Parliamentary legislation is necessary. I am fully conscious of article 3 of our Constitution. All that article 3 of the Constitution says is that before a new State is formed the Legislatures concerned, will have an opportunity of discussing both the act of introduction and also the provisions of the Bill. Then alone the President will recommend the Bill to be considered by the House. This article is clearly meant for the purpose of enabling the States also to express their views on the proposed measure. May I ask the hon. the Home Minister: Is it not open for the States voluntarily to come forward and make a request to the President to recommend consideration of that aspect by this House? So, whatever may be the position with regard to the question of boundaries between Andhra and other States, so far as the dispute of the Andhras in relation to other territories within the Madras State is concerned, I respectfully submit that the resolution of the Madras Legislature itself is sufficient and there is no need for a further enactment.

I always respect the time-limit. I fully endorse the sentiments expressed by other friends from Andhra in relation to the allocation of services, in relation to the division of assets and liabilities, and in relation to the administration and development of Tungabhadra project. Before I conclude, I would like to make one thing clear. Though it has not been directly suggested, it looks to me, unhappily, there is an impression in the mind of a number of my hon. friends of this House that the Andhras are actuated by parochial considerations. The very fact, the very presence of the eminent, poet, dramatist, and playwright,

Shri Harindra Nath Chattopadhyaya in this House must convince everybody that Andhras are always Indians, they have been Indians first and they will be Indians last.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan: I would be very brief, even at the risk of not mentioning my point, because my namesake has also spoken and I do not want the two Narasimhams to monopolise the House.

The House has been listening to various arguments, conflicting demands and counter demands made. We are, so to say, having a sort of variety entertainment provided by the concerned regional Members for the others. In the variety entertainment was included the poetic fancy or rather as I would put it the poetic frenzy of Shri Harindranath.

In the midst of these bewildering and conflicting arguments it is rather difficult to find a solution and I am glad that the Government Bill provides the greatest common measure of agreement. The Bill has been further fortified by the advices that have been given by the legislators of Madras and Mysore. From the various speeches we covered a large ground. Demands have been put forward in the name of Vishal Andhra, Samyukta Karnataka and the last speaker even included Madhya Bharat. Therefore, naturally it is a very complicated problem.

Suggestions were made about boundary commission also to demarcate vishal linguistic provinces and the Home Minister gave his view and the Finance Minister intervened on the question of finances. Therefore, we have the benefit of their views. My own view is that we should not take up the question of greater linguistic provinces in the near future. As regards the question of borders and the adjoining area of Andhra State, it is too small a matter for any boundary commission to be appointed at all. I would like both the questions to be bypassed. If the desire of the people of Andhra is to start, with good work I think they should start

with a clean slate and not get complicated with issues like border areas such as that so and so areas belong to Madras, so and so belong to Mysore and so and so to Tamil Nad. This is too small a question to be put to a boundary commission? Without entering into this question, I think, the Andhras can flourish. Why quarrel over the demarcation of the boundaries? Is it a demarcation between nation and nation? Vast areas between Burma and India are still undemarcated; so also vast areas between Pakistan and India are still undemarcated. Even with China we have a large area with undemarcated boundary.

Shri Venkataraman: What about raids?

Shri C. R. Narasimhan: We are not going to have raids. My case is stronger if in spite of such raids we have undemarcated frontiers in the other countries.

Shri Raghuramaiah (Tenali): The hon. Member will remember that there are more than 100 villages in his own constituency which are a Telugu-speaking area.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan: I think my hon. friend is not quite correct. It is not a big majority. The taluk to which he refers viz. Hosur is a Tamil majority area. Sixty per cent. of the people of that taluk are non-Andhras composed of Tamilians and Canarese. The 40 per cent. Telugu people do not wish to join Andhra. They wish to continue as they are. That is why they have passed resolutions that they should continue as they are.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: They would rather go to Mysore than to Andhra.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan: What I wanted to impress is that these small questions need not be raised. These small border areas should be left alone. Do not put them into the melting pot. They would abide by any decision that is applicable to all. In the interest of the welfare of the country and welfare of the new provinces that

[Shri C. R. Narasimhan]

are emerging, the question of boundary commission need not be raised here. I say "provinces" because one of the previous speakers has said that "twin States are being created" viz. Andhra and Karnataka. I say twin-States are Tamilnad and Andhra. My respected friend Shri Ramachandra Reddi said, "Mutilation of territory has taken place but let there be no mutilation of good will." But in the heat of the moment most of the Members are forgetting his advice. I with all the emphasis at my command insist that this small border question be left untouched on the occasion of the ushering in of the new State. All of us wish the Andhra State to emerge as a great State. We should have a wide outlook just as my hon. friend Mr. T. Subrahmanyam has said, "Ganga is our own, Himalayas are our own". Similarly we can say Godavari is our own, Krishna is our own. There will be healthy rivalry and this is going to be a great success. I congratulate the Government for having brought forward this measure which embodied the G.C.M of agreement of various views.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: I thought that I was left in the lurch but then, as usual, man after going a long way will be bound to turn back and come to the point where he has started so that he may have peace.

The Andhra State Bill has been presented to this House. It is the first of its kind, the first experiment tried by this Government to consolidate Indian on linguistic basis. So far so good. But to me it looks as if the Bill had been forced down the throat of Government which had given promises during the days of agitation but which have been very conveniently forgotten. I am not averse to linguistic provinces being formed as a basis of the political set-up in India. But I am averse to the manner in which this Bill is presented in this House, in a haphazard manner, with the Finance Minister coming with his assets and

liabilities a day after the fire—as is usual with the Finance Department—and then creating such a confusion of ideas and thought on assets and liabilities that one is bound to think that this Bill is the result of confounded confusion.

Though I support the Bill I wish at this juncture to pass a few remarks on this Bill. We have realised our dream of freedom and we know what we have paid for it. Independent India had to go through a series of difficulties. The first experience of India was to go through a major operation on principles of religion, cutting the auricle and the ventricle, leading to physical and emotional complications with far-reaching consequences, undoing the history and tradition of ages. When a handful of men and women had been enthroned, millions had been set afloat without food, clothing and shelter, not to speak of the bloodshed of thousands of men, women and children, whose lingering moans can still be heard in the midnight silence of Hindustan and Pakistan. Time has not elapsed to soothe the deep wounds caused by that historic event—wounds that still show signs of pain and suffering, wounds that still demand careful nursing and soothing balms—when minor ambitions have cropped up to perform minor operations on the rest of the body, on principles of language, so as to perpetuate the pain and suffering disintegrating the Constitution so securely cemented by Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. All honour to his name.

I am one of those who feel the pride of living in a free country and thinking that this is my own, my native land. But the freedom that we enjoy today is confronted with problems awaiting solution from patriotic and united efforts of every citizen in India, irrespective of State, language or religion, freedom, into whose sanctuary are creeping up silently, secretly, unnoticed poisonous enemies, imperialist interests, demanding caution, diplomacy and circumspection on the part of the administrators, parliament-

tarians and electors. I support this Bill; but I wish to recall to the minds of the progenitors of this Bill certain circumstances. What I feel is that the masses in India today are in need of food, clothing and shelter, the fundamentals of life. The thousands who are starving, the thousands of beggars with dying children in their arms, without even the rudiments of a dress to cover their modesty, struggling between life and death, know only one linguistic ideal, one language, the language of the stomach, the language of hunger and thirst. Crores and crores of rupees are invested in huge schemes and projects and the nation is still waiting with great anxiety to see the problem solved. The State of Madras has invested enough for the Tungabhadra and Machkund projects and the famine stricken Rayalaseema and its neighbours are looking with great interest to see streams flowing into the parched fields, when the linguistic State has come up to upset and retard the completion of the scheme, rousing emotions of partition, leading to irresponsibility and neglect and competition.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): It does not retard.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: We have got to wait and see. The masses in India are illiterate; only 13 per cent. are literate. Any ambitious and interested party can lead or mislead them to a public opinion and to follow them. Surely, the ideal of linguistic consolidation can wait till we have completed these projects and the food problem is solved. The advocates of the Andhra province may say, we have enough food, I quite agree with them. But, I had been going through the report of Justice Wanchoo and reading with great interest about the problems that he had placed before us. This Bill is found lacking in the pre-requisite of a Federal Government, namely, financial self-sufficiency. The federal principle requires that the regional Governments must each have under its own independent control financial resources sufficient to perform its exclusive functions. Mr.

Justice Wanchoo had brought in by way of example, an analysis, of the Budget of 1951-52. He says that there is a deficit of Rs. five crores as far as the Andhra province is concerned. The expenditure of a new State is bound to increase and new organs of Government like the executive, Legislature, judiciary and a thousand other administrative functionaries are to be created. After suggesting a reduction of expenditure and increase of taxation, he goes further and suggests the revival of excise duties and the doing away of prohibition. It is very interesting to note that he suggests this measure as a solution and says:

"I would therefore recommend the necessity of giving up prohibition to avoid bankruptcy from the very beginning."

That is a point where I wish to disagree with my friends. To revive the excise duties: I am for it. But, then, here we have got a Government with prohibition austerities imposed on the people. Now, this has given rise to a cry, shrouded in the garb of prohibition ethics. I think the common man, while he has to pay other taxes to fill up the gap caused by prohibition austerities, has also to pay a black-market price for a bottle of toddy. He will be much obliged to Justice Wanchoo who suggests that hereafter when the Andhra province comes into existence, the problem can be solved by selling toddy in the open market.

Shri Nambiar: The State will do it when it comes.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: I am a supporter of that. I am not in favour of prohibition austerities.

An Hon. Member: What happened to the bottle of liquor you presented to this House?

Kumari Annie Mascarene: I have tried to enquire and found that this Government is not willing to wash the dirty linen of Travancore-Cochin State in this Parliament.

The ideal of linguistic provinces is a recent one. If you examine the ideal.

[Kumari Annie Mascarene]

you will find that in all federal countries, beginning with Canada, there are provinces, federal units, with not the same language in the units, all not speaking the same language. In Canada, there is French, English and German. In Switzerland, there is French, English and German and Italian. U.S.S.R. is the one ideal country which has adopted linguistic provinces with great success. But the conditions in Russia are different from the conditions in India. In U.S.S.R. they call it a fraternal union whereby the Republics have voluntarily joined the Union on a fraternal basis with independence to secede. Article 17 says that they are at liberty to secede from the Union at any moment: a challenge to the imperialists who accuse the U.S.S.R. of imperialist designs.

Shri N. M. Lingam (Coimbatore): Has any State seceded so far?

Kumari Annie Mascarene: If they are willing, they are at liberty to do so.

Shri N. M. Lingam: Can you give an example?

Kumari Annie Mascarene: If the Republics are not doing it, I will ask the interrupter to please go and persuade them.

Shri Nambiar: Will he be given a passport?

Kumari Annie Mascarene: But there is one difference there also. I have been to Uzbekistan, and I am told that in Uzbekistan there are people who speak Azerbaijan, and the rest speak Uzbekistan. Even in U.S.S.R., the ideal Union on a linguistic basis, the language is not so cut and dried as we are going to impose on this our own country by cutting Telugu, Tamil and Kannada into such water-tight compartments as to create a strong minority of states.

In these bilingual localities we have to find a solution. They exist everywhere. The conflict between the majority and the important minority

opinion with regard to their choice of capital is seen. Justice Wanchoo's report is evidence to this conflict. I wish to recall to the framers of this Bill the fundamental principles of a federal Government, that is, when once a federal Government is formed, continuance of it is a problem in itself. Its success depends on various things and a spirit of compromise among the statesmen who work it. Swift and decisive changes are impossible. Deep dividing issues must be avoided. Changes can come only slowly. The Federal Government is a conservative Government. It is also legalistic as it is created by Constitution.

1 P.M.

Shri R. N. S. Deo (Kalahandi-Bolangir): I hail this Bill as an usher of a bright dawn—of an era of hope—for the fulfilment of the aspirations of millions of people for the formation of linguistic States. I congratulate my Andhra friends on the fact that their efforts and sufferings for over forty years are now going to give them a State which they had demanded. Though their hopes are going to be realised, and the thing for which they had been striving is being granted to them, still why do we find that this Bill has not given them the satisfaction which it should have given to them? There are certain differences of opinion, as regards the division of assets and liabilities, and the future of certain taluks in Bellary district, but the main discontent seems to have arisen from the fact that the idea of a Vishal Andhra State has not been fulfilled. But let me remind this House that this idea of a Vishal Andhra is of later development. When in 1916, Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya drew up the linguistic provinces scheme for the Andhra Conference, which was submitted to the Joint Select Committee on the Government of India Bill, 1919, Ganjam, Koraput in Visakhapatnam and the agency areas were conceded by our Andhra friends as belonging to Orissa, and they had asked for only eleven districts, which they hoped, would later become the twelve districts of the Andhra province. That was their

filled to a very large extent. demand, and that is going to be fulfilled.

The main discontent seems to spring from the fact that in 1916 or 1919, nobody could dream of the disintegration of Hyderabad. Then it was a separate State, and therefore their demand did not include the question of the disintegration of Hyderabad. But today circumstances have changed. The Indian States have been integrated, and therefore the idea of Vishal Andhra has inspired our friends of the Andhra areas.

But I would like to remind my Andhra friends, that the sufferings of the Oriya people were much greater than those of the Andhras. At least in the case of the Andhra State, they had the major portion in one administrative unit, while in the case of the Oriyas, they were divided and tagged on to three different provinces first, and later on to four provinces. At one time, there was even the danger of the Oriya language disappearing. Even after several years of effort, the Oriyas have not got the complete Oriya speaking areas in their province. There are still preponderantly Oriya speaking tracts which are out of Orissa, and we are agitating for justice being done. An injustice has been done to us by taking away Seraikella and Kharswan from Orissa, against the wishes of the people of those States, which have now been unjustly merged with Bihar. We are demanding the restoration of these two places back to Orissa. We have also got some Oriya speaking tracts in Bastar district of Madhya Pradesh, which my friends from the Andhra are claiming. There are other areas in Madhya Pradesh—Phuljher, Bindra Nawagarh, Raigarh, Saranagarh, Sakti, etc.—where there are a large number of Oriya speaking people. There is Singhbhum in Bihar. There are also our counter-claims on our friends in Srikakulam and Visakhapatnam.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Give us Ganjam and take Tekkali.

Shri E. N. S. Deo: I should like to remind my Andhra friends who have laid claims on Ganjam and Koraput that they would be going back on their professed attitude of fairness and their sense of justice which had inspired the leaders of Andhra in the past. I should like to remind them that many eminent Andhras like the Raja of Bobbili and the Raja of Vizianagaram have in their memorandum to the Philip-Duff Committee said that they agree to Jalantar and Biridi estates going to Orissa in spite of the fact that their transfer to Orissa would cause them personal inconvenience; they said they would not stand in the way of these areas being given to Orissa, because the people wanted them.

Now, I should also like to remind my hon. friends that Jalantar, though it has been conceded to be a preponderant Oriya area, still continues in Srikakulam district. I should like to remind them that though Berhampur taluk had over 60 per cent. Oriya population, it was divided without any justification and Ichhapuram has been separated as a taluk.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: What about Berhampur City?

Shri E. N. S. Deo: I find from some of the amendments tabled that they have also an eye on Berhampur. Even in the debate on the resolution for formation of Linguistic States on the 7th and 12th July last year, unfortunately these claims on Ganjam and Koraput were raised by certain friends from Andhra. Unfortunately, in spite of all our efforts not a single Member from Orissa got a chance to give a reply. I should like to take this opportunity to remove this wrong impression. This claim is entirely baseless and without justification.

I will not say anything of my own. Rather I would quote something from what an Andhra friend has written, an Andhra of Berhampur, Shri Koka Appa Rao Naidu, in a memorandum to the Joint Select Committee on the Government of India Bill 1919, on the

[Shri R. N. S. Deo]

25th August 1919. He was the Secretary, Ganjam People's Association, and he is an Andhra. He has submitted a memorandum and in that there is a section with regard to Oriyas. This is at page 108 of the Appendix to the Report of the Joint Select Committee on the Government of India Bill, 1919. I will read it out for the benefit of my friends.

"Uriyas. Uriyas form a minority community in Madras Province, their population being 6,04,321. They differ from their neighbouring Andhras in language, race, customs and manners. Not even a single Oriya was returned to the Madras Legislative Council through election from the time of the establishment of elected Councils in India".

Please note this. Then he goes on to say: "Even in the municipality of Berhampur"—underline the word—"Even in the municipality of Berhampur they could not secure a single seat although they are in a majority".

Please underline these words "although they are in a majority".

An Hon. Member: This was in 1919.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: And, subsequently more Andhras have migrated to Oriya areas for trade or for service as the Philip-Duff Committee has also clearly stated in its report in 1924 that many Andhras have migrated for trade and service to the predominantly Oriya areas. I would like to take the House into confidence and tell you that as a matter of fact during the Philip-Duff Committee inquiry and also during the Orissa Commission of 1932, our Andhra friends were indifferent to the fate of the Agency areas in Koraput and Ganjam and these Committees have recorded the reasons. They have stated that the Andhras were indifferent to what happens to these areas because they are undeveloped, because they will be a liability rather than an asset. And, today why do they cast greedy eyes upon those areas? It is because the State of Orissa, in spite of its

chronic deficit has spent lakhs and lakhs of rupees on these under-developed areas at the cost of other districts of Orissa and has now opened up roads and trade and other facilities. That has attracted a large number of our Andhra friends who have now migrated to this territory. After we have developed the area they want to take it back. I ask you, is this fair?

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: It is just like the claim on Madras.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: In the Koraput district, which my hon. friend has mentioned in the amendment, out of a total population of 12,69,534 the Telugu population is only 79,604, which works to only 6.2 per cent. Now, I ask you, is there any justification for the claim?

Several Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: In Ganjam also you will find that out of 16,24,829 the Telugu population is only 2,36,878 which works out to only 14.58 per cent. But, on the contrary, there are areas in Ichchapuram, Somepeta and several other parts of Srikakulam district which are preponderantly Oriyaspeaking. In the Somepeta taluk out of a total of 289 or some such number of villages 185 are Oriyaspeaking majority. In Udhyankhand also, I am not going into the details now (*Interruption*). If my Andhra friends have got certain claims let them also remember that we have got counter-claims. Our Andhra friends in the past having conceded all this in favour of Orissa are now complaining of ill-treatment in Madras. Let them not forget what was the position of the poor Oriya minorities in the Madras province, where the Andhra did not at least have the fear of losing their language. The Oriya minorities had their difficulties about schools in the districts of Ganjam and Vizagapatnam; while the Andhras got all the facilities to themselves the Oriyas suffered for centuries. (*Interruption*).

I will not refer to those points now.
When the amendments come I will
have an opportunity of speaking

शिवमति स्वामी (कुड्डली) : अब मैं
इस चीजे पर जो बिल हाउस के

सामने पेश हुआ है उस की पुरजोर तार्ईद
करते हुए खुशी से इस का स्वागत करता हूँ।

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member
may resume his speech tomorrow.

*The House then adjourned till a
Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on
Wednesday, the 19th August, 1953.*