

[Shri Punnoose]

question of handlooms. It means thirteen lakhs of people. In fact, in the whole of Kerala poverty is raging, and what is being done? You say, "Don't be worried about this linguistic province business. It does not matter." I am asking you in all seriousness, what steps have you taken, what are you doing, to look after these things? You ask us to go to the State Government. The State Government says that it is awaiting replies from the Central Government. And the Central Government is expecting—I do not know, what. The result is that we the people of Kerala with one voice demand the immediate implementation of that linguistic province.

Shri Matheu (Thiruvellah) : No.

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh) : On a point of information, Sir. The hon. Member asked what the Central Government are waiting for. I told the deputation that unless they send schemes I do not know what kind of assistance is required. Those schemes must come from the State Government.

Shri Punnoose : Yes, Sir. It is a question of schemes. The Finance Minister did say that the State Government should send schemes. It is a matter to be settled between them. Schemes or no schemes, our people are in difficulties. We believe that a Government of Kerala can tackle these problems more successfully. The House would be aware of the fact that nearly 50 crore of rupees worth of commodities are being exported from Travancore-Cochin State alone, which means about eight per cent. of the total export value of India. If Malabar is also taken in and a linguistic province is formed we the people of Kerala will be able to manage our affairs and have a better future. We will be able to preserve our culture and develop on our own lines.

There is no question of our getting away from India. Neither we in Kerala, nor the Tamilians, nor the people of Andhra want to live in isolation. India is as dear to us as it is to any hon. Member who opposes linguistic provinces. This burning problem among the people should be taken up immediately and a solution found. There are people who are honestly in doubt that India will go asunder. I say that is an instance of supreme disbelief in the patriotism of our people; in the shrewdness of our people and in their capacity to keep together. It is good that our leaders feel themselves intelligent. But they should not feel more intelligent than the people themselves. The people have

the strength, have the capacity, have the foresight to guard their own interests. Therefore, it is not a question of submitting to the people's will but of giving shape to their desire and to implement it here and now. I want to tell the Prime Minister in all humbleness that any more delay in this matter is fraught with the gravest consequences to India. We Indians have got our noble dreams of a united India to occupy her place in the comity of nations. Therefore it is not a question of disintegrating India; it is not a question of weakening India. It is, on the other hand, a case of strengthening India; so that our great economic programmes, like the Five-Year Plan, may remain not merely paper plans, but become realities, that would go to help our people, that would go to make our country one of the greatest in the world.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru) : Sir, I am not quite sure if this debate is ending today.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : I have got as many as forty-five names.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru : I am merely enquiring.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : I leave it to the House.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee : We suggest it may be continued.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru : What I wished to say was this. If the House so desires, so far as Government is concerned, we shall give every facility for its continuance. I am intervening, therefore, in the middle of this debate and I hope my colleague and near neighbour at the present moment will at a later stage reply to the rest of the debate.

I shall refer to some points that have been mentioned and some ideas which I have on the subject. Right from the beginning it was said—I think it was Dr. Lanka Sundaram who said it—that we should keep away from passion and prejudice. I entirely agree with him. Dr. Mookerjee said that this is not a matter which might be considered a party matter. I also entirely agree with him. And yet, may I say, that perhaps it would have been better if it was a party matter. I shall explain myself. Not that I want things to become party matters, but a party matter is something that cuts across provincial feelings. It may be good, or it may be bad. But anyhow it is not on a provincial basis that a party would consider it. Well, this particular question

12 Noon

is in the nature of things a provincial question. Therefore, where division comes or where friction comes as between representatives of one province and another—which I think is worse than party divisions—perhaps it would have been better if it was a party matter, if it is considered on the basis of some principle, if you like. There are different ways of looking at it, but not on the basis of provincial differences, or thinking.

Now, an hon. Member—one of the noted poets we have in this House—referred to the policy, the old British policy of divide and rule. He seemed to conclude, to hint that in this matter of linguistic provinces, the policy of the present Government is a continuation of this divide and rule policy. Now I must confess that I have failed to understand that. It may be a flight of poetic fancy, perhaps. Whatever one's view on this question may be, how it is a policy of divide and rule I do not understand.

Now repeated references have been made to the Congress policy for a large number of years and one hon. Member said that some time or other in the past I used to go about shouting from the House-tops or street corners about linguistic provinces. I am not aware of having done so at all. In fact, I have never been very anxious about linguistic provinces. I might say—and this is entirely, if I may say so, a confidential aside to the House—I have had peculiar views about our provinces and coming as I do from the biggest of India's provinces, I think that provinces should be very small in this country, but not provinces as we have them today with all the paraphernalia of a Governor, a High Court and this and that. But my voice has been a lonely voice, even when the Constituent Assembly was considering it. We were so used to existing conditions that we followed, more or less what we have been used to.

Now talking about the Congress, everybody knows that thirty years ago or thereabouts, the Congress stood for linguistic provinces. Then skipping over the period, in 1945-46 (seven years ago) the Congress in its election manifesto said:

"It (the Congress) has also stood for the freedom of each group and territorial area within the nation to develop its own life and culture within the larger framework and it is stated that for this purpose such territorial areas or provinces should be constituted, as far as pos-

sible, on a linguistic and cultural basis."

That was seven years ago. The latest position is as embodied in the election manifesto of the last General Elections drawn up at Bangalore. May I read that out?

"The demand for a redistribution of provinces on a linguistic basis has been persistently made in the South and West of India. The Congress expressed itself in favour of linguistic provinces many years ago. A decision on this question ultimately depends upon the wishes of the people concerned. While linguistic reasons have undoubtedly cultural and other importance, there are other factors also, such as, economic, administrative and financial, which have to be taken into consideration. Where such a demand represents the agreed views of the people concerned, the necessary steps prescribed by the Constitution, including the appointment of a Boundary Commission, should be taken."

That more or less represents the policy and the position of Government in this matter.

Now, in regard to the Andhra Province, for instance, hon. Members have said: go and take a vote or plebiscite; 95 or 97 per cent. would vote for it. I entirely agree. But that does not get over my difficulties. I am all in favour of the Andhra province. But what will happen if you take the votes of the Andhras and the Tamilians and others in regard to the issue and conflict like Madras city? Then you will not get 90 per cent. this way or that. It is quite clear that if you take the vote of the Andhras on the Andhra province on principle they will vote for it *en bloc*. And rightly so, if I may say so: just as if you take the votes of large numbers of our friends on the Karnataka question they will vote for the Karnataka province. I have no doubt about that. Or Maharashtrians, if they did not do so, or if they were not expected to do so, the question does not arise for our discussion. So we proceed on the basis, on the assumption that considerable numbers of people in certain areas desire a province—more or less a linguistic province you may call it, although it is too limited a phrase—but they want a province where more or less their language prevails.

But the other question is where two such areas overlap, where they come into some friction with each other how is one to decide about that overlapping and that friction?

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): Votes can be taken there.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Possibly. That is a suggestion.

Therefore, the policy that Government stated previously, a year ago and more, was this that where a demand is made which is by general consent—of course, it was taken for granted that the people of that area as a whole more or less wanted it, but the consent meant of those who were concerned in regard to those overlapping and border areas.—if that is obtained, then one can go ahead.

Shri S. S. More: If these difficulties were there, why did the Congress in 1927 at its Madras session pass a resolution that "time has come for the creation of Andhra, Karnatak and Sind provinces"?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: My hon. friend talks about 1927.

Shri S. S. More: Yes.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Well, much has happened since then. I am prepared to say: time has come today. I am not challenging that statement.

Shri S. S. More: Did you not visualize these difficulties then? That is my question.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No. Certainly not. Because the question was not a question which might be called a practical question which could be given effect to then. At that time, naturally, we gave expression to something which was fundamentally a sound matter of principle. But in giving effect to that, where there is conflict you have to resolve that conflict. How are you to resolve it? You may resolve it, as somebody suggested, on a straight vote in that particular area on that particular issue. But some questions cannot be decided by a straight vote of that type. You have to consider, you have to find ways and means of resolving that difficulty, and you have to prepare a suitable atmosphere for it.

Speaking for myself, I have been over-burdened by the thought that in these critical days or years we must give topmost priority to developing a sense of unity in India and that anything that might come in the way of that unity might perhaps be delayed a little, till we have laid that strong foundation. Because of that I have, frankly—and I should be quite frank with this House—not taken any aggressive or positive step for my own part in regard to the formation of these linguistic provinces. Although I agreed with

the demand in many cases I left it at that, and if there is general consent, well and good, we will do it and are prepared to do it. Two and a half years ago or a little more, that is towards the end of 1949 we had practically come to the conclusion to have an Andhra Province, because most matters had been settled not by compulsion by us, but by other people concerned, the Tamil people, the Andhras and others. I think a Committee was formed and the Local Government had practically settled matters, when suddenly we found that two or three important matters, very vital matters, were not settled. Were we to give some kind of a decision to compel acceptance of that? This was just on the eve of the New Constitution of the Republic. The question was whether in this New Constitution we should not include Andhra as a separate Province. We as a Government were perfectly prepared to do it. But we could not do it when at the last moment conflicts arose: so that for the last two and a half years or more we were on the verge of doing this, but something happened outside our own competence that delayed matters. I have no doubt at all in my mind, taking an individual case like the Andhra Province, that there is a great deal of justification for it. It is bound to come, and I have no doubt that the Andhras want it. And in the final analysis that is the final justification for it.

But when we get into difficulties about the City of Madras or Rayalaseema—I am not putting this just trying to create difficulties, I hope the question of Rayalaseema would be settled—whatever it is, when you get into these difficulties what is the Government to do, except that it can follow two courses. One is to allow a better atmosphere and to try to encourage a settlement by consent. The other is to come down with a heavy hand and overrule this party or that and give its own consent. The second can be done. Governments do it. But in a matter of this kind hon. Members will no doubt realize that strong feelings are roused, and if we make a new province by some kind of coercive method and leave a trace of intense bitterness behind between those two provinces which used to be one and were divided up later, it would not be good for either to start with that trail of inheritance of ill-will and bitterness against your neighbours just at the time when you are starting from scratch, when you have to settle down and build yourself anew. Therefore it is infinitely better, even

though it takes a little more time, to do it with the goodwill and consent of your neighbours and others.

That was our general approach. And I submit that is the right approach because it will ultimately save you more time this way than to try to do something apparently quickly but in effect by a method which may entangle you into long arguments for years. After all, even the simplest of partitions brings problems and all kinds of difficulties, administrative, financial, this, that and the other. The Burma partition was very different, of course. Nevertheless, it was a complete partition with our goodwill. There was no conflict in it. Still it took ten years, I think, to work itself out gradually, while it has not quite worked out yet in some ways. And those other partitions, the unfortunate ones, which happened in this country undoubtedly made many of us and many in the country become rather hesitant about changing the map of India too much. It is not in that way, of course, and I am not comparing it with that. But it does rather upset things. Of course, where it is necessary, let us change it. I am perfectly agreeable that it is necessary in some cases. But the resolution that has been put forward, as it is worded, seems to me, not only completely unacceptable, but, if I may add, completely objectionable. It is all very well for our friends from Andhra, or Maharashtra or Kerala or Karnataka, to put forward a definite proposal which could be considered and then accepted or not. But, a general proposition saying "let us take the map of India, and on the basis of language, let us reshape and cut it up anew," is one, which, I submit, no reasonable person can support. Because, it means your cutting up everything that you have got, upsetting everything that you have got, and just at the moment when you are more or less settling down in some way or other, unsettling everything. It will be dangerous at any time. More so, at a time when the world hangs on the verge of a crisis,—one does not know what tomorrow or the day after might bring—for us to unsettle and uproot the whole of India for a theoretical approach or a linguistic division seems to me an extraordinarily unwise thing.

Then, again, in this matter, we have got a magnificent inheritance of India. We want, of course, to better that inheritance, to further it, to advance it. In doing so, if we think too much parochially or provincially, which is sometimes justified.—I do not say that one should not think of his parish or his province; one should—if one ap-

plies that parochial way of looking at the whole of India, it is a dangerous thing. This resolution is for transferring the parochial or provincial outlook to the whole of India, and upsetting everything.

My hon. friend Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee spoke eloquently about West Bengal. I have no doubt that every Member in this House realises the tremendous burdens that West Bengal has had to shoulder and face. I have no doubt at all that of all the States in India, West Bengal has had to shoulder more burdens than any other as a result of the Partition and the rest of it, and other matters connected with that. I am sorry that he rather strayed away into other matters in regard to East Bengal; those are other questions. He advanced an argument that because of the heavy population of West Bengal, some adjoining areas may be added on to it. Now, I am not giving an opinion. Logically or theoretically speaking, that seems to be a valid argument. But, you cannot always be logical in these matters. I am quite sure that Members from Bihar did not wholly approve of what Dr. Mookerjee might have said, regardless of party or anything else. I am not going into whether they are right or he is right.

Let us take another thing. Dr. Mookerjee talked about certain districts, etc. Two or three months ago, I was in the Darjeeling area of North Bengal, and there was a deputation from the Gurkha league demanding a Gurkha or Nepali province in North Bengal. Now, I am quite sure Dr. Mookerjee does not approve of that. It means taking away something even from this restricted Bengal. I might inform the House my own reactions to that. But, instead of using my own words, I shall read out an answer that Sardar Patel gave in this House, with which I entirely agree. When this question of Gurkha province or Uttarkhand came up, his answer was:

"The Government of India consider this move of Uttarkhand in North Bengal as unreal, misconceived and harmful to national interests. The Government of India are determined not to give any quarter to any agitation for the formation of any such province and will not allow the solidarity of the country to be disturbed by such mischievous moves."

In this matter, Dr. Mookerjee and I are in complete hundred per cent. agreement. My point is this. If Dr. Mookerjee starts the question of redistribution round about Bengal, all

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

these questions arise, not only in the west, but in the north too. Everything comes up in the boiling cauldron of distribution all over India and one does not know what will emerge out of it ultimately.

It is all very well to say, as some hon. Members have said, as Dr. Mookerjee has said, as Dr. Khare has said, 'decide this question this way or that way; do not leave it undecided'. Well, I confess I do not understand that. I can understand even a specific matter being decided. But, a general question of re-distribution in India being decided this way or that, I do not understand. In fact, such things, normally, are not decided this way or that way. You may lay down some general principles if you like. But, principles come into clash. There is the principle of linguistic provinces. There is the principle of economic self-sufficiency or whatever it is. There are financial considerations; this, that and the other; there are so many considerations. You have to balance all these things and then come to a particular decision in a particular place. No single general principle will apply. Normally speaking, you take what you have got. You have got the present structure of India, geographically. In fact, in the last three, four or five years, it has changed very greatly. First of all by the Partition which took away a part of India, and secondly by the merger of a large number of the old Indian States, the picture has changed greatly. But, nevertheless, roughly speaking, the old provinces of India remain more or less the same. That does not mean that they should not change. Certainly, they may change. You start with the basis that you do not upset it. You take one particular demand, and if it is reasonable, you consider it and give effect to it, if you like. But, to say, that you should give effect to the principle all over India, there is no particular meaning.

In great countries like India, like China, there is always this great difficulty about provincialism. They are huge countries and inevitably, different parts of the country differ from other parts, sometimes in language, sometimes in ways of living and so many other things. In China they have some great advantages over us. They have, at any rate, one written language for the whole of China although the spoken language differs. Both these great countries have had to contend against provincialism. I do not know enough about the past or

the recent history of China as to how they have dealt with this question for me to go into details about it. But, generally speaking, they have tried to get over it by getting rid of the provinces themselves. I believe they have divided China into a number of what they call Zones, five or six or seven or eight, whatever the number may be. Apart from two or three autonomous areas, which are Mongolia and Tibet, the rest are Zones, which, presumably, cut across the old provincial boundaries. I cannot judge about China; I merely mention this because the problem is, in regard to size and provinces, much the same here. May be, it is more difficult here or more different here. But, our thinking too much in terms of anything that leads to an intensification of provincial feelings will, undoubtedly, weaken the conception of India as a whole. That is one aspect of it.

Another aspect, which is equally important, is that we have certain very important languages in India. A language by itself may be good or bad; but round that language clusters ways of living, sometimes ways of thought and all kinds of ways have grown round it and it is but right that that particular aspect of cultural manifestation should have an opportunity for full growth.

So far as language is concerned, I think that we should encourage almost every hill dialect in India. I am not in favour of suppressing these languages, and certainly the major languages must go ahead. So, in order to encourage the growth of the people, the best way is through the language they speak, and every State should do that if it is multi-lingual, it should do it in the different languages, whatever it is. Why the political boundary should necessarily be a linguistic one, I do not see. If there are within the same boundary different languages, they can have pride of place and be given full opportunity. But I think that although the linguistic demand is mentioned so often, it is not really the question of language that counts in this. Here and there it does, but behind that there is something which is a little more difficult to deal with. It is a feeling of not having a square deal, if I may say so. That feeling comes in; otherwise, probably the language issue would not arise—a feeling that if they were separate and managed their own affairs, well, they will see to it that they get the square deal. If the feeling is there—and it is there—I cannot say whether there is much justification or not, but the mere fact of feeling, it should not be there.

That is bad for us. That we should still function in this narrow provincial way of showing favour to one group and distinguishing the other group from it—that certainly is a bad thing which means that we are still limited in our outlook, and however big our talk may be, we do not really think or function in a national way. We have to admit that. Having admitted it, we have to try to get over it. If we get over it, we should not do something which encourages that rather limited outlook. So you come up against two things. One is that we should not encourage that limited and limiting outlook; secondly, we must encourage the growth of the people in every way through their own language—cultural and other growth. You can balance these things. As a matter of fact, roughly speaking, part of the south of India, certain parts of the south of India—there is more or less a linguistic division in India; it may overlap here and there, but it is there—in the south you have two great States, Bombay and Madras which are multi-lingual. I should have thought that to live in a multi-lingual State gave greater opportunities of growth and for developing the wider outlook than to live in this, if I may say so, as somebody said, big leviathan of a State like Uttar Pradesh. Then you will find, because you will find in history and elsewhere, that countries, small States are forced to think in large terms. The people living in small States are forced to think in large terms. They are forced to learn languages of other States. Because people live in huge States and countries, they become so content with the vast area that they do not think of the other areas or other people. They become self-complacent and all that. It is not a good thing, this business of size by itself. It never connoted either intelligence or anything else. I do not know why people are intent on greatness in size, geographically or otherwise. This idea of size, if I may say so, comes from olden days and is connected with land: a man owning more and more land, therefore getting more and more income; therefore, if he is a King, more and more people calling him Your Majesty or whatever it is. The size does not mean growth in any sense, but still we seem to think so—I am quite sure, for my part I am perfectly agreeable for Uttar Pradesh to be made into four provinces if you like; have three, four or as many as you like, but I doubt very much if many of my colleagues of Uttar Pradesh will relish that idea, and they probably would like another chunk from another province.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma (Kanpur Distt. South *cum* Etawah Distt.—East): After all, we are Hindi speaking.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is quite so. Some hon. Members referred to Hyderabad and the desirability or necessity for it to be cut up. May I say that I think it would be undesirable and unfortunate and injurious for Hyderabad to be disintegrated. Some hon. Members may not agree with me. That is a different matter. I am not challenging their *bona fides* in this matter, and I am not speaking about ever and ever. I am speaking of the present and the near future, and I think any attempt at splitting up Hyderabad would upset the whole structure of South India.

Shri Velayudhan: How?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am expressing my opinion. It would upset the whole structure of South India. For years you go about trying gradually to settle down. Here you have got a certain administrative and other continuity. As a matter of fact, we should have thought in terms of these provinces or States purely as administrative units and nothing more. Whatever is convenient we have. In regard to other matters we do not think in terms of the provinces necessarily.

Dr. N. B. Khare: On a point of information. Will not the abolition of monarchy in Kashmir affect the whole structure of the whole of India?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I, first of all, suggest that the hon. Member's use of the word "monarchy" is not first accurate or precise? There are no monarchs in India of any kind. There are certain persons who had a limited authority in their States under the British power in the old days, and even that limited authority has gone, and they have been given some kind of honoured place without the slightest power or authority. That is the present position.

Dr. N. B. Khare: I meant the same thing by the word. I used the word "monarchy" because there is no other simple word.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I quite agree with the hon. Member.

I do not agree with the suggestion that this will have any large upsetting effect if that is done there. I do not see any upsetting effect in what happens to an individual here and there, however big he may be. It does not upset the country. What would happen to millions of people that upsets the country. But, if any right

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

move is taken in Kashmir, they may try to like the consequences of that in the rest of India. The position, therefore, of Government in this matter is this: that we feel, that we realise that there is a strong demand by large numbers of people for certain linguistic provinces in India to be constituted. More or less this is so in South India—in other parts also as Dr. Mookerjee has pointed out. Almost every province has some petty demand, but those are not important.

Now in regard to these demands in South India which are old demands, which have great justification behind them, we are perfectly prepared to go ahead. We are not going to take up the question of India and shape it on a linguistic basis, but we are prepared to take up any particular matter, to consider it and I would repeat what we have said before, in regard to them nobody expects agreement by everybody, 100 per cent. agreement, but in regard to the major matters which are at the present moment dividing the States concerned, on that there should be a fair measure of agreement. If that is so, if I may give an example with regard to the Andhra claim, I believe it was Dr. Lankasundaram who said that no Andhra will ever give up his claim to the city of Madras. I am quite sure the Members of this House here from the other parts.....

Shri Vittal Rao (Khammam): What Dr. Lankasundaram said is not very true.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sure many Members from the Tamil areas would equally vehemently assert something to the contrary. But there it is. Let them come together and come to some kind of settlement. So far as I am concerned, or so far as we are concerned as a Government, I do not suggest that we should remain passive in this matter. I am prepared to do all I can to help in that settlement, I am certainly prepared to bring them together, but I just cannot see how I can go with a flaming sword to the Tamils or the Andhras and say "You must submit to the other's demand." That I find very difficult to do. If I do that, even so the result will be not good, because you leave this trail of bitter memories behind, then may be they will have a feeling of recovering the lost territory later on from another province. But the difficulty is this. We talk about Vishala Andhra, the Maha Gujerat, or the Samyukth Maharashtra. If we see a map, we find that they all overlap.

Shri Gadgil: The word "Samyukth" means unite only, Samyukth Maharashtra means no overlapping.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If you look at the maps of Maha Gujerat, the Vishala Andhra or the Samyukth Maharashtra, you find that they overlap and come into conflict with each other. So long as you are discussing the theory of it, many people from the Maha Gujerat will vote for the Vishala Andhra and so on. But as soon as they see the maps, they will come, as the poet said, to brass tacks—it is not very poetical, if I may say so. As soon as they come to brass tacks, then you find conflicts arising all over.

Shri Chattopadhyaya: I have become rather unpoetical after coming to the House.)

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: And we may be told, and ancient history may be invoked to say that "in the year 1000 A.D. or something like that, Maha Gujerat spread right up to there," or "Look at history, at the time of the Rashtrakutas, the Maharashtra empire was up to here or there." It was there; very interesting history no doubt, to say that the Andhra Empire at the time of Ashoka or later had spread up to... (Interruption). We get back to these ancient historical memories, and try to claim that territory. Those ancient empires in their day were rather warring empires or imperial entities conquering other places. If the Andhras think of the ancient Andhra empire, and if the Maharashtras think of the old Maharashtra empire and so on.....

Dr. N. B. Khare: But we do not think like that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not accusing anybody. I merely say that this is something where no Member of this House thinks that way. But this talk of linguistic provinces and historical parallels of where they were, leads quite inevitably to thinking that way and of spreading out in a sense, not a dominating one, but still of being in a more important position *vis-a-vis* the neighbour. Obviously you cannot possibly produce all those things. You cannot divide and give the same territory to two provinces, because they overlap. So there are all these difficulties.

Why have an agitation to convince me? I am convinced. If you are an Andhra go and talk to the Tamils or others who are concerned, and I will join the talks too if necessary, not that I want to keep out of it. It is no good trying to convince me because I

am convinced about the same. I am not convinced about the same, as I said, if somebody talks to me about Uttar Khand. I am very much opposed to it; if somebody else talks of a Sikh province, I say "Nothing doing." I am not going to play about with my frontiers there. That is a different matter. But in regard to these major claims like Andhra or Karnatak or Kerala or Maharashtra.....

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: And of West Bengal.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: West Bengal and other places are not questions of new provinces. They are merely questions of frontier rectification, if you like it to put it that way. I have no objection to that. I do not myself see why conditions should arise between the State of Bihar and the State of Bengal such that people should feel unhappy in crossing over from this side or that, either refugees or others. I think it is all one country.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): There is no such difficulty.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think that there is universal agreement in that matter. However, we shall consider that separately, but again that has to be considered, in a spirit of goodwill, because the odd thing is that the more the one side agitates about it, the more the other side gets rigid, because you are not dealing with.....

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: That is why we want your intervention.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: My intervention? Not intervention, but my help I am prepared to give, because I do, as everybody else here, want to solve these problems. But it must be realised that this kind of one-sided agitation really comes in the way of the solution of these problems, because the people of the other provinces get excited the other way.....

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: To solve, not to avoid the issue.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): What is your objection to holding a plebiscite?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Plebiscite of the population of Madras about Madras?

Dr. Rama Rao: In all disputed areas.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That too, if the States concerned, agree to the plebiscite, let us have it, but imposing a plebiscite where it may be a decision,

let us say, by 45 to 55 or something like that, would not help, bitterness will remain and you cannot dispose of all these things normally by plebiscite.

Shri Meghnad Saha (Calcutta North West): May I just point out that Soviet Russia had all these multi-lingual problems, and they had solved it very satisfactorily and it has been working for the last 30 years?

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): As far as the Andhra Province is concerned, there was a partition Committee, and the hon. the Prime Minister has admitted that almost all the questions have been solved except one or two—such as the city of Madras etc. May I know what prevents the Government now from postponing these two issues like the Madras City and others, to a later date, but meanwhile form the Andhra province in regard to which he has accepted that every Andhra is very keen.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Prof. Saha referred to the case of the Soviet Union. Well I do not think it applies here. That is helpful, no doubt, but not very much so. First of all, the Soviet Union emerged as it is today after years of fire and civil war and slaughter. All kinds of things happened there. There was invasion from outside, and what not. Out of that it is in a sense easier to build up. Secondly, India is much more, if I may say so, of a unity than the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is no longer an Empire as a whole, but it is a collection of a number of totally different countries, Russia plus other countries and Siberia. They have formed a political unit and are happy about it. That is very good. So they proceeded on a different basis, on the basis, in theory, of independent republics federating together. Now, India is completely different from that position. You cannot have that here, on the basis of independent republics federating together. We are a much more unified country. The question would arise if you took Russia, that is, not the Soviet Union, but Russia which is more of a unified country, and compare that to India. That will be a better comparison than taking large tracts of Asia which belong to the Soviet Union, which have been added to it, and which follow a common policy etc. Even so, as a matter of fact probably the theory there is somewhat different from the practice—I mean the theory of secession. I think it is perfectly clear that no part of it can secede at all, and as it happens, there has been a progressive decentralisation there. In spite of the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

theory of secession, the process of centralisation has gone pretty far.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I have to say something for the information of the Prime Minister. The case of North India has been dismissed in one sentence, that even in North India they want a Sikh State. There is nothing to it. Before hearing any representative of North India, it has been assumed that some State is desired. I am afraid the judgment has been given before hearing the parties. Why has it been assumed that a Sikh State is desired? That pre-conception is wrong and I should add, Sir, nobody ever demanded that. The resolutions of the Akali Dal and...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will give the hon. Member an opportunity to speak.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I welcome the hon. Member's declaration. I do not for a moment say that any responsible person has asked for it.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Does the Prime Minister listen to what irresponsible persons say?

An Hon. Member: Are we starting the question hour now?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: On a point of procedure, Sir. Before you call upon the next speaker, would Government indicate their intentions as to the continuation of this debate, and if so, for how long?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are still as many as 46 Members who desire to speak.

Shri Nambiar: I move a closure, Sir.

Several Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I will not accept the closure.

Shri Nambiar: Otherwise, is it to be talked out, Sir?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is within the province of the Speaker to decide whether there has been sufficient discussion or not. I do not feel that there has been sufficient discussion over this matter.

Shri Lakshmayya (Anantapur): Linguistic provinces will breed antagonism and bitterness and create a number of differences and dissensions. Mere separation of a province on a linguistic basis is injurious to the national language and national spirit. It creates sub-nations and it creates inter-provincial isolation; inter-provincial isolation will have its

own sub-national sentiments. It stands in the way of the growth of national spirit and national language. A linguistic province will bring in its train a number of other evils. It creates minority problems by breeding intolerance. There may be a large number of people living in a province speaking a different language; what about their fate? Soon after the linguistic province is formed, they will be looked down with contempt and will be treated as aliens and outsiders by the majority of the people, who speak the regional language. The Telugu-speaking people of the Ramnad and Coimbatore districts are not at all happy; they have been treated with contempt and hatred by the Tamils. Again, I may quote another example regarding the spirit of 'intolerance.' The people of some districts in Orissa are even now unhappy. Though Orissa was separated some 17 years ago, these people have been suffering from this handicap. This minority problem has to be considered in regard to linguistic provinces.

Mere separation of a province on a linguistic basis is really an injurious thing. Geographically it must be contiguous and for administrative convenience it may be separated. Now, if at all these provinces are to be redistributed on a linguistic basis, as the motion itself lays down, the old map of India has to be redrawn and old border States are to be broken into fragments. Now this is not the propitious time and we do not at present have peaceful atmosphere which is necessary for dividing States by proper planning on a linguistic basis or some other basis, convenient to all.

I come from Rayalaseema, and the inclusion of Rayalaseema in the proposed Andhra province is again a thing to be considered. From the very beginning, the people of Rayalaseema have been definitely opposed to their inclusion in the Andhra province. Not because we do not want that we should be included; there are several difficulties for its inclusion. The distrust and apprehension which exist in the minds of the Telugu people against the Tamilians for their domination and exploitation find their counterpart in the mind of Rayalaseema. They are economically, educationally and politically backward. Hence they doubt and they apprehend that the people of the coastal districts, who are more advanced will exploit them and will dominate in services and in the Legislatures and in the developmental