

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

Dated..... 20.11.201

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

3287

3288

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Monday, 7th July, 1952.

The House met at a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

9-20 A.M.

RESOLUTION RE LINGUISTIC STATES

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now proceed to resolutions. I must announce to the House that the Mover of the resolution and the hon. Minister concerned may speak for 30 minutes each or for such longer time as the Chair may direct, while other Members' speeches should not exceed 15 minutes.

I shall now call upon Mr. Tushar Chatterjea to move the resolution that stands in his name.

Shri Tushar Chatterjea (Serampore): I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that immediate steps should be taken to redistribute the States on a linguistic basis and that the boundaries of the existing States be readjusted accordingly."

This question of formation of States on a linguistic basis is not altogether a new one. It has been dominating the minds of the people of our country for a long time, and on this question I believe, even different political parties take more or less a common view. I say this, mainly because I know that the Congress itself supports this proposal at least on principle, although it wants under the one plea or the other, to defer the issue for practical purposes. I say

101 PSD.

that not only as a matter of principle, but as a matter concerning the urgent needs of the people and of the good of the country, the formation of States on a linguistic basis should be made forthwith.

The present provincial division is a creation of the Britishers. They had made provincial division in this way, not to satisfy the needs of the people, but to suit their own imperialistic designs. The entire British administration, as we know, was based on the policy of 'divide and rule', which has been applied to the fullest degree in this provincial division. It is quite well known to all of us how people speaking different languages have been kept apart by provincial barriers, and how they have been kept divided into this or that part of the country, with the result that their natural unity has been completely destroyed. The policy of 'divide and rule' was followed by the British only to maintain their iron grip on the administration, and we also know that it is on this division of people created by the Britishers who always tried to play on the differences of the people, that all these systems of exploitation like feudalism, landlordism, rule by the Rajpramukhs etc. were made to thrive. It is our fundamental task to deliver our people from the bonds of British system and for that we must initiate a fundamental change in provincial division. The question has been raised that if we divide States on a linguistic basis, it will mean disruption of the general unity of the country. But I say that it is not disruption that will follow from this division of States on a linguistic basis, but only real unity. If the unity of the country is to be based on popular unity, we must establish the real basis on which we can develop the unity of the people speaking the same language. It is quite easy to understand that if all people speaking a particular language, as for instance, the Telugu language in the South, unite, and

[Shri Tushar Chatterjea]

really promote their unity, that will never mean disunity to the country.

Another point that must be taken into consideration is this, namely the popular enthusiasm that is necessary for rebuilding the country with a view to developing it. Every person who visited China says that a new force is visible in New China, and that is the tremendous amount of popular enthusiasm that has been released. Here in India too we must make such arrangements that such a kind of popular enthusiasm is released and that enthusiasm is possible only if there is unity of people on the basis of a common language. If all the Bengali-speaking people can feel united and can find inspiration to work shoulder to shoulder for the common good of their region, and for achieving their aspirations, and a similar unity could be developed between people speaking the same language, then a new type of popular enthusiasm will be created which will go a long way in rebuilding the economy of the country.

My last point is that even if we are to judge the question from the administrative efficiency point of view, the reformation of States on a linguistic basis should be started forthwith. Administrative units formed on the basis of areas composed of people speaking the same language, will certainly help to develop administrative efficiency. For in that case, the people will be able to develop link with the administration. The representatives of the people will have their say with regard to the administration which will also be linked with the people. In this way real co-operation between the administration and the people might develop. The Britishers did not want administrative efficiency in that way. Their sense of efficiency was from the point of view of bureaucracy, and not from that of popular co-operation. The time has come when we must end that system and build up instead real administrative efficiency which can be done only if we redistribute States on a linguistic basis.

Thus from every point of view the re-formation of States on a linguistic basis is a historic necessity today. This necessity finds expression in the irresistible urge of the people that is everywhere. There are movements going on everywhere; in Andhra the 'Vishala Andhra' movement with a tempo and strength unprecedented in the history of India; then again the Bengali-speaking peo-

ple even beyond the present boundary of Bengal, they also want unity. And not only so many great movements are going on on this question of Linguistic States, but also a very large measure of unity of opinion is there in the country on this question. So it is a historic necessity today; it is a necessity for the building up of the country in a perfect way. So I say that my Resolution should be adopted and with these few words I close my speech.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will place the resolution before the House and then call upon hon. Members who have tabled amendments to move those amendments. Then general discussion will go on on both the resolution and on the amendments as a whole.

Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that immediate steps should be taken to redistribute the States on a linguistic basis and that the boundaries of the existing States be readjusted accordingly."

Now, there are as many as 22 amendments to this resolution. It is not necessary for me to call upon each hon. Member as the names are on the order paper. Whoever wants to move his amendment, if he is in his seat may kindly say 'yes', and if he does not wish to move he may intimate to me that he does not want to move his amendment.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that necessary action should be taken immediately to regroup the existing States in South India on sound economic and linguistic principles and an impartial Boundary Commission should be established consisting of ministers, members of the legislatures and officials to re-draw the boundaries accordingly."

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): I beg to move:

That after the words "opinion that" the following be inserted:

"a time has come for the re-distribution of provinces on linguistic basis with a view to ensure opportunity for homogeneous, social, cultural and economic development of the different provinces and therefore".

Shri Kd Subrahmanyam (Vizanagar): I beg to move:

That after the words "linguistic basis" the following be inserted:

"keeping in view the economic viability, geographical contiguity and cultural affinity".

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): I beg to move:

That after the words "linguistic basis" the following be inserted:

"keeping in view the considerations of defence and financial self-sufficiency".

Shri Sivamurthi Swami (Kushtagi): I beg to move:

That for all the words occurring after the words "linguistic basis" to the end the following be substituted:

"and that to begin with Hyderabad State should be disintegrated into three parts namely Karnatak, Andhra and Maharashtra and the boundaries of the proposed linguistic provinces in general should be readjusted in accordance with the majority of the opinion as exercised by votes on adult franchise in the respective areas."

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): I beg to move:

That for the words "and that the boundaries of the existing States be readjusted accordingly" the following be substituted:

"and that a commission be appointed forthwith to take up the question of rectification of boundaries in the provinces of Northern India."

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): I beg to move:

That for the words "and that the boundaries of the existing States be readjusted accordingly" the following be substituted:

"and that a Boundary Commission be appointed to report to Parliament as to how the boundaries of the States should be readjusted or redistributed keeping in view the reconsideration of economy, defence, geographical contiguity and cultural affinity."

Sardar Hukam Singh: I beg to move:

That after the words "existing States" the words "including those of Northern India" be inserted.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: I beg to move:

That after the word "readjusted" the words "without insisting on the agreement on the part of regional units concerned" be inserted.

Shri Kelappan (Ponnani): I beg to move:

That the following be added at the end:

"keeping in view administrative convenience, economic viability and geographical contiguity."

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

That the following be added at the end:

"by appointing a boundary Commission."

Shri K. Subrahmanyam: I beg to move:

That the following be added at the end:

"and for that purpose a high-powered commission be appointed to decide the future of territories over which there is controversy between any two of the new States."

Shri S. S. More: I beg to move:

That the following be added at the end:

"This House is further of opinion that the State of Hyderabad be forthwith disintegrated and its different linguistic parts be integrated with the adjoining similar linguistic units."

Shri R. N. S. Deo (Kalahandi-Bolangir): I beg to move:

That the following be added at the end:

"and that in view of the changed circumstances arising out of the merger of Mayurbhanj in Orissa and consequent geographical contiguity, Seraikella and Kharaswan be immediately restored to Orissa in accordance with the terms of the merger agreements."

Shri B. Das (Jajpur-Keonjhar): Sir, I believe under rules when a resolution is moved only one amendment by a particular Mover is permitted, and subsequent amendments must be supplementary to the original amendment. Therefore, I would like you to give a ruling on that so that we do not repeat things.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is aware that alternative amendments can be moved. I will put the first one to the vote of the House and when the occasion arises—if it fails—I will have the other one. If they are so connected, we shall debate both of them together.

Now, the original resolution and the amendments are before the House for discussion.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): The resolution before this House is capable of being discussed with passion and prejudice. I do not propose to do so this morning for two reasons. In the first place this is the first time when the nation's Parliament debates formally the question of linguistic provinces, and secondly I am most anxious that the hon. the Leader of the House should in his reply to the debate dispose of this question honourably and permanently—with the result that I propose to address a few remarks with dignity and restraint, and if I may have to say harsh words, I am sure the hon. the Leader of the House would forgive me..... (An Hon. Member: With intelligence.) That is another issue. I am coming to that portion.

I was saying that I am most anxious that this vexed problem of linguistic provinces should be disposed of finally today. (An Hon. Member: Today. Oh, very good.) because I find that we are in this country even swayed by a tumultuous sense of parochial and tribal loyalties, with the result that unless and until these problems are attacked properly and disposed of with a view to enabling this country to settle down, I am afraid there will not be internal peace.

I have made a reference to the recrudescence of tribal propensities in this country that has occurred during the last ten years. To my mind, speaking as an Indian first and as an Andhra next, it is due to the fact that there is in our midst a tremendous amount of exploitation going on of group by group, of area by another area, and there is also some sort of

a Tammany Hall in certain definite areas in this country, with the result that any one who goes to the Madras Legislature or the Bombay Legislature today finds that it is not only a babel of tongues which is in evidence there, but also an operation of what I have said, with due respect, namely, political Tammany Hall methods.

There has been a tremendous amount of agitation against "linguism"—a phrase coined by Shri Munshi. I am here to confess that I am an unashamed "linguist" or "linguicist"—I do not know how to describe myself in terms of the new word coined by Shri Munshi.

An Hon. Member: Linguo-maniac!

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Call it what you will.

I believe that this country, which has been hundreds of years old administratively divided, in a haphazard manner has been unable to solve this problem of the desires of certain people in defined areas who want an opportunity to order their own affairs in a manner suited to their genius. For example, the Godavari and Krishna river basins must necessarily become the habitat of Andhras. Again, the south-western-sea-board must be the base for operations of the emotions of my Kerala friends. Again, the Deccan Plateau must be the place where the Maharashtrians must dominate and rule their house in their own way. And finally, the glories of Mysore must become the heritage of Samyukta Karnataka.

Why do I make this general proposition? Because I feel that if there was a Tamil Nad province today, the Dravida Khazagam and the menace which it is offering to this country of a demand for secession would not be there. If there was a Punjabi-Speaking province today, there would not be the menace of Khalistan. Again, if I get an Andhra or Visala Andhra province, I am certain the so-called Communist menace to this country would not be there. (Interruption.) Yes, My hon. friends are unable to react to the proposition. If we analyse the results of the recent elections, where are the Communists? In Andhra, they do not form even one-sixth of the returned candidates. (Interruption.) Finally, if Maharashtra and Kannada Desh be created, there would be greater administrative and political stability imparted to this country. Such small boundary disputes as arise can be disposed of by a high powered Boundary Commission whose

findings will be accepted, I am sure, by all parties to the dispute.

I do not wish to devote my attention to a detailed examination of the claim of the Andhra people for a separate State, for I am fortified by the belief that not only the Dar Committee but also the three-man Committee's Report, called the J. V. P. Report, have fully discussed this question, and I am sure there is no disposition on the part of the Leader of the House to delay this question if all the other narrower issues are capable of settlement. The twelve Andhra districts of the existing Madras State, with two crores of population, have a revenue possibly of Rs. 30 crores a year. I am not here to read out all the details which have been fully worked out as to the self-sufficient character of the Andhra State even with the existing twelve districts. Certain disputed questions like certain Telugu areas in Orissa; North Arcot, Chingleput and certain taluks of Bellary in Madras; Kolar, etc. in Mysore; Chanda and Bustar in Madhya Pradesh;—these and similar questions to my mind, can be disposed of by a Boundary Commission whose decisions will be accepted. I am sure, in all honour and will be observed by the Andhra people.

The other day the hon. the Leader of the House made a reference to the intelligence quotient of the Opposition. With your permission I want to make a reference to it because I feel very strongly about it. My hon. friend Dr. Syed Mahmud referred to the vexed question of Madras City. On page 14 of the J.V.P. Report the following statement by the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, then Congress President, and the hon. the Leader of the House occurs:

“We are of opinion, therefore, that if an Andhra Province is to be formed, its protagonists will have to abandon their claims to the City of Madras.”

But I have been frankly troubled about this particular statement in the J.V.P. Report. What is the intention of the gentlemen who have drafted this report? Andhras to surrender their claims to Madras City? To whom does it go? Not a word is said. A few months after, Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, then Congress President, made a remarkable statement at a place called Nandyal, in Andhra Desa. The statement was made on the 7th November, 1949. I am quoting two versions as reported in the Press—one in *the Indian*

Republic, of which Dr. Pattabhi was the Chairman of the Board of Directors, and the other in *the Hindu*. Here is what *the Indian Republic* of the 9th November, 1949, says:

“By abandoning our claims to Madras we are not losing it permanently.”

The Hindu report of the 9th November, 1949 says:

“He (Dr. Pattabhi) emphasised that the J.V.P. Report only suggested to Andhras to give up Madras City, which certainly did not mean that it should go to Tamils—which was not understood by many Andhras.”

To my mind, this sort of loose drafting and postponing the day of reckoning, this sort of what might be called not grappling with the problem in full, has led to the debacle of the Andhra question during the last many years. I quote a more recent statement by Dr. Pattabhi, made on the 19th of June this year—a few days ago. I am quoting from *the Free Press Journal* (June 20):

“Dr. Pattabhi said that hurdles in the way of the formation of Andhra Province could be overcome if Andhras were permitted to retain their capital in the City ‘for a short while’.”

The result is that today, if there is an attempt made by Andhras or by anybody in the country to have an authoritative pronouncement from the Prime Minister or the Congress President or any other person who was a signatory to this report, we are left in mid-air like *Trishankhu*. We are tinkering with the question. It should have been very frankly stated, and firmly stated, what the position would be so far as this question is concerned. Promises were made and promises were repeatedly altered, but no final disposal has been made so far of this problem. Reference has been made to a letter written by Shri Rajagopalachari to Lord Zetland, and some Andhras compared it to the Zinovieff letter. Some of us also know that even at the time of signing the J.V.P. Report, the Congress President, Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya had conferred with Shri Rajagopalachari, then Governor-General, in Delhi on the formula about Madras City. I want an honourable and speedy settlement of this issue. I personally would not surrender my claim to Madras City. Let there be no mistake. But Speaking as an Indian first and an Andhra

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

next, I make this very important proposition which I urge before the Members of this House in this august chamber, and it is this that all these bi-lingual or multi-lingual cities, whether it be Madras, Bangalore, Hyderabad, Bombay, Nagpur City, and even Calcutta for that matter...

Dr. M. M. Das: What do you mean by "Calcutta"?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram:...let them be Centrally administered areas. I would like to be taken seriously for the reason that I am not here surcharged with passions—local, parochial or others. I say this with a sense of responsibility. If these multi-lingual or bi-lingual cities are made Centrally administered areas, and if this vast administrative machinery of the Government of India is decentralized and located in different areas, I am sure the country's future will be safe and sound. For, after all, it is a question of what you call fair shares in services for all. That is why the cry today in this country is "India, that is Bharat, that is Uttar Pradesh." That is what I say as one who has resided in the city of Delhi for 18 years and has seen the concentration of power in the hands of a few people, a few groups. I am not referring to any individuals or groups in particular, but to the unequal manner in which the administration of this country has been in the possession of only a few people or a few groups of people.

There are three small and residual points relating to Andhra Desh which I would like to dispose of before I sit down. I want to be particularly within my time limit because I know many Members on both sides are anxious to speak. The residual points of Andhra Desh are the following:

(i) *Madras City*.—No Andhra worth his salt would surrender his claim. I am sure that every Andhra would accept it as a Centrally Administered Area.

(ii) *Disintegration of Hyderabad*.—Disintegration of Hyderabad State must be there and we Andhras, four crores of people, have come to this conclusion. Nobody has disputed the disintegration of Hyderabad so far. The Hyderabad State Congress has been committed to disintegration, and Maharashtrians, Kannadigas and Andhras from surrounding areas un-animously want it.

(iii) *Royalaseema*.—I come now to a very important point and what I say is in a sense of humility and a sense of responsibility, viz. the question of Royalaseema. There have been statements and counter-statements during the past few weeks to the effect that Royalaseema would not like to come into the Andhra Desh. In 1937 there was what is called The Sree Baugh Pact of all the Andhra leaders which laid down certain programmes of action, and Sir, you are thoroughly aware of the intricacies of this problem. There was an attempt made on the part of the Andhras generally speaking to observe this Pact. It was agreed that for ten years irrigation works should go to Royalaseema, and consequently we have the Tungabhadra project. Even today the C. D. College is affiliated to Madras University. No one has objected to it. If Royalaseema people want to co-operate, I am sure there will be more and more of goodwill and a tremendous amount of goodwill and understanding will be coming forth. But if they want to get attached to Tamil Nad, I am sure that will not be objected to. But one thing I would tell them. Royalaseema has a deficit of rupees four crores which is made up by the coastal districts—the twelve Andhra Districts' surplus revenues are devoted to the deficit areas of Royalaseema. If they are not satisfied, let them get more finance from elsewhere. I am sure that if this question of the Andhra Province is disposed of, it will lead eventually to the reconstruction of this country on sound, administrative, economic and linguistic lines.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Ramachandra Reddy.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore): Sir, as a matter of fact I had no desire to take part in the debate but. . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But the hon. Member has sent down his name.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: I have not sent it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then the hon. Member need not speak. I would now call upon Mr. Sivamurthi Swami.

श्री सिवमूर्ति स्वामी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कृपया इस के कि मैं अपना भाषण आरम्भ करूं, मैं अपना अमेन्डमेन्ट

पेश करना चाहता हूँ। वह इस प्रकार है :

That for all the words occurring after the words "linguistic basis" to the end the following be substituted :

"and that to begin with Hyderabad State should be disintegrated into three parts namely Karnatak, Andhra and Maharashtra and the boundaries of the proposed linguistic provinces in general should be readjusted in accordance with the majority of the opinion as exercised by votes on adult franchise in the respective areas."

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, भारतवर्ष की दो सौ साल से यह मांग रही कि अगर हमें अपने भारतवर्ष को कल्चरल युनिटी (cultural unity) में लाना है तो उस को तुरन्त भाषावार प्रान्तों में तकसीम किया जाये। चुनावों के बाद हमने अंग्रेजों के खिलाफ मुहिम शुरू की उस वक्त भी हमारे नेताओं का ध्यान इसी ओर रहा और उन्होंने यह कह कर ही हमारा मार्गदर्शन किया कि जब हम हुकूमत हासिल करेंगे तो फ़ौरन ही भारतवर्ष को भाषावार प्रान्तों में तकसीम किया जायगा। चुनावों के बाद हमारे इस हाइडस के मुअज़्ज़िब नेता हैं पंडितजी, १९२८ ई० की उनकी रिपोर्ट से भी ऐसा ही वाज़ेह होता है। उस के बाद आज्ञादी हासिल हो गई, लेकिन हम को अफ़सोस है कि हमारी हुकूमत के सामने बहुत मुश्किलत पेश आईं और यह काम न हो सका। आज यह वक्त आया है कि हमें इस संसद् में लिंग्विस्टिक प्राविन्सेस (linguistic provinces) के बारे में सोचने का मौक़ा मिला है। आज हर प्रान्त से, मदरास, बम्बई सभी जगहों से लोगों की यही आवाज़ है। हमारे माननीय पंडितजी के पास कर्नाटक की तरफ़ से दातार साहब और उनके हमराह १८ और लोग, जो इस हाउस के नुमाइन्दे हैं, और कांग्रेस पार्टी के नुमाइन्दे भी हैं, नये और कर्नाटक के लोगों की सही नुमाइन्दगी

की। वहाँ के नेता श्री निर्जालगप्पा भी इस बात को आप के ध्यान में लाने के लिये याद दिलाते रहे, इसके अलावा जब आप ने बंगलौर में कांग्रेस का सेशन (session) किया उस वक्त भी आप की पार्टी की यही आवाज़ रही कि हम प्रान्त को भाषाभाषियों के ही हाथ में दे देंगे। कर्नाटक प्रान्त के तक्ररीबन बीस लोकसभा के नुमाइन्दे होते हैं, और जनसंख्या तक्ररीबन दो करोड़ या उस से भी ज्यादा है। इस फ़ैसले की तकमील करने के लिये हमारा पहला क़दम यह होना चाहिये कि हैदराबाद का डिसइन्ट्रेशन (disintegration) किया जाय। जब तक हैदराबाद का डिसइन्ट्रेशन नहीं किया जायेगा उस वक्त तक हैदराबाद के मामले और हैदराबाद के प्रश्न को मुलज़ा नहीं सकेंगे।

मैं दावे के साथ कहता हूँ कि हैदराबाद के लोग शान्तिवादी थे लेकिन वहाँ के चन्द हिंसात्मक लोगों ने इस चीज़ को आधार बना कर आन्दोलन खड़ा कर दिया है। वह पूरे हैदराबाद को हिंसात्मक मार्ग पर चलाने की कोशिश करते हैं। इस बात को देखते हुए इस प्रश्न को जल्दी से जल्दी हल करना चाहिये। हैदराबाद में अगर इस एलिमेंट (element) को निउद्लाइज़ (neutralize) करना है तो फ़ौरन ही हैदराबाद को डिसइन्ट्रेंट करना होगा। हैदराबाद में आज पूरे तीन हिस्से हैं। कर्नाटक, आन्ध्र और महाराष्ट्र। वहाँ के लोग इस बात को डिसाइड (decide) करने के लिये जो क़दम उठाते हैं उस से भी आप को साफ़ साफ़ ज़ाहिर होगा कि वहाँ के हर एक लोग यही चाहते हैं कि डिसइन्ट्रेशन हो जाय और प्रान्तों की भाषावार तकसीम अमल में लाई जाय। मैं जानता हूँ कि कांग्रेस ने बहुत पहले इस उसूल को

[श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी]

कबूल कर लिया है और पंडितजी भी इस बात को जानते हैं कि हैदराबाद की जनता इस के लिये रजामन्द है। राष्ट्रपतिजी से भी मेरी बात उन के भवन में हुई। इस से मालूम होता है कि वह भी फ़ैवरेबल (favourable) है। मैं जानता हूँ कि सरकार के रास्ते में मुश्किलें हैं, लेकिन जब तक आप इन मुश्किलों को हल करने के लिये कदम नहीं उठायेंगे तब तक आप का काम नहीं चलेगा। जिस क़दर आप देर करेंगे उसी क़दर लोगों की परेशानियाँ बढ़ती जायेंगी और एक दिन ऐसा आयेगा कि आप की पार्टी के लोग जो आज पार्टी के नुश्ते नज़र से और पालिसी की तहत ऐमेन्डमेन्ट नहीं पेश कर रहे हैं, या पेश करने में हिचकिचा रहे हैं जब जनता को यह मालूम हो जायगा कि अब कांग्रेस पार्टी-इन-पावर (party-in-power) भाषावार प्रान्त बनाने के लिये तैयार नहीं है तो वह आप के रास्ते में दिक्कतें डालेंगे। लिहाज़ा ज़रूरी है कि फ़ौरन ही आप इस बार कदम आगे बढ़ाइयें। इस में आप का भी हित है और हैदराबाद का भी। अगर आप चाहते हैं कि हैदराबाद में हिंसावाद खत्म हो और अहिंसावाद के पुजारियों की सहायता करना चाहते हों तो कदम उठाइयें। मैं जानता हूँ कि आप को हैदराबाद के राज-प्रमुख को निकालने में इन्टर्नेशनल (international) दिक्कतें होंगी, लेकिन मैं कोई कम्यूनल (communal) या प्राविन्शलिज़्म (provincialism) की बात नहीं कह रहा हूँ। मेरा यह दावा है कि अंग्रेज़ों ने फ़ौज के बल पर हुकूमत नहीं की, उन्होंने हुकूमत इसलिये की कि हिन्दुस्तान के एक तिहाई हिस्से को नरेन्द्रों के हाथ में दे कर तकसीम कर दिया, और यहां के जो प्रान्त थे या स्टेट्स थीं उन को

होमोजीनिअस (homogeneous) नहीं बनने दिया बल्कि उन्हें हेटरोजीनिअस (heterogeneous) बना कर हैदराबाद के अन्दर कर्नाटक और कर्नाटक में आन्ध्र और महाराष्ट्र को मिला कर डिवाइड एंड रूल (divide and rule) की पालिसी से हुकूमत करते रहे। अगर हम को हैदराबाद के लोगों की दिक्कत को दूर करना है, अगर हमें पुरअमन तरीक़े से जम्हूरी उसूलों को भारतवर्ष में बढ़ाना है तो आप इस बात पर शीर कीजिये और शीर करने के बाद वहां की आम जनता की जो आमफ़हम भाषा है उस के आधार पर इस हिस्से को तकसीम कीजिये।

मैं समझता हूँ कि इतना आसान प्रश्न रहते हुए भी हम इसको समझने से कासिर रहे हैं। इसलिये मैं खास तौर से पंडितजी से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस के लिये आप ही ने हम को बचन दिया था और आज्ञा दी कि हर नेता की ज़बान पर यह लफ़्ज़ था और हर नेता की यह आवाज़ थी कि हमारे देश को भाषावार दृष्टि से तकसीम करना होगा। लिहाज़ा जो मैं मांग कर रहा हूँ उसके पीछे एक नैचुरल सैक्टिटी (natural sanctity) है। मैं यह जानता हूँ कि मैं सब से पहले भारतीय हूँ, बल्कि उस से भी पहले मैं सारे संसार का हूँ, उस के बाद भारतीय संघ का हूँ और उसके बाद मैं प्रान्त 'कर्नाटक' का हूँ। मेरे लिये ऐसा सोचना स्वाभाविक है, यह मेरा स्वाभाविक गुण है। यह ख्याल हम से दूर नहीं रहता। लेकिन अगर आप को इस काम में मुश्किलें आती हैं तो आप कमीशन बिठाइयें। जो डिस्प्यूटेड एरियाज़ (disputed areas) हैं और जिन के बारे में मुश्किलें हैं उन के सबालों को हल कीजिये और वहां के लोगों से दरियाफ़्त

कीजिये कि वह कर्नाटक में रहना चाहते हैं या आंध्र प्रान्त में रहना चाहते हैं या महाराष्ट्र में रहना चाहते हैं और जिस तरफ़ उन का झुकाव हो उस तरफ़ उन को रख कर इस प्रश्न का ऐमीकेबिल सेंटिलमेंट (amicable settlement) आसानी से हो सकता है। आप इस प्रश्न को निष्पक्षता से देखें और खास तौर से दक्षिण भारत की सिचुएशन (situation) को आप देखें। मुझे प्रसन्नता है कि दक्षिण के सिवा हिन्दुस्तान के ओर किसी हिस्से में हिंसात्मक और डिमाग्नेसी के विरुद्ध पार्टिज़न नहीं बन रही हैं। उन की वजह से बहुत से मसायल वहां दक्षिण में पैदा हो गये हैं और उनको समझने में आप पीछे पड़ रहे हैं। उन मसायल पर आप को गौर करना चाहिये और लोगों के दिल में जो जोश और बलबले हैं और जो उन की फ़ितरती मांग है उस पर आप को गौर करना चाहिये। अगर आप इस प्रश्न पर फ़ौरन गौर करें और इस के लिये क़दम उठाएँ और इस पांच साल के दौरान में ही इस पर अमल करें तो निहायत ही अच्छा होगा। बहुत दिनों से बचन आप ने दे रखा है उस को आप इस तरह पूरा करें। लिहाज़ा मैं एक बार फिर आप का ध्यान इस तरफ़ दिलाना चाहता हूँ। हम तो चाहते हैं कि हर तरफ़ जम्हूरी हुकूमत फैले, लेकिन अगर उस हुकूमत के अफ़सर ऐसे हों जो कि जनता की भाषा न समझते हों तो हम ऐसी हुकूमत का क्या करें। इसलिये आप हैदराबाद को डिसइन्टेग्रेट कीजिये। हां अगर आप हैदराबाद के निज़ाम ही को हमारा राजप्रमुख बनाना चाहते हैं और मैसूर के महाराजा को नहीं बनाना चाहते तो ऐसा ही कीजिये लेकिन हमारा प्रान्त तो अलग कीजिये। जम्हूरियत के नाम से हमारी यह भावना नहीं दबाई जा सकती; न यह हो सकता है कि हम माइनारिटी (minority) पर कोई

शासन करे। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हम को प्रान्तीयता की तरफ़ बढ़ना भी चाहिये और उसको ख़त्म भी करना चाहिये। ख़त्म इस माने में करना चाहिये कि जो यह हैटरोजीनस प्रान्त हैं उन में जो ख़राबियां हैं उन की दूर करना चाहिये। हम अपने भारत वर्ष में एक अखंड संस्कृति को कायम करना चाहते हैं और हमेशा के लिये उसे क़ायम करना हमारा अब्बलीन फ़र्ज़ है। हम समझते हैं कि हमारा यह फ़र्ज़ है कि हम देश की पूरी सेवा करें और दुनिया की शान्ति बनाये रखने के लिये जो कुछ हम कर सकते हैं करें। मैं फिर पंडित जी से अर्ज़ करता हूँ कि यह एक आला मौक़ा है, इस को न छोड़िये और इस मौक़े पर इस उसूल को मान कर फ़ौरन क़दम उठाइये। आप इस काम को एक कमीशन के तबस्तुत से कीजिये। लोगों को अब भी आप पर बहुत भरोसा है। मैं फ़रज़ के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि कर्नाटक से कोई ऐसा व्यक्ति, नुमायन्दा हो कर यहां नहीं आया है जो कि हिंसावादी हो। या तो कांग्रेस वाले हैं और या इंडिपेंडेंट्स (independents) हैं जो कि अधिकतर कांग्रेस के प्रिंसिपल्स (principles) से सहमत हैं परन्तु कुछ व्यक्तिगत कारणों से अलग हो गये हैं। कर्नाटक गांधी जी का प्रान्त कहा जा सकता है। इस को भी इस समय स्थानिक स्वराज्य मिलना चाहिये। इसलिये मैं एक बार फिर प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि आप हैदराबाद प्रान्त को डिसइन्टेग्रेट करें। मैं कर्नाटक प्रान्त को फ़ौरन अलग बनाने के प्रस्ताव की ताईद करता हूँ।

10 A.M.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I find here a note by the Chief Whip, Mr. V. G. Deshpande, giving the following names: National Democratic Party: Dr. Mookerjee; Sardar Hukam Singh, Shri

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

R. N. S. Deo, Dr. Krishnaswami, Dr. N. B. Khare and Shri B. Ramachandra Reddy.

It is very wrong to put the Chair in a very delicate position like this. I noted down the name of Mr. Reddy from the note but it only shows that I ought not to accept any recommendation made by any Chief Whip. I am exceedingly sorry—if the hon. Chief Whip did not consult the hon. Member he ought not to have given the name.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: I have given the note after consultation. There was some confusion. We took the names according to the linguistic provinces—we wanted chances to be given to the different linguistic provinces.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I was willing to give the chances.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: There is no confusion now, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But due caution should be exercised in giving names.

Shri Raghuramaiah (Tenali): I am very thankful to you for having given me this early opportunity of speaking on this very vital question because I do not want it to be said that only the Members sitting on the Opposition benches are interested in the formation of the Andhra Province. I may say that the feeling about the Andhra Province is very intense and widespread. It is not spasmodic. It is, in fact, as old as the freedom struggle itself. Nor is it purely linguistic. There are very many great reasons behind it. To mention only a few in the matter of development projects and the administrative set-up Andhras feel, very strongly sometimes, often with great justification, that they have been let down in a conjoint province. Only recently I was amazed to hear one of the Ministers of Madras Government making a statement that he would go ahead with the Krishna-Pennar Project. The intention underlying this project is to divert the waters of Krishna much beyond the river belt.

Shri Alagesan (Chingleput): That statement was made by an Andhra Minister.

Shri Raghuramaiah: May be—I did not say Andhra Minister or Tamil Minister, I said a Minister of the Madras Government and I wish my friend could contradict me on that. The fact is, the Central Government, having taken cognisance of the demand of Andhras, have appointed an impartial technical Committee to go into

this question fully and examine which of the projects as between Krishna-Pennar and Nandikonda is feasible, economical and does justice to the claims of all concerned. The report of the Committee is pending. At this stage for whatever reasons, it may be, to make a statement of that sort is very unfortunate. I am not happy to make this reference but I feel I cannot help it because I want to make it clear to this House that the agitation for Andhra Province has always been provoked by actions like this. The object of the Nandikonda project, you will all be interested to know is to confine the major portion of the Krishna water to the Andhra area and Andhras are very keen about it. In the administrative set-up also sometimes more weightage has been given to certain other people. The demand for Andhra Province is not therefore based purely on linguistic grounds. The demand is based on the genuine apprehension of a vast majority of the Andhras that their interests are greatly neglected. A vast body of Congressmen in Andhra Pradesh have already committed themselves to this demand, and if I may say so with gratitude, even this Government has already expressed its desire to fulfil the wishes of Andhras subject, of course, to certain conditions being fulfilled. It is true that of late this demand for Andhra Province has become a plaything of politicians and the dreamland of revolutionaries. The leaders are trying to fly it solo. They soar high when the chances of their becoming the first Premier of Andhra become bright but once those chances become blasted they crash equally rapidly. It is sometimes said that Congressmen who sponsored this movement and nurtured it are today going back upon it merely because they are afraid of a Communist regime. Let me assure my friends on the other side that we are still democratic—more democratic perhaps than any other party in this country. If the duly elected peoples' representatives want to form a Government, we shall be the last to stand in their way. The way we fought for the recognition of China shows that we do respect the wishes of the proper representatives of the people. What the vast majority of Andhras are afraid of today is not therefore the establishment of Communist rule but the sly carving of a Russian Province in Andhra Desh. It is for my friends on the opposite side to convince the people that such is not their design and they are not going to use Andhra Desh as a base of operation for their international play-tricks.

There is no gainsaying that among Andhras there is not that concord to-day which is essential for the formation of a new province with goodwill allround. Just now, Dr. Lanka Sundaram has said that no Andhra worth his salt would give up his claim to Madras city. Mr. Prakasam, the leader of the United Democratic Front, has also said something to that effect very recently. I am not sure if my hon. friends of the Communist Party would agree with it. There are some among them who will be prepared to have an Andhra Province at any cost. Like Vamana, who wanted only three feet of ground they would be satisfied with even three districts. Let me make it clear that we are not prepared for that. Then there is Rayalaseema. I cannot agree that a good deal of opinion in Rayalaseema is against the Andhra Province but there is certainly a section there which is against it. That section has to be satisfied. You cannot have a new province on the dead bodies of those who oppose you. Then there are the Tamilians and the Canarese, we have got to deal with them in a friendly way. It is no good passing on our headache to the Central Government. Andhras are not without genius or originality. They have shown their great and illustrious abilities in the past. I would therefore appeal to them to settle the matter between themselves first and then with the others concerned. Let them sit at a conference table and decide what should be their boundary and whether they want Madras City or not. Let them try. Nothing is lost by trying. I hope they will under no circumstances strike a note of despondency. There is no section of Andhras which is not earnest about the Andhra Province. It is a question of life and death for Andhras. Let not politicians exploit it. Let not revolutionaries dream too much about it. I am convinced that a mere babel of voices or a motley of demands even though interjected by a series of fasts will not achieve our object. What is wanted is a united effort. I would therefore appeal to the hon. Members opposite and to everybody who is concerned with this question to give their very best attention to it and see that a generally acceptable demand is presented, we will then make it easy for the Central Government to fulfil their promise.

डाक्टर एन० बी० चारे (ग्वालियर) :

उपवाचस्पति जी, यद्यपि मैं इस भाषावार प्रान्त का समर्थक हूँ मगर मैं स्पष्ट कर देना चाहता हूँ कि मैं सब से पहिले हिन्दू या

भारतीय हूँ और उसके बाद महाराष्ट्री हूँ। मेरे दिल में कभी भी केन्द्रीय सरकार से अलग होने का विचार नहीं आया। मेरी भावना यह है कि इस देश में बहुत जल्द एक सत्तावान और सामर्थ्यवान केन्द्रीय सरकार होनी चाहिये। मैं इस वास्ते भी इस बात का समर्थक हूँ कि लोकशाही और डेमोक्रेसी (democracy) को अगर बलवान बनाना ही है तो फिर इस बात की जरूरत है कि हर एक देश और हर एक प्रान्त की मातृभाषा में उस की शिक्षा होनी चाहिये। उस का कारोबार होना चाहिये। इस के बिना सामाजिक, सांस्कृतिक और राजनीतिक तौर पर वह राज्य प्रगति और विकास नहीं कर सकता है।

दूसरी बात मेरे समझ में यह नहीं आती है कि इस सवाल से घबरा जाने की क्या जरूरत है। हम देखते हैं कि हमारे कांग्रेस राज्य कर्त्ता बहुत घबराये हुए हैं और वह इस का हीवा बनाना चाहते हैं। अगर किसी ने इस बारे में कभी कुछ बोल दिया तो वह अपनी नाक भौंह सिकोड़ लेते हैं। यह बात हमारी समझ में अभी तक नहीं आई है। बात तो यह है कि स्वयं कांग्रेस की संस्था ने इस सवाल का समर्थन किया था और जहाँ तक मेरा ख्याल है करीब ३० और ३५ वर्ष हो गये उन्होंने इस बारे में एक प्रस्ताव भी पास किया था। मैं भी कांग्रेस का पुराना पापी हूँ इसलिये मैं इस बात को अच्छी तरह से जानता हूँ। उन्होंने उस समय यह बचन दिया था कि जब कांग्रेस के हाथ में शासन आ जायेगा तो हम यानी कांग्रेस भाषावार प्रान्त बनायेगी। लेकिन उन्होंने अभी तक उस बचन का पालन नहीं किया जबकि उन के हाथ में सत्ता आये हुए ६ साल से ज्यादा हो गये हैं। जब एक संस्था अपने प्रस्ताव को और अपने बचनों को अमल में

[डाक्टर एन० बी० बरे]

नहीं लाती है तो इस बात से उस संस्था की अप्रामाणिकता मालूम हो जाती है।

तीसरी बात यह है कि विन्ध्य पर्वत के उत्तर में जो प्रान्त हैं वह सब भाषावार प्रान्त बने हुए हैं। उदाहरण के लिये आसाम, बंगाल, बिहार, उड़ीसा, उत्तर प्रदेश, मध्य भारत, पंजाब और राजस्थान यह सब भाषावार प्रान्त हैं। विन्ध्य पर्वत के दक्षिण में जितने भी प्रान्त हैं वहां पर तमाम भाषाओं की खिचड़ी बनी हुई है। मध्य प्रदेश में हिन्दी और मराठी का झगड़ा है। इसी तरह से आज हम देखते हैं कि बम्बई में, मराठी, कर्नाटकी और गुजराती का झगड़ा चल रहा है। मद्रास में तामिल, तैलगू और कन्नड़ आदि भाषाओं का झगड़ा चल रहा है। इसलिये यह बात स्वाभाविक है कि दक्षिण वालों के दिल में रंज पैदा हो। हमारे जो उत्तरी भाग के जो प्रान्त हैं वह भाषावार प्रान्त होने की वजह से, सुख या दुख जो कुछ भी हो उसका वह अनुभव करते हैं। मगर इसी सुख या दुख के अनुभव से, दक्षिण वालों को वंचित किया जाता है। अगर वह लोग किसी प्रकार के भाषावार प्रान्त बनाने की बात सोचते हैं या कहते हैं तो इस का दोष उन लोगों पर नहीं है। जब वह दूसरों को उसका अनुभव और सुख या दुख उठाते देखते हैं तो उनके दिल में भी इसी तरह के ख्याल होते हैं।

हमारी सरकार कहती है कि हम भाषा-वार प्रान्त बनाने के हक में हैं मगर हम से कहा जाता है कि कोई एग्रीड सोल्यूशन (ag-

reed solution) हो तो हम तैयार हैं। वह जानते हैं कि किसी प्रकार का एग्रीड सोल्यूशन नहीं हो सकता है इसलिये वह इस तरह की बातें सामने रखते हैं। दुनिया में कहीं ऐसा हुआ है कि किसी बात पर सब तरह की बातों में सब लोग अच्छी तरह से एग्री (agree) हो जायें। मैं धन्यवाद देता हूँ राज्यकर्ताओं को कि उन के गुरु ब्रिटिश वालों के वह इतने जल्द योग्य चले हो गये हैं। जिस तरह से ब्रिटिश हमारी स्वराज्य की मांग के बारे में कहा करते थे कि कोई एग्रीड सोल्यूशन सामने लाओ तो हम भारत को छोड़ देंगे उसी तरह से आज राज्यकर्ता भाषावार प्रान्तों के मामले में कह रहे हैं। मैं पूछता हूँ कि यह एग्रीड सोल्यूशन कभी हो सकता है? पाकिस्तान की मांग जो मंजूर कर ली गई क्या कभी भी वह एग्री हो कर की गई थी? कांग्रेस वालों ने ब्रिटिश सरकार से हाथ मिला कर एग्रीमेंट (agreement) किया और जो पाकिस्तान आज हम देख रहे हैं वह अंधेरे में हमारा गला काट कर बनाया गया। मगर आज दक्षिण वाले छोटी सी मांग रख रहे हैं और वह यह भी नहीं चाहते हैं कि हम बिल्कुल अलग हो जायें। वह तो वफ़ादार प्रान्त बन कर रहना चाहते हैं। आप ने पाकिस्तानी ऊंट तो आसानी के साथ निगल लिया मगर भाषावार प्रान्त रूपी जो मच्छर है उस को आप थुकते हैं। यह ठीक भी है क्योंकि पाकिस्तान रूपी जो ऊंट था वह आप का बड़ा अजीब है, लजीब है, प्यारा है दुलारा है। भाषावारी जो मच्छर है यानी हिन्दू रूपी जो मच्छर है वह आप के मुंह का जायका खराब करता है, कड़वाहट पैदा करता है और मन को खराब करता है इस वास्ते मैं कहता हूँ कि अगर आप एक दफ़ा निश्चय कर लें कि भाषावार प्रान्त होने चाहिये या नहीं होने चाहिये तो इस

सवाल का हमेशा के लिये अन्त हो जायेगा। अगर आप यह सोचते हैं कि होने चाहिये, देश को पसन्द होगा तो आप भाषावार प्रान्त बना दें। फिर आप इस बात की परवाह न करें कि कौन क्या कहता है। आप इस बारे में साफ़ साफ़ और ईमानदारी के साथ बोल दें कि हमें यह करना है।

बाबु रामनारायण सिंह : (हजारीबाग पश्चिम) : ईमानदारी रहे तब ना।

डॉक्टर एन० बी० कर् : अगर आप भाषावार प्रान्तों को नहीं बनाना चाहते हैं तो इसको बिल्कुल ही एबोलिश (abolish) कर दीजिये और आप विन्ध्य प्रदेश के उत्तर में जो प्रान्त हैं उन के भी टुकड़े कर दीजिये। फिर ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन (administration) के वास्ते राज्य प्रबन्ध की सहूलियत के वास्ते हिन्दुस्तान के पांच छः जोन (zone) बना दें। उस में भाषा का कोई सवाल नहीं होगा, यह न्याय की बात होगी। उस से फिर जो यह दक्षिण पर अन्याय है और उत्तर के साथ न्याय है, यह बातें नहीं होंगी यही मेरा कहना है।

अब रहा महाराष्ट्र का सवाल। मैं जानता हूँ कि जो कोई ऐसा सवाल उठाता है तो उसको हमारे मुन्शी साहब, जो यहां मिनिस्टर रह चुके हैं, एक नये शब्द से पुकारते थे, लिङ्ग्विज्म (linguism) भाषीयता। भाषीयता, प्रान्तीयता, जातीयता यह सब कहते हैं। लेकिन यह नहीं जानते कि पक्षीयता भी सब से बड़ा सवाल है और बुरी चीज है मुन्शी साहब ने हमारे महाराष्ट्र को लिङ्ग्विज्म की गाली दी। लेकिन वह खुद क्या कहते हैं यह किसी

को पता नहीं। वह एक कवि हैं, साहित्यिक हैं। उन की पोयट्री में एक लाइन बताता हूँ जो वह लिख हैं और जिस से मालूम होगा कि वह स्वयं कितने लिङ्ग्विज्म के दोषी हैं :

ज्यां ज्यां बसे एक गुजराती, त्यां त्यां सदाकाल गुजरात।

एक गुजराती भी जहां कहीं बसता है वह सब गुजरात बन जाता है, यह उन का कहना है और वह हमको लिङ्ग्विज्म के दोषी कहते हैं।

इसलिये आप को इस सवाल को हल करना चाहिये। पहले आप साफ़ तय कर लो कि भाषावार प्रान्त होने हैं या नहीं यह तय हो कि भाषावार प्रान्त होने हैं तो फिर एक बाउंडरी कमीशन (Boundary Commission) बिठा दो। अगर यह तय कर लो कि यह भाषावार प्रान्त नहीं होने चाहिये, यह देश के लिये नुकसानदेह है, तो फिर सारे देश को जोन्स में बांट दो। बस यही मुझे कहना था, और कुछ नहीं।

Shri M. V. Krishnappa (Kolar): Sir, I crave your indulgence and the indulgence of the House as this is the first time that I am speaking on the floor of this august House. I am here to oppose this resolution tooth and nail. I oppose the formation of linguistic provinces because it is detrimental to the country's interests and is going to jeopardise the unity of this great nation.

Of all people I was surprised at the speech of Dr. Lanka Sundaram for whom I had great reverence. When I heard his name I was wondering myself as to how there could be a Sundaram in Lanka. Then I thought of Vibhishana, that great diplomat, the realist who could appreciate the situation. So I thought there could be a Sundaram in Lanka that is Vibhishana of Lanka.

[Shri M. V. Krishnappa]

Today a great internationalist like Lanka Sundaram—as while speaking he refers to internationalism and other things—wants to distribute this land on a linguistic basis. I was astonished when he made a reference to Kolar. I have got the honour of representing that area which is in Mysore. It is the golden part of India—so to say. About 95 per cent. of Indian gold is produced there. Mysore is not a unilingual area—it is a multi-lingual area. The progress of Mysore has been achieved not by the labours of Kannadigas alone. There are the Tamils; there are the Telugus. We in Mysore have developed a cosmopolitan outlook since a long time.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I made a reference to Kolar in terms of the resolution of the Provincial Congress Committee of Andhra Desh.

Shri M. V. Krishnappa: In Mysore we have developed a peculiar culture of our own. We have developed a cosmopolitan outlook which is very essential for the progress of this great nation. Though there are Telugus and Tamils, we do not believe that they are in any way different from us. In fact Mysore is a meeting place of all these cultures. We have got a happy combination of three cultures in Bangalore which is the capital of Mysore.

Sir. C. V. Raman, the great scientist, after going round the world has come to the conclusion that there is no more beautiful city than Bangalore. This is the great invention of that scientist. The beauty of Bangalore is not due to the labours of the Kannadia people alone. It is because we have developed a cosmopolitan outlook and we welcome everybody. Even foreigners when they come to Bangalore feel homely and express it in no uncertain terms.

My hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram wants a portion of Mysore, that is the Kolar Gold Fields, which I have the honour to represent, to be included in Andhra Desh. We, the Mysoreans, are not prepared for it. We are not prepared to go to any part of Karnataka either. It has been openly expressed a number of times in the Mysore Assembly that Greater Mysore would welcome the inclusion of pockets and corridors around Mysore speaking Kannada. Some of my friends coming from Rayalaseema are prepared to join Mysore provided Bangalore would be the capital, because they feel that they would be more homely with the people of Mysore than with Andhra

or Madras. I can appreciate the fact that there is a good case for the distribution of Madras province according to administrative convenience. That is because of the unwieldy nature and size of the province and its heterogeneous composition.

As I said already, we Mysoreans are not prepared to join any part of India. We have developed a cosmopolitan culture and outlook of our own. There are three communities living in Mysore speaking three different languages. But we have made such a happy combination that we are not going to yield to Mysore being merged with any part of India.

Coming to my Communist friends, I am surprised to see the number of resolutions tabled by them. I had the opportunity of meeting Mr. Gopalan on three or four occasions when he visited Kolar Gold Fields. It is a predominantly labour area and I had to oppose a Communist candidate. Mr. Gopalan addressed two or three meetings in Kolar. I attended almost all the public meetings. After Gopalan had made a speech, I used to address the same audience. But the House would be surprised to know that Mr. Gopalan never said a word about linguistic provinces in any of the meetings. But here in this House the Communists seem to be the champions of all causes in this great land,—not because they are interested in this province or that province, but because they want to create as much trouble as possible for the existing Government. They want to wreck this Constitution; they want to jeopardise the national unity of this great land. I know many of the inconsistencies of my Communist friends. I am a super-Communist myself, I may not look like a Communist; I may not have unruly hair; I may not wear a pair of spectacles; I may not have my shirts inside my pants; or carry a bag supposed to contain documents.

Now let me point out the inconsistencies of my Communist friends. In 1941 they were the enemies of the British. In 1942 they were their friends; they wanted all people to fight the people's war. In 1943-44 they were again enemies of the British and the Americans and were not prepared to tolerate even a word about the British or American people on the floor of the House. What I wish to stress is that our Communist friends seem to be champions of all causes in this world. They seem to hold the monopoly to speak about the workers, as though it is none of our business. They criticise us whenever we speak, on behalf of workers and peasants. Coming to the

linguistic principle, the division of this great land on a linguistic principle, as I have said already, is going to be detrimental to the progress of this nation. The Pakistan issue also looked equally simple. If all the after-effects and repercussions of Pakistan had been known to our leaders they would not have accepted it. They thought wherever there are Muslim majority areas they will go to Pakistan and wherever there are Hindu majority areas they will come to India. It looked so simple. So also the advocates of separate electorates said in the beginning. And the advocates of linguistic provinces advance today three or four reasons for the formation of linguistic provinces. They are political, economic and cultural reasons. So far as the political causes are concerned, the matter looked very simple with regard to the Pakistan issue. They said the minorities are neglected in the provinces ruled by people speaking the majority language. For example, in Bombay they say that the Karnatak people who live in Bombay have been neglected. They also say that to progress culturally they will have to carve out provinces on a linguistic basis. In my opinion it is not desirable. Because, the advocates of separate electorate advanced the same reasons. They said that Muslims living in provinces ruled by a majority of Hindus were neglected and that the only remedy was separate electorate or separate Government by the Muslims for the sake of those Muslims. What is the result? The result is Pakistan and the coming into existence of the two-nation theory. And you know the after-effects of the two-nation theory.

In the whole world I do not find anywhere provinces being carved on a linguistic principle. I have seen the map of the United States of America. There are forty-eight States and they have drawn the boundaries with the help of a foot-rule. If at all the linguistic principle has been adopted anywhere, it is in Europe. That is Balkanisation. And Balkanisation is the curse of Europe. This Balkanisation is not a lesson to be followed by India; rather it is a warning to us.

So my humble suggestion to the Leader of our Party is this. In regard to the question of the Congress having committed itself in any way on this matter, I want only to read a brief portion from the impartial, dispassionate, unbiased and unprejudiced report of the Linguistic Provinces Commission. It says:

"It is said that Congress pledges are behind this demand, and that the Congress has formed its provinces on a linguistic basis that

the present political leadership of the country is committed to it, that the desire for these provinces has sunk deep down into the masses, and that, if it is now delayed or denied, it will cause serious discontent. There may be some truth in all this, but we trust that the political leadership in the country will rise to the occasion and guide the country to its duty. The Congress did not form its provinces on a linguistic basis alone, and so far as we are aware, has not committed itself to any time limit in regard to the formation of these provinces, unless it be that the time-limit intended by the Congress was the attainment of *Swaraj*. But freedom has come to us in a way unforeseen and unthought of and has brought in its train problems and dangers never dreamt of. In view of the dangers, which now surround our country, and in the circumstances that now exist, the Congress stands relieved of all past commitments and it is its right as also its duty to come to a fresh decision on the subject in the light of the present circumstances."

So I humbly submit that there should be only one language for India. It has been laid down in the Constitution, it has been agreed to and we are following it that there should be a *lingua franca* for this country at least within fifteen years, when every Indian is expected to know it. Then where is the importance of these languages that is emphasized so much? There should be one language for the whole country after fifteen years. That is Hindi, and every one of us should know it. As regards these languages, there are many languages in a region. For instance, my friend Mr. Srinivasa Mallayya comes from South Kanara, but his mother tongue is not Kannada but Tulu or some other language. Of course he speaks so many other languages, and he loves Kannada. He loves Hindi also. What I wish to say is that we may have regional languages as our mother tongue but so far as the State is concerned, for the unity of this country we must have only one language. That is Hindi. Let it be in Devanagri script so as to facilitate the unification of this country.

Therefore, once again I appeal to our Leader and to the hon. Members of this august House to revise their decision on this issue. It has worked up so much sentiment in this country, it has become a fashion, and it is no more a matter of reason today. I know it may wound the feelings of some of my friends. But today the interest of the nation is more important

[Shri M. V. Krishnappa]

and the cause of the nation is greater. We have to solve several problems. The food problem, the refugee problem, the removal of caste distinctions, the distribution of land in the country to the tiller—these are problems to be immediately tackled. We have to give our first attention to these problems rather than to this linguistic question. And, as I said, the unity of this country is of very great importance. I would therefore again appeal to the Leader of the House and hon. Members of this House to revise their opinion on this issue and have in their mind the one important consideration, namely the unity of this great nation.

I would conclude with this:

{Kings and Lords may flourish or may fade,

As a breath can make them, as a breath has made.

But the national unity, a country's pride,

When once destroyed, can never be replaced. }

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South-East): While dealing with the question of redistribution of the boundaries of the States of the Indian Union one would like to approach the problem not from the point of view of any political party. Under article 3 of the Constitution this House, and this House alone, is competent to decide this question. It is no use our saying that the problem bristles with difficulties. Undoubtedly it does. But it has got to be settled, and settled in a manner which would be fair and just to all concerned. It may be that in some areas political advantage is being taken by some section or other, of the volume of opinion that exists for a re-examination of the boundaries of the States of the Indian Union. But still the fact remains that there is a genuine demand in many parts of the country—north, south, east and west—for a quick examination of this problem.

I do not want to go back to history. The Congress made many promises year after year, and in fact it declared that as soon as it came to power one of the first questions that it would tackle would be the re-formation of Indian Provinces on a linguistic basis. I have before me the report signed by Pandit Nehru, Sardar Patel and Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya. There in one place they emphasize that although in the past the Congress had made these promises, the matter has to be re-examined from a new point of view altogether, especially after what happened in August, 1947—referring to Independence and the Partition of India—and the language used is this:

"We have to adjust all our thinking and our activity to the new conditions that have arisen in India and the problems of today. There can be no greater error than to think of today in terms of yesterday, or to seek to solve today's problems in terms of yesterday's."

It becomes incumbent upon us therefore to view the problem of linguistic provinces in the context of today. I would earnestly urge upon the Prime Minister to examine this question in the context of today, not merely in the context of what may have happened years ago. Although we may draw upon the lessons of history, we have to consider the grave situation that has arisen in different parts of the country and settle once for all whether India is going to be divided mainly on a linguistic basis. Speaking for myself, I have always maintained that linguistic consideration cannot be the only consideration on which India can be divided. You must take into consideration other factors also, like administrative efficiency, security, economic prosperity, and the unity of the country. These are vital factors which no one in his senses can possibly ignore. At the same time, India is divided into so many provinces. If the proposal is that we need have no provinces at all, that we will have only districts, and there will be no question of any language controversy, I am prepared to accept that proposal. Let the provinces disappear. But, if you say that the provinces must exist, then there must be some basic considerations on which these provinces must be formed and in forming them, language will obviously be one important, very important consideration. I have not got the time to refer to the various aspects of the matter arising in different parts of the country like Punjab, Bombay, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Andhra, Mysore, Karnataka, Orissa. Within the limited time at my disposal, I would like to refer to my province of West Bengal.

In the report sent by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and others which I have just mentioned,—that is the latest which the Congress has submitted about this question in 1948,—they have just brushed aside the claims of North India. On page 10 the members say:

"We are not concerned with what might be called petty adjustments of provincial boundaries such as are demanded in parts of Northern India.

Even apart from our view of this reference to us, we are firmly of opinion that no such question should be raised at the present moment. This does not necessarily mean that the demands for adjustments of provincial boundaries are unjustified or without merit."

They are not prepared to raise this question now. I would place, with all seriousness, the case for West Bengal before the Parliament of free India. I do not wish to put it on a controversial basis. I do not want to raise questions.—I already see my hon. friend Mr. Syamnandan Sahaya sitting erect—which will make Bengal and Bihar fight today here on the floor of the House. But, look at the problem from the point of view of today: I am using the words of Pandit Nehru in this report. Here is a province which, as you know, stands in a very difficult position today. It has been partitioned for the sake of the freedom of India.

Shri M. P. Mishra (Monghyr North-West): You agree to that.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: The circumstances in which we agreed are well known to the interrupter. It would be much better, if he suffers from lapse of memory so that he should re-read those papers.

Shri M. P. Mishra: You carried on a campaign for the purpose.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: We did ask for the partition of Bengal because India was to be partitioned, and the party to which the interrupter belongs was guilty of that betrayal.

Punjab and Bengal were partitioned for the sake of the freedom of India.

An Hon. Member: Assam also.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee Yes; Assam also to some small extent, but Assam has also got large areas added to its territory. Today, if you take the area of Bengal, it is about one-third of what it was before. When we raised the question of the re-adjustment of the boundaries of Bengal, we naturally raised the question of bringing into Bengal certain areas belonging to Bihar, if I may refer to history for a short while, the district of Manbhum, parts of Singhbhum and Santhal Pargannas, and a small portion of Purnea. Bengal was partitioned in 1905 and the House will remember that was how the Indian freedom movement started. When in 1911, the annulment of the Partition was made, it was directed that there will have to be a re-distribution and the boundaries of Bengal adjusted specially in relation to the districts which I have just mentioned. I am reminded of certain historical facts which we cannot possibly ignore. In fact, in the 1911 Congress session, a resolution was passed that at the earliest opportunity these areas which are Bengalee-speaking areas should be handed over to Bengal. In 1912,

a statement was issued by persons led by the late Dr. Sachchidananda Sinha, than whom there could be no greater patriot in Bihar. They admitted that the return of these areas to Bengal was fully justified and that immediately steps should be taken. That was not done. Why was that not done? Official documents are being published now. What was the history of the partition of Bengal in 1905? In the secret letter which was sent by Lord Hardinge to the British Secretary of State, it was mentioned that it was for the consideration of putting Bengal under check that Bengal had to be partitioned in 1905. It was not done for administrative reasons or for the purpose of helping the people of those areas, or for the matter of that, of the country as a whole. Then we find that resolution after resolution, passed by the Indian National Congress, recognised the justification for linguistic provinces. The claims of Bengal so far as these particular Bengalee-speaking areas in Bihar were concerned were also admitted. In fact; as late as December, 1937, at the meeting of the All-India Congress Committee which was attended by many people who are present here, including the Prime Minister himself, a resolution was passed on the question of the reformation of the Indian provinces on a linguistic basis. It was stated at the end that the Congress Cabinet of Bihar be requested to take early steps to restore those portions of Bihar to Bengal. That was as late as December, 1937, when the Congress Cabinets were functioning in different provinces in India.

Now, today, I raise this question. For what reason? It is not a matter of sentiment for us. It is a matter of our very existence, of life and death to Bengal. Today, the area has shrunk to one-third of what it was previously. Look at the census of 1951. The density of population has gone up to 805, from 755 in 1941. It is the highest so far as I could gather in the whole world.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): No, no. It is 1015 in Travancore-Cochin.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: For the whole State?

Shri A. M. Thomas: Yes.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I stand corrected. It stands at 805 today. If I know that it would stand there, it might have been different. As you know there are 90 lakhs of Hindus living in East Bengal. What their future will be none can tell. The

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

Prime Minister sometimes indulges in statements of self-delusion. He said the other day that these people who are coming are beggars. Suddenly, thousands of beggars are pushing out from East Bengal. They are not all of them beggars.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I did not by any means say that they were all beggars. It would be very unfair to say so, surely.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I am very glad he did not say so. In any case, it has created some misunderstanding. It is not a question of their being beggars at all. They are being pushed out deliberately by that State. They will not be allowed to live there. Suppose ten or fifteen or thirty lakhs come out, where will they live? Can West Bengal keep them? That is the problem which this House will have to solve: not West Bengal alone. It is a problem for India. It is suggested that they may be transferred to some provinces. That is not a practical proposition. You can send a few thousands to other provinces. They will have to live as children of Bengal. It is not a provincial claim that I am making. As I said at the beginning, if the decision of Parliament is that there will be no provinces, it is all right. But, if you have provinces based more or less on linguistic considerations, then, you must give a unit to each particular section of the people so that they may develop an area in accordance with their own traditions and sentiment and add to the national strength and solidarity of India as a whole. I stand for a strong Central Government. Although the powers may be decentralised to the provinces, I am not suggesting that the powers should be given to the provinces in such a way that India may be balkanised, as the previous speaker said. Far from it, let there be contentment, let there be satisfaction in the minds of each section of the people that they are getting what is their birth-right, and that they are being allowed to contribute the best that they can give to the consolidation of their motherland.

Hindi may be a common language and we should all learn it. But I was surprised to find that the hon. Member who spoke last should suggest that there was no difficulty in the country today because Hindi was accepted as the national language of India. Even the Constitution provides that Hindi will not thrive at the cost of the regional languages. It

will be a grievous day for India if these great Indian languages which have made their contribution to the development of Indian culture as a whole, and some of them also contributed not in an insignificant manner to world culture and civilisation, should disappear from the face of free India.

Pandit A. R. Shastri (Azamgarh Distt.—East cum Ballia. Distt.—West): He did not mean that.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: He did not mean that perhaps. None is questioning why Hindi has been accepted as the national language; but you cannot have Hindi alone in India. India still consists of various units and provinces which must thrive according to their cherished traditions and culture. Now, here the point is: how are we going to solve the future of West Bengal? You must give us a little living space from the adjoining provinces which do include large tracts of Bengali-speaking people. I am not suggesting that you should give us areas which will make such adjoining provinces weak. I am not suggesting that for a moment. It is not that I want to snatch away something from the adjoining provinces unfairly and render them weak or inefficient or administratively impossible to be run. I am not making that suggestion. Both in respect of Assam and Bihar, certain well-demarcated areas can be handed over to West Bengal without jeopardising them—as indeed the Congress itself has often admitted. Tripura should also rightfully come to West Bengal.

If you look at some of the figures—I am not going into details; time will not permit me—if you look at the calculations which have been made in the last census report, you will find almost all provinces in India have gained after partition because so many new States etc., have been added to them and the density of population in most of these areas has gone down; at any rate, they have got more than ample space. I wish good luck to them but there may be some re-adjustment, not by quarrelling with each other, but by sitting together round a table. Who is to take the initiative? Some third party is to take the initiative. The Prime Minister says: let agreement be reached, and then we will see what we can do about it. That is not possible. The initiative can be taken by no one else except the Prime Minister of India because he could do so in the best interests of all and of India. He has got to call together

the people concerned not for creating disputes but for settling them. The facts and figures are there. Let each put up his case, and let each unit be strengthened in such a manner that each may feel that it is being done in the best interests of the country.

Truncated though West Bengal is today, the upper portion being cut off from the lower, thanks to Radcliffe Award what is the contribution West Bengal is making even today? So far as Income-tax revenue is concerned, even today about 35 per cent. of the total income-tax revenue of India comes from West Bengal and West Bengal is getting back in return about twelve and a half per cent. If you take your Customs revenue, nearly about 40 per cent. of the total customs receipts of India emanate from this truncated province of West Bengal. If you take, say, heavy industries, even today about 70 per cent. of the heavy industries in India are located in the small over-congested truncated area of West Bengal. If you take the sea-borne trade of India, 40 per cent. of the sea-borne trade of India even today are in the hands of this truncated province of West Bengal. Then, you have jute, you have other industries, your dollar earning industries, your coal—and they are also concentrated in the small area. And how is that province populated today? If you take the last census report, even today nearly 20 per cent. of the people of West Bengal come from different parts of India. It is a cosmopolitan province from that point of view. And I take pride for the manner in which they have been treated in the province of my birth. Take education. Mine has been the first province during the last 50 years that has given the fullest liberty and scope to every one coming to my province to receive their education through their mother tongue. There are schools like the Gujerati school, the Khalsa school, the Hindi schools. We have not imposed Bengali on the non-Bengali people who have come to our province. I do not want that this Bengali and non-Bengali feeling should be aroused. It may be in some areas some whisperings may be heard, but they are often heard due to frustration, due to the inability of the powers that be to tackle the vital question: Is West Bengal going to live or not? That is the question which I am going to pose before this House, not as a party man, not for the purpose of snatching away some territory from somebody else. Give us living space, some area so that we can develop ourselves according to our genius, and in a manner that we consider to be fit and proper and make

our contribution to the development of India as a whole.

There is East Bengal. I have repeatedly told the Prime Minister that the very basis of partition is gone. The very basis of partition was that the Muslims and Hindus, all will live in both the territories. India has played her part. Fact after fact has been enacted, but it is just a one-way affair, it is just a one-way traffic. If you could only ask that East Bengal should give India proportionate territory, if you could have demanded one-third of East Bengal to India—Sardar Patel raised this question, some three years ago in his Nagpur speech—so that these unfortunate people, millions of them who had been pushed out, could have some land on which to live, I would not have raised this question. It seems ours is a policy, an approach of love and peace. Let that be your approach to Pakistan. But you settle the problem at least so far as our own country is concerned. My appeal to the Prime Minister is this. He should not brush aside this problem. We do not want to raise controversies for the purpose of picking up quarrels. We can make a cast-iron case that from the consideration of language and from the consideration of administration, West Bengal should have more space so that the great stress which is now being laid on this province may be checked in some manner which will be justifiable from the point of view of India's advancement.

The hon. Rehabilitation Minister some time ago stated that the Bengalees could be sent out to other parts of India. But it is not a question of their being sent out. The question is of their legal rights, it is a question of their rights of citizenship, rights of representation. If today two or three million people are pushed out to other parts of India, I do not know which parts of India will absorb the people coming from Bengal, having a different language, living a different mode of life. There is the question of their representation in the Indian Parliament. There is the question of their claims for service, trade, business etc. These are matters which you cannot lightly deal with. Before things deteriorate, I would beg of this House that this question should be gone into—not the case of West Bengal alone, but along with all the others. It is no use adopting an ostrich-like policy and thinking that everything is going on all right. If you say: let us not redistribute the boundaries of India for any consideration, if that is the policy of Government, let them say so, let them announce it and face the consequences.

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

Then the people will know where they stand. It may lead to troubles, but then, the troubles will be the making of the Government itself. If you say there is to be redistribution consistent with the declaration that the Congress has made for the last 35 years, then do not leave the matter to be decided, by the parties concerned, but take the initiative in your own hands. This is my appeal to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Let him take the initiative in his own hands, appoint a Commission, appoint Advisers, or call informal conferences of the leading representatives of the areas concerned, and try to adjust matters in such a way that they may come to a decision which will be mutually acceptable to all. I know that whatever decision is arrived at it will not be acceptable in full to all. There may be sections of the people who may oppose any decision arrived at—I concede that point. We can face this, once we settle the fundamental issues on a just basis and make the major sections of the people agree to them. It is not a question of making some debating point from the Congress side or the non-Congress side. It is a first class national issue which has got to be settled on a national basis, not a party basis. I like the speech which one hon. Member made from the other side of the House, that it is not a question of the Government party or the Opposition party making some point here and there. It is a matter which we have to go into with extreme care and vigilance, keeping in view the needs of the units and also the security of India as a whole, and if we as responsible representatives are capable of achieving this, I am sure, we will be solving a problem on which rests the peace and prosperity of millions of people throughout this land of ours.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): I rise to oppose this motion. So far I have noticed that only one speaker has opposed this motion in an unequivocal manner. This problem of language and linguistic provinces has been assuming an increasingly emotional aspect. It has profound significance for the country, widespread significance, which I regret seems to be becoming the plaything of political expediency, a plaything of local passion. And I say this to my Communist friends with all due respect that I feel that this problem of linguistic provinces is being approached in a spirit of political expediency, that local and State passion over this problem—and

few problems can create greater passion—of linguistic provinces is sought to be exploited for purposes of political expediency. The main argument underlying my hon. friend Dr. S. P. Mookerjee's speech in adducing support for these linguistic provinces is that cultural autonomy requires that as far as possible administrative autonomy should be coincident with cultural autonomy. If we accept that thesis, if we accept that in principle, then we accept in principle the fragmentation of this country. Where will this principle be abridged? How and by what yardstick will it be applied? Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee has entered a passionate and an eloquent plea for this principle being applied to Bengal. Another Member of the Congress party has entered an equally passionate plea for it to be applied to the Andhra area. Somebody who has done research in this matter has said that there are 220 main dialects and patois in India. If cultural autonomy is to be made coincident or co-terminus with administrative autonomy, how are we going to apply this principle? We will not solve the problem. It will be exactly as complicated as the problem of Pakistan and the division of India.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh (Amravati East): Nobody has asked for dialectical autonomy.

Shri Frank Anthony: I have said that. What I was attempting to point out was that once we accept the principle of cultural-cum-administrative autonomy why and how will we deny the same principle to other languages or linguistic groups? I will not attempt to deal with all these problems, but none of these persons who are protagonists of linguistic provinces has pointed out as to how we will deal fairly with the linguistic sub-groups or sub-linguistic groups which will be left behind, however much we may divide India on a linguistic basis. That is the problem to which my hon. friend Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee has not attempted to give an answer. I am not questioning the rights or wrongs of the claims of the Andhras, but I say that this sort of claim, if it is conceded in principle, will not end with the Andhra, it will not end with Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee, but that claim will represent, if we accept it even in principle, the throwing into the political arena of a bone which will deliberately provoke inter-necine bitterness and inter-provincial strife. We will set the different provinces at each other's throats like ravening dogs, before which all your plans and

aspirations will recede into oblivion. As I see it, this whole demand for linguistic provinces is inspired not entirely by unworthy motives. It is a demand which has been inspired in the minds of some persons by fear, and in the minds of other persons by ill-concealed communalism. Belonging to a linguistic group or a sub-group, I can understand the motive of genuine fear which inspires many of these claims for linguistic provinces. There is fear and there is good basis for fear in the minds of linguistic groups. I say this with all respect to my friends who are seeking to propagate Hindi overnight. I have accepted Hindi as a national language. I say that it can be the national language of this country. But what is happening? We see that the intolerance and aggressiveness on the part of Hindi fanatics are creating a comparable resistance characterized by this increasing demand for linguistic provinces. The more the Hindi fanatics will parade this demand for Hindi being imposed overnight, equally, to that extent will this cry for linguistic separatism be accentuated. The other motive, as I see it, is the motive of ill-concealed communalism. I know that in making that plea for linguistic provinces, people will not only deny, but indignantly deny that their motives are even remotely communal. I say this with all respect that many of those who are pleading the case for linguistic provinces, that spiritually they are akin to the former Muslim Leaguers, and that the motives which underlie their claims for linguistic provinces are indistinguishable from the claims put forward by the Muslim Leaguers. Stripped of verbiage, what are these motives? The motives of many of those who are claiming linguistic provinces, are to create enclaves, cultural enclaves, administrative enclaves, and political enclaves, which each group will make a happy hunting-ground for the privileges of that particular group. In effect, while the Pakistan demand was based on a two-nation theory, I submit, that the demand for linguistic provinces is based equally on a multi-national theory. While my hon. friends may make out a spacious case, they present only one side of the medal, that of cultural autonomy being coincident with administrative autonomy, where this is feasible as an inalienable right. But I present the other side of the medal. Let us ask ourselves what was perhaps the greatest cementing factor that gave to India a sense of nationhood. Different people will answer the question differently, but I say, perhaps, the grea-

test single factor was the English language. It is an Indian Language because it is my mothertongue. It was because there was this common vehicle for communion of thought and feeling at least between the intelligentsia of India that a sense of nationhood was given to the leaders of India. Today the Hindi fanatics are destroying English overnight.

11 A.M.

Pandit A. R. Shastri: But who are the Hindi fanatics?

Shri Frank Anthony: I do not know why people suffer from a guilty conscience. I am not pointing my finger at any one at all. I say that the Hindi fanatics are destroying the English language. We have not now the capacity to put in its place the Hindi language. But what are we doing? We say that Hindi should become the national language of this country. But if we accept at this initial and formative stage, the strengthening or reinforcement of linguistic separatism by administrative autonomy, I say that Hindi will never become the national language of this country, that more and more linguistic separatism will be entrenched, and that Hindi will be driven into oblivion, the only cementing factor that we have ever had will disappear and India as a nation will cease to exist.)

I think it was Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee who said that we should not forget the lessons of history. I also want to remind the Leader of the House—he is unfortunately not here, in fact I do not need to remind him, for he is a fairly profound student of history himself—of the lessons of history. What has Indian history got to show us? Indian history has shown us that throughout the centuries, parochial, regional or state loyalties have more often than not outweighed or overborne national loyalties. I say this with all seriousness that we are still in the formative stage of trying to be one nation—we are not a nation as yet—and we have yet to build it firmly the various constituents of nationhood. If in this incipient stage, we accept even in principle linguistic provinces, then I say we will revive and enflame State loyalties to such an extent that they will destroy and consume our nascent national loyalties. That is why I am so opposed to accepting even in principle this concession with regard to linguistic provinces. Some of my friends have pleaded—and it is a usual plea—that linguistic provinces will bring greater

[Shri Frank Anthony]

administrative efficiency. I entirely disagree with that proposition. I say that linguistic provinces will create chaos, from our experience of what has been or what is likely to be. Take for instance the Andhra State. If an Andhra State should be formed, Telugu will become increasingly the pride of the Andhras. In the case of correspondence between a Hindi-speaking province and this Telugu-speaking province, what will happen? [The fanatical Hindi-speaking provinces will insist on sending their communications in Hindi while the Andhra State which by this time would have acquired its own stature—will insist on sending counter-replies in Telugu. It is going to happen].....

An Hon. Member: You will be the interpreter then.

Shri Frank Anthony: I have not yet assumed such multi-national proportions as to act as an interpreter. My friends may repudiate that such a thing will happen. But what is going to happen to administration? For instance, in the Hindi-speaking provinces, where we already have this cultural autonomy coincident or coterminus with administrative autonomy, what has happened? Overnight all the officials, even those who are not natives of that State, who have not achieved that degree of efficiency in order to be able to write their communications with an appreciation of all the nuances of that language, to make those communications intelligible and effective, what is happening to them? My friends from Madhya Pradesh—senior people who are not natives of that State, who do not understand Hindi well—they are obliged to sign orders etc. written by clerks without understanding them. I say this has happened and will always happen in every State if this principle is accepted.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): English should remain.

Shri Frank Anthony: Certainly English should remain, until we have some uniformity in the country. Hindi-speaking parents—I happen to be the Chairman of a Board connected with 300 schools—have come to me and have complained that the education of their children is being destroyed. [Why do people like Pandit Pant and Ravi Shanker Shukla send their children to Anglo-Indian schools? Why? Because where you have cultural *cum* administrative autonomy what has happened is, that English has been effaced and "Paranthu"

Hindi, to which my hon. friend, Mr. Chatopadhyaya referred, put in its place. Overnight they have been asked to pursue studies in "Paranthu" Hindi, they have been made to swop educational horses in mid-stream. What are the parents saying? The boys who pass the Matriculation have learnt only the ABC of English from the 7th standard with what result? You are destroying in the States where you have this language-*cum*-administrative autonomy, the education of the present generation. These children, as they are turned out, are semi-literate—they are semi-literate in "Paranthu" Hindi, they are semi-literate in Hindustani and are the most pitiful ignoramuses in English (Interruptions).]

My friends from the South have not been overborne by this narrow linguistic curse. Today if in spite of this, we force linguistic provinces on them then they themselves will be caught up in the maelstrom which will lead to administrative inefficiency and which will lead to the destruction of the South Indian student.

Sir, there are so many interruptions that I think I should be allowed at least five minutes more. I hope you will give me at least three more minutes. As I was saying, the South because it has not been afflicted by this narrow linguistic controversy, will lead India more and more and the South will enjoy.....(Interruptions). I am not from the South, I am from Madhya Pradesh which has deliberately limited the educational cultural horizon of the students. But the South has not done so because it is more liberal. I almost said more civilised. Because they have not destroyed their educational system, they will increasingly enjoy the monopoly of our administrative services. So far as overseas and higher studies are concerned, the South will also enjoy a monopoly more and more. I say, let us not throw a fly into their ointment of enjoyment. Let them continue as at present.

I am sorry that the Leader of the House is not here. But Home Minister is here. I want to make a final appeal to the Prime Minister. I say that this problem requires—I say it with all respect—not only clear thinking, but great courage. I know the political quandary that the Congress Party has been put into. This question of linguistic provinces has now invested with such a degree of passion and irrationality that the Congress party, merely from the point

of view of political expediency, cannot deal with it with the forthrightness that it might because in the political field, when the hustings come closer, and closer, they will have a competition in promises. That is the request I was going to make to the hon. the leader of the House. Do not from motives of political expediency be led into a competition of promises with the Communist or any other party; any party inspired by political adventurism can indulge in, shall we say, more lurid promises—promises more ravishing in the artificial nudity—than any responsible Government.)

I say that the first great surrender that the Congress party... (*Interruptions*). May I continue, Sir, without being interrupted?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will cut out two minutes from his time.

Shri Frank Anthony: As I was saying the first great surrender by the first great retreat that the Congress beat was when they accepted against the advice of Mahatma Gandhi that the national language of this country should be Hindi instead of Hindustani. I say that that is the first great retreat they beat. Today the Congress party is faced with another language challenge. The Congress has not yet stopped beating retreat on the language front. If on this particular issue the Congress makes another surrender, then I say it will be releasing into the political arena opposing linguistic armies which will make Pakistan and the Muslim League theories pale into insignificance. I say that you will not have partition of the country into two parts, but you will have partition or the butchering of the country into multiple parts, as great in number as you will have linguistic provinces. I see my friend, Dr. Katju is shaking his head. I hope the shaking of his head does not represent the considered opinion of his party. I say that the only approach to this problem is the approach from a rational linguistic point of view. Jawaharlal Nehru has done well in tackling communal-political bodies, that is an issue with which he has joined battle, but he has failed today to join battle with the new communalism, the communalism represented by this new phrase—coined by K. M. Munshi—linguism. I say it is a new communalism which is hydra-headed. It has a greater potential of danger than the old communalism with which Jawaharlal Nehru had battled in this country and practically wiped out. And the only way in which the Congress party can deal with it is

by applying itself—it is long overdue—to the problem of language. Even Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee, although he did not expressly say it, implied it. This question of language supremacy, this question of competing language claims can be solved and there will be competing claims and no articulate rancorous claims for linguistic provinces only if the Leader of the House will set out immediately—it is long overdue—to have a coordinated and properly integrated language policy for this country. Certain paper guarantees have been incorporated in the Constitution. The Prime Minister has joined battle with the communal-political groups. Let him join battle with the new communalism. He has not done it yet. Let him join battle with this new communalism which is represented by this fanaticism in respect of Hindi and let him evolve an integrated language policy, where the claim of Hindi will be recognised as paramount but the claims of every other language, every other linguistic area and group will be properly integrated, where instead of competing claims we will have an integrated language structure, where there will be harmony between the claims of Hindi and the other languages.

Shri Chattopadhyaya (Vijayavada): When I woke up this morning, I did not realise that I would be addressing this very august House. But I felt that I should add my humble voice to the voices that support the resolution which is under consideration. I am not going to take up more than five minutes, because this is not going to be a speech but just a record of my voice and my vote.

When I think of the promises of the Congress and its attitudes of the past and compare them with those of the present moment, I am reminded of a little story which I cannot help telling and which I think you will enjoy. There was once a man, a very brilliant man. Somehow, for what reason God only knows, (and I do not know whether God himself knew) he became slightly unhinged. He was taken to a mental asylum. The superintendent of course knew he was a very brilliant man. After two days the superintendent thought he should examine this man and analyse his case. So, he went to the man and said: "Hallo, Mr. Jonathan?" "Hallo?" "May I know who you are?" "Ha, ha, ha! Don't you know?" "No, I don't know." "I am King George!" "Thank you." And the superintendent went away. The next morning

[Shri Chattapathyaya]

he went back to Mr. Jonathan and said: "Hallo, good morning." "Good morning." "How do you do?" "Very well, thanks." "May I know who you are, Sir?" "Ha, ha, ha! Don't you know?" "No." "Hitler!" "Very sorry to have to interrupt you, Mr. Jonathan," the superintendent said, "Yesterday you said you were liking George, and today you say you are Hitler. How do you explain it?" "Ah, ha! That was by a different mother," said Jonathan. These promises of the Congress seem to be by different mothers of yesterday and today.

The proposition of linguistic areas is just four years younger than I am; that is to say—I am 54, and this is about 50 years old. It is nothing really new. We all know it and I have nothing really new to say about it, because all the preceding speakers have talked very ably and very learnedly. There has been a lot of learning about those speeches. I hope mine will have at least a little wisdom if not learning.

Well the Congress itself, as we know, in the past, fought tooth and nail against the British on this very point, and always stood for linguistic provinces. It knew of the British technique of dividing India. It knew of their very mischievous policy,—that they wanted to rule by that mischievous technique of imperialism which has always been "divide and rule". Today we find that the very thing is continuing. It seems rather curious to me. I am not a politician; I am a poet and I suppose I am not supposed to understand politics, but still in any case it seems to me rather queer to see a continuance of the selfsame method and technique.

The Congress had always been a valiant fighter, as I said, and in fact we all know that it is on this very basis of linguistic areas that the Congress wanted to conduct its affairs. I feel that today the tactic of promoting individuals from various States to high positions in order to assure those States that the Government are doing wonderful things—as also to keep them quiet, does not really working among the people. I represent Andhra from where I have been elected and I have had the occasion of knowing the opinion of many thousands of people, without exaggeration, and I know that the people beyond doubt are for the formation of an Andhra Province. It is absurd to

say that they have differences amongst themselves. They have not. I do agree that there is a handful, a small handful, who for some reason or the other—may be selfish ones: I do not want to attribute motives to them—make these differences loom large on the horizon of decision. But I am dead sure, I am sure that I am not wrong, that if you take a plebiscite, if you put the Andhra Province to vote, you would find over 90 per cent. would stand for an Andhra Province. We have to face things squarely. We cannot close our eyes like little children and say, "Well, we are safe." The child thinks it is safe: "The parent cannot see me because I close my eyes." It is not fair. I think, at this historic moment in the history of our country to shut our eyes to realities. I, therefore, sincerely hope that our Prime Minister, the hon. the Leader of the House, will not just wave away this great burning proposition with a slight wave of his hand, but will really sit down and come down to brass tacks and discuss it with the various leaders of the various provinces and get to know the mind of the people. For after all the mind of the people is the main thing in the great national progress of any country. I wish also to give this warning: if we do not consider this tremendous question with more seriousness, with more clarity of understanding and an attitude of generosity which is very essential today, you will find that the people will see to it that if it is not given, they will take it. It is not a gift that we ask for: it is a matter of right and that right shall be fulfilled, if not today, tomorrow; if not by the Prime Minister, then by the people.

श्रीमती मणिबेन पटेल (कैरा दक्षिण) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अब तक मैं सब के भाषण सुन रही थी और मुझे आश्चर्य हुआ कि सारे महीने भर जो हम ने बजट की चर्चा के मौके पर भाषण किये वह सब हम भूल गये क्या ? बजट के हर एक आइटम (पद) पर जो लोग बोले, उन सब ने कहा कि हमें उस के लिये पैसा दीजिये, इस चर्चा के लिये पैसा दीजिये, इन्फ्रस्ट्रक्चर (उद्योगों) को बढ़ाने के लिये पैसा दीजिये, देश में शिक्षा प्रसार कार्य के लिये पैसा दीजिये और रिबर वैली प्रोजेक्ट्स (River valley projects) के लिये पैसा दीजिये ।

और हमारे अर्थ मंत्री ने कहा कि हमारे पास पैसा नहीं है। अब हम जो लिग्विस्टिक प्रोविंसेज के बनाने की बात कर रहे हैं तो हमें सोचना चाहिये कि आखिर हमारी क्या स्वाहिस है और कौन सी चीज करने का कौन सा मौका ठीक है और आज की हालत में ऐसा करना क्या मुनासिब है। इन सब बातों पर हमें विचार करना होगा। इस में कांग्रेस अथवा सरकार ने इस सम्बन्ध में जो कहा है उस के पीछे जाने की कोई बात नहीं है। आज हम बदले हुए हालात में रह रहे हैं। जब हमारा देश स्वतंत्र हुआ, तब हम ने सब से पहले इस चीज पर विचार किया कि अपनी इस स्वतंत्रता को कायम रखने के लिये हमें अपने देश में ला एन्ड आर्डर (law and order) ठीक तौर से कायम रखें और वह काम हमारी सरकार ने सब से पहले अपने हाथ में लिया और उस के बाद दूसरा काम इंटिग्रेशन आफ इंडियन स्टेट्स (Integration of Indian States) भारतीय राज्यों का विलय अपने हाथ में लिया और देशी राज्यों का एकीकरण किया, लेकिन इंटिग्रेशन (विलय) के सम्बन्ध में भी अगर हम अच्छी तरह से सोचें तो पता लगेगा कि केवल राजा, महाराजाओं के दस्तखत लेने मात्र से यह इंटिग्रेशन (विलय) का काम पूरा नहीं होता।

जिस तरह से दूध पानी में मिलता है उस तरह से जो जो स्टेट्स आपस में इन्टिग्रेट (विलीन) हुई हैं या प्रान्तों में मिलाई गई हैं उन का इंटिग्रेशन ठीक हो जाय तभी हमारे देश का काम अच्छी तरह से आगे चल सकता है। जो जो यूनियन्स (संघ) बनाये गये उन यूनियन्स में अभी पूरी पूरी सर्विसेज (सेवाएं) भी नहीं हैं। राज्यों में जिस प्रकार से काम चलता था

उसका ढंग देखिये, काम देखिये तो कई जगह तो यह भी अभिलेख नहीं है कि जमीन कितनी है और कहाँ है। यह सब काम अभी करना बाक़ी है, और इस सब चीज को सोचे बिना हम ऐसा कहें कि नहीं भाषादार प्रान्त भी होने चाहिये तो काम कैसे चल सकता है? क्या आप ने कमेटी रिपोर्ट को पढ़ा है कि उन के एकानमिक इम्प्लीकेशन (आर्थिक प्रभाव) क्या हैं। कमेटी रिपोर्ट में पढ़ी है सिर्फ गुजरात प्रान्त अपना काम चला सकता है। इसलिये में लिग्विस्टिक प्रोविंसेज आज बनाने का विरोध करती हूँ। इस में कोई पीछे जाने की चीज नहीं है। हमारे देश में अन्न की स्थिति बहुत खराब है, हम गरीब लोगों को आगे बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, हम अपने देश की एकता को मजबूत करना चाहते हैं, यह सब काम पूरे होने के बाद हम इस के बारे में कुछ सोच सकते हैं। हमारे पास काश्मीर का मामला पड़ा हुआ है, इन सब चीजों के लिये पैसा चाहिये।

इसलिये मेरी सब सदस्यों से विनती है कि इस समय आप अपने अपने निर्वाचन क्षेत्र के मुताबिक मत सोचिये, अपने देश की बात सोचिये। इस में कांग्रेस या सरकार के अपने बचनों से वापस जाने की बात नहीं, लेकिन देश की आज की हालत में कौन सी चीज पहले करनी चाहिये यह सोचना चाहिये। जब नदी घाटी परियोजनाओं पर चर्चा की जा रही थी तो उस समय हर एक प्रान्त वाले और हर एक डिस्ट्रिक्ट वाले की मांग थी हमारे प्रान्त में हमारे डिस्ट्रिक्ट में, हमारी कान्स्टिटुएन्सी (constituency) में यह प्रोजेक्ट (project) होनी चाहिये। किसी ने यह नहीं कहा कि इस प्रोजेक्ट के लिये पैसा है या नहीं। कहीं से पैसा ले आओ, लेकिन यह प्रोजेक्ट हमारे प्रान्त में होनी ही चाहिये। तो

[श्रीमती मणिबेन पटेल]

हमें तय करना चाहिये कि कौन सी चीज हमें पहले चाहिये। अगर इस समय हमें अपने देश के लोगों की आर्थिक स्थिति को ठीक करना है, अपने देश को मजबूत करना है, जिस समय पुनर्वास मंत्रालय पर बहस हो रही थी तो विरोधी पक्ष ने कहा कि इस का काम पूरा नहीं हुआ और भी पैसा हम को चाहिये तो क्या विस्थापित व्यक्तियों की समस्याओं को आपको बाकी रख छोड़ना है? श्यामा प्रसाद बाबू ने कहा कि पूर्वी बंगाल से आये हुए इतने आदमी पड़े हुए हैं और उन को राहत मिलनी ही चाहिये। तो क्या आप वह काम नहीं करना चाहते हैं? अगर करना चाहते हैं तो पहले उस के लिये आप को पैसा चाहिये कि लिग्विस्टिक प्राब्लिसेज चाहिये। आप को कोरी भावनाओं में पड़ कर एक दूसरे के झगड़े में नहीं पड़ना चाहिये। मैं आप सब को यह सोचने के लिये कहती हूँ कि इस खयाल से सोचें कि हमारे देश की भलाई की दृष्टि से कौन सी चीज करनी ठीक है।

अभी एक भाई ने महात्माजी का नाम हिन्दी के बारे में ले कर कुछ कहा। हिन्दी के बारे में या हिन्दुस्तान के बारे में जो भाषा महात्माजी चाहते थे वही भाषा हमारी सरकार ने मान्य की है और हमारे कान्स्टिट्यूशन (संविधान) ने मान्य किया है, आप उस को हिन्दी कहिये या हिन्दुस्तानी कहिये। उस में यह लिखा गया है कि जो भाषा सब लोग समझ सकें वही भाषा हमारे देश की भाषा है। बात यह है कि जब ट्रान्जिशन पीरिअड (transition period) होता है उस में कोई भाषा बनती है तो उस में कहीं कहीं थोड़ा सा फर्क हो सकता है। हमारी भाषा तो अभी बन रही है इसलिये भाषा पर इस तरह झगड़ा करना ठीक नहीं है। इस-

लिये जिन भाई ने यह प्रस्ताव रक्खा है उन का भी यही कहना है कि आप सोचें अपोजीशन (विरोधी पक्ष) वाले तो हर एक मौके पर यह सोचा करते हैं कि किस तरह से तकलीफ हो। इस में यह सोचने की बात नहीं है। आन्ध्र प्रान्त वाले कहते हैं कि हम ने कभी इन्कार नहीं किया, आन्ध्र तो सब से पहले तैयार है लेकिन हमारे आन्ध्र के लोग कभी एक राय पर नहीं आये। इस के लिये प्राइम मिनिस्टर से यह कहना कि आप सब को इकट्ठा करें यह उचित नहीं है। इकट्ठा करने का काम ठीक भी नहीं है। बात यह है कि आप खुद आपस में एक राय पर नहीं हैं। मद्रास का कोई आदमी कुछ कहता है कोई कुछ कहता है कि मद्रास के बिना भी काम चल जायेगा, आन्ध्र वाले कहते हैं कि हमें मद्रास चाहिये। पहले आपस में तय करें और उस के बाद आप कुछ कहें। लेकिन अगर आप आर्थिक दृष्टि से देखें तो यह चीज ठीक नहीं हो सकती। इसलिये यह भाषा-वार प्रान्त की बात बिल्कुल गलत है। आप जो बहस कर रहे हैं उस में जो आर्थिक दृष्टि है उस को सोचें बिना आप अपनी बात कहते हैं इस बात की तरफ में आप का ध्यान खोंबने के लिये खड़ी हुई है।

मुझे आप ने बोलने का मौका दिया इस के लिये मैं आप को आभारी हूँ।

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): It is impossible to accept the resolution as it is too vaguely and too widely worded. At the same time the broad principle of having linguistic provinces which in a way underlies this resolution is certainly acceptable and in fact the Congress manifesto—in its latest form—which was adopted at Bangalore has accepted the same. I agree with my friend Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee that this is a problem which is not very easy but

which is of a national importance. Therefore it deserves to be solved in that higher and upper atmosphere. And in that he has promised his co-operation. I think the Government will certainly note this and take advantage to the extent possible.

People have been here even today to oppose the formation of Provinces on linguistic principles and one of the points expressed was that it would lead to fragmentation. But they do not see the full picture of today. On the one hand we have Ajmer-Merwara, Bhopal and a magnificent province which is as big as the pin-head, namely, Coorg and on the other side we have Uttar Pradesh extending like a leviathan covering the entire Doab and trying to stretch its hand much further to reach Vindhya and aspires to be still bigger. Now, not only this but every year it is sending thousands of bhayas to Bombay and dozens of politicians to Delhi, but not willing to send outside its border one grain of its surplus food. Now if you want some scientific approach to this question you cannot but adopt certain principles for the administrative division of this country, namely, those principles which the Congress manifesto has adopted. The British went on administering the country as they went on annexing. Annex and administer as you annex that was their policy. There was no principle in it and all sorts of strange things are noticed today. And the worst lot has been that of those whose mother tongue is Marathi.

Now there are 45 lakhs Marathi-speaking people in Hyderabad—in a minority, about 80 lakhs in the Central Provinces in a minority and in Bombay with the recent merger we are practically not a majority nor a minority too but somewhere in a doubtful situation. See the injustice resulting from this arrangement. Very recently the Bombay Government had introduced a Bill for making Hindi as the State language and all the three languages, namely, Kannada, Marathi and Gujrati have been reduced to the district level. Apparently it seems to be a very innocent piece of legislation. But the Gujrati language has the status of State language in Saurashtra; the Kannada language has the status of State language in Mysore. But so far as Marathi is concerned, it has not got the status of a State language anywhere. Now what does it mean? Language progresses as experience is accumulated, but here at State level the Marathi people are completely deprived of the advantage therefrom. Not only this but as far as I know the social

and the economic order in the Marathi-speaking area is to the disadvantage of the local people. The trading community and the industrialists are all non-Marathi. The rest of the population are merely workers and peasants. We see the inequalities of wealth, inequalities of opportunity. Do you sincerely feel that this will not create social strains and stresses and ultimately result in an atmosphere of despair and desperation? No country can afford to keep a substantial section of its population in that state. What is worse, I fear, is that a mood of sullenness is gradually coming over and when that happens all initiative is immobilised, all constructive urges and impulses are arrested because there is no outlet. We are told there are a number of difficulties. In 1947 and 1948 I myself realised that those difficulties were really valid and giving evidence before the Dhar Commission I said, "Even if you offer me United Maharashtra now I will not accept it because we are not ready, the country is not free from difficulty." In 1947-48 we had to consolidate the power, we had to bring about a sense of unity in the country, and therefore the great Sardar Patel started the unification by three stages: First, accession of the States, then merger, then democratization. All that is achieved, and logically now we must say we are in a position in which we can afford with safety to consider the question of redistribution, administratively, of this country. There are people who will always say there are difficulties, that the times are not propitious. I do not remember any generation which had not had to face problems, I do not remember any point of time which was free exclusively from anxiety. Therefore, this argument will not hold water—you must proceed. Some of the circumstances that were narrated by Dr. Mookerjee are absolutely valid and must be taken into consideration. It is wrong to say that because a people speak a particular language therefore they are against a united State. On the contrary I would say that unless you create an atmosphere of consent and happiness in those areas which have a particular linguistic community their loyalty will not have the opportunity to flower and they will not be able to contribute, to the best of their ability and to the best of their intellect, to the progress of the country as a whole.

This problem has got to be tackled, and the Congress is committed to it. The Congress manifesto says, "when there is general agreement". I would most respectfully request the leader that

[Shri Gadgil]

this does not mean that there must be not a single dissident voice and every interest must agree and then only you can move. That is not the narrow interpretation I put on it. I honestly felt when I raised my hand at Bangalore in support of that manifesto that it did cast a positive duty on the Congress, when it came into power, to do something concrete. Otherwise, to allow things to remain where they were will lead to a mood of sullenness which would result in very dire consequences. As I have said on earlier occasions, we must

move, स्थित्य गति चिन्तनीया ।

You must move—you may take small steps if you like. According to me all these problems are of two varieties: main problems and marginal problems. The problem referred to by Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee was essentially a marginal problem, but the main problems are Karnatak, Maharashtra and Andhra. And I would not mind if the Government first tackles Andhra, then Karnatak and then put me last in the queue because I have sufficient confidence in the Congress organisation and its leadership that when they are pledged to a proposition they will do their best to implement it. Therefore, instead of merely waiting for events to develop the right leadership consists in manoeuvring events, not in meeting what the other people do. You must take the initiative. What have the Communists done? In fact, in Andhra they actually stole the political clothes when they were about to be ironed—before they were ironed they were stolen—and they succeeded in the elections. Therefore, the initiative must not be given into the hands of those who do not share the nationalist ideology but the motive behind this resolution is not free from doubt. It seems to be to ultimately redistribute this country on the principle of nationalities which is the solution offered by the U.S.S.R. philosophy. I am not for this. When we ask for linguistic provinces none of us says that he belongs to a separate nationality. No, we ask for it on the analogy that the entire building belongs to all of us, but let us divide it in such a way as to reduce friction between brother and brother and to create an atmosphere in which hearty co-operation will follow as a necessary consequence. In that spirit the demand for linguistic provinces is urged, and I assure you that so far as the Maharashtrians in Bombay are concerned, although they have a majority in the Bombay Assembly they never

abused it. In fact, they suffered because of their majority; they were overwhelmed with a sense of responsibility that they must be fair to their neighbour so long as they are a composite State. I assure them that when we part we will part as friends. We will adjust all our differences. I do feel that though you may oppose the solution of the problem here and now, or, immediately as the resolution says, and it may not be practical to do so, yet it will not be statesmanship to delay the solution and create a sort of suspicion in the minds of people. When I went last time to Karnatak they were all against the Congress. They say, "We have been trying for this linguistic province and every time we are being told, 'Today', or, 'Tomorrow', but that day never seems to come and the problem remains". I therefore honestly feel that this is a challenge to the statesmanship, to the constructive genius of our leadership and our genius for political compromises and if we accept that challenge I have not the slightest doubt that this problem will be solved.

Somebody referred to Mr. Munshi. Undoubtedly it is very difficult to state where he exactly stands, because he was the first man to speak of Maha Gujerat. Then there was the cry of Vishal Karnatak and we the poor Maharashtrians, out of sheer instinct of self-defence said, let us be something—we will be a united family. But even Mr. Munshi in his book has said that a redistribution of provincial boundaries should only be undertaken when the national emergency has passed,—that was written in 1947-48— and when a dispassionate consideration of the relevant factors, administrative, economic and geographical is possible. To do justice I feel the time has now come. There is no national crisis facing us now. Freedom has been consolidated but to every citizen in the country it is useless unless as a citizen he experiences in his own life that freedom means to him more bread, more cloth, greater opportunity to speak in his own tongue, and enough fields for the expansion of his personality. In that spirit, we must approach this problem. I therefore earnestly request the Leader of the House to make the position very clear and undertake this positive duty to bring about an atmosphere in which the different elements will come to an agreement, and not leave the matter in the good old British imperialist style saying "Unless you agree, nothing can be done."

I do not want to take up any further time of the House.

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey) : Finding a large number of hon. Members coming forward to partake in the discussion, I thought that I would have no chance to speak at all, but here is an occasion when I can contribute my views on the question of linguistic provinces. I was listening very carefully to the speech made by my hon. friend Shri Gadgil and I could not exactly understand where we differed. He made a certain reference to the Communists and said something about their taking hold of principles that had been put into practice in the U.S.S.R. He said that linguistic provinces should be formed and that language was a basic factor. What more is being demanded by the Communist Party, I cannot understand. The Malaylee, the Tamilian, the Bengalee—they are not simply sections of people. They have certain hall-marks of their own. True, we are all sons and daughters of India, but there are certain specialities, certain special features, certain traditions, that are our own. We are not simply sections of people. We have a past. We have a language. We have tastes. We have got a certain culture, a certain outlook specially our own, all of which we characterise as the qualities of nationality. In acknowledging them, in recognising them, in implementing them, we shall do nothing wrong. We believe that by doing so India will become stronger, will become more united, and will achieve that personality which will enable her to tackle her problems more ably.

I am told that the Congress leadership is prepared to concede this principle. In the past it has done so. That itself is proof positive that this question has to be tackled immediately. Whenever the Indian National Congress had to mobilise the people, to inspire the people, it shouted the slogan of linguistic provinces. When we were fighting the British, when the Prime Minister of today was the leader of the anti-British movement, he shouted from the housetops this slogan of linguistic provinces. Why? In 1946 when the Congress issued its election manifesto, it did not forget to add this question of linguistic provinces. They knew that it was a mobilising factor. Today we are told that we have to take into consideration the unity of India, the economic prosperity of India. We find a tendency to pose this question of linguistic provinces as against the economic prosperity and against the unity of the country. That is a very mischievous way of doing it. That is very misleading. In fact, we will be able to tackle our economic and social problems better if we are organised on

a linguistic basis. The happiness of the Malaylee, the contentment of the Tamilian and the feeling of satisfaction among the Bengalee—all this will give us greater strength to tackle these problems. Therefore, it is not a question of the Malaylee or the Tamilian or the Bengalee demanding something. It is a question of India gathering strength to tackle her problems.

The leadership of the Indian National Congress is always in difficulties. The Prime Minister, of course, dislikes the princes but he has to tolerate them. He would like to hang the black-marketeer by the neck but he has to tolerate him. He is a hater of imperialism, but he has to reconcile himself to the British Empire—I mean its new edition, the Commonwealth. On every issue you find the leadership of the Indian National Congress compromising. I would say that our Prime Minister spends half the day in enunciating principles and the other half he spends in finding out ways and means, in finding out excuses, for getting away from them. This is not an accidental contradiction—this is conflict between principle and practice; between what is to be done and what is actually done. If you look at the Three-Man Committee Report, on more than one occasion it is said "As a democratic Government, we will have to submit." The word "submission" is there repeated twice or thrice. It is not merely a question of submission. A Government of the people does not sit tight and say, "If people want linguistic provinces, they will have it." If the Government is really a democratic one, if it is a peoples' Government, then it should not allow things to take their own course. It must give shape to the aspirations of the people and implement and put into practice immediately the desires of the people. This sort of fumbling, this sort of looking this way and that must be stopped immediately. This problem has to be tackled now and here. This is the first time I am hearing arguments against linguistic provinces. In Kerala no public speaker can easily do it, because people will not allow it. I am not saying this with any parochial or provincial feeling. We people are a crore and a quarter or so and we want to tackle our problems in our own way. The hon. the Finance Minister knows that irrespective of party affiliations, we the Members of Parliament took up the question of coir. (*An Hon. Member*: Also copra.) Yes, copra also. A fall in the market price of coir means the starvation of fifteen lakhs of people in Kerala. Again, take the

[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 Mattheu (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 by mutual consent 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 re-shape 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 Maharashtra 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 in 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 or 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

schemes which are going to come. Of course there is an agreement between the people of Rayalaseema and the people of the coastal districts comprising Vizag, West Godavari, East Godavari, Guntur and Krishna. These five districts are called the coastal districts. The agreement which was made in the year 1937 is generally known as the Sree Baugh Pact which my hon. friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram, referred to. According to it—there are some conditions laid down to safeguard the interest of the people. Rayalaseema will have a University centre at Anantapur; she will have the choice of selecting the capital of the State or the High Court in any place within the area of Rayalaseema and will have equal number of seats in the Legislatures and secure priority for the irrigational schemes. In spite of this agreement unfortunately the differences are not bridged; they are as they were. For instance, the Government College at Anantapur seceded from the Andhra University and got itself affiliated to the Madras University. This itself shows that there is no harmony between the people of Rayalaseema and the people of Andhra. As the Partition Commission indicates, there are a number of outstanding differences and unresolved questions, which still remain unsettled. Now there is a boundary dispute also in the district of Bellary, and some of the *taluks* in Chittoor district are claimed by the Tamils as well as by the Kannada people. Chittoor also claims some *taluks* in Chengalput, some in North Arcot and some in the District of Salem. These are not easy for solution. We have another difficulty, and that is the financial position of the proposed new State. The phrase Rayalaseema itself is an attractive one; it is a reminder of the past glory and a pointer to the future. It has seen glorious days, and it has enjoyed unique splendour and privilege during the reign of King Krishnadevaraya. It was described by foreign travellers and the historians who visited the Capital of Vijayanagar empire as a "land of plenty and prosperity." Now it is a famine zone—a poor and backward tract. It requires a number of projects, both major and small, to be executed. The economic development of Rayalaseema is to be assured, and if at all this recurring famine is to be warded off, all the projects that are now under execution and some of them are under contemplation have to be executed completely. Then alone will famine disappear and the area will again become a land of plenty and prosperity. All that involves heavy capital expenditure. If we got the Andhra Province

established, it is already a province of deficit budgets. According to the Dar Commission, the deficit will be Rs. six crores. The Partition Commission, estimates the deficit to be Rs. two crores. The revenues have dwindled and many of the funds—famine fund, village development fund and several other funds—have largely disappeared; the amount in the funds has come down from Rs. 32 crores to a few lakhs. Under the allotment of assets and liabilities to Andhra Province by the Partition Commission, it gets very scanty amount. It cannot meet the requirements of the projects. Starting with a career of deficit budgets resorting to taxation in the very first year, how can the new Andhra Province find funds to meet the expenditure on all these projects? There are some thermal stations to be installed, and some other schemes of extending power supply are ready for sanction. All these require money. The Andhra Province will be very much crippled by its deficit budget and by its divided resources in these areas. The effect of partition will be a disaster for Rayalaseema. Rayalaseema sees much chance in an undivided Madras State and they hope that they will get something. They have a right over Madras, because all these days they have been neglected and now the undivided Madras State is coming forward to help them and hence we cannot leave Madras. Further, Madras is close to Rayalaseema, and we do not want that it should be cut away from Madras. That is one reason. Secondly, on account of paucity of funds most of our projects, big and small, may be abandoned or slowed down if it is included in the proposed Andhra Province. In view of all these things, we oppose the motion for the immediate formation of an Andhra Province and also the inclusion of Rayalaseema in the Andhra Province.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Sir, before you adjourn the House, may I know when this debate will be continued? In order to maintain the continuity of the debate, it should not be put off for a long time. We may have to sit on Saturday in order to continue the debate on this resolution.

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): We will consider the matter and let hon. Members know some time in the near future.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: We may sit in the afternoon. If there is any objection to sitting on Saturday, we

[Shri Syamnandan Sahaya]

could sit in the afternoon and finish the debate. My hon. friend Dr. Mookerjee is right when he says that a debate like this should not be postponed for long and then again discussion started. We could sit in the afternoon tomorrow, if the hon. Minister agrees.

Dr. Katju: The hon. Member will not expect me to consent off-hand. We may be able to say something tomorrow.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I suggest we sit day after tomorrow in the afternoon.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I understand hon. Members are anxious to have this debate closed as early as possible. The Government will consider that matter and give an indication to the House tomorrow.

The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Tuesday, the 8th July 1952.
