

THE

Date 25/11/2014

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

1075

1076

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Wednesday, 19th August, 1953

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

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

9-15 A.M.

ANDHRA STATE BILL.—contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now proceed with further consideration of the following Motion moved by Dr. Kailas Nath Katju on the 13th August 1953:

"That the (Bill to provide for the formation) of the State of Andhra, the increasing of the area of the State of Mysore and the diminishing of the area of the State of Madras, and for matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration."

Along with this is the amendment moved by Dr. Lanka Sundaram.

I find a number of hon. Members are still not satisfied because of their not having been called, though I have been calling a number of them and restricting the time of their speeches to 15 minutes. I have as many as 35 still on my list; possibly some more will come. I therefore request that hon. members will confine their remarks to 10 minutes each. If it is agreeable to the hon. the Mover of the Bill, he may reply tomorrow. That is for convenience....

347 PSD.

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): As you please, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So that in 4 hours I can call as many as 24 or 25 Members. I would even prefer hon. Members reducing their speeches to 5 minutes, because much has been said and except that they want to take part, there is nothing more that is new. Of course, some hon. Members may have some fresh light to throw on the subject. Now, Mr. Sivamurthi Swami will continue his speech.

श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी (कुष्टगी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कल मैं आन्ध्र बिल पर प्रारम्भ करने वाला था कि

(At this stage, some hon. Members started leaving their seats.)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not know what to do with respect to hon. Members who feel that as soon as the Question Hour is over there is no more House sitting, and get away to the Lobby. What attraction there is in the Lobby, I am not able to understand. Hon. members come from distant places and must take part to do justice to their constituencies. I am seriously considering the question of noting down the hours each hon. Member sits here and then publishing the same from time to time.

Now, Mr. Sivamurthi Swami.

श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी : मैं माननीय आन्ध्र जनता को हार्दिक बन्दन अर्पित

[श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी]

करता हूँ और उस हस्ती को अपने दिल से इज्जत पेश करता हूँ जिसने अपन जन्म त्याग से इस आन्ध्र बिल का इस सदन में आना सम्भव बनाया है और आन तौर पर लिक्विडिफिक प्राविसेज का दरवाजा खोला है। श्री रामूलू के बलिदान से जनता के दिल में जो बलबले उठे उनको दुनिया की कोई ताकत नहीं रोक सकती थी यही वजह है कि आज इस हाउस में यह आन्ध्र बिल पेश हो रहा है। मैं सोच रहा हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट को इस पर किस तरह से बर्बाई दूँ जो कि ताकत से जनता के बलबले को दबाने में नाकामयाब होकर इस बिल को पेश कर रही है और इस बिल के उसूल को ही खत्म करने के मकसद से आन्ध्र देश में इस बिल के जरिये मद्रास के सिर्फ एक हिस्से को इन्कारपोरेट किया गया है। यह अफसोस की बात है और दुःख की बात है। उसूल के मुताबिक हैदराबाद के तेलंगाणा हिस्से को भी इसमें मिला कर पूरा विशाल आन्ध्र बनाना चाहिए था। अगर ऐसा होता तो हम खुशी से इसका स्वागत करते। लेकिन इसको अधूरा रखा गया है और फिर राजधानी को ढूँढा जा रहा है जब कि हैदराबाद मौजूद है जो कि परमानेंट कैपिटल बन सकता है। वहाँ के लोगों को यह डिमांड है कि हैदराबाद को डिस्ट्रिक्ट प्रेंट किया जाय। यह आवाज न सिर्फ कांग्रेस की तरफ से उठाई जा रही है बल्कि दूसरी पार्टियों की तरफ से भी यही मांग है और हर पोलिटिकल पार्टी इस में एक मत है कि हैदराबाद को डिस्ट्रिक्ट करके पूरा विशाल आन्ध्र बनाया जाय। मैं इस मौके पर सिर्फ इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह गवर्नमेंट के लिए कोई अच्छी बात नहीं होगी कि वह थोड़ा सा ही आन्ध्र का हिस्सा दे। लेकिन फिरहाल जो इस बिल

में दिया गया है उसका समर्थन करते हुए, एक दूसरी बात पर जो कि इस बिल में दी गयी है मैं गौर करना चाहता हूँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, बहस में यह कई बार कहा गया है कि दक्षिण भारत में आन्ध्र स्टेट बना कर जो यह पहला कदम उठाया जा रहा है इस मौके पर कर्नाटक और दूसरे प्रान्तों में एक तरह का फीलिंग उठना स्वाभाविक है और हर प्रान्त वाले चाहते हैं कि अपने अपने प्रान्त को बनायें। यह जो दक्षिण भारत में डिमांड हो रही है इसको एक दिन गवर्नमेंट को मानना ही पड़ेगा और यह देना ही पड़ेगा। वरना आन्ध्र की ही तरह लोगों में बलबले उठने पर और एक बलवा होने पर जिस तरह यह बिल यहां आया है अगर उसी तरह दूसरे प्रान्तों में भी सत्याग्रह होने पर और दूसरे कांस्टीट्यूशनल तरीकों को अस्तित्वार करने के बाद अगर ताकत आजमाने पर ही वह बिल यहां आये तो यह अफसोस की बात होगी। अब कर्नाटक की स्थिति में आपके सामने रखूँ। वहाँ तमाम पार्टी वाले मिल कर अपनी एक ऐक्शन कमेटी बना कर इस बात पर तुले हुए हैं कि अगर इस समय पर कर्नाटक प्रान्त न दिया जाय तो आन्दोलन करें।

बार बार यह कहा जाता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की यूनिटी को देखा जाय। कोई भी लिक्विडिफिक प्राविसेज की डिमांड करने वाले या उनके लिये एजिटेट करने वाले यह नहीं चाहते कि हिन्दुस्तान की यूनिटी पर किसी तरह से भी असर पड़े। हर एक चाहता है कि हिन्दुस्तान को मजबूत से मजबूत बनाया जाय। जब हम हिन्दुस्तान के तमाम परिवार अपने अपने घर की पोषीशन को सम्भाल कर खुश होंगे तो हिन्दुस्तान की यूनिटी कैसे अधूरी रह सकती है। हिन्दुस्तान में जो

मुख्तलिफ कल्चर वाले लोग हैं उनके जब होमोजिनियस (एक सम) स्टेट बन जायेंगे और डिवाइड एंड रूल के प्रिंसिपल पर जो पहले दो दो तीन तीन भाषा वाले स्टेट बनाये गये थे वह खत्म हो जायेंगे तो हिन्दुस्तान का अम्युदय होगा। अब अगर आन्ध्र वाले अपना प्रान्त बनावें या कर्नाटक वाले अपना प्रान्त बनावें तो कोई बात नहीं कि इससे भारतवर्ष का अम्युदय न हो। जो लोग कि लिग्विस्टिक प्रॉविसेज के ऐडवोकेट हैं उनके दिल में किसी किस्म की यह ख्वाहिश नहीं है कि कोई भी चीज जरूरी बराबर भी हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ हो। लेकिन अगर आप देर करेंगे तो दक्षिण भारत में एक द्राविडिस्थान की आवाज उठेगी जो कि हमारे नैशनलिज्म के खिलाफ है। आपको इसको दबाना चाहिए। और यह तभी हो सकता है जब कि लिग्विस्टिक प्रॉविसेज बना दिये जायें। आप अपनी ही रिकमेंडेशन को देखें। मैं यहां एक कोटेशन धार कमीशन का देता हूँ और फिर उसके बाद इस बिल पर आता हूँ।

"Two of these linguistic provinces, Kerala and Karnatak, being situated at the tail end of their provinces and represented by ineffective minorities"—underline 'ineffective minorities'—"have undoubtedly suffered in their development. There can no doubt that they would prosper and be able to manage their affairs much better under their own Government nearer home if such a Government were possible. The cases of Andhra and Central Provinces and Maharashtra are more complicated and have a political colouring in them."

तो कर्नाटक सबसे आसानी से बनने वाला प्रान्त है। और मुझे ख़शी होगी कि आन्ध्र के बनने के बाद कम से कम इसका जवाब देते बहन गवर्नमेंट इसके लिये केटागारीकल एक्शयोरेंस (निश्चित आश्वासन) दे। मैं

इसकी गवर्नमेंट से आशा करता हूँ। स्टेटमेंट आफ आबजेक्ट्स एंड रीजन्स (उद्देश्यों तथा कारणों के विवरण) में जो आन्ध्र बिल में दिया गया है लिग्विस्टिक का लफ्ज नहीं है और न इसका प्रोग्राम है। अगर इसके लिये गवर्नमेंट ने कोई प्रोग्राम न बनाया और एक्शयोरेंस न दिया तो, प्रान्तों में जो इसके लिए आवाज उठेगी उसको दुनिया की कोई ताकत नहीं रोक सकती और न कोई ताकत उन लोगों के दिलों में शान्ति पैदा कर सकती है।

इसके बाद मैं बिल पर अपने ख्यालात पेश करूंगा। बलारी के सम्बन्ध में बहुत कुछ कहा जा चुका है। मैं उसको दुहराना नहीं चाहता। लेकिन उसका जहां तक ताल्लुक कन्नड प्रान्त से है उसके बारे में दो चार लफ्ज कहना चाहता हूँ। यह बात नामुकिन नहीं है कि इस पर हम और आन्ध्र वाले आपस में बैठ कर फौसला कर लें। आपस में लड़ने से और एक दूसरे के खिलाफ मोटिव लगाने से मुश्किलता पैदा हो सकती है। हम खुद इसका फौसला न कर सकें ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है। प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने खुद कहा है कि:

"Unchallenged and uncontested Telugu areas should comprise the Andhra State."

मैं ने जो पिटीशन दी है वह तमाम मेम्बरों में सरक्यूलेट की गयी है। उसमें भी यह दिखाया गया है कि एलूर में ९४ गांव हैं जिनमें से ५१ कन्नड गांव हैं। यह मैं १९३१ की सेन्सस (जनगणना) के आधार पर बोल रहा हूँ। अडूनी में १७८ गांव हैं उनमें ३८ कन्नड गांव हैं और रायचूर में ८५ गांव हैं उनमें ५२ कन्नड गांव हैं और यह सारे वार्डर के पास हैं और मिलाये जा सकते हैं।

जैसे इस अनन्तपुर में मुडकामिरा तालुक है और इसका मैं एक सबूत और देता हूँ। शर में अब डाक्टर पट्टाभि सीतारमैया

[श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी]

कर्नाटक के बारे में एक मेमोरेण्डम वाइसराय विलिंगडन को पेश कर रहे थे तो उन्होंने ने खुद कहा था कि :

"The Districts of Bellary, South Kanara (Managlore) and the Nilgiris; and the talukas of Madakasira (Anantapur District), Kollegal (Coimbatore District) and Hosur and Krishnagiri (Salem District) with some villages in other bordering districts in Madras Presidency should all be formed into the Karnataka State."

यह डाक्टर पट्टाभि सीतारमैया ने जब वह वाइसराय विलिंगडन को मेमोरेण्डम पेश कर रहे थे उस वक्त खुद अपने दस्तखत से दिया है ।

यहाँ पर जो डिप्टी होम मिनिस्टर दातार साहब हैं, उन्होंने भी एक मेमोरेण्डम देते वक्त कहा है :

"finally appeals to the two hon. Members to take note of the seriousness of the present situation and to report to the Cabinet of Madras (that a Boundary Commission be appointed forthwith. The Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee requests them to recommend the exclusion even provisionally of the above Kannada areas from the Andhra Province in any case."

इतना कहने के बाद मैं अब यह कह कर अपना भाषण खत्म करता हूँ, इससे ज्यादा कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता कि

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I gave notice to the hon. Member two minutes before. He has completed 11 minutes. What is the use of going on adding? The hon. Member has said enough. We are not discussing Karnataka here.

श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी : तो मुझ केवल इतना कहना है कि हर एक दिव्य के लिये बाऊंडरी कमिशन जल्दी से जल्दी बिठाय

जाय और जो कुछ मैसूर से मिलाना है वह मिलाया जाय और जो कुछ आंध्र को देना है वह उनको दिया जाय । हमें इसके बारे में खुशी है और मैं इस बिल की परखोर ताईद करता हूँ ।

Shri Matthen (Thiruvellah): I rise to support this Bill. In doing so it would be unfair to this House and to myself if I do not give expression to what I have been feeling about this since the announcement of the Andhra State. As one who had an opportunity to observe things at close quarters and to form an objective opinion, I have no hesitation in saying that the entire agitation has been initiated and whipped up by political parties with an eye for their own advantages or advancement and that it has no basis or origin among the right-thinking people.

The common charge is that the Tamil Ministry of Madras has been exploiting the Andhras—I wonder whether the House is aware of the fact that all the Chief Ministers of Madras except perhaps the present incumbent were Andhras. No further proof of what I have said above is required than the welter of subsidiary and minor controversies that have crept up consequent on the decision to form a State. Has there been one single instance of substantial agreement on points like the location of the capital, shifting of the High Court, the personnel of the Shadow Cabinet or even the leadership itself, with which the Tamils have nothing to do? If the demand for the State was a movement which has root in the people, who are the people behind these unifying controversies? Rajaji described the idea of the linguistic State as a tribal idea. I think he has been dating it back a little too far. It is really an oligarchic idea, initiated by a small loosely-knit oligarchy of politicians. (Interruption.) I am not a Tamil.

Shri Raghuramaiah (Tenali): These are very caustic remarks about our great leaders and I would request my hon. friend to keep himself within respectable limits.

Shri Matthen: I have said what I feel about it. If it has wounded my hon. friend, I am very, very sorry.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): It has wounded many hon. friends.

Shri Matthen: I am very sorry.

My object in pointing out this vital aspect of the matter is not to oppose the Bill or to accuse particular persons—Mr. Raghuramaiah or anybody else—but to advocate a realistic approach to the question and to point out the danger of the situation—that the men who started the controversies and agitation may get more than they bargained for, that they will find themselves so involved in petty controversies and local factions that it will be impossible for them to make any progress with administration. It is useless now to look back. A definite commitment has been made and a date has been set for the formation of the new State. I doubted the wisdom of the announcement when it was made and subsequent developments have only confirmed my doubts, but faced as we are with a different situation now, I agree that we cannot go back and that we should bring the new State into being with as little delay as possible. That is why I am supporting the Bill. But there are three concrete suggestions which I would like to make.

Firstly the Government of India have a duty to the people of the new Andhra State and having regard to the history of the movement as I have outlined, the Government of India cannot absolve themselves of all responsibility, so far as the State subjects are concerned, when the new State Government is formed. They must see that the new State is not a mere playground for the so-called

politicians. The interests of the poor people should be given priority, whoever may be the Chief Minister. They should make it quite clear that if the new State is unable to form a reasonably efficient, responsible and stable Ministry, the Government of India's obligation to the Andhra people will require them to introduce President's rule.

Secondly, the success of the new Government will depend to a very large extent on the ability, integrity and impartiality of the permanent Civil Service. The discussions in the Madras Assembly have shown that there is considerable apprehension in the minds of officers, whether in the conditions likely to exist in the new State in the near future, it will be possible for them to function in that manner and whether they will not find themselves the unjust victims of political and communal intrigues. Adequate safeguards should be provided in the present Act in the light of the discussion in the Madras Assembly on this aspect of the matter. In this connection I would like to point out that while the Government of India have accepted the amendment suggested by the Madras Assembly in respect of the State services and incorporated certain safeguards in section 63 for 'Transferred Officers', they have not accepted the Madras Assembly's suggestion so far as the All-India Services are concerned. The Chief Minister of Madras who is on the spot and who knows the facts of the case more closely and much better than several other people, stated on the floor of the Madras Assembly as follows:

"In our view, the All-India services also should be treated on the same lines and for the same reasons. The Government of India have a different opinion in the matter. The Andhra opposition to non-Andhra personnel in the public services of the Andhra State is by no means less pronounced in the case of members

[Shri Matthen]

of these services than in the case of members of the State and subordinate services. If anything, it would be more as many of these officers would be at or near the top level."

Rajaji said:

"In our view, this will be the only wise arrangement in the interests of the non-Andhra officers who are ordered without reference to their own opinion to serve the Andhra State."

These are wise words and I would strongly urge the Government of India to listen to them and provide in sections 61 and 62, also that persons compulsorily allotted against their wishes should be allowed to go back to the residuary State after a specified period of service. Failing that, provision should be made in the Act for the President to guarantee them their service rights, their prospects and fair and non-discriminatory treatment against any hasty, vindictive or short-sighted policy by the new Andhra Government to promote and improve immediately and at any cost the prospects of Andhras in Government services as against non-Andhras.

Thirdly, Sir,—and this is the most important suggestion I have to make—Government should make it clear that the formation of the Andhra State does not commit them to a policy of fragmentation of the country on the basis of languages, or of yielding to fads, threats or other political stunts. The integration of the State was a special contribution of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel to Indian unity. In the main, his work has endured; instead of strengthening that grand conception, let us not do anything to weaken that edifice. The movement for linguistic States is definitely a weakening factor, whatever the people most interested in it think; its mode of expression has sometimes been as irresponsible as its timing. It has

been marked by hunger-strikes even unto death, by the stoppage of trains, by acts of violence which may amount to murder as is evidenced in Bellary and Chittoor. "We have to remember always that if India does not progress nobody will progress." Please mark these significant words of the Prime Minister when he unfurled the National Flag at the Red Fort the other day.

Sir, while they may find that in one case the interests of a section of the people and the interests of the country generally can be advanced by the partition of a particular State, they should be equally prompt and willing to carry out the opposite process of integration where they find that such a step will serve the same ends, in another case. I want particularly to bring to the notice of the Government of India and of this august House . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. member may occasionally refer to his notes and not go on reading.

Shri Matthen: I thought I was making a speech on a very important matter. I could speak *extempore*, but I thought this is a very, very serious matter. I want particularly to bring to the notice of the Government of India and of this august House the growing volume of enlightened public opinion in the South in favour of an integration of Travancore-Cochin with the neighbouring residuary State of Madras with which it has everything in common.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is suggesting that Travancore-Cochin must be integrated with Madras: I want to make him understood by the House.

Shri Matthen: That is the opinion among the enlightened people of Travancore-Cochin. That will be of immense economic and administrative advantage to the South and to the country at large.

In fact, I would go a step further and express a pious wish to see, in the not distant future, the creation of two large States in the South, one with Hyderabad as the capital to which the new State of Andhra may be added and the other with Bangalore as the capital with Mysore, Travancore-Cochin and Madras formed into one State.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): Why not the whole of South India into one State?

Shri Matthen: I would earnestly appeal to the saner section of the House to form a front to counter this linguistic State idea.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): Is the hon. member within his right to refer to a 'saner section of the House' meaning thereby that there is an 'insane' section?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member only says that the whole House is sane; but there are some sections which are saner.

Sari Matthen: I make these suggestions for what they are worth.

Shri Kakkan (Madurai—Reserved—Sch. Castes): In supportinig this Bill, I pay my tribute to the Congress leaders of Andhra Desh and also to the Provincial Congress Committee. For a number of years past, the Provincial Congress Committee of Andhra Desh was fighting for the formation of a separate Andhra province. So, the credit for the formation of an independent State of Andhra goes to the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee, especially to the leader, Mr. Sanjeeva Reddy. Some of my hon. friends on the other side mentioned the name of Shri Potti Sriramulu, for whom I have the greatest respect. I would request my hon. friends to follow the principles and foot-steps of Potti Sriramulu and maintain peace in Andhra Desh.

Coming as I do from Tamilnad, I strongly oppose the provision in the Bill providing for Rs. 230 lakhs as compensation for the buildings. As you know, we in Tamilnad are not now in a position to pay this compensation. I suggest that this compensation must be given by the Centre. The Partition Committee of the Madras Cabinet had recommended a sum of Rs. 1 crore when the reserve fund was more than Rs. 42 crores. Since Madras is not in a position to pay this amount in her straitened financial circumstances, the Centre should pay this amount to Andhra and also come to the aid of Madras.

Lastly, I come to Chittoor. I think you are also a Tamilian.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member will not drag the Chair. I am an Andhra.

Suri Kakkan: In 1911 six taluqs of North Arcot district were added to Chittoor district.—Tirupathi. Tirutani, Palavaneri, Kalahasti, Puttur and Chittoor. This was done as a matter of administrative convenience. So, these six taluqs must come back to the residuary State of Madras. I think, the people living in these taluqs would like to come to the Residuary State. In this connection I would like to quote a song of Subramania Bharathi:

"Neela thirai Kadal oaraththileh
Naidru Niththem thavam Seyyum.
Kumari ellai Wadamalavan Kundram
Ivatrinidehyeh Pukal Mundikkiduk-
kum Tamil Nad.

It means that the boundary of Tamilnad in the South is Kanyakumari and in the north Tirupathi. The area between these two places must come to Tamilnad. We the Tamilians have been fighting for it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is he an ancient poet or a modern poet?

Shri Kakkan: Modern poet. When my friends from Kerala ask for Aikya Kerala, certainly we are going to get

[Shri Kakkan]

eight taluks from Travancore-Cochin State and then the ambition of Subramania Bharathi will be fulfilled.

I am sorry that Mr. Lakshmayya called Shri Rajagopalachari as Duryodana.

Shri Lakshmayya (Anantapur): My friend is perhaps not aware of what Shri Rajagopalachari had said about us. He said that Andhras are like Ravana, and that we have come there to entice Sita—meaning the City of 'Madras'. I do not know whether my friend has heard that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Let nothing be said against any provincial Minister or Governor here.

Shri Kakkan: And Mr. Muniswamy coming from Tamil Nad, said that Andhras have no right to say that Shri Rajagopalachari is a Duryodana but that the Tamilians have a right to call him as Duryodana or Sakuni. It is entirely wrong. Tamilians should never say a word against Rajaji. So I think Mr. Muniswamy also will not use such words.

Shri Nambiar: Mr. Muniswamy added Sakuni also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Such things should not be said. Apparently the hon. Members who were presiding in my absence were not able to follow it exactly. I am sorry.

Shri Kakkan: Lastly, Mr. Muniswamy suggested that the residuary State may be called Dravida Nadu or Tamil Nadu. I strongly oppose the word Dravida Nadu. The people who are agitating for Dravida Nadu have no faith in Tamil culture. They have no faith in God. They are also agitating for separation from the Centre. So I strongly oppose the name Dravida Nadu. I would call the residuary State of Madras as *Senthamizh Nadu*. And I hope that the youngsters in Tamil Nad will work for *Senthamizh Nadu* and that not only Andhra Desh but also Tamil

Nad will become glorious and prosperous in the future.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Within the time allotted to me I want to confine myself to one or two points which I think the House has not yet discussed at all. At the outset let me point out that I am not a protagonist of linguism or the redistribution or distribution of States on the basis of language. Whenever I have had any chance in this House to speak on the subject in the past I have said that the linguistic idea is a dangerous idea, not from the point of view of the unity of India alone, but from a very cardinal and important point namely the future social structure of India. I have a definite view regarding this linguism in India, because it cannot be compared with the linguistic states in the western countries. Of course, countries have been developed in the world mainly on the basis of language and in India too it has developed to some extent on the basis of language. But it is my contention that it is not on the basis of language alone that our country had been developed in the past. If we study the history of India, the past history and the ancient history, I must say that it is on the caste basis that all these ideas have come. It is from this point of view I was always opposing the idea of linguistic states.

Some Members have mentioned that the Chief Minister of Madras, Shri Rajagopalachari, has said that it is a tribal idea. When I look into this question I must emphasise again that this linguistic idea or the idea of linguism is purely a caste idea and nothing else. When you talk about linguistic states you talk a lot about the cultural unity of India. The culture of India is a caste culture. That is the fundamental thing behind all the ills from which we are suffering today. Unless that

mental ill is removed we cannot say that we are a civilised society or a civilised nation. When you say Indian culture I see it is a caste culture. **Many Members may not agree.** But it is a fact. It is history. When you say that you want an Andhra State or a Tamil State or a Kerala State, the idea that comes to my mind is caste domination and nothing else. **That is why I oppose the linguistic idea.**

I have had long discussions with friends who are protagonists of the linguistic idea and they have given me examples regarding the linguistic basis of division in Soviet Russia and in European countries. But the condition in India, the historical background in India, the social and economic development of India has been different. Here the one fundamental basis was the caste social structure. And if the States are now redistributed on the basis of language alone, it is really the caste idea which is behind it and that is why I oppose linguistic states.

Our Prime Minister has always been referring to the disunity of India in terms of communalism, regionalism and linguism. But behind it all there is this fundamental fact, and the greatest weakness that we are facing today in India is this weakness on account of the existence of caste culture or caste civilisation in this country.

If you are going to accept this regional idea now, I say that we are certainly going to perpetuate that idea again with the result that it will never be possible for India to become a perfect democracy. That is the greatest danger arising from the linguistic idea that the country will have to face.

I am not against the formation of the Andhra State, as it is today. Tracing the history of the formation of the Andhra State, I think the leaders of the nationalist movement had promised the Andhra State to the

leaders of Andhra. It was promised as a present to them because of their sacrifices, because of the share that they had in the national struggle. Nothing more than that. The Government is now giving it to them. Therefore, it should not be taken as a linguistic State. If anybody is thinking that the country is going to be divided into linguistic States, I for myself will think that the evil day is coming for India, because I consider that by that democracy will be debarred from continued existence in India. Nothing else.

My hon. friend Mr. Matthen has said, regarding my State, that is Travancore-Cochin, that it should be merged with the Madras State. Of course, there is an idea in the Travancore-Cochin State and views have been expressed by leading men that a solution should be found for this question: either it should be Aikya Kerala or Kerala State or it should be merged with the Madras State. As I said before, I am against any linguistic State. I am perfectly satisfied with Travancore-Cochin as it is today and it should continue as a State. It is a compact State today. Even when the small Cochin State came to us, the people of Cochin did not like the idea. But, it has become a fact now. It is better to retain it as it is today without any trouble. If we are going to have an Aikya Kerala, certainly Tamil portions should be given to the Tamil Nad.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Can't there be a sub-federation?

Shri Velayudhan: Of course, I would like to have a sub-federation in this region.

Shri Nambiar: That will never happen.

Sri Velayudhan: My own view is that we must have smaller and smaller units. Why not have 40 or 50 smaller units and a federal State in India, by cutting across this linguism? If I have the power, I would see that

[Shri Velayudhan]

the Andhra State is cut into two States. Administration should be made more and more easy. It is only from the point of view of administration....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is a Member of this House. He has got the power to cut Andhra into two pieces

Shri Velayudhan: That is what I said, if I had got the power. I have not got the power. Only the Government have the power. They are in majority. If I have the power, what I will do is, to divide India into smaller units. We must have a federation in India: not on the basis of linguism. This linguistic idea should be cut across by means of this division.

In Travancore-Cochin, this idea of merging it with the Madras State is now developing as a political thesis. But, I must say it will only complicate our situation further because we as a State will not like to part with the South Travancore State. So long it has remained as one State and it must remain as one. It is not a linguistic idea; it is not a linguistic State. It is an administrative unit alone. It is stated that South Travancore should be conceded to Madras. I oppose linguism. In order to avoid this difficulty, I must emphasise that no alteration should be made in the present structure of the Travancore-Cochin State. We must continue it as it is today. As far as possible, the minority communities, that is the Tamilians, should be satisfied to the greatest possible extent. We must make all kinds of concessions to them. That is how we are going to develop the unity of India: not by suppressing the minorities, but by befriending the minorities and encouraging them.

10 A.M.

Shri N. R. M. Swamy (Wandiwash): Unfortunately, as I have been noticing the debate here for the last four

days, on the first two days the speeches consisted of hurling words against one another. The Andhra Members, who initiated the debate with regard to the motion for reference to the Select Committee, started the game and it has been sufficiently answered by some of the Tamil Members also. But, I find that the Andhra Members have been very passionate in their words. I only wish that they had not allowed passion to gain mastery over reason and thereby sown this wind with a view to reap whirlwind. I only wish that they do not do such a thing hereafter. I also find that my Tamil brethren have also with equal passion been hurling words at the Andhras.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): Set-off.

Shri N. R. M. Swamy: As my hon. friend says, it has been set-off. In the rest of the two days, the discussions have been of a desultory nature. The hon. Members have left off the Andhra State Bill altogether. That has nowhere been referred to. They have only been speaking about linguism. That was started by Acharya Kripalani. He started with being averse to the formation of linguistic provinces. It has been supported by Mr. Gadgil.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): I am sorry my speech has not been correctly understood by hon. Members. I said that these linguistic provinces must be established quickly. I am not against it now. I said that if the idea had not been originally mooted it would have been much better. Since it has been mooted, and it has excited the passion of the people, the matter must be settled soon.

Shri N. R. M. Swamy: I understood his viewpoint. He started with opposing and then amended...

Acharya Kripalani: Again, I must say, I did not amend my statement. I explained it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He said, originally he was opposed; but anyhow circumstances have so contributed or conspired and so it is no longer desirable to withhold it.

Shri N. R. M. Swamy: The entire discussion in this House has been about linguism. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons, nowhere has this word linguism been used. I find that word only in the Statement made by the Prime Minister and the reports of Justice Wanchoo and Justice Misra. The Bill has been designed to carry out their decisions; but they have cautiously and scrupulously avoided the word linguism because they will be throwing the apple of discord here for the creation of such provinces hereafter in the way in which they may want to have. They may want to have linguistic provinces: Karnatak, Tamil, Andhra, and a host of provinces. I only think that if such a thing is allowed, in the long run there would be a kind of Dravidian federation. My friends may object to the word Dravidian. But, I really think if they allow things like this, that would be the result. They have already created a precedent by throwing a piece of Madras, some taluks in Bellary, to Mysore. The idea of linguism must have been in the mind of the Central Government. They have made a start here so that in future if a Kannada State is to be formed, it can be easily tacked on. That seems to have been in their mind. But, I visualise that, in the long run, if such a contingency arises, there will be a Dravidian federation, in which case I think there will be complete dissection of India into North and South. If they really want to have such a thing, then they must have linguistic provinces. There should be no provinces on a linguistic basis. That is all I have to say about linguistic States.

In this connection, I am reminded of the case of a junior member filing a suit for partition of the joint family

property. People let in evidence in regard to their respective claims and ultimately the entire assets and liabilities of the joint family are given away only to the contesting parties. They do not take away the properties in the suit and give some portion to third parties. Here, Mysore was not at all claiming a share in any territory. I do not know how they have been really lucky. By so doing, without any claim or evidence on their part, they are creating something in order to have it as a precedent so that hereafter if any province is to be created, they will be asking something to be carved out in any other region. This is happening unwittingly. It may be for some ulterior purpose. I wish that we shall not repeat it hereafter. They have given a portion to Mysore. After all, the parties concerned in the agitation are the Tamilians and the Andhras. The Mysoreans are not very particular about that piece of land coming to them. They never wanted it. If really a Karnataka province was to be carved out, then they might have been interested. They would have been pleased them to add a few more territories. I request you, Sir, to give me one or two minutes more for referring to some of the clauses.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will give two minutes.

Shri N. R. M. Swamy: Let me advert to certain points in the Bill now. I find that in the Bill itself, a provision for the setting up of a Boundary Commission is absent. The Deputy Minister said that it need not be mentioned specifically in the Bill as it would create some difficulty. I submit that by including this provision in the Bill itself we are not going to make this measure ineffective. You are aware of the agitation that is going on in Chittoor, Tiruttani and other places. Some disturbances have been created there. Therefore, if the Boundary Commission had been provided for in the

[Shri N. R. M. Swamy]

Bill itself and these disputed areas had been included in its terms of reference it would have been very much better. The previous speaker, Mr. Kakkan, said that before 1911, when there was some difficulty regarding administrative units, some of the taluqs in the North Arcot district had been tacked on to the Chittoor district and similarly some taluqs were taken away from Chittoor district. It is not as if we claim any territory in the disputed places. What I wished to state is that in these areas there are hundreds of villages of a bilingual character. Therefore, if only the Boundary Commission had been provided for in the Bill and these areas were included in its terms of reference, things would have been much clearer.

Regarding the term of office of the Upper House members, clause 10 says that the term of office of one of the two members specified against serial numbers 4 and 5 in Part I of the first schedule shall be increased and that of one of the seven members specified against serial numbers seven to thirteen in Part II of that schedule shall be reduced. Now, when the term of office of all other Upper House members has to be fixed by the Election Commissioner, I do not know why in this case the increase in the term of office of one member and the decrease in the term of office of another member has to be done in such manner as the Chairman of the Council of States may direct. I am of the opinion that the Chairman need not be entrusted with this job. This must be done by the Election Commissioner himself.

Then, Sir, I find some contradiction with regard to clauses 47 and 51 of the Bill. Clause 47 says that if there is any dispute relating to or arising out of the apportionment of assets and liabilities the same shall be referred to the President whose decision shall be final. After that, there will be no appeal. But Clause 51 says: "The

President may, after consultation with the State Governments concerned, by order determine....." Here it is something contrary to what is contemplated in Clause 47. I, therefore, suggest that Clause 47 and the Seventh Schedule may be deleted. Otherwise it will create difficulty. I say this because at one stage you give scope for the States to intervene in regard to the apportionment of the assets and liabilities and at another stage you give the President full freedom to do it. I request the hon. Minister to look into this aspect.

Another suggestion that I wish to make is with regard to the setting up of a committee to go into the question of assets and liabilities. When the committee is appointed, I suggest that there should be certain rules and regulations by which the parties may be allowed to file memoranda of objections and after perusing them the committee may decide the matter and action may be taken according to Clause 47 or 51. I, therefore, suggest that these Clauses should be suitably amended. I support the idea that a committee must be appointed to go into this question impartially. Have a member from Madras; another from Andhra, and a third, if you like, from North India. Let them work out a solution.

At one stage, my hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram stated that although he was coming from the Vizagapatam constituency, he was quite willing to have Bezwada as the capital. I was at a loss to know how a member from Vizagapatam could pitch upon Bezwada and not insist upon Vizagapatam. I now learn that he was born in Bezwada district and therefore has a soft corner for Bezwada.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: What I said was that I told my constituents that Bezwada was the natural capital of Andhra, and they gave me a mandate for Bezwada. This is what I said. Do not impute motives.

Shri N. R. M. Swamy: He has a mandate from his constituency and so he worked for Bezwada—very well. I request my friends to come to an agreement upon this question. I hope that at the inauguration of the Andhra State in the new capital we will all be invited. With these words I support the Bill and oppose the motion for reference to Select Committee.

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal-West Cuttack): I stand first of all to support this motion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Orissa is in the north of Andhra Desa.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I had been away from India for a long time, as I lived abroad. When I was a boy I started life abroad and I lived with other students from all over India. I had Tamil friends, Andhra friends, Bengali friends, Punjabi friends and so on. It was a time when I dreamed from that distance in America that India was a country where we all lived together and we were all brothers. I never thought, in those days, of different provinces for people who spoke different languages. I never imagined that Indians speaking different languages should have different States. That was the idea in my youthful days but when I came to India and I saw realities, things were seen in a different perspective. There is an oriya saying: "Distant mountains look very beautiful". That is what India looked to me in those days.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member went from the mountain and came back to it.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: When I came back I found that in a state where there are minorities, they are dominated by the majority. I have always felt that, even before entering public life, in Bihar for instance. Consequently, I changed my mind, and I fell in line with the Congress resolutions of those days during the struggle and thought that there should be linguistic provinces, and I welcomed the idea of the Congress forming

Congress Committees for Maha Vidarbha, Maha Koshal etc., giving Orissa a Committee in Singbhum District even. All that I welcomed, but unfortunately, when Congress got on the *gadi*, everything is shelved, because the Congress Government does not want to change the *status quo*. Although the Prime Minister always says everything is dynamic, he is afraid of moving, his Party is afraid of moving. So, the result is that for this Andhra province that was promised long ago—and there were committees including the Prime Minister himself—never was any action taken. Then came this fast of Sriramulu, and that Andhra patriot died. After his death came this violence. I call what happened beginning from the fast to the violence that was committed during the three or four days after Sriramulu's death, political blackmail of the political parties who wanted Andhra Desa, and this Government yielded to that blackmail.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh West): It is cowardly.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: This is a very bad precedent for the country not only with regard to the formation of linguistic provinces or States, but with regard to any other demand of the people, that a Government that administers the country should yield to any kind of political blackmail. Therefore, I condemn this Government for having yielded to this blackmail, and I condemn the people who committed violence.

But, at the same time, now that the Government has yielded, it is high time that there should be a complete plan to carve out different States according to the language spoken, and not have it done piecemeal. I was reading this morning a despatch from Dharwar about the Karnatak people, how they are frustrated and after the enforcement of the Security Rules there how the movement is going underground, and nobody can tell what will happen. So, I urge upon the Government not only to appoint the

[Shri Sarangadhar Das]

necessary Boundary Commission as early as possible, but also to carve out the different States keeping in view their viability, their financial resources and all the other things that make a State a good unit in the Union. There is a dispute about certain areas that are in certain other provinces. This province wants a slice out of the other province. All of that should be settled as soon as possible so that there will be no more animosity between the people of different provinces, and all of us can get together and go ahead with the work that is needed, and not beat about linguistic provinces and minorities being neglected here and there. That is all I have to say about the present motion.

As far as the Bill is concerned, I see one important thing, and I must mention it, and that is the Tungabhadra Project. These river valley projects are situated in different States. That is, the same project is situated in two States or three States. This was a joint venture of Madras and Hyderabad, and now, because of parts of Bellary having gone to Mysore, the Chief Minister of the Mysore Government, as quoted by Dr. Katju, says:

"This project is situated on our land, in that part of Bellary District.....which has fallen into our territory. Therefore, it is ours. The whole thing is ours. We may do with it what we like."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Close it also!

Shri Sarangadhar Das:

"We have no objection to its being completed, but after it has been completed, its maintenance, control and management for all purposes shall be our absolute concern."

No Government at the Centre, should, under such circumstances, hand the project over to the provinces concerned, to the States that are fighting each other. At least for the present, it should be kept under Central control until the two come to an understanding. This is what all Gov-

ernments were afraid when 560 States existed. The river Mahanadi in Orissa goes through half a dozen States. This Raja says: "I won't allow you to do anything here." That Raja says: "I will build a bund here." Now, that is gone and we are having autonomous States. One State says: "This is our property. We can deal with it as we like."

Acharya Kripalani: The Chief Ministers are the new Princes!

Shri Sarangadhar Das: They are the new Princes, the new feudal lords. I mean this Party's Subedars in the different Subas are the feudal lords of those areas, and they want.....

Dr. M. M. Das (Burdwan—Reserved—Sch. Castes): What is the Suba you are Subedar of?

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I am not.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No personal remarks.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I am an ordinary citizen of the country, just the same as you are.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Both the hon. Members will address the Chair.

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey): Then those sentences will be about you!

Shri Sarangadhar Das: So, it is very dangerous to leave these projects in the hands of the States as new States are formed. These projects should be under the control of the Government of India.

My time is up. I have many things to say, but I do not want to take the time of others. But my principal point is that although, like Acharya Kripalani, I did not think at one time that linguistic States were necessary, later on I felt, and I know from experience, that it is very necessary. But the thing should be done quickly or at once, and not piecemeal, allowing these quarrels against one another going on for ten or fifteen years.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव (गुड़गांव) :
इस बिल में मुझे दो तीन बातें
सूझती हैं, जो मैं आप के सामने अर्ज करना
चाहता हूँ ।

सब से अख्बल, आज से तीस वर्ष के
बाद

Shri Punnoose: You are speaking to us. You are speaking on the Andhra State. So please speak in English.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: After 30 years, when the historian would begin to write the history of India, and go through the proceedings of this House, he will be thinking in certain terms which the present generation will never like. We have been speaking of the haphazard manner in which the provinces grew in British times. That was an accident which the Britisher could not avoid; that was an accident of history. But now when we have got an Indian Union, if things happen in the same haphazard manner, we are responsible for them.

When the Wanchoo and the Misra reports are read by the future historian, he will not realise why these two judges were so much in haste. He will not realise why the Government of India was in so much haste. When the Andhras had waited for forty years, could they not have waited for a year or two? I fail to understand this haste in which all things are done.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: Tinidity.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: A new state is being ushered into existence, but there is no certainty about its capital. A new state is there, but we do not know, where the High Court will be established. Is this the manner in which a new state should be ushered into existence? My humble submission is that when the future historian writes about all this, he will come to the conclusion that the Government of India as at present constituted, failed to do its bounden duty towards the people of Andhra. Well, it is the Andhra people who are to blame to a

certain extent. They did not allow the Government to do its duty. They put all the pressure upon the Government, and they complain also later on. Nothing would have been lost if all these matters had been gone into by an independent boundary commission, and if all these disputed questions had been settled in the right way, ultimately, not this truncated Andhra State, but a Vishala Andhra State in the true sense of the term, could have been carved out.

When I read this Wanchoo report, and find that financially the new State is not self-sufficient, I have to hang my head in shame. What is the use of a province which is not self-sufficient financially? Besides, prohibition, which is one of the Directive Principles in our Constitution, has to be sacrificed. This is the Wanchoo report. Now that the Government have agreed that some portions of the present Madras State are to be given over to Mysore, I fail to see any reason behind the plea that Hyderabad cannot be touched. So far as the entire Indian Union is concerned, it is all one. If you can make over a past British tract to Mysore, I do not see why portions from Hyderabad could not be tacked on to the new Andhra State, so as to make it a self-sufficient state. If we find as a matter of fact that some people who should have belonged to the Andhra people are living in Hyderabad, there is absolutely no reason, to my mind, why we should not do our duty by them. It is quite true that I am not in favour of linguistic states, because I know that if all the states are carved out on this basis, there will be hundreds of states in India. In my own district, which is a small district, seven languages are spoken, Punjabi, Hindustani, Hindi, Bagdi, Desai, Bagdi etc.

Dr. Katju: In Hissar district?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Yes, in the Hissar District.

If you take the whole of Punjab, you will find that new languages and new dialects are spoken in different districts and people from one tract may

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

not understand the dialect of the people from the other tracts. If on the basis of language, India is to be carved out into different provinces, I think the number of our states will be very large. Language is no doubt a useful consideration. If on other grounds we could justify it, and if a tract were financially self-sufficient, and administrative efficiency also required it, then I can understand a new state being carved out.

So far as the Andhra State is concerned, it answers this description, and there is no inherent difficulty on my part in accepting that an Andhra State may be carved out, as it has been carved out; but my only difficulty is that I do not like this truncated Andhra State to be brought into existence in such haste.

I would like to make one more point, and that is with regard to Rayalaseema. It so happens that I come from a part of the country, where the conditions of existence are almost the same as in Rayalaseema today. I belong to the Hariana tract consisting of four districts. Hissar, Gurgaon, Karnal and Rohtak.

As Hon. Member: Ambala.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Part of Ambala can be said to be in Hariana and part represents Punjab proper as well as the Hariana tract.

Dr. Katju: What about Bulandshahr?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It is in Uttar Pradesh. You will not allow me to touch Bulandshahr. You have now reminded me of an incident that happened long ago. When in 1928, the all-parties conferences was there, I approached Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and told him that we were in great difficulty, since for the last one hundred years we had been tacked on to Punjab by way of punishment for the part we played in the the mutiny of 1857 and we did not belong properly to Punjab, and so it would be better if a new province were carved out, consisting of parts of Uttar Pradesh, the Hariana

tract etc., so that there could be a homogeneous unit; then Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru came down upon me and said, "No, you want partition of Uttar Pradesh", and he would not hear me. And you are now speaking of Bulandshahr. I wish all parts of U. P. which had common characteristics with us came to Hariana, but you would not allow them to be touched.

Dr. Katju: Bharatpur?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: You will not again allow it to be touched.

In the Constitution, we have laid down the terms liberty of the individual and the unity of the nation, but there is no concept like provincial nationalism embodied in it. But here we find that everybody is thinking in terms of provincial nationalism, including Uttar Pradesh. Left to myself, I would divide Uttar Pradesh into two parts straightaway. That is all by the way.

I was submitting that according to my conception, when there is a reorganisation of provinces, the reorganisation should take place only in such cases where on other grounds besides language, such a reorganisation would be compatible with efficiency and prosperity. If any state is there, which has got a population of 3 crores or so, and we find at the same time that on other grounds, it can be a viable state, then I would rather like that that state is carved out as a separate state. After all, India is too big, and we cannot have a unitary form of Government, or a fully democratic Government, for the whole of India, because there is the liability that the weaker parts of the same province are liable to be forgotten. It is from this point of view, that I want to urge one thing in regard to Rayalaseema.

I was speaking of Hariana; in the old days, when it formed part of the undivided Punjab, we were the Cinderella of Punjab. Everything—Education, Irrigation, Public Services—that was beneficial was meant for Pun-

jab, the entire irrigation system was meant for Punjab, and so far as Hariana was concerned, it was absolutely forgotten. Similarly in regard to Rayalaseema, which is to be a part of the Andhra State, I am really afraid that it will not get as much justice as it ought to.

When I read the Wanchoo report, I found that there was a reference to one pact called the Sri Bagh Pact. I found that even then, the Rayalaseema people insisted that there should be some safeguards to see that Rayalaseema is brought up to the same level as the other parts of Andhra. I have got experience with regard to Hariana: even now when it forms part of the present Punjab, it is still being forgotten. I only hope that this fate should not visit Rayalaseema. Rayalaseema is a poor part of the Andhra State, and I wish that the whole House realises its duty, when a new state is to be formed, it is the Parliament which forms the new state, not any other state. It is the duty, therefore, of this Parliament to see that Rayalaseema gets a fair deal. I would therefore humbly submit that this House will be well-advised in putting some safeguards in this Bill, so far as Rayalaseema is concerned.

We can say that for the first few years a certain portion of the entire revenues of Andhra State should be devoted to the educational, economic, industrial and agricultural advancement of Rayalaseema. Similarly, I apprehend that some of the non-Rayalaseema people belonging to Andhra may perhaps take it ill. (*An. Hon. Member*: No, no.) and think that I am rather casting aspersions on them. Nothing of the kind. But I know, as a matter of fact, it does happen that in States where there is a bigger majority, that bigger majority can take advantage. Today the Andhra people are complaining about the treatment given to them by Madras. But when the Rayalaseema people say something, they ought to realise that, as a matter of fact there is a good case for Rayalaseema being safeguarded. I would, therefore, re-

quest the whole House that they should see that Rayalaseema is treated properly in accordance with the Pact or even without the Pact. So far as I think, at one time when there was an agreement between the different parts of Andhra—Rayalaseema and others—they did not realise that certain other factors might come into existence and their Pact might not be effectuated in its entirety. For instance, so far as the High Court and the Capital are concerned, at that time when that agreement was made, I do not know whether it was in the minds of the parties concerned that a time might come when they might get some parts of the Hyderabad State also. I say that even now, if it is possible, the Government of India may reconsider the position and see that they bring into existence the full Andhra with a proper Capital, with a proper High Court and everything. Now, in the case of a partition of a joint family, the one thing that all the members concerned look to is to see that the separated member gets a proper house, that he gets some utensils and that he gets something to eat. Now, what are we doing here? After all, everybody says that there should be no bitterness, no rancour and no acrimony. But as a matter of fact, what is happening? Andhra is being treated very unfairly. You are putting Andhra in a position where it looks as if you are putting some stranger on the sea onboarded. I remember to have read a reply to 'The Black Hole of Calcutta' by Mr. Wilson when he said that about 110 Indians were thrown out on the sea by the Britishers without proper arrangements for their food etc. You are behaving today towards Andhra in the same way. The report says Andhra is not financially self-sufficient, yet without making a proper provision you are launching it into existence. It has got no Capital and no High Court which are, I should say, the very pivots of existence for a new State. In this uncertain state, what is the hurry? Either the Madras people or the Government of India—whosoever is responsible for this deal—should

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

see that the foundations of the Andhra State are properly laid. It is the real duty of the Government of India who are sponsoring this Bill to provide for all these matters beforehand and not to leave the Andhra State in lurch.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: They have given 40 lakhs of rupees for a temporary capital as a loan!

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It may be so. I am speaking from an all-India point of view. When from the Centre a certain amount is given to a certain Province, it is not given out from a vacuum; it is given out from a fund to which the whole of India is entitled. So far as Andhra is concerned, it is a limb of India and, therefore, anything given to Andhra in this manner from the Central funds will be supported by the whole House, because we really want that Andhra may be put on its feet rightly and be established on a sound basis. We do not want that Andhra may be just put up and there should be a scramble for finding a place for the Capital. When I read the Wanchoo report, I found that Justice Wanchoo went into the entire question, and looked to the circumstances of each district and then said that nothing could be done and then he made a recommendation which is not being stuck to.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: He recommended Madras City for a period of five years.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Now, Sir, you will kindly excuse me if I refer with pain to this aspect of the question. What would have been lost if for five years the Capital had been in Madras?

Shri B. S. Murthy: That is the question.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: As a matter of fact, those from whom Andhra is separating, in a fit of desperation or perhaps anger, do not want that Madras should be made the Capital for Andhra. Nothing would have been lost if the Andhra people also agreed to have the Madras High

Court under whom they have been working for such a long time, for five years. So far as the Capital and the High Court are concerned, we ought not to play with these things. We should see that if no other arrangement is possible, even now it is not too late and we should agree that the Capital should remain in Madras and the High Court also should remain there. (*Interruption by Shri B. S. Murthy*). Is it a fact, that in 1954 or sometime thereabouts, some parts of Hyderabad will be given to them? I think, when this report was written and perhaps at the back of the mind of the Government of India also there is a feeling that during the coming one or two or three years some portion of Hyderabad may be going to Andhra. It may be so. Otherwise, I cannot understand why they have put in that the High Court may go in 1955 or 1956 and not earlier. Where will they house their Capital and where will the Governor go? Here I may say that the Government of India have given the services of a distinguished Governor to them, but at the same time what will he do if he has no proper place? I am rather ashamed that this Bill has come before me without proper provision for the Capital and the High Court. Unless a proper provision is there with respect to these two matters, I am afraid I cannot be happy over this Bill, though I am happy over the fact that Andhra Province is coming into being. Andhra has got a very good population also. I would have liked that some more were added to it and it had a population of 3 crores of people and had good financial resources. I am afraid unless this is done, it will not be very acceptable. But as far as it goes, it has established a few good principles which will bring peace to this land.

I understand that as soon as this Bill is passed, there will be a scramble again for Karnatak, a scramble for Kerala and so on. I find that the Orissa people want some piece of land from some others and the Bengal people want some piece from another

place. Here I am reminded of a Sanskrit sloka:

मत्सु वाञ्छति गणेशे राक्षु शम्भवो क्षुधासो कृणी
तंच क्रौंचरिपो शिखी तंच गिरिसुतो सिंहोपि
इत्यादि ।

I have forgotten the rest of it, but the meaning is this: "Ganesha's mouse is sought after by the hungry serpent of Mahadev and the said serpent is sought after by the peacock of the Commander-in-Chief of the forces of the Gods and the peacock is sought after by the lion of Parvati". Each one is after the other. So that, if there is so much dissension in the house of the Gods themselves, what to speak of the people?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Beggar thy neighbour.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: What happens is that every province wants a slice from another province. Either this should be stopped or a Boundary Commission should go into this question and settle the matter once for all. We do not want that this scramble should continue and every province should have a grievance against the other. There should be a way out of this.

I would submit one more point. In our Constitution, we have said that there should be equality between man and man, and there should be no discrimination on the basis of race, religion, etc. etc. I want that this should also be established as a convention in this country that there should be equality for all tracts in the country. There are certain tracts to which more attention is paid. There are irrigated tracts and unirrigated tracts. The economic conditions in the different tracts in the country are quite different. In tracts which were very wealthy and which were properly irrigated, Community Projects were established. They started 54 Community Projects in tracts which were prosperous and had plenty of water and were fertile. There was

understandable reason behind it then but people were not fully apprised of the reasons and the difficulty arose that the other tracts which did not get the community projects said, 'Oh, this Government is only pampering the interests of those who are already wealthy'. Rayalaseema is a very poor tract and we have heard so much of famine etc. in Rayalaseema. In Rayalaseema no full efforts were made to see that famine conditions did not recur—even the famine conditions were not fully relieved. I come from a constituency, Gurgaon, where the sub-soil water is plenty, where if proper efforts are made it will become very, very wealthy. The Government is not looking after that area. The Government have no leisure to look after Gurgaon because it happens to be in Harijana. Similar is the case of Rayalaseema. I am therefore anxious that so far as Rayalaseema is concerned they should make proper safeguards that for the first ten or five years a certain proportion of the revenues will be spent towards the bettering of the conditions in Rayalaseema. I would therefore like that there should be some arrangement by which the Government of India should see that there is no discrimination between different parts of the country and that all parts receive the proper attention which they ought to.

In some States in our Union where there are majorities and minorities, the majorities are exercising tyranny over the minorities. I have visited Rajasthan and some other parts of India also and I feel that the people are not feeling that Swaraj has come. As a matter of fact, they do not feel that there is one Indian Union which is looking to their welfare. In the States such things are happening as have never happened before; the standard of justice has gone down; the standard of living has gone down and people are not getting proper care and attention to their demands. I am saying all this because I want the Government of India to see that there is no discrimination so far as economic conditions and other conditions are concerned in the

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

various tracts in the same province. It may be said that this is not the province of the Government of India but I am humbly submitting that if we look to the entire Constitution as we have framed it, it is the bounden duty of the Government of India to see that no tract in the country is allowed to be discriminated against—by the various States also—and full justice is done to each and every tract.

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): We who come from the Hyderabad State welcome this measure and are very glad that the Andhra State is being formed very soon. Sir, I had a very high opinion—and I still have it—about the hon. Home Minister, Dr. Katju. He had been a very straightforward gentleman. But in this Bill, I fail to understand one thing. He has taken meticulous care not to use the words 'linguistic' State, though the Bill deals with nothing but that. Anyway, without touching upon it, I would like to come to the other points.

We in Hyderabad do not understand or rather fail to understand the mind of the Central Government and, to some extent, the mind of our Andhra friends, when they are thinking of a linguistic State. Why do not they take a decision about the future of Hyderabad? Hyderabad comprises of three tracts speaking three different languages, Telugu, Marathi and Kanarese. The area that comes under the Telugu-speaking tracts is more than 50 per cent. and its population is near-about 10 millions. It is not a small population.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): You mean ten millions?

Shri Heda: Yes, ten millions, one crore. So far as population is concerned, it is more than half of the present Andhra and therefore it would have been in the fitness of things if the decision about Hyderabad could have been taken because there is one more advantage so far as Hyderabad is concerned. The present Andhra State lacks vitally in two matters.

Firstly, it is the Capital. Unfortunately, in the whole of Andhra, that is the 11 districts there is no single town which, I think, would be worth calling even a district centre. Fortunately in Hyderabad, we have got a ready-made capital, one of the best cities in the whole of India, very good cement roads, many buildings and all the amenities of city life. Therefore, if a decision about Hyderabad State could have been taken, Hyderabad city would have been a very easy and ready capital and so many difficulties and hurdles would have been easily overcome.

I can understand that there are certain times when it is easy to take a decision but it is very difficult to implement it. That is just possible. In that case, I think it is also possible that a decision may be taken now and the implementation may be deferred to some future date. Of course, the Government of India may ascertain the wishes of the people. Not only the people of Hyderabad city but practically 95 to 99 per cent. of the people of Hyderabad State are in favour of disintegration. The Government of India could have taken the decision now and implementation could have been deferred to a future date. In that case, Hyderabad could easily be made the provisional capital of the present Andhra.

I do not understand the mind of the Andhra friends in this regard. When they are clamouring for the city of Madras as a provisional or a guest capital why do not they claim or clamour for the city of Hyderabad as a provisional or guest capital?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: It is because of contiguity. There is Telengana in between.

Shri Heda: If Hyderabad is going to be the future capital of Vishal Andhra, why not create those links; why not develop those links which are already there and thereby facilitate the

future location of your capital? That is my point.

Apart from that, I would refer here to another aspect. That aspect vitally concerns people like me who have spent most part of their lives in cities like Hyderabad. A controversy has been raised recently whether cities like Hyderabad and Madras or some such cities should be raised to the status of Part C States. A few days before, there was a very bitter controversy in Hyderabad about the city of Hyderabad and some sections of the people were of the opinion that Hyderabad city together with the city of Secunderabad and some suburban area could be easily formed into a Part C State.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA
in the Chair]

I am of the opinion that Part C States should become things of the past. They have no place in the present set-up of India and I am not in favour even of retaining—why talk of creating—any Part C State.

When there was a discussion about Bellary in this House, I was thinking that it was just possible that there would be some such discussion about Hyderabad also. So far as Bellary town is concerned, it was said that about 40 per cent. of the people speak Urdu there, some 26 per cent. speak Kanarese, another percentage speak Telugu and likewise. I think, about Hyderabad the figures will be still more complicated. The Urdu-speaking population is not few there. Only in the city of Hyderabad it would come to about 45 per cent. while the Telugu-speaking people would be near about 25 to 27 per cent. and there would be other Kanarese, Hindi and Tamil-speaking people also. Therefore I think that once for all the Central Government should lay down a clear policy that no city has any chance of being formed into a Part C State. If this is done, better relationship between the different sections of the people living there would be secured.

Sir, at the time of the Hyderabad session of the Congress I had a talk with some Andhra friends who reside in the city of Madras. I told them that our position and their position was rather similar. When I asked them their opinion about the demand for creating Madras city as a Part C State, I was very glad to find out that the Andhra friends who live in the city of Madras feel that if Madras is formed into a Part C State it has no better future. But, if it is the capital of a bigger area, Tamil Nad or the residuary State of Madras, whatever it is, then certainly it would have better prospects. In the same manner, in the interests of those people who live in Hyderabad city, in the interests of all, it is better that a magnificent city like Hyderabad should be the capital of a bigger area. As the capital of Vishal Andhra with a population of more than three crores it has greater prospects and better chances. Moreover the cosmopolitan character of a big city is never changed. It is just possible that if Hyderabad becomes the capital of Vishala Andhra there will be greater predomination of Telugu, no doubt. But the cosmopolitan character of Hyderabad will remain as it is and I am sure people who have other languages as their mother tongues will not suffer in any way, either economically or socially, or even politically at the hands of their Telugu friends.

I would in this connection like to make a reference to Rayalaseema. Let me assure my Rayalaseema friends that when I suggest Hyderabad as the provisional or guest capital of Andhra, I have nothing against them. In fact, at least in six of the eight districts of Telangana, the culture, the tradition and economic life of the people are quite akin to that of people of Rayalaseema. They have a friendly feeling and all goodwill for them.

Similarly, why not my Andhra friends express a desire to locate their High Court in Hyderabad, which is going to be the capital of Vishala Andhra one day or other, rather than keeping it in Madras? That is our wish.

[Shri Heda]

Why not create links and develop them? When the Andhra State comes into being on the 1st October and the Government moves to Kurnool, they will consider this point fully and decide about it.

As has been mentioned by you a few minutes back there is a feeling among a section of us that it would be better if the Government of India would come to a definite decision at an early date in regard to their policy about the reorganisation of States on a linguistic basis. Of course, I understand that it may take some time for the implementation of it. But if their policy is known definitely, there will not be any room for the fissiparous tendencies which you notice now. For instance, if they were to lay down a definite condition that the minimum population for a linguistic State should not be less than, say, a crore, all the talk that is now going on about the formation of cities like Madras and Hyderabad into Part 'C' States will vanish into thin air. I wish the Government of India makes a definite policy announcement that while language may be a predominant factor in the matter of reorganisation of States on a linguistic basis, administrative factors, such as the availability of a suitable place for the location of the capital, will have due weight. They should also lay down, as was suggested by Kaka Sahib Gadgil yesterday that the minimum area, minimum population and the minimum financial resources of the new States will be as important factors which will be taken into consideration, at the time of forming new states.

Shri N. Rachiah (Mysore—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I offer my whole-hearted support and welcome this important Bill which creates a new State in new India. It is my desire, on behalf of the people of Mysore State, to pray that Andhra should be a model State for the whole of India. We wish that Andhra people should set an example for the whole of India by their being true to the Constitution, by their not asserting their rights over territories

which in fact do not belong to them. In fact, this measure should have been brought long back. I am very happy that the new State is coming into being on the 1st of October.

11 A.M.

I wish to take this opportunity to reply to the charges levelled against the Mysore State. Mysore is a noble State. We have been always charitable honest and honourable. Mysore is in no way, inferior to any of the so-called Part A States. The very fact that Mysore has been exempted from the provisions of Article 371 of the Constitution shows that it is in no way less advanced than any of the Part A States, either in regard to administration, or in regard to economic development.

Coming to the Bill itself, the Preamble reads:

"A BILL to provide for the formation of the State of Andhra, the increasing of the area of the State of Mysore and the diminishing of the area of the State of Madras, and for matters connected therewith."

This clearly shows that Mysore has not aspired for any territory. The Central Government are giving certain parts to Mysore voluntarily. The Mysore people have on no occasion disregarded the orders or the command of the Central Government. So just to obey the Central Government's wishes we have welcomed the seven talukas of Bellary district. We are prepared to receive or absorb any area that comes to Mysore. So voluntarily the Central Government offered us these seven talukas.

Bellary has got a great history behind it. Formerly this district belonged to Mysore State. If you refer to Mr. Justice Misra's report it will be clear that there is much in common between the people of the seven talukas of Bellary and the people of Mysore. Mysore people have on no occasion resorted to violence to get Bellary. Our Prime Minister was pleased

to declare in this House on the 19th December 1952: "The Government of India have decided to establish an Andhra State consisting of Telugu-speaking areas out of the present State of Madras and that the Government were appointing Justice Wanchoo..." We have no objection to the Andhra state taking all Telugu-speaking areas, where the Telugu-speaking population is predominant. But they have no right to claim Kannada speaking areas, because these seven taluks of Bellary District consist fully of Kannada speaking people. It is not a matter for the Government of India or the Members of Parliament to decide: it is for the people of those seven talukas to decide. My hon. friends like Raghuramalah spoke of the injustice they have suffered at the hands of Tamilians. But I ask how can the people of these 7 talukas expect justice at the hands of the Andhras or Tamilians. Kannada people living in Andhra areas have had only misery, because their culture, their education, their progress in all aspects of life have been at a standstill and they have not been afforded opportunities to progress in free India. Because under our Constitution every citizen has his right of expression, right of development, right of organisation. Even from the humanitarian aspect these seven taluks, including Bellary town, should go to Mysore and Bellary question should not be reopened again. And I was sorry to hear the remarks of Mr. Raghavachari. He is a very old gentleman. I have got the greatest regard for him. He says he has been born in Mysore, has been bred and brought up in Tamil Nad, and is living in Andhra. But such a gentleman says that Andhra and Madras are cats and Mysore is a monkey. I say these two cats are growing like tigers and Mysore is reduced to a cow before them. Mysore has been torn into pieces. Kannadigas have been divided into so many parts. Some parts have been added on to Madras, some to Andhra, some to Maharashtra. Some parts are in Bombay, some Kannada parts are in Madras. Now, instead of taking their own areas from Madras

State, our friends from Andhra want even Mysore. They wanted Madras City. Then they wanted Bellary town. They failed. Now they want Hyderabad. Tomorrow I think they may want even Calcutta, Delhi and Bombay. Sir, there must be some limit to their asking and with some justification. After all we are Indians, we are the citizens of Great India. We should feel that way. Whether some part is in Mysore or is added on to Madras we must tolerate, and should in a constitutional and peaceful way try to get our territory for ourselves. But at the cost of other people one cannot, or one State cannot, or one country cannot play upon the poor and innocent people of other parts or country.

In this connection I wish to point out that with regard to the Misra Report they have said and done so many unpleasant things. When Mr. Seshagiri Rao, the special officer deputed from Mysore was investigating certain matters with regard to the report, some unpleasant things happened. I do not want to name them. It is really unpleasant. It is not right and fair on the part of the Andhra people.

Another friend, Mr. Choudhury wanted Tumkur, Chitaldrug and even Kolar. Let him take away Mysore. We are prepared. But is he efficient to rule all the areas? He himself admits that he is getting truncated, anaemic Andhra. When he himself is truncated and anaemic, how can he manage other parts? I am sorry. I do not know. I oppose this strange idea. Let him bring this New Andhra, —and we all pray to God that it should be an example to other States —let him bring this State to the level at which the States have been for centuries. Let him patiently do so and if there is any bit of land pertaining to Andhra let him take it. But, Sir, if there is any bit of Kannada area which is in Tamil Nad or Andhra we do not want to leave it. We do not want to take it by violent means, but if they are prepared to re-

[Shri N. Rachiah]

sort to violence we are also prepared for violence.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has taken thirteen minutes. He must conclude now.

Shri N. Rachiah: In the end I congratulate the Central Government for having brought this Bill. I shall conclude with the request to the Government that areas like Nilgiris, Kollegal and South Kanara may, if the people are willing, be added to the Mysore State so that we can have a Greater Mysore and a better integration of the country as a whole.

Shri Eswara Reddy (Cuddapah): I welcome this Bill on behalf of millions of Andhra people who are acclaimed all over India as the first and foremost people in carving out their own State and thus infused greater confidence in their neighbours, namely, the Karnataks, Keralas and Maharashtrians to carve out their own State. The Andhras stand by them and wish them speedy success. I welcome this Bill particularly on behalf of the Rayalaseema people who broke through all obstacles placed by the Congress leaders of Rayalaseema, joined hands with the people of Northern Circars for the common cause, disproved the false and mischievous propaganda of the Central Government about disunity among Andhras and thus made easy the formation of the Andhra State. And I am quite sure that the people of Rayalaseema will consolidate and strengthen their unity with their brethren in the Northern Circars and fight with greater vigour for the demand of Vishala Andhra and achievement of their projects.

While welcoming this Bill I cannot pass on without paying homage to those who sacrificed their lives for this noble cause, especially Sri Potti Sriramulu, and twelve other Andhras who were shot dead in the firings. All glory to them and my heart-felt sympathies to the bereaved families.

With all our joy on this solemn occasion we cannot be blind to the

injustice done in the Bill to the Andhras, but coming from Rayalaseema I shall confine myself to such issues which have caused great concern to Rayalaseema, especially about the Tungabhadra project, the location of the capital, etc.

The Tungabhadra project is the only project constructed in Rayalaseema in this century. That too is not yet completed. The high level channel is yet to be taken up. The people of Anantapur and Cuddapah have been agitating for the taking up of this channel. It is designed to irrigate 3 lakh acres in this famine-stricken area and it can feed Gandikota project also. It was mainly to relieve this area from famine that this project was designed by Mr. Mackenzie, Superintending Engineer, in 1902. But it was taken up only in 1945. The famine-stricken people of Rayalaseema have been eagerly waiting for the early completion of this project, for which they have been agitating for fifty years. When such is the position, the statements and recommendations of the Mysore Government came like a bolt from the blue and have caused great concern among the people of Rayalaseema. Their suggestions strike at the very root, at the very purpose of the project, at the very design which was intended and which was to be implemented. To entertain ideas like this against the unfortunate millions of Rayalaseema is very unjust and improper on the part of the Mysore Government. And for persons of eminence like Mr. Nijalingappa to invent reasons in support of these recommendations of the Mysore Government under the garb of one clause of the Bill or another is still more amazing. On the score that the Tungabhadra project is located in Mysore, it cannot belong to Mysore. Under the Constitution, any person can have property in any part of India and be the owner of it. In the same way, States can have and do have such property. But, we do not go to the extent of claiming complete ownership of the Tungabhadra project. We

only want that this inter-state project should be looked after by the Centre and a Corporation may be set up comprising of representatives from Andhra, Hyderabad and Mysore with a representative from the Centre, who should be the Chairman, with definite instructions to fulfil the set purposes of the project and carry out the work. In the past, whenever an idea of construction of projects in the Rayalaseema was conceived, some interested powerful parties prevailed upon the Government and our hopes were foiled and irrigation facilities denied to us. It is more heartrending to see that a project constructed mainly for Rayalaseema is not now allowed by the Mysore Government to achieve its purpose. How long have we to bear these injustices? Should there not be a limit to our patience? All these days, Rayalaseema fought for a separate province because our projects were neglected in the composite State. But, even before we form our State, and think of new projects, all of a sudden, the Mysore Government raises up and spreads its tentacles, even on this single project which we have at present. I do not blame the Mysore Government. Let it claim to have as far as possible. But, is it not the bounden duty of the Central Government to intervene and have, in the best interests of the project, a Corporation to carry out the purposes of the project? Is it fair on its part to put two diametrically opposite States at logger heads and enjoy the *tamasha* from here? In the past, the Central Government including the Prime Minister shed rivers of tears in sympathy to the famine stricken people. But, tears alone will not fill our stomachs. We urge upon the Government to allow the waters of this river to flow into our land, and stand by the commitments given to the Rayalaseema people.

Coming to the location of the capital, the hon. Minister for Home Affairs tried to create an impression in the House that the location of the capital at Kurnool has been decided upon by the Andhra legislators of 347 PSD.

Madras, which does not coincide with the facts. Of course, it is true that in June when the Andhra legislators met, a decision was taken in favour of having the capital at Kurnool, by a majority. But, how did it happen? What are the things that occurred behind the scene? These are matters that have greater importance. These are the matters that created hell in the political arena of Andhra. This is a decision which goes against the age-long aspiration of the Andhras and against the fair name and fame of the Andhras. For six months after the statement of the Prime Minister that the Andhra State will be formed, the Congress, the PSP and others kept mum over this question. All the while, they were thinking of how to form the Government, how many seats each party should get in the Cabinet, who should be the Chief Minister, etc. It is these questions that they were really discussing. Never did they put this issue of the location of the capital before their respective provincial committees meetings and decided and take their opinion. Nor did they place this question before the people. They made this location of the capital an issue for creating political unity. In the moves and counter-moves that dragged on for days, the PSP dragging the capital to Vizagapatam, and the Lok Party and the Sankar Reddy group in the Congress dragging the capital to Tirupathi, the decision fell at Kurnool, which was nobody's interest. There was an uproar against this decision in the whole of Andhra Desh and as a result in the Madras legislature, the decision went in favour of Guntur-Bezawada. I want you to respect this opinion, and honour this opinion and locate the capital at Guntur-Bezawada. If the Government still feel uncertain, let them ask the Special Officer to convene a meeting of the Andhra legislators and ascertain their will. There is no use of saying that you can change the capital from Kurnool after inauguration. That is a very dangerous proposition because, to change a capital when once it is located there, is very difficult and serious dissen-

[Shri Eswara Reddy]

sions might occur. I request the Prime Minister to reconsider this suggestion and immediately intervene and see that the capital is decided at Vijayawada.

Shri Achuthan (Crangannur): I am really glad that we are having a new epoch in our country when the Government of India want to have a re-formation of the States on a scientific basis. Even when the Britishers were here, in 1919 they stated that these Provinces were not formed on a scientific basis. So our political organisation even from the beginning wanted that when India becomes independent we should have a structure which will be federal in form as far as possible and on good principles. Now we have the Andhra Bill before us. According to me even though I do not agree to have linguistic States, pure and simple, in this vast country, it may be taken as one of the considerations for the formation. If linguism is accepted in its vast sense, it may have its own repercussions in this country. Even though it may be a passing phase, to me instead of accelerating our progress it may retard our progress for the time being which we cannot tolerate. So, even though opinion may be expressed that there must be minimum area, minimum population and minimum financial resources in deciding a separate State, we must have by now an overall picture of how many States we must have in India. Let us say 12 or 15 States on that basis. To my mind people must not be after Visala Andhra and Visala Vidharba and so on and so forth. That will not solve our problem. Moreover how is the world today moving and what will it be after 25 years? What will our coming generations think of us?

An Hon. Member: Are you opposing the Bill or are you in favour of the Bill?

Shri Achuthan: I am in favour of the Bill. Dr. Lanka Sundaram does not belong to a party. He is an independent member having no party

behind him whereas we belong to parties. I was wondering why Mr. Raghuramaiah, a level-headed man, should repeat so much about the statement of our Prime Minister and say that Telugu speaking areas must form one particular state. Does he want to create pockets of Andhra State throughout the Madras Presidency? It is too much. It should not be given too much importance and should be treated as madness. The Prime Minister's statement is that in India there will be a re-formation of States after the appointment of the commission. I wish the Andhra people all prosperity when their State is formed in the near future.

What about the Travancore-Cochin people, Karnataka, Tamil Nad and others? Travancore-Cochin has a large population not like the Andhra State but we are wanting in money and material resources. On the other hand we have got enough of men and famines in our State. We won't be a liability to you but we will help you if you would welcome us in large numbers and allow us to settle there. I want to bless the Andhra people as our friend Mr. Gadgil had done the other day. He is a Brahmin. Blessing is the monopoly of the Brahmins. My idea is that nobody is above or below another because of birth, race or any other rituals. All are equal. I will give my blessings as an extreme non-Brahmin.

Shri M. R. Krishna (Karimnagar—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I am very thankful to you for giving me this opportunity to express the views of the people of Hyderabad. The Telugu people of Hyderabad may at any time join with the Andhra State. According to the Prime Minister's statement, the Andhra State is to emerge very shortly and if the Andhra Province proves a success, it will be followed by many more linguistic States, like Karnataka, Maharashtra and others. This is really a very commendable statement. So far as the Andhra State is concerned, as you know, Sir, it is comprised of the dry famine areas of

Royalaseema over which more than half the revenues of the coastal districts of Andhra State will have to be spent. Already I am told that about Rs. 30 crores have been spent on the Royalaseema area but yet the Royalaseema districts could not be freed from the demon of scarcity.

Sir, there may be so many problems cropping up along with this Andhra Province. Yesterday, I was told by a friend of mine from South India that they would ask for a separate province for Dravidians. Similarly I have got another friend here who fears that it is not right to form linguistic States. It has created in him a fear that South Indians are already having a powerful feeling that this Government at Delhi is a Government of the North by the North, for the North. So at any time these States which are clamouring for linguistic States may demand for a separate Central Government for the South. I do not know how the Government will accede to it.

An Hon. Member: This is far-fetched.

Shri M. R. Krishna: It may not be true, but that is what I heard. There is one more problem. That is the location of the capital. The capital is going to be located at a place called Kurnool, which is in the famine area and this place will not accommodate all the offices of the Secretariat since there are only 12,920 houses for a population of 60,000. And in that way, I think those buildings will not be able to accommodate even the camp offices and I think there will not be even a semblance of efficiency in the administration if these offices are not shifted to one place and all the departments of the Secretariat are located at one place right from the beginning.

Now, I would like to say something about Hyderabad. The Hyderabad people are very much disturbed due to the formation of Andhra and about various other things. The Central Government has so far not given its consent or come to any definite decision about Hyderabad. The Hydera-

bad people have already been neglected in many respects. Even when the Constitution was framed, the Hyderabad people were not a party to it. They had to simply accept what the Constituent Assembly had drafted and passed.

Shri Velayudhan: It is not our fault.

Shri M. R. Krishna: It may not be your fault. Even now.....

Shri Nambiar: He was a Member of the Constituent Assembly. He was there.

Shri Velayudhan: I was never a Member of the Constituent Assembly.

Shri Nambiar: His wife was, excuse me.

Shri M. R. Krishna: Even now they are ignored because all the leading political parties in Hyderabad including the Congress have said that Hyderabad should be disintegrated. Already two Corporations in Hyderabad have expressed their view by passing a Resolution that Hyderabad should be immediately disintegrated. Now, I would like to say that if the temporary capital of Andhra is located somewhere outside Hyderabad, then, after some time when the Government of India decides that Hyderabad should be disintegrated, it would create more problems for the people of Hyderabad who have been all the time patiently hearing and acting on the advice of the Central Government. Therefore, I would say that instead of locating the temporary capital outside Hyderabad, Hyderabad should be immediately disintegrated and the capital should be located in Hyderabad. Further, the High Court is going to be located at Madras which is comparatively far away from the capital city. I understand the Advocate-General has to be always on the spot for daily consultations with the Government, and as leader of the Bar, he is also inseparable from the very set-up of the High Court. If that is the case, the people of Andhra who are already poor will be forced to make two

[Shri M. R. Krishna]

journeys to these two important offices. This will be nothing less than cruelty. Further, if Hyderabad is disintegrated today, that may also create some difficulty for the other districts which are to be merged with the provinces like Maharashtra and Karnataka. Therefore my suggestion would be—it may look peculiar to some of my friends, but in the long run it will help not only Andhra but the people of Maharashtra and Karnataka. My suggestion is—that the whole of Andhra which comprises about eleven districts and three Telugu-speaking Taluks of Bellary, should be integrated with Hyderabad till the time other provinces like Maharashtra and Karnataka are formed, so that those people may not be disturbed.

Lastly—I have been given very little time and I do not want to prolong my speech—I think the Government of India is not deciding the fate of Hyderabad because they have got a peculiar love for the Nizam. This is the only thing that prevents the Government of India from taking a definite step. If the Government of India is going to listen to one man, and if it is going to care for one individual, we will not be able to call it a democratic way of doing things. If that is not the criterion, then I would like that Hyderabad should be disintegrated as early as possible, to that a lot of troubles that my Andhra friends will be facing may be got rid of.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): I am really thankful to you for giving me an opportunity at least at the fag end of the debate. I do not want to take much of the time of the House. I would only make a few remarks and close my speech.

This Andhra Bill gave an opportunity to me and many Members of the House to know who is who in the House and we have come to know now who come from Andhra, who come from Tamil Nad and Karnataka, who is from the North, and who

is from the South. From that point of view, I think the sponsors of the Bill have really done a good thing.

Many speeches have been delivered, on this Bill, very perfervid, flamboyant and extravagant. I have heard speeches full of sense and also speeches full of nonsense, speeches...

Shri G. H. Deshpande (Nasik—Central): On a point of order, Sir

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: There is no order, there is no point.

Shri G. H. Deshpande: Can it be said by any hon. Member in this House that a speech delivered by another Member in this House is nonsense?

Mr. Chairman: Firstly it was said that some speeches were full of sense, and then that other speeches were full of nonsense. "Nonsense" has not been used otherwise than in contradistinction to "sense". Therefore, it loses all the sting about it. Therefore, I do not think it is unparliamentary in this context.

Shri Namdhari (Fazilka—Sirsa): The hon. Member might think he has heard certain speeches from that side also. That is what he means probably!

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I am indeed very thankful to you, Sir, for your ruling.

An Hon. Member: I hope your speech will be a mixture of sense and nonsense.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Many Andhra friends were emanating heat instead of light during the debate. Before I proceed further I want to make a request to them that this is not the time to wage war between Mysore and Andhra or Andhra and Tamil Nad. We do not want any type of strife or conflict, and we do not want any language war, and we do not like inter-provincial rivalry. Some of the Members from Andhra made claims, exorbitant claims, over other parts of the territory which legitimately belong to Mysore and Tamil Nad. Now I will only say that

prejudice will lead to prejudice, contempt will lead to contempt, and hatred will lead to hatred, and claims will lead to counter-claims. So if they are unreasonable or extravagant in their claims, certainly they have to meet extravagant claims from other parts of India—Karnataka and Tamil Nad and so on. So, they should confine their demands to reasonable limits. In this connection I refer particularly to the case of Bellary Taluk. I know for some time it was a bone of contention. Now it has been settled for all practical purposes by the award of Justice Misra. It has been accepted by all of us, and so I must say that we should not harp upon the idea of a plebiscite as it is full of dangerous possibilities.

Shri Lakshamayya: Because it is in your favour you must naturally say like that. If decided otherwise, you would not have talked in this strain.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: It is your opinion. But I will say I am not speaking as an interested party. I want to be as dispassionate and as objective as possible.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Your stomach is full.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: My hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram says that my stomach is full. It is not full. It is they who are celebrating a festival today; they are rejoicing because they are having a State of their own, while we Kannadigas are weeping because there is no State of our own. If they are happy, I am happy too, but Andhras should understand that the people of my part are not happy, because the Karnataka State is not yet formed.

I want to remind the House of the resolution passed by the Congress. Working Committee only a few years ago. It stated in categorical terms that Karnataka and the Andhra States will be formed simultaneously. The Working Committee had also recognised that the claims of the Karnataka people were much more, and that the formation of a Karnataka State was much easier than the for-

mation of the Andhra State. Now, I am not in any way grudging that Andhras have got their State much earlier than us, but I am only sorry to see how the Congress Government sitting at Delhi cannot appreciate the wishes and demands of the people. And forgive me, Sir, if I say that—those people who are administering the country today are quite an imbecile lot; they do not want any problem to be solved peacefully. They expect some pressure here, some *satyagraha* there; they want some killing or some shooting in some part of the country or other. Unless some unhappy incidents occur, they do not want to move. They are so wooden, so stupid and devoid of vision, that they do not want to solve any problem immediately. In one single session of this House, within the time allotted to the Andhra Bill, you could have passed one consolidated Bill for the reorganisation of all the States in India. But what have the Government done now? They have brought forward a Bill only for the Andhra State. Next time, they may bring a Bill, if there is pressure from Karnataka, for a Karnataka State, some other time they may bring yet another Bill for Tamil Nad or Maharashtra and so on. They are taking unnecessarily a lot of time, and irritating everybody. We are worried, and everybody in the country is worried. So I ask, why should they not solve this problem once and for all?

We are hearing about the vague idea of setting up a high power commission. I do not know whether it will be a high power or a low power commission. But there is so much of delay in forming this commission. If they were earnest and sincere about it, why should they not come out with that commission now? The other day, I was told that the commission will be set up by the end of this year. But why should they wait till the end of this year? Pandit Nehru did not wait even for a single day, when he wanted to take a decision regarding Korea. We are happy

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

about it. We do not grudge it. I am not complaining about it. But I want the same type of attitude, the same quickness and smartness in taking decisions in this matter as well. But I find that this Government is very lethargic, and would not like to move.

There is one important point, to which I would like to refer, before I conclude. Today, there is a great agitation going on in Karnataka area. Many people have been arrested and put in detention without trial, and nobody has taken cognizance of this movement. It is spreading very rapidly all over Karnataka. Unless a quick and categorical statement comes from the hon. Minister regarding the formation of the Karnataka State, it is very difficult to control the movement. It may spread further, it may lead to violence, and it may result in the breaking of hundreds of heads. So, it is the bounden duty of all of us, and especially that of the Government of India to make a categorical statement conceding the demand for the formation of the Karnataka State. Let them take some time for the division of assets and liabilities; let them take some period for the actual formation of the State. But let there be a fixation of time. Let there be a categorical statement in regard to this. Let them not dilly-dally with the idea of the unity of the country. You know we are all responsible citizens. I am an Indian first, and I am an Indian last. I will ever be a citizen of India. So, let them not think that those people who are clamouring and agitating for linguistic states are parochial-minded, narrow-minded and so on; I would only say they are foolish. They should not go on like this. Even the very idea that the unity will be broken, and that solidarity will go if linguistic States are formed, is itself a tribal idea. It is a very monstrous idea. I was sorry to hear the Deputy Minister saying the other day that they would give linguistic states, provided the unity of India is not

endangered. Are we fools in demanding states on a linguistic basis? Are we not equally responsible for ensuring the unity of the country? Why should they teach us? It is not as if there is a school or a monastery here where they should teach and advise us and we should listen to their advice. We are acting with all responsibility; when we demand that there should be linguistic states, we are keeping in view the fact that India's unity should be strengthened. The disintegrating elements are those who oppose the idea of linguistic states. Sir, I want a greater synthesis of the land and the people. I want a greater consolidation of the states, and a greater unity of India. If you want that to be possible then please support the demands of the people, and please form the linguistic states immediately.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): Sir, I am thankful to you for the opportunity you have given me for expressing my views on the subject that has been engaging the attention of this House for the last four days.

No doubt the Andhras are the pioneers so far as the demand for linguistic states is concerned. No doubt, they put in their efforts and made sacrifices. They are therefore to be congratulated on the fact that they are achieving the object that they had in view. I am conscious, however, of the fact that all their aspirations have not been fulfilled, and they are not satisfied with what they are getting. But so far as I can see, though it may be half-hearted, still it is something that they are being given. For others who are fighting for the same cause, it is a good sign; they welcome it, because it opens out that path which may be followed by others as well, and which may give others opportunities to achieve their own goals.

I got satisfaction by the observations of certain hon. Members here, when

they expressed themselves clearly, and said that really they have been dubbed as communalists, sometimes as parochial-minded; their tendencies were described as fissiparous. They were denounced as having Muslim League tendencies. I was satisfied to know that because exactly these are the epithets that have been applied to people who live in the north, and want a state of their own on linguistic basis. The Congress is wedded to this policy; the other parties have also supported it, and now it is too late in the day to stand up here in this House or outside, and oppose this movement. It has been acknowledged by most prominent leaders of the Congress that they have been rallying the different sections of the community round their movement by assuring them that as soon as freedom was achieved, it would be the first duty of the Congress leaders to redistribute the provinces on a linguistic basis.

And relying on them, people have been making sacrifices as they wanted. This has become now a matter of passion rather than of reason and when any resistance is offered at this moment, people feel, of course, astonished as to the attitude, that was being adopted by the same Congress leaders. Even now, when this Andhra Bill has been brought before this House it has not been stated frankly that it is being done in recognition of the principle of carving out or redistributing the boundaries of States on a linguistic basis. We want to know—and it should be made clear—what the actual policy of the Government is. Even the speech of the hon. the Home Minister did not specify that this was the principle that was being conceded. What we in the North fear is whether some discriminatory treatment might not be meted out to them again. The Constituent Assembly passed a Resolution that a Commission be appointed to go into the question and see whether it was feasible to carve out provinces on a linguistic basis. But actually when that Commission was appointed, only

certain areas of India were entrusted to them, and North India was particularly excluded from that reference. Therefore, an observation was made in the report of that Commission that it was not within their terms of reference to go into the question of North India. Then, subsequently a High Power Committee went into the question. What of course pinches North Indians most is the observation that was made in the last paragraph of the report of that High Power Committee which runs as follows:

"Whatever the merits, the case of North India shall not be considered for the present."

I don't know what fault we have committed to merit such a treatment, a discriminatory treatment. If it had been decided on merits that North India could not have such a State, we may have been satisfied.

Then, Sir, as was put by Mr. Gadgil, the Government had been adopting a negative attitude—that unless all the parties agreed, this demand would not be met. That rather encouraged people to fight against one another and instead of coming together nearer to unity, they quarreled and the Government could put forward the excuse that because there was no unity, therefore that demand could not be acceded to. Mr. Gadgil expressed the hope that now the Government had come round to the positive attitude and he welcomed it. I support him in that. Certainly, I also see a change; the Government have at last come round to this fact and they have now adopted this attitude that they would try to bring about as much agreement as is possible.

I assure you, that the protagonists of this demand for redistribution of India on a linguistic basis are no less patriotic than the others. As has been observed by the last speaker, patriotism is not the monopoly of those who oppose it. We claim to be as loyal to Indian unity as any others in this country. We lay claim to be Indians first and Indians last, and we challenge anybody to prove that they have

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

any doubts to harbour in their minds about our loyalty or our sincerity. So it rather offends us and pinches us when we are faced with such excuses that these tendencies are fissiparous, that they would impair the unity of India or they would create circumstances that might not be useful for United India.

On the 6th of August 1953, the Prime Minister made a statement here in this House that when this Andhra State is established, when it begins to function—and it may be in the latter part of this year—the Government proposes to constitute a High Power Committee which would go into the question as a whole. This is a welcome announcement. People in the North also have welcomed it. But the apprehensions are that as that part of the country has been discriminated against in the previous statements, in the previous appointment of Commissions and in the previous Committees, that part of India may be discriminated against even now. Of course, I admit that there is tension between the communities in the North of India. I agree that this is not an easy question. It does open out certain difficulties as we are experiencing here when we are discussing this Bill. Perhaps that might give us a certain amount of experience as to how we can deal with them. But that should not deter us from the policy that we have been putting forward so far.

12 NOON

I remember when Dr. Pattabhi Sitarayya was elected President of the Congress, and the Dhar Commission report came out, he was entertained at a party and somebody stood up and said: 'The Dhar Commission's report is very commendable. They have said that for the present this question should be kept behind and should not be pressed forward'. I would not like to disclose all the observations that he made there, but one thing I can say safely. He was bold enough to say in that party that 'freedom is no freedom unless this redistribution on a

linguistic basis is made, and we would not cherish the real fruits that we had been waiting for unless this is done'. This was the view of the Congress President. We certainly have been taking those views and now when we have formed those impressions and are asking for those very things which were promised by the Congress leaders, to turn round and resist that demand is not fair. It is rather creating troubles—complications. The sooner it is settled, the better it is.

I might here say, Sir, that it must have certain merits of its own. It is not fair to say that North India people cannot agree and there are differences among them. There may be differences, but it is the duty of the Government to smoothen out those differences. But to come out with a statement that whether this demand has any merits of its own or not it would not be conceded, is not justified. In the days of the British regime we found they were telling us that if Hindus and Muslims could agree, they would concede any demands in this country. Then we began to fight against each other, the tussle was greater and the quarrel was more acute. Meanwhile, they went on merrily. Similar is the case here. When they tell us that it would not be conceded unless all the parties agree, those who do not want it find themselves encouraged in safer positions; they try to oppose that and can never agree to that. But if the question is decided on merits—and everybody is agreed that it is a fair thing—I think most of the people will settle down to decide their problems peacefully, and these troubles would not arise.

There is another move to stifle this demand in the North of India. Just now I heard in the Lobbies some hon. Members saying 'We want a Visala Punjabi-speaking province'. That is a very good idea. I heard this even on the floor of this House sometime ago. One of the hon. Members said 'Hukam Singh cries for a Punjabi-speaking

province'. But he did not know what province I would choose. In his opinion, there were 4 provinces already where people spoke Punjabi—Himachal Pradesh, Delhi, Punjab and PEPSU. He said there were four already and what else was wanted? I put him the question whether in any of these provinces Punjabi was the official language. He could not answer that. To those gentlemen who in the garb of this idea of a Vishala Punjabi-speaking province oppose this demand in the north, I put this question and say that there is no harm in uniting all these 4 provinces. Let them have all these 4 provinces, together, if that suits them, but then Punjabi should be its official language. If they agree, I have no objection absolutely. I am not asking it on communal lines so that I might get special advantage or greater benefit than the other communities. I accept their move if they are agreeable to this. Let these 4 provinces be formed into a Maha Punjabi-speaking province, as they call it. (*Interruptions*). Let them agree that Punjabi would be the State language as well as medium of instruction. But this is a queer move, a manoeuvre, to defeat the real demand that is uppermost in the minds of the people. It is unfortunate that an impression has been created in the minds of the people that this Government does not agree to anything unless pressure is brought to bear upon it. It is really very unfortunate. I don't agree with that. It should not be an impression and Government should see that this is removed as early as possible. We want that Government should be bold. It should leave that timidity that it has been following so far. If they decide on one policy, let them declare once for all that provinces are to be formed on a linguistic basis and it shall apply to the whole of India. And the High Power Committee that they have envisaged must be appointed forthwith. I assure you, Sir, that most of the difficulties would be solved.

Then there is another point that I want to put before the House. Some

347 PSD.

people have apprehensions that the Punjabis are opposed to the introduction of Hindi or the development of Hindi. This is absolutely wrong and interested parties only give publicity to it. Hindi has its own status, it has its own place and it will have that. Everybody will read it and try to learn it as far as possible, but it has its own status. We only want that Hindi should not exclude the regional languages and each should be given its own domain: Even the Sachar formula that had been agreed to by all the parties has not been implemented. Therefore, there is trouble in Northern India which baffles solution most hon. Members fail to understand that. It is a very simple question; it is a very genuine demand on account of the feelings that are in the minds of other citizens also.

Again, in the end, I assure you, Sir, that people in the North are as loyal as anybody else. They want this redistribution on linguistic basis; their demand is growing stronger and stronger every day. It cannot, in the case of Punjab, be brushed aside by simply saying that it is a border province. We are as anxious for the defence of the country as anybody else. Let some criteria be laid down for the creation of linguistic provinces and we will stand by them. If we cannot satisfy those criteria, let our demand be refused or rejected on merits but it should not be simply rejected by saying that it is a border province and there is defence problem. We all say that it should be considered on merits. If we cannot satisfy all those requirements, then certainly our demand might be rejected. It is not right simply to reject it on the ground that a particular community is more vocal about it. Is it to be decried or rejected simply because one community is more vocal than the other? That should not be the reason. It should be decided on merits. So far North India has been discriminated against; that is the reason of the whole trouble. It should be gone into dispassionately and if on merits it is rejected people may be satisfied.

Shri K. Subrahmanyam (Vizianagaram): I whole-heartedly welcome the Bill as far as it goes. But, at the outset I have to tell the House that I am not at all satisfied with the scope of the Bill and many of the provisions of the Bill. We Andhras have fought for a separate State of our own for the last 40 years and at last now we are getting a truncated Andhra State. Thirty-three million Andhras have fought for a State with 33 million Telugu-speaking people in a contiguous area, but, unfortunately, we are now having a truncated Andhra State with only 20 million population. But the day is not far off when we shall establish *Vishal Andhra*. We, as a matter of fact, want to get all the legitimate parts of our Telugu areas which are now in the Hyderabad State, in the Mysore State, in the residuary State of Madras as well as in Madhya Pradesh and in Orissa. Until that day the Andhras will not rest.

As I have already said, we began our fight as long back as 1913. The Congress organisation itself is committed to the principle of linguistic division of India as long back as 1920 or 1921. But, unfortunately, the Congress after coming into power have forgotten all their promises and are not implementing this principle of the re-division of India into linguistic provinces.

We the Andhras have from the very beginning given priority for the movement for national independence. As long as the national independence movement was on, we never pressed for the Andhra Province and it was given only second priority. We the Andhras played our part well in the national movement and as a result of the joint efforts of all of us we have got the Indian independence in 1947. But, unfortunately, even afterwards, the Congress has not acted up to the principle of re-division of India into linguistic provinces.

At this stage I cannot but refer to the great men of Andhra who have lost their lives in the battle for in-

dependence as well as the movement for a separate Andhra State, the late Andhra Ratna Duggirala Gopalakrishnayya, Deshabhakta Konda Venkatappayya, Deshoddaraka Kasinaduni, Nageswara Rao Pantulu and many others who have sacrificed their all for the sake of the country's freedom as well as for the establishment of a separate State for Andhra.

Soon after freedom was achieved, we expected that Pandit Nehru and the Central Government would set up a high-power Commission to go into this matter of linguistic provinces once for all and settle the issue of the re-division of India into linguistic provinces. But, unfortunately they have forgotten all their promises given to the people and they have put them in cold storage. Let not people mistake me. I do not mean that language alone should be taken into consideration as the sole criterion but it should be given priority. It should be taken into consideration along with economic viability, the contiguity of area as well as administrative convenience. We must take all these into consideration and see that provinces are formed on this basis. Even Shri Jai Prakash Narain has appealed to the country as well as to the Government for the establishment of a high-powered Linguistic Commission at an early date. But, unfortunately the Central Government and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru have turned a deaf ear to this request. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the Central Government are under a mis-apprehension that the linguistic re-division of India will lead to disunity and disintegration and balkanisation of the country. I very strongly feel, that the linguistic re-division of India will never lead to the disintegration of India but will lead to the reintegration of India on a sound basis. 1st October 1953 will be a red-letter day in the annals of Andhra Desha and it will be the prelude to the establishment of Alkya Kerala, Bruhauna Maharashtra, Samyukta Karnataka, Mahakoshal and other provinces.

The last but one phase in the Andhra State movement was initiated by Shri Gollapudi Seetharama Sastry by

his fast unto death. After 35 days of his fast, Acharya Vinoba Bhave played an important part and advised him to break the fast and that he would see that an Andhra State was formed. Even then the gravity of the situation was not appreciated by the Central Government and Pandit Nehru. After this Shri Potti Sriramulu undertook a fast unto death. On the 50th or 51st day of the fast we appealed to the Prime Minister on the floor of this House to see that at least then they may declare that the State would be formed and save the precious life of Sriramulu. But unfortunately even at that moment Pandit Nehru was not able to understand the gravity of the situation, or understand the reality behind the demand for a separate Andhra State. After the death of Sriramulu there was such a tremendous movement in Andhra, a people's movement, as a consequence of which Pandit Nehru had to declare on the floor of this House on the 19th of December 1952 the establishment of a separate Andhra State.

Even then I would like to say with all the emphasis at my command that Pandit Nehru has done an incalculable harm to the Andhras. Firstly he has not declared the *Visala* Andhra for which the Andhras have fought all along. As a matter of fact, all the problems that are coming up before the new Andhra State would not have come up if *Visala* Andhra had been established with Hyderabad as the capital. But that particular aspect was not taken up by Pandit Nehru. There is another matter on which Pandit Nehru has done incalculable harm to the Andhras.

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): Say Prime Minister.

Shri K. Subrahmanyam: Even Justice Wanchoo's recommendations were flouted by the Prime Minister. When it is a question of forming a new Andhra State—diminishing of the Madras State and creation of a new Andhra State—it would have been better if the district of Bellary as a whole had been tacked on to the Andhra State. When the question of Sam-

yukta Karnataka comes up those parts of Bellary consisting pre-dominantly of Kannadigas may be attached to that State. That was not appreciated by the Prime Minister and he considered Bellary to be a disputed area. In regard to Madras City Mr. Justice Wanchoo recommended that it should be the temporary capital of Andhras for three to five years to come. But arbitrarily the Prime Minister took a decision against this recommendation. On the 25th March the Bellary dispute was again referred to Justice Misra. I have nothing to say against Justice Misra's report. But instead of confining the reference to the three Firkas, Bellary taluq as a whole was referred to the decision of Mr. Justice Misra.

Then, I have to make one or two points on the question of affiliation of colleges. The Rayalaseema colleges are affiliated to the Madras University for the present. They are to be dis-affiliated from the Madras University and should be immediately affiliated to the Andhra University and a special provision to that effect should be made in the Bill. Then, the question of giving sufficient safeguards for the study of Andhra students in Madras colleges should be given sufficient consideration. For courses which are not provided for in Andhra Colleges the students should be given admission in the Madras colleges for twenty years to come. In the case of courses which are provided in Andhra colleges, a safeguard should be provided in the Madras colleges for ten years to come. Of course, there is a provision in the Bill itself that if the two States are not able to come to an agreement, the President will arbitrate. But in spite of that there should be a specific provision.

A word about the temporary capital. So much of fuss is being made about the temporary capital. I for one am in full agreement that the capital should be at Kurnool, in order to keep the word of honour that we have given to Rayalaseema people. That decision should not be changed again. The Sri Bagh Pact is there; it is a word of honour we have given to the Rayala

[Shri K. Subrahmanyam]

seema people. That pact has been endorsed several times. Even today the majority of the Rayalaseema M.L.As want the capital to be located in Rayalaseema. With due respect to the wishes of the people of Rayalaseema their wishes are being respected and there should not be any change in the location of the capital at Kurnool. It has been argued that the capital question was decided by a minority. When we have signed a pact, when we have endorsed a pact, is it right to go against it? The Circarites are greater in number. Therefore it is not a question of minority or majority opinion. It is a word of honour given to the Rayalaseema people which should be respected and therefore the location of the temporary capital should never be changed from Kurnool until we form *Visala* Andhra with Hyderabad as the permanent capital.

Diwan Raghavendra Rao (Osmanabad): The people who reside on the northern side of Narbada have got a misconception and misapprehension about linguistic provinces. When we speak of linguistic provinces we do not mean the redistribution or reorganisation, but we mean the reunion of people who were living in an integrated area, but because of the Britishers were made to live separately in separate States. That is the conception of the linguistic provinces.

Then the misapprehension which these people entertain is that such a reunion of the people who live in different provinces will bring about disunity and there will be danger to the integrity of India. I do not understand, how people who have sacrificed so much for the freedom of India, who have proved their patriotism, can be unpatriotic, simply because they happen to shift from one part of India to another part of India. Well, I do not think they can be less patriotic.

In regard to the present Bill, I want to say that it is not an Andhra State Bill at all. If it were an Andhra State Bill all the people who speak

Telugu language could have been brought together and then the name Andhra State Bill could have been a befitting name. Now, about 84 lakhs of people who speak the Telugu language have been excluded from the jurisdiction of this Bill. Besides, about 40,000 square miles of area has been excluded from the purview of this Bill. Even then we are asked to call this the Andhra State Bill.

An Hon. Member: Is it *Vishala* Andhra Bill?

Diwan Raghavendra Rao: I do not know what these people mean by *Vishala* Andhra. When Andhra State or Telugu State means people who speak the Telugu language being brought together, what is this *Maha* and *Vishala*. I don't understand. So let people leave aside this idea of *Maha* and *Vishala*. Let Maharashtrians come together, let Andhras come together, let Kannadigas come together and then their State will be simple Maharashtra, Andhra or Kannada. What is this *Vishala* and *Maha*? All these are misconceptions according to me. So I say it is not an Andhra State Bill. If it were so, all the people who speak Telugu should have been brought together.

For the last four days we have heard the greatest controversy going on in this House regarding this part having been taken by one State and that part not having been given to another State. Let me tell the people who are protagonists of linguistic states that this sort of controversy is going to come in our way of linguistic states. So let us stop all such kinds of controversies. We have got a generous tradition before us. We cannot afford to forget that. Mahatma Gandhi, when the question of Rs. 55 crores to be given to Pakistan arose, undertook a fast and asked the people of India to be generous. In the same way we have got to be generous when some part, which we think should remain in our State, is going to the other State. We should be generous enough, and let the part go if at all the time and circumstances want it.

I do not want to go into the controversy. On the contrary I want to be generous enough to donate—not exactly to donate—but to give them as of their own right half the portion of my State, that is the Hyderabad State. I do not want to take anything from any other State, but I want to give eight districts of my State, the Hyderabad State, to make it a complete State and not half Andhra State as it is today. By the inclusion of these eight districts of Hyderabad in Andhra we shall be solving the problem of the capital. There will be no problem as there is today, whether to have the Secretariat offices in the tents and some such things. We have got a ready-made capital there. So we will be solving the problem of capital, as well as the problem of the High Court. Our Home Minister was very anxious about the poor advocates and the poor solicitors. We have got ample accommodation for all these poor advocates and poor solicitors in the Hyderabad City. So that problem also can be solved very easily.

Thirdly, our eight Telengana districts are well developed, well irrigated and they have got good many schemes in the newly introduced community projects. So that way none of the Rayalaseema famines and none of the Rayalaseema droughts will affect the future Andhra if our eight districts are included.

I shall conclude by pointing out that if the eight districts of Hyderabad are not included in the Andhra State, the Maharashtrians who are remaining in the Hyderabad State today will be put to a great inconvenience. Because, today the feeling of separation has come, even in the minds of the Andhra people in the Hyderabad State. Therefore whatever money comes from the Centre is being diverted towards the Andhra area alone and that Maharashtrians are starved. So the Maharashtrians feel it is better that the eight districts are joined to the Andhra State, the earlier the better.

Then the next thing is about the disintegration of Hyderabad. Some top-ranking people have expressed their apprehension that the disintegration of Hyderabad is going to disturb the whole picture of South India. Let me tell this House that the integration of Hyderabad, as it is today, is going to disturb the picture of the whole of India in the future because of some elements existing in Hyderabad today.

The first danger to the whole of India is the Nizam who is forming cliques, who is bold enough to publish this book "Ruler to Rajpramukh" wherein he maintains his claims. He is claiming for his dignities, dynastic and all sorts of rights. Besides, if these rights are not given he threatens—I will read one extract:

"For such appeals to find ready response, however, is it not necessary that the recipient himself should feel that he receives goodwill and fair play from those with whom he has to deal, and that his mind should be unclouded by any sense of injustice or invidious treatment?"

That is, some people had demanded from the Nizam Rs. 15 crores in order to start some business. In reply to that he says this. It goes on:

"Can the record that has gone before be expected to inspire in the Nizam such a sense of trust and confidence? Relic as he may be of the ancient past, he is not a fossil but a man—a live organism to whom history has become a living substance because of his own intimate connection with it, who sees a value and a purpose in preserving and upholding memories and traditions of the past."

Then again he says:

"All that can be asked is that there should be fair play in dealing with a man who has himself played fair, scrupulous regard paid and effect given to solemn

[Diwan Raghavendra Rao]

obligations that have been undertaken to guarantee his personal rights, privileges, dignities and titles, and respect for an institution and a Dynasty which has shown respect for its obligations to the State and people of Hyderabad as well as to others."

"Though times change, old loyalties do not die. The sentiments of loyalty to the State is not entirely a matter of logic or even, despite cynics, of material advantage. If on the other hand, a sense of injustice and insecurity prevails, even though the recipient of that injustice may bear no illwill; but there are other minds in which it will foster and carry the seed of dissatisfaction."

There is another danger. That is the bureaucracy, the bureaucracy which helped the Razakar movement. That bureaucracy has not changed its heart overnight. That bureaucracy is there. It is forming cliques and intrigues with the help of the Nizam.

The Nizam speaks of three dangers to the Hyderabad State. I shall not take more time by quoting. One of these, the Nizam has pointed out, is that there is a well-knit minority of Muslim communalism, which is a danger to Hyderabad State. I say that the danger which exists for the Hyderabad State is equally a danger to the whole of India, and therefore, taking into consideration all these things, Hyderabad State should be disintegrated as early as possible, for the sake of Maharashtrians, for the sake of Andhra, and for the safety of India.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi (Yadgir): I congratulate the Andhra people on having achieved their long cherished goal, i.e. Andhra Desh. They have been fighting for this Andhra Desh for the last so many years and have made sacrifices. I wish them the best of luck in having their new State.

Many people hold the view that unless Hyderabad is disintegrated and

the 8 districts of Telangana integrated with the Andhra State, the Andhra State will remain incomplete. Yesterday, Mr. Gadgil rightly said that Hyderabad should be disintegrated. Many of my Hyderabad friends have now expressed the same view. The people of Hyderabad are very clear on this point of disintegration. As early as 1950, the Hyderabad Congress adopted a resolution categorically demanding the disintegration of the Hyderabad State. I would like to read the relevant portion of that resolution:

"This session, having fully considered the historical and political aspects of the question involved in the problem about the future of Hyderabad, reiterates the view that the consolidation of the sixteen districts of Hyderabad State into an artificial political unit under the Asafjahi is a historical accident which is an anachronism to the present democratic set up of the Indian Republic. The continuance of the entity of this State for any considerable length of time, would, in the opinion of this session, retard the natural growth of the people of Hyderabad and smooth functioning of the sovereign democratic republic of India....."

"This session has taken into earnest consideration the views expressed by its provincial and district units in favour of the disintegration of the State. It has also taken note of the growing trend of the people of the State in the same direction. The Indian National Congress from time to time has reiterated the desire to redistribute and form provinces on linguistic basis, and has moved in that direction.

"This Congress supports the reorganisation of the administrative units on linguistic basis, and feels that this process shall have to be completed in All India context. This session therefore resolves that Hyderabad State should

be disintegrated and the three areas of Telangana, Marathwada and Karnatak should be merged in the adjoining linguistic provinces or areas according to the wishes of the people concerned."

The people of Hyderabad, who form three different linguistic zones, Telangana, Marathwada and Karnataka, belong to the same stock of people who reside in the adjoining areas. They have got a common language, and a common culture. It is a historical accident that they have been scattered. In this resolution, they have made this point very clear. The people have been demanding this for the last so many years. Even before the State Congress was formed, there were three political conferences, the Andhra conference, the Maharashtra conference and the Karanataka conference demanding disintegration of Hyderabad and joining the areas to the adjoining States. In this resolution, it is not any political body of one district or taluk that is concerned. The people as a whole have decided that Hyderabad should be disintegrated. They have been waiting for this for a long time. When the Andhra State is being formed, I think this is the proper time for the people of Hyderabad to demand the disintegration of the State. Recently, the Hyderabad Pradesh Congress Committee has reiterated the same demand. In the resolution passed on 2nd June 1953, the Hyderabad Pradesh Congress Committee has said:

"The Hyderabad Pradesh Congress Committee is of the view that the formation of the Andhra State is only the first step in the direction of the reorganisation of the States as laid down in the Resolution of the Nanalagar session of the Indian National Congress. The Committee welcomes the resolution of the Working Committee of the 16th May, 1953, and the statement made by the Prime Minister that a high-powered Commission to consider the question of re-organisation of the States would be set up after the estab-

lishment of the Andhra State. The Committee, however, hopes that the Government of India would consider the advisability of appointing this Commission even earlier so that a systematic plan for the formation of new States may be prepared and implemented as early as possible.

"The Hyderabad State, comprising of three linguistic areas, is vitally concerned with the re-organisation of the States in Southern India. It is the considered opinion of the Hyderabad Pradesh Congress Committee that in accordance with the various factors mentioned in the Nanalagar Resolution of the Congress, these areas are to be integrated with the contiguous linguistic regions. This Committee therefore, authorises its executive to appoint a Subcommittee to go into the matter thoroughly and collect all relevant data to be placed before the high-powered Commission."

The Resolution clearly shows the determination of the people for the disintegration of the Hyderabad State. In Hyderabad, there are certain elements which are against disintegration. Vested interests, reactionaries and the Nizam himself are going against the will of the people. The Nizam, as my hon. friend has just now quoted from the Book called 'From Ruler to Rajpramukh', has criticised the Government of India also. It is for the Government of India to reply to the criticisms. In that book he says that he has got a right to survive as a constitutional monarch. This the people of Hyderabad resent.

Now, I come to the question of Bellary. For the last 3 days, the question of Bellary has become a subject of heated discussion. I would request the Government of India to include at present the whole of Bellary district in the Mysore State. I am saying this in the interest of the Andhra people. Because, if you want a division or break-up of a district, you must accept a certain principle. If

[Shri Krishnacharya Joshi]

you say that Bellary should be broken up and 7 taluks should go to Mysore and 3 to the Andhra State, you must accept the same principle in regard to Chittoor. In Chittoor district, there are certain Tamil taluks and you will have to divide Chittoor also. The same is the case with Anantapur. In Anantapur there are certain Kannada taluks. If you want a division of the Bellary district, then Anantapur should be broken up and a portion given to the Mysore State. Regarding Bellary town, the demand of the Andhras is surprising. Bellary is surrounded by Karnataka areas. Some of the Andhra friends were demanding a corridor for Bellary. They never demanded Bellary before as an Andhra territory. Now they are demanding it. They cannot blow hot and cold in the same breath. Some Andhra friends are demanding a plebiscite in Bellary. They are dissatisfied with the award of Justice Misra. If you want to open the Bellary problem again, it will go against you.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Let it.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi: I know in Bellary, the Kannadigas are in a minority. The same is the case with the Andhras in Hyderabad city. If Bellary does not go to Kannadigas, Hyderabad city will not go to the Andhras.

[**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER** in the Chair]

Because in Hyderabad city, 55 per cent. are Muslims. Formerly they were 50 per cent; after the police action, they are 55 per cent. Then you will find, Maharashtrians, Kannadigas and Tamilians etc. 20 per cent. Then, there are some Marwadi, Gujarati and Hindustani speaking people. It will all come to about 80 per cent. The Andhras are 20 per cent. in Hyderabad City. If they demand a plebiscite in Bellary—of course, there was a hint yesterday in the speech of Shri Chattopadhyaya that for Hyderabad also they will demand a plebiscite—it would be very hard for the Andhras. We in Hyderabad make no distinction

between Andhras and Karnatakas. We are prepared to support the Andhra case provided their stand is just. One of my friends was not only demanding Bellary, but he was demanding a Karnatak king who is no more, who died some 500 years ago, saying that he belonged to Andhra. He may have very well demanded Shivaji as an Andhra! The student of history is surprised to hear that Vijayanagara or Krishnadevaraya was Andhra. It is a fact that Krishnadevayara patronised some Andhra poets, and he wrote some books in Telugu. If the King of England patronises Andhras, they will tomorrow claim that he also belongs to Andhra. That is the ridiculous stand taken by my friend.

As the Andhra State is coming into existence, we people of Hyderabad have made our stand very clear, that we stand for the disintegration of Hyderabad State. Unless the eight districts of Telengana are added to Andhra State, it will not be complete. Not only that. We support the Andhra stand that Hyderabad City should go to Andhras. I wish Andhras god-speed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Mishra.

Pandit S. C. Mishra (Monghyr North-East) *rose*—

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): We have given our list. My name is next.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have already called the other gentleman with the turban.

Pandit S. C. Mishra: I have been called.

Several Hon. Members: *rose*—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All of you may stand, but I will call only one. I cannot call four.

Pandit S. C. Mishra: You called "Mishra", Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I thought his name was "Mishra". Shri Jaswant Rai Mehta.

Shri Punnoose: We may have numbers hereafter.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I must arrange. I will give numbers.

There are many others also who want to speak.

Shri J. R. Mehta (Jodhpur): I wish to offer my felicitations to my Andhra friends on this measure which is going to fulfil their long-cherished hopes for the formation of a new Andhra State. I wish I could feel equally happy about the factors which have been at the back of this demand. It seems to me that it is not the desire to bring together all the Telugu-speaking people that has been the main factor. On the other hand, I feel that there has been a deep-seated grievance which has been agitating my Andhra friends that in the Joint State of Madras they have not had a fair deal, so that it seems to me that it is not on linguistic grounds alone that we are having this Andhra State though it seems to have suited the purpose of politicians to make their claims on linguistic grounds in the hope that they could expect a better hearing. What makes me still more sad is that this sense of grievance and this bitterness continues. And it has affected even the tone of the debate in this House so far as our friends from Madras and Andhra are concerned. There have been charges and counter-charges, and a particularly acrimonious and meticulous controversy is sought to be waged over the question of assets and liabilities. I would appeal to my friends on both sides not to allow a spirit of petty bargaining or hard bargaining to mar the pleasure or the glory of this occasion, but to settle the matter in a spirit of brotherliness, and in a spirit of grace and give and take. I would respectfully suggest to my Madras friends, if I may, that it is up to them to act as the bigger brother, as even India acted in regard to Pakistan. But if our Madras friends are not able to rise to the occasion, I would expect my Andhra friends to behave as the bigger brother and to give a better account of themselves.

In this connection, I wish to commend the very valuable advice which was tendered by the hon. Home Minister to my Andhra friends. This is what he said:

"I would suggest to the Andhra Government: you start with a clean slate; make a programme, and prepare a plan—come to the Centre and ask for help on the ground that Andhras had not been properly dealt with in the past, and so on. We shall then consider it. It will be a much better course than fighting amongst yourselves."

It will not only be a better course, but it will be the most practicable and most honourable proposition also. Let me tell my Andhra friends in confidence—and since the Home Minister does not happen to be here, I can say so—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: His Deputy is here.

Shri J. R. Mehta: It is their good luck that he has held out this generous promise. Act upon it and cash it before the lawyer in him asserts him and tries to wriggle out of it. It is open to him at any time to say: "My friends, you didn't take my advice. Therefore, you help yourselves."

Lest I might be misunderstood, I should like to seek the indulgence of the House to make it clear that the fact that I have been offering my felicitations to the Andhra people is not to be taken as an indication that I am in support of linguistic States as such. I am here to say, and to say with all the emphasis at my command, that I see in this linguism a new and subtle danger to the safety and integrity of India. The very conception, in my humble opinion, is fraught with grave consequences to the country. I venture to submit that if you look back a little into the long history of this ancient land, and try to find out which were the factors which impeded the growth of nationalism in this country, we shall come to the irresistible conclusion that

[Shri J. R. Mehta]

the barriers of language played a most conspicuous part. I suggest to the hon. Members here to consider whether by falling into the error of forming linguistic States we are not trying to revive those conditions which existed here before we saw the rise of the spirit of nationalism in India. I venture to submit that this will give rise to isolationist tendencies and make us more regional-minded than we are at the moment. Apart from this, the matter has to be looked at from another angle also. I would ask hon. Members to seriously consider whether the craving for linguistic States is not something akin to, or even more sinister than the craving for territory in olden times—not for dynasties or clans, I admit, but for larger groups clamouring affinity on a linguistic basis. Today we are seeing the spectacle of each state trying to have more and more territory at the expense of its neighbours. Otherwise, how can we explain the spectacle of Bengal claiming more territories at the expense of Bihar, and the Punjabis claiming more and more territories at the expense of the neighbouring provinces like Rajasthan, and so on.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: What about Mount Abu?

Shri J. R. Mehta: I am coming to that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would not allow it. They are worrying over Kurnool and Bellary. What is the meaning in bringing in Ajanta, Ajmer or Mount Abu?

Shri J. R. Mehta: We are good boys. The Rajasthanis are not claiming any additional territory, though they don't want to be deprived of their own.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member need not then have participated in the discussion.

Shri J. R. Mehta: Are we here merely to claim additional territory?

Shri Raghavalah (Ongole): He is referring to historical monuments to be shared.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let nothing become a historical monument in the Andhra.

The hon. Member has finished?

Shri J. R. Mehta: I wanted the other Members to finish, before I continue.

I am aware that there are many esteemed friends in this House who consider themselves committed to the idea of linguistic states. But may I remind them that this idea of linguistic states had its origin, when we were under the domination of foreign masters. Then everything was good enough to beat a thief. The proposition of linguistic states was a very good rallying point for securing popular support, and it was also a very good means of embarrassing the Government. But now the Congress Government are in power. I dare say, if they are honest about it, with the administrative experience they have got, they will now agree that linguistic states need not have the same charm for them as it had while they were in the opposition. And they should muster courage to say so openly. I once more offer my best felicitations to the people of the Andhra State. I hope they would be good citizens of Andhra, and still better citizens of greater India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have tried to accommodate as many Members as possible, but I am afraid I will have to close this debate at 1-15 P.M. today, and call upon the hon. Minister tomorrow at 9-15 A.M. immediately after the question hour is over. For clause by clause discussion, I think there will be a couple of days, tomorrow and possibly some other day. In the list, there are only four or five more hon. Members. All of them need not be worried, if I do not call their names. I shall allow them to speak on this matter, when the clause by clause discussion proceeds, and then I will give them preference.

An Hon. Member: Not recall?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Not recall any of those who have already spoken, unless they are intimately connected with Andhra or Tamil Naḍ. So far as the

others are concerned, I will give them an opportunity.

I shall call upon two hon. Members, one from this side of the House, and one from the other side.

Shri Punnoose: Some of us have persistently kept aloof, so that we may participate in the clause by clause discussion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall call the hon. Member from Kurnool. He will speak for five minutes.

Shri Gadilingana Gowd (Kurnool): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I represent a peculiar constituency. I call it a peculiar constituency because it consists of three taluks of Bellary, and two taluks of Kurnool; but is called the Kurnool constituency, for which the Collector of Bellary is the returning officer. Out of the three taluks of Bellary, Siruguppa is a predominantly Kannada spoken area, and it is going to Mysore. Adoni and Alur are two taluks where both Kannada and Telugu are spoken. Kurnool and Pattikonda taluks are predominantly Telugu areas. I therefore represent both Kannadigas and Andhras. Because of the conflicting claims both by Andhras and by the Kannadigas, I did not want to speak on this Bill, but some of my Andhra friends began to tell the House some incorrect things as though they were facts. It is therefore that I have risen to tell the House what the facts are, regarding Bellary.

1 P.M.

As regards Bellary, I must say that it is predominantly a Kannadiga area. Some of my Andhra friends took advantage of the mistake committed by the Central Government on the 25th March 1953, in announcing that six taluks will go to Mysore, keeping Bellary in suspense. They thought that by starting an agitation, they could get Bellary also. They therefore started an agitation for Bellary taluk. They had never claimed Bellary taluk up to that date, namely the 25th of March 1953.

As regards the agitation for Bellary, it is not at all voluntary. I know personally that the Andhra Samiti, Bellary, is paying wages to the persons who defy the law. That is the position of Bellary.

Shri Raghuramalah: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, such mis-statements of facts which are likely to irritate, should, I think, be avoided. I think the statement 'paying wages to agitators', etc. is very unfortunate.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let not the hon. Member be interrupted. Possibly this is his maiden speech.

Shri Gadilingana Gowd: Therefore, the Andhras have absolutely no claim for Bellary taluk. As regards the Kannadiga claim for the three taluks of Adoni, Alur, and Rayadrug of Bellary district, I may say they are also not justified in claiming these three taluks completely. There are no doubt some villages which have to go to Karnataka, or in other words, to Mysore, and the hon. Home Minister has been pleased to assure the House that he is going to appoint a boundary commission to go into the question, and so the Kannadigas need not be anxious about the villages which have to go to them.

Next I come to the temporary capital of Kurnool.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: Are there mosquitoes in Kurnool?

Shri Gadilingana Gowd: The choice of the capital was left to the Rayalseema people, according to the Sri Bagh Pact. Accordingly, the Andhra legislators, after five days' discussion, have fixed upon Kurnool, and it is just that Kurnool has been selected as the temporary capital, and the Government have acted correctly.

I oppose the motion for referring the Bill to a Select Committee. I am of the view that the passage of the Bill should be expedited as much as possible, in order to enable the Andhra State to come into being on the 1st of October 1953, for which we have been longing for quite a long time.

[Shri Gadilingana Gowd]

I thank the hon. Minister for having brought forward this Bill, and I make an appeal to him to make a statement about the formation of the Karnataka province, and also release the Karnataka leaders who have been detained and sent to unknown destinations.

Shri Neswi (Dharwar South): It gives me great pleasure and satisfaction to express my feelings in regard to the Andhra State Bill, because the members of the Andhra Desha and the members of the Karnataka areas are sailing together to reach the shore. My co-comrades have already reached the shore and I expect that we will also very soon reach the shore. But I am sorry to say that this Bill came very late. This proposal to form Provinces on a linguistic basis ought to have come with the commencement of the new Constitution of India; failing that, it should have come with the Five Year Plan. Without the Provinces being on this basis, which is known as a scientific basis, we cannot progress at all. Really speaking, this should have come along with the Planning Commission's Report. That is why I say it has come very late.

I also want to express my feeling that the Union Government should not commit other mistakes. They have already committed many mistakes, that is, they ought to have formed provinces on a linguistic basis with the commencement of the new Constitution, and failing that, along with the Planning Commission's Report itself. Now in regard to the other provinces that are going to come, they must make haste. If they wait, I am sorry to say that they will have to suffer in the next election.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: 'They' means who?

Shri Neswi: Government, of course.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: You are part of Government.

Shri Neswi: If you take the case of Karnataka province, I say that subject matter is as easy or easier than any other provinces. We have already

got a Capital, the Executive, everything readily prepared and plans even. I don't know why the Central Government are showing hesitation to grant the request of the Kannadigas. The Karnataka people are already fighting. A movement has been started, in spite of the assurances of some very important persons. Still the agitation is going on. It has spread to the student world. The students are derailing trains and doing so many other things. Of course, I do not approve of it. Still the movement has spread like wild fire in the student world. It is very difficult to control. So it is better to see that Karnataka province is also established without any hesitation. Then others like Maharashtra, Alkya Kerala and so on will follow.

Now, here I want to make one thing clear. I want to stick to the jurisdiction of the Bill itself and I shall have to say a few words about one matter. All the Kannada villages or taluks that are in Madras itself should be joined to Mysore immediately, because otherwise their fate will be hanging fire. For example, there is the taluk of Adoni, Alur, Rayadurg, Kasargat, Kollegal and then Nilgiri. There are so many portions where the Kannada language is predominantly spoken. I do not mean the entire taluks, but in some villages the Kannada language is spoken by a large majority and they should be immediately joined to Mysore. Then only will the object of this Bill be fulfilled because it is to decrease the Madras State and increase the Mysore State wherever possible. Otherwise, if you do not do it, it is simply making a State again without a scientific basis. Just as the English people did in previous days.....

Shri Thimmalah: Coorg also.

Shri Neswi: Yes, Coorg also is remaining. Mr. Dodda Thimmaiah is thinking that I forgot it.

Shri Lakshmayya: What about the Telugu-speaking parts of Karnataka State in the districts of Chitaldrug, Tumkur and Kolar?

Shri Neswi: Wherever they are, you may take them, if it is the desire of the people. Unless and until you know the desire of the people, you cannot do it. (*Interruptions*). Anyhow, if the people say that they want to join with them, we cannot stop them.

Shri Namdhari: If they all speak English, why don't they join with England? (*Laughter*).

Shri Neswi: So I appeal to the Central Government that the question of the formation of a Karnatak province should be taken up as early as possible. I support the Bill with all my heart and satisfaction.

Shri G. H. Deshpande: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir.....

Shri Namblar: Is he Andhra? (*Interruptions*.)

Shri G. H. Deshpande: I thank you for this opportunity which you have given me at the fag-end of the debate. I rise to support the Bill because I am convinced that it is a step in the right direction. Many people have criticised Government—and have criticised Government very strongly—by saying that they were lacking in boldness. I do not want to enter into an argument at this time. But whether Government were lacking in boldness or whether they had not enough courage is a matter which history will decide and history will give its decision against those who have criticised the Government for this. The only thing that I want to say, is that recently people very eminent in our public life have started entertaining fears regarding this demand of the masses for provinces on a linguistic basis. What is wrong about it? There are millions and millions of people outside who want to see that provinces are established as soon as possible on a linguistic basis. And why? Because unless and until this has been done, people will not be in a position to realise the fruits of freedom.

Some time back when I was in the Bombay Legislative Assembly, one day with a Karnatak friend of mine some

27 agriculturists from a rural area came to the Visitors' Gallery. They sat there in the Visitors' Gallery and when I had seen them they were very jubilant. They said: We have come to see how our Assembly is working under Swaraj. But when they came down, they were very much dissatisfied. They said—after all, we are foreigners to this Assembly. We do not think that this is a House of our representatives because it was not possible for us to follow a single word that was uttered there. Under these circumstances, is it possible that the masses in India will feel the glow of freedom unless you make conditions which will be favourable, wherein even an ordinary man of the village will think that it is his Government, that he has got the power to control it, that he has circumstances wherein he can give the best and have self-rule in his own state? Is that possible today? There are millions and millions of Maharashtrians in Hyderabad, there are millions and millions of Maharashtrians in Mahakoshal, and there are millions and millions of them in Bombay. What wrong is there if they say that they would like to be united in one province? I do not think there is anything wrong. Some of us have begun to think that if provinces are redistributed on a linguistic basis, that will endanger Indian freedom. Never; it will never endanger Indian freedom. People who are suffering from a superiority complex need not try to give us sermons on patriotism. We are not lacking in patriotism.

I was watching the debate in this House with a mixed feeling. But having watched the debate with a mixed feeling for the last four days in this hon. House, I am not a disheartened man. Why is it that we were required to watch this bad blood for the last four days? It has come down to us on account of our inherited past which has been thrown upon us by the foreign rule that existed here for more than a century and a half. It is they who brought about very awkward combinations for administrative purposes. Because they wanted to set community against community, and province

[Shri G. H. Deshpande]

against province, they wanted to exploit all this feeling and, therefore, they wanted what today Bombay is and what today Madras is, that is the present composite states. What is the feeling of every friend from Andhra who spoke here? Everybody from Andhra who spoke here is labouring under the impression that after all they were suffering for a long time from injustice. I do not want to blame my friends from Tamil Nad. They might not have deliberately done anything which might have injured these people but the circumstances under which they were made to work have made them feel unanimously that they were labouring under injustice. That shows that the combination was very unhappy and it is better that today at least they have got an opportunity of breaking from that combination which they do not like.

Now, I want to say one word to my Andhra friends, regarding what I have witnessed during the 4 days' debate here. Every hon. Member from Andhra, whether on this side or on the other created the impression that he feels that nobody is there in India today who would give him any justice. Please let them have no such frame of mind for that attitude never helps those who hold that. Forget the past and think of the future. You will have Vishal Andhra; you may call it Vishal Andhra or whatever you like. But the ball has been set in motion and it will reach its destination; you will have a speedy journey from Kurnool to Hyderabad. Be cheerful, do not labour under the impression that nobody in India will give you any justice. The sympathies of India and the Indian masses are all on your side.

One word more and I will have done. This is a good idea, this is a good principle to ask for self-determination, to ask for provinces carved on linguistic basis. Of course, there must be some

other considerations also. I have no objection to that, but the question comes in, what methods we are going to adopt for its realisation? Much of the bad blood that we have witnessed would not have been there if people would not have indulged in unwholesome methods. It is no use carrying virtue to an excess. People have taken to objectionable methods. Many people have begun to wonder where this thing will lead us to; they think it may lead to the disintegration of the country. That is why we must be cautious. It is no use saying that we must do every thing in hot haste. We should not cry, haste. It is no use pressing the accelerator without seeing that the brakes are efficient. I say that it is a good thing to have provinces established on a linguistic basis as soon as possible, but everybody interested in it must see, that objectionable methods will never be resorted to. Then and then alone you will have the integrity of India and the realisation of your dream which you have cherished for so long. Sir, I have done.

Df. Katju: Sir, I have heard this debate with very great interest. We have taken four days over it and for me it has been a very profitable and very interesting experience. I shall go further.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister will continue tomorrow.

I have to make an announcement. On the 24th there is *Raksha Bandhan*. A number of hon. Members made representations to me that instead of holding the sitting of Parliament in the morning we may have it in the afternoon. Therefore that day the House will meet at two o'clock and go on till seven.

The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Thursday, the 20th August, 1953.