

## PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

## OFFICIAL REPORT

705

## HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Thursday, 13th 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

## PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

Shri Sivamaurthi Swami (Kush-  
tagi): I beg to present to this House  
two petitions, one signed by eight peti-  
tioners on behalf of the Karnatak  
Action Committee and the other sign-  
ed by 203 petitioners on behalf of the  
public regarding the Andhra State  
Bill, 1953.

## ANDHRA STATE BILL

The Minister of Home Affairs, and  
States (Dr. Katju): I beg to move:

"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 diminish-  
ing of the area of the State of  
Madras, and for matters connect-  
ed therewith, be taken into consi-  
deration."

This is a very important matter and,  
in many ways, this is a day of historic

330 P.S.D.

726

significance. The House is familiar  
with the past background of this Bill.  
It goes back to 1917 when the people  
residing in Andhra Desh put forward  
their claim for a separate province.  
From that year onwards this matter  
has been constantly under discussion  
in one way or another. Many com-  
mittees appointed by the Congress  
Working Committee, several com-  
mittees appointed by the Government  
of India and one committee appointed  
by the Madras Government itself, have  
gone into this matter. I do not pro-  
pose to tire the House by going into  
the past history, but in December last  
the Prime Minister made a statement  
on the floor of the House in which he  
announced that Government had  
decided to form a new State and pro-  
posed to appoint Chief Justice Wan-  
choo for investigation into many  
matters, particularly financial impli-  
cations. That report was submitted  
on the 7th February 1953. I should  
like to take this opportunity of ex-  
pressing our deep appreciation to  
Chief Justice Wanchoo and later to an-  
other learned Judge, Chief Justice  
Misra of the Hyderabad High Court,  
for the very expeditious work that  
they did and for the very considerable  
pains that they devoted over the  
matter.

On the 25th March 1953, the Prime  
Minister communicated the Govern-  
ment of India's decisions upon Chief  
Justice Wanchoo's report and it is  
mainly upon those decisions that this  
Bill has been formulated. In between  
there was, as the House knows, some  
controversy about one particular taluk  
of the Bellary district, which is called

[Dr. Katju]

the Bellary taluk, and for a consideration of that matter Chief Justice Misra was appointed; and he has submitted his report upon which Government have taken a decision, as recommended by him.

Now, the Constitution requires that when it is proposed to alter, add to or in any way modify the area of any State, then the States concerned should be asked to comment upon it, and the Bill as proposed to be framed by the Central Government should be communicated to the legislatures of the States concerned so that they may consider the Bill and forward their comments upon it. Here this Bill, as drafted in the first instance, was forwarded by us both to the Madras Legislature and to the Mysore Legislature. The Mysore Legislature came into the picture for a very fractional part of the Bellary district which it is proposed to be transferred to Mysore. We are very grateful to both these State Legislatures for a considerable discussion upon this Bill. They took up this Bill clause by clause and expressed their opinion upon it after careful debate. The Bill that has now been placed before the House is a Bill which has very carefully taken into consideration every expression of opinion made upon it both by the two State Legislatures and by leading organisations and by every body concerned, and we have come to our conclusions after such consideration. In many instances, we have adopted the suggestions made and modified the Bill accordingly. In many other cases, we have not been able to do so and, therefore, the Bill stands with slight modifications as it was previously prepared.

Now the House will consider the Bill both by way of general discussion and by way of clause-by-clause debate. But it might be useful if I were to place before the House certain broad features in it so that you might have a clear picture of what the Government's intention is and what we propose to do and where parti-

cularly we have not been able to accept the opinions expressed by the State Legislatures.

The House would recollect that Chief Justice Wanchoo expressed the opinion, and that was adopted by us, and the Prime Minister said so in the statement that he made on the 25th March, that our proposal is to limit, for the time being, if I may put it that way, the Andhra Desh to the eleven undisputed districts and the twelfth one, namely Bellary, which has to be divided. We do not propose in this Bill to go beyond these districts. Chief Justice Wanchoo said that before him many organisations had put forward the case that there were many districts in the State of Madras where it was desirable that certain alterations should be made, namely, that certain areas should be transferred to the Andhra Desh because in many villages there was a Telugu-speaking population. But Chief Justice Wanchoo expressed the opinion that it would be highly desirable if, in the first instance, till this new Andhra Desh was stabilised, it was limited to the eleven undisputed districts plus a portion of the Bellary district. That is the main object of this Bill. I am dwelling upon it because I notice that various amendments have been tabled and demands made—and the Madras Legislature has expressed the opinion—that there should be a boundary commission. Now the way in which that suggestion has been made really, so far as I can put it, opens a frightful prospect for investigation—I mean it will probably throw many States into some excitement. A boundary commission, it is said, should be appointed not only for the purpose of investigating the boundaries between the new State of Andhra Desh and the residuary State of Madras and the adjoining State of Mysore but, it should also consider questions of Orissa—I am familiar with that part of the country very much—the districts of Ganjam and Koraput, with the adjoining State of Madhya Pradesh, Bastar and some other areas and Hyderabad, three or four districts.

Now, that will be a boundary commission quite outside the scope of the Bill. The Government is committed, and a clear statement has been made, that by President's executive Order we propose to appoint a boundary commission for a very limited purpose. There are these eleven districts; some of these districts are on the border or dividing line between the State of residuary Madras and the new Andhra Desh. It was quite possible both ways. We might have said, 'Here is a district which has got certain administrative boundaries for the last 200 years; do not interfere with them.' The other view was that there may be marginal adjustments for the purpose of straightening the border line. Five villages this side or five villages that side may be exchanged and for that limited purpose only we propose with the concurrence—I will not say concurrence—with the co-operation of all, to set up a boundary commission. If that boundary commission suggests minor alterations of the description I have indicated, then the result would be that even for the purpose of shifting one village from this side to the other side or *vice versa* we will have to undertake Parliamentary legislation.

The amendments that have been suggested want a provision for, a boundary commission of the wider description suggested before, to be put into the Bill. I respectfully suggest to you that really there will be no necessity—not in the least—of encumbering the Bill with any such provision. It is a matter of administrative convenience which can be dealt with by executive order. The boundary commission will be there for that purpose; it will soon be appointed. I am anxious that the new Andhra State and the Andhra Government should be firmly established in the saddle. They will have very many important questions to decide, questions for which the people have asked for the establishment of the Andhra Desh, namely irrigation projects, the removal of poverty and the removal of scarcity conditions in Rayalaseema. I

am very anxious that the new Government should apply itself to these urgent problems rather than that its energies should be diverted to this small matter of a few villages this side or that side. That was the opinion expressed by Chief Justice Wanchoo and I suggest to you that this is really the correct opinion. So far as the wider case is concerned, namely the rectification of borders, the addition to or subtraction from Orissa, from Madhya Pradesh or from Hyderabad, they are all big questions. You may consider them at any time you like. You may ask for a boundary commission. It is open to you to make any suggestions. But, so far as this Bill is concerned, I say that we should limit ourselves to the kind of the boundary commission which the Government contemplates and that can be done effectively and expeditiously by executive Order. I do not propose to add anything to this question at this stage excepting this that that is the view which the Government holds on this question of a boundary commission.

The second question which has attracted attention is the question of temporary capital. Now, the House would recapitulate that the Union Government has made it quite clear right from the start that the question of the location of the capital is something entirely for the Andhras to decide for themselves, collectively or through their representatives. The Government has to make some preliminary preparations. The Government of India proposed and the suggestion was accepted that the Andhra members of the Madras Legislative Assembly should meet together and should consider this matter and should let us know as to what they think about it. They met towards the end of May this year and they came to the conclusion, after, I think, about four days' discussion, that they would like to have Kurnool as the temporary capital. So far as we are concerned, the decision stands and we have accepted it. That has been the whole position right from the start. But, at the same time, it is open to the

[Dr. Katju]

Andhra people to change their decision if they like to do so. They may change it after the new State has been formed. They may change it, if they so like, after six months or after one year. The only way in which the Central Government might come into the picture is if they ask us for assistance for building a new capital and if we find that they are really vacillating about it, then the Union Government may say, 'We do not really know what is in your mind. Sometimes you say A, sometimes B and sometimes C. You help yourselves; it has nothing to do with us.' In that way we might come into the picture. Otherwise, from our point of view, that is a matter entirely within the province of Andhra Desh. When the State is established after the Bill is passed as it is—and the appointed date is the 1st of October—then on that date the temporary capital will be Kurnool. After that it would be open to the members of the Andhra Legislature to change their view if they want to do so.

From this point of view, in the Bill itself, it was really not necessary at all to mention as to where the temporary capital was going to be. But the name was mentioned purely by the way—it might not have been mentioned at all—in another connection in the Seventh Schedule, in which the House will see that there are some detailed provisions about financial matters, division of assets and liabilities, methods and all that. Naturally the Madras Government—I am talking of the residuary Madras Government—said, why should the Madras Government be saddled with the charges for the construction of the new capital? Today if any money is borrowed for that purpose it can only be borrowed by the Madras Government because the Andhra State Government is not in existence and the Madras Government was anxious that all monies lent by the Government of India for the purpose of the construction of the temporary capital, wherever it might be, should after the new State has

come into existence, be the liability of the new Government. That is mentioned in one of the paras of the Seventh Schedule. It so happened that quite unnecessarily it was stated there "for the purpose of the construction of the temporary capital at Kurnool"—the mention of the name was wholly unnecessary. In the Madras Legislature it was taken advantage of and it led to a great debate. There was voting upon it and an attempt was made in two ways, first to say that the word Kurnool should be kept out and some other name should be substituted or something should be done. There was some voting upon it and the motion was carried by one vote. It is a purely financial matter. We have made it clear that whatever money is borrowed by the present Madras State for the purpose of the construction of the temporary capital and for purposes incidental thereto will be the liability of the new Andhra State. We thought that the mention of the word Kurnool was unnecessary and really inappropriate in the context and therefore we have taken it out. I am dwelling upon it at some length so that there may be no doubt whatsoever that this removal of the word Kurnool does not indicate that we have changed our view in any case. So far as the Government of India is concerned, according to the decision taken by the Andhra members in the month of May, on the 1st October, the appointed day, Kurnool will be the temporary capital. We do not want to question the perfect right and liberty of the Andhra members and the new Andhra Assembly to change their view, if they like. But it is their concern.

The other matter to which I should like to draw the attention of the House is the structure of the legislature in the new Andhra Desh. Of course, there must be a Legislative Assembly and it has been provided that members elected to the present Madras Legislative Assembly from the newly created or going to be created Andhra Desh shall become *ipso facto* members of

the new Andhra Legislative Assembly. Then, what about the Legislative Council? In the Constitution there is a provision which is binding upon us that whenever there is a new State and the question arises whether there should be a Legislative Council there or not, this question can only be decided when a resolution of the local Legislative Assembly has been passed recommending the creation or establishment of such a Legislative Council. For the purpose of creation of an Andhra Legislative Council there must be a resolution by the Andhra Legislative Assembly after the State has come into existence. I say this because while the Madras Legislative Assembly was silent upon this point the Madras Legislative Council has made a recommendation, sitting as a Council, that there should be a Legislative Council also for Andhra Desh. Now, we cannot consider one way or the other this particular provision, whatever our opinions may be about the functions or about the propriety of having a Legislative Council in a State. That is a matter principally for the Andhra Legislative Assembly. Therefore, in this Bill as it stands there is no provision for the establishment, in the first instance, of an Andhra Legislative Council.

Then the next question was the question of the establishment of a High Court. I may be partial in this matter. Indeed, you may even call my views prejudiced. But as between the establishment of an executive capital at a particular place and the location of a High Court at a particular place, I consider that from the common man's point of view, the question of the location of a High Court is of greater importance. So far as the common villager is concerned he may have occasion to go to the seat of the executive Government, the headquarters, once a while. Poor fellow, he has got no work there! So far as his own questions and difficulties are concerned he has to approach the District Magistrate, the Commissioner, the local member of the Legislature and he can talk to them about

them. The Ministers now are always touring—the Ministers, the Deputy Ministers, the Parliamentary Secretaries. They go there, they hear all local complaints. The members of the Legislature are there to voice their grievances. I said to myself that out of a thousand villagers probably one may go to the seat or the headquarters of the executive Government. But speaking very moderately I think that at least five out of that one thousand will go to the High Court—because the High Court cannot go to them, they have got to go to the High Court—for the purpose of taking opinion, or fighting their civil or criminal cases. Today they will be very familiar with the writ jurisdiction, applying for writs and doing all sorts of things. So this question of the establishment of a High Court is, in my opinion, of greater importance.

The House knows the history of this matter. When the discussions started our friends in Andhra, while they wanted a new State, were keen and anxious to carry on in Madras City for a certain number of years.

**Some Hon. Members:** No, no.

**Dr. Katju:** I am talking of past history; I am not talking of conditions today. They were very keen to remain in Madras for a number of years, both for the High Court and for the seat of the executive Government. Well, that past history is gone and today the position is that the capital is to be at another place outside Madras in the Andhra Desh itself, any place they like. So far as the High Court was concerned it was agreed that there might be a sort of intervening period and some time should be given to the Andhra Desh Government to make proper arrangements. Up till now—whatever may be the implications of private pacts of ten years ago, the Sribagh Pact and other pacts—no firm decision has yet been taken as to the seat of the High Court.

Secondly, a building is not a High Court; you have got to have proper court rooms, Judges chambers; the poor lawyers, they have to sit some-

[Dr. Katju]

where. They have to talk to their clients; they cannot talk under the trees, Mr. Gopalan has very wide experience of the law courts and I am sure he has been defended by very competent lawyers. But he has never consulted them under a tree. So you should have advocates' chambers. Then there are going to be libraries, law libraries for the High Court, law libraries for the advocates. Then, please remember if you have six or seven Judges for the Andhra High Court you have got to provide residences for them, a sort of bungalows or cottages. Then the poor advocates must also live somewhere. If you have got a bar of fifty or hundred advocates you will have to give them and their staff accommodation. So, we thought that there should be some time given for making all these arrangements. The Bill, as originally drafted, provided that the High Court shall remain in Madras till the Andhra Government wanted it to be removed. If the Andhra Government said: we want it tomorrow, very well they can have it tomorrow. There is no question of placing any restriction on the Andhra people or Andhra Government as to when they must have the High Court. They can have it at any time they like. We did not in the Bill, as drafted originally, put any restriction that within such a limit it must be taken away. In the Madras Legislature when they considered this provision they put the time limit both ways. First, they gave liberty to the Andhra Government to have their High Court whenever they liked. First of October is the appointed day; they might have the High Court from the 1st of November. The other way was that the High Court must be taken away, must go away from Madras, before the 1st of June 1954. When we considered that we said to ourselves that October, November and December, a period of three months is too short a period. If we add five months that side it gives only eight months to the Andhra Government to decide about the seat of the High Court buildings, about

accommodation for advocates and all that sort of thing. And while the Bill, as it is before you, reserves the liberty to the Andhra Government to have their High Court whenever they want it, we have rather postponed the date from the 1st of June to the 1st of January 1956. That would really give an additional 19 months to the Andhra Government to make the proper arrangements. If the High Court must be within Andhra then there are 27 months for the Andhra Government to decide.

Now here people stated that this 1st of January is rather an inconvenient date. Hot weather commences about the end of April and the change should come when the High Court re-opens. That is really a matter of very small detail. Speaking with some experience, it is really of no consequence if you open the High Court from any date or you break it from any other date. From the 1st of January New Year opens. In the Allahabad High Court everything is done according to the financial year, that is, 31st March, but the High Court must see for their statistics and business and all that is upto the 31st December. When we thought about it we thought that there is Christmas. The year closes on the 31st December and the new High Court may begin from the 1st January 1956. This is a minor point. The more important point is the desire on our part to give a little longer time to the Andhra Government to take proper steps for setting up a proper High Court with all conveniences at a proper place.

There is a third point which I might mention here. It is of some small importance and has been discussed by the two State Legislatures. As to some cases there will be no difficulty whatsoever. Cases pending in the Madras High Court from their districts will go to Madras High Court and the others will go straight to the Andhra Court. All the pending files will be transferred. Similarly cases coming from the Taluks of

Bellary will go to the Mysore High Court. But there may be a small thing about which there might be some difficulty—some property situated in the residuary State of Madras. A decision may be required to be taken as to where it should go, whether it should go to the Andhra High Court or the Mysore High Court. It is a matter of very small consequence. The Bill provides that this matter should be left to the sole discretion of the Chief Justice of the Madras High Court. He should say whether this case should go from Madras or should remain in Madras. His decision should be final. The Madras Legislature attached some importance to it. They said, "No, no, we want this question to be decided by a joint decision of the two Chief Justices". But where is the Chief Justice of the new High Court? The new High Court will only come into existence and begin to function as from the date when the Andhra Government decides to function it. This matter should be decided a little earlier. The Mysore Government has also adopted some complicated view upon this point and I respectfully suggest to the House that the Bill makes a very straightforward provision. The number of cases of this dubious nature to which the rule may apply will be small everywhere and we may very well leave it to the discretion of the Chief Justice. This is all about the High Court.

Then I come to a matter of some importance, that is, services. The House knows that there are two kinds of services, All India Services and Provincial Services. Provincial Services are under the State Government completely. If a member of the Provincial Service has any grievance, he has a right of appeal to the Governor and probably has access to the State Public Service Commission. The matter does not come to us. All India Services, on the other hand, are under Central control subject to rules and regulations. The All India Services are divided into Indian Civil Service—

for the time being some remnant members of it—the newly established Administrative Service and the Indian Police Service.

So far as these All India Services are concerned, the Union Government have attached very high importance to these Services. It was from that point of view that these Services were established; the idea is to promote a sense of all India unity and, therefore, it is desirable that there should be an interchange of officers. The rule that we have adopted is that when a particular candidate has been selected and he undergoes training then he is allotted to different States. In every province there might be a number of native members—for a long time I have been using this word native *viz.*, people belonging to that very State and people coming from other States of India. We are working on a principle of 50 per cent. That way it promotes solidarity, impartiality and good administration. From every point of view it is a desirable course. So far as the All India Services are concerned, the President will have absolute right to allocate members of the Service to the States.

The difficulty that arises in this question is, for instance, in Madras the number of Andhras in All India Services is not too large. The Andhras may require, I am not certain, about 30 members of the All India Services for their requirements. There will not be 30 or anything like 30 Andhra members. Please remember that in the Madras State there are three classes of natives *viz.* Andhras, Tamils and people coming from the Malayalam part of the State. There are some Kanarese people also, so there may be four.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Minister should say Kannada.

**Dr. Katju:** Very well, Sir. We have all these four to draw upon for our quota of Andhra Desh and in case of any further requirement we might meet it from other parts of

[Dr. Katju]

India, for example, Punjab, U. P. or Bengal or some other province.

So far as the provincial State Services were concerned, the original proposal in the Bill was that the President allocates the number of members for the new State. I might mention here that you do not expect much difficulty in getting Andhra people for these services, that is, Munsifs, District Judges, Civil Judges. It is implied that there are several Andhras there, Similarly for Deputy Collectors, Deputy Magistrates and all that there are sufficient number of Andhras. In services like Forest, Industries, Agriculture, there might be some deficiency. What we had suggested in the Bill, as originally drafted, was that the President will allocate and will give an option to the non-Andhras to go back if they want to go back to the residuary State of Madras after two years. The option will be open for 12 months. If they do not decide their option within 12 months then they remain members of the Andhra State Services.

The Madras Legislature has made another suggestion. They say: you send these Andhras first; if the President feels it absolutely incumbent because of deficiency of personnel in offices and no other arrangements can be made by re-employment or by getting Andhras from other States, then you may send the non-Andhra members of the Madras Civil Service to Andhra Desh on deputation. And their suggestion was that the deputation should be only for one year. Of course, when you send a man on deputation he is there and he gets a deputation allowance and he is there working for the time. We have adopted that suggestion with this minor change. We have thought that one year may be too short a time. We have made it three years—deputation not exceeding three years. But we do not propose that this should be a burden upon the Andhra Government because for at least three years they will have to pay some de-

putation allowance. So if the Andhra Government find that they do not need their services and have got their own men or that they can make other arrangements, then they can terminate the period of the deputation and ask the officers to go back to Madras at any time they choose.

The net result is we have adopted the recommendation of the Madras Legislature in so far as the State Services are concerned. We have not been able to adopt the recommendation in so far as All India Services are concerned. The All India Services shall remain, as usual, under the President's control and the President will be entitled to allocate them in any way he likes.

Then, another matter of importance here, of general importance, is the Tungabhadra project. The House is aware that this is a two-State project right from the beginning the State of Madras and the State of Hyderabad. The headworks are situated in the Bellary district. But after the headworks, I think so far as the canal system is concerned and other works are concerned, you have got really two branches, one going to Hyderabad and the other going to Andhra Desh. After this division the residuary State of Madras retains no interest in the Tungabhadra project. Tungabhadra project was really intended for the benefit of Rayalaseema and the Andhra districts. Now it so happens that the headworks are situated in the portion of the Bellary district which has gone to Mysore. And the project is still incomplete. Some thing has got to be done to complete it. It will take another twelve months to complete the project, and afterwards there are some further works to be done.

Now, therefore, there are two points: how the new construction should be made, which is the authority to deal with it; how the project is to be completed; who will deal with it; and thirdly, the regular maintenance, management of the whole project after it starts functioning.



The Mysore Government and their Legislature have expressed their view—very straightforward: this project is situated on our land, in that part of the Bellary district, that taluk, which has fallen into our territory, therefore it is ours, the whole thing is ours, we may do with it what we like, we have no objection to its being completed, but after it has been completed its maintenance, control, management for all purposes shall be our absolute concern.

10 A. M.

Now, please remember that at present, so far as I see, the proportion of the territory which has gone to Mysore is 1·36 per cent. Thirty-six per cent. is Andhra Desh and 62 and odd per cent. is residuary Madras. So we thought this was too extreme a view to take. We cannot allow this project to be made a sort of sphere or subject of controversy between two States. The interests were much too large. It has got to be properly managed. National interest demands it that it should be properly controlled and Andhra Desh for whose benefit it was really undertaken should have the benefit.

**Shri Nijalingappa** (Chitaldrug): It was undertaken for both Andhra and Kannada.

**Shri B. S. Murthy** (Eluru): The tail wagging the head!

**Dr. Katju**: You just listen to me. What we have done is this. The Bill provides that the two State Governments of Andhra and Mysore should come to some amicable agreement about its management, control and what is to be done with it—the future additions and the present work and everything. But if that agreement is not arrived at, then the Bill reserves complete authority in the President to make suitable orders to ensure the proper control, management and working of the project in the interests of everybody concerned, all authorities concerned, and the President may issue proper orders. And the President, if he so desires and thinks appropriate, may issue some orders for joint authority. I mention

this joint authority because this House has now approved of the joint board—there is a Corporation in Jamodar, there is a joint board in Bhakra-Nangal, we have the same thing in contemplation in the Chambal project, in another State project the same thing is done. That is the example we have followed here.

Now, the next important matter or rather the last important matter to which I should like to refer is the question of division of assets and liabilities. That is dealt with in the Seventh Schedule and, speaking very broadly, in a majority of cases, you may even say in a vast majority of cases, we have taken the population proportion—36 per cent. for Andhra Desh, 1 1/3 per cent. for Mysore and 62 2/3 per cent. for the residuary State. But that is not feasible in every case. And we have had before us two examples by which we have governed ourselves, so to say. The previous examples of how the whole thing was carried out were the separation of Sind from Bombay and, later in 1936, of Orissa from Bihar. And we have gone on those precedents. The general rule is that so far as immovable property is concerned, wherever you get the property, well it goes with that area. If any property is situated in any Andhra District, whatever it is, it goes to Andhra. Similarly if any property is situated in Madras, it goes to Madras.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker**: Movable and immovable property?

**Dr. Katju**: So far as movable property is concerned, we have stores. I may mention here that the stores may be divided into two or three groups. Foodgrains and chemical manure: that is one. The second is a large group, may be going into crores, of stores ordered for specific projects: stores ordered for the Tungabhadra project and for the Mettur project—I am not quite familiar with all the projects going on there, everywhere. There are miscellaneous stores which are generally ordered and kept in the general godowns and then issued to the

[Dr. Katju]

several districts for district use. When I asked for a chief example of such stores, they said, stationery: pens, pencils, paper, etc. The second thing that was mentioned to me was about electrical goods, bulbs, etc., for use: not of very great value. So far as that is concerned, hon. Members will notice that there is a particular provision about unissued stores. Stores which have been issued have been issued and have gone to the various districts. I may add here that, to avoid any charge of, what you may call, a speedy handling of the stores, the Chief Minister of Madras has frozen the stores and stores have not been issued for some time now. They are there lying in the godowns. For their distribution we have suggested, in accordance with the precedents, that you do not take the population basis, but take the figures of the past three years and go by the averages.

A suggestion has been made—that is a general suggestion and the House will debate upon it—that for the division of assets and liabilities, you should appoint a regular sort of a Fiscal Commission, with an independent Judge as Chairman and that it should go into all the matters of assets and liabilities movables and immovables, book values, etc., then make up an account, debits and credits, and then come to a decision. I say that that has never been done. Secondly, we considered every aspect and came to the conclusion that that would be a highly inexpedient and unwise step to take. It would lead to unnecessary bickering, unnecessary commotion in the Secretariat. I repeat once again that my utmost anxiety and the anxiety of the Government of India is that the new Government should be firmly planted in the saddle and should immediately start with the work of the improvement of the State. So far as this *post mortem* examination is concerned, that would do no good. Please remember, it is not a question of mere examination into the present values. The moment you start this investigation, it may be said, well who contri-

buted to the revenues during the last 100 years; let us have a proportion; what was the revenue derived from the eleven districts or 12 districts; what was the revenue derived from the residuary State? You cannot have it both ways. You might say that the residuary State is rich and has been dealt with very favourably in the past. If it is rich, it has contributed to the revenues also. If Andhra Desh is poor, its contribution to the revenue has also been poor. If, there is an investigation, I do not know, it may go back to 50 years or 60 years, the proportion of the average revenue got from this State and the other State may come to be considered. The second head will be the expenditure. Rayalaseema is a famine area. Crops fail almost every second or third year. We know that something happened last year and there was tremendous suffering. I am told that the Madras Government have spent about five crores. They might say; you must take the expenditure into consideration: how much has been over-spent; if there has been famine, the money has come from the whole State. Therefore, our conclusion, after very great consideration over this matter, is that that step is, as I said, inexpedient and that it will not lead to any good results. It will be, in the national interests, a very undesirable step to take.

What is the present position? My hon. colleague the Finance Minister knows very well that Madras Government has got no money. It has done a very fine performance: it has been able to raise money from provincial loans. It gives me personally great pleasure that the people have got confidence in the Government and are willing to help themselves. But, at the present moment, in the treasury, there is no money. They have been asking the Finance Minister for help. I would suggest to the Andhra Government: you start with a clean slate; make a programme and say, we have not been properly dealt with, our development has been ignored in the past years, here is a

Five-Year Plan or a Six-Year Plan, and come for assistance to the Central Government. Every Government is now coming to the Centre for assistance. You may pitch your demand too high if you like. The Finance Minister will consider the whole thing and go into the matter. That is a much better course rather than fighting among themselves. When there is no money with the Madras Government, where will they pay from? You would not get anything from them. It is not a question of the decree being executed by the judgment creditor against a judgment debtor where it is known that the judgment debtor has not got any money.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram** (Visakhapatnam): Send him to jail.

**Dr. Katju:** It is not a justiceable matter. It is from that point of view that we came to the conclusion that this was really an inappropriate course.

I have dealt with practically all matters. It would be tedious for me to take the House into every clause. There is a sort of an omnibus clause which gives powers to the President to pass the necessary Orders for removing inequities and things of that description. If in the working out of the different provisions of the Bill, in the division of assets and liabilities, attention is drawn and a case is made out that the new State has been very hardly dealt with, I am certain that the President will intervene and will, probably with the willing co-operation of both the States, set matters right. There is this saving clause in the Bill.

Then there are the usual necessary provisions for contracts and liabilities. Most of it is formal and technical. One point has been made that the burden of contracts with which the residuary State will no longer be concerned should be thrown entirely upon the Andhra State and should not be thrown in any way upon the residuary State. Personally I think that we have made the necessary provision for that. But, this as well as the other points of detail which may arise in the course of the debate will be considered.

Lastly, I may deal with one matter. I find that my hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram has tabled a motion for the appointment of Select Committee. Personally I have no objection; I would have had no objection. But, we are all pressed for time. The appointed date is 1st of October. I am anxious that this Bill should be passed at an early date in this House. It has got to go to the other House. There some time will be taken. The Deputy-Speaker has allotted seven days for the passing of this Bill. We may discuss this matter here; I am always at the service of hon. Members who are taking an interest in this matter. You may consider all the amendments with me; if you like, every afternoon we can consider them. Otherwise, I speak without meaning any offence, it will not serve any purpose. I will tell you why.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** You have made up your mind?

**Dr. Katju:** I will never make up my mind.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Somebody makes it up for you.

**Dr. Katju:** Please remember that I am troubled by my past as an advocate. An advocate never makes up his mind right upto the last moment. Leaving that aside, what will be the position now? If we have about two days for general discussion and then the Select Committee sits, then when the Select Committee reports, undoubtedly, there will be a discussion just as we had on the Estate Duty Bill. Then I am certain that any amendment which my hon. friend and his friends are unable to carry in the Select Committee will be moved by them. Therefore, there will be no saving of time. What I am anxious is that we should proceed in the most friendly manner both on the floor of this House and outside and consider every amendment, push on with it and finish and bring this Bill to a close.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** You have heard what Mr. Nijalingappa said about the friendly manner.

**Dr. Katju:** I should like to bring these preliminary observations to a close with expressing the earnest hope, the devout hope, that this State which we are now starting and setting on its journey may have a most prosperous career and the hopes and aspirations which have been behind the sponsors of this State during the last thirty-five years may be fulfilled. Speaking as an Indian myself, having connections with various Provinces—I have a small connection not with Andhra but with Waltair and with Puri being very close to me—I feel a little sad because when I was in school to us speaking in our Indian Hindi language a Madrasi was an individual who came from below the Satpuras. I am only repeating my mistake. A Madrasi was any one who came from the South. We made no distinction between an Andhra and a Tamil or between a Malabari and a Travancorean. We treated all as Madrasis and I personally will have to reconcile myself into the division of Madras State into two parts. You are all very very happy now and I wish you all good luck. This two centuries old association among you is now coming to an end. I can only hope that you will part like friends and you will treat each other with real affection; there will be no bitterness left behind after the two States have separated; and, further, when after the 1st of October there will be many questions of common concern between the residuary Madras State and the Andhra State, I do hope and pray that all those questions will be approached and considered and decided in a spirit of mutual co-operation and trust, love and affection between them. Mr. Gopalan is determined to hate everybody. I cannot help it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion moved.

"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".

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I beg to move:

"That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Dr. Kailas Nath Katju, Shri Balwant Nagesh Datar, Shri R. Venkataraman, Shri S. V. Ramaswamy, Shri S. Nijalingappa, Shri C. R. Basappa, Shri B. Ramachandra Reddi, Dr. N. M. Jaisoorya, Shri Kadyala Gopala Rao, Shri Kotha Raghuramaiah, and the Mover, with instructions to report not later than the 22nd August, 1953."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** If you want to speak, you can do so, but let me announce to the House the decision of the Business Advisory Committee so far as the time is concerned. As it was referred to by the hon. Minister of Home Affairs, the Advisory Committee met regarding this matter and it was decided that seven full days should be allotted for getting through all the stages of the Bill. It is for the House to allocate the time. I would like to receive from hon. Members some indication as to who want to participate in the general discussion. So far as the clauses are concerned, they will adjust themselves. No names need be given. It is for the purpose of enabling me to allocate time to various Members. Is it the general desire that three days will be enough?

**Some Hon. Members:** Four days.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** If four days are given for general discussion, you may have no time for clauses. Then the time will be reduced to two days. During the third reading you may have some time. Therefore, three days seem to be reasonable for general discussion.

**Shri Ramachandra Reddi** (Nellore): Seven days will not be sufficient at all to have a complete and satisfactory discussion on this Bill. The preliminary discussion must at least be for four days. Clause-by-clause discussion and third reading must be at least for a week. It is, therefore, very necessary that eleven or twelve days should be allotted for this purpose, as all the sections of the House are anxious to speak on this Bill both at the general discussion stage and at the clause-by-clause discussion stage. It is but necessary that satisfaction should prevail on all sides of the House and a proper discussion should be held and then a decision, after discussion will have to be arrived at. In the end if extension of time is absolutely necessary, I do not think the House will demur to give that extension.

**The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs** (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): If necessary we shall make it eight days. A unanimous decision was taken that seven days would be sufficient for all the stages of the Bill.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I agree with my hon. friend, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, that a decision has already been taken—three days for general debate, three days for clauses, and one day for third reading. If my impression is correct, it was also agreed that half a day more will be given, that is, in the evening. I want your ruling on that.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Let us have three days for general discussion. We may devote four days for the clause-by-clause consideration. If, however, we want some more time for the third reading we can have a sitting in the evening and hold a second session from three to eight to carry on the discussion without encroaching on the Government's time. That is, exchange of compliments on the last day, and referring to various things. I shall consider that matter. That will not interfere with the other work of the House, but so far as these seven days are concerned, I believe that time-limit is enough, but

it is for the House to decide. If the House feels that this is hustling, I do not want to create that impression. The Advisory Committee's opinion is subject to the opinion of the House, from whichever section the advice might proceed. Therefore, I shall watch the proceedings. As advised at present, let us have three days for general discussion and then three days or four days, as the case may be, for clause-by-clause consideration and the last day, the seventh or the eighth day if necessary—not the eighth day, but the eighth sitting—for the third reading. That will be the present programme. I would invite hon. Members just gently to pass on to me chits, and I shall try to give as far as possible an opportunity to all sections of the House, to all Parties and Groups, to express their opinion on this matter.

**Shri Raghavachari** (Penukonda): May I mention the fact that tomorrow is not a whole day?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Why should he invite my opinion now? I have said full days.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I regret to say that I am not convinced by the arguments advanced by my hon. friend the Minister of Home Affairs with reference to my motion on the Order Paper relating to the reference of this Bill to a Select Committee. I would like to give my assurance to this House, and I am sure the House would not deny my *bona fides* in this matter, that it is not a dilatory motion on my part, to take the Bill farther away from today, and to straddle Government work. I feel very strongly that after four Legislative bodies have examined this Bill and made a series of recommendations, some of which were accepted by Government and incorporated in the present text of the Bill and most of them rejected, it is only necessary that this House should have an opportunity of examining at a very high technical level the implications of most of the clauses of this Bill. I feel, in particular, that this House in the general discussion or even in the

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

clause-by-clause stage cannot possibly hope to deal with the ramifications of the Seventh Schedule which is related to clauses 47, 48, 51, 52 and 66 which deal mostly with financial provisions, and with the vexed and all-important question, as far as Andhra is concerned, of the division of assets and liabilities. I do sincerely trust that the hon. the Home Minister would see his way to accept this motion of mine for reference of this Bill to the Select Committee in order that all these highly complicated and intricate matters are properly thrashed out and then brought before the House in the shape of conclusions. I will have occasion very soon in this debate to show why I suggest an examination by the Select Committee of this particular Bill, especially, as I have said, with reference to assets and liabilities. I will come to that later with your permission, but having made these few remarks in support of my motion, I would, with your permission and the permission of the House, address myself to the Bill proper.

It was in 1913 that the movement for the formation of an Andhra State was initiated. I thought I heard the hon. Home Minister say 1917. It was 1913.

**Dr. Katju:** I stand corrected.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Forty long years have gone by. As I look back now on the contemporary Andhra history—I am not old enough to pass observations thereon; I came rather late on the scene of Andhra politics—I can say with a sense of confidence and joy that for four long decades a succession of Andhra leadership has placed before 3½ crores of Andhra speaking people, wherever they are today in India, this one objective, viz., the re-unification of these Andhra people who are widely scattered in various administrative units, viz., Madras, Hyderabad, Orissa, Mysore, Madhya Pradesh etc., so that they can be regrouped together and cherish

their proud and emotional history of two thousand years. I give my assurance to my hon. friend the Home Minister that I am not saying this in order to widen the scope of the Bill. I am only trying to say that this Bill would be the first step in the direction of repairing the damage done to the fortunes of nearly four crores of Andhra people who are now scattered all over the country. I say, and I am sure I am not exaggerating, that this Bill has given this House an opportunity, a historic opportunity, of doing justice to various peoples in this sub-continent who are desirous of having their fortunes properly regulated. As I have said, I am not trying to widen the scope of the Bill, but I make these remarks in my capacity as the President of the All-India Linguistic States Conference only for one purpose, viz. that the time has gone past when King Canutes can push the waves back of popular sentiment. I do not wish to bring in any controversy into this discussion, but I cannot fail in my duty to pay my humble homage to the late Potti Srimamulu who was martyred for the cause of the establishment of this Andhra State. I only hoped, fervently, in those historic days of December last that better counsels would prevail with the Government of India and that our agonizing call for the prevention of the sacrifice of Potti Srimamulu would be heard. Unfortunately, it was not heard, with what consequences most of my hon. colleagues in this House know—the uprising of the people in demand of the State; and it was that uprising alone which has hastened the advent of this Bill, and also the immediate possible inauguration of the State. Having said this, I would like to address myself briefly to one or two main considerations relating to this Bill.

I have said earlier that for the first time since the Constitution of India was drafted, article 3 has not only been invoked, but is also sought to be

implemented through the medium of this Bill. I have said earlier four Legislative bodies, *viz.*, the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly of Madras State—composite Madras State—and the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly of the Mysore State have gone over this Bill for several days together. That itself is an important step in the direction of the broadening of the democratic basis of the governance of this country because the local opinion of people always must prevail, and nothing should be done or sought to be done from the Centre which will go directly against the expressed wishes—properly expressed wishes—of the people in various parts of the country.

The second point to which I would like to invite the attention of the House generally, is this. On the 27th July, an extraordinary situation developed in the Madras Legislative Assembly. Three Ministers of the composite Government of Madras State, *viz.*, the Minister for Local Administration, Mr. Shankara Reddy, the Minister for Public Works, Mr. Ranga Reddy, the Minister for Education, Dr. M. V. Krishna Rao—each one of them a Congressman of standing to my personal knowledge—actually walked out along with every one of the Andhra Members present as a protest against the decision of the Government of India, or the Government of Madras, to rush through with a snap vote to defeat certain amendments sought to be made in the Seventh Schedule to para. 12, sub-para (5). I make a reference to this in order to show that the history of the agitation, of the demand for the Andhra State, the history of the contemporary events...

**Shri Natesan (Tiruvallur):** May I observe that this observation that the Ministers walked out on the particular date is incorrect?

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I wish the alacrity with which my hon. friend Mr. Natesan stood up is based upon real facts. I have got here the cuttings from nearly twenty papers

every day pasted up, and I will make a present of these cuttings to Mr. Natesan, and he can see for himself who walked out, when, and for what purpose.

**An Hon. Member:** Papers are not documents.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** His own paper, the *Hindu*, not run by me or..

**Shri Natesan:** Again he is wrong. It is not my paper. It is the country's paper.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I am making a reference to this, in order to show to this House the vast mass of actual and potential stakes involved in this question of separation of the Andhra State from the residuary State of Madras. My hon. friend Dr. Katju said that he was sad, as an Indian, for the necessity on his part to reconcile himself with dealing with two States, the Andhra, and the non-Andhra, out of the composite State of Madras. I have written these words of his, and I hope I have not done him any injustice. In other words there is almost a lurking suspicion on the part of my hon. friend which makes him feel that the Andhras are on the war-path, and that they have no case.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Unnecessarily such inferences need not be drawn, when there is good intention.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** This is a very important question. I will not waste words, but I would like with your permission, to quote two important statements made by no less a person than Shri C. Rajagopalachari, one in the Madras Legislative Council, and the other in the Madras Legislative Assembly, justifying the necessity for the creation of an Andhra State. I am making a reference to these, in order to set at rest certain doubts raised by some very distinguished friends of mine from all sections of this House, both in the Lobby and outside, as to why we are demanding that an Andhra province should be created, bluntly suggesting thereby that we are something

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

like Pakistanis, demanding disintegration of this country.

**Shri Algu Rai Shastri** (Azamgarh Distt.—East *cum* Ballia Distt.—West): But who is opposing this?

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** This is what Shri C. Rajagopalachari said on the 27th July in the Madras Legislative Council.

"What the Andhras would say was just as India was happy when separated from the British Empire, the Andhras were feeling happy by what was called by Dr. John—one of the Members of the Madras Legislative Council—"as disintegration. Whatever might be the cause, once a large and intelligent body of people who have got feelings, education, understanding, pride and self-respect and everything else, felt that they were being ruled by another people, there is an end of goodwill. There is a conflict created which must be removed, and the only way to remove it is by granting a separate State. It was all right that a ruler was ruling over them; it was all right that Hyder Ali ruled heterogeneous provinces; it was all right that British Kings and the British Parliament ruled over them"—"them" meaning Andhras—"but when the common people took the rule into their own hands, once they imagine that a different set of people carried on the administration, it will be difficult to carry on."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Has the hon. Member got any apprehensions that anybody is opposing this Bill?

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Yes, Sir. That is exactly the point that I sought to make out. A number of friends have asked me why we are pressing for the separation of the Andhra State from the residuary Madras State. I thought I could refer to them the justification for the creation

of the Andhra State, by no less a person than Sri C. Rajagopalachari.

**Pandit K. C. Sharma** (Meerut Distt.—South): But this Bill was passed by the Madras Legislature, and so, is there any use referring to a remark made by the Chief Minister of Madras? It is hardly complimentary to them.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Because he apprehends there may be some opposition from some quarter.

**Shri Algu Rai Shastri:** He is grinding the ground *atta*!

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Immediately after that, Shri C. Rajagopalachari stated in the Madras Assembly—I shall quote to you again.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I wish to remind the hon. Member that I had suggested earlier to hon. Members to send in their names, if they want to speak, and I find that almost all hon. Members want to take part in this debate. I am really at a loss to find out how I have to adjust the time. Anyhow, I would request the hon. Member, who is in possession of the House, to conclude by eleven o'clock, so that more hon. Members can take part in the debate.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I am entirely in your hands, but what little indulgence can be given for the statement of the Andhra case, will be very much appreciated.

**Shri Algu Rai Shastri:** The Andhra case is already proved and accepted.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member started at 10-30 a.m. I am giving him some more time, because he has tabled a motion in his name. If he could conclude in about 20 minutes' time, I think it will be better.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy** (Salem): The hon. Member started at 10-20 A.M.



**Shri Raghuramajiah (Tenali):** If more time is given to the hon. Member because he has given notice of a motion in his name, then we would have done it too.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I thought the hon. Member might not press his motion. But it is open to any hon. Member to press his motion.

I shall give 15 to 20 minutes for the hon. Member who is on his legs now. Let us see.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I shall take your advice, and submit to your ruling. I was proceeding to give another quotation from Shri C. Rajagopalachari's speeches; I was making a reference to them, not to rake up any bitterness, but only to show how deep the feelings in Andhra Desa are.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** Only in your imagination.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** My hon. friend says, in my imagination.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Should the hon. Member reply to every interruption?

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** What can I do? When hon. Members interrupt, I have got to answer them.

I would make a broad proposition, and shall demonstrate that it was the pauperisation of the Andhra people, which was at the back of this demand for the Andhra State. Some of my hon. friends in this House might not possibly understand why I have said 'pauperisation' in such blunt, brutal and candid way. I shall give a few samples.

The provision for the entire district electrification scheme in the Andhra areas in.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I would request hon. Members to avoid these references, because it is not necessary to bring heat to the controversy now. Let us look ahead and see what has to be done.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** My whole argument is based on the Seventh 330 P.S.D.

Schedule, and for building up my argument, I would quote a few budget figures, and nothing else. At page 121 of the Budget Memorandum of the Madras Government for the year 1947-48, the following entries occur:

"Provision for the District Electrification Scheme of West Godavari district:

Rs. 7,000 for 1945-46.

Rs. 7,000 for 1946-47.

Rs. 8,000 for 1947-48.".....

**Pandit K. C. Sharma:** On a point of order, Sir. The Madras Government are not here to defend themselves. So what is the use of quoting these figures?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There is no harm. Let the hon. Member proceed with his arguments. He is now laying the foundation for demanding that the assets must be distributed to a larger extent to the Andhra State, than to the residuary Madras State.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** These are the three successive budget appropriations—monies which would not be sufficient even for white washing this august Chamber.

Then, Shri C. Rajagopalachari gave the following figures to the Madras Legislative Assembly on 23rd July, 1953, as regards the availability of Andhras as administrative personnel:

	Total Madras	Andhra
The Indian Service of Engineers	7	None
The Indian Forest Service	17	1
Indian Police	23	3
The Indian Police Service	27	6
Officiating D.S.P.'s	30	8
Deputy Superintendents of Police	126	40
Deputy Collectors.....	Surplus of Andhra Officers.	

I do not want hon. Members to run away with the impression that it

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

is a matter of loves and fishes, jobs for Andhras, which is at the back of this movement.

I shall then proceed to give you examples of the financial stewardship of the composite Madras Government, for the past three or four years. The closing cash balance of the composite State of Madras was Rs. 348 lakhs on the 31st of March, 1949. It became a minus balance of Rs. 223 lakhs on 31st March, 1953. The securities and cash balances, investment account and reserve fund were Rs. 4,270 lakhs on the 31st of March 1949. On 31st March 1953, it was a mere trickle, Rs. 59 lakhs, as compared with Rs. 4,270 lakhs earlier. And what is the position today?

Taxes	Rs. 61.76 crores
Security Head	Rs. 13.90 crores
Public borrowings	Rs. 400 lakhs.

All this comes to Rs. 80 crores in a single year, which is comparable to the total Budget of undivided India before the Second World War. All this money has gone away, and today we are asked to share debits, liabilities and debts. That is exactly my complaint.

I am making a reference to these things, because the Seventh Schedule is the most important for us. My hon. friend Dr. Katju has put out of court the suggestion of the Andhra people for an expert committee to investigate these questions, even though it was backed by a resolution of the Madras Legislative Assembly.

I am sure the House will give me a little more indulgence to place before it certain facts. Everything is from the Madras Government records. I have not got them manufactured here. The Partition Council in paragraph 20 of the annexure to its report had suggested a special cash grant of ten crores of rupees for Andhra. But today I have to begin my State with no money and with encumbrances and liabilities for which the entire responsibility is that of the composite Government of Madras.

**Shri B. Das (Jajpur-Keonjhar):** It was Mr. Prakasam's fault. Why did he not accept it in 1949?

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** There is a jumble of principles in the Seventh Schedule concerning Andhra as regards the division of assets and liabilities. One principle is division of assets on the basis of location. The other principle, as my hon. friend, Dr. Katju, stated, is on the population basis. And each one is knocking the other out. I will give examples here as to the manner in which even the Government of India, instead of remaining neutral, had become partisan. I am referring to the Tungabhadra Project. Before me I have got a Bill as introduced in the Madras Legislature and also the Mysore Legislature. At page 35 of the Bill an extraordinary statement occurs which has completely disappeared from the text of the Bill which is before this House. It will be noticed that the total capital expenditure sanctioned for the Tungabhadra Project was of the order of Rs. 27.64 crores of which by the end of March this year Rs. 16.53 crores were already spent and the balance of expenditure yet to be incurred is 11.1 crores. That is, Rs. 16½ crores of money has already been spent. What does the Bill presented to the Madras and Mysore Legislatures say? "This expenditure", I am quoting, "is deemed to be incurred by the Andhra State". I do not know why that provision has been dropped from this particular Bill which is before this House. At one time, and you are aware of it, Sir, there was an entry in the Parliamentary Bulletin about the Tungabhadra Project Bill. That also, I understand, has disappeared. I am not satisfied that this sort of accounting, both by the Madras Government and by the Government of India, will satisfy the Andhra people. I am a reasonable person and I want justice to be done. Supposing, for argument's sake, we have to divide with Mysore the Tungabhadra Project, we will get rupees six to seven crores cash and I can begin my State with an assurance that there is no dearth of

money. But what is done? We have to wait for two years and then the President will issue an Order. I have never come across another instance where the Central Government, which is responsible for every section of the people of this vast sub-continent, has behaved in this manner.

Mr. Justice Wanchoo had a very important remark to make on this, and I repeat it with a full sense of responsibility—the pauperisation of the Andhra people. I am quoting from page 38 of the Wanchoo Report: "There will be nothing available for ways and means purposes for the new State". Well, my friends, especially from south of Madras City are naturally upset.

**Dr. Krishnaswami** (Kancheepuram): They are all pleased.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram**: I will give some examples about the question of the division of assets and liabilities on the twin principles of location and population. I have before me here worked out certain random figures, and all the references I am giving are from the Budget Memorandum of the Madras Government for the year 1953-54, which is obviously the latest available to us. There is no road transport scheme at all in the Andhra State, whereas in the residuary State of Madras the road transport scheme is shown to have a value of Rs. 127 lakhs. I invite the attention of the hon. Home Minister to what happens to the Andhra area by the application of this principle. Let us take electricity. In 1950 it was estimated that the investment on electricity in the Andhra areas was Rs. 2.85 crores and in the non-Andhra area Rs. 14.99 crores. I will give you the latest figures from the Madras Budget Memorandum. The appropriation for 1952-53 is Rs. 48 lakhs for Andhra against Rs. 125 lakhs for the residuary State of Madras. I have got here the figures for capital outlay on industrial development, interest on debt services, expenditure on debt services and I can go on multiplying these items *ad infinitum*. I do sincerely trust my hon. friend, the Home Minister, once he

examines these figures, will see the reasonableness of the demand for an expert Committee to go into these matters. Let there be no decision announced before the formation of the Andhra State on the appointed day. But let justice be done and let not the Government of India proceed on a partisan basis.

The Dhar Committee, at page 86 of its report, had some remarks to make. It was a Committee appointed in the name of the Constituent Assembly by the then President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad. I do not know why the Government of India has got such an easy conscience over a report of that character. This is what the Dhar Committee said:

".....to estimate assets at their market price, and divide them between the two separating parts on population or revenue basis and compensating the losing province by payment in cash".

What happened to this recommendation of the Dhar Committee? Why was it appointed in the name of the Constituent Assembly? These are questions to which my hon. friend, the Home Minister, and also my friends from the Tamil Nad should care to give answer to me.

**Dr. Krishnaswami**: We will certainly give you.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram**: I have got here worked out fully some of the most extraordinary things which have happened in the Madras Finance Secretariat which alone has supplied figures to Chief Justices Wanchoo and Misra or to the Government of India. I will give two choice examples. At page 3 of the Budget Estimates for 1953-54 of the Madras Government, item 17, the following entries are to be found:

"Interest on works (irrigation, etc.)  
Andhra Rs. 1,27,15,900

Residue of Madras Rs. 1,27,15,000."

I am not given to cheap raillery, but I am sure the House will bear with me if I put questions on these accounts which are the basis for separation of Andhra. Could these figures be exactly

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

identical between Andhra and non-Andhra? Could these figures be at all correct? How are these brought about? When one non-Andhra officer was attached as assessor to Mr. Justice Wanchoo, a demand was made that there should be a duplicate officer for Andhra interests. But it was turned down. I would not like to say more than this. It is an extraordinary position.

I will quote from the preface to the Budget Memorandum as the last point on this particular issue. "Figures for Telugu districts have been worked out in consultation with the Heads of Departments who are largely guided by the figures of the respective treasuries in the past few years". I am prepared to make a bold statement: the figures of separation submitted to the Madras Legislature a few months ago do not give figures for a series of years. And yet this bald statement is made in the preface.

"In respect of transactions which cannot be traced to district treasuries and of budgets of a common nature for the whole State, the allocation between Telugu areas and non-Telugu areas has been made on the basis of population according to the 1951 census."

There must be equity. I do not want anything more than equity. Let justice seem to be done also. I am sure this House would bear with me when I say that a proper investigation by an outside authority should be conducted. Let it be any agency appointed by the Government, even without representation from Andhra, to go into this question.

I have got here a series of letters sent to me by no less a person than Mr. T. Viswanatham. I will end up this point with these.

**An Hon. Member:** He is also an Andhra.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Shri Viswanatham was formerly Leader of the Opposition and one of the Advisers now,

we understand, to Mr. Trivedi, the Special Officer for Andhra who is to be the Andhra Governor. He has asked for information as to the manner in which certain items, certain assets and liabilities are located. I am quoting from the letters of Mr. S. Venkateswaran, I. C. S., Additional Secretary to Government, and who was assessor to Mr. Justice Wanchoo.

"In your letter cited you referred to the proposal that stores, articles and other goods should remain the property of the State in which they are situated and you wanted to know what kind of stores, articles and goods are covered by the proposal."

I do not mean any injustice to him when I read only the replies.

"You have also asked for a statement showing the various places where the 'unissued stores' are kept, the quantity, value and categories of stores in the various districts, the loans and advances made by the Government to Local Bodies, Societies or Agriculturists and which are outstanding for recovery, for each district separately."

I am again quoting:

"I am directed to say that the collection of these particulars will take a great deal of time and entail considerable labour which will not be commensurate with the value of the information obtained."

I have got several other letters addressed to Mr. Viswanatham which were received by him in reply to his letters asking for information and facts relating to the location of assets and liabilities etc. This is the reason why we, at any rate, from the Andhra Desa are most particular that an impartial and neutral committee should go into and investigate these. I do not think that any hon. Member will think it unreasonable. I am buttressed in this demand by the vote taken in the Madras Legislative Assembly which is entirely in favour of an investigation of this character,

Before I go to the next point or two, Sir, with your permission, I would like to state that today some 1,20,000 tons of ammonia manures are in the Central pool in Madras. Does Andhra get credit for a share of it? My information is that there are about three lakh tons of rice in the Central pool. Do we get credit for it?

**An Hon. Member:** You will get it.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** These are some of the points.

**An Hon. Member:** Anyway you will get the manure.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Without it you cannot get any rice from Andhra.

At page 93 of the Budget Memorandum for 1953-54, the Grants to Universities are shown as follows:

"Madras University—6½ lakhs plus Annamalai University—7 lakhs"

That is 13½ lakhs, and Andhra gets four lakhs. I can go on like this.

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):** What about the previous years?

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** This question of assets and liabilities is very important question and justice should be done.

I would like to tell the hon. Home Minister that I am asking for a reference to an expert committee because all these can be debated upon, the assistance of officers will be there, all the sides can be represented. We want justice and pure justice and nothing more or nothing less.

**Dr. Katju:** What good will it do?

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Having said that, I would try to conclude my speech by making a reference to one or two small issues and I hope the House will give me an opportunity to speak more when the clause-by-clause discussion comes. I was really surprised at the facile manner in which the hon. Home Minister touched upon the location of the temporary capital. The votes were taken by the Convention or whatever it is of the Andhra members of the Madras Legislative Assembly. I am

quoting from the proceedings of the Madras Legislative Assembly. The decision was taken on June 5 by the Andhra Members of the Assembly and later on it was voted on by the Madras Assembly.

I regret to say that the Government of India has not been impartial in the approach to this question. According to the estimates of Mr. Lobo Prabhu, the Special Officer deputed by the Government of Madras, Rs. 95 lakhs ought to be spent and yet the temporary capital will not be ready. Up to date 40 lakhs have already been granted as a loan by the Central Government. Here are the proceedings:

"Speaker (of the Madras Assembly): Is the resolution of the Andhra Members or the Convention binding on this House.

**Shri Viswantham:** I say it is binding.

**Shri Rajagopalachari:** I would like for the information of the House to say so far as this issue is concerned we are both on common ground that it does not form part of the Seventh Schedule. I must give notice to the members speaking about it, that members of the residuary State, should not take part in the discussion or in the voting, so that their position may be understood clearly."

11 A.M.

The Speaker said that it was "not a session but only an informal meeting of the Andhra members." The Speaker again said that it was a meeting of the Andhra members of the Assembly and it was not a meeting of the Assembly. The only point I want to impress upon the Government of India was the manner in which the decision for the location of the temporary capital was sought to be reached. Geography is against it. The whole of Andhra Desa is against it. I come from Visakhapatnam and my constituency asked me not to sponsor Visakhapatnam as a temporary capital. Some of you might ask, "Why have you given notice of an amendment?" I am only trying to revive the recommendation of Justice

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

Wanchoo. Vijaywada is the focal point. Let not Government be frightened by any political party and run away from it. I say, as a Member from the Visakhapatnam constituency that I secured a mandate from my voters that Vijaywada should be the capital.

Sir I thank you and I hope I will have further opportunity to speak when we go to the clauses.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Amendment moved:

"That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Dr. Kailas Nath Katju, Shri Balwant Nagesh Datar, Shri R. Venkataraman, Shri S. V. Ramaswamy, Shri S. Nijalingappa, Shri C. R. Basappa, Shri B. Ramachandra Reddi, Dr. N. M. Jaisoorya, Shri Kadyala Gopala Rao, Shri Kotha Raghuramalah and the Mover, with instructions to report not later than the 22nd August, 1953."

**Shri Nanadas** (Ongole—Reserved—Sch. Castes): May I know whether the Mover has taken the consent of these Members?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Certainly the Mover must have had the consent of the various Members before their names are put down. If he has not done so already he will get it now.

**Shri Natesan:** May I make a submission, Sir? I do not know when I will get an opportunity to speak. But I do not want the House to be carried away by the impression or the misleading statement made by Dr. Lanka Sundaram in saying that three Ministers went out of the Madras Assembly. I would like to give a correct version so that the hon. Members may have an idea of the background.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member is an old parliamentarian. He takes possession of the House much earlier than he is called. I will try to give opportunities to all sections. There are Andhras interested in it, at whose instance the Andhra province is coming into being, there are Members of

the Tamil Nad which is the residuary province and Karnataka, Mysore with Bellary added to it. There are also Members from Malabar in the composite province. Generally the whole House is interested. I will try to distribute the time; it is rather difficult.

**Shri Natesan:** I just want to correct the impression.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member will have his own opportunity to make the correction. Whether three Ministers went out or five Ministers went out, it is not going to affect it here in this House.

**Shri Natesan:** It is not correct, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He insists that his statement is correct.

**Shri Venkataraman** (Tanjore): May I just ask whether it is a general discussion or a discussion on the motion for reference to the Select Committee.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There will not be a separate general discussion. Whoever wants to speak will address himself both to the motion for reference to the Select Committee as also to the general motion.

**Shri Venkataraman:** The residuary State of Madras is very happy and it shall do all in its power to hasten and expedite the formation of the Andhra State and for that purpose we oppose the motion for reference to the Select Committee. We do not want even a few days' delay that may be caused by a reference to the Select Committee.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** The cat is out of the bag.

[SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTY in the Chair]

**Shri Venkataraman:** Dr. Lanka Sundaram's speech reminded me of one of the suits for partition in a partnership. Usually, the acts of commission and omission of the partnership are added on the remaining partner when one of the partners goes out of the partnership. It is in that spirit the speech has been conceived and delivered. Since the charge that the State of Madras has been very unfair to the Andhra

has been stated and repeated very often I wish to place on record a few facts, as briefly as I can, so that the House may get and the country may also get a correct picture of what has happened.

The Andhra State when it is formed will have an irrigated area of 27 lakhs of acres. The residuary State of Madras will have an irrigated area of 18 lakhs of acres. Of these 18 lakhs of acres, eight lakhs were irrigated by the schemes of irrigation started by the Chola kings in the tenth and eleventh Century A. D.

**Shri B. S. Murthy:** And by the Andhra kings in the third Century B. C

**Shri Venkataraman:** My learned friend will read history better.

In regard to irrigation, since 1946—because I do not wish to go into the history of the period during which the State was under British administration—the total amount sanctioned and works taken up in Andhra area is to the tune of Rs. 23 crores. The total amount sanctioned and works taken up in the residuary State is only Rs. 22 crores, the actual expenditure between the period 1946 and the financial year 1953 is Rs. 17 crores in Andhra—my learned friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram will kindly hear what I am saying because he made a charge that the Andhras have been treated unfairly—as against Rs. 14 crores in the residuary State. The result is that today you find that the capital expenditure so far as the Andhra State is concerned is Rs. 29.1 crores and the total expenditure on capital works on irrigation in the residuary State is Rs. 24.7 crores. They constitute 36 per cent. of the population and I ask the House now to judge whether the State of Madras has been unfair to one of its component parts.

Take again food, Andhras, as a result of this, would be in surplus to the tune of three lakh tons and the residuary State of the Madras would be in deficit to the tune of ten lakh tons. My learned friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram, dealt with the question of reserves. He spoke passionately and said that in the

year 1946—that is on 31st December—we had Rs. 40 crores as revenue reserves.

**Shri B. S. Murthy:** Why is 1946 taken?

**Shri Venkataraman:** That is the period from which we are responsible. The period up to that we were under the British administration. By 'we' I mean, Tamils, the Andhras, the Keralas and the Kannadigas.

So far as revenue reserves are concerned, my learned friend said that on the 31st of December 1946 we had Rs. 40 crores. It is true. Along with this I shall take the borrowings of the State of Madras between 1949 and 1952 and give you the picture. The total amount of the revenue reserves and the amount of borings comes to Rs. 72 crores. Out of this Rs. 72 crores, the expenditure on Andhra portion is Rs. 31½ crores, which is more than 44 per cent. It is, as I said, more than 36 per cent. which the population would warrant.

Then my learned friend referred to electricity schemes. He said that the electricity schemes in the residuary State have been greater and that the electricity schemes in the Andhra State have been very poor. It is true that owing to certain natural advantages, certain electricity schemes like Pykhara and the Mettur Dam were started earlier. But the first scheme to provide Andhra with the largest amount of electricity was started in Machkund in 1940. Other considerations delayed it and, therefore, it was taken up only in 1946. If the Machkund project which is nearing completion comes into operation the Andhra State will have 1,20,000 kw from Machkund and 30,000 from Tungabhadra, as against 46,000 kw. from Pykhara and 40,000 from Mettur which the residuary State receives. I do not see how the State of Madras has been unfair to the Andhras.

I want to dispel any wrong impression that may be created by friends on the other side. If they want more money, let us join together and ask the Central Government.....

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Rob Peter to pay Paul.

**Shri Venkataraman:**.....but let us not try to throw stones at each other, while really there are no grounds for doing so.

Then take the case of roads. The total mileage of roads which Andhra possesses is 15 thousand miles and the residuary State of Madras 24,000 miles.

**Shri B. S. Murthy:** That is not correct. May I know the source of my hon. friend's information?

**Shri Venkataraman:** I do not wish to weary the House by going through the whole list of figures. I am only anxious to show that if there is any complaint at all it is not against the residuary State of Madras, but it must be laid at somebody else's door. The residuary State of Madras was administered not by the Tamils, not by the Malayalees, not by the Kannadigas, but by the Andhras in collaboration with the others in the State. In fact, during the period about which my learned friend complained—that is, from 1949 to 1952—when the revenue reserves are said to have been trifled away, it was Mr. Gopala Reddy, an Andhra, who was the Finance Minister of the State of Madras. How can any charge be laid against the residuary State when actually both of us have jointly worked the State to the best advantage of the State as we then thought fit. Now it has been suggested that the accounts must be reopened—I do not know how long; I would even suggest that you may go as far back as 1858. To ask for a re-examination of the accounts and make allegations is to ask for trouble, ask for more bitterness, is to ask for something which is going to permanently endanger the friendly relations which we want to have in the future.

The residuary State of Madras is dependent on Andhra in a number of matters. We want the new Andhra State to help us in every possible way. We do not want to stand in the way of the Andhra State having all that they have a right to and all that they

can get according to the well known canons of administration. Therefore, I beg to submit that this House at least should absolve the residuary State of Madras of any partiality, of any unfair treatment, of any prejudice towards the Andhra State.

Now, I will proceed to a few other points which arise out of the Bill. The hon. Home Minister has said that a boundary commission will be appointed to straighten out the boundaries and that he does not think it necessary to provide for it in the Bill. We are not concerned whether it is provided in the Bill or not. But we are anxious that some boundary commission should be appointed and the disputed areas—there are some claims by the Tamils with regard to Tiruttani in Chittoor district, and there are counter-claims by Andhras in other areas—settled. Whether it is done in pursuance of an amendment to this Bill or by virtue of powers which the Central Government always has, we do not very much mind. We are thankful to the hon. Home Minister for making a clear statement that a boundary commission would be appointed.

Then with regard to some of the matters contained in this Seventh Schedule viz. division of assets and liabilities, I beg to submit that there have been serious deviations from the well-known principles which have been accepted by the Central Government and by this House. For instance, with regard to the division of the share of income-tax and excise duties, the Finance Commission has recommended that the entire excise duties and 80 per cent. of the income-tax should be divisible on the population basis and 20 per cent. of the income-tax should be divided on the basis of collection. Unfortunately, in the Seventh Schedule the whole of the amount of excise duties and income-tax is made divisible on the basis of population. I should ask the Government the reason why they have deviated from a principle which has been accepted with regard to division of taxes in respect of Bengal, Bihar or U. P. The principle



adopted is that 80 per cent. of the income-tax and entire excise-duty is divided on the population basis and the balance of 20 per cent. in income-tax is divided on the basis of collection. In the case of Madras this principle has been given a go-by and the entire amount for the future years is made divisible on the basis of population. This will create difficulty to the residuary State and it should be corrected.

The second principle which has been deviated from is this. The Central Road Fund is constituted out of a tax on motor spirit. The Central Road Fund is allocated to the various States on the basis of the consumption of taxed motor-spirit in that area. Now there is a certain amount of reserve in the Central Road Fund to the credit of the Madras State. My suggestion is that it should be divisible between the Madras State and the Andhra State on the basis of the consumption of motor-spirit in accordance with the resolution of this House passed on 14th April 1950 which confirms the previous resolution of the Constituent Assembly (Legislative) passed in 1947. I do not know why that principle has been deviated from in respect of the Central Road Fund.

Then, the third deviation is in respect of compensation for buildings. We are asked to pay to the Andhra State a sum of Rs. 2,30.4 lakhs as compensation for buildings. The principle enunciated in the first paragraph of the Seventh Schedule is that immoveable property, should go to that State in which it is situated. Now certain immoveable properties are situated in the City of Madras and naturally will go to the State of Madras. Payment of compensation is against the very principle enunciated in paragraph 1 of the Seventh Schedule viz. immoveable property situated in the territories of one State will go to that State.

Secondly, there is no precedent for paying such compensation. Sind separated from Bombay; Orissa separated from Bihar; on those previous occasions there has been no precedent of paying any compensation.

Thirdly, it is a bad precedent for the future. We are going to have a redistribution of the States and then the Kerala people from Malabar also want to divide from the residuary State of Madras. Where shall we go? It is a wrong principle and it will give rise to claims and counter-claims which will put the Government of India in very great difficulty.

Lastly, my submission is this. We had money at the time when the Partition Committee agreed to pay rupees one crore. There was a balance of Rs. 40 crores then. Now, today there is no money. We have only liabilities to share. It will be rather hard on the State of Madras to say that they must bear this Rs. 2.34 crores and pay to the Andhra State.

I will only touch one more subject before I close and that is with regard to services. Now, the hon. Home Minister looked at the services from the administrative point of view. He did not look at the question from the point of view of those people who are employed, that is, the employees. I shall place the point of view of the employees before this House.

It is true that All India Services should be allocated according to the wishes of the President and they must serve wherever they are posted. But there are certain traditions in services viz. that the senior man is not overlooked unless he is otherwise incompetent. There are certain rules with regard to promotion and appointment to key posts. I am sorry to say this that certain speeches of Andhra politicians have created a suspicion in the minds of the members of the services that because they are non-Andhras they may not get their due promotion in the services. The hon. Home Minister ought to have satisfied us by a statement in this House that the interest of those non-Andhras who are allotted to the State of Andhra would be always looked after by the Central Government.

Then with regard to the subordinate services, that is State Services. These people have to go and work in Andhra State for three years as the hon. Minis-

[Shri Venkataraman]

ter says, and two years as I am going to suggest, and one year as the Madras Assembly has already suggested. As far as the Madras Government is concerned for two years, they may not make any recruitment; they may not fill up any vacancy and they will be looking to the Andhra State as to when and how they will return these officers. If we know that at the end of a specified period the persons, whose services have been lent, or who are sent on deputation, will go back then it would be possible for the residuary State of Madras to make arrangements in that respect but if we do not know and if we are asked to wait for a period of three years, then the administration of the residuary State will seriously suffer. Therefore, I would submit to the hon. Minister that he may consider as alternative to one year suggested by the Madras Assembly, two years suggested by me. The period may be reduced to two years.

I have only to say that we are all very very happy that this Bill is going through with the good wishes not only of the people of the residuary State of Madras but the people of the whole of India.

**Shri Ramachandra Reddi:** At the outset, I must express my inability to agree with Dr. Lanka Sundaram in his suggestion to refer this Bill to a Select Committee. He has been a member of the Business Advisory Committee and he has taken part in fixing the time-limit for the discussion of this Bill. According to him and according to the Deputy-Speaker, a seven days' limit has been fixed. Now he comes forward with the proposition that the discussion should be continued or that the Bill should be kept in abeyance for a longer time. In fact, it is very necessary in the interest of both the Andhra State and the residuary State of Madras that the matter should be expedited as early as possible. First of October having been made the date on which the Andhra State should be formed, there should be no avoidable delay in the passing of this Bill which will certainly

have to be taken into consideration when forming the new State.

It is heartening to welcome this Bill into this House. This is a culmination of nearly 40 years of agitation on the part of the Andhras. Latterly, in the last few years every linguistic area has been asking for a separate province of its own and the entire matter has been expedited, I think, by this Government which has already made an announcement to that effect. The proper working of this new State, governed by the new Bill, depends upon the proper working and cooperation of so many areas which are going to be formed into linguistic provinces. It is therefore necessary that the representatives of all linguistic areas should look upon this as a forerunner of any reform which has got to be followed in the formation of new provinces on a linguistic basis. And it is therefore very necessary that the cooperation of all the representatives of the several linguistic areas should be given and that the Bill should be passed in such a manner that it will be agreeable to all sections of the House. There is no reason for excitement, and much less for incitement, in this House. All hon. Members have got their own responsibilities to discharge, and when most of the hon. Members are anxious to form their own linguistic provinces it behoves them to keep a very calm mind and see that things are properly conducted on the floor of this House.

It has to be mentioned that every stage of the struggle for Andhra there has been some mutilation of the population or other of the region or of its assets. In 1937, when Orissa Province was formed, a portion of Andhra was cut off and added on to Orissa. The J. V. P. Report has completely given the go-by to Andhra having any share in Madras City itself. The Mishra Report recently has stipulated that Bellary town and three other *firkas*, which are still contested, should go to Karnataka or rather to the Mysore State. There is also the prospect of mutilating Chittoor district and the agitation is still going on there. But for the

timely action taken by the Madras Government, probably the agitation would have gone on in a greater intensity. It is also true that a large number of villages in Chingleput district, which is now considered to be an undisputed Tamil area, want that they should be tacked on to the Andhra area and they do not want to be in the Tamil area.

Apart from all these things, there has been a further mutilation of the finances that are to accrue to the Andhra State. The deletion of the reserve fund is one of them. Apart from all these things I must mention that a lot of goodwill has been mutilated between the two States. We require that goodwill should continue between Andhra and Tamil Nad, and also between Andhra and the new Karnataka State, so that in the development of all these provinces there can be amity and concord between the several States and there will be a possibility for all the States to develop themselves in a proper manner. In the administration of the adjoining provinces it is very necessary that a greater amount of cooperation should prevail and a proper understanding of each other's views should also prevail.

But unfortunately the recent discussions, both in the Madras Assembly and in the Mysore Assembly, have excited certain sentiments and they have given rise to suspicions. Even Mysore, which had very little to do with the combined province and which perhaps is going to have a very little share of the spoils, has excited itself and has given certain propositions which have to be properly examined.

It is pointed out that there are still certain matters on which a proper understanding is necessary. No doubt the discussions in the several Assemblies and also the view point that has been taken by the Central Government have mellowed down the severity of the controversy that has been raging elsewhere.

In spite of all this there are a few aspects of this Bill which require further consideration. Some observations

have been made by both Dr. Lanka Sundaram and Mr. Venkataraman about the division of assets under Schedule Seven. There is an amount of suspicion in the minds of the Andhras that they have not been given their due. It is equally possible that in their minds the Tamil brethren might be thinking that the Andhras are given more than what they deserve. It is therefore very necessary that an impartial Committee should go into the matter. It is not a matter in which Parliament can make a decision without knowing full facts. It is also not a matter in which the Central Government can come to conclusions without examining the question in greater detail. It is therefore suggested, and very seriously too, that a Committee, whether it is a judicial Committee or an administrative Committee, should be appointed to go into these details on such terms as the Central Government might stipulate and see that the matter is closed. They might stipulate terms regarding the period during which these assets will have to be assessed and also the qualities and quantities of stores that are available for distribution. The Andhras would not ask for the division of pins and penknives and such other small stores. There are bigger items which have to be looked into and which have to be properly assessed and divided. For that purpose, neither this House as it is constituted nor the Central Government with the meagre information that it may possess, is competent to look into the matter. I therefore seriously suggest that a Committee may be appointed. I do not mind if it is a Judicial Committee. But for administrative reasons, if the matter is to be expedited, an administrative Committee may be set up.

I will make a specific suggestion also. Mr. Trivedi has now been appointed as the Administrative Officer for Andhra. He is going to be the Governor of Andhra shortly. He might be asked to go into the matter with the assistance of two able administrators, one from Andhra and the other from Tamil Nad. We have got several experienced administrators who, though they have re-

[Shri Ramachandra Reddi]

tured from service, have not yet retired from public life. They are still capable of giving assistance and advice to any impartial administrative tribunal. In fact, this is a very modest suggestion which I commend to my Tamilian brethren also. If they resist, it would only mean that there is something suspicious about the whole affair. If they agree, we should only think that friendliness is offered from the other side also. I do not therefore propose to go into the details of the Seventh Schedule. I leave it at that.

A boundary commission has been suggested by the Central Government to go into the question of allocating certain areas between State and State. If a commission is to be appointed by the local Governments, for deciding these problems of boundary, I am afraid it will never come up. I am afraid a solution will not be easily possible. It is therefore suggested that the Centre should take the initiative in forming that commission either for particular localities or for the entire area, especially when the Andhra province is going to be formed. For instance, there is a great demand for the inclusion of Hyderabad so that Visal Andhra may be formed. Whether it is possible or feasible, it is not a matter which can be discussed at this stage. It all depends on how the boundary commission, if and when it is to be appointed by the Government, is going to decide or advise the Central Government.

In Bellary, a peculiar situation has arisen after Justice Misra has reported on the matter. Three firkas and Bellary town are said to be Andhra areas. That is disputed by our Kannadiga friends. Even Justice Misra said that nothing short of a plebiscite would be able to solve this question. I ask the Central Government why they should not undertake it. There is no insuperable difficulty. It is only a question of three firkas, a few villages, a small population that have to be gone into. A plebiscite which is supposed to be the most democratic method of deciding things is suggested.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore):** Why not in other areas also?

**Shri Ramachandra Reddi:** If it is a question of extending the plebiscite to other areas, I have absolutely no objection. Let us start with Bellary first. Let us first set at naught all suspicions and difficulties that are involved in this problem. I therefore very strongly urge that the Bellary question should be decided by a plebiscite and not by the decision of a Judge or a Commission. Because, the matter has assumed such proportions that it cannot be ignored. In fact, the suggestion is that only villages contiguous to this territory or that territory should be taken into consideration. Pockets remaining in other areas need not be touched at all. Therefore, it should be a simple proposition for an attempt which can be easily made by the Central Government to set at naught all the suspicions entertained and agitations that are being carried on.

**Mr. Chairman:** Three minutes more.

**Shri Ramachandra Reddi:** I do not know how a time limit has been fixed for this Bill.

**Mr. Chairman:** It has already been explained in this House that 15 to 20 minutes will be the time-limit. You have been speaking from 11-22. At 11-42, you will please end.

**Shri Ramachandra Reddi:** I was not aware of the time calculation, especially on a Bill like this. Therefore, I have to cut short some of the remarks that I wish to make on this occasion.

The question of services has been touched by Mr. Venkataraman and it has also been adumbrated in the Bill under consideration. We do not in any manner come in the way of the proper allocation of the services. But, the very spirit in which the Andhra agitation has been going on was to secure jobs to the Andhras in their own areas. If there has been a particular weightage on one side all along, that will have to be remov-

ed. A compromise for one or two years would not matter very much; but both the States must be in a position to agree for such compromises.

The Tungabhadra project is another question which requires careful consideration. The Tungabhadra project was originally conceived for developing the Rayalaseema area.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** Bellary also.

**Shri Ramachandra Reddi:** At that stage, Bellary was part of Rayalaseema. Before this scheme is seriously taken up and completed, the whole of the Tungabhadra area is going to be tacked on to the Mysore State. If the development conceived at one time has to be totally achieved, the high-level channel which is proposed to irrigate a large portion of Anantapur also must be stipulated before any such Commission or Committee or Corporation is appointed.

I find that no provision has been made in the Bill about the constitution of a Public Service Commission. Under the Constitution, each State or more than one State can have one Public Service Commission. I find that no such provision has been made; nor is there any indication that a separate Bill will be brought up by the local Legislature.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** I do not think that is necessary because what is contained in the Constitution will come into operation immediately the State comes into being.

**Shri Ramachandra Reddi:** Another matter which I would simply mention—I do not have the time to say anything about it—is the constitution of the Upper House in Andhra. So far only 140 Assembly Members are there in the Andhra area. It is probably thought that it is unwise to have an Upper House in a State where there are only 140 Assembly Members. According to the recent proposals that have been made, there will be

196 Members in the Andhra State. The question of having an Upper House in the Andhra State will also have to be re-opened.

As regards the capital, there is a difference of opinion among the Andhras themselves. Fortunately, my hon. Tamilian friends have no option in that and they need not be worried about that. The Andhra themselves have not been able to come to any definite decision about the location of the capital. The local members of the Madras Legislature, belonging to the Andhra area, had at one time proposed in favour of Kurnool. Later on, there have been certain other changes and political parties, jumbling up themselves into several groups, seem to suggest a different capital altogether. Mention has been made about the temporary nature of the capital at Kurnool and it is said that any amount spent upon that capital would be a waste. Even if Kurnool is not going to be.....

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member's time is up.

**Shri Raghuramalah:** I hope by the time I finish my speech, my hon. neighbour friends would have applauded me with equal grace. (*Some Hon. Members:* Yes.) I shall look forward to that spirit not only now, but after the formation of the Andhra State also. (*Some Hon. Members:* Oh, Yes.) I heartily welcome the announcement made by the hon. Home Minister this morning that there will be a boundary commission. Because, I may say that this Andhra Bill comes as a relief only to about half the Andhra people in India. The Telugu speaking population comes as the third largest group. First comes the Hindi speaking population, then the Bengalee and the third largest the Telugu.

**Shri B. S. Murthy:** May I correct my hon. friend? It is now the second.

**Shri Raghuramaiah:** It is welcome news to me. There are four crores of Andhras distributed over a number of States. I said, this Bill comes as a relief to only about two crores of Andhras. We take it, as a first instalment of a great experiment. We shall look forward to the day when all the four crores of Andhras, wherever they are, shall be able to say, this is our home and here we are for the good of the country. But in stating the details of the boundary commission—I am sorry the Home Minister is not here but I see his Deputy sitting there. I hope he would make a detailed account of what I am going to say. It is a matter of supreme importance. I shall recapitulate the statement made by the Prime Minister on the floor of the House on the 19th December, when he announced that there would be an Andhra State. He said:—

“.....the Government of India have decided to establish an Andhra State consisting of the Telugu speaking areas of the present Madras State, but not including the City of Madras...”

I would like to emphasize, “the Telugu speaking areas of the present Madras State”. Justice Wanchoo was sent to enquire into the various questions arising out of this and he had before him considerable evidence that there are a good number of Andhras outside the eleven districts and three taluks, who are anxious to join the Andhra State and they are all within the present Madras State and he has referred to the districts in the residuary Madras State and other areas where some lakhs of Andhra people are living and who are anxious to join the new State. Justice Wanchoo further observed that the appointment of a boundary commission might be taken up a little later. I take it, that the hon. Home Minister had in mind the boundary commission which Justice Wanchoo contemplated. In any case, on the 25th of March the Prime Minister reiterated his earlier

pledge to the people of Andhra. I am quoting the words from the statement made by the Prime Minister:

“The basic considerations which have to be kept in view are that an Andhra State has to be established and that it should consist of the Telugu speaking areas of the present Madras State.....The Andhra State, therefore, is to consist of what might be called the undisputed Telugu speaking areas of the present Madras State. At a subsequent stage, as I shall indicate later, a boundary commission or commissions may have to be appointed to determine the exact boundaries of this new State.”

Here again I would emphasize the words “it should consist of the Telugu speaking areas of the present Madras State”. With great respect to the hon. Home Minister, what I am trying to drive at is that it is not a mere question of taking a village here or straightening a road there. This is a question of bringing into the compass of the Andhra State the entire bulk of the Telugu speaking people who are residing in the Madras State. They reside in an area which is continuous and contiguous to the eleven districts and three taluks which are going to be constituted into the Andhra State. I would only emphasize that anything short of that would create discontent throughout the Andhra State. It would be against the very pledges of this Government and I would with all the emphasis at my command repeat and request the hon. Home Minister to make it very clear that the boundary commission which is going to be appointed must have as its primary object the bringing into the Andhra State all the contiguous. Telugu areas, within the residuary area.

**Dr. Katju:** But did my hon. friend read the Prime Minister's statement that “the Andhra State will consist of eleven districts”?

**Shri Raghuramalah:** I would like to invite the attention of the hon. Minister to paragraph four line one onwards. With the permission of the Chair, I shall repeat it. The Prime Minister stated:

"The basic considerations which have to be kept in view are that an Andhra State has to be established and it should consist of the Telugu speaking areas of the present Madras State."

It does not mean the Telugu speaking areas only within these eleven districts. Actually the hon. Prime Minister said next that the Andhra State should consist of what may be called the "undisputed Telugu speaking areas".

**Dr. Katju:** Will you please read the sentence further?

**Shri Raghuramalah:** With the permission of the Chair, I would say that the hon. Home Minister was referring to the statement made by the Prime Minister on the 19th December. At that time there was no question of eleven districts. Then Justice Wanchoo was appointed. He went into the matter. He decided that for the present it should be eleven districts and Bellary but that sooner or later a boundary commission would have to be appointed to go into the claims of Andhras living in Chingleput and other districts. That was the position then and he said it might be done later. When this subject came up on the 25th of March the Prime Minister repeated that an Andhra State would be established and that it should consist of the Telugu areas of the present Madras State. It is true that he referred to the undisputed Telugu speaking areas of the present Madras State. That was the procedure which was contemplated. "At a subsequent stage a boundary commission may have to be appointed to determine the exact boundaries of this new State". The plain meaning of this pledge to my mind is that though the State at present is to consist of eleven districts

and some taluks of Bellary District only, there would be a boundary commission later to define the other Telugu speaking areas in the Madras State for purposes of their inclusion in the Andhra State. I do not want to say anything more than that. The words are clear and I request that the Government would give their earnest consideration to this aspect of the matter.

The next question that has been agitating the minds of the entire masses of the Andhra people is this. The whole atmosphere in Madras State has been against the Andhras right from the beginning. Even now, many of us suffer under that handicap. What are the facts and what are the figures, for instance, in the matter of stores? Some reference has been made, that the stores shall be divided according to the indents. We do not know who indented, for what stores and in what proportion. Mr. Venkataraman has made some personal references to Mr. Gopala Reddi. I would be the last man to make a personal reference. I am compelled in self-defence to refer to Shri Bhakta-Vatsalam, the Minister of Public Works there. The Public Works Department has been ordering the largest quantity of stores. We do not know in what proportion it has been indented and just because an indent has been made it does not mean that irrespective of the quantity indented the apportionment has to be made. There are besides other considerations also, which I shall go into when I take up the Seventh Schedule but I would only say that our demand for a finance commission is just and most equitable for the simple reason that we do not know what the facts are and what the figures are as we have no means of knowing them. They say: what is the use of the finance commission? Even if the finance commission says "They owe you Rs. ten crores", where is the money for them to give you? Well, let them at least reduce the huge debt which they have imposed on us. The forty crores or rupees of reserve fund which was available

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

with them in 1949 is no longer there. It has disappeared. Now, instead of that Rs. 40 crores reserve fund, there is Rs. 40 crores deficit. Let there be an independent enquiry committee and let them go into the whole affair and decide our fair share whether it is deficit or surplus. Even between brothers, however loving they may be, we always find an outsider being called to settle partition. We do not know what our assets and liabilities are. Why cannot the Central Government now at least appoint a finance commission? I do not think they should go into minor details. After all, how did they go about to help the formulation of the various principles on which the Seventh Schedule is based? Did they go into pins and knives? If it is only broad principles, what prevents an enquiry committee to go into the broad principles and confine itself to that? I would, therefore, with all the emphasis at my command, most respectfully request the hon. Home Minister to reconsider his views regarding the finance commission.

Coming to the Bill itself, on the Seventh Schedule I have some remarks to make. I have already explained about unissued stores, and to show how inequitable sometimes things can be, I may point out the provision that advances made to local bodies should be recovered by the area in which the advances are made. My information is—I am of course, subject to correction because of the general disability from which every Andhra suffers, viz., that we do not know what the correct figures are—that only a little amount of loan has been lent in the Andhra area which fetches an interest amount of Rs. 12,000 whereas a large amount has been lent in the Tamil Nad area—in the residuary Madras area—which fetches an amount of Rs. 24 lakhs interest. As I said, this is subject to correction, but if these facts are true, it is most unfair that you should take away the best part of the loaf and leave us only a small portion

on some obviously innocent-looking principle, like: "Oh, you collect what is due in your area!" As a matter of fact, in the matter of loans given by Madras outside the State, it has been stated in the Bill that the collection will be made by Madras, but that we are entitled to 36 per cent. of it. I would earnestly request the hon. Home Minister to consider why the same principle cannot be applied to loans advanced even inside the present Madras State. The particular State in whose area it falls can easily collect it and then bring it to a central pool or a joint account, and then have a distribution on 36 per cent. Andhra basis.

Then, there is a very large amount which has been quietly ignored by the Bill. I am very sorry to use that expression. It relates to the Tungabhadra project. It is well known it has cost us about Rs. 17 crores up to this minute, and there is a provision in the Bill only for the division of the public debt portion of that expenditure. The public debt portion of that expenditure, to my information, covers only about half of it—Rs. 8½ crores. The rest of the expenditure, that is about Rs. 8½ crores, has been spent out of the joint revenues of the present Madras State. Mr. Venkataraman has given us some figures as to the amounts spent on the Andhra area in recent years, and he has given us figures of some crores. When we hand over this Tungabhadra project to Mysore, are we not entitled to get our share of the revenue portion of expenditure, that is Rs. 8½ crores? Are they to get the whole lot of Rs. 8½ crores, and get away with it scot-free? If you can divide the public debt portion of the expenditure, why should not the revenue portion of the expenditure which has been debited to our account be shared between Mysore and Andhra? I am very sorry that I do not see any provision to that effect in the Bill, and I would earnestly request the hon. Home Minister to consider that aspect.



19 NOON

As regards the equities between Madras and Andhra, I did not really want to say much because I did not want to dig up the past, but Mr. Venkataraman has made an extraordinary statement which I feel bound to resist with all the force at my command. He said that within the last few years—luckily for him he has quoted only the last few years—a great amount has been spent on Andhra. Well, I would like you to go a little deeper into the picture and not be carried away by superficial figures. What has really happened is this. When prices were low, all that the residuary Madras wanted by way of electrical schemes, by way of irrigation projects, had been completed, and when prices have gone up, they have taken up projects like the Tungabhadra and the Muchkand. On Tungabhadra which would have cost Rs. two or Rs. three crores, they have spent Rs. 17 crores, and Muchkand which would have cost a few crores, has cost five or ten times. They show us these figures. All these years, when prices were low they neglected us, ignored us, and after a few years they have been doling out one project here, and one project there, which would have normally cost us Rs. five or Rs. six crores, and now they cost Rs. 30 or Rs. 35 crores, and they say: "Well, we have given you Rs. 35 crores worth of things". Justice Wanchoo himself—I have got, luckily for me, the authority of a Chief Justice—admitted that prices have gone up enormously, and in fact, even in suggesting the book value for some things, he said that considering the rise in prices, we must take double the book value, and not, as is the usual rule, the original book value. I am only saying that there is a feeling—a general feeling, a wide-spread feeling—throughout Andhra that there has been a tremendous amount of lop-sided development, that Andhra has been completely ignored, and I may say that although our movement is as old as 30 years, it has received recent spurt because of this step-motherly treatment of this innocent, small child.

I would only say one thing more about Madras City. Mr. Venkataraman said that it is unnecessary, it is a bad precedent, it is inadvisable and unjust to give Rs. two crores, and he has cited the example of Orissa and Sind. I would only request him to refer to what Justice Wanchoo has to say about this particular subject when our Tamil friends urged this point before him. He said—I am quoting from his report:

"It is said that when Orissa and Sind were created separate provinces, they were not allowed any compensation for buildings in Bombay and Patna which were for the use of the whole province. They were, however, deficit districts as is clear from the fact that both of them had to be given subventions. As such, they may have contributed nothing towards the buildings in the capital of the composite State."

We have directed our money, our effort and our everything for the construction of Madras City, and now you are driving us to the jungles. Actually we have to go to the jungles to have our Government in tented sheds. One General Hospital in Madras City alone is worth Rs. ten crores. It would cost as much if you want to have such a first class hospital with first class equipment. You have asked us to get out of it.

**Shri Natesan:** You want to go.

**Shri Raghuramiah:** We never wanted to go. We wanted, first of all, that Madras City should be part of Andhra State. Secondly, when we failed in that, we wanted that it should at least be a Chief Commissioner's State, and I, for one, still stand for that demand, and I know that the whole of the Andhra people stand for that demand. (An Hon. Member: No.) When it came to the question whether we should have the Andhra State with or without Madras City, we did not want to suffer any longer, and we decided

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

to go, leaving the Madras City question alone, in obedience to the wishes of the Prime Minister. Otherwise, we thought Andhra State would never come. Even for having it as a temporary capital, for having a few offices there for a few years, you have made so much fuss and driven us to the jungle, and you say "We have no money". Well, you are giving us a debt. At least take away that debt, and relieve us of the debt. We are going to be a deficit State, and I think the Centre should have more sympathy and more consideration for these orphans than our fattened friends.

I would only say one thing in conclusion. I do not want to take your time. And that is really an appeal to the Central Government. There is a feeling in Andhra, irrespective of parties—I am sorry to say it on the floor of this House, but I feel it my duty to say it here—there is a tremendous amount of feeling that Andhras are being let down very badly in every way. We have lost Bellary district recommended by Justice Wanchoo. (An Hon. Member: By whom?) It does not matter by whom; may be by God, but it is a fact, we are all people of India. We have got to take stock of the feeling of the people, whether they are Andhras or Tamils. We are an all-India party, and this is Parliament of the whole country, and we have got to take stock of the fact that the Andhras feel aggrieved, that there is a tremendous amount of resentment that they have been let down in every way. They have been denied even Bellary and the neighbouring *irkas*. They have lost a good bit of other Telugu speaking areas. Mr. Nijalingappa is laughing. I did not want to refer to him, but since he is laughing, I must say one thing; we feel that what is most bitter today is that a third man knocked off the loaf. I have therefore to make a special appeal to this House to be considerate and sympathetic towards the Andhra case, whenever it

may arise, and I would say on behalf of the Andhra people, with all the emphasis that I can command, that our ambition is to live without malice, and with perfect friendliness to all.

**Shri Gopala Rao (Gudivada):** I deem it a great privilege to speak on this historic occasion, on behalf of the Andhra people. For the last 40 years, and more, they have been fighting heroically against British imperialism for the cause of national liberation on the one side, and on the other, for the formation of linguistic provinces. Even against the present Government, they have had to fight for the last five or six years. They have been cherishing this desire for a separate Andhra State for the last so many years, and at last with the help of the Indian people, their sacrifices and their sufferings, they have achieved their objective. I must, on this occasion, pay my homage to the martyrs who sacrificed their lives for this great cause, in general, and particularly to Mr. Potti Sriramulu, who sacrificed his life in the cause of the Andhra province.

We welcome this measure as being the first step in the redistribution of States on a linguistic basis. We hope it will lead very shortly to the formation of some other States on linguistic basis. It is a good beginning in the right direction, which will usher in a new era of real unity amongst the people of India.

**Shri Dhulekar (Jhansi Distt.—South):** Very bad beginning indeed.

**Shri Gopala Rao:** At the very outset. I would appeal to all hon. Members to consider this matter in a cool and calm atmosphere. It is not merely the question of the Andhra State that is involved here—of course we are supposed to confine ourselves technically speaking, to this Andhra State Bill—But some valuable democratic principles must be evolved as a result of our debate on this particular issue, so that they may give us a guidance for the future, when we want to form—I believe very shortly—the

Aikya Kerala, or the Maharashtra or the Karnataka States.

**Shri Dhulekar:** We do not want that.

**Shri Gopala Rao:** I would appeal to all hon. Members to approach this question in a calm atmosphere, so as to evolve some democratic basis, which will help us in the future, in regard to the formation of other linguistic States. Naturally, certain complicated problems do crop up, but we have to face them with boldness, and we should evolve certain principles on this occasion, on the basis of which we can solve these problems.

Before going in detail into the provisions of the Bill, I would first like to refer to the Statement of Objects and Reasons. It is really surprising to see such a Statement of Objects and Reasons. We had expected a statement to the effect that this step is being taken in response to the wishes of the people, and as I said at the very beginning, that people are expecting this as a first step in the redistribution of States on a linguistic basis. But we do not find such a statement even in the introductory speech of the hon. Home Minister. He has deliberately avoided the mention of the words 'on linguistic basis'.

**Dr. Katju:** It is a very complicated word. I never use it.

**Shri Gopala Rao:** In the Statement of Objects and Reasons, we find:

"On the 19th December 1952 the Prime Minister informed Parliament that the Government of India had decided to establish an Andhra State.....On the 25th of March 1953, the Prime Minister announced the decisions reached by Government after careful consideration of Mr. Justice Wanchoo's report and of the other matters connected with the establishment of the Andhra State....

On the 20th May 1953, the Government of India announced their decision regarding the Bel-

lary taluk after consideration of the report of Mr. Justice Misra."

But what about the long history of the demand for the formation of the Andhra State, and for redistribution of States on a linguistic basis? There should have been a reference to these in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. If there is any constitutional or other difficulty in using such terminology, then we can change even the title of the Bill. That is quite a different matter altogether. But I wonder how this Government, and the ruling party which was at one time behind this movement for the formation of linguistic provinces, have ignored these basic facts. There is no mention of this even in the speech of the hon. Home Minister, even though it is one of the basic principles involved in this Bill. The other day, in the course of a speech in the Madras Legislative Assembly, the Chief Minister of Madras also categorically stated that the Andhra State was not being carved out on the basis of linguistic provinces, but for some other reasons. Moreover, from what was stated by the hon. Prime Minister in one of his recent talks, it appears that he is now opposing the principle for the disintegration of States. That means that even after so many unhappy incidents, or unfortunate events, the Central Government deliberately want to play the same role as the Britishers, to keep the people against their will in the old administrative units as carved out by the British imperialists.

With these preliminary remarks, I shall take up the main points in regard to the important clauses of the Bill. For instance, there is the question of a boundary commission. Though it has been stated on the floor of the House that a boundary commission or commissions will be constituted some day or other, still I find no mention of it in this Bill, which is completely silent over that matter. If there is any technical or constitutional difficulty, then we can evolve a broad principle on which these divisions can take place, and which will serve as a guide for future work as well. The

[Shri Gopala Rao]

settlement of the boundaries is one of the major problems, that has to be faced, when a new State is proposed to be formed. If we could evolve certain basic principles on democratic lines, then it is not difficult to solve this problem.

If the people of the concerned States or the Governments of the concerned States come to an agreement, it is well and good. Otherwise, boundary commissions can be appointed to go into the question, and give their awards. Even if it was not possible for the boundary commission to decide these things, the other alternative, and it is the most democratic one, is to hold a plebiscite over the issue. These are the methods which can be adopted to solve this issue, in the present set up. But we do not find a mention of even the boundary commissions in this Bill.

Again, take for instance the Bellary affair. I am not going into the merits or demerits of the decision that has been taken. Justice Misra was asked to go into this issue, and he gave his report to Government, but the terms of reference of his inquiry were themselves not proper. We never demanded the whole of Bellary taluk. The simple demand of the Andhras was that Bellary town and the contiguous territory should go to the proposed Andhra State. But in the terms of reference, the future of the whole of Bellary taluk was referred to Justice Misra, and the whole basis of his inquiry is wrong, and that is the reason why a section of the people is not convinced of the fairness of his decision. A majority of the Andhra people did not accept this decision taken by the Central Government, on the basis of the Misra Award, and very unhappy developments are taking place on account of such feelings. Nobody can deny it. These are stark realities. Would it not be desirable and proper on the part of the Central Government to take other steps to solve the problem, such as by holding a plebiscite, the most democratic solution that can be thought of?

I do not see any reason why my friends from Kannada should oppose this democratic solution. They can as well accept this proposal. But that was not accepted by the Prime Minister in the recent talks some of us had with him. In a statement in another context, he had said that it was once for all closed. But if you simply say that it has been decided once for all and it need not be opened, it is not realising the living realities. You must take into consideration the latest developments. (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, order. There is a lot of talk in the House. I would request all hon. Members to listen carefully to the speeches made as this is a very important Bill and the speeches should be heard with respect.

**Shri Gopala Rao:** What I propose is this. The Bellary question can be easily decided by a plebiscite. I believe the Central Government and the other parties concerned also will accept this proposal.

Then I come to the second important point in the Bill—liabilities and assets. The basic principle taken here for the division of liabilities and assets also is not correct. The basis is location. Assets allocated—building goods, articles etc.—should go to the State where they are located or situated without valuation in money and adjustment. If this is the principle taken as a guiding line to divide the assets and liabilities, is it consistent with the principle of the redistribution of States on a linguistic basis? After all, what was the historic necessity for a new State? It is a well known fact that the areas in the proposed new State were completely neglected. I do not want to name any particular individual or person, but the reality is that these parts fighting for the formation of a separate State on a linguistic basis have suffered a lot. They are not developed either economically or culturally, they are completely ignored. The very origin, the historic necessity, for a new State is that their parts are

ignored and they must be taken into consideration and developed. For developing those parts economically and in other ways, a separate State is needed. If that is the basis of this division and separation and formation of the new State, what is the meaning of accepting this basic principle 'Everything it past. The assets in the form of land and buildings etc. located in a State will belong to that State'? The residuary part of the State of Madras is an advanced State. It is a developed State, whatever the reasons may be. That is why a great injustice will be done if this principle is adopted. And this principle is inconsistent with the very necessity of a new State. That is why this cannot be a democratic principle which can be adopted and implemented in this context.

Coming to the other aspect of the division of assets and liabilities, the basis given for the division of unused stores is the proportion of indents for the last three years. This also cannot be a correct method for the solution of the problem. Here also we are giving seal of approval for undue advantage taken by the residuary State. This cannot do justice. What I propose is that an expert commission must be appointed to go into the question and the assets and liabilities must be divided on a population basis. That can be the only correct solution.

Then I come to the river projects. Mr. Venkataraman was giving a very peculiar example. You know the great rivers, Krishna and Godavari, flow through our land. Unfortunately, 90 per cent. of the water was allowed to go to the sea and only ten per cent. was being utilised, whereas on the other side, from the Cauveri river 90 per cent. of the water is utilised. Of course, I am glad of it. But the reality is this: that 90 per cent. of the water is utilised and lands are brought under irrigation. In spite of its great potentialities in rivers, minerals or other wealth, Andhra Desh is completely left out and it is therefore a land of poverty in the midst of plenty.

Provided these potentialities are properly harnessed, there is no doubt it can be transformed into a heaven on earth. Such a great potential wealth we have.

Some friends have given statistics. I need not go into details. But in Mr. Justice Wanchoo's report also it is stated that out of 672 million units of electricity generated in Madras State, only 42 million units are generated in Andhra province. The population comes to something like 36 per cent. But if you take all the works done or money spent on capital outlay on industry, capital outlay on electricity, on buildings, educational institutions or others—whatever you take—you will find they are never taken into account.

Then, it is said in the Bill that Rs. 2.34 crores are being given as compensation for relatively smaller buildings for the Andhra State. How can this be a correct method? There are two reasons why it is not correct. One is that the Madras City is one of the biggest cities in India and is well equipped as a capital. On the other side, Mr. Justice Wanchoo has said, as you are all aware, that a nominal, ordinary capital with minimum equipment, will cost not less than Rs. ten crores. In view of these two facts, what is the justification for proposing a compensation of Rs. 2.3 crores? This must also be reconsidered. Otherwise, injustice may be done. In this way I can quote so many examples. But I do not want to waste your time, and my time, unfortunately, is also limited.

Regarding the services, I do not want to say a lot. But whenever a new State is formed, it is better to adopt a general principle that the sons of the soil, the local cadre, should be appointed. I advocate this for two reasons. One is that the efficiency of the administration can be improved with close contact with the masses as the new States are expected to function their administration through the medium of the local languages. The second point is that the sons of the soil, the local cadre will, naturally,

[Shri Gopala Rao]

have greater interest in the development of their own State. For these two reasons, I say, as far as possible, we should observe the principle that local cadre should be appointed. But I have no hesitation in taking in other officers also. Certainly a new State must be prepared to take advantage of the experience of officers from other States and utilise their services properly. But, as far as possible, they must try to avoid it.

In the course of his speech the hon. Minister also accepted the proposition that where a project concerned more than one State there must be some mechanism to coordinate. May I propose in this connection that we may have a board or a Corporation—whatever it is; I am sorry I do not know the exact functions of each—so as to look after a project when it concerns more than one State?

I appeal to the Members of the residuary State to take our remarks in a friendly manner. We are trying to find out a democratic solution of the issues and we are trying to develop the young State. That is our whole anxiety. It is only by these factors that we are guided. I appeal to all the members of the residuary State: let us part as friends and let us live as good neighbours. In this spirit, let us live.

Finally, I appeal to all the Members who are coming from areas fighting for linguistic provinces to fight together. So, far as the disintegration of the Hyderabad State is concerned, the Central Government and the Prime Minister are very adamant. They are not able to see the realities at all. They refuse to learn the lessons of history. That is why I appeal to all the Members coming from such areas to fight unitedly for the disintegration of the Hyderabad State so that the real unity of the country is achieved.

**Shri Dhulekar:** Madam, on a point of order. We are also interested in the discussion. Does this gentleman think that it is a home affair in which one party says the other Government

should bear it and the other party says the Central Government should bear it?

**Mr. Chairman:** There is no point of order here.

**Shri Dhulekar:** I should also be given a chance to speak.

**Mr. Chairman:** If there is time you will certainly get a chance. Naturally, those who are connected with the State will have to get the first chance. I agree with you that others also should speak. If there is time you shall certainly get a chance.

**Shri Nijalingappa:** Before I speak on the Bill I would request you to spare me more than 20 minutes. I will try to confine myself to these 20 minutes. The Deputy-Speaker said that in some cases discretion would be used and as a Member who rarely speaks I think I deserve that discretion.

**Mr. Chairman:** May I just make my position clear? There is such a large number of speakers and I am sure the hon. Member will also appreciate the desire of other Members who may be advocating their own opinions also to have a chance of speaking. Therefore I would ask him to keep within the bounds of 20 minutes.

**Shri Nijalingappa:** I wholeheartedly welcome this measure and it has come none too soon. Some of us feel that it ought to have come much earlier and Andhra should have been established in 1950 itself. Apart from that I congratulate my friends the Andhras that they get part of Andhra. I am not quite satisfied because for those of us who believe on the integration of India on a linguistic basis—of course, administrative conveniences are also there—we feel that it is not going the whole hog and if Andhra is really to be formed it should be formed with that portion of Andhra which is in Hyderabad State. I am saying this because I am interested in the whole matter, not because I am interested in Karnataka—I am equally interested in Andhra—and I am surprised that

two of my friends should make adverse references to me in their speeches. My submission is that Government should take steps to disintegrate Hyderabad as early as possible.

**Shri Dhudekar:** Disintegrate the whole of India.

**Shri Nijalingappa:** If disintegration leads to better integration it is very good.

I said I welcome this measure and in doing so I would refer to certain remarks that have been made regarding certain portions which Mysore gets. I am sorry that some of my friends seem to think that Mysore is an interloper and a third party who has got the best of both worlds in having Bellary district. It is not so; because the people in Mysore and the Kannadigas outside have been demanding this. What the Central Government has done in bringing this measure is to satisfy that demand. There is a large demand from outside Mysore that they must be added to Mysore and a Karnataka State formed. I must congratulate my own friends of Mysore that they have taken a very reasonable attitude throughout. In the first resolution passed by the Mysore Constituent Assembly as long back as 1948—and it was moved by no less a person than the present Minister of Production here—it was said that in the Constitution a provision be made that areas adjoining Mysore should be enabled to join Mysore. That resolution was supported by the present Chief Minister, Mr. Hanumanthayya of Mysore. Therefore this Bellary district being added to Mysore is nothing strange, nothing wonderful. Now, when the Bill is diminishing the area of the residuary State of Madras and increasing the area of the Mysore State, I would just request the Government to go a step further and it is a very desirable step. I congratulate them and I am very grateful to them for having taken this step. They may also include other Kannadiga areas like South Kanara and other districts. It will come and I expect it to come.

**An Hon. Member:** What about Kolar? It should go to Andhra.

**Shri Nijalingappa:** It does not come within the scope of the Bill. The Bill is to increase the area of Mysore and not to diminish it. It is a question of the will of the people of the area which must ultimately prevail. As a basic guide for us we are considering the question of language.

Bellary district is a very unfortunate district. I wish the whole district of Bellary had been joined to Mysore; and I base my remarks on weighty authority. The first authority on which I claim that the whole of Bellary district should have gone to Mysore is the J.V.P. Report. It said that Andhra State should be formed of the undisputed Andhra areas in Madras State. I submit again that Bellary has been in dispute since 1921 when the Kelkar Award was given. Shri Kelkar was the Chairman of an Arbitration Committee which was appointed by the Indian National Congress. He said, 'I would have been justified in giving the whole of the Bellary district to the Karnataka P.C.C. jurisdiction but for these three taluks having considerable Telugu speaking population. There is considerable weight for the demand that it may for the present go to Andhra.' He said that this was a temporary measure and the matter may be looked into after the next elections. Of course, the Congress was then engaged in other weighty matters. Since then no demand has been seriously made regarding this Bellary Taluk that it must be in Andhra. Before Justice Wanchoo there was a Partition Committee. In the Partition Committee this matter came up. In view of the complications of this issue, that is about the area of Andhra, particularly in regard to the Bellary district, they decided that all the seven taluks including Bellary have to go to Karnatak. There were four top-ranking Congress leaders on the Committee besides four others but there was not a single Kannadiga on it. I am sure if there was a representative of ours, the decision would have been different. In that Mr. Prakasam has

[Shri Nijalingappa]

written a minute of dissent. Prakasam is a very good Andhra; he is a very good man; he is entitled to respect. He is a man who would never give up anything that belongs to him. I very carefully read the minute of dissent. He has not said a word about Bellary. That is the reason why the Kelkar Report was accepted. Now, coming to Justice Wanchoo. He also says:

"An alternative solution would be to separate the three taluks of Alur, Adoni and Rayadrug here and now. Rayadrug could be added to the district of Anantapur while Alur and Adoni could be added to the district of Kurnool. The remaining 7 taluks could then be formed into the Bellary district which will be predominantly Kanarese. This district may be administered by the new State but with proper safeguards for its language and culture. This solution would also be opposed by the Kanarese speaking part of the district whose claim is that the Census figures of 1951 are incorrect, and that the Adoni, Alur and Rayadrug taluks are also predominantly Kanarese. It is not, however, possible for me to overlook the Census figures of 1951."

He finally says:

"If there is any dispute about those three taluks.....the matter may be finally adjudicated by a Boundary Commission."

I am glad that the hon. Home Minister has made it clear that a boundary commission will be appointed and this matter will be referred to the commission.

Then comes Mr. Justice Misra's report. There he says—page 21, paragraph 34:

"Having examined the question of allocation of Bellary taluk from the view point of linguistic composition, administrative convenience, financial implications, economic stability cultural affinity

and historical background, I would next like to examine the history of the controversy relating to Bellary taluk which is not without significance. The dispute arose for the first time in the twenties of this century after the formation of linguistic provinces by the Indian National Congress for its own organisational functions. Both Andhra and Karnataka Provincial Congress Committees claimed the whole of Bellary district and the Congress Working Committee appointed an Arbitration Committee in 1921 to settle this dispute. Shri N. C. Kelkar, who finally gave an award, allotted Adoni, Alur and Rayadrug taluks to the Andhra Committee and the rest of the district including Bellary city, to Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee. There was controversy over Bellary city, but Shri Kelkar decided to give it to Karnataka Committee with the remaining taluk as he came to the conclusion, after examining the census figures and the testimony of responsible leaders, that Bellary taluk was a predominantly Kanada area. The matter again came before the Partition Committee.

There were four outstanding Andhra leaders and three non-Andhras on the Committee. The members were unanimous in accepting the Kelkar Award regarding Bellary Taluk without any reservations and the Madras Government too in forwarding the Report to the Government of India recommended the allocation of the Bellary taluk to the Kannada portion of the Bellary district. Similar recommendations were made by Shri Justice Wanchoo. It is a little surprising in this context to find that a controversy which should have been completely set at rest by the above decisions has been raised again in a vehement and bitter form and even the Andhra leaders who previously signed the Partition Committee Report have



thought fit to make a demand for Bellary city and the Bellary taluk. The Kannada leaders therefore bitterly complain and not without some justification they say that a dispute which had already found its burial should not have been allowed to be unearthed at this late stage."

So, that is the position. Regarding the other three taluks, I submit I have been receiving a number of telegrams every day that they want to go to Mysore. Hundreds of them are being received by me.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Shall I present these to you?

**Shri Nijalingappa:** I shall present you ten times that number.

I do not want to come in the way of the Bill being proceeded with. I entirely oppose my hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram's motion for its being referred to a Select Committee. Andhras should get their province as early as possible. But let us approach it like brothers—not quarrelling over the spoils, but like brothers sitting quietly and distributing what we have got. I may just mention an experience of mine in this connection. I had a number of well-to-do clients. Whenever they came to me, brothers quarrelling over their property, I would advise them: "Go home, sit together and divide your assets and properties and if there is anything remaining come to me." I always found that they came back settling their disputes. It so happened once that three brothers could not come to an agreement. The dispute was about the jewels of one of the wives. The other two brothers were claiming those jewels. I told them that it was very unwise for them to claim them and that they must go to the lady who was wearing them. But the three brothers kept on fighting among themselves. About two months back I summoned the three ladies and suggested that it was not good that their husbands should keep on fighting like this and

that they should now settle the matter among themselves. Ladies are usually more reasonable; they are wiser. There were three or four jewels. They readily agreed to the lady wearing a particular jewel having it and shared the other jewels among them. They are very happy now. The brothers go to the house of one another and take food. I am also very happy.

So, let us not quarrel over small things, but try to apportion what we have. After all, we are going to have a new province. I wish my Andhra friends very well indeed. On behalf of the Kannadigas and the Mysore people, I assure them that we will do everything in our power to help them to establish themselves.

Certain remarks have been made against the Mysore people. The Mysore people have always been welcoming people who are willing to go to them. They did not want Bellary district to be added on to them. After all, we are not going to have a property with no liabilities. I do not agree with my hon. friend Mr. Raghuramaiah when he said that we must share some liabilities, that is not the way of approach at all. I do not think Mysore can be burdened with further liabilities in this matter. The same remark was made even by the hon. Home Minister that Mysore people have not been very just in claiming ownership and other things of the Tungabhadra project which is in their area. I would refer him to paragraph f of the Seventh Schedule which says that all land, all stores, articles and other goods shall remain the property of the State in which they are situated. The main dam is in Hospet taluk which is to be in Mysore. Therefore, we must have control over it. But I may assure this House that the Mysore Government will not object, after a final analysis and after the high level canal is constructed and electricity is produced and a clear picture is available, as to which areas would go to Karnatak, which areas to Mysore and which

[Shri Nijalingappa]

areas to Andhra and to sit together and allocate assets and liabilities. We do not want to quarrel over this; it is not correct either to do so. On behalf of the people of Mysore I tell you that we are always amenable to any agreed settlement. I would like a similar gesture from our Andhra friends.

Regarding these three taluks, a remark was made that I was laughing over the Bellary district and taluk. Some friends approached me uninvited—Andhra friends. They told me: "Well, why should you quarrel about the district of Bellary. You have seven taluks; have them. We have no objection." Regarding the other three taluks they said: "Look here, in those villages there are predominantly Kannada speaking people adjoining to your taluks; similarly we have got predominantly Telugu speaking areas. If there is any dispute regarding a small area, we will sit together and talk." I wrote a letter to the Prime Minister in this behalf.

"Regarding the 3 taluks they cannot be given over to Andhra as they are disputed areas since 1921 when the Kelkar Award was given. Even that award was in favour of Karnataka than Andhra. I may bring to your kind notice that some Andhra leaders met me and agreed that they do not claim the seven taluks and do not press their inclusion in Andhra. Regarding the three disputed taluks, they said that the latest census or the census of 1931 can be consulted and the villages of the 3 taluks can be added on to adjoining Kannada or Andhra areas according to the number of population speaking the respective language. It is I feel possible to adjust the boundary equitably and if one official or commission is appointed it could be solved amicably."

I stand by that even today.

**Shri Lakshmayya** (Anantapur) Why do you not agree to a plebiscite—it is for the people to decide.

**Shri Nijalingappa:** It is an easy escapist method—I do not agree with it at all. I am not afraid of a plebiscite in this area, but I ask: as wise men, as practical men, would it be reasonable, would it be in the national interest to resort to a plebiscite wherever there is a dispute? We are not giving away Bellary out of India. It will be very wrong to accept it. If you accept it for a particular area, or city, you will be creating untold troubles for ourselves in every area. There will be hundreds of towns and areas which will demand a plebiscite. It will be a wrong precedent. I would strongly oppose that suggestion. If there are any other Members let them enunciate a policy; we will sit together and distribute these areas.

I will make another suggestion for the appointment of a boundary commission. Therefore, let the whole of Bellary be added to Mysore immediately.

So, having said so much—as I have no more time left for me—I will appeal to the friends opposite not to quarrel over these things. I am sure my Andhra friends will be reasonable. We will sit together and decide and not talk in a manner as if we are dividing any property here.

**Shri Raghavachari:** I have listened to the points so far dwelt upon by about half a dozen friends, some with passion, some with assumed fairness and others with indifference. I for one would suggest that there is some danger and some need for carefully assessing the kind of appeals they have made for peace and goodwill.

So far as my personal approach to this problem is concerned, I feel and I believe that my approach is a fair one. I am by birth and education a Kannadiga, I am by culture a Tamilian, I have gone and settled in Andhra and I am representing a constituency predominantly Telugu. I have also been a student of active politics for the last 25 years. I have worked for it and I know the inside

and outside history of the movements of all these politics and policies regarding linguistic States.

But now what actually has happened? Andhras have been agitating for a province for generations and hundreds and hundreds of people have suffered and lost their lives for this purpose. Ultimately circumstances have forced the Government to think of forming a State for the Andhras. Whenever it suits any particular individual to talk about a particular part of that area to be included in his State he quotes from the ancient records and says that this was the recommendation before and this was not urged then. We must keep a very calm and a realistic view of the existing state of affairs today when a province is to be formed and not be guided by old records. I would like to be fair to the Kannadigas, to the Tamilians and also to the Andhras.

I must frankly state, so far as the disputed boundaries of the new Andhra State are concerned, there has not been a very fair on a proper approach. I state it deliberately because it is Andhras that have been agitating for their Andhra province. When the province is going to be formed today it is said that it would be confined only to the undisputed areas of Madras State. Now the Kannadigas also come in. They were not at any time participants of this agitation. There was some movement for a Samyukta Karnataka. There are some parts not only in Bellary but in other districts also which might have all gone into another State but was it ever contemplated by the Government that a Kannada province should be formed? It was never a proposition. All of a sudden like a bolt from the blue people come forward and say that Bellary will go to Mysore and that is the result of the whole of this agitation.

Well I do not wish to pretend to advise the administrators. If they were going to form Kannada State certainly they should have said so before and not all of a sudden. Justice

Wanchoo reported that the whole of the Bellary district must be part of Andhra. The atmosphere here in Delhi was very favourable. Somehow they managed that some taluks would go to Kannada country Mysore. And then it whetted their appetite, increased their thirst—"let us have every other taluk, every other district and every other part of Madras State". I am not against the formation of Karnataka. Certainly it would come when the question of formation of the Kannada Province becomes an issue. By all means let them have it.

More than that I wish to request the Members of this House that the desire for a boundary commission is not to be talked of or treated lightly by any section of the House. As somebody has already said, this is the first formed linguistic State, whether the word appears in the Statement of Objects and Reasons or not. This is the beginning of linguistic provinces to be formed. And when linguistic provinces are formed, the principles on which areas will be allocated to the Andhra State will be the principles which must ultimately guide the formation of every other linguistic province also. Therefore, when you ask for a boundary commission you must be very clear in your mind as to the principles on which the boundary commission is to decide the matter.

In this case you have administrative-ly haphazardly, whimsically treated some parts to be Andhra and some parts not to be Andhra and to be handed over to Mysore. No consideration—"all over, ancient history", somebody's report. It is not a proper attitude to take. The attitude should have been, "We have just taken an administrative decision, and a boundary commission must be appointed to finally settle it". I am glad Government is prepared to appoint a boundary commission, though not under a statute, at least administratively. Let them by all means say: "A boundary commission will decide the question of all the disputed areas; never mind even though administra-

[Shri Raghavachari]

lively we have decided it one way or the other". If that one statement is made, all this agitation about Bellary and of the Kannadigas about portions of my own district, can all be settled very fairly, reasonably and satisfactorily.

Do not say it is all over, simply because you have got a decision approved in your favour. Justice Misra's Report today, the next morning Government of India's decision! Wanchoo's Report, two or three months no decision, we had to put questions here for quick action. After all, Justice Misra's Report was a sudden thing. Nobody knew. Justice Misra goes to Bangalore, stays there for a few days, then some people come by air to Delhi, and all of a sudden the Report is accepted!

All that I am stating is that there is danger in this hurry; in the indecent hurry with which you have accepted a particular decision. Do say "let us close, there is a Judge who has come, there is a decision, there is an end to all this"—this is a very cheap argument, it is an irresponsible argument. Let them say: We are going to appoint a boundary commission; all the disputed areas will be re-examined, if necessary, and re-allocated; and the principles on which the boundary commission will function will be these: (1) contiguity to the State on a linguistic basis; (2) that it must have a majority population with that mother tongue when it will be added on; (3) there are always in this 'majority', as it happens in the case of Bellary, the others who do not come and are not considered either under majority or minority. In Bellary 32 per cent. are Telugus, 25 or 26 per cent. are Kannadigas and the rest, who are neither Telugus nor Kannadigas, come to 42 per cent. You do not care for the opinion of these 42 per cent. of people! They form the majority. It is said that there are Telugu labourers who have come to work in the Tungabhadra project and so, they will have to be dropped—some thousands—from the population figures. There are some in jails who

are resident there and are Telugus. Justice Misra says, I will drop these 900 people from the calculation. He says: there are some people whose birth place is stated to be elsewhere in the registers; they must have come subsequently and so I will take out these 2000 or 3000. All these deductions made, finally the Andhras are in a minority and the Kannadigas in a majority.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Armed police, 5000.

**Shri Raghavachari:** I am not concerned with the details. All that I wish to say is that it is an arbitrary decision and that it is a decision not carefully thought out. That is suspected to be a decision—I am not attributing motives to anybody—that is a decision which, on the face of it, is not acceptable to the people. Is it a case of some people agitating? No. The people have been carrying on this agitation for the last so many months. Tens and tens of people are going to the jail. It is a mass movement. It is a people's movement; they are not satisfied with this decision. It is not an administrator or a politician who has set them up and has paid for the agitation. This agitation has been there for so many months. A man was also about to go to the other world by his long fast for this purpose. It is a thing in which the people sincerely and honestly believe that they have an honest case.

There is another matter. In the boundary commission, the 4th principle that will necessarily have to be adopted is the willingness or the opinion of that section of the people who do not belong to this group or that group. Are they cattle for you to drive them into this pound or that? They form 42 per cent. of the population. You must ask those people, consult them, take the opinion of those people and then decide. They suggested a plebiscite. It may be an extreme solution and administratively very inconvenient. I for one agree that it

might be very inconvenient to concede that principle. What I wish to say is, you cannot help conceding the principle namely, though not a plebiscite, the wishes of the people to go into one State or other should be ascertained. When they are fairly as big a number as 42 per cent. and even more than the Kannadigas or the Telugus who are fighting, how can you ignore their wishes? I say, if not a plebiscite, at least in the re-examination of the question, when the boundary commission is asked to review the whole thing, take these matters into consideration and decide. You decide this principle now for all linguistic States. Do not look upon this question lightly. It is worth careful consideration.

The Mysore people, somehow, as the atmosphere in Delhi is favourable and they have got a few *taluks*, now say that in the Adoni and Rayadrug and some other *taluks* also they have got portions of Kannada areas. I am not disputing the fact that there are Kannadiga people there. But, I ask in how many *taluks* of your Mysore State—and even districts—are there not Telugu speaking people? I was surprised to hear Mr. Nijalingappa take refuge in the provision that the purpose of the Bill is to expand our territory: an atrocious kind of argument in Parliament. What I wish to say is (*Interruption*)—please do not interrupt me—if you are going to insist on the formation of a Kannada province and you want all the Kannada speaking areas to be added on to you, be fair, be just, be straight and say, you take your Telugu areas. I have made this offer more than once. I have discussed this with Mr. Nijalingappa many times. He tells me, our Telugu speaking sections in Mysore do not want to go to you. He has the wishes of these people in his pocket. I told him that all the Kannada people in these areas do not want to go to Mysore. Why then all this agitation, why these Bellary people dying, going to jail, being beaten? I have told you I am a Mysorean. I am happy about it. I love your country.

**An Hon. Member:** You are not now there.

**Shri N. Rachiah** (Mysore—Reserved—Sch. Castes): You are not a Mysorean.

**Shri Raghavachari:** I do not wish to go into that question. I can well answer him by saying that a citizen is born and also domiciled. It is not necessary to waste the time of the House on that. The question is this. If the Kannadigas want the Kannada speaking areas from the Telugu parts, they must be fair enough to say, you take away the Telugu parts from our Kannada parts also. Let us consult the people whether they want to be with us or with you. Why do you say that those Telugus do not want to go to our Andhra area?

One more general point about the boundary commission. Another principle that must also guide will be, what is the unit when you have to consult the wishes of the people. If taking a whole district is favourable to you, you will say take a district as a unit; if it is a *taluk*, then take the *taluk* as a unit, or *firka* or a village. I for one would say, that if an area is contiguous to the other area, if it so adjoins, you must take that as the unit. Even a *firka*; by all means take it as a unit. Even if it is a revenue village, consider it and then allocate it that way. Where it is not very clear who is in a majority, the wishes of the people must also be consulted. That is the best solution. I hope the Government when it appoints a boundary commission will also refer this disputed part of Bellary district, and satisfy the just demand of the people. If all of you are sure that these *firkas* are predominantly inhabited by Kannadigas, as Justice Misra you say has shown by facts and figures, why do you not say, tomorrow let us ask the people whether they want to be with us or with you? They are not prepared to expose themselves to the risk of such consultation because it might, after all, go against them. That is their fear. That much as far as the boundary commission is concerned. I do not wish to take the time of the

[Shri Raghavachari]

House any more over that matter. I go to the next point.

1 P.M.

I again want to say something about the activities of the Mysoreans so far as the present territory is concerned. I am glad that the hon. Home Minister has caught the point that the Tungabhadra project was conceived only to benefit that portion of Rayalaseema which was constantly the victim of famine. It was for that purpose that for generations we have been agitating for it. As regards the Tungabhadra project, what I wish to say is that the speaker previous to me says, Mysore claims ownership and control over the Tungabhadra project because of para. 1 of the Seventh Schedule. There are other paras. too. I do not want to say anything very lightly. When two people quarrel, we always find that the third party benefits. It is just like the cats and the monkey story. I would only say to the Central Government that they should issue a directive clearly stating the purpose for which the project was started and the area for which it was intended should have precedence over the requirements of others. As regards the division of liabilities that are invested on the Tungabhadra project, they wanted only the public debt portion of it to be allocated between them. It must be the entire expenditure that has gone into the construction of the dam that has to be allocated.

Then about service allocation. I will not go into details, but, as has already been suggested, wherever Andhras can be found, either in the Centre or in the other States, experienced men with zeal and interest to work for their State, should be transferred to Andhra, should form the human material wanted for that State.

As regards assets and liabilities, I am not quarrelling with the principle laid down in the Seventh Schedule, for I am not in possession of the facts and figures. As our friends have been complaining for long, the basis on which this allocation is made is a

sealed thing for us. We do not know. It may be fair and in the best interests of safeguarding the interests of all the people, but I wish to say that there has been an agitation in the Madras Assembly, a resolution has been passed by that Assembly by a majority, stating that there is need for the appointment of a commission to examine the financial allocation of assets and liabilities. When that is the position, it would certainly be in the interests of the country that a committee is constituted which will examine the entire picture and the basis of the allocation. I am bound to support the demand for a commission or an expert body, but I would go further and make a concrete suggestion. There is the fact that the Andhra State will be in a perpetual state of poverty. The residuary Madras State is richer and well off. It is the usual experience we have in life when a man has got for his share something bigger, he will always say: "Let us have goodwill, let us not quarrel. Let us be good friends. I wish you god-speed and prosperity and all that". But god-speed, and prosperity and good wishes must all be measured in terms of money. When division of assets and liabilities comes, as a lawyer I know, the elder brother who has got his daughters married after lavishly spending Rs. 10,000 or Rs. 15,000 and left debts to the family, ultimately will simply say: "Divide the debts also. What is it we can do? All that has been spent has gone already." That kind of attitude is not fair if your good wishes are to be sincere and real, and you really intend that these people also should prosper in the country. Even if some kind of injustice is done, the Andhras, numerically a big nation...

**An Hon. Member:** A big nation?

**Shri Raghavachari:**...numerically a big group of people, have plenty of resources which they can harness. If only they can do so, they will be the envy of all of you, but I am afraid that there are certain things wanting, such as unity of action, a single-purpose-objective, undisputed leadership. But

I hope, when the responsibility comes to the new State, all these quarrels will stop, and the desire to emulate other States, and advance will be prominent. But let them not be told, "I will not give you anything, I will send you away without anything." That is not very fair, and that is no measure of good sincerity.

The Government as well as the Andhra people know that there is such a thing as the Sri Bagh Pact. I do not find any mention of it here. I intend giving an amendment to the effect that the Sri Bagh Pact may be included as one of the Schedules to this Bill, with a directive that the principles involved in that Pact must be constantly borne in mind, in the administration of the new Andhra State. That would certainly give a certain amount of unification, and enlist the co-operation of a large section of the Andhra population in Rayalaseema.

So far as Central aid for the building of the capital is concerned, I put a question to the Government, but it was brushed aside with some answer like, that will take care of itself. But there are instances where the Centre has come to the aid of the States, for building up their capitals. For instance, we have the Punjab Government capital, for which large funds have been sanctioned by the Centre. The case of the new Andhra State that is to come is even stronger. They have been driven out of a city to the prosperity of which they have contributed—I do not wish to go into that history of pangs of those who have actually struggled, and contributed to the prosperity of that city—but we are being driven out of that place unceremoniously to tents, as some hon. Member said, into places where there are no buildings in which we could even put our heads. Even in Bellary public buildings worth Rs. 22 lakhs have been allotted to some other part of the country namely Mysore. Then we are told, no contribution, you had better manage somehow, even the cost of the peg for the tent, you must bear. It is rather very uncharitable. I would

therefore beg of the Central Government to consider the need, under these circumstances, for a substantial contribution for the construction of the Andhra capital. The hon. Home Minister made no reference to this in his speech. Fortunately the contribution by the residuary State of Rs. 2·3 crores as compensation for Madras City, which was there in the original Bill, has been retained. Of course, our Tamil friends would talk of goodwill, sincerity etc., here, there, everywhere and in the Madras Assembly. But they had omitted even this provision on the pretext that, after all you want a commission, therefore that will decide everything. But here, there is no mention of any expert commission. We have lost that here. Fortunately, the Central Government have been kind enough to see that the unfairness of this assumed goodwill was not good, and so they have retained the original provision in the Bill. But in addition to this, I would request the Central Government to make some more substantial contributions.

So far as the location of the High Court is concerned, I had personally intended that it should be left to the Andhra Legislative Assembly to decide. But when they have left the decision of the capital to these people, I find that these people are quarrelling like cats, and they have not been able to decide upon their capital. Unfortunately, that has been the experience. So, I am afraid, if this question of High Court location is also left to be decided by the political body, namely the Andhra Legislature, there may be some trouble. But trouble or no trouble, the Sri Bagh Pact contained a provision that the two—capital and the High Court—should be located in different places. If the location of one of them is to be decided by one body and the location of the other is to be decided by another body, the Sri Bagh Pact will go to the winds. And therefore, these two things must be decided by the same body. When it can certainly have some heaviness in its conscience, it cannot say: 'I want to have

[Shri Raghavachari]

both'. Therefore, my submission is that so far as the location of the High Court is concerned, it would have been better—though there are risks involved in it—and it is essential that that decision also should be left to the Andhra State only.

**Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada):** May I speak, Sir?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Yes.

**Dr. Rama Rao:** I have great pleasure in welcoming this Bill on behalf of the Andhras and on behalf of all those who are interested in the formation of linguistic States...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member evidently wants to speak at length. He may continue tomorrow.

*The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Friday, the 14th August, 1953.*

---