

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

Dated.....28.11.201

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

2521

2522

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Thursday, 26th June, 1952

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

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

9-29 A.M.

GENERAL BUDGET—DEMANDS FOR  
GRANTS

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. We shall now proceed with the discussion of the demands for grants to the Ministry of States. The Demands are Nos. 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, and 126. The agreed cut motions are—I shall ask the Hon. Members at the end if anyone has to add to the list.

DEMAND NO. 81—MINISTRY OF STATES

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,31,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of ‘Ministry of States’.”

DEMAND NO. 82—PRIVY PURSES AND  
ALLOWANCES OF INDIAN RULERS

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,31,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in

90 PSD

respect of ‘Privy Purses and Allowances of Indian Rulers’.”

DEMAND NO. 83—KUTCH

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 64,77,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of ‘Kutch’.”

DEMAND NO. 84—BILASPUR

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,65,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of ‘Bilaspur’.”

DEMAND NO. 85—MANIPUR

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 30,89,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of ‘Manipur’.”

DEMAND NO. 86—TRIPURA

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 73,90,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of ‘Tripura’.”

## DEMAND NO. 87—RELATIONS WITH STATES

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 39,52,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Relations with States'."

## DEMAND NO. 88—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF STATES

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 54,66,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of States'."

## DEMAND NO. 126—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF STATES

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,14,03,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of States'."

**Shri U. M. Trivedi** (Chittoor): May I ask one question, Sir? About Demand No. 87 printed at Page 992, why no budget estimates have been shown against the head Central Armed Police.....

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not know, but he may raise the points during the course of the discussion. The hon. Minister will reply. I do not know the details.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** On a point of information, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** He may raise the point during the course of the discussion. The agreed cut motions may now be moved.

*Formation of linguistic provinces*

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

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*Disintegration of Hyderabad State*

**Shri Madhao Reddi** (Adilabad): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*Appointment of Advisors in B States*

**Shri Damodara Menon** (Kozhikode): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*Scheduled Castes in B and C States*

**Shri P. N. Rajabhoj** (Sholapur—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*Policy re: Kashmir and Hyderabad*

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

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*Privy purses and allowances of Indian rulers*

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

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*Allowances of Ruler of Hyderabad*

**Shri Waghmare** (Parbhani): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*Sanjukta Maharashtra as linguistic province*

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

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*University in Pepsu*

**Shri Ajit Singh** (Kapurthala—Bhatinda—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*Separate flag for Kashmir*

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

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*Disintegration of Hyderabad State*

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

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*Nizam of Hyderabad*

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

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*Withdrawal of Kashmir issue from U.N.O.*

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

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*Development of Manipur State*

**Shri Rishang Keishing** (Outer Manipur—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Manipur' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*Administration in Tripura*

**Shri Biren Dutt** (Tripura West): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Tripura' be reduced by Rs. 101,000."

*Plebiscite in Kashmir*

**Shri A. K. Gopalan** (Cannanore): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Relations with States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*Ministry of States*

**Shri Nesamony** (Nagercoil): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

**Mr. Speaker**: If there are any other cut motions which hon. Members want

to move they may intimate to me and then do so.

*Constituent Assembly of Jammu and Kashmir*

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

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*Application of Constitution to Kashmir*

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

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*General Policy*

**Shri Anandchand** (Bilaspur): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*Linguistic Provinces*

**Shri P. N. Rajabhoj**: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

*Custom duty in Hyderabad State*

**Shri Waghmare**: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

**Mr. Speaker**: So, these are the demands and the cut motions to be discussed now. Cut motions may be deemed to have been placed before the House. But there is one point which I would like to make quite clear to hon. Members. The cut motions numbering 223, 1014, 1127, and 1178 raise the question of the formation of linguistic provinces. Hon. Members will note that 7th July 1952 is the date fixed for private resolutions, and the very first resolution which is bound to come before the House reads as follows:

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

So, this question of linguistic provinces will come in for discussion on that day, and I think the various points raised in the cut motions for discussion

[Mr. Speaker]

would be covered then. That is what *prima facie* appears to me. Therefore there should not be any discussion on that issue just at present, because according to the rules of procedure, we should not anticipate the debate at present. Whenever there is any matter which is coming before the House at a later date, and a debate is going to be raised on that particular matter later, to raise any question of debate at an earlier date is technically known as anticipating a debate. The whole idea behind it is that the debate should not be multiplied twice over. Incidentally, from the point of view of hon. Members, whose number is unduly large today, expressing a desire to speak, it would save time also for their other points which they would like to make in the course of the discussion. Therefore, excepting for this, all the motions are open for discussion on all other points.

**Shri S. S. More:** I want to raise a point of procedure and the significance of the cut motion; supposing my cut motion is passed, it will be a sort of censure on the Government, but if the resolution is passed, it is only a pious declaration by the House, which will not be binding on the Government.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps, it is theoretically so. The hon. Member who raised this question is right, but there is no chance of his cut motion being passed. Why suppose something which is not going to happen, and then proceed further with that? Let us have the realities before us. Apart from that, that is not the point. The point is, should this House discuss the same subject in the same session twice over and take up the time? That is the question before us, because every discussion and every sitting means cost to the taxpayer. The hon. Members will kindly remember that point. For other reasons also, it is very important that Members must not multiply or double the debates.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram** (Visakhapatnam): I am in some difficulty, Sir. We are discussing the Demands for grants to the States Ministry. The question of the future of the Hyderabad State which will also come up for discussion involves redistribution on a linguistic basis. How do you propose to meet that point?

**Mr. Speaker:** Whatever hon. Members want to state about the Hyderabad State in particular, it will be perfectly competent for them to state. But to link on that question with the

formation of linguistic provinces, is something different. No doubt, at places, the line of demarcation will be very small. But I would press upon hon. Members with all earnestness that they need not go into the question of linguistic provinces, because it is to the advantage of this House to spare the time and also to follow the regular procedure.

As regards Mr. More's point, I want to say one thing: A resolution expresses the opinion of the House, and the Government which is responsible to this legislature, I do not think, will flout the opinion expressed by the House. It is binding on them in a sense, though not legally, at least in all equities and morals.

**Shri S. S. More:** But it would not have any legal binding.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think moral bindings are more important than legal bindings. (Interruption). There could be found various ways of evading the law. Therefore let us not talk so much of legal bindings as of moral and equitable bindings. Whatever that may be, I am not going to say anything further about it.

**The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha):** What about time-limit, Sir?

**Mr. Speaker:** That is what I am going to say.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** Half an hour is already lost.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is not lost; it is usefully spent.

Now, I have got a very unusually long list and a request has been made to me that I should curtail the time to 10 minutes. I have no objection to curtail the time, if the House is agreeable.

**Several Hon. Members:** Yes.

**Dr. S. P. Mookerjee** (Calcutta South-East): Let us sit in the afternoon.

**Mr. Speaker:** No, because there is pressure. I have already explained my disinclination about it. If Members are really inclined to put their points, I think they can put them shortly or they can just control the urge to speak. From day to day we are sitting; it becomes a difficult matter.....

**An Hon. Member:** Parliament is for speaking.

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes, Parliament is for speaking but not for irrelevantly carrying on. I fix 10 minutes, and I hope hon. Members will observe that limit. But if some Member takes more time, that means the other people will be crowded out and their own parties will suffer. I shall keep account.

**Dr. S. P. Mookerjee:** Uptil now you have fixed no time. Today we are discussing a very important question and the discussion should not be stifled like this.

**Mr. Speaker:** Therefore, I was saying that if hon. Members, say of the Opposition, took more time they might, but other speakers would be crowded out. If the Congress Members want to take more time, they may, but their speakers will be crowded out. It is with a desire to allow a large number of Members that I am suggesting 10 minutes. Even when 15 minutes were suggested, hon. Members will note that some Members from the Opposition had taken as much as 30 minutes, with the result that one of their speakers was crowded out. I want to be very clear that this should give Members as good a chance as possible. That is the only thing. Mr. Chatterjee.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** Uptil now India had placed herself under a self-denying ordinance with regard to Kashmir. There was a general feeling of reluctance to say anything which might help Pakistan in its anti-Indian propaganda. But unfortunately, some of the recent speeches of Sheikh Abdullah as the Chief Minister of the State of Jammu and Kashmir compel us to speak out our mind; specially the resolutions passed by the Kashmir Constituent Assembly compel us to review the constitutional position and both the Government of India and the House of the People should address themselves seriously to the situation which is now facing us.

Mr. Alan Campbell Johnson has said in his book "Mission with Mountbatten" that when Sheikh Abdullah was nominated to represent India at Lake Success, there was uneasiness in high quarters because he was known as a "flamboyant personality", and when a flamboyant personality makes flamboyant speeches, always difficulty comes into being. We maintain that our Government has bungled badly over the Kashmir issue. The biggest bungling was to refer the Kashmir

problem to the UNO. The big leaders were afraid and succumbed to the machinations of the imperialists, supposed to be friends of India. The sooner we get out of the UNO and withdraw this problem, the better for India and for Kashmir. The second bungling, was the 'cease fire' order. While the valiant Indian Army had gone into Kashmir and was chasing the marauders and aggressors who were helped by Pakistan and the whole territory was going to be cleared by our valiant soldiers, this unfortunate 'cease fire' order went. The result is that Kashmir territory, which is under the law, under the Constitution and by all canons of morality and justice Indian territory, one third of it—more than that—is today occupied by these illegal trespassers who are still sticking to it and we are passive spectators and cannot do anything.

The third bungling to my mind, that is the most tragic thing which has happened in Indian history—was this offer of a plebiscite, which should never have been given. I maintain and I say with all earnestness that under the law, under the Constitution, accession to the Dominion of India under Section 6 of the Government of India Act, as amended after the Indian Independence Act, was final and irrevocable, and there ought not to have been any question of plebiscite. This tragic offer of plebiscite led to all this result and we are faced today with a serious situation. Indian blood had been shed on the valley of Kashmir, 150 crores of rupees of the Indian taxpayers' money have been spent there and more will have to be spent there and yet we are not out of the woods. Not only that, this is responsible for the uncertain situation and for the pandering to communalism which the Government of Kashmir is today doing. Look at it. Sheikh Abdullah says: 'How can I tolerate any party demanding fullest accession, fullest integration to India? How can I face the Kashmir Muslims?' That is an astonishing statement. What about the poor Hindus of Jammu and Kashmir? What about the people of Jammu?

شر غلام قادر : کشمیر میں کمیونازم  
ہے۔ اس کا آپ کے پاس کیا ثبوت ہے ؟

[Shri Ghulam Qader (Jammu and Kashmir): Have you got any proof to show that there is communalism in Kashmir?]

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** I hope I will go on uninterrupted. My hon. friend

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

will have his turn. We expected a different stand from Sheikh Abdullah. He has got to talk like this because of this offer of plebiscite, which ought not to have been given. I maintain that the accession is final and irrevocable. Under our Constitution too, Kashmir is an integral part of India. Under Article 1, the Indian Union consists of a Federation of States, and it is a Part 'B' State. There cannot be any going back on that. But the unfortunate thing is that the Constituent Assembly is doing something there which is against the spirit of our Constitution. I know my non. and learned friend, Dr. Katju, will point to me article 370 of the Constitution. Article 370 is in Part XXI and it deals with temporary and transitional provisions in the Constitution. Article 370 itself says that "For the purposes of this article, the Government of the State means the person for the time being recognised by the President as the *Maharaja* of Jammu and Kashmir acting on the advice of the Council of Ministers for the time being in office under the *Maharaja's* Proclamation dated the fifth day of March 1948." I have got that Proclamation before me. It was read out to the Constituent Assembly of India by the hon. Mr. Gopalswami Ayyangar on the 17th October 1949. That Proclamation signed by the *Maharaja* said as follows:

"I hereby ordain as follows:—

(1) My Council of Ministers shall consist of the Prime Minister and such other Ministers as may be appointed on the advice of the Prime Minister. I have by Royal Warrant appointed Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah as the Prime Minister with effect from the 1st day of March 1948."

Then, Mr. Gopalswami Ayyangar pointed out that the Proclamation proceeded to set out another sentence as follows:

"The Prime Minister and other Ministers would function as a Cabinet and act on the principle of joint responsibility."

I maintain it is absolutely a travesty of facts to say that they have achieved a wonderful thing—this wonderful Constituent Assembly of Kashmir—by abolishing despotism, or tyranny or any unconstitutional rule of a tyrant who was sitting on the throne as the *Maharaja*. Immediately this Proclamation was promulgated by the *Maharaja* and article

370 of the Constitution came into operation, the *Maharaja* of Kashmir was nothing but a constitutional ruler just as the other Rajpramukhs are, and it is absolutely wrong to say that they are going to remove or liquidate the *Maharaja* and a triumphant progress in democracy is being achieved in that wonderful State of Jammu and Kashmir. But what about article 366? I would request my learned friend Dr. Katju to remember article 366. It is not in Part XXI—not in the chapter dealing with temporary and transitional provisions. In clause (21) of article 366 there is a definition of "Rajpramukh" it says as follows:—

" 'Rajpramukh' means—

(a) in relation to the State of Hyderabad, the person who for the time being is recognised by the President as the Nizam of Hyderabad;

(b) in relation to the State of Jammu and Kashmir or the State of Mysore, the person who for the time being is recognised by the President as the *Maharaja* of that State;"

Now, this is our Constitution. I am not for any particular *Raja* or *Maharaja*. I am not one of those who would support any vestige of feudalism in the Republic of India. But this is our Constitution, and the Constituent Assembly of Jammu and Kashmir must recognise the sovereignty of the Indian Parliament, the sovereignty of the Indian Republic, and that this Constitution is the paramount and organic law which it can not transgress. Here, you place the Nizam of Hyderabad on the same footing as the *Maharaja* of Kashmir and the *Maharaja* of Mysore. You have made all of them constitutional rulers, constitutional heads, as you have got other constitutional heads of States. What right has this Constituent Assembly to drive this kind of wedge in the Constitution and declare by its unilateral action that it will liquidate the rule of the *Maharaja*? This cannot be, I say with respect, dealt with by Sheikh Abdullah or by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. This must be done by bilateral action, if at all, by the amendment of the Constitution. Therefore, this must be done by this Parliament functioning as the supreme sovereign authority. First of all, I maintain that they must recognise the sovereignty of the Indian Parliament. They must recognise that the Constitution is the paramount law which the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir

cannot transgress. They cannot infringe its letter, and they cannot infringe its spirit; they must act within the framework of the Indian Constitution. If Sheikh Abdullah cannot be brought to his senses, if he stands for a republic within a republic—have you heard of a republic within a republic?—if we allow this to be done, tomorrow the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir may say: "We shall cease to be a Part B State." They cannot do that, I maintain, under this Constitution. Day after tomorrow they will come and say: "We shall not accede to India even in three matters—Defence, Communications and External Affairs." I maintain that that cannot be done. That would be an outrage on our Constitution. Once you allow this Constitution to be tampered with in that manner, you will be setting a dangerous precedent. It will have serious repercussions on the other States and their constitutional position would be affected. We have got to reflect on this. If this Parliament or the Prime Minister of India, or the Government of India cannot induce the Constituent Assembly or Sheikh Abdullah to come to their senses, if they are determined to say, "We shall be a republic within a republic; we shall have a separate flag of our own; we shall have an elected head as President; we are not going to recognise article 366 or the other provisions of the Constitution", it would mean an abridgement of the power of this Parliament. [By this Constitution—I have not got the time, otherwise I could read it out to you—there is a definite legislative abridgement of the power of this Parliament to liquidate the Rulers. There is a provision that even this Parliament, in exercise of its legislative powers, cannot legislate to liquidate the rulers, nor can any legislature of a State exercise this power to the detriment of the guarantees given by the Covenants or Instruments of Accession. By certain solemn documents guarantees and assurances have been given to the Rulers of Indian States, and we will have to implement those pledges.] Will you, as Members of this Parliament, allow this Government, with whose support Sheikh Abdullah and his Ministry are operating, to do anything to infringe the spirit of this Constitution, to do something against this Constitution? They cannot do it. But if they cannot induce the Constituent Assembly to give up its stand of having a republic within a republic, of having a separate flag of its own, and if the Constituent Assembly is determined to say, "We shall not fully accede to

India, and we will not allow the people of Jammu to have their legitimate expression of self-determination and complete accession to India", then, Sir, I submit that the representatives of Jammu and Kashmir should not be allowed to participate in any discussion or in any voting in this House excepting in respect of these three subjects of Defence, Communications and External Affairs. What right have they to participate in our internal affairs? I remember, in the Irish debates in the British House of Commons, when Ireland was acceding under the Home Rule Bill of Gladstone only in respect of certain subjects like Defence and External Affairs, it was made clear that no Irish Members could sit in the House and vote on other subjects. There is an incongruity that should be faced. I am reading to you a very thoughtful address by Mr. Kodanda Rao, a distinguished member of the Servants of India Society. He has written:—

"If the Maharaja's Dogra administration had its black spots, the Nizam's Razakar Government had blacker spots. India had to fight to save Kashmir from outside hostiles, the raiders and Pakistan. India had to fight Hyderabad to save it from internal hostiles, the Nizam and his Razakars. Indeed, if the Maharaja deserved to be deposed, the Nizam deserved it infinitely more. And yet the Maharaja has been deposed while the Nizam has been made the Rajpramukh! While the Government of India have been chivalrous towards the hostile Nizam who defied them, they have been mean towards the friendly Maharaja who sought their protection."

He is a man who weighs his words. The language is strong. But I maintain it is a fair description of the position. How will you face the country and say that you will keep the Nizam in office as Rajpramukh under article 366, clause (21), and tolerate this unilateral action of Sheikh Abdulla and his Constituent Assembly to liquidate the hereditary ruler of Kashmir? You cannot do it under the Constitution, and it should not be left to any powerful personality here. It ought to be brought before this Parliament. It should be discussed by this Parliament. It ought to be thrashed out. But if they do not do it, I maintain that their representatives should not be allowed to function here in this

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

Parliament, discussing and participating in all votes for grants on every possible and impossible step relating to the internal administration of India. That would be most improper, and that should not be tolerated.

Lastly I would say that this flag question cannot be brushed aside. I know Sheikh Abdulla has been delivering speeches of diverse degrees of warmth and eloquence to suit different occasions. The latest I.D. broadcast has toned down his previous somewhat indiscreet utterances. We are thankful for it. But are you going to allow any State to have a separate flag of its own? Is it not an expression of hostility towards the Union, towards our flag, towards our sacred Flag which is the emblem of India's sovereignty? Are you going to tolerate that? And would you allow all other States to have separate flags of their own? The Constitution of India says that there shall be one elected President and none else who will be the head of the State. The other constituent federating units will have nominated heads either as Rajpramukh or as Governor. Nobody else will be the elected head of India or her constituent units. Will you allow Kashmir to go its own way in defiance of the fundamental scheme of our Constitution, in defiance of the letter of the Constitution, in defiance of the spirit of the Constitution? I hope that will not be allowed to be done. This thing should be made clear, that it is not a question of the liquidation of a despotic monarchy. It had already been liquidated, finally liquidated. There is no question that a Tudor tyranny or a Stuart despotism is being wiped out by the sagacious wisdom of somebody in Kashmir. It has already been done. It is a closed chapter.

My appeal to the Prime Minister and to Dr. Katju is: Do not allow this Constitution to be tampered with or whittled down. Do not allow these disruptive forces to operate by saying that they will have a separate flag, or that they will not have parity with other Part B States, that they will have their own elected President. It is a dangerous innovation. You should not tolerate that. That would not be showing true allegiance to India. What is our predicament? India has spent Rs. 150 crores and more, and Indian blood has been shed in the valleys of Kashmir. That has been done, but we do not want this kind of treatment in return.

Then, we shall have to say: "Ingratitude, thy name is Kashmir." That should not be tolerated. That should be put a stop to. Our Prime Minister and our Minister of States should be firm in dealing with this kind of encroachment, which is an outrage on our Constitution, which is an outrage on the cherished document which is the supreme organic law of the country.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

श्री राधा रमण : आज हम उन स्टेट्स के बारे में सोच रहे हैं जो कि "बी" और "सी" क्लास स्टेट्स कही जाती हैं। इन स्टेट्स के विषय में पिछले मौकों पर हमारे बहुत सारे मित्रों ने अपने अपने विचार प्रकट किये हैं। पार्लियामेंट में यह सवाल कई बार आया है कि हमारे देश में 'बी' और 'सी' क्लास में जो स्टेट्स हैं उन की उन्नति आहिस्ता आहिस्ता ऐसी की जाये कि वे भी "ए" पार्ट स्टेट्स के समान जन-तंत्रीय शासन चला सकें। पिछली पार्लियामेंट में सदस्यों ने यह जान कर कि यह स्वाहिश उन स्टेट्स के रहने वालों की मुनासिब और स्वाभाविक है, इस बात का निर्णय किया कि जिन स्टेट्स में अभी तक जम्हूरी उसूलों पर शासन कायम नहीं वहाँ के लिये विधान में ऐसी व्यवस्था की जाय कि वहाँ पर भी जम्हूरी शासन कायम हो सके। हम अपने उन तमाम सदस्यों के बहुत कृतज्ञ हैं जिन्होंने इस स्वाभाविक स्वाहिश को पहिचाना और हमारा समर्थन किया और उन के प्रयत्नों के फलस्वरूप इन "सी" स्टेट्स के अन्दर भी जम्हूरी शासन कायम हुआ। मगर यह बात हमें नहीं भूलनी चाहिये कि इन स्टेटों में जो आज शासन कायम है उस शासन के अन्दर अभी कुछ बातें ऐसी बाकी हैं कि जो लोक-प्रिय सरकार के अन्दर होनी चाहियें। मेरा यह विश्वास है कि ज्यों ज्यों ये इलाके या ये स्टेट्स अपने आप को काबू में करेंगे और प्रजातंत्रवाद के अनुसार अपने शासन को उन्नत करेंगे

भविष्य में वहां पर भी उसी प्रकार का शासन कायम होगा जैसा कि हम पार्ट "ए" स्टेट्स में देखते हैं ।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There is lot of noise. I am not able to understand why this noise is there. Let there be no obstruction from the Galleries. There is too much of noise. We cannot go on with out proceedings here.

**श्री राधा रमण :** इसलिये जहां मैं अपनी सरकार का आभार प्रकट करता हूं वहां यह आशा रखता हूं कि हमारी सरकार इस विचार को अपने अन्दर सदा कायम रखते हुए इन स्टेट्स को अपना आशीर्वाद प्रदान करेगी और आहिस्ता आहिस्ता ये स्टेट्स भी "ए" स्टेट्स की तरह ही अपने यहां राज्य शासन कायम कर सकेंगी ।

दूसरी बात जो मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूं वह यह है कि चन्द पार्ट 'सी' स्टेट्स ऐसी हैं जहां पर अभी तक कोई रिफार्मस् ( reforms ) जो वहां के लोगों को मंजूर हो सकता है या जिसे लोग वहां पसन्द करते हैं, या चाहते हैं और जो कि तसल्ली बरूश कहा जा सकता है, वह अभी तक वहां नहीं दिये गये हैं । मेरा मतलब त्रिपुरा और मनीपुर आदि से है । जो भाई उन स्टेट्स से आये हैं उन को अगर आप ने मौका दिया तो वे अपने विचार रखेंगे मगर मैं उन के विचारों का पूरा समर्थन करता हूं कि इन स्टेट्स में जो शासन की असुविधायें अभी तक मौजूद हैं उन्हें हमें जल्दी से जल्दी दूर करना चाहिये । आप ने और हम ने सब ने देखा है कि पिछली पार्लियामेंट में इस बहस पर बहुत काफी लोगों ने विचार प्रकट किये थे और बहुत से हमारे भाइयों ने यह माना था कि इन छोटे छोटे स्टेटों को अगर हम ने प्रजातंत्रीय शासन दिया तो उस का नतीजा यह होगा कि हम उन के खर्चों

को बढ़ा देंगे और वहां के लोगों की तकलीफें बढ़ जायेंगी और बहुत सारे काम शायद ऐसे होंगे कि जिन से हमें नुकसान पहुंचे । लेकिन जिन जिन राज्यों में आप ने प्रजातंत्रीय शासन कायम किया वहां आप ने देखा कि ऐलेक्शन ( election ) के जमाने में एक नया जोश, एक नया उत्साह पैदा हुआ और वहां की जनता ने बड़े जोरों के साथ कांग्रेस को कामयाब कर के दिखाया । अगर आप जरा विचार करें तो आप को पता चलेगा कि दिल्ली, हिमाचल प्रदेश और विन्ध्य प्रदेश में जहां ऐसा शासन कायम हुआ वहां पर कांग्रेस की बहुत बड़ी मंजोरिटी (majority) आज मौजूद है । इस का कारण यही है कि वहां की जनता चाहती थी कि जिस प्रकार देश के दूसरे हिस्सों में राज्यशासन है उसी प्रकार का राज्यशासन उन के राज्य में भी हो । यह एक स्वाभाविक ख्याल था और उस स्वाभाविक ख्याल को पूरा करने पर जो नतीजा निकला वह बहुत अच्छा नतीजा आप ने देखा । अतः मैं यह अर्ज करूंगा कि मनीपुर, त्रिपुरा और इस प्रकार की जो स्टेट्स हैं जहां पर अभी तक प्रजातंत्रीय शासन कायम नहीं हुआ है वहां पर लोक-सभा को और हमारी सरकार को बहुत जल्दी ही कोई ऐसी शासन पद्धति निकाल कर चलानी चाहिये जिस से कि जनता का असंतोष खत्म हो जाये, वहां के लोग खुश हों और वहां के लोगों में एक नया जोश पैदा हो, जिस की वजह से वह शासन का भार अपने ऊपर ले कर आम जनता की भलाई की तरफ आगे बढ़ सकें । मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि हमारी यह लोक सभा और यह सरकार इस तरफ पूरा ध्यान देगी और वे स्टेट्स जो कि अभी तक लोकप्रिय शासन से वंचित हैं उन को इस प्रकार का शासन प्रदान किया जायेगा जिस से वहां के लोगों को संतोष हो सके ।

[ श्री राधा रमण ]

मैं इस सम्बन्ध में आज जब कि “सी” स्टेट्स के बारे में हम चर्चा कर रहे हैं, दिल्ली की स्थिति पर कुछ रोशनी डालना चाहता हूँ। दिल्ली एक छोटा सा राज्य है और इस में २०-२२ लाख के करीब की जनसंख्या बसती है। यह राजधानी भी है। ६ महीने पहिले इस राज्य की हालत वही थी कि जैसी और दूसरी “सी” स्टेट्स की हालत थी। एक आन्दोलन हुआ, जनता ने एक आवाज़ उठाई, सारे हिन्दुस्तान में उस का कुछ असर हुआ, हमारी सरकार ने भी उस पर गौर किया और खास तौर पर हमारे नेता पंडित जवाहरलाल जी ने, जो कि जम्हूरी उसूलों के पाबन्द हैं और जो हमेशा एक सही और जायज मांग को सुनते हैं और इस के मुताबिक अमल करते हैं, इस आवाज़ को सुना और दिल्ली को एक “सी” स्टेट बना कर यहां पर लोकप्रिय सत्ता कायम की। बहुत से लोगों ने यह ख्याल किया कि इस सत्ता के कायम होने के बाद हमारा बहुत सारा काम खत्म हो जाता है और बहुत से लोगों की जो तकलीफें हैं वे भी बहुत कुछ खत्म हो जाती हैं।

मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि दिल्ली दारुलखिलाफा होने की वजह से, एक राजधानी होने की वजह से, एक खास हैसियत रखता है। यहां पर जो कुछ भी काम होता है उस का सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान पर ही नहीं बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर भी असर होता है। साथ ही साथ यहां पर ऐसे लोग भी मौजूद हैं जो हमेशा इस बात की कोशिश करते रहते हैं कि कोई न कोई गड़बड़ का काम हो, कोई न कोई बात ऐसी बने जिस से कम से कम उन को यह मौका मिले कि वह इस स्टेट को कमजोर बना सकें या उस को गिरा सकें। अभी चन्द दिन हुए कि

आप लोगों के सामने एक मसला आया था और जिस का जबाब काटजू साहब ने यहां पर दिया था। मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि अगर इस मसले के अन्दर कांग्रेसमैन न होते या कोई कांग्रेसमैन का ख्याल नहीं होता, तो दिल्ली में किसी आदमी के कानों कान खबर भी न होती। वह मसला भी उसी तरह से चला जाता जिस तरह से आम मसले रोज चले जाते हैं। सिर्फ यह बजह होने से कि उस में कांग्रेसमैन शामिल थे, जो लोग हमेशा इस बात की ताक में रहते हैं कि जब कभी भी मौका मिले कांग्रेसमैनों पर वार करें और कांग्रेस वालों को नुकसान पहुंचायें। इन लोगों ने इस छोटी सी बात का फायदा उठाया और उस को बढ़ा चढ़ा कर सारे हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर ही नहीं बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर तक फैलाया। यह एक बहुत अफसोसकुन बात है।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि लोक-सभा के सदस्य और हमारी सरकार के नेता इस बात को ख्याल में लायें कि दिल्ली एक ऐसी जगह है, और दिल्ली हिन्दुस्तान की राजधानी होने की वजह से एक ऐसी अहमियत रखती है कि अगर यहां पर एक छोटा सा मामला भी हो जाय जिस पर कहीं कोई गौर तक नहीं किया जा सकता वह यहां पर बड़ी से बड़ी शकल अख्तियार कर सकता है।

मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के एक कोने से दूसरे कोने तक जो इस तरह के शरारती लोग मौजूद हैं और जिन का सिर्फ एक ही मकसद है कि हिन्दुस्तान को हुकूमत कमजोर या बदनाम हो, वह ऐसी हरकतें करते रहते हैं और हमें उन से होशियार रहना चाहिये। और मैं यह कहूंगा कि ऐसे मौकों पर पार्ट “सी” वालों की जिम्मेदारी बहुत काफ़ी बढ़ जाती है। मुझे विश्वास है कि हमारे नेता दिल्ली में जो कि “सी”

पार्ट में आता है, हमेशा अपने ख्याल में रखेंगे। और उस की हिफाजत करते रहेंगे। वह इस की उसी तरह से हिफाजत करेंगे जिस तरह से एक माता अपने बच्चे को पालती है और उस को हर मुसीबत से बचाती है या हर दिक्कतों से बचाती है और उस को बड़ा बनाती है। मुझे विश्वास है कि हमारे नेता दिल्ली स्टेट की इसी तरह से सहायता करते रहेंगे और यह आगे बढ़ती ही रहेगी।

इस समय इन बी और सी स्टेट्स में जो कमी दिखाई देती है अगर हमारी सरकार और इस सभा के सदस्य उन की मदद करेंगे तो बहुत जल्द वह वक्त आयेगा जब कि यह कमियां सब खत्म हो जायेंगी और इस समय जो तीन किस्म की स्टेट दिखाई दे रही है वह भी न रहेंगी। फिर इन तीनों स्टेटों के सवाल खत्म हो जायेंगे और यह तीनों एक बन कर सारे देश को एक मजबूत मुल्क बनायेंगे। फिर हम को किसी तरह की भिन्नता शासन पद्धति में कहीं भी नहीं दिखाई देगी। जिस तरह से ए पार्ट वाली सरकार अपनी जनता की सेवा कर रही है और लोक प्रिय बन गई है, उसी प्रकार बी और सी स्टेट वाली सरकारें भी लोक प्रिय बन जायेंगी।

में आप का अधिक समय नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ, एक बार फिर कृतज्ञता प्रगट कर के अपना भाषण खत्म कर दूंगा। पिछली बार पार्लियामेंट में सी स्टेट्स में रहने वालों की स्वाहिशों को देखते हुए विधान में संशोधन किया गया था। यह एक मुनासिब स्वाहिश थी और जनता बहुत दिनों से इस को चाहती भी थी, जो कि हमारी सरकार और हमारे नेताओं ने पूरी की। मगर मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि आगे चल कर जो कमी इन के शासन में रह गई है और जिस की वजह से पार्ट सी स्टेट्स के रहने वाले असन्तुष्ट हैं, हमारी सरकार

इस कमी को भी पूरा कर देगी। इस कमी को पूरा करने से हमारा सारा देश एक जगह से दूसरी जगह तक एक ही जायेगा और सब का शासन प्रबन्ध भी एक ही तरह का होगा।

(English translation of the above speech.)

**Shri Radha Raman (Delhi City):** Today's debate concerns with what are commonly known as Part B or Part C States. Many hon. friends on several occasions in the past have expressed their views with regard to these States. The issue of gradual development of Part B and Part C States with the ultimate object of introducing a full-fledged democratic administrative machinery in them—as in Part 'A' States—has been discussed in the Parliament a number of times. The hon. Members of the Provisional Parliament, holding the wishes of the people of these States as legitimate and natural, had decided to make provisions in the Constitution for a democratic administrative machinery in the States where it did not exist upto then. We feel grateful to all such hon. friends who recognised this natural urge and supported us and because of whose support these states have also been granted a democratic administrative set up. We should not, however, be oblivious of a few shortcomings in the democratic administrative structure of these States from which popular Governments generally do not suffer. I trust and hope that with the passing of time, as these states consolidate their position more and more, their administration shall be run on more democratic lines and ultimately their position will become analogous to that of Part A States.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There is lot of noise. I am not able to understand why this noise is there. Let there be no obstruction from the Galleries. There is too much of noise. We cannot go on with our proceedings here.

**Shri Radha Raman:** So while expressing gratitude for the Government, I hope they will constantly try to give all necessary encouragement to these States and ultimately enable these administrations to function more and more in conformity to those of Part 'A' States.

[Shri Radha Raman]

Another matter which I want to place before the House is that in some of Part 'C' States no reforms that are acceptable to the people of those States and which they like and as such want to be introduced, or which otherwise can be considered as satisfactory, have yet been granted, I am thereby referring to Tripura and Manipur States. The hon. friends coming from these States, if they are given an opportunity to speak, will place their views before the House. I, however, support them inasmuch as the handicaps and drawbacks still being experienced in these States should be removed at the earliest. We all know that quite a large number of hon. Members of the provisional Parliament participated in these discussions. The consensus of opinion was that the grant of democratic system of Government to such small States will only add to their expenditure and consequently to their difficulties and further in many respects our own interests will stand to suffer. But during the recent elections we witnessed a wave of enthusiasm prevailing in all those States where a democratic administrative machinery has now been set up. The people there have returned the Congress to their legislatures most enthusiastically. You Sir, can know it very easily that Congress has a large majority in the legislatures of Delhi, Himachal Pradesh and Vindhya Pradesh which were granted a popular system of Government only very recently. The one reason for that is the people there fervently desired the same system of Government should have been introduced in their respective territories as has been introduced in other States. It was a natural urge the fulfilment of which yielded wholesome results. I, therefore, submit that this House and our Government must evolve a system of Government for States like Tripura and Manipur, which are so far without a democratic administrative set-up, so that the aspirations of the people there may be satisfied and fresh enthusiasm necessary to give them the strength to shoulder the responsibilities of administration may be created and they also may march forward along the path of the service of the masses. I feel confident that this House and our Government will give due consideration to this issue and the States which are deprived of a popular Government, will be granted a system of Government that will meet their wishes.

Now that we are discussing the problems of Part C States, I want to say a few things with special reference to Delhi. It is a small State having a population of 20 to 22 lakhs of persons. It is our Capital too. Six months before there was no difference between Delhi and other such States now known as Part 'C' States. An agitation was started, the public raised their voice which made itself somewhat heard throughout India. Our Government also gave some thought to it and, in particular our leader Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who always champions democratic causes and listens to all reasonable and just demands and tries to satisfy them, paid heed to the public voice and helped Delhi attain the status of a Part 'C' State with a popular Government running its administration. Many people thought that with the transfer of power to popular Governments in these States, our work would be finished and the difficulties of the people would be over to a very large extent. I wish to submit that Delhi being the Capital is a particularly important city. Anything that happens here has its repercussions not only in India but outside as well. Also there are people who are constantly on the watch to seize any opportunity to start some trouble here whereby they may weaken this State and ultimately cause its downfall. Only a few days back, an issue had come up for discussion before the House. The hon. Dr. Katju had replied to that debate. I feel convinced that had the Congressmen not participated in that event or were there no considerations of Congressmen vs. non-Congressmen involved in it, not a single person would have even come to know of it. That event would have passed the normal way of other such events. Only because some Congressmen were involved the people who are always on the look-out for any opportunity to bring discredit to Congressmen, took advantage of this trifle and presented it in an exaggerated form, not only in India but outside as well. All this is much regrettable indeed.

I wish our leaders pay more attention to the fact that Delhi is the Capital of the country and as such has a special importance of its own. They should bear it in mind that any ordinary happening, that may pass unnoticed at other places, can assume great magnitude here in Delhi.

I may warn the House to beware of mischievous elements who are present from one corner of the country to the other and whose one aim it is to weaken the Government

of the country or to give it a bad name. They are ever busy in such nefarious designs and exploit every opportunity to that end. I want to emphasise that the responsibility of Part 'C' States in such matters becomes particularly heavy. I fully trust that our leaders will always keep an eye on Delhi which also is a part 'C' State and will always guard it against such evil designs. I hope they will shower a mother's affection on it and like a mother protect it against all calamities, and would help in solving its difficulties and thus create conditions favourable for its growth. I am confident that our leaders will continue to help Delhi State as ever before and that it shall continue to make progress.

There are several difficulties confronting Part 'B' and Part 'C' States at present. On assistance being given by the Centre and by the hon. Members of this House, these difficulties will be removed before long and the three categories of States which we find at present will be merged into one. The problems of these three classes of States, will be solved and having assumed a similar status, all of our States will make the country very strong. Nowhere a disparity in the administrative set-up will then be found. Part 'B' and Part 'C' States also will then be as efficient in serving the people as Part 'A' States are at present. They will then be no less popular either.

While expressing my gratitude once more, I may submit that the Constitution was amended last time to meet the wishes of people living in Part 'C' States. These were legitimate wishes for which people were clamouring since long and which at last have been honoured by our leaders. I fully trust that our Government will also remove the remaining causes of dissatisfaction of the people of these areas and make up the deficiency existing at present. This will unify the administrative structure of the country as a whole.

**Shri Punnoose (Alleppey):** I had prepared a fairly long speech for this occasion, but being under the restriction of time and also after hearing the first speech made by the hon. Member there, I have changed the content as well as the form of my speech. I would begin by speaking on Kashmir. The hon. friend who spoke first raised the question of the constitutional issue and said that the Kashmir Constituent Assembly has been violating the law of the Indian Constitution. I am no constitutional

expert but one thing is very clear to my mind; to me the expressed will of a people is thousand times more precious than the biggest rule contained in any constitution. Here the people of Kashmir stand up, for a cause they meet through their Constituent Assembly—properly elected I believe—and they decide that there shall be no *Maharaja*. I ask you where is the power, where is the morality, where is the strength, where is the sanction for you or for any other power under the sun to go and tell the people of Kashmir, "No, you should have a *Maharaja*"? I entirely agree with the hon. Member that a partial treatment was meted out to the *Nizam*—for the matter of that the very kind and soft treatment given to all these *Maharajas* and *Rajpramukhs* is really against the will of the people. Therefore, what is to be done is not to obstruct the people of Kashmir on their way but to accept the principle immediately, now and here, and pull out every one of these *Rajas* and *Maharajas*, the *Nizam* of Hyderabad, the *Rajpramukh* of Travancore-Cochin. They had their days—ask them to come down.

Well, the hon. Member was asking a question: Why another republic inside this Republic? I ask him back: Can you show an instance in the whole history of constitutional experiments where there is a republic which has on one side a crown. I mean the king of England, and on the other dozens of crowns—I mean these Indian Rulers? Therefore, there are several curious things here. (*An Hon. Member:* That is not democracy. Yes, it is not democracy. Let us have cent per cent democracy. We shall not go and tell the people of Kashmir that they shall have a *Maharaja*. We on this side of the House will stand with the people of Kashmir through thick and thin. I know there are elements going about working against the Kashmir people.

Then there is the question of the flag. The hon. Member seems to be surprised at seeing a flag in Kashmir. I will invite him to travel to the other Part B States. Go to Mysore where you will see a flag fluttering. Come to Travancore-Cochin, there you will see another flag fluttering.

**The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju):** No.

**Shri Punnoose:** I inform, Dr. Katju that there is a flag there with elephants etc. But these are flags of the royal families. The only difference is that the Kashmir flag

[Shri Punnoose]

is a flag chosen by the people. Well, our Constitution will all the more be stronger, healthier and richer if it reflects the will of the people. Therefore we stand by the people of Kashmir and we would call upon the Congress Ministry, the Central Government, to accept this position here and now. And also, let us not play with this question of Kashmir in the U.N.O. The expressed will of the people is there. The Constituent Assembly has said that it accedes to the Indian Union. Accept it. Where is the question of negotiation and mediation when the will of the people is there? Therefore, accept it and, as the hon. Member has suggested, take out the issue from the U.N.O.

Then I will call upon the Congress Government and the interested parties here not to bring to bear any influence on the people of Kashmir to accede in anything more than the three subjects which they already have done. And if I can make myself audible to the Kashmir people, let me tell them not to accede anything more because I come from a State which suffers bitterly as a result of having acceded all and sundry to the Indian Constitution. The hon. Dr. Katju wants to make us believe that it is all beautiful, that it is all ideal, and all successful in the Indian States. I shall tell him very frankly: The people there feel that it is not so beautiful, so ideal and so successful as he wants us to believe.

What is happening in the States today? To say that there is popular Ministry in our States, or in any of these States, is a mockery. These Ministries are filled with the yes-men of the Centre with the result that the Ministers never look to the people but look up to the Centre—they are more interested in pleasing the people at the Centre.

**An Hon. Member:** What about PEPSU?

**Shri Punnoose:** I hold no brief for PEPSU.

Every congressman during the election campaign went about the country saying: Look here, what is the benefit of voting for the Communists or the United Front? Do not vote for any other party, because we have the Centre in our hands. Whatever you may do here, whatever Government you may set up, whatever party you may return to power, you people can do nothing, because we have got the Centre in our hands. Is this demo-

cracy? The other day when I had occasion to talk to a Minister in Travancore-Cochin—not of the present Ministry, but of the previous one—he told me that he would not be a member of the next Cabinet, because there was the threat of a counsellor being appointed. The Ministers are supposed to be under his tutelage to be taught lessons in democracy.

**Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam):** The very same Minister consented to have a Counsellor in his regime.

**Shri Punnoose:** May be; that is the inconsistency of the congress leaders.

The result is that people in the States are losing their respect for the Ministers. Moreover the Centre is interfering in every thing. The Centre wants I.Gs', and Chief Secretaries to be appointed from here.

There was a funny instance when the Chief Secretary—not the present one, but the previous incumbent—of the Travancore-Cochin issued a circular that no file shall be sent up to the Ministers. You know what happened—the Ministers met and passed a protest resolution! The only thing they could do was to pass a resolution. Everything seems to be in the hands of these few people who enjoy the confidence of the Centre.

Then, with regard to the privy purse, a sum of Rs. 4½ crores has been set apart. What is it for? For the meritorious service they have done to this country? Or are they so poor as to deserve this dearness allowance? The other day, we the Kerala Members of Parliament met the hon. the Finance Minister in connection with the coir industry in our State. He listened to us very carefully and patiently—I am thankful to him for that. But nothing has happened. Why are you so anxious to please the princes? Are they so poor? They have got enough of funds; they have got bank balances and property to the tune of lakhs of rupees.

**Some Hon. Members:** Crores.

**Shri Punnoose:** Crores, I stand corrected. Yet, in the name of integration nearly Rs. 4½ crores has been taken away from our income. When people go to the Ministers in the States, pointing out that they have returned them, they reply: "Look here, we have absolutely no money; you know everything has gone to the Centre." When we bring complaints to the notice of the Central Ministers, they turn back and say: "Why, you

have got your fellows there." Therefore, as a spokesman of the party to which I belong, I call upon the Congress Government to stop this privy purse, by amending the Constitution.

**Babu Ramnarayan Singh** (Hazari-bagh West): What about the high salaried posts?

**Shri Punnoose**: All that can be done afterwards.

Then there is the question of Part C States. I have not got enough time to go into this question in details. These Part C States cannot maintain themselves. They are numerically small, but they have to maintain the big paraphernalia, with retiring rooms for the fossils who come out of the bureaucracy. The only alternative is the disintegration of these States immediately and their re-integration into linguistic states.

**Shri C. R. Iyyunni** (Trichur): In the first place, may I thank you for the opportunity that you have given me to express my views. Secondly, I would like to say that the order passed by the President of the Republic that there should be a Counsellor for each of the Part B States is justified.

I come from a State which was one of the best governed States in the whole of India—namely Cochin. I say that deliberately. In the matter of education, we are at the top. In the matter of medical relief, we can compete with any other State in the whole of India. In the matter of *panchayats*, we have *panchayats* all over the State. In the matter of means of communications we are equal to any State in the whole of India.

We have been integrated with the neighbouring State of Travancore. But what is the position? Our position has considerably deteriorated after the integration. At the time when the integration took place, there was hardly any opportunity for the people of Cochin to express their views; even if they had expressed their views, I am sure the Centre would not have accepted it. It was under such circumstances that we had to integrate with our neighbouring State of Travancore.

What was the condition of Travancore at that time? The administration of Travancore could not come anywhere near that of Cochin. I know there is corruption in all places; but corruption generally stops at the lower rung of the ladder of officialdom. But

in our neighbouring State of Travancore, of which we now form part, corruption prevailed not only in the lower ranks, but pervaded the upper ranks also. It is now nearly two and a half to three years since the integration took place; but integration of services has not yet been completed. If there is a Ministry of six, Cochin will have only two seats on it; if there is a Ministry of four, Cochin's share would be only one. The salary of the officers in Travancore is much more than the salary of the officers in Cochin. Nothing has been done to integrate the two services into one. I am receiving several complaints from officers in Cochin. The ultimate authority to decide this matter is the President of the Republic under Article 371 of the Constitution which reads:

"Notwithstanding anything in this Constitution, during a period of ten years from the commencement thereof, or during such longer or shorter period as Parliament may by law provide in respect of any State, the Government of every State specified in Part B of the First Schedule shall be under the general control of, and comply with such particular directions, if any as may from time to time be given by, the President:

Provided that the President may by order direct that the provisions of this article shall not apply to any State specified in the order."

I am perfectly conscious that the President has exempted Mysore from the provisions of this article. What is the reason? The reason is that there is no chance there for showing discrimination between man and man. But in Travancore-Cochin we are the weaker and minor partner and the Travancore people are trampling us under their foot. To whom can we go? We can go only to the Centre or to the President. They have done us an injustice. For, what exactly is the power of the Counsellor that is going to be appointed by the Centre? The Counsellor will be there, as an observer sent from the Centre, to see what things are taking place. He is not to interfere with the administration. He can only give advice to the Ministers concerned, and if they do not listen he makes a report to the Centre which will dispose of the matter properly. In Cochin we have had a Legislative Assembly for twenty-seven years and in Travancore they have

[Shri C. R. Iyyunni]

had it for about the same period. In spite of that were they able to bring in that amount of administrative capacity that is to be expected? They have not been able to do it.

There is one other matter to which I would refer, and that is with regard to the procurement of paddy last year. You will be pleased to hear that in Cochin the area brought under cultivation of rice is about 2 lakh and odd acres of land, whereas in Travancore it is 6 and odd lakh acres of land. While the paddy that was procured from Cochin was 24 lakhs of parahs, in Travancore it was only 21 lakhs. Can there be a better illustration to show that we have not been properly treated and that discrimination is shown.

Justice is not meted out to us and therefore we have a right to say that unless the Centre or the President of the Republic comes to our rescue, there is hardly any chance for us to get on. I would even go to the extent of saying that if the situation continues like that and we have no chance to get on, we would even welcome disintegration. We will be perfectly satisfied with that.

With regard to other matters which are taking place in Travancore I do not wish to say more because the Ministers are my friends. I could have said more, but I do not want to say. If there is absolute necessity for the appointment of a Counsellor in Travancore-Cochin I would say that there would be greater necessity for the same so far as other States are concerned because they are politically less developed than the State of Travancore-Cochin. There was a time when the Cochin administration was considered to be the best, and that fastidious Viceroy, Lord Curzon, said that if there was one State in the whole of India which was entitled to be called a model State it was Cochin. The position of such a State has deteriorated, and I therefore beg to submit that the appointment of a Counsellor in States where discrimination is shown between man and man, because of parochial and other interests, is absolutely necessary.

That is all that I wish to say.

श्री माधव रेड्डी : श्रीमान् डिप्टी  
स्पीकर साहब, कल्ल इस के कि में कट मोशन

नम्बर ४०१ पर अपने विचार आप के सामने रखूँ, मैं ज़रूरी समझता हूँ कि स्टेट्स मिनिस्ट्री की पालिसी के बारे में कुछ कहूँ। यह दावा अक्सर किया जाता है कि स्टेट्स मिनिस्ट्री ने हिन्दुस्तानी रियासतों के मामले को बड़ी खूबी से हल किया। मैं अब इस बहस में नहीं पड़ना चाहता कि कहां तक यह दावा सही है, मगर हिन्दुस्तानी रियासतों के मामले में स्टेट्स मिनिस्ट्री की हमेशा यह नीति रही है कि हिन्दुस्तानी रियासतों के अद्वाम पर स्टेट्स मिनिस्ट्री अपनी मर्जी ब फंसले को थोपे। मैं हैदराबाद से आता हूँ और वहां के बारे में ही मैं बात कहता हूँ। पुलिस एक्शन (Police action) के बाद हैदराबाद के लोगों से यह वायदा किया गया था कि हैदराबाद की किस्मत का फैसला हैदराबाद के अद्वाम ही करेंगे। जब वज़ीरे आजम हैदराबाद आये थे, तो उन्होंने हैदराबाद के पांच लाख लोगों को मुखातिब करते हुए कहा था कि हैदराबाद की किस्मत का फैसला और निज़ाम का फैसला हैदराबाद के लोग ही करेंगे और स्वर्गवासी सरदार पटेल जब हैदराबाद में आये थे तो उन्होंने भी यही कहा था कि हैदराबाद की किस्मत का फैसला हैदराबाद के लोग ही करेंगे। स्टेट्स मिनिस्ट्री का जो व्हाइट पेपर (White Paper) शायद हुआ और निज़ाम ने जो फरमान जारी किया और जिस की बिना पर हैदराबाद का ताल्लुक हमेशा के लिये रिपब्लिक आफ इंडिया (Republic of India) से किया गया और जिस में साफ तौर पर उन्होंने कहा :

"I further declare that the above decision which I have taken after mature consideration in order to ensure for the people of Hyderabad the benefits of an honourable partnership in a united

and democratic India, shall, in view of its far-reaching consequences, be subject to ratification by the people of this State whose will as expressed through the Constituent Assembly of the State proposed to be constituted shortly must finally determine the nature of the relationship between this State and the Union of India, as also the constitution of the State itself."

और स्टेट्स मिनिस्ट्री का यह व्हाइट पेपर जो शायद हुआ, उस में साफ तौर पर यह कहा गया कि :

"The proclamation makes it clear that the decision taken by the Nizam is subject to the confirmation of the people whose will, as expressed through the Constituent Assembly of the State, must finally determine the nature of the State's relationship with the Centre as also the constitution of the State itself." And

"The Government of India have repeatedly declared that the political future of the State and its relationship with India are matters to be decided by the people of the State."

फिर उस के बाद जैसे जैसे वक्त गुजरता गया, वैसे वैसे हैदराबाद के इस मसले को सेंटर (Centre) ने अपने हाथ में लिया। हैदराबाद के सोलह लोगों को कांस्टीटुएन्ट असेम्बली (Constituent Assembly) में नामजद किया, नामिनेट (Nominate) किया जिन्होंने हैदराबाद की किस्मत का फैसला किया और स्टेट्स मिनिस्ट्री दावा कर सकती है कि हम ने तो हैदराबाद की किस्मत का फैसला हैदराबाद वालों पर छोड़ दिया और जो वहाँ के सोलह नुमाइन्दे यहाँ आये थे, उन्होंने फैसला किया था और मंजूर किया था कि हैदराबाद को पार्ट बी स्टेट्स में शामिल किया जाय। ठीक है, अगर इस से यह

मतलब निकाला जाय कि वह फैसला हैदराबाद के लोगों ने, वहाँ के अवाम ने किया, तो यह बात सही है।

इस के बाद हैदराबाद के कई मामलों में खास तौर पर फायनेंसियल इंटिग्रेशन (Financial integration) के मामले में हैदराबाद का दस करोड़ का नुकसान हुआ, जो आमदनी उस को ऐक्साइज (excise), रेलवे और इनकम टैक्स वगैरह से थी, उस को इस इंटिग्रेशन से करीब दस करोड़ का नुकसान हुआ, हालाँकि मैसूर को तकरीबन सिर्फ २ करोड़ का नुकसान हुआ लेकिन उस दो करोड़ के लगभग सबवेंशन (subvention) मिलता है, इस के बरखिलाफ हैदराबाद की इतनी बड़ी स्टेट को जिस की आमदनी फायनेंसियल इंटिग्रेशन से पहले दस करोड़ की थी, उस को सबवेंशन के तौर पर केवल १ करोड़ २५ लाख या १ करोड़ ३० लाख दिया गया,— मुझे ठीक तौर से इस समय फिगर (figure) याद नहीं है, लेकिन वह बड़े करोड़ के अन्दर है।

तो यह तो रहा हैदराबाद के बारे में खास तौर से जो ऐग्रीमेंट (agreement) किया गया वह हैदराबाद के लोगों से नहीं किया गया वह ऐग्रीमेंट स्टेट और स्टेट्स मिनिस्ट्री के बीच में हुआ। हम यह मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं कि वह ऐग्रीमेंट हैदराबाद के लोगों से किया गया। क्यों कि जिस वक्त फाइनेन्शियल ऐग्रीमेंट किया गया उस वक्त हैदराबाद की हुकूमत की बागडोर आप के हाथ में थी, हैदराबाद की हुकूमत हैदराबाद के लोगों के हाथ में नहीं थी। इस लिये मैं आप से यह दरखास्त करूँगा कि फाइनेन्शियल इन्टिग्रेशन के बारे में जो

[श्री माधव रेड्डी]

एग्जिमेंट है उस को रिवाइज (revise) किया जाय और हैदराबाद की ऐसेम्बली में उस को पूरी तरह डिस्कस (discuss) किया जाय और अजसरे नौ समझौता किया जाये ।

इस के बाद हैदराबाद के कई मामलों में खास तौर से अभी अभी सेंटर ने फैसला किया कि उस्मानिया युनिवर्सिटी को सेंटर ले ले । अगर इस मौके पर मैं यह भी कहूँ कि इस के बारे में भी हैदराबाद के लोगों से पूछा नहीं गया तो बेजा न होगा । क्योंकि हैदराबाद में स्टेट कोन्सेलर बैठा हुआ है जो इस बारे में अपना दखल रखता है । हैदराबाद के कई लोगों ने, उस्मानिया युनिवर्सिटी की सेनेट (Senate) ने और कई युनियन्स (unions) ने यह डिमान्ड (demand) किया कि यह मसला ऐसा है कि जिस को हैदराबाद की ऐसेम्बली (Assembly) में रखा जाय और वहां पर यह डिस्कस हो । मैं यह नहीं कहना चाहता कि उस्मानिया युनिवर्सिटी को आप न लें । लेकिन कम से कम हैदराबाद के लोगों के सेन्टिमेंट्स (sentiments) का ख्याल करें । मैं यहां दिल्ली इम्पीरियलिज्म या और किसी इम्पीरियलिज्म (imperialism) की बात नहीं कहता, मैं यहां इस चीज को भी नहीं लाना चाहता जो यहां हिन्दी वसेंज नान हिन्दी, नार्थ वसेंज साउथ या इस तरह की चीजों के बारे में लाई जाती है । लेकिन फिर भी हैदराबाद में जो ऐटीट्यूड (attitude) रहा है उस को मैं दिल्ली इम्पीरियलिज्म कहूँ तो बेजा न होगा ।

फिर कौंसिलर की बात लीजिये । हैदराबाद में स्टेट कौंसिलर को एप्पाइन्ट (appoint) किया गया । इस्तदलाल यह है

कि हैदराबाद के लोग इतने काबिल नहीं हैं । हैदराबाद का एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन साउण्ड (sound) नहीं है । मैसूर के बारे में फैसला किया गया, मैसूर ने एग्जेंम्पशन (exemption) मांगा और आप ने फैसला किया कि मैसूर को एग्जेंम्पट किया जाय । वहां कौंसिलर नहीं है । इस्तदलाल यह है कि हैदराबाद स्टेट के लोग काबिल नहीं हैं । ठीक है, हैदराबाद की हुकूमत तीन चार साल तक आप के हाथ में रही । स्टेट्स मिनिस्ट्री के हाथ में रही । स्टेट्स मिनिस्ट्री ने क्या किया, किस हद तक अपनी जिम्मेदारी को पूरा किया, किस हद तक आप उस को जायज समझेंगे स्टेट्स मिनिस्ट्री ने जो कुछ तीन सालों के अन्दर किया । मैं इन बातों की तफसील में नहीं जाना चाहता । लेकिन खास तौर पर ला एंड आर्डर (law and order) के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ । तेलंगाना के बारे में कई दफा यहां बहस उठाई गई । स्टेट्स मिनिस्ट्री ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में यह दावा किया कि हमने तेलंगाना में अमन कायम किया । अब तो वहां पूरी पीस (peace) है, कोई गड़ बड़ी नहीं है । सारे तेलंगाना में अमन कायम हो गया यह बहुत बड़ा काम था जिसे स्टेट्स मिनिस्ट्री ने किया । अगर इस को मान लिया जाय कि आप ने तेलंगाना में अमन कायम किया, उस में आप को कामयाबी हुई लेकिन जिस ढंग से वहां अमन कायम किया गया वह किसी मोहज्जब हुकूमत के लिये फ़खर की बात नहीं हो सकती । आप की इंडियन युनियन (Indian Union) से, एडज्वाइनिंग प्राविन्सेज (adjoining provinces) से, मध्य प्रदेश से, मैसूर से, बिहार से जो पुलिस आप ने वहां भेजी उन्होंने क्या किया ? कोई जा कर देखे कि उन्होंने क्या किया है । सारे तेलंगाना में दहशत फैला रक्की है ।

हुकूमत की यह पालिसी रही है, मैं स्टेट्समिनिस्ट्री पर यह इल्जाम लगाना चाहता हूँ कि उस की पालिसी यह रही है कि कम्युनिस्ट टैरर (Communist terror) का मुकाबला काउन्टर टैरर (counter terror) से किया जाय। अगर कम्युनिज्म को खत्म करना है तो एक ही रास्ता है कि जुल्म करो। स्टेट गवर्नमेंट की हमेशा यह पालिसी रही है कि सब लोग गांव के कम्युनिस्ट हैं इस लिये उन पर जुल्म करो, जिस से वह मजबूर हो कर कम्युनिस्टों को पकड़ा दें, या उन के खिलाफ हो जायें। इस पालिसी का नतीजा क्या हुआ? फिर कम्युनिस्ट भाई क्या कहते हैं, कई दफा उन्होंने ऐलान किया कि हम ने तेलंगाना में पैजेंट रिवोल्ट (Peasant Revolt) किया, पेजेन्ट्स थे, जिन्होंने रिवोल्ट किया, पुलिस और जमींदारों के जुल्म के खिलाफ रिवोल्ट किया। यह कह कर वह सारी दुनिया को धोखा दे सकते हैं, हैदराबाद के लोगों को धोखा नहीं दे सकते हैं। मैं तेलंगाना से आता हूँ और दावा कर सकता हूँ कि मैं तेलंगाना के बारे में कुछ जानकारी रखता हूँ। मुझे अफसोस है कि इस से पहले मुझे बोलने का मौका नहीं मिला, अब भी केवल दस मिनट ही मिले हैं, इस लिये मैं तफसील से कुछ नहीं बतला सकता, लेकिन तेलंगाना में जो कुछ हुआ था वह हुकूमत या कम्युनिस्टों के लिये कोई शान की बात नहीं है। कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों ने चुनाव के जमाने में खास तौर से ऐलान किया था कि हम ने हथियार नीचे डाल दिये। हम आइन्दा नहीं लड़ेंगे। हम को वोट दो। किसानों की भोखा हुआ। उन्होंने कहा ठीक है, अगर तुम वायदा करोगे, अगर हथियार नीचे डाल दोगे, और आइन्दा कभी हथियार ले कर गांव में नहीं आओगे तो हम तुम को वोट देंगे, यह कह कर वोट दिया। मगर अब हालत यह है कि कम्युनिस्ट लोग अभी भी हथियार

लेकर गांवों में आते हैं, अब भी गड़ बड़ी करते हैं, यह मैं दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ, मैं अच्छी तरह से जानता हूँ कि मेरी कान्स्टीटुएन्सी (constituency) में अब भी कम्युनिस्टों के दल घूमा करते हैं, और वहां से बराबर मजालिम की रिपोर्ट मिला करती है। वह जगह जगह तेलंगाना में टैक्स वसूल कर रहे हैं, खून तो अब नहीं होते, लूट मार नहीं होती, लेकिन वहां पर डबल टैक्स वसूल किया जाता है। एक तरफ आप टैक्स वसूल करते हैं, दूसरी तरफ कम्युनिस्ट करते हैं, और इस डबल टैक्स के बीच में तेलंगाना पिस रहा है, मेरे पास कई लोगों के स्टेटमेंट्स (statements) हैं, कि कम्युनिस्ट आते हैं, रातों में हथियार ले कर गांवों में घूमते हैं, और पैसा मांगते हैं, और सब लोगों को देना पड़ता है। उन से कहा जाता है कि पीपुल्स गवर्नमेंट (Peoples Government) के लिये चन्दा चाहिये। नहीं दोगे तो मकान जला देंगे और कत्ल करेंगे, और जब दे दिया जाता है मजबूर हो कर, तो दूसरे दिन पुलिस आती है, अक्सर मैं ने देखा है कि पुलिस वहा क्या करती है। पुलिस यह समझती है कि किसान खुशी से देते हैं, किसान कम्युनिस्टों का साथ दे रहे हैं। वह यह नहीं महसूस करते कि जो दहशत और डर कम्युनिस्टों ने वहां फैला रक्खा है उस की वजह से यह करना पड़ता है। पुलिस दूसरे दिन आती है पता चलाती है कि किस किस ने दिया, और तब उन को डिटेन (detain) कर लिया जाता है। मैं जानता हूँ कि मेरी कान्स्टीटुएन्सी में सौ से ज्यादा आदमी डिटेन हुए थे, भले ही कुछ बाद में छूट गये, जिन्होंने भी चन्दा दिया था कम्युनिस्टों से मजबूर हो कर दिया था। चूंकि आप नाकामयाब हुए थे, आप में इतनी शक्ति नहीं थी कि आप उन की रक्षा कर सकते। ऐसे मामले भी हैं कि कुछ लोगों को डिटेन नहीं

[ श्री माधव रेड्डी ]

किया गया, पुलिस उन से रिश्वत ले कर, सुपर टैक्स (super tax) ले कर उन को छोड़ देती थी। मैं बता सकता हूँ कि अक्सर अगर कम्युनिस्टों ने दस हजार जमा किया तो पुलिस ने कुछ कम किया। पांच हजार या छः हजार उन्होंने भी किया। कम्युनिस्टों ने कई दफा जनरल ऐमनेस्टी (general amnesty) के मसले को उठाया। मुझे इस के बारे में कुछ कहना नहीं है, यह आप लोगों के आपस का मामला है।

मैं तो कहूँगा कि हुकूमत को तेलंगाना में कभी हथियार नहीं मिलने वाले। वहाँ आप की पुलिस रही, लेकिन अब भी कम्युनिस्ट जंगलों में हथियार ले कर घूमते हैं। उन को न आप का खौफ है और न उन के पकड़े जाने की उम्मीद है। जब तक आप किसानों को अपने विश्वास में नहीं लेते तब तक आप को कामयाबी होने वाली नहीं है। जब तक आप यह समझते रहेंगे कि किसान कम्युनिस्टों के साथ मिल कर रहते हैं तब तक आप किसानों को अपने साथ नहीं ले सकते और आप को हथियार नहीं मिलने वाले हैं। आखिर, मैं इतना कह कर रुकसत लेता हूँ कि यह हैदराबाद का मसला हैदराबादियों पर ही छोड़ दिया गया होता तो आज हैदराबाद का कुछ दूसरा ही नक्शा होता।

(English translation of the above speech.)

**Shri Madhao Reddi:** Sir, before expressing my views about cut motion No. 401, I would like to comment on the policy of the States Ministry. It is often claimed that the States Ministry has solved the problem of the Indian States very creditably. I do not like to enter into the controversy as to how far it is correct to say so, but the policy of the States Ministry towards the Indian States has always been to impose the desires and

decisions of the States Ministry on the people of the Indian States.

I come from Hyderabad and I am referring to Hyderabad alone. After the police action, a promise was made to the people of Hyderabad that the future of the State would be left to the people themselves to decide. When the hon. Prime Minister had visited Hyderabad he had addressed a meeting of five lakhs of people and told them that the future of Hyderabad and the Nizam would be decided by the people of Hyderabad themselves. The late Sardar Patel also had said the same thing when he had come to Hyderabad. The States Ministry issued a White Paper and the Nizam issued a Farman, on the basis of which Hyderabad was said to have permanently acceded to India. It said:

"I further declare that the above decision which I have taken after mature consideration in order to ensure for the people of Hyderabad the benefits of an honourable partnership in a united and democratic India, shall, in view of its far-reaching consequences, be subject to ratification by the people of this State whose will as expressed through the Constituent Assembly of the State proposed to be constituted shortly must finally determine the nature of the relationship between this State and the Union of India, as also the Constitution of the State itself."

The White Paper issued by this States Ministry clearly stated that:

"The Proclamation makes it clear that the decision taken by the Nizam is subject to the confirmation of the people whose will, as expressed through the Constituent Assembly of, the State, must finally determine the nature of the State's relationship with the Centre as also the constitution of the State itself." And

"The Government of India have repeatedly declared that the political future of the State and its relationship with India are matters to be decided by the people of the State."

As time passed, the Centre gradually took the Hyderabad problem into its own hands. Sixteen persons from Hyderabad were nominated to the Constituent Assembly. The States Ministry might very well claim that they left the future of Hyderabad to be decided by the people of Hyderabad

and that the sixteen persons who had come here decided and agreed that Hyderabad should be included in Part B States. If it is taken to mean that this decision was made by the people or the masses of Hyderabad, then, of course, the States Ministry is right.

After that, the State suffered in many respects, especially in the matter of financial integration in which Hyderabad suffered a loss of Rs. 10 crores because its income from Excise, Railway, Income Tax etc., was stopped by this integration. Mysore suffered a loss of about Rs. 2 crores, but it gets a subvention of almost the same amount. On the other hand, a large state like Hyderabad whose income prior to financial integration was Rs. 10 crores, has been given a subvention of only Rs. 1 crore 25 lakhs or Rs. 1 crore and 30 lakhs. I do not remember the exact figure but it is less than Rs. 1½ crores in any case.

The agreement which was made was not made with the people of Hyderabad. It was between the State and the States Ministry. We are not prepared to accept the plea that that agreement was made with the people of Hyderabad, because at the time of the financial agreement the control of the government of Hyderabad was in your hands and not in the hands of the people of Hyderabad. Therefore, I would request you Sir, to revise the agreement relating to financial integration. It should be fully discussed in the Hyderabad Assembly and a new agreement should be entered into.

The Centre has also decided to take over the Osmania University. It would not be out of place to say here that in that matter also the people of Hyderabad have not been consulted. The Counsellor appointed in Hyderabad is authorised to deal with this matter. Many people of Hyderabad, including the Senate of the Osmania University and a number of unions have demanded that this matter should be placed before and discussed by the Hyderabad Assembly. Not that I do not want you to take over the University. But the sentiments of the people of Hyderabad should at least be taken into account. I do not want to say anything here about the Delhi imperialism or any other kind of imperialism. Nor do I want to enter into the Hindi vs. non-Hindi controversy or the North vs. South controversy or any other controversy. Still I would not be far wrong if I characterise the attitude shown towards Hyderabad as Delhi imperialism.

Now let us consider the matter of the Counsellor. A State Counsellor was appointed in Hyderabad. The reason given is that the people of Hyderabad are not very efficient and its administration is not sound. A similar decision was taken in regard to Mysore, but Mysore asked for exemption and it was decided to grant it exemption. There is no Counsellor in Mysore. The administration of Hyderabad remained in your hands, rather in the States Ministry's hands, for three or four years. But how far has the States Ministry discharged its responsibility during these three years and to what extent its actions have been legitimate? I do not wish to go into details, but would like to say something particularly about law and order there. Telengana has been discussed here many times. The States Ministry in its Report claims that peace has been established and there are no disturbances of any kind. The States Ministry has, of course, succeeded in doing so, but the way in which this peace has been established cannot be a matter of pride for any civilised Government. What did the Police which was sent there from the Indian Union, from the adjoining provinces of Madhya Pradesh, Mysore and Bihar, do there? Let everybody who cares may go and see for himself. There is a reign of terror in Telengana. I accuse the Government and the States Ministry of meeting the Communist terror with Counter terror. Their policy has been that if Communism is to be ended, the only way is to resort to oppression and tyranny. The policy of the State Government has been to dub all the village people as Communists and oppress them so that they may be compelled to get the Communists apprehended or they may become opposed to them. What has been the result of this policy? And what do the Communists say? They have declared many a time that their revolt in Telengana is a peasant revolt against the tyranny of the police and the Zamindars. They might deceive the world in this manner, but they cannot deceive the people of Hyderabad. I hail from Telengana and have some information about Telengana.

I regret that I had no opportunity of speaking before this. Even now I have got only ten minutes. Therefore, I cannot speak at great length, but what has happened in Telengana does no credit to the Government or the Communists. During the election days the Communists sought votes by declaring that they had surrendered their arms and given up violence, and the Kisans were taken in by this propaganda. They promised that, if

[Shri Madhao Reddi]

the Communists did not indulge in armed attacks on their villages in future, they would vote for them and they did actually vote in their favour. But the Communists still attack the villages and create disturbances. I can say on good authority that bands of Communists still roam about in my constituency and reports of atrocities still pour in from there. They are realising taxes at various places in Telengana. Murders and loot have, of course, stopped now, but people have to pay the taxes twice. First the Government realise the taxes, then the Communists realise them on their own. In this way, Telengana is being crushed under double taxation. I have got many statements in my possession to the effect that armed communists come into the villages at night and extort money from the people. People are forced to pay. The Communists ask them to contribute towards the funds of the People's Government, and they are threatened with murder and arson in case they do not contribute. People are in this way forced to pay. The next day the police comes on the scene. They believe that Kisans give money to the Communists willingly and thus support them. They do not realise that people are forced to pay because of the terror and fear spread by the Communists. The police on arrival investigates as to which persons contributed and then detains the persons concerned.

I have information that in my constituency more than hundred persons were detained. Some of them might have been released afterwards. The contributions were made under compulsion. As you were unsuccessful, you had not the courage to protect them. There have been cases in which police released some detained persons after taking bribe or after realising a kind of super tax from them. I can say that if the Communists collected Rs. 10 thousand, the police collected a little less than that, say five thousand or six thousand rupees. The Communists have raised the question of general amnesty. I have nothing to say about that, as it is a matter to be decided by the Government. I would say that Government would never be able to recover arms in Telengana. The police is there but armed communists still roam about in the jungles. They have no fear of the Government or of being arrested. Unless the Kisans are taken into confidence, the Government would not succeed. So long as they believe that Kisans co-operate with the Communists, the Govern-

ment cannot win them over to their side and cannot recover arms. I shall finish by saying that had the question of Hyderabad been left to Hyderabadis, its picture would have been entirely different now.

श्री कृष्णाचार्य जीशी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, विरोधी दल के हैदराबाद के मेरे दोस्त ने स्टेट मिनिस्ट्री के निस्वत अभी यह फरमाया और यह तस्वीर हाउस के सामने पेश की कि जब से स्टेट मिनिस्ट्री के आफिसर्स ( officers ) वहां गये हैं तब से बहुत मजालिम कर रही है। वहां जो पुलिस वगैरह गई थी उस ने जो देहातियों पर मजालिम किये उसकी उन्होंने बहुत लम्बी फेरिस्त बतलाई। लेकिन उन्होंने यह नहीं बतलाया कि हैदराबाद में पुलिस ऐक्शन ( Police action ) के बाद क्या हालात थे ? हैदराबाद में रजाकारों के जमाने में जो हालात थे और १ मजालिम और केआस ( chaos ) की हालात थी उसको सब लोग जानते हैं चाहे वह इंडियन यूनियन के रहने वाले हों या हैदराबाद के रहने वाले हों। और सब लोग यह भी जानते हैं कि किस तरह से स्टेट मिनिस्ट्री ने अपने आफिसर्स के जरिये से ला एंड आर्डर ( law and order ) कायम किया और उन हालात का मुकाबला किया। स्टेट मिनिस्ट्री ने वहां जा कर ला एंड आर्डर कायम किया और इस तरह से वहां के लोगों को इत्मीनान की सांस लेने का मौका दिया इस के लिये चाहिये तो यह था कि वह स्टेट मिनिस्ट्री का शुक्रिया अदा करते। वह एक मामूम की तरह से यह बतला रहे हैं कि वहां कम्युनिस्टों ने कुछ नहीं किया। कम्युनिस्टों के निस्वत और तेलंगाना के मसायल की निस्वत आज तक काफी बहस हो चुकी है। कितने बार उन के मजालिम के बारे में कहा गया है कि लूट, मार, कत्ल ब गारत कर के किस तरह से उन्होंने ने देहातियों की जिन्दगी को नामुमकिन बना दिया था।

में अर्ज करूंगा कि न सिर्फ देहात में रहने वाले लोगों पर मजालिम किये गये हैं बल्कि उन लंबाडे व आदिवासी पर भी मजालिम किये जाते हैं जो कि जंगल में झोंपड़ियां डाल कर रहते हैं इस लिये कि उन से छिपने के लिये मदद चाही जाती है। उस का नतीजा यह हुआ कि उन लोगों को अपने झोंपड़े छोड़ कर दूसरी जगह जाने की जरूरत पड़ी। तो इस तरह से उन की दहशत की पालिसी का यह नतीजा हुआ कि देहातों में एक इन्तिशार पैदा हो गया है और देहात के लोग इस कदर परेशान हैं कि बहुत से लोग तो आ कर शहरों में बस गये हैं। और देहात खाली हो रहे हैं। देहात की मुआशी हालत बहुत खराब हो गई है। अब कहते हैं कि वहां अमन हो गया है। यह सही है कि इलेक्शन (elections) के बाद वहां पहले के से हालत तो नहीं हैं लेकिन ऐसा मालूम होता है कि यह एक तूफान के आने से पहले वाली खामोशी है। इस वास्ते में यहां की स्टेट मिनिस्ट्री से यह अर्ज करूंगा कि वह काफी अहतियात करे। वहां के फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर ने जो अखराजात पुलिस के लिये मांगे हैं वह मसला ऐसा है कि उस पर गौर होना चाहिये, इस वजह से साबिक में हम काफी अनुभव उठा चुके हैं। इस कम्युनिस्ट मूवमेंट (Communists movement) की वजह से न सिर्फ हैदराबाद पर ही बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान की दूसरी स्टेट्स पर भी बहुत बुरा असर हुआ है। यहू तेलंगाना का मसला सिर्फ हैदराबादियों का मसला नहीं है बल्कि यह मसला एक आल इंडिया प्राबलम हो गया है। अगर हिन्दुस्तान में अमन कायम रखना है तो तेलंगाना के मसले को खास अहमियत दी जाये और स्टेट मिनिस्ट्री को चाहिये कि उस को अच्छी तरह से डील (deal) करें और वहां के फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर ने जो फाइनेन्शाल (financial) मदद मांगी है वह दे दें।

11 A.M.

दूसरी चीज में यह अर्ज करना चाहता था कि आज जो यह कहा जाता है कि ए० स्टेट्स और बी० स्टेट्स में जो फर्क रखा गया है उस को निकाला जाय और स्टेट मिनिस्ट्री जो कंट्रोल बी० स्टेट्स पर रखती है उस को भी बरखास्त किया जाय। यह मतलब एक हद तक सही हो सकता है। लेकिन जिन स्टेट्स को पहले से कोई डिमाक्रेटिक ऐक्सपीरिऐंस (democratic experience) नहीं था और जहां पहले से डिमाक्रेटिक इंस्टीट्यूशन्स (democratic institutions) नहीं थे, उन के लिये नई हालत काफी तकलीफदेह थी। हैदराबाद का मसला एक खास अहमियत रखता है। पुराने जमाने में हैदराबाद में कोई डिमाक्रेटिक इंस्टीट्यूशन नहीं था न वहां के लोगों को डिमाक्रेसी का तजुर्बा था। जनरल इलेक्शन (general elections) के बाद वहां ऐसेम्बली (Assembly) बनी है और मिनिस्ट्री बनी है और वहां अब डिमाक्रेटिक इंस्टीट्यूशन्स शुरू हुए हैं। वहां स्टेट मिनिस्ट्री के मशविरों से काम होता है। लेकिन इस का यह मतलब नहीं है कि रोजमर्रा के मामलों में दस्तअन्दाजी की जाती है। स्टेट मिनिस्ट्री तो सिर्फ मशविरा देती है खुसूसन उन स्टेट्स को जिन को कि डिमाक्रेसी का तजुर्बा नहीं है। इस में किसी स्टेट का कुसूर नहीं है। लेकिन यह वाक्या है कि नेटिव स्टेट्स (native states) डिमाक्रेसी के अनुभव में पीछे थी। आप बम्बई और मद्रास को लीजिये। वहां यह हालत नहीं थी जो कि हैदराबाद में थी। हैदराबाद में फ्यूडलिज्म (feudalism) था और वहां कोई डिमाक्रेटिक इंस्टीट्यूशन नहीं था ऐसी हालत में अगर स्टेट मिनिस्ट्री वहां के लोगों को मदद करती है तो यह कोई

[ श्री कृष्णाचार्य जोशी ]

बेजा दस्तअन्दाजी नहीं समझी जानी चाहिये। अलबत्ता यह काउंसलर (counsellor) को मुकर्रर करने का मसला काबिले गौर है। काउंसलर के मुकर्रर करने के बारे में मेरी यह राय है कि इस का अख्तियार स्टेट गवर्न-मेंट को दे दिया जाय, और अगर वह जरूरत समझे तो, काउंसलर मुकर्रर कर ले।

इस के अलावा मैं एक चीज और अर्ज कर देना चाहता हूँ। वह यह है कि हैदराबाद में जो मसला युनिवर्सिटी (University) के निस्वत उठाया गया है वह काबिले गौर है। हाल ही में मैं हैदराबाद गया था। वहाँ हिन्दी युनिवर्सिटी बनाने के निस्वत काफी ऐजिटेशन (agitation) हो रहा है। वहाँ अब तक उर्दू युनिवर्सिटी थी। वहाँ के रहने वाले लोगों में से ८० लाख के करीब तेलगू बोलते थे ५० लाख मराठी और ३५ लाख कन्नड बोलते हैं। यहाँ के लोगों की मर्जी के खिलाफ वहाँ एक जमाने में उर्दू युनिवर्सिटी बनाई गई थी। और उसी का नतीजा था कि हैदराबाद ऐजुकेशन के मामले में काफी तरक्की नहीं कर सका। अब बाज लोग यह ख्याल करते होंगे कि हिन्दी युनिवर्सिटी बनाने से कोई नुकसान नहीं होने वाला है। यह ठीक है कि वहाँ के लोग हिन्दी के खिलाफ नहीं हैं। लेकिन वहाँ के लोगों का ख्याल है कि सिर्फ स्क्रिप्ट (script) को बदल कर हिन्दी युनिवर्सिटी बनाने से फिर से उर्दू को ही जारी किया जायगा। उन का यह ख्याल है कि इस वक्त हिन्दी युनिवर्सिटी न बनाई जाय। आज वहाँ इस की मुखालिफत हो रही है। इस वास्ते आज के हालात के लिहाज से मैं अर्ज करूँगा कि इस मसले को अभी दोबारा सोचा जाय या इस वक्त इस को मुल्तवी कर दिया जाय। और इस के निस्वत एक ऐसी

कमेटी कायम की जाय जो आफिशियल्स (officials) और नानआफिशियल्स (non-officials) की हो और वह इन मसलों को समझ कर कोई तजवीज पेश करे और उस के बाद कोई फैसला किया जाय।

इन चन्द अल्फाज के साथ मैं अपनी तक्ररीर को खत्म करता हूँ।

(English translation of the above speech.)

**Shri Krishnacharya Joshi (Yadgir):** Sir, some hon. friends on the opposition benches while referring to the work of the State Ministry have presented a picture of many atrocities being perpetrated on the people of Hyderabad ever since the officers of the Government of India have been there. They have drawn up a fairly long list of the excesses committed on the villagers there by the police. They have, however, made no reference to the situation obtaining immediately after the police action in that State. The chaotic situation that obtained in that State in the days of the Razakars, the excesses committed by them and also the exemplary way in which the Ministry of States established law and order there with the help of their officers and faced all the difficulties, is common knowledge irrespective of the fact whether one belongs to that State or any place outside its territory. It was after the establishment of law and order there that people heaved a sigh of relief. The Ministry of States should, in fact, have deserved thanks of the hon. friends of the Opposition. Quite innocently they are saying that the Communists have done no wrong there. Much has been said here about the problem of Telengana and the role played by the Communists in general. Times without number the tale of excesses, loot, arson and murder on the part of Communists has been told here. It has now clearly been shown as to how they had made life impossible for the local public. Not that the people living in the countryside were alone subjected to these excesses, for even Lambade and Adivasis living in huts in the jungles had to suffer the same atrocities just because they were expected to give shelter to the wrong-doers. The result has been that people of these tribes had to shift their huts to other places. This policy

of terror pursued by the Communists has dislocated village life and the people there feel so much terrified that many villages are being evacuated and quite a large number of people have now settled in the cities. The economy of villages has badly been shattered. The reports, however, indicate that peace has now been restored there. It is true that the post-elections situation is very different, but it appears to be a lull before the storm. I, therefore, want the States Ministry to keep an eye on the situation in Hyderabad. We should carefully examine the request made by the Finance Minister of the State for allocating funds toward expenditure on the Police measures. We have suffered much on this account in the past. The Communist movement had drastic consequences not only for Hyderabad, but for the rest of India also. The Telengana problem does not pertain to Hyderabad alone; it has become now All India problem. If we are to keep peace in India, the Telengana issue must be viewed as important. The States Ministry must be very careful in dealing with it and as such should accede to the request made by the Finance Minister of the State in regard to financial aid.

Next I wish to refer to the demand for doing away with the distinction made between the various States as Part 'A' and Part 'B' States. It is demanded that the control exercised by the States Ministry on Part 'B' States should end. That demand may be justified to some extent, but it has to be admitted that there were difficulties in the way of these States which lacked in democratic experience and where there were no democratic institution before it. The Hyderabad issue has special importance. In days bygone no democratic institutions functioned in Hyderabad and the people had no experience or knowledge of democracy. It is only after the recent general Elections that a Legislative Assembly has come into being and other democratic institutions have started functioning. Administration of that State is now being carried on in consultation with the States Ministry. That, however, does not imply that the Ministry in question interferes in the day to day administration. The Ministry only gives advice to such of the States as lack democratic experience. The fault does not lie with any of the States. It is, however, a fact that native states were much backward in the matter of democratic experience. Just take the case of Madras and Bombay. The situation in these States was not analogous to that obtaining in

Hyderabad. In Hyderabad feudalism reigned supreme and no democratic institutions ever functioned. Any assistance given by the States Ministry, therefore, should not be misconstrued as unjustified interference. Yet the question of appointment of a Counsellor deserves consideration. To my mind this issue should be left to the State Government who, should they so desire, may appoint a Counsellor of their own choice.

Further I consider that the University issue pertaining to Hyderabad, that has been raised here, deserves our special attention. I visited Hyderabad recently. The agitation in regard to the establishing of a Hindi University is gathering momentum. So far there was an Urdu University. Out of the total local population, 80 lacs of persons speak Telugu, 50 lacs speak Marathi and 35 lacs speak Kannada. Fairly long back an Urdu University was imposed on the local people against their wishes. That explains why Hyderabad has not been able to make much headway in the matter of education. Now some people may consider that the establishing of a Hindi University is not likely to do us much harm. It is true that the people of the State are not opposed to Hindi, but they also entertain a feeling that a change in the script only is not going to replace Urdu anyway. They regard the moment as inopportune for the establishing of a Hindi University. Just now the idea is being opposed there. In the present circumstances therefore I hold that the whole issue should be reconsidered or it may be postponed to some future date and meanwhile a Committee consisting of both officials and non-officials be set up to which this issue may be referred. A final decision should be taken in the light of the recommendations made by that Committee and after a careful examination of the whole issue.

**Dr. S. P. Mookerjee:** There are many questions relating to the working of the States Ministry on which one would like to speak. But, in view of the limited time at my disposal, I would like to deal with Kashmir.

One naturally would like to speak with some hesitation and consideration when one speaks about Kashmir, because we should not say anything or do anything which may strengthen the hands of Pakistan and also prejudice the consideration of our case before the Security Council. Yet one considers with great misgivings recent developments in Kashmir, and one

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

would like to know where exactly India stands *vis-a-vis* Kashmir. I especially request the Prime Minister to have some patience with those who differ from his policy in relation to Kashmir. It is no use our throwing stones at each other. It is no use our calling each other communalists or reactionaries. He should realise that on certain points there are fundamental differences between his approach and what we consider should be the national approach regarding this problem. It may be that after we discuss the matter in detail not only amongst ourselves, but with the representatives of Kashmir, we may be able to arrive at a satisfactory solution. Whatever I shall speak, I shall speak from that point of view. We are anxious to find a satisfactory solution so that Kashmir may remain within India so that the great sacrifice which India has made along with the people of Kashmir during the last five years may blossom into fruits which will benefit the people of the entire nation. That is our anxiety.

On the constitutional aspect, my friend Mr. N. C. Chatterji has spoken, and I shall not repeat his arguments. It will be for Dr. Katju to answer as to how far strictly under the Constitution the recent acts of the Kashmir Assembly, and the recommendations of that body, can be deemed to be justifiable and acceptable in view of the provisions of the Constitution. But I shall go beyond the limits of the Constitution for the time being. There is the question of the flag. The Prime Minister the other day at the press conference tried to minimise the gravity of this decision taken by the Constituent Assembly. Sheikh Abdullah spoke two days ago, and he said "Oh, of course, we will recognise the Union Flag". There is no question of his recognising the Union Flag. The Union Flag is there in spite of anybody, and that is the flag of free India. If you want to accept the principle that any State may have its own flag, you immediately create difficulties and you do not know where they may stop. It is no point to say that the Maharaja of Kashmir had his flag. I know the Maharajas in different parts of India have their flags. Our own Governors have their flags. The question is: Can there be a State flag? Should India accept the position that barring the use of the flag of the Union of India, any other flag should be allowed to be used? If I may use the expression, when the principle of monogamy is to

be introduced here, it should be introduced in relation to the use of one flag for the whole of India. You cannot have divided loyalty. Sheikh Abdullah has said: "We will treat both flags equally." You cannot do it. It is not a question of fifty, fifty. It is not a question of parity. It is a question of using one flag for the whole of India, India that includes Kashmir. There is no question of having a separate Republic of Kashmir having a separate flag. It is not a small matter. I have no time, otherwise, I would have read brilliant extracts from the speech delivered by Pandit Nehru before the Constituent Assembly when he had the present flag of India accepted as the National Flag of the country. He expressed there in language which you cannot surpass, the sacrifice, the real significance of the flag not for one State, not for this portion of the people or that part of India, but the entire people of India, and for the matter of that, for the free nation itself. So that is a question where the Government of India should deal with the matter very firmly. The National Conference can have a flag. I have no objection to that. Sheikh Abdullah's argument is that we had shed so much blood, there has been so much suffering behind this flag.

Undoubtedly. Let them keep the flag for the National Conference in Kashmir. No one objects to it, but when you work as Government, no matter where you function, only one flag can fly and will fly and that is the flag of the free country, of free India.

So far as the question of the Maharaja is concerned, the constitutional difficulty is there. There is no question of your deposing the Maharaja. It is an irony of fate that it is because the same cursed Maharaja signed the Accession that India sent the troops to Kashmir which enables Sheikh Abdullah to reign over that territory as the great monarch. If the Maharaja had fled away from Kashmir for whatever reason, then Indian troops would not have been sent, and then it is not the flag of India, it is not the flag of the Maharaja that would be flying today, but the flag of Pakistan.

**An Hon. Member:** It was because of the Maharaja that Pakistan raided Kashmir!

**Dr. S. P. Mookerjee:** The Hon. Member says something which he does not know. So far as the position in

Kashmir on 27th October, 1948 is concerned, it is a matter of history. There Mr. Jinnah was standing on the door of Kashmir, and as the Prime Minister said once, if we had been late by 24 hours, then Srinagar would have fallen, and who knows, history would have been written in a different way. In any case, the Maharaja is gone. There is no question of the continuance of his autocratic administration. He functions as the constitutional head of Kashmir with his hands completely bound, a dignified rubber stamp. But if you want that the Maharaja should not remain in any part of India even as a constitutional head over a particular unit, let it be done soberly, properly and constitutionally. Let us consider the matter independent of any other issue. If the Parliament of India considers that the Constitution of India should be amended and there should be no Maharaja's rule, no Rajpramukh in any part of India, let us discuss it. There are points in favour of it. There are points against it. There may be practical difficulties. There are already contracts made with them which are now enshrined in the body of the Constitution itself. Let us see, let us discuss with those very persons and see whether we can find any way which may ultimately get rid of this Maharaja's rule from India altogether.

About the Princes—you can say much against them, but read the White Paper which has been circulated which represents the policy of the Government of India regarding the States. Let us not forget the difficulties that confronted us.

When the British went away, they did two monstrous things. One was partition of the country, and the other was the sudden withdrawal of paramountcy from nearly 500 States covering about one-third of Indian territory. No country was asked to face a situation such as we were in 1947. It was practically leading to chaos. Due to partition, various forces had come into play to which I need not refer, but due to this latter act, the sudden lapse of paramountcy and making 500 units sovereign States throughout the length and breadth of the country, created such a state of affairs that one did not know, how to proceed. And here one naturally recalls the name of that great architect of India's freedom Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. On account of his statesmanlike policy—he was fearless, realistic, courteous, bold whenever case demanded as to how he should act—he succeeded by 15th

August 1947 in getting 497 states of these States coming into the fold of free India. They came in what capacity? In respect of three subjects only, foreign relations, communications and defence, because the British had declared that so far as the States were concerned, they could go to India or Pakistan only in relation to these three subjects. It was deliberately done so as to add to our difficulties, but in any case, barring Hyderabad, Junagad and Kashmir, all these 497 States came into the fabric of the Indian Union in relation to these three subjects alone. Today, Sheikh Abdullah speaks about Article 370. What is the history of Article 370 under the Constitution. I have got here the speech delivered by Shri Gopalaswamy Ayyangar when this particular article was accepted. I have no time to cover the entire speech, but since Sheikh Abdullah has referred to the speech in his broadcast the day before yesterday as if he got a charter from what Mr. Gopalaswamy Ayyangar said on the floor of the Constituent Assembly, it is necessary that we should re-read the speech and find out with what objective we accepted this inclusion of Article 370 in our constitution.

Forget not what was the picture of India then. All these States had come into the Indian Union in relation to these three subjects alone. Then started the second phase. The second phase also was another grand performance of Sardar Patel. There was no question of forcing anybody. He sent for the ruling princes, because the Government of India then acknowledged that sovereignty, the rest of the sovereignty, the residuary powers did vest in the hands of these individuals. He argued with them, he discussed with them and ultimately by the time the Constitution was framed, almost all the States came forward and accepted the pattern of the new Indian Constitution, a federal structure with all the units accepting that the Central Government will exercise its power in relation to all the subjects. Hyderabad and Junagadh had to be treated separately. Undoubtedly there are varied states, Part A states, Part B states, and Part C states. And now although they have all been united into one pattern, difficulties have arisen. We saw during the last one hour how one Member from one area and another from another area got up and pointed out his own difficulties. I do not deny that; the difficulties are there, but the structure is there before us. With regard to Part B or Part C States, certain extra powers have been deliberately kept in the hands of the

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

Central Government, but in any case all the units came into the structure of one Indian Union.

When this particular article was placed before the Constituent Assembly, hon. Members interrupted; "why this discriminatory treatment was being given to Kashmir?" And this is what Mr. Gopaldaswami Ayyangar said:

"The discrimination is due to the special conditions of Kashmir. That particular State is not yet ripe for this kind of integration. It is the hope (mark the word 'hope') of everybody here that in due course, even Jammu and Kashmir will become ripe for the same sort of integration as has taken place in the case of other States. (Cheers)."

After his statement, there are the words 'Cheers', apparently from Congress-members, many of whom are today challenging the wisdom of questioning the right of Sheikh Abdullah to remain separated from India except in regard to these three subjects.

Mr. Gopaldaswami Ayyangar then goes on developing this point further. He states what are the reasons. The first naturally, is that a war is going on, secondly the matter is before the Security Council, and thirdly the Constituent Assembly will sit in Jammu and Kashmir. Then again he repeats:

"I would like to assure the House that we can only now establish an interim system."

Proceeding further, he goes on to state:

"At present, the other provisions cannot apply to Jammu and Kashmir."

Then there is one other paragraph to which I would draw your attention, especially of the representatives of Jammu and Kashmir here in this House. This is what Mr. Gopaldaswami Ayyangar has stated:

"It is not the intention of the members of the Kashmir Government whom I took the opportunity of consulting before the draft was finalised, it is not their intention that the other provisions of the Constitution are not to apply. Their particular point of view is that these provisions should apply only in cases where they can suitably apply, and only subject to

such modifications or exceptions as the particular conditions of the Jammu and Kashmir State may require."

That is to say, even at that stage, the members of the Kashmir Government made it clear that although there might be some lapse of time, some delay, but ultimately they also were thinking of some sort of fuller integration with India. That is the major question. I was glad the Prime Minister the other day in his speech at the Press Conference emphasized this aspect. The Maharaja's thing is there, the flag is there, but we can deal with them. They are comparatively minor points, I say comparatively, but I do not ignore their importance, but the major issue is how is Kashmir going to be integrated with India? Is Kashmir going to be a republic within a republic? Are we thinking of another sovereign parliament within the four corners of India barring this sovereign parliament? That is the claim of Sheikh Abdullah and we contest it. Are we thinking of the rights of the Kashmir people to get whatever they can from India and not to give anything? Money, resources, roads, bridges all to be taken? Is it a question of 'Give and take', or is it a question of 'Take and not Give'? That is the question which has to be decided now. What is going to be the attitude of the people of Kashmir? We have proceeded up to now on this basis that we may carry the people with us. I would beg of the Prime Minister this much. Let him exercise that statesmanship, that strength of will, and the determination as Sardar Patel exercised. Let us know clearly what is in our minds, first of all, as to what we want. If you just want to play with the winds and say, "We are helpless and let Sheikh Abdullah do what he likes," then Kashmir will be lost. I say this with great deliberation that Kashmir will be lost. If, on the other hand, we should make it clear in our mind that we do not want any individual pattern for Kashmir, we can think of only one pattern which we after great deliberation evolved in this Constitution, then you must find ways, peaceful ways of persuading our friends in Kashmir that their safety, our safety and our common good require that Kashmir should come and fully integrate with India. Kashmir has come in relation to three subjects only, but it is not these three subjects alone that we want. In this connection, I shall just quote a small extract from the White Paper containing the policy of the

Government in regard to these States, as regards the way in which the States and Provinces should be integrated with India. This quotation is taken mainly from the speeches of Sardar Patel, which sum up the position in a nutshell. There is put forward the demand which we also are putting forward. That statement comprises the Governmental policy. Paragraphs 243 and 245 of the White Paper on Indian States, which embodies the policy of the Government says:

"The Congress agreed to a central authority limited to the most essential subjects and to vest all residuary authority not only in the States but also in the provinces, to avert the threatened disruption of the country. With the recession of the Muslim majority provinces of India, the *raison d'être* for an attenuated centre disappeared in so far as the relationship of the Centre with the Provinces was concerned. As regards the States, with the rapid demolition of the barriers which separate them from the provinces, the question of the constitutional relationship with the Centre appeared in a new context.

"This altered the whole background, and gradually the position veered round to a federal structure with a unitary bias providing for a centre strong enough to develop the resources of the country and to help against disruptive forces."

Thus, in six or seven sentences, the entire principle is embodied. I claim that these principles have got to be applied to the people of Jammu and Kashmir, that being one of the units in Indian Union, under Article 1 of the Indian Constitution. In a democratic federal state, the fundamental rights of the citizens of one constituent unit cannot vary *vis-a-vis* the citizens of another unit. Are not the people of Jammu and Kashmir entitled to the fundamental rights that we have given to the people of India minus Jammu and Kashmir? There is no scope for varied constitutional patterns, disparities as between one federating unit and another, the legislative or executive authority of the units in respect of the States will be co-extensive with a similar authority in and over the provinces; subject to certain adjustments during the transitional period, the fiscal relationship between the provinces and

the States and the Centre must also come under one authority. The Auditor-General of India must have fuller control over the audit systems in the States as also the Provinces. The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court must now extend to the States to the same extent as in the case of the Provinces. The High courts in the States are to be constituted so that they will function in the same manner as the provincial High courts. All citizens of India, whether residing in States or Provinces, must enjoy the same fundamental rights and the same legal remedies to enforce them. In the matter of constitutional relationship with the Centre and in internal set-up these States must be on a par with the provinces. That is the question that we have to settle. We have declared our policy that there must be one set-up—you may treat differentially in respect of certain matters in a special way with regard to the affairs of Jammu and Kashmir. I am not worrying about that. But the fundamental question is that the fundamental rights of the citizen must apply to Jammu and Kashmir. There could be no compromise on that issue. The Supreme Court must function as the highest court or tribunal in the whole of India, Jammu and Kashmir including. The Auditor-General's writ must function in the whole of India including Jammu and Kashmir. These are important issues, which should be conceded. Who made Sheikh Abdullah the king of kings in Kashmir? Who made Sheikh Abdullah a great authority? It is because the Indian troops went there and worked with the co-operation of the people of Kashmir. Did we do it for the purpose of creating a sovereign republic within a sovereign republic? Let me ask this question categorically? We would like to know what exactly are the feelings of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. I have got with me certain reports—but time will not permit me to go into these details—which are coming from Jammu and Kashmir regarding the discriminatory manner in which that Government is carrying on its functions. It is painful for me to make these allegations on the floor of the House, but I do so for this reason that the Prime Minister may at least hold an inquiry, and not simply brush them aside as some arguments being put forward by communalists and reactionaries. We will not permit him to do so. He must go into each one of these questions and satisfy himself as to whether the allegations made are true or not.

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

If I may just refer to some of the points, what about civil rights? Is the House aware that the old Defence of India Rules promulgated by the British and the old Public Security Act promulgated by the British rulers for the purpose of crushing the freedom of the people of this country, still continue without the change of a single comma or semi colon, and still function in that free domain of Jammu and Kashmir? How many hundreds of people were arrested under the provisions of that law? Was any charge-sheet given to any of them? Was the case of any single person placed before any Advisory Committee? The Public Security Act is applied in the case of a person who complains that the people are dying for want of food, and even the courts in Kashmir cannot convict them because the Public Security Act cannot apply in such cases. I have got here the names of newspapers which have been suppressed in Jammu and Kashmir, newspapers which are not allowed to go to Jammu and Kashmir from India.

What about education? During the time of the cursed Maharaja, there were at least Urdu and Hindi. Both got the same place. Hindi has disappeared from Jammu and Kashmir today. There is Hindustani only where the script is no doubt in Devanagiri, but so far as the content is concerned it is nothing but Persianised Urdu. I shall present a copy of this book to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I have shown it during the last three days to a number of friends who know something of Hindustani—not Hindi—and very few of them have been able to understand many of the words which are used in this book, a book which is compulsorily used for all people in Jammu and Kashmir today. Hindi has disappeared under the secular leadership of Shri Abdullah in Jammu and Kashmir. No one reads Hindi there today. I shall make a present of this book to Panditji. He may kindly see it and I say with all his knowledge of Hindustani he may find it difficult to understand some of the words which many of our friends have found it difficult to understand. It is a book (*interruption*)—I am glad I was interrupted—published by the Textbook Committee in Jammu and Kashmir, a Textbook Committee of which Sheikh Abdullah himself is the Chairman, a Textbook Committee which, according to the secular character of that State, does not include one single member of the minority! It is all Muslims and one or two Europeans who, no doubt, are the best interpreters of what sort

of education should be imparted in Jammu and Kashmir! Now, in this book, there is one expression like this for "Rights of women". It is given as

औरत को तलाक़ और खुला लेने का हक़ होगा।  
It is a textbook compulsory for all, where the rights of women in Jammu and Kashmir will be

तलाक़—the right of divorce—(*interruption*). Of course those who want it, can have as many marriages and divorces as they like and be merry, (*interruption*). So far it was

तलाक़ alone, now it is

खुला also. (*Interruption*). You will read and digest it. So far as खुला marriage is concerned, I am told they have some form of contractual marriage—in American language 'companionate' marriage—where you can live as husband and wife for a short while and then separate. That is the great right which is being held out to the women of Jammu and Kashmir.

مولانا آزاد - آپ کو معلوم ہے کہ  
کہہ گا کیا مطلب ہے -

[The Minister of Education (Maulana Azad): Do you know what is meant by *Khula*?]

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I do not know.

مولانا آزاد - آپ بالکل ایک غلط  
بات کہہ رہے ہیں -

[Maulana Azad: You speak a wholly incorrect thing.]

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I am speaking on the authority of those who have said they know about it. If I am wrong, the hon. Minister will correct me. He can include it in educational textbooks in India also!

Five minutes more, Sir. Now, so far as the boundary is concerned, I may just give you a few illustrations.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has taken a lot of time.\*

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I will not have a chance to speak again on Kashmir during this session, and I request I may be given a few more minutes.

Now, with regard to the boundary, the Udhampur district within the province of Jammu has suddenly been divided into two parts. It has remained as one district for years. A district which had a Hindu majority has now been divided and a portion of it facing the Kashmir valley has been turned into a new district with a Muslim majority. Now that has been done without taking a plebiscite, without

taking the opinion of the people. If there is any plebiscite on a zonal basis, then at least that area of Udhampur district which is very fertile may go to Kashmir valley.

**Shri M. Shaffee Choudhri** (Jammu and Kashmir): May I know whether he is not creating a new Pakistan?

**Dr. S. P. Mookerjee:** I know that my hon. friend is finding it hard. I do not yield. I shall discuss it with the hon. Member later on. (*Interruption*).

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member does not give way. I will give the hon. Member an opportunity to reply.

**Dr. S. P. Mookerjee:** Now I will bring this to the notice of the Prime Minister, Sir (*Interruption*), I know he is getting impatient. I am sorry, but one has to face this.

Now, Sir, there was a Trust known as 'Dharmarth Trust' with several lakhs of rupees which was created by Maharaja Gulab Singh and there was quite a large area of land attached to that Trust. It was meant for religious activities, education and for helping poor people. Now, what is the condition of that Trust? Most of the land has been taken away and the money is being frittered away.

Regarding the Government services, posts are being advertised reserved for Muslims. Is there any other State or administration where posts have been reserved for the majority community?—Is this secularism? Even officers are being encouraged to join the National Conference. They are allowed to join as members of the political party and they also hold administrative jobs. It is an unheard of thing. If you have officers like that who will also be directly concerned with a political party, naturally what the consequences will be, you can realise.

Take again, Sir, the refugee question. You know we discussed it the other day. Thousands of Hindu refugees from Jammu and Kashmir are being settled in India. Why cannot they be given land in Jammu or Kashmir? Why should people from outside be brought and settled there? That also indicates a discriminatory policy.

Then you have the permit system. You have the customs duty. You have the old rights in the Maharaja's time restricting rights and privileges, under which an Indian could not go and live there with equal rights with others. Those rights and privileges are still continuing—restricting the liberty of Indian citizens to enter and settle into that area.

I have got here two different versions of a speech delivered by Sheikh Abdullah on 9th May at Srinagar. It is a very serious matter; I have got both the copies with me. One was distributed in Jammu and Kashmir officially, and so far as India was concerned, the version was different. Certain portions were taken out which might not be liked by the people of India. This was done in a very clever way. I have got with me copies of both these communiques issued by the Jammu and Kashmir Government—one for Indian consumption and one for consumption at home.

I do not wish to continue my speech longer because I have exceeded my time limit, but the only thing which I would say at the end is: what is the remedy? What is the way out? Under the Constitution as we have provided, we cannot compel Jammu and Kashmir to accede in respect of other subjects unless Jammu and Kashmir agrees, the Constituent Assembly agrees. That provision is there. I can understand my Communist friends. They have been from the very beginning for the dismemberment of the country. They started this by supporting Rajaji's formula. They have supported the Muslim League and they have supported Pakistan. I do not blame them. Now, a strange position has been created. Dr. Katju, the Communist Party and Sheikh Abdullah stand on the same platform today. Yesterday Dr. Katju told me that a man is known by the company he keeps. Dr. Katju knows that the Communist party today is supporting Sheikh Abdullah.

What is my constructive suggestion at the end? I have one constructive suggestion to make. Persuade Sheikh Abdullah and let us all come to a private conference. Let us discuss the whole question. We are anxious that Jammu and Kashmir should come to India just as any other State has come. Let us know what special precautions he wants. But let him say that the people of Jammu and Kashmir are Indians first and Kashmiris next. Prime Minister must firmly assert that we do not want this kind of Kashmiri nationalism; we do not want this 'sovereign Kashmir' idea. If you start doing it in Kashmir, others also will demand it. The South is now asking for separation from the North; other provinces may come and say, 'We will remain with the Indian Government only in relation to these three subjects'. Persuade them, but if Kashmir does not agree, then you give freedom to the people of Jammu and Ladakh to decide what they think best for their territory. I have got with me.....

**Shri Sofi Mohd. Akbar:** You are creating a new Pakistan—Districtwise Pakistan.

**Dr. S. P. Mookerjee:** .....from the leader of Ladakh, a copy of a letter which has been sent to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. He has sent a copy to me as President of the Mahabodhi Society. In it he demands specifically and says—if Kashmir valley does not wish to integrate with India, give them at least the same right of self-determination and the opportunity to decide; their safety lies in remaining with India. That is the alternative which I would offer to Pandit Nehru. Let him devise a scheme, first of all, whereby Kashmir may not have to be divided. We do not want Kashmir to be divided. On the other hand, we want that the lost territory within Jammu and Kashmir should be brought back within Jammu and Kashmir—the territory which is now in the hands of Pakistan. But if Sheikh Abdullah is completely intransigent, and if he says, "I shall not come within India except in respect of the three subjects," then at any rate let us devise a scheme by which the people of Jammu and Ladakh may have the full liberty to decide whether they will integrate fully with India. Let him have a loose integration only with regard to Kashmir valley. I do not want partition, and I have repeatedly said that. If Panditji can exercise his influence, his goodwill, his power of persuasiveness and whatever he possesses and thereby persuade Sheikh Abdullah and others to remain with India as a constituent unit in accordance with the sacred principles which have been repeatedly declared and which are contained in this White Book, then I have no objection. If not, do not drag large numbers of people of these other provinces who are desirous of remaining within India—do not drag them to the same fate as Sheikh Abdullah would like to drag them to.

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** The hon. Member who has just spoken has appealed to me to exercise such influence as I might possess in this matter of Kashmir. May I reply to that and say that not only will I exercise my influence to the best of my ability and according to the light as I see it but that I have done so in the past. But my difficulty has been, and it is a serious difficulty which has come in the way of a solution of this problem—a difficulty that speeches like the one which the hon. Member has delivered are delivered.

The hon. Member started off in his speech today reasonably. There are important matters to be considered to be

weighed by us, to be decided by us. Not only to be decided by us, sovereign Parliament as we are, but there are some matters which are outside our scope. We cannot decide the shape of the world, for instance, however much we would like to do it. For instance, we cannot stop the fight in Korea. Yesterday, when an hon. Member wanted to move an adjournment motion regarding the bombing on Yalu river, it was not discussed. But I am quite sure every Member here dislikes it, and was aghast at it—that this should be done at this moment, when peace was being talked about. But we cannot stop it. But we could have discussed it, but we can certainly not stop it. There are many things beyond the power of this Parliament. Therefore, we have to proceed about these matters with wisdom, with caution, with restraint and with firmness. And during all this period there has been much—much wrong we may have committed and the hon. Member may have committed. I am no paragon of virtue, nor is our Government paragons of virtue. I do not say that. But I do humbly submit to this House and to the hon. Member who has just spoken that there are certain approaches which lead to right results, and there are certain approaches which lead to wrong results however eloquently they are put forward. And the approach which has been made often enough, not so much by the hon. Member, but by the hon. Member's companions—I regret he keeps such amazing company nowadays.....

**Dr. S. P. Mookerjee:** I was in your company for 2½ years.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** And during all that period when the hon. Member was in our company, he, if I may say so, functioned with remarkable clarity of mind. And it is an amazing thing that much that he criticises or dislikes today was done when he was in our company. There was nothing to criticise then. But gradually he drifted away into evil courses, with the result that we see today. As I listened to his speech, as I listened to the first part of the hon. Member's speech, I did not agree with everything, but it was an able, cogently argued speech on constitutional and other problems which we have to decide in this House. But then he drifted off. The influence of his earlier career in this Government apparently passed away, and his later associations came to the front, and he brought out all kinds of amazing things.

I wish I had the time to deal with each single point. He referred to the permit system. Either it is ignorance, or it is wilful forgetfulness on his

part. It is the Indian Army which had introduced the permit system in Kashmir. It is India and the Indian Army which have introduced it, not because of anything else, but because spies went there—not our spies, but other people's spies. It was the Indian Army that wanted to control entry into Kashmir of undesirable persons. It has been represented as something imposed by some one else to prevent Indians from going there. Now, that is a thing which misleads persons. I am not here to defend every act of the Kashmir Government or, for the matter of that, of my own Government. Let us consider them. If we have made mistakes, let us change them. But I submit that this kind of approach cannot possibly lead to any reasonable result that we may aim at.

Now this Kashmir affairs has lasted in this present form for nearly four years and nine months. Public memories are short, and many of the hon. Members who have come here have not heard the previous debates on this subject here, and the subject may, in a sense, be new to them. Previously this Parliament, or rather the previous Parliament, has often considered this problem. So far as I am concerned, it is important enough for us to give it as much time as we can possibly give, and I am prepared to say this to hon. Members opposite, that if they wish to confer with me privately, I am prepared. What is more, should occasion arise, and should the House so desire, I am prepared to have a full-dress debate on this issue, so that we may not be hurried about the matter.

**Dr. S. P. Mookerjee:** That is welcome.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** It is not the Government's desire to hurry this through or to follow any policy of hush hush. There is no secrecy about it. The point is that this problem is a difficult, intricate problem, and no amount of eloquent speeches by me or by the hon. Member opposite will solve the problem. It may influence us for a while. Some of us have faced this problem in this particular way for nearly five years. Some of us have faced this problem in other ways for the last 22 years. It is a long problem: various types of conflicts—conflict of the people against their autocratic Government, and conflict which involved me personally in an incident in which I myself was the prisoner of an earlier Government in Kashmir State. So that, there is a history behind this. It is not so simple as the hon. Member makes out. It is a long history. When

90) PSD

the time came, in July and August, 1947, when Independence was coming and partition was coming, at that time still Sheikh Abdullah and most of his colleagues were in prison. Remember that. They had been in prison for a long time. And when I sought to go there merely to interview him, I was put in prison by the Maharaja's Government of the day. That was the inheritance just before partition came.

And ultimately, by pressure of events, the Government of that day released Sheikh Abdullah and his other colleagues. They conferred with some of us. What was the advice that was given to them, by bigger people than I am? The advice given to them was that they must not hurry. It was a difficult problem, this Kashmir problem, and whatever steps they took should be after consulting their people as formally as possible, because we knew that this matter of Kashmir was going to be complicated. So, when the hon. Member referred to that process of accession which went on on a large scale in July and early August, through the great wisdom and courage of Sardar Patel, three States were left out—two major ones and a minor one—the major ones being Hyderabad and Kashmir; Hyderabad for different reasons, and Kashmir for different reasons. This was done deliberately, and our advice to the Kashmir people and the Maharaja so long as he was there was: "Do not hurry. It is a difficult problem. Do it soundly and well, and we shall abide by the decision of the people of Kashmir." That is the policy that Sardar and our Government laid down in regard to every State in India. Naturally the question did not arise in regard to most States. But this was the policy in regard to every State—that the people of the State should decide.

Long before the struggle with Pakistan about Kashmir arose, we put it to the Maharaja and if I may say so in this connection it is my conviction and an honest conviction that at least 75 to 80 per cent. of the troubles of Kashmir today and in the last few years have been due to the amazingly mistaken wrong-headed policy that the Maharaja pursued there. Well there it is. So we put it to him but what was much more important, we put it to the organisation—to the National Organization of Kashmir. It was an organization of Kashmir only but it has been closely associated for 20 years or so with that other great organization which does not function now as such, the All-India States Peoples Organization and what was closely associated with the people from other States and

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

the people from Kashmir. So the Government of India and others put it to them, to the Maharaja and Sheikh Abdullah as soon as he came out, that this matter must not be hurried and it was our idea then that a Constituent Assembly should be elected in Kashmir quickly and as soon as possible to decide about these and other questions. We advised them.

Of course the House will remember that immediately after partition and independence horrible things occurred in Pakistan on the borders of India. Killings, massacres and migrations took place and we were completely tied up with these things. Then came the news on one fateful day—in the last week of October—about the invasion of Kashmir by those raiders. It was an exceedingly difficult question for us and the hon. Members who spoke about it was the member of our Government then. He might remember how difficult that choice was for us. It came suddenly. We were busy with troubles at home. From a military point of view it was exceedingly difficult to cross over the mountains into Kashmir and to take an effective part. The first day we considered it. We could not come to a decision. We wanted more news. The next day the news was much worse. Mahora Power House was burnt down and so on and so forth and it seemed to us that whatever might be the risks, we had to intervene and intervene by air. We had no air force worth the name at that time. The whole army was split up. Everything was split up and it was rather a fine effort that I think within 12 hours of our decision by the Defence Committee of the Cabinet troops were on their way to Kashmir by air. We stopped all the civil lines overnight and sent some troops—I think the first day about 270 persons and the second day about 200 or 300 of them—and these troops went straight from the air field to battle near the Srinagar city. However, much happened that day and before we sent our troops an appeal came to us from the Maharaja and an appeal came to us from the National Conference.

I do not wish to go into the past history or to cast blame on people for past events but when crises came to Kashmir in those days, the part played by a number of leading persons was not creditable. In fact, it was very discreditable and it was in the ultimate analysis—even before the Indian army got there—the common people of Kashmir who stood the strain and

faced the enemy. It was not the big people there who faced the enemy. It was this organisation—the National Conference—and their volunteers, without arms of course, who stood the strain and stayed there even when the enemy was 10 miles away. Not a shop in Srinagar closed. It was really astounding how they showed their courage. So that way this story of invasion started.

Now in accordance with our previous decision—quite apart from Kashmir and Pakistan—a declaration was made by Sardar Patel and us that every State where there was a difference of opinion will be allowed to decide by popular verdict if necessary. When this question of accession came before us, if the Maharaja only had asked for accession we would have hesitated unless we had known there was some popular backing behind it. We knew that the Maharaja had no popular backing. Hence it was not for the mere asking of Maharaja that we could agree to a thing like this. It was only because of the popular organisation there that we decided to accept it. Even so we repeated what we had said previously. We accepted it and of course the accession was complete. It was not a kind of partial accession or limited accession. The accession was complete. But we said that we will abide by the verdict of the people whenever the chance or the opportunity comes to take it.

Later we referred the matter to the United Nations. It is very well for hon. Members to be wise after the events or for us too and realise what we should have done four years ago. But the position as we saw it then it seemed to us a wise thing to do and in those days we had also the high advantage of taking counsel from the Father of the Nation and in this matter too I do not wish to drag his name because it is not fair to do so. But I do wish to say that I took counsel with him because we were in a state of great difficulty and perplexity. We did not want wars all over just at the beginning of our career as an independent nation. And yet we had to defend Kashmir and there was a possibility of that war spreading and becoming a major one. Now regardless of the question as to who was right and who was wrong, there is no doubt about it that if that war had spread, it would have been disastrous for us—more so for others but disastrous for us also—and would have stopped all our ideas of progress, development, etc. So we decided—to stop the war spreading—to refer this matter to the United

Nations. May I say that hon. Members sometimes ask us to withdraw this question from the United Nations? I do not understand that. I do not know how it can be done. Of course we can break with the United Nations when we want to and we can say to them and tell them "We leave you, we go away from you and take the consequences." If you are prepared for that, well, I do not think that will be a right step. That will be a wrong step from many points of view—either broader grounds of policy or narrower opportunist grounds, call them what you will. Therefore the question of withdrawing something does not arise in that way. We have made it perfectly clear to the Security Council and the United Nations that we went there with the particular appeal. We did not go there to seek their arbitration or to be ordered about. Our original request to them was a very simple one and that was: "Please ask the Pakistan Government not to aid the raiders". That was our sole request that we made. So since then several resolutions have been passed by the United Nations or the Security Council with or without our agreement. One at least—and major one—has been passed without our agreement and we have not accepted that. And we have made it perfectly clear that we cannot accept it or a large part of it. There the matter stands. So that there is no question of our submitting to any direction which we consider wrong. But apart from that we have made it clear that we will, in our desire for peace, accept any advice or mediation if you like. And even though it is awful enough, rather distressing and disheartening to carry on these interminable talks without end when often enough the major issues are put aside, long arguments take place over trivial details.

So this story continued and about fifteen months after that came the truce. The hon. Member. Mr. Chatterjee said this was our second bungling, error—that we agreed to the armistice then. Well, I do not know where Mr. Chatterjee was at the time and how far he was acquainted with what was happening, but I was here and I was acquainted with every full-stop and comma and semi-colon of what was happening and what was being done, and all I can say is that the inference he has drawn is completely unjustified from the position. It may be good to be wise after the event. And there is no doubt about it, and I am free to confess it, that always our desire has been to stop fighting wherever possible with honour and self-respect and with the preservation

of our freedom. We do not want unnecessary wars. After judging the situation very carefully we came to that decision. It was the depth of winter, the 31st of December, 1948. All over Northern Kashmir fighting itself was not too easy because of heavy snow and all that—of course fighting was nevertheless taking place. It was only in the South that really effective fighting could take place and was taking place.

I really am very sorry, I apologise to you, Sir, and to the House for going into this past history. I shall briefly refer to some of the matters that have been raised. So far as the strict law is concerned, my colleague, the States Minister is obviously an infinitely better lawyer than I have ever claimed to be, but it is clear that when this accession took place it was an accession of the same kind as in the case of the other States in the first stage-accession on three subjects. Now in regard to the other States later on various processes of integration took place. Obviously, in regard to Kashmir they could not take place because the position had been petrified because of various things happening: a war happening, the reference to the United Nations happening, and the undertaking and assurances given by us. It could not change until some other step was taken. So that it became inevitable that the position in regard to Kashmir was limited to the accession on these three subjects. Of course, the rest we might confirm, we might decide by conferences, by friendly reference—that is a different matter—but strictly speaking it was only that, and that position had remained and it had to remain until some major change in the other circumstances took place. Because all these years—it is now three years since the 'Cease fire'—we have not been assured at any time whether there would be a resumption of military operations or not.

The House will remember that we declared clearly more than a year ago that in spite of the fact that our territory had been invaded and part of it was actually in enemy occupation, we would not resume military operations unless we were attacked and we would rely upon a peaceful settlement of that problem whether it is through the United Nations or otherwise. The hon. Member asked me a question: How do you hope to get back those territories? Well, my reply then was and now is. By peaceful means. Because I think that resuming war for them would mean disastrous consequences which we do not wish to face. However, I am not going into that question. Then we made it clear, first of all that we

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

would not start military operations unless we were attacked. Secondly we made it perfectly clear that if an attack took place in Kashmir by way of Pakistan, any kind of attack, then the operations that would ensue would not be limited to Kashmir State. This was made perfectly clear. We were not going to be tied down if Pakistan attacked Kashmir State thinking it could confine its operations as previously to Kashmir. That could not possibly happen. That declaration of ours I believe had a salutary effect and probably prevented attacks in Kashmir in the last year or two.

Now that has been the position. Constitutionally that position continues and no doubt it is desirable and I wish it as much as Dr. Mookerjee, that the constitutional position should develop, should be clarified. Certainly, and we shall try to have that done, but it must be remembered that the basic causes which prevented it developing still continue to a large extent and that is the difficulty. We have not got a clean slate to write upon, we are limited, inhibited by the United Nations, by this, by that. But, nevertheless, the basic thing still remains, that we have declared—and even if we had not declared, that fact would remain—that it is the people of Kashmir who must decide. And I say with all respect to our Constitution that it just does not matter what your Constitution says, if the people of Kashmir do not want it, it will not go there. Because what is the alternative? The alternative is compulsion and coercion—presuming, of course, that the people of Kashmir do not want it. Are we going to coerce and compel them and thereby justify the very charges that are brought by some misguided people outside this country against us? So the question becomes one of having the closest possible union with the people of Kashmir, with their goodwill and our goodwill. Therefore, any action taken which comes in the way of that goodwill, any action taken which frightens, irritates, brings suspicion in the way, comes in the way of that very thing that we desire. And that is why I venture to say that some of the advisers of my hon. friend opposite, may be with all good intentions but nevertheless have been acting in a manner which has come in the way of the very thing they may desire. Now it is clear that today the accession of Kashmir is in regard to three subjects and the idea was and is that the matter should be looked into when the time comes, extended, or whatever it is, but for the moment it remains in those three sub-

jects. Of course “three subjects” as interpreted can mean much more or a little less, but the accession is complete, it is not partial. And when we said that the people of Kashmir will decide, that did not limit in any way the accession. It only meant that for other reasons, not constitutional, not legal but we placed them on higher ground, if such a contingency arose—let us suppose there was a proper plebiscite there—and the people of Kashmir said, “We do not want to be with India”, well, we are committed to it, we would accept it. It might pain us, but we would not send an army against them; we would accept that however much hurt we might feel about it and we would change our Constitution about it. We do not think that would happen—that is a different matter—because even previously, and in the last few years, numerous bonds have arisen which bring us together, the people of Kashmir and the people of India.

So Kashmir, obviously, is a constituent unit of the federation of the Union of India, but a difference has arisen, subsequently arisen—you please remember that, not originally—between Kashmir and the other States because subsequent to the earlier accession the other States have become integrated more which Kashmir has not and could not in the circumstances as I have tried to point out. But, nevertheless, it is a full constituent unit of India. Various things flow from it, various consequences—consequences for instance, in regard to the President of the Republic. The President has certain authority which he exercises on behalf of the Republic and wherever the constituent unit may be the President will exercise that authority in that measure. Of course, the President exercises that authority on the advice of his advisers. That is a different matter. The President may recognise or not recognise a Rajpramukh or someone else like that. That presidential authority, therefore, applies to every State of India in that sense. It may be exercised on a recommendation after some choice by others, whatever it may be. But the President's ultimate right has to remain for a constituent unit of India.

The hon. Member referred to the flag, and he was good enough to refer to what I said long ago in the Constituent Assembly. But there can be no doubt that in any part of India it is the flag of India that must prevail and that must be dominant. But remember that in some States in India even now—or till recently—there was the State flag. In the state of Mysore, till a few

days ago (till four or five days ago) every public building, apart from the national flag also displayed the State flag which was the Maharaja's flag really, but which the State had adopted as its own. It so happened that just four or five days ago, the Mysore Government, with the concurrence of the Maharaja, decided not to display the State flag. I welcome that move. What I mean to say is that it is not such an extraordinary thing for a State flag to be there in a subordinate position, provided the flag of India is the dominant flag and represents the Republic of India all over the territories of the Union. These are matters of importance, no doubt, but not of great difficulty, matters which we can consider and settle amongst ourselves.

Take the Supreme Court. Undoubtedly, in regard to matters concerning which a State is associated, or has acceded, there can be no doubt that the Supreme Court only can decide. I am not for the moment referring to other matters. The matter is not clear in my mind. It is a matter for the lawyers and others to consider. But it is obvious that within that sphere of accession, the Supreme Court must come in. It may come in otherwise too.

The hon. Member referred with great force to the Fundamental Rights of citizens. It must prevail all over. The Fundamental Rights which we have, have ensured the liberty of the individual here certainly, but the House will remember they have also ensured the continuation, for some time at least, of certain systems which we wanted to get rid of—for instance the landlord system in this country, for instance the *zamindari* system. For years we have been trying to get over that difficulty and the Fundamental Rights came in our way. I wonder how many hon. Members present today, if we have the framing of the Fundamental Rights, would have anything to do with the Fundamental Rights which restrict our social and economic progress. Certainly, I would not. So that having gained this experience of the Fundamental Rights, we had to amend the Constitution ourselves a little while ago. Having gained this experience, would you like us to push that on to Kashmir in regard to land reform and other things? I feel that it would be improper for us to do that.

I am not talking about other Fundamental Rights. But take that particular one about land reforms. As a matter of fact, as the House knows, considerable land reform has taken place in Kashmir with advantageous

results. Some individuals no doubt have suffered, as they must when there is any big scheme like this. But the whole scheme has been considered to be a great success. I wish if I may say so—that we in the rest of India could make as rapid progress in land reform.

There are many small matters to which the hon. Member referred—Hindi, Urdu, Hindustani, etc. The House will remember that the hon. Member mentioned that the language is written both in the Devnagri script and the Persian and Urdu script. So, it is the content of the language that he objected to. Now, I have not seen the book (referred to by Dr. Mookerjee) and it will not help me even if I see it. I take his word for it. But may I point out to the House that the kind of language which perhaps the hon. Member might approve is totally incomprehensible in Kashmir. Nobody understands it. What the future will bring I do not know. But we are overwhelmed with complaints even from Eastern Punjab to the effect that they do not understand this new language that is growing up. Even they say so. They say that they cannot understand our Radio and that they have to listen to Pakistan radio which they do not like, because Pakistan radio curses them. But that is the only one they can understand. It is no good your imposing Banaras Hindi on Kashmir. It is not the language of Kashmir at all.

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani** (New Delhi): This language (*referring to a book*) cannot be understood even by a person knowing Hindustani.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: First of all the language of Kashmir is Kashmiri. Kashmiri is a language of not any particular group or religion. It is the language of Kashmir—Hindu, Muslim or Sikh. They talk in Kashmiri.

Kashmiri is a mixture of Sanskrit, Persian, Pushtu and quite a number of near-by languages. There is a good deal of Persian in it. It has nothing to do with Muslim or Hindu. You can talk to anybody there. Maybe a particular text book is not good; maybe the language of it can be improved. But that is not the point. Please remember in regard to this language matter, our friends from the South raised the issue in another context. This vast territory from Central India to the tip of Ladakh in Kashmir, you may call vaguely a Hindi-speaking area. But it varies very much and a person right in the north does not understand, or otherwise struggle to understand, the Hindi that is spoken elsewhere. So, you will have to find out a middle language.

✓[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

There is no doubt that this type of Hindi is not understood by one per cent. of the people in Kashmir—Hindu or Muslim. I include in that the vast number of Hindus of Jammu too.

So, one has to develop a language. There may be errors in the text-books or mistakes. Get over them; simplify them. If that is a grievance, it is a far greater grievance all over here, including my own province of Uttar Pradesh. The language they use is incomprehensible largely to me today. What am I to do about that? The sign-boards on the roads. I do not understand—I do not know what they are.

So, may I finish by again saying that this matter is an important matter. It is not a matter ultimately of eloquent speeches, but of dealing with a situation which is very delicate, very difficult, and the decision for which ultimately lies with the few million people in Kashmir—not even with this Parliament. That is the important thing. And if we seek to gain their goodwill, we should act accordingly. Remember also that India is a great country, spreading right from Cape Comorin to Kashmir. And if you look at the map, Kashmir is almost the heart of Asia. There is an enormous difference, not only in geography but in all kinds of factors there. Do not think you are dealing with a part of U.P., Bihar or Gujerat. You are dealing with an area, historically and geographically and in all manner of things with a certain background. If we bring our local ideas and local prejudices everywhere we will never consolidate. We have to be men of vision and there has to be a broad-minded acceptance of facts in order to integrate really. And real integration comes of the mind and the heart and not of some clause which you may impose on other people.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I would like to know from the hon. Minister of States whether he would like to reply to the debate today or tomorrow.

**Dr. Katju:** If there are other hon. Members who would like to speak, I can reply tomorrow.

**Dr. S. P. Mookerjee:** Better today. There are two Ministries coming up tomorrow.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There is a suggestion that if the House agrees we

may dispense with the Question Hour tomorrow.

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

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Very well. In the absence of any agreement I will call upon the hon. Minister. How long would he take?

**Dr. Katju:** I have to deal with other matters. I would require about twenty-five minutes. So, if any other hon. Member wants to speak for another fifteen minutes, I have no objection.

**Shri Sarmah (Golaghat-Jorhat):** I would like to say a few words about the Part C States of Manipur and Tripura in the North East Frontier of India. The problems of Manipur and Tripura may not be as urgent.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I have not called upon the hon. Member to speak. I have got a number of other hon. Members in my list.

**Shri Sarmah:** Sir, my name has been put down as the fourth in the list of the Congress Party.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Very well, the hon. Member may go on.

**Shri Sarmah:** The problems of Tripura and Manipur may not be as urgent as those of Kashmir today, but they are nonetheless important. While, therefore, the mind of the House is rivetted upon Kashmir, I would like to invite the attention of the hon. Members to the problems in these two North-East frontier States. To understand the problems of Manipur and Tripura one has to understand the historical association, the geographical position and the present economic condition of these two States.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. Hon. Members will not create any noise in the House.

**Shri Sarmah:** If Kashmir was raided upon by Pakistani aliens from outside, we have also raids on law and order, and thus security itself, from within these States. Perhaps it might be news to some hon. Members that inside the State of Tripura, administered Centrally by the Government of India, there are areas in which the Government of India do not, in fact, function. I mean that certain portions of the State of Tripura are so much under the grip of anti-social activities that the arms of our Government long as they are, do not reach them. The total area of the State of Tripura is 4,049 square miles, and the population is 49,930. The total revenue of

Tripura is just Rs. 35,56,000 and the Government of India, according to the present Budget, have to spend Rs. 1,39,68,000 there. Out of the total expenditure, that on Education is Rs. 19,17,000, under 'Medical' it is Rs. 4,11,000 and on Public Health it is Rs. 2,43,000. The total expenditure on all these three nation-building departments comes to Rs. 25,71,000, whereas the expenditure on Police alone comes to Rs. 29,85,000. That is to say, the expenditure on all these three nation-building departments, namely, Education, Medical and Public Health, is less than what is proposed to be incurred on Police.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Hon. Members ought not to carry on conversation here inside the House among themselves when an hon. Member is speaking. I have been appealing to them again and again. If they want to carry on a conversation let them go to the lobby and not disturb the proceedings of the House.

**Shri Sarmah:** When the expenditure on Police comes to Rs. 29.85 lakhs and the total expenditure of all the three nation-building Departments, namely, Education, Medical and Public Health, is only Rs. 25.71 lakhs, there need be an explanation. Those areas or zones in the Tripura State which are practically not accessible to our Indian police are under anti-social activities which are, synonymous in our part of the country as Communist activities. The Communists there are spreading literature which were printed in and published from the neighbouring towns inside Pakistan. That is a dangerous situation. And I would urge upon the Government of India to examine the matter. The Communist activities in Tripura are such—and I have it on the authority of the President and Secretary of the Tripura State Congress Committee—that during the last year and a half, about a hundred persons have been kidnapped. A number of those kidnapped have not been heard of since and presumed to be murdered. One of them lately escaped. That gentleman who was kidnapped and who escaped from the kidnapper's custody gave certain informations, in pursuance of which some persons of Tripura State were placed under arrest. We had a furore on the floor of the House in respect of that arrest.

In respect of Manipur State, the total revenue receipts of that State are Rs. 29,19,000 and the expenditure is Rs. 75,03,400. Out of this expenditure, provision for Education is of Rs. 10,01,000 (ten lakhs, one thousand), including a lump sum provision for

tribal areas of Rs. 1,14,000 and a lump sum provision for schemes under consideration of 1,46,000. For Medical there is a provision of Rs. 3 lakhs 15 thousand and for Public Health only Rs. 15,000 while budget provision for Police is Rs. 8,79,000. In this State also the condition of administration before 1947 was rather of mediæval type. So much so that one will be amused to hear that a letter was written to the then European Political Officer there to arrange to hand over paramountcy on the night of 14th-15th August, 1947. From this one can easily judge the standard of government there.

To go to Manipur one has to go from a North Eastern Railway—Dimapur Station—by a hill road 134 miles. There is no other means of communication to that place except by air. The whole length of this road, barring about 20 miles, is on hills and as the temporary bridges that were built during war time to make this road double way are all worn out and one cannot use them. Tripura State is approachable from Indian Union only by air. We heard of a road being constructed connecting Tripura State with Cachar and Shillong. It is called the Agartala Road and we also were told that about Rs. 2 crores were spent on it. At one time there was a storm in a tea cup, when the Minister of State of the Government of India said in connection with this Agartala Road that Government of Assam was specializing in wasting money; but on enquiry it was found that the road in question was being constructed directly under the control and supervision of the Central Government, and by Engineers in the Employment of the Central Government. The name of the Assam Government was dragged in quite unnecessarily. That episode has been closed. But even after the expenditure of Rs. 2 crores the road is not in a zeepable condition. As I said, the State of Tripura can be approached only by air and there is no means of communication by land or water with the rest of India. She adjoins Pakistan, and we get leaflets inciting people to indulge in anti-social activities printed in Pakistan.

These two States constitute stronghold of communist anti-social activities also, and these activities also spread to the neighbouring State of Assam.

**Shri L. J. Singh (Inner Manipur):** This is a fantastic proposition. I strongly object to what my hon. friend, Mr. Sarmah has said.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. The hon. Member does not give way.

**Shri Sarmah:** My hon. friend, to quote Dr. Mookerjee, is talking about things, which he does not know. But he belongs to our party and I do not propose to reply to him fittingly.

**Shri L. J. Singh:** He is not the right person to speak about Manipur State.

**Shri Sarmah:** Would my hon. friend deny that certain letters sent to the Government of India by the Naga National leaders for independence was drafted by a certain communist body in Manipur, including a lady. I do not refer to any one person here. I had had information on reliable authority. Let us have another instance. The communists and their supporters held a "Cultural Show" in the Railway Colony at Dibrugarh. It so happened that certain persons amongst the party fell out and some one approached the Dibrugarh Thana Police with a complaint of assault and wrongful confinement. The next day Police went and made enquiries from people at the spot, which was in the heart of Dibrugarh town. The members of the "Cultural Show" surrounded the police officer and the 4 constables with him. Two of these constables were belaboured mercilessly and two somehow escaped. The Police Sub-Inspector was beaten murderously. When he was in a half dead condition, he was thrown into a pit which contained human excreta. On post mortem examination human excreta was found inside his bowels, as, it was said, he was still breathing at that time when he was thrown into the pit and he might have swallowed. The poor and small State of Assam had to spend in 1949-50 a sum of Rs. 2,14,194 to put down the anti-social activities in the District of Sibsagar and Kamrup. My hon. friends here may say: Why do you spend too much money on police, but they do not know that the whole countryside is terrorised and the police officers are murdered and placed into pits of human excreta. In my own district communist terrorism went to such a pitch that at one time in the heart of Sibsagar congress workers were afraid of going to the Congress office after dusk. I should say that people who live in a safe place are not likely to appreciate what happens and how things happen. The Communists murder whole families, when they seek to terrorize the villagers. A Revenue agent in Sibsagar, Bhudher Thakur was waylaid and was murdered. When that gentleman asked for some water while dying, what was the reply given by the social culturists? His tongue was dragged out and cut, and then he was cut to pieces. These are the experiences in the distant North East

Frontier regions. I want to ask the Government what they propose to do with Manipur and Tripura States. I am not here to criticize the administration although I had some observations to make. Until these two states are integrated, I suggest that due care should be exercised in the selection of officers who are sent to Tripura and Manipur. However much we may dislike the expenditure on the police, the provision on this item for Tripura is rather small as compared with the main task of maintaining Law and order and this should be looked into. If Tripura is not properly handled and managed, we do not know how the North West Frontier is going to be defended. We must know that frontiers are not defended with guns alone. There is a lot else to be done. Therefore, I suggest to the Central Government to look into the affairs of these States and the sooner they find their own mind, frame their policy and act upon it, the better for all concerned.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Home Minister.

**Shri Vallatharas (Pudukkottai):** I want to submit for the consideration of the hon. Minister...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am not giving him an opportunity.

**Shri Vallatharas:** I want to make some representation whether they will consider.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is what a speech means.

I have called upon the hon. Minister to speak.

**Dr. Katju:** The very thin attendance on the benches opposite shows that apart from Kashmir there is really no other topic on which they have got any grievances so far as the States Ministry is concerned. I propose in the few minutes at my disposal to touch upon the various matters which have been mentioned in the cut motions which have been moved, and in some of the speeches which have been delivered. For instance, something was said in one speech about the privy purses. Now that is a matter of history.

The hon. Prime Minister dealt with it shortly. The House knows that this question has been discussed at great length and is now embedded in our Constitution. The Constitution-makers deliberately thought it right to make a constitutional guarantee. It is open to this House or to its successors to move

for an amendment of the Constitution. But so long as this Constitution stands the privy purses stand and are not even votable in this House. The previous history is this. The Government of India have actually entered into covenants which are matters of record and, in consideration of the Rulers giving up their rights and privileges and the so-called suzerainty over their States or domination over their States, the Government of India agreed that they should be allowed a private privy purse on a certain scale which was much less than what those Rulers used to draw from their own States before and that it should be guaranteed to them. This amount is paid to them for their own maintenance, for the maintenance of their residences, families, relations, marriages, and what not, free from all tax whatsoever. I respectfully suggest that that is a very big question. The question is one of policy and secondly also of the moral obligation which may have been undertaken by our Government. It is a matter for the amendment of the Constitution and cannot be decided very summarily in the way in which it was put forward here.

Then, the other matter which was raised by my hon. friend representing the Delhi State was the treatment of what he called the Part B and C States. The suggestion was that they should be allowed complete autonomy in the sense in which that autonomy is now conferred upon the Part A States under the Constitution and is enjoyed by them. I speak with some confidence on this topic because I myself come from these smaller States, one of the Part B States, and I have some personal knowledge of the conditions prevailing there. So far as the Constitution is concerned, in regard to the Part B States, you have got one section. The section provides that within 10 years, or rather after the expiry of ten years, all restrictions will disappear and Part A and Part B States will be on the same footing. So far as the Part C States are concerned, which are much smaller areas, Parliament passed a special legislation two years ago. There is one fact of importance which is sometimes overlooked. Among these Part B States, leaving aside Mysore and Hyderabad, which have been there as one political unit, under one administration for long periods, Hyderabad for over 200 years and Mysore, I imagine, for a much longer period, all other units are unions. Saurashtra, Madhya Bharat, Rajasthan and, on a smaller scale, Travancore-Cochin are unions which have been brought into existence and merged together for the purpose of

integration into our Indian Union. They had no common tradition, if I may use that expression, among themselves. In Madhya Bharat, from where I come, of course, you have two big States Indore and Gwalior, completely separate from each other. In addition to these two big States, there are about 20 or 21 smaller separate ones which were leading their own independent lives. In Rajasthan, you have Jodhpur, Jaipur and Bikaner with their traditions going back into centuries. So far as Saurashtra is concerned, you have hundreds of small principalities and now they have been brought together as one State. About Travancore-Cochin, there is a feeling, as some hon. Member tried to suggest, that by the merger they have not been put in a favourable position.

**Shri P. T. Chacko** (Meenachil): That is not a fact.

**Dr. Katju:** There are complaints somewhere that in these smaller Unions by these mergers they have been, if I may use a colloquial expression, demoted to some extent, their prosperity has been much interfered with and their status has been lowered. We are passing through a sort of a transitional stage. I do suggest to you that it is desirable that in these States, which are financially not self-supporting, and which find themselves in great difficulties, there should be some general, shall I say, advisory jurisdiction in the hands of the Central Government. There are great difficulties in these Unions, particularly, in the Part C States. Each one of these States was run by its own administration. We have now to integrate all these services. It is a long drawn process and it has not yet been completed. We have to fit in the Indian Administrative Service, the Indian Police Service, etc. So far as financial resources are concerned, they have got vast resources, but still unexploited. They need assistance.

This brings me also to the second question which has been mentioned: "Why do you appoint Counsellors?" Some views have been expressed that Counsellors are not needed. I do not want to go into the past history as to why Regional Commissioners and Advisers were appointed when integration began. They were appointed at that time with the full concurrence of all the Rulers and all the State Unions. Some of them had no ministries at that time; some of them had no legislatures at that time. By the grace of God during these four years, conditions have changed. Each one of them has got a legislature and has a duly res-

[Dr. Katju]

possible Ministry. Far be it from the desire of the Central Government to impose any authority on them. Why do we want to keep the Counsellors? It is not with any intention to interfere with their day to day administration. None whatsoever. The Counsellor is there at their disposal. If they want his advice, he is at their elbow. If they want to take advantage of his experience, well and good. But, I do suggest one thing. He might serve a very useful purpose, because I speak, again, from personal knowledge. In these States, still, the process of integration is not wholly complete; it is still in the process of making. It is desirable that there should be someone, some experienced, tactful officer representing the Central Government, not in the slightest instance a replica of the old political resident or agent. Not at all. We want them to be at the disposal of the Ministry and to give advice when such advice is needed.

If any particular Union were to tell me: "Well, we do not want the Counsellor; we are able to look after ourselves", well and good. I do not want to insist. We do not want to throw away able officers. There are not many of them. Someone said: "Well, you send Chief Secretaries, Law Secretaries and other people". The misfortune is that they themselves admit. We do not send them, they require them. They themselves admit that in their States, in their Unions, administrative talent is not at present available. It is not their fault, not the fault of the residents of the State. As I said, I know it, because up till now local talent was not given sufficient opportunity to develop itself. It will take a little time, four years, five years, ten years, for that administrative experience to ripen and as soon as any State administration says: "We can produce our men", very good. They have got colleges, they have got educational institutions, and I am very glad to say in many States all these officers are coming up, and the situation will, so to say, solve itself in a few years.

The "C" States, I must say, stand on a somewhat different footing. Now, you take for instance, Delhi. Delhi is in a peculiar position of its own. It is a capital city. In the United States, as everybody knows, while they have got 48 States, Washington is D. C., District of Columbia, but here, Parliament in its wisdom thought it right that even the Capital of the Indian Union should have local administra-

tion. They are its own responsible people, and deliberately, some topics, some matters were excluded from their jurisdiction. I should like to assure all the Ministers and Governments of each "C" State that so far as the Central Government is concerned, it is our utmost anxiety to be of the greatest assistance to them, to make them work on their own, and not to interfere in any way, but they should remember also that they are very small units. So far as I am concerned, my personal opinion is, I am not against small units. I think in some States, they might function very well. I noticed in Coorg they are functioning quite well. They have got large resources. For their small population of about 2 lakhs of people, they have a revenue all theirs. Without any subvention from the Central Government, they have got their own revenue of Rs. 80 lakhs. Two lakhs of people can look after themselves with Rs. 80 lakhs, but other States are not so well situated. Their resources are few, and for their development and even for other purposes, they have to rely upon the Centre, and I should think, if I were a resident of those small States, I should welcome the financial assistance and, if I may say so, also the administrative assistance which may be available to them. There should be less of suspicion and more of good will and fellow feeling, more of confidence and trust on both sides. There should be no desire, so to say, of trying to boss over the other, on the "C" States, and on the other side, the "C" States and their Governments should not be very sensitive either and should not feel that there is interference where nothing of the sort is intended.

Then, two small States have been mentioned particularly which have recently engaged my attention greatly, and these are Tripura and Manipur. My hon. friend who spoke just now rightly said that these two States occupy a peculiar position of their own. They are on our North-eastern border. They are border States. Their resources are not very great, but they are partly inaccessible. There is no direct nor easy communication with Tripura. Manipur is still far off and there are no Legislative Assemblies. We are particularly anxious that the administration there should be efficient. I do not want to go into the question which was touched upon because I do not want at this late stage to raise any controversy, but there has been a great deal of complaints in Tripura. It may be right, it may be wrong, but there it is—of

abductions and kidnappings, not of women and children, but of grown-ups by political parties. There are not going to be any Legislative Councils there, but we propose.....

**An Hon. Member:** Has the Minister been enquiring about all these matters, or is it all propaganda?

**Dr. Katju:** It is all propaganda from your side. I propose to appoint, or the Central Government propose to appoint shortly Advisers to assist the Chief Commissioners there. That is the best that we can do in those two States.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Official or non-official?

**Dr. Katju:** And I do suggest that the appointment of Advisers would be useful.

**Shri Bhawanji (Kutch West):** There are three border States, including Kutch.

**Dr. Katju:** But Kutch is not an inter-border State. Anyway, you know you are getting Advisers and help.

**Shri Bhawanji:** The Minister said there were only two border States. That is why I stood up to correct him.

**Dr. Katju:** Very well, then I shall correct myself—Tripura and Manipur and Kutch will all get Advisers and as quickly as I can give it to them. I will only appeal that the Advisers will properly co-operate with the Chief Commissioners in the right spirit and will treat the Chief Commissioner as one of them, and there should be no sign again of any quarrelsomeness, if I may use that expression, on the part of anybody.

These are the points which have been raised in these cut motions, and I may repeat once again that the States Ministry when it started had had naturally very very important functions because, as the Prime Minister said, on the 15th August 1947, all the 500 and odd States of India were technically independent, and the States Ministry had to deal with them. Then there was the question of integration and the Standstill Agreements and the amount of Privy Purses and private properties and so on. All this has now been practically settled, and it is really all Home affairs, and I do hope that in a very short period, by a process of administrative adjustment in India, there shall be just one Ministry of Home Affairs dealing with our

'big home', all together on one big scale.

**श्री पी० एन० राजभोज :** I would like to ask one question. हिमाचल और विद्य-प्रदेश और उड़ीसा में शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट की कंडीशंस बहुत खराब हैं, इस के लिये आप कृपा कर के कुछ न कुछ करें।

[**Shri P. N. Rajabhoj:** I would like to ask one question. The hon. Minister is aware that the Scheduled Castes of Himachal Pradesh, Vindhya Pradesh and Orissa are living in deplorable conditions. The Government should do something in this behalf.]

**डा० काटजू :** मैंने जैसा कि कल आप के सामने निवेदन किया था कि मेरी नज़र में विद्यप्रदेश के एक हरिजन में और उत्तर प्रदेश के दूसरे हरिजन में कोई फर्क नहीं है। सब की उन्नति का बराबर लिहाज़ रहेगा।

[**Dr. Katju:** As I stated yesterday that to me there is no difference between a Harijan belonging to Vindhya Pradesh and a Harijan of Uttar Pradesh. We seek welfare of all the Harijans alike.]

**श्री पी० एन० राजभोज :** कट मोशन के ऊपर बोलने का मुझे समय नहीं मिला इस लिये मैं इस तरफ ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

[**Shri P. N. Rajabhoj:** I had no opportunity to speak on the cut motion. That is why I wish to draw his attention to this issue.]

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I shall now place the cut motions to the vote of the House. As regards cut motion No. 1016, it was already intimated to the hon. Member Mr. Ajit Singh that it was out of order, in so far as it relates to Demand No. 82 where privy purses and allowances are charged on the Consolidated Fund of India, and are not votable. The other cut motions will now be placed for the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Manipur' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Tripura' be reduced by Rs. 101,000/-."

The motion was **negated**.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Relations with States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was **negated**.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of States' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I shall now place the demands for grants to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the order paper in respect of Demands Nos. 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88 and 126 be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of the corresponding heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof."

The motion was adopted.

[As directed by the Deputy-Speaker the motions for Demands for grants which were adopted by the House are reproduced below.—Ed. P. P.]

#### DEMAND No. 81—MINISTRY OF STATES

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,31,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Ministry of States'."

#### DEMAND No. 82—PRIVY PURSES AND ALLOWANCES OF INDIAN RULERS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,31,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Privy Purses and Allowances of Indian Rulers'."

#### DEMAND No. 83—KUTCH

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 64,77,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Kutch'."

#### DEMAND No. 84—BILASPUR

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,65,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Bilaspur'."

#### DEMAND No. 85—MANIPUR

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 30,89,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Manipur'."

#### DEMAND No. 86—TRIPURA

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 73,90,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Tripura'."

#### DEMAND No. 87—RELATIONS WITH STATES

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 39,52,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Relations with States'."

#### DEMAND No. 88—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF STATES

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 54,66,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the

sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of States'."

**DEMAND NO. 126—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF STATES**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,14,03,000 be granted to the

President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of States'."

*The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Friday, the 27th June 1952.*

---