

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

The question is:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the report of the Select Committee on the Bill to provide for the better governance and administration of Muslim Wakfs and the supervision of Mutawallis' management of them, in India, be extended upto the last day of the second week of the next session."

The motion was adopted.

ANDHRA STATE BILL—Contd.

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

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

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): While welcoming this Bill I would draw the attention of those people who are interested in the formation of linguistic States that by the existing indifference of the Government towards the popular demand for the formation of linguistic States, Government leave no choice to the people but to resort to Satyagraha, direct action or some such other method. I request our friends from Karnataka, Maharashtra and Kerala to take this very significant attitude of the Government into consideration.

Unfortunately, our Congress party like the Bourbons leave nothing but they forget everything they promised before. The Government in particular and unfortunately our north Indian friends in general do not understand this problem of linguistic

States and do not apply their mind to it. They think that there is no need for it. Just like Dr. Knows Best, it is easy to teach a man who does not know, it is easier to teach a man who knows that he does not know but even Brahma cannot teach the man who thinks he knows everything and knows nothing.

Retina is a very sensitive organ but it has a blind spot. I think for the Government in general and our hon. Prime Minister in particular, the problem of linguistic States is a blind spot. But those that believe in the formation of linguistic States and rapid and progressive development of their country know that linguistic States are essential. They must make the problem easy and accede to our request.

Shri T. N. Singh (Banaras Distt.—East): What about your blind spots?

Dr. Rama Rao: We may have our blind spots all right. The problem is before the country for a long time. No boundary commission is necessary. If you are earnest about taking steps then only boundary commissions are essential. Instead of taking the correct and direct steps necessary for a solution of this problem, the Prime Minister in particular has been shelving things which are adding to his trouble and to the troubles of the people. They are increasing friction among the people. I almost pity him when I know that conflicting interests are worrying him day and night. But it is of his own making. Instead of trying to solve the problem in a rational democratic way he just postpones and leaves things to time but ultimately is compelled by popular action to take the correct step.

In this connection I do not agree with certain remarks made about Bellary, about the loaf going to the third party and things like that. I congratulate the Karnataka friends to that extent. But I also congratulate the Congress Government on this rare

piece of sensible action. They did the correct thing by allocating that part of Bellary to Karnataka and I hope they will follow it with similar sensible actions hereafter.

My time is limited and I won't elaborate on that. The sooner the Government realizes the need for the formation of Vishala Andhra, Samyukta Karnataka, Samyukta Maharashtra and Aikya Kerala, the better for them and the people. There again instead of creating a sense of frustration among the people the sooner they are united the better. It is not disintegration as some of our North Indian friends think. It is a question of re-unification of linguistic areas which had been divided by accidents, mistakes and crimes of history. Do the right thing at the right time. Unfortunately that is lacking for the Government.

I want to refer to Dr. Katju's statement yesterday about a vote in the Madras Assembly. When he said that the vote was 63 *versus* 62 against Vijayawada-Guntur, he spoke the truth. But that is not the whole truth. He did not say much more than is vital to the question. I want our North Indian friends to understand this problem. The vote was on Vijayawada-Guntur. 63 voted against it and 62 voted for it. Please remember, there was an understanding that non-Andhra members should not vote on this issue. But 5 non-Andhra members thought it fit to vote against this issue, that is against Vijayawada-Guntur, thus bringing the number to 63. Therefore if the Government are earnest to know the views of Andhra members of the Madras Assembly, it is clear as daylight that, not 63, but 58 voted against Vijayawada-Guntur whereas 62 voted for it.

Not only that. The press information is that eight members of the Congress who intentionally abstained from voting, wrote to the Prime Minister—I speak subject to correction—that if they had been given the option to vote they would have voted

for Vijayawada-Guntur. Because they had to vote for Kurnool they abstained.

Shri Viswanatha Reddy (Chittoor): That presumption is not correct that eight Congressmen deliberately absented themselves.

Dr. Rama Rao: It is for the Prime Minister to contradict it. It is only a news item that they walked out and made statements privately that they abstained because they were opposed to Kurnool and were in favour of Vijayawada-Guntur.

Shri Viswanatha Reddy: They will do it when the time comes.

Dr. Rama Rao: And about those five gentlemen there have been reports that they wrote to the Chief Minister and that the same was conveyed to the Prime Minister, that they voted by mistake. If you take these five non-Andhra votes away, then the Andhra members were definitely in favour of Vijayawada-Guntur. I expect Dr. Kailash Nath Katju to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. It is very wrong. The hon. Member must withdraw this remark. I cannot allow this remark that another hon. Member is not speaking the truth.

Dr. Rama Rao: The whole truth.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The whole truth or partial truth. Shall I allow the other 375 Members to say that all these other people are not speaking the truth? I do not want to allow such things. I hope the hon. Member will in decency withdraw the remark.

Dr. Rama Rao: I withdraw the remark, Sir, but I am afraid you had not followed what exactly I said. I said he spoke the truth, but not the whole truth. Have I to withdraw it, Sir?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He need not repeat it.

Dr. Rama Rao: I said that he spoke the truth, but not the whole truth. Have I to withdraw it?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would like that so far as such characterisations or reflections are concerned they may be avoided.

Dr. Rama Rao: So, I do not withdraw it because you have not ruled it out.

As I was saying, if the Government wants to see the facts, they are clear as day-light.

Now, I come to a very important point. The only issue on which there is a real conflict of interest between ourselves and the Tamil friends is over the question of assets and liabilities. The gain for the one is loss for the other. So, naturally, people will be very particular and, sometimes, very unreasonable. Now, our request to the Government has been to accept a Commission of experts presided over by a judge of the Supreme Court. We have never said that our demands must be accepted straightway. We have never said: give us fifty lakhs or one lakh as our share of the property. Ours is a simple demand. I want the honourable House to judge whether it is a justifiable demand or not. The simple demand is for an enquiry by a Commission of experts—not Andhras, preferably from the North—presided over by a Judge to go into these matters. To this the objections raised are: this Commission will take a long time, probably your grandchildren will receive the report—they will probably be lucky fellows if they receive it! We do not want them to go into the question of chairs and pin-cushions and so on. Give them the choice of adopting a reasonable and rational method. All that we want out of the joint State is this. Large amounts of money have been spent—it is not thousands and lakhs, it is crores and dozens of crores. Can we be so liberal as to give everything away to our Tamil friends?

We should be glad if we could afford. But we cannot. Therefore please see if it is reasonable or not for us to ask a Commission, a high-powered Commission presided over by a Judge, to go into this issue and give their verdict on this question of assets and liabilities.

My hon. friend from the Tanjore district, Shri R. Venkataraman, tried to make out a case that they spend more for Andhra than for Tamil Nad. In that case he must be the first person to support this demand for an expert Commission to go into this issue and decide the matter. Otherwise there will be fighting and friction and no end to arguments. Of course, knowing the ordinary procedure of bargaining, I think our friend Mr. R. Venkataraman does not want to give even those Rs. 2:34 crores recommended by this Bill. I do not want even this Rs. 2:34 crores provided you accept this Commission.

Now I come to Tungabhadra. The hon. Member from Karnataka, Shri Nijalingappa, who is usually a very reasonable gentleman, has made a very dangerous statement. I say 'dangerous' because it comes from a gentleman who has been a rational and consistent advocate of linguistic States and a responsible person. He must take special note of it. I am referring to our request for the formation of a Tungabhadra Corporation. The Bill provides that the Central Government will take action after two years if the concerned Governments do not come to an agreement. Yesterday, the hon. Home Minister was pleased to give us the information, which we already knew, that a responsible body like the Mysore legislature has passed a resolution that the whole of the Tungabhadra project must belong to them and must be under their administration. I think I have five minutes more, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I ring the bell after 15 minutes. You may take two minutes more.

Dr. Rama Rao: I shall leave other matters to my friends and I shall take up only this Tungabhadra project. We asked for a Corporation. We never said, give it to Andhra. We never said that we must manage it because a greater part of the benefit is going to Andhra. We asked for a very reasonable and, I believe, a very rational thing. The Centre must step in now, not after we quarrel and fight for two years and inundate Delhi with telegrams and deputations. If I had any doubts,—I had known this before—the statement made by Mr. Nijalingappa yesterday strengthens this argument. The Centre must take effective steps first before trouble starts. Why allow trouble to start?

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): May I intervene for a minute? Under the Bill as it stands, till the agreement is reached in two years, the President will have control over the Tungabhadra project. If, in the meanwhile, there is agreement, it will be given effect to. If there is no agreement, the President will continue to pass such directions as he does today. Today, the control shall be with the President.

Dr. Rama Rao: I thought I made that point clear. The Bill provides that. My objection is, why wait for 2 years, and allow these people to quarrel so that our other friends can have the fun of all these things. Quarrel is sure to be there. Water, though it looks very innocent, is such a thing that it compels blood to flow like water very often. There will be a lot of trouble. We have witnessed yesterday something about this. I appeal to the Central Government to take steps to form a Commission or Corporation to manage it in such a way that justice is done both to Mysore and Andhra.

Shri Natesan (Tiruvallur): Sir, I rise to support the Bill moved by the hon. Home Minister and I oppose

the motion for reference to the Select Committee.

Before offering my comments on the Bill, I should like to refer to a misleading statement made by my hon. friend—I repeat it once again today,—by my hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram. He said yesterday:

“Three Ministers actually walked out along with every one of the Andhra Members present as a protest against the decision of the Government of India.”

I say, it is wrong; it is misleading; it is not right that a responsible Member should make that sort of a statement in this House. Incidentally I may mention that out of the Ministers who were present there, Mr. Ranga Reddy and Mr. Krishna Rao, are not Members of the Legislative Assembly. They were Members of the Council and probably they must have thought that if there was a question of voting, they had no right to vote. Even if it was true, they should have brought about a Cabinet crisis. They should have resigned. But, we find them jogging along merrily with the Chief Minister. I cannot understand how Dr. Lanka Sundaram could make such a statement in this House. He referred to my paper *Hindu*, as if I was running the whole show. After all, the *Hindu* is the country's paper. The *Hindu* must have got this report from its correspondent. I cannot say that all the versions which appear in the *Hindu* or any other newspaper are correct.

It is common knowledge that there has been a lot of avoidable incidents and suffering attending the birth of the Andhra State. One lamentable feature throughout has been the consistent suspicion and positive ill-will expressed by the leaders of the agitation against their erstwhile companions and friends in the residuary territory. The suspicions are entirely unjustified and the ill-will is absolutely unnecessary. Hon. Members tried to make out a case that the undivided

[Shri Natesan]

Madras State simply neglected Andhra. My hon. friend Mr. Venkataraman gave details about irrigation, yesterday. Before dealing with other matters, I would like to say a few words about electrical development, because I feel I could talk with authority in this matter.

Some Hon. Members: Special subject.

Shri Natesan: Yes. I want hon. Members here to understand that it is really an exaggeration on the part of Andhras to say that nothing has been done. Today, we are handing over an Andhra State with electricity completely developed all over the State. Take for instance the Machkund scheme which is going to produce as much as 102,000 kw. That exceeds the capacity of Pykara and Mettur put together. There is the Tungabhadra Hydro-electric scheme and that is going to produce 30,000 kw. Then, Sir, the Thermal Stations at Vizagapatam, Kakinada and Vijayawada have just been augmented. In Vizagapatam, it has gone up from 6,000 to 12,000; in Vijayawada, it has gone up from 3,000 to 6,000; in Kakinada it has gone up from 500 to 1,000. These plants are going to serve as a stand-by for the Machkund hydro-electric scheme.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): May I interrupt my hon. friend? Will he refer to para. 84 of the Wanchoo report which runs as follows:

"The main electricity schemes since 1920 have been constructed in the residuary State. The total units of electricity generated in the whole State is 672 millions out of which 42 million units are in the new State, the remainder being in the residuary State."

Will you answer this point in Wanchoo report?

Shri Natesan: I cannot answer; I am not Justice Wanchoo. What I

say is absolutely correct to the very word. That is all I can say.

You have got these stations in Vizagapatam, Vijayawada and Kakinada. In Nellore we have got a thermal station with a capacity of 5000 k.w. There are thermal stations at Kurnool, Cudappa, Nandyal and Madanapalle. These stations are there. But, that did not deter the Government from taking action. The Government of Madras wanted to give you 'something nice on a plate. If you are going to develop power to the extent of 135,000 kw. my hon. friends, may rest assured that Andhra will flow with milk and honey. There is no question about that.

Then, about the development of industries. What are you grumbling at? Have you not got the cement industry in Vijayawada? Mr. Kowtha Suryanarayana Rao has put up a blast furnace in Vijayawada. You have the paper mill in Rajahmundry; you have the Vizagapatam shipyard, mica industry at Gudur; manganese, barytes and iron ore at Cudappah. What is lacking in Andhra? You are complaining of the Tamils not doing much for you. When did we get the power to do anything? Only now. It is only after Independence that we have had an opportunity of showing what we could do. So long, the Britishers were here. Yesterday, Mr. Raghuramaiah complained—I am sorry he is not here—that Machkund has been taken up.....

Some Hon. Members: He is coming.

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): Think of the devil and he is there.

Shri Natesan: I repeat it; yesterday Mr. Raghuramaiah said, "you people took up the Machkund scheme at a time when the prices were high; all these are going to be debited to us."

What does it matter?

[SHRIMATI AMMU SWAMINADHAN in the Chair]

After all, these are capital works. In spending capital you think of long range plans and not short term plans. At the present time when prices are high, have not the Government of Madras taken up new schemes? Have not the Government of India taken up schemes? Are they not spending crores on Bhakra-Nangal and Damodar, etc.?

In fact, yesterday, when Mr. Venkataraman spoke about the expenditure on irrigation in Andhra, Mr. Raghuramaiah pointed out that what has been done was not satisfactory. Referring to Shri Venkataraman's references to figures of expenditure in Andhra area and non-Andhra area on irrigation, Shri Reghuramaiah pointed out what was spent in Tamil Nad was when prices were low and that the Tungabhadra Project was taken up only when prices were high. For the past, the non-Andhras were in no way responsible. Why? The Godavari and the Krishna Anicut Schemes were taken up long ago in the British days. In those days it would have cost only five crores. Now it is worth about fifty crores.

Shri Raghuramaiah (Tenali Is that an argument?

Shri Natesan: Then, who was responsible for running the administration of Madras for the last thirty years? In the early years the Raja of Panagal, an Andhra, was in power; then came Mr. Muniswami Nayudu, who was also an Andhra; then came the Raja of Bobbili, another Andhra. When the Congress came into power, Mr. Prakasam was the Revenue Minister. He could have done any amount of help to you. Mr. Viswanatham was his Parliamentary Secretary then. Now, how many Andhra Ministers have you got in the Rajaji Cabinet? It certainly could not be said that these Andhra Ministers were negligent of Andhra interests. On the other hand, there has been a

systematic infiltration of Andhra elements of all classes in purely Tamil areas both in Madras City and elsewhere. Any one who knows Madras as it was 40 years ago or even less can easily bear out this statement. I am sure Mr. Raghuramaiah and Dr. Lanka Sundaram do not know very much about what Madras was forty years ago. I can recollect the days, when I was in the matriculation class in the year 1906. One Telugu pandit will take two students in the fourth form, one in fifth form and probably one or two in the sixth form. That was the position. That is why I was saying that Andhras infiltrated into every walk of life during the last forty years. Even now, Madam, fantastic claims for the city have not been abandoned and we have the curious spectacle of a couple of Andhras serving notice on the Central and State Governments—not a very friendly gesture on the eve of the establishment of the new State. This agitation for the Madras city is engineered by the Congress politicians, K.L.P. and P.S.P. politicians. There is no Dravida Kazhakam in Andhra. Even Mr. Raghuramaiah gave an indication of this claim to Madras city in his speech.

Personally, I deplore the division of this great country into a series of linguistic States. Let us not forget how in olden days, a divided India fell an easy prey to the foreigners and that only a strong and united India can face up to the modern world and not go under.

Barring a few minor amendments here and there the Bill has emerged practically as originally framed from the Madras Legislature. The baseless charges and suspicions against the good faith and integrity of Tamil Nad leaders continued to be thrown about recklessly as before and the final stages witnessed an ineffectual and somewhat meaningless walk-out by the Andhra legislators.

10 A.M.

I would like now to refer to some of the clauses. First, I come to the

[Shri Natesan]

clause dealing with the Boundary Commission. Mr. friend, Mr. Raghuramaiah said that several villages in the border areas of Chingleput district are entirely Telugu villages and that the people want to go to Andhra State. He particularly referred to Ponneri, which is really my constituency. I know my people better than Mr. Raghuramaiah. We have no objection to Andhra people going to Andhra if they feel like going there. In fact, in the representation made to Mr. Justice Wanchoo by the Tamil Nad Congress Committee and in another equally representative memorandum presented by the Members of both Houses of Madras Legislature belonging to Chingleput district this fact was made clear. Shri Raghuramaiah wants a Boundary Commission to take in Telugu villages in the Andhra State. There is a large Tamil population in the southern border of Nellore district and in Tiruttani and Puthur Taluks in Chittoor district. These should be transferred to Madras State. The whole point is that we do not want any Andhras to be in Tamil areas against their wishes and we do not want Tamils to remain in Andhra areas against their wishes. I suggest, therefore, that this Boundary Commission should be appointed as stated by the hon. the Home Minister as soon as possible.

Now, I refer to clause 48 regarding the contracts. In the Bill before us even contracts which are unconnected with the residuary State but which are not exclusively for purposes of the State of Andhra or Mysore will continue as contracts made by the residuary State of Madras. I have in mind the case of contracts relating to Machkund Hydro-electric projects which would be the concern of Andhra and Orissa States. This should naturally be deemed to be contracts made by the Andhra State. I should like the Government to examine this aspect and make the position clear by suitable amendments.

Now, I come to the provision made in the Bill for the payment of 230 lakhs.

Mr. Chairman: You have only two minutes more.

Shri Natesan: Madam, I want five minutes more.

Mr. Chairman: There are several members waiting. 15 minutes should be a good enough time. You will have only two more minutes.

Shri Natesan: Why should we pay this money, I cannot understand. We did not ask the Andhras to leave us. They themselves are going away. Why should we pay so much money? This payment is sought to be made by adjustment in debt account between the two States. The Partition Committee of the Madras Cabinet in 1949 recommended that out of the reserves then available, a sum of Rs. 1 crore may be set apart to enable the Andhras to build their capital.

Shri Raghuramaiah: What has happened to those Rs. 40 lakhs?

Shri Natesan: What happened was we put most of that money into the Tungabhadra Project. That is how the money has disappeared. Mr. Justice Wanchoo has suggested that we should pay Rs. 230 lakhs. I do not understand how he arrived at this figure. For some reason known to himself he took certain arbitrary figure, doubled it, then worked out 36 per cent. as compensation payable to the new Andhra State. I cannot understand why he doubled the amount. He could have as well multiplied three times or four times and arrived at a figure. I would like this payment of Rs. 230 lakhs be dropped completely.

Next, I shall deal with clause 51 of the Bill. It appears to give powers to the President to unsettle any allocation or division of assets and liabilities once settled or apportioned in accordance with the Seventh Schedule. Besides there is no time limit

prescribed in Clause 51 for reopening or reallocating assets and liabilities. I do not think that powers are intended to be reserved with the President for any length of time.

Again, I am unable to reconcile Clause 47(2) with Clause 51 of the Bill. If any dispute arises regarding the apportionment of the assets and liabilities in accordance with the Seventh Schedule, the dispute shall be referred to the President and his decision shall be final under Clause 47(2). Can the same subject be reopened under Clause 51? In the face of Clause 47(2) I feel that any further reference to the Seventh Schedule in Clause 51 is not only unnecessary but fraught with serious consequences. I would request the Government to examine this aspect and see if the reference to the Seventh Schedule in Clause 51 should not be dropped. This is an important matter. I cannot leave it. I at least want the Government to make a note of it.

Shri Kelappan (Ponnani): As one coming from the Malayalam speaking area of the residuary State of Madras, I welcome this opportunity to express my reaction on the question of linguistic provinces in general and of the Andhra State in particular. The long cherished objective of the Andhra people to have a State of their own is being fulfilled. The bitterness and bickerings that the agitation engendered, I am sure, will vanish and will turn into goodwill and co-operation the moment the new State takes shape. I wish them godspeed.

Attempts are in progress to form other linguistic provinces. The Karnataka people are threatening to launch even a Satyagraha campaign to focus the attention of the country on the Karnataka Province issue. Other linguistic groups including the Malayalis are eager to have provinces of their own. While I sympathise with the move, I wish to make my stand on

the linguistic province issue clear. I am afraid it will not be the whole truth if I say that I stand for linguistic provinces. Language, as far as I am concerned, is not the main consideration, nor even the most important consideration. Economic viability, geographical unity, size and population of the State and their homogeneity are equally important. If the linguistic province idea, as I am fairly convinced, has its roots in the belief that people who speak one language cannot have justice at the hands of people speaking another language, I must admit I am opposed to linguistic provinces.

The propaganda for linguistic provinces, I regret to say, degenerated to that level. The accusations and counter-accusations that some speakers hurled at each other on the floor of this House will bear out what I say. If people speaking different languages cannot trust each other, we cannot have a united India. We forget in the heat of the argument that in every linguistic province there will be minorities speaking other languages. We shall not lose sight of them. How shall we assure those minorities, and how can those minorities feel convinced that they will get justice at the hands of the majority. So, it is a dangerous game to rouse narrow linguistic fanaticism. India was divided on the wrong assumption that people of one faith cannot get justice at the hands of people following another faith,—you know with what result. To create disaffection on the score of language is as dangerous as creating disaffection on the score of religion. So I have come to feel that language is only a minor consideration in the formation of a province. If Kerala province would mean dismembering Travancore, and handing over the richest slices to another State and crippling the resources of the Kerala State for all time to come, then I must resist the formation of a Kerala province based on language alone.

[Shri Kelappan]

Holding as I do these views, I cannot agree to deciding the question of Bellary or any other part by a referendum. The question of self-determination does not arise here. I cannot allow Mahe or Goa to decide for itself whether it will go with the foreign powers, or remain with India. The boundaries will have to be decided by an impartial high-power commission. The Commission will take into account not only the language, but all the other considerations germane to the issue. And the people must be prepared to abide by their decision.

The Central Government committed an initial mistake of adding a part of Bellary to Mysore. The formation of the Andhra State was the problem before the Government. They ought to have confined the Bill to that limited purpose. The Bill before us is a very curious document. Though it is called the Andhra State Bill, it is a Bill "to provide for the formation of the State of Andhra, the increasing of the area of the State of Mysore and the diminishing of the area of the State of Madras, and for matters connected therewith". I wonder why increasing the area of some other provinces and diminishing the area of certain others were included. I do not know why Mysore was thought of at this juncture. If Bellary is not part of Andhra State, then it must form part of the residuary Madras State. Why should Mysore come in at all?

It was an unfortunate decision from another point of view also. The Tungabhadra Project is the one important irrigation and hydro-electric works in the whole of Andhra. The head works of the project are in one State, and the benefit goes to another State. Even granting that Bellary has an excess of Kannadigas, other considerations ought to have prevailed in deciding to which State Bellary should belong. Even now there are other disputed areas both in the residuary State and in the the Andhra State, and a Boundary

Commission will have to go into the whole question. If the convention is that the Leader of the House has decided that the Andhra State is to be formed of those undisputed areas where Telugu is spoken, then Bellary could have remained part of the residuary Madras State. I know Bellary is not a contiguous area of Madras. That is only a passing phase. It would have been rectified when the Boundary Commission came in.

I have also a word to say about the division of assets and liabilities. It is a complicated matter. I find claims and counter-claims are being made. I do not think that any serious injustice has been done to Andhra State. To divide assets and liabilities on a population basis is more advantageous to an undeveloped area. As in the case of Income-tax and the Road Fund where 80 per cent. goes by population and 20 per cent. on the basis of accrued if some such basis were adopted it would have been more advantageous to the residuary State. I also hope it would be possible to make whatever further adjustments are necessary. I am glad there will be no Upper House in the Andhra State. I am one of those who feel that the Upper House of this Parliament also is an unnecessary encumbrance, and its abolition would be a great advantage as it would save time and money. I once more wish the new State of Andhra all success.

I ought not to conclude this speech of mine without paying my homage to Potti Sriramulu, that great patriot and fighter, whose sacrifice was necessary to awaken the conscience of the powers that be.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): I welcome this measure with mixed feelings. I am not very happy to take a truncated, mutilated, anaemic State.

For over forty years, the aspirations of the Andhras have been to have their own State, with Madras as their capital or at least as the joint capital with

our Tamil friends. But sometimes fortune favours, and this time, the Tamils are lucky not only to have unity among themselves, but a leadership which looked as if invincible even for the gods of Delhi.

We have been sent out without any ceremony—I am only quoting the words of my friends from the Tamil side. We did not want any ceremony. We Andhras know how to take care of ourselves, but when we are asked to go and pitch our tents in Kurnool, a sentence from the Bible came to my mind:

"The foxes have holes, the birds have nests, but the son of man hath no place to lay down his head."

I do not want to comment upon this. Anyhow, we have got the province, and it is due not only to the tremendous sacrifices made by our Andhra leaders and the Andhra people, but due also to the recent supreme sacrifice made by Potti Sriramulu. Most of you may not know the life of Potti Sriramulu. Many people pooh-poohed the idea of his taking a fast unto death, and even the Chief Minister of Madras in his cynical way was trying to think that this man was not true to his intentions, but I am told admiration was wrung out of him, when the body was laid bare dead in Mylepore. His sacrifice is there as a beaconlight for the Andhra State, which is being hemmed in from all sides.

It is rather peculiar to see how we Andhras are starting our new voyage. Madras has been unjustly denied to us, and then we have been also denied by the Madras Legislative Assembly, the compensation which Mr. Wanchoo has been pleased to give us; then Bellary has been handed over to the Mysoreans; the Tungabhadra is to be completely controlled by Mr. Hanumanthaiva and his Government; and finally when we come to Delhi and ask, at least give us a commission to go into the assets and liabilities question, the

Prime Minister, the Home Minister and the whole Cabinet say, it is impossible and it is not worthwhile; therefore do not ask for all this, take what is given. We are taking, as you are giving, and we are glad that we have been able to get at least this, which you were not willing to give before.

Now we are beginning our State with all these difficulties. As the saying goes:

अपस बहु विद्वमानि

With all these 'Vignas' we are starting our State, with 'Vignas' from the south, 'Vignas' from Mysore, and the biggest 'Vigna', I suppose, from the Centre.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Vigneswaras also

Shri B. S. Murthy: But we have got the courage and the confidence to carry on. For what sins of ours, have the Central Government treated us like this? This is the question I want to pose here. The Andhras have been foremost in their patriotism. Had they like other linguistic sections, been willing to give a tea-party to Sir Simon they would have got their province long ago, but their patriotism and self-respect did not allow them to go and bow down with bent knees before the Simon Commission, and it is for that that you want to punish us today, saying, look out for yourselves, no compensation, no grant, nothing whatsoever, look out for self-help only. We have done that in the South.

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): Would the Simon Commission have given them Madras?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Definitely.

Shri B. S. Murthy: Had it been in 1917 or 1921, the Madras city would have been an Andhra city, and the Tamils would have been only our guests.

But we are not worried about this, because the history of nations, and the

[Shri B. S. Murthy]

history of the countries are all peculiar. Hundred years ago every inch of the Madras city was Andhra's and history will prove it. I tell you, Madam Chairman, this hon. House, and the world at large, that after one hundred years, Madras city will be in the hands of the Andhras.

Shri Venkataraman: Invasion?

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): Why should we enter into all this controversy? Controversy is unwarranted here.

Shri Venkataraman: It is not a prophecy?

Shri B. S. Murthy: It is not a prophecy, it is merely an interpretation.....

Shri Venkataraman: A threat?

Shri B. S. Murthy: ...of the trends in history.

Shri Nambiar: You will get Hyderabad, but not Madras.

Shri B. S. Murthy: As long as Mr. Nambiar is anxious to have the city of Madras in his pocket, I will leave it there.

Shri Nambiar: Go to Hyderabad. I will be with you.

Shri B. S. Murthy: We have got Hyderabad, we have got Madras, we have got Mysore, we have got Bangalore—they are all in India, but we wanted only the city of Madras. Today if we are not having the city of Madras, after hundred years it will become ours. How the city of Madras will come back to us, I am not here to tell you.

In this connection, I have to point out one thing, namely, the way in which the Andhras have been treated is nothing but shabby.

An Hon. Member: By whom?

Shri B. S. Murthy: By the Central Government, by the Congress Party,

the party which has received the best support in the Independence struggle from the South. It was the Andhra leaders who were in the forefront; it was the Andhra women who led the Independence movement in the South; it was they who exposed themselves to the bayonets; it was they who gave their heads and lives; it was they who went to the jails; it was they who allowed their lands to be confiscated; it was they who died in jails; but when the time came for distributing the spoils, we were told, oh! Andhras, there is no unity among them; they have no leaders, nothing of that kind; nothing to them.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi (Hamirpur Dist.): The Andhras are being treated most favourably; there are so many demands from other people, but only the demand of the Andhras has been met. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. May I ask the hon. Members not to interrupt him, but to hear him patiently?

Shri B. S. Murthy: These interruptions show their excitement and anxiety.

In this connection, I want to make one or two appeals to the hon. Home Minister. The first one is in regard to the division of assets and liabilities. We have lost Madras.....

Dr. Katju: You will get Madras city back again after one hundred years. You yourself have just said that.

Shri B. S. Murthy: Thanks to the hon. Home Minister's homily, today there is a lot of suspicion amongst the Andhras that the accounts given by the Madras Government are not quite acceptable, because they do not know the data from which they have culled all these figures. And even those persons who have been associated in the Partition Committee and also others afterwards are not able to state whether or not the figures supplied by the Madras State Government could be

relied upon. Therefore, at least to allay the fears, maybe unfounded,—I do not say that the State Government of Madras is trying to deprive the Andhras to the extent of a few crores—that sufficient justice has not been done by the Andhras in sharing the assets and liabilities, an Expert Committee with a Chief Justice of any State High Court or a Judge of the Supreme Court may be constituted, and in a month or two they will be able to give us their report. Then the Andhras will have their fears allayed. After all, this is not an impossible request; after all, this request will not delay the passage of the Bill and this will not also in any way jeopardise the formation of the Andhra State. Therefore, this is a just, fair and legitimate request of the Andhras and I do not know why the Central Government should fight shy of accepting an honourable request like this.

Then about the fast of Sri Kami Reddy, I want to say a word. After all, the area now under dispute, on which Sri Kami Reddy had gone on fast, is an area consisting of a lakh and twenty thousand people. And as my friend, Mr. Raghavachari stated, Mr. Justice Misra was anxious to go to Bangalore, sit down, have his arrangements completed, write down his report and then send it to Delhi and get it accepted; whereas the Wanchoo report had to be kept in cold storage for two or three months and repeated requests had to be made in the Parliament to get it published! Whatever recommendations Mr. Justice Wanchoo has made have been thrown to the winds, whereas even though Mr. Justice Misra himself has stated that this question could not be settled without a plebiscite—the issue of the frkcas of Moka, Rupangudi and Bellary including Bellary town—it was not considered but the whole area is made a gift to the Mysore State.

Here I want to say one thing to the Central Government and to other

friends. I am not willing to take an inch of land where the people are not in majority Andhras, because that goes against the principle of redistribution of India on a linguistic basis. We do not want any such area. I also request that neither the Kannadigas nor the Tamilians nor anybody should be anxious to grab—if I can use that word without doing an injustice—any area where the people are not in a majority belonging to that linguistic area. For instance, I do not want any area in Chittoor if there are Tamilians there in a majority. I do not want any area in Nellore if, according to Mr. Natesan, there are majority of Paranians there in a contiguous area. Because we must be true to ourselves. When we propagate a principle, we must take the whole thing and be true to ourselves. But if there are certain pockets of Telugu areas in one or other taluks of Ponnur etc., we must not have to go and ask for them. They must give them to us saying: 'This is a Telugu area; please take it', and 'That is a Tamil area; give it to me'. In the same way as Mr. Hanumanthaiya is anxious to have Bellary and have the supreme right over the dispensation of the Tungabhadra Project, why not he himself make us an offer of the Kolar Gold Fields because they are a Telugu area—the Kolar district. (Interruptions). My friend, Mr. Vittal Rao, says so. Therefore, as a matter of fact, for mutual adjustments we need not wait till the Boundary Commission is set up, an impartial Boundary Commission which will give us such recommendations which cannot be questioned. Therefore, the Central Government should try and see that in these three frkcas, Moka, Rupangudi and Bellary a plebiscite should be resorted to. Some people say a plebiscite cannot be taken; it is a dangerous thing. Why should it be dangerous? After all, it is the birthright of every citizen to decide his place of abode by his own will, and therefore, the people in Rupangudi, Moka and Bellary frkcas including Bellary town should be given that right. Andhras think that Mr. Justice Misra has not

[Shri B. S. Murthy]

done justice by them. Mr. Misra in calculating population figures has said: "These people will come in and those people will not come in". He has not even accepted the Government records. He has not even accepted the population statistics published in census reports. He said this could not be taken. He has given a singularly curious reason for his method of approach to the whole question. Therefore, Justice Misra is not at all a Judge from the standpoint of the Andhras. I may be wrong. But the way in which he has come to such conclusions is still unacceptable to Andhras. Therefore, plebiscite is their birthright. I want the Central Government at least to do this small favour. They have shorn the Andhra State of all greater things. At least to see that their conscience is not agitated over the other things, they should agree to a plebiscite here and a Commission to go into the assets and liabilities. With these few words, I welcome this Bill once again.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): Charges of partiality and step-motherly treatment have been levelled not merely against the Madras Government, but, surprisingly enough, even against the Central Government. My esteemed friend, Dr. Lanka Dahanam(prolonged laughter). I am sorry. I stand corrected.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): Lanka Dahanam! We must have a fire brigade.

Mr. Chairman: Please let the hon. Member go on.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: My esteemed friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram waxed eloquent on this and tried to develop heat but in the air-conditioned atmosphere of this august House it fizzled out. Now, I do not want this House to have or go with the idea that Madras—the residuary State of Madras—has treated the Andhras unkindly or

in a manner which is not fair, just or honest. My friend, Mr. Venkataraman, and my friend, Mr. Natesan—who is aged more than 60.....

An Hon. Member: It looks like that

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:....have put the case very well. But there are certain additional facts which I would like to place before this House. My friend flourished certain papers yesterday and today he flourished Mr. Justice Wanchoo's report. It seems to me to be his Bible. But let me quote from the same Bible certain passages to show that even Mr. Justice Wanchoo has pointedly said that the residuary State of Madras has treated the Andhras very fairly. Let me read from page 33. The figures for capital works at page 33 are: Total capital outlay: Rs 111 crores, out of which Rs. 42 crores are in Andhra State and Rs. 69 crores in the residuary State. Commenting upon this he says: "Working on the basis of population figures according to 1951 Census, it will be seen that these figures are roughly proportionate to the population ratio of 36:64. If the amount spent in 1952-53 is added to this, the difference, if anything, would be in favour of the Andhra State. I trust that the residuary State would not mind this difference.....". We do not mind it.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Will my hon. friend read the sentence above that? This is arrived at after doubling the outlay.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: I am not taking this sentence out of its context.

Before Mr. Justice Wanchoo the Andhras put another extraordinary case that the Godavari and Kistna Delta schemes cost only Rs. 12 crores and out of it Madras State got a revenue of Rs. 32 crores. Therefore deducting Rs. 12 crores from Rs. 32 crores they want the residuary State to give back Rs. 20 crores. With regard to that, on

page 33 of the Report, Justice Wanchoo says like this:

"It is an undisputed fact that the Rayalaseema area is economically backward and there are famines in that area off and on. It is quite possible that these profits which are said to have been made from the Krishna and Godavari systems, might have gone to alleviate distress in the Rayalaseema area."

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Might have gone.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: It is an undisputed fact. Possibly Justice Wanchoo did not want to go into it. Why go so far? During the past two or three years the State of Madras has spent about Rs. 10 crores for famine relief alone and what is it that the Centre has given. The Centre has given only Rs 2 crores by way of loan. The major portion of the amount has been spent on Rayalaseema which is now incorporated in the Andhra State.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Will you please read the next sentence? Don't misquote.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: I will carry on and argue my point.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: The next sentence is:

"It may even be that these profits were spent to alleviate distress in areas which will be in future in the residuary State."

Don't misquote. Quote properly.

Mr. Chairman: May I ask the hon. Member not to spend his time in arguing? His time is short.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: He is wasting my time.

I would like to deal with the question of capital. At page 33 the argument for the city of Madras is given.

I cannot understand the argument for compensation for the city of Madras. I do not follow the reasoning at all.

"It is said that when Orissa and Sind were created separate provinces, they were not allowed any compensation for buildings in Bombay and Patna."

Mr. Justice Wanchoo wanted to argue the case as:

"I understand from the Finance Department that the deficit began only with the introduction of prohibition and that there was no deficit before. It appears, therefore, that during the relevant period when these buildings must have been constructed in Madras city, the Andhra area was not a deficit area and, therefore, the analogy of Sind and Orissa does not apply."

The argument is fallacious. What is the relevant period? The relevant date must date back to the date of the construction of the Rajaji Hall formerly the Banqueting Hall. I believe it was constructed by Lord Clive in the 18th Century. If you want to go to the relevant period you must go to the period of Lord Clive, to the siege of Arcot and the subsequent building up of Madras.

One other point that I want to submit in this connection is this. You may very well know that the value of immovable property has gone down from what it was in 1949 by about 25 per cent. On the basis of what the Partition Committee on which there were very great leaders of Andhra agreed to take namely Rs. 1 crore, we must now take into consideration the depreciation and also the fall in the market value. If it is written down they should get much less. Whatever it is, Mr. Wanchoo has said that the new State should be given 2.34 crores. We are not disputing it. We do not fight our case and say that the Andhra State should get much less on the basis

[Shri S. V. Ramaswamy]

I have suggested. We are not pressing for it.

With regard to the charges levelled against the Central Government, it takes my breath away. (*Interruption.*) The main attack has been regarding the division of assets and liabilities. Take for instance, clause 1(1) of schedule 7. It reads:

"Subject to the other provisions of this Schedule, all land and all stores, articles and other goods shall remain the property of, or, as the case may be, pass to, the State in which they are situated."

What is wrong with this? My friend Mr. Ramachandra Reddi also requested that there should be a Committee appointed to go into this. After all, if you will read page 30 of the Wanchoo Report you will know why this is being done. Paragraph 81 at page 30 of the Report says:

"The first principle as far as the division of assets is concerned is that all assets attached to the land shall pass to the State in which they are situated. Thus all lands, works, forests and buildings shall remain the property of or, as the case may be, pass to the State in which they are situated."

The Government of India have done nothing more than that. They have merely accepted the verdict of Justice Wanchoo and they have incorporated it in clause 1 of the Seventh Schedule.

Now, my friends spoke next about clause 3, that is with regard to unissued stores. I do not know whether they read through the new proviso that has been introduced by the Government of India which was not in the original draft Bill. It is meant deliberately to protect the interests of the Andhras. Without even reading through the proviso they charge the Government of India with being partial and giving step-motherly treatment

to the Andhra State, which is very unfair. Now, let us read the proviso:

"Provided that nothing in this paragraph shall apply to stores held for specific purposes.....",

namely, the specific schemes or projects which are in the Andhra area,

".....such as, for the use or utilisation in particular institutions, workshops and power houses or on specific works under construction."

Therefore, it is patent that the Government of India have been very particular to protect the interests of the Andhras by introducing this new proviso, which has escaped the attention of the Members on the opposite side.

Now, I come to clause 7 also. If we are to logically press for the principles which have been accepted by this House and the Government we ought really to get more under clauses 7 and 8. Sub-clause (2) of clause 7 deals with the shares of income-tax and Excise. The Finance Commission has given the different basis for the allocation of income-tax between several States. If the principles contained in the Finance Commission's Report are accepted then we should get more. We are not going to press for it.

My friend, Mr. Ramachandra Reddi and others urged that there should be a Finance Commission or some other high-power Commission to go into this question. After all, the Finance Commission in its Report, on page 76, has dealt with 7 modes of division of assets between the States. They have gone into the whole question as to how such assets are divided in several States in the world and they have given their considered view that the population basis is the best with regard to income-tax. With regard to Excise they have completely accepted the principle. After reviewing the whole situation throughout the world, they have accepted the population basis as the best. What else can any

other Commission high or low do? We are accepting this principle even though we stand to lose. Since the Government of India has, in its wisdom, chosen to accept it, we do not press it. Our intention is not to fight because we want to part as friends.

With regard to the Road Fund also, my hon. friend Mr. Venkataraman has drawn attention to the Resolution of 1947 which has been ratified in 1950. By the application of that resolution also we should get a few lakhs more out of the Road Fund because we have more vehicles and our consumption of petrol is much greater than that of Andhra and certainly our proportion should be much greater. We are not pressing that even. Why? Because we want to have friendship, we do not want to make the new Andhra State feel that we are partial.

In conclusion, I would only urge that we have all of us a common culture, we have got a common history and a common civilisation. Let us not think in terms of petty States; let us think we are all Indians first and Indians last.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Heads I win, tails you lose.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is now 10-45; the House will now take up non-official business.

INTRODUCTION OF PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): Sir, with regard to Private Members' Bills which have to be introduced I have to make a submission. Some of these Bills relate to social reforms pertaining particularly to the welfare of women and children; some others are labour Bills. These Bills are not allowed to be introduced on the ground that there are some Bills undisposed of.

This matter having had the consideration of the Rules Committee we request you to allow us to introduce these Bills. Of course, these Bills will take their turn one after the other according to the rules framed. This will afford us an opportunity to introduce the Bills at least and to ventilate our grievances if we get a chance. This matter has attracted the attention of the House for a long time and there is unanimity of opinion both on that side and this.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): This matter came up before the House last session as well when we had pressed that opportunity should be allowed to us to introduce the Bills. I hope you will agree to it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members may be aware that from time to time it has been pointed out that a number of Bills of which notice has been given appear in the Order Paper without any chance of being introduced. The ground on which I have been avoiding this is that they will also join the other Bills in the matter of ballot. If the chances for the existing Bills are one to ten, and if another thirty Bills are allowed to be introduced, the chances of the earlier ones will become one to forty. That is the consideration that weighed with me.

Another consideration was that Government is burdened with a number of Bills, for which they have to prepare themselves, though they may not come up before the House at all. It may be within the knowledge of hon. Members that there was a suggestion for a change of the rules, so that these may not be permanently blocked. The Rules Committee may categorise Bills according to their importance; in which case there will not be any harm in allowing these Bills.

Apart from this, Mr. Nambiar, who has now made this suggestion, handed over to me a letter from Mr. Kazmi and others in whose name a