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Note: * at the commencement of the speech denotes confirmation not received in time from the Member.
Mr. B. Sreeramamurti (Vijayanagara): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce the Andhra Pradesh Removal of Caste Distinctions Bill, 1959.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved

Sri B. Sreeramamurti: Before coming to the merits of the Bill, I wish to state the main objects and reasons of the Bill. Division of this country into various hereditary and exclusive communal groupings known as castes has been an unfortunate residue of the descendant past which has come to divide the society into various water-tight compartments resulting in mutual distrust, dissatisfaction and discrimination. This, in its process has created a foul and polluted atmosphere where the merit is at discount, initiative is lost, and talent is undermined. This situation has in its wake created further problems, the ugly head of which has come to raise itself in different walks of life spreading its ugly tentacles in the sphere of education and services as well. Under these circumstances and with a view to
eliminating caste and communal distinctions which have been corroding the social fabric and eating at the very vitals of harmonious social living, this Bill is found obviously necessary.

By bringing the provisions of the Bill into force, this distinction will be obviously necessary.
Equality of treatment, equality of opportunity arise in matters relating to employment or appointment to any office under the State;

(2) No citizen shall on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex, descent, place of birth, residence or any of them be ineligible or discriminated against in respect of any employment or office under the State;

(3) Nothing in this Article shall prevent Parliament from making any law prescribing in regard to a class or classes of employment or appointment to an office.
(4) Nothing in this Article shall prevent the State from making any provision for the reservation of appointments or posts in favour of any backward class of citizens which in the opinion of the State is not adequately represented in the services under the State.

(5) Nothing in this Article shall affect the operation of any law which provides that the incumbent of an office in connection with the affairs of any religious or denominational institution or any member of the governing body thereof shall be a person professing a particular religion or belonging to a particular denomination.”

Nothing in this Article shall prevent the State Government, on the grounds of Preferential treatment for fundamental rights or any other grounds to discriminate against the State Government, on the grounds of Preferential treatment for fundamental rights or any other grounds to discriminate against
The Madras Survey and Boundaries (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1959

12th December, 1959

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved.

I beg leave of the House to withdraw the Andhra Pradesh Removal of Caste Distinctions Bill, 1939.

The Bill was, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

I beg leave of the House to withdraw the Madras Survey and Boundaries (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1959.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved.

Sri P. Rajagopala Naidu (Tavanampalle): I beg to move for leave to introduce the Madras Survey and Boundaries (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1959.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved.

* Sri P. Rajagopala Naidu (Tavanampalle): I beg to move for leave to introduce the Madras Survey and Boundaries (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1959.
245 12th December, 1959

The Madras Survey and Boundaries (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1959

...
Sri P. Rajagopal Naidu: “An appeal under section 11 shall be preferred within three months from the date of service of notice under section 8, 9 or 10.”

“Explanation: The fact that notice under section 8, 9 or 10 was not served personally on the appellant shall be deemed to be good and sufficient cause within the meaning of the above proviso.”

“In section 12 of the Madras Survey and Boundaries Act, 1923 (1) in clause (a), after the expression ‘Notice under section 8, 9 or 10’ the following words shall be inserted, namely: ‘or if the notice was not served’.”
you have briefly explained. If he opposes, there is an end of the matter explain consider close.

*Note, in the event of a close (in the M. L. A. vote) : If the Speaker, after permitting, if he thinks fit, a brief explanatory statement from the Member who moves..."
The House divided.
Ayes: 30  Noes: 85
Neutral: 1
The motion was negatived.
Leave was not granted.

Mr. Speaker: Will you please sit down. I will read.

Rule 102: "If a motion for leave to introduce a Bill is opposed, the Speaker, after permitting, if he thinks fit, a brief explanatory statement from the member who moves and from the member who opposes the motion, may, without further debate, put the question:

Provided that where a motion is opposed on the ground that the Bill initiates legislation outside the legislative competence of the Assembly, the Speaker may permit a full discussion thereon."

Now, I put the question: The question is:

"That leave to introduce the Madras Survey and Boundaries (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1959, be granted"

The motion was negatived.

Sri P. Rajagopala Naidu: I demand a division.

Sir.

The House divided.
Ayes: 30  Noes: 85
Neutral: 1
The motion was negatived.
Leave was not granted.
Mr. Speaker : Motion moved.

The Hyderabad Tenancy and Agricultural Lands (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1959

The bill aims to regulate tenancy on agricultural lands in the state of Andhra Pradesh. It seeks to protect tenants' rights and ensure fair tenancy conditions. The bill also includes amendments to existing laws to address issues related to tenancy, such as rent control and eviction procedures. The main objectives of the bill are to prevent arbitrary eviction of tenants, ensure security of tenure, and promote agricultural development by providing incentives for farmers.
The Hyderabad Tenancy and Agricultural Lands (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1959

The City of Hyderabad Tenancy and Agricultural Lands (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1959 is hereby introduced in the Legislative Assembly of the State of Andhra Pradesh in pursuance of the provisions of Section 1 of the Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1950 (Act No. 20 of 1950). The Bill seeks to amend the said Act to provide for the introduction of comprehensive legislation to regulate the tenancy and agricultural lands in the State of Andhra Pradesh. The Bill also seeks to amend the provisions relating to the disposal of tenancy and agricultural lands. The Bill is presented in the Legislative Assembly for approval.

* * *

To the House of Ministers:

The Bill seeks to introduce comprehensive legislation to regulate the tenancy and agricultural lands in the State of Andhra Pradesh. The Bill also seeks to amend the provisions relating to the disposal of tenancy and agricultural lands. The Bill is presented in the Legislative Assembly for approval.

The Bill is hereby introduced in the Legislative Assembly of the State of Andhra Pradesh in pursuance of the provisions of Section 1 of the Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1950 (Act No. 20 of 1950). The Bill seeks to amend the said Act to provide for the introduction of comprehensive legislation to regulate the tenancy and agricultural lands in the State of Andhra Pradesh. The Bill also seeks to amend the provisions relating to the disposal of tenancy and agricultural lands. The Bill is presented in the Legislative Assembly for approval.

I beg to move for leave to introduce the Andhra Pradesh Preservation of Parks and Play Fields Bill, 1959.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved.

(The Bill was, by leave of the House, withdrawn)
Resolution re:
Amendment to the Constitution to Ensure Democratic Decentralization

The Bill was, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

RESOLUTIONS

Prohibition of declaration of caste by any person seeking employment in services or admission into Educational Institutions.

*Sri K. Brahmananda Reddy: He is not pressing his resolution.

*Sri B. Sreeramamurthi: Yes, Sir. I am not pressing my resolution. I beg leave of the House to withdraw my resolution.

The resolution was, by leave of the House withdrawn.

Amendment to the Constitution to Ensure Democratic Decentralization.

*Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnayya: Sir, I move:

"This Assembly recommends to the Government to impress upon the Government of India to amend the Constitution so as to confine Foreign Affairs, Defence, Communications, Planning and Finance to the Centre and to greatly enlarge the State List to ensure Democratic Decentralization.

Temporary Chairman (Srimathi T. Lakshmikanthamma)
Mr. Speaker: Motion moved.

* Sir C. V. R. Sekhar: As such, I have nothing to add except that I appreciate the amendment proposed by Sri Gopalakrishnayya.

"Peace mission" abroad to continue
Resolution re:

Amendment to the Constitution to

Ensure Democratic Decentralization

Shri Mehr Chand Mahajan in one article said:

'It is the federal constitution that creates a desire amongst politicians to have separate States, however small in dimensions to rule over them.'

Prof. M. Rathnaswami in one article said:

"In truth, under a democracy, the chances of good Government are greater because power is divided and balanced, official careers are open to talent and the rule of law prevails and the party in power is checked and controlled by a strong party in opposition."

By list 2, 7th schedule included inter alia the legislative power on subjects like education, law and order, agriculture, police, health, jails etc.

*Sri K. Brahmananda Reddy: Madam, Chairman, before Mr. Vavilala Gopalakrishnayya resumes his argument on this subject, I would say that the Resolution is outside the scope of this Legislature. In this connection, I would like to bring to your notice Article 368 of the Constitution which provides for amendment of the Constitution. It says that “an amendment of this Constitution may be initiated only by the introduction of a Bill for the purpose in either House of Parliament, and when the Bill is passed in each House by a majority of the total membership of that House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the
members of that House present and voting, it shall be presented to the President for his assent and upon such assent being given to the Bill, the Constitution shall stand amended in accordance with the terms of the Bill; provided that if such amendment seeks to make any change in (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) referred to therein the amendment shall also require to be ratified by the Legislature of not less than one-half of the States by resolutions to that effect passed by those Legislatures before the bill-making provision for such amendment is presented to the President for assent.” So, the position is absolutely clear.

Anything which seeks to amend the Constitution shall be introduced only in the House of Parliament and passed by a requisite majority as mentioned therein. In some other matters referred to in the proviso, namely, sub-clauses (a) to (e), not only the assent of the Parliament, but agreement of not less than half the number of States by way of a Resolution is also necessary. Therefore, the proposed Resolution is clearly out of order.

Temporaray Chairman (Smt. T. Lakshikanthamma): Can’t we make a recommendation?

Sri K. Brahmananda Reddy: Your point is whether a recommendation can be made. A recommendation to amend the Constitution is clearly out of order. When we are not seized of a matter and when it is not within our competence, it does not mean, we can go on passing Resolutions. A Resolution of a House of a Legislature of a State has some effect, some value and some dignity. It is not as if we can pass any Resolution opposing the Constitution or providing an amendment to the Constitution because we are a House. It is not possible.
Resolutions re:
Amendments to the Constitution to
Ensure Democratic Decentralization

12th December, 1959

Mend for the Constitution. An amendment of this Constitution may be initiated only by the introduction of a Bill and not by any resolution. 

The Assembly recommends to the Government to impress upon the Government of India to amend the Constitution to initiate such a Bill. 

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

This Assembly recommends to the Government to impress upon the Government of India to amend the Constitution. 

Mr. Speaker: I want to hear the Government’s viewpoint now.

*Sri K. Brāhmananda Reddy*: My submission is this, Sir. We all realise, Sir, that a recommendation of this body i.e., the State Legislature, has some value and some effect and if passed it must also be capable of execution to a certain degree. Here, the Resolution seeks to ask this Government to impress upon the Central Government to amend the Constitution. According to
me, Sir, under Article 368 of the Constitution, an amendment could be processed only in a particular manner. Now, the Opposition members agree that amendment of the Constitution is outside the scope of this Legislature. They agree to that extent, but they say 'what is there, after all, if we recommend to a certain body to do something?' I say that also is not proper. It is unconstitutional and also not proper. Just because we are here, it does not mean we can recommend anything. The Resolution, for instance, says 'to impress upon the Government of India'. Supposing you impress upon the Government of India, what happens! Even the Government of India is helpless. Amendment to the Constitution can come in only in a particular manner. Therefore, what I say is, supposing we seek to pass a Resolution here saying that there shall not be a President or there shall not be a Public Service Commission or there shall not be something else, is it good? Is it capable of execution? Secondly, as I said, the proposed Resolution is outside the scope of this Legislature definitely, Sir, and let us not construe lightly a recommendation of this House. The sort of attitude 'what is there, after all, if you make a recommendation' is a great blow to the dignity and effectiveness of any House of the Legislature. That is my first point. We must pass such a Resolution which can be considered by the Government of India or somebody else and which later can be executed also. The attitude that there is no harm in passing a Resolution is not correct. I do not think, Sir, we should treat this House so lightly and pass a Resolution of this type off-hand which is after all a very very serious Resolution. It is not an easy Resolution, but seeks to make fundamental changes in the Constitution itself. Probably, to a certain extent, it will change the character of the Constitution itself. Therefore, it is not a very light matter which can be consider lightly and passed off-hand without taking into consideration all the aspects. Therefore, both from the point of constitutionality or otherwise and from the point of propriety, I would request the Chair to rule this Resolution out of order.
Resolution re:

Amendment to the Constitution to Ensure Democratic Decentralization.

* * *

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

12th December, 1959
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The important point is whether the Resolution is proper or not. That is one question. The other question is whether the House can discuss it or not. These are two separate questions.

Rule 83 reads as follows: 'Subject matter of resolution—subject to the provisions of these Rules a member or a Minister may move a resolution relating to a matter of general public interest within the cognizance of the State Government.' I think Rule 82 throws some light on the question. Rule 82 reads: A resolution may be in the form of a declaration of opinion, or recommendation or may be in the form so as to record either approval or disapproval by the Assembly of an act or policy of Government, or convey a message; or commend, urge or request an action; or call attention to a matter or situation for reconsideration by Government or in such other form as the Speaker may consider appropriate.'
Resolution re: Amendment to the Constitution to Ensure Democratic Decentralization

12th December, 1959

To any action within the province of the Government.

Sri G. Yellamanda Reddy: Where is it?

Now we are asking the Central Government to do a particular act or to initiate a certain amendment of the Constitution. It may be that the Central Government or any party in the Parliament may do it. Parliament can take care of its own activities. Our representatives also are there in the Parliament to take care of certain matters of public importance. But our resolution should be confined only to the activities of this Government.

That is entirely within the purview of the Central Parliament, not our Government. It is an activity which is appertaining to the Central Parliament.

If it is considered as a matter of public importance and if it is felt that the Andhra public are very much interested in getting decentralisation of the functions and amendment of the Constitution, the proper course would be for our representatives in the Parliament to take up the matter. It is not for us here to spend some time over a subject which can be properly tackled by the Parliament or members of the Parliament.

Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnayya: It is not like that, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I understand. Your resolution is that this Assembly recommends to the Govern-
ment of Andhra Pradesh to recommend to the Government of India to amend the Constitution. That is, this Government will send the opinion of this Assembly and request the Government of India to amend the Constitution, through Parliament. In what way the amendment should be done? The amendment is calculated to give very large powers to the States. That is the question. Now, two questions arise: The one is, whether such a resolution can be introduced in this Assembly, and if a majority passes such a resolution, it can be passed and communicated to the Government of India to introduce certain changes in the Constitution. The constitutional amendments will be made under Article 368 by introducing a Bill in the Parliament. Now, the fundamental question is whether such a resolution can be moved in this House.

The question of passing is not within my province. I have to give a ruling. The other thing is not within my jurisdiction, viz., passing the resolution. It is within the jurisdiction of the House. The House will consider: "Why should we wait till the Central Government amends the constitution of its own accord"? With regard to that, namely, passing the motion before the House, I cannot deal with that and I am not going to deal with it. The only question now before me is whether such a resolution can be moved in this House. Sri Rokkam Lakshmi Narasimham Dora says that all resolutions must relate to questions to be taken by the Ministry, must relate to affairs relating to the Legislature or the Ministry. So I have to read Rule 82 again:

"A resolution may be in the form of a declaration of opinion, or recommendation or may be in the form so as to record either approval or disapproval by the Assembly of an act or policy of Government, or convey a message, or commend, urge or request an action, or call attention to a matter or situation for reconsideration by Government or in such other form as the Speaker may consider appropriate."

The expression "record either approval or disapproval" does not relate to the subject-matter before us.
now and so that form does not apply. So, it must be in the form of a declaration of opinion. The third form, namely, "convey a message; or commend, urge or request an action; or call attention to a matter or situation for reconsideration by Government", has no application. I think that the Assembly has got a right to go into the question and express an opinion whether it is good or bad. Therefore, I rule it is within the jurisdiction of this House to discuss this resolution. I rule it is in order. That is my ruling.

*Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnayya: "This Assembly recommends to the Government to impress upon the Government of India to amend the Constitution so as to confine to Foreign Affairs, Defence, Communications, Planning and Finance to the Centre and to greatly enlarge the State list to ensure democratic decentralization."

"I suggest that the Central Government decentralise their powers to the States, retaining ultimately in their charge only foreign affairs, defence and finance."

At the Local Self-Government Council Session, Mr. Sanjiva Reddi said "that decentralisation of power to the States was much more necessary than the decentralisation of power from the State to the Samithi level."

"For the smallest thing, we have to go to the Capital of India", the Chief Minister said. "People who make a larger number of trips to Delhi get better results. States nearer Delhi have better advantages than those far away from it. When schemes are included in the Plan, the State Government must have the liberty to pick and choose and then execute the work. The Central Government may foot the bill, but it is the State Government that executes the schemes. While
the State Governments had eminent engineers in every State the plans and estimates have to be approved by the Central Government. The Chief Engineer of a State prepares the estimate and it is scrutinised by junior engineers in the Planning Commission and the Government of India. This causes any amount of delay. I feel that when a project is included in the Plan it should be the responsibility of the State Government to execute it which will naturally do it efficiently and see that the benefits reached the people. A time will come when the Panchayat Samithis and Zilla Parishads will attend to minor irrigation and other works. Step by step we propose to give them more powers and finance. Ultimately, the State Government should be in charge of only major schemes. We hope that the Central Government will fall in line with this development. I suggest that the Central Government decentralise their powers to the States, retaining ultimately in their charge only foreign affairs, defence and finance.”

All India Congress President’s statement. It is true, we must strengthen our institutions. If we don’t All India set up, we may strengthen our institutions. If we don’t impress our people with our efficiency we shall not be able to impress the people. When a project is included in the Plan it should be the responsibility of the State Government to execute it which will naturally do it efficiently and see that the benefits reached the people. A time will come when the Panchayat Samithis and Zilla Parishads will attend to minor irrigation and other works. Step by step we propose to give them more powers and finance. Ultimately, the State Government should be in charge of only major schemes. We hope that the Central Government will fall in line with this development. I suggest that the Central Government decentralise their powers to the States, retaining ultimately in their charge only foreign affairs, defence and finance.”
India may easily degenerate into a dictatorship as in the case of Pakistan” as Dr. Rajendra Prasad pointed out in a speech at an important event. He also emphasized the importance of a strong Federal Government to prevent such degeneration.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad said:

“...We have, Mr. President, much in common in our aims and ideals. Like yours, ours is a democratic country, a Federation and a Republic” (Hindu, dated 10th December, 1959).

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a federal state, formed on the basis of a voluntary union of equal Soviet Socialist Republics (Page 76 of the Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, J. Stalin, 1931 Edition).

Preamble of the US Constitution: “We the People of the United States in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America” (Page 102: A Government by the people by the Department of State).
Resolution re: Amendment to the Constitution to Ensure Democratic Decentralization

We, the people of India, having solemnly resolved to constitute India into a Sovereign Democratic Republic and to secure to all its citizens:

Justice, social, economic and political;

Liberty of thought expression, belief, faith and worship,

Equality of status and of opportunity;

and to promote among them all

Fraternity assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity of the Nation;

In our Constituent Assembly this twentysixth day of November 1949 do hereby adopt, enact and give to ourselves this Constitution” (Preamble to the Constitution of India).

For two years or more we have drawn up constitutions, and finally the All Parties Committee put a crown to these efforts by drawing up a scheme of its own which the Congress adopted for a year” (Presidential Address to the National Congress, Lahore, December, 1929)

Dominion status &a^a independence *Er*xr*(9a s^^*a5d).
“This constitution according to the Congress view, should be a Federal one, with the largest measure of autonomy for the federating units, and with the residuary powers vesting in these units” (All India Congress Committee Resolution, Bombay, August 8, 1942).

“We recommend that the Constitution should take the following basic form:

1. There should be a Union of India, embracing both British India and the States which should deal with the following subjects: foreign affairs, defence, and communications; and should have the powers necessary to raise the finances required for the above subjects.

2. x x x

3. All subjects other than the Union subjects and all residuary powers should vest in the provinces.

(Statement by the Cabinet Mission to India and His Excellency the Viceroy, page 4—1946).
In any event, it would be wholly wrong to compel a Province to function against its own wish. While we agree to the Provinces having full powers in regard to all remaining subjects as well as the residuary powers, we have also stated that it should be open to any Province to exercise its option to have more common subjects with the Federal Union.

(Letter from the President of the Congress to Lord Pethick-Lawrence, dated 28th April, 1946).

2. "The Constituent Assembly shall draw up a constitution for the Federal union. This shall consist of an All India Federal Government and Legislature dealing with Foreign Affairs, Defence, Communications, Fundamental Rights, Currency, Customs and Planning as well as such other subjects as, on closer scrutiny may be found to be intimately allied to them.

3. All the remaining powers shall vest in the Provinces or Units." (Points suggested on behalf of the Congress as a Basis for agreement, 12th May 1946).

There is reason to fear that the recent trends towards operating the Indian Constitution as if it were unitary while preserving the federal formalities, are doing great harm to the country and undermining the respect to the Constitution which is essential for political stability and growth...."
The practical unification of the country for policy and finance on account of planning has not resulted in strengthening All-India patriotism. On the contrary, it has given rise to bitter rivalries and extravagant demands. Mr. Mahajan vaguely refers to the problem of language. He did not explain how he would deal with it and whether he would continue English as the official language of the unitary state of India he has advocated. If, for that purpose, he had insisted on the retention of that language as the medium of instruction in all Universities, he would have to face a combined revolt of all the linguistic communities.

(India's constitution and its Critics by C. Santhanam, Hindu dated November 11, 1959).

"Far from saving the unity of India centralisation would imperil it towards the point of destroying it. A large country like India, covering more than one million square miles, with a population of more than 350 millions, speaking different languages in different large regions and professing different religions, cannot be ruled from one single centre. Even despotic governments like that of the Turks, as Burke reminded us had to rule their far-flung territories with a light rein; much more is it the case with democratic Governments. For together with unity they have to ensure liberty. Decentralised Government is the very essence of democratic Government."

"True republicanism, said Lord Acton, is the principle of self-government on the whole and in all parts; in an extensive country it can prevail only by the
union of several independent countries in a single confederacy; or in other words a great democracy must either sacrifice self-government to unity or preserve it by federalism”.


“...And even for the prosperity which Mr. Mahajan thinks cannot be attained in India under the present Constitution, autonomy of the States encourages enterprise, competition which in the case of peoples as of individuals is the high road to prosperity. A centralised administration, warned De Toqueville, the great authority on democratic Government, ‘tends to enervate the nations in which it operates by incessantly diminishing public spirit; such administration succeeds in crystallising at a given moment or at a given point all the disposable resources of the people; it impairs the renewal of these resources; it may ensure victory in the hour of strife but it gradually releases the sinews of strength; it may help admirably the transient greatness of a man, but it cannot ensure the durable prosperity of a nation’.

“You and we from our first days have sought, by national policy, the expansion of democracy. You and we, peopled by many strains and races speaking many tongues, worshipping in many ways, have each achieved national strength out of diversity. Unity in diversity and prosperity in diversity is our aim.”
Resolved that it is desirable that the Central Government decentralise powers to the States retaining for themselves Defence, Foreign Affairs, Planning, Communications, and Finance.

"I suggest that the Central Government decentralise powers to the States retaining for themselves Defence, Foreign Affairs, Planning, Communications, and Finance."

"There is one problem facing the country which concerns us nearly and to this I shall now turn and..."
deal with it, however inadequately, the demand for the reconstruction of the artificial British-made Presidencies and provinces into natural divisions forming a new system, new and yet founded on the principle of diversity in unity attempted by ancient India. India, shut into a separate existence by the Himalayas and the ocean, has always been the home of a peculiar people with characteristics of its own distinct civilisation, way of life, way of the spirit, a separate culture, arts, building of society. It has absorbed all that has entered into it, put upon all the Indian stamp, welded the most diverse elements into its fundamental unity. But it has also been throughout a congeries of diverse peoples, lands, kingdoms and, in earlier times, republics also, diverse races, sub-nations with a marked character of their own, developing different brands of forms of civilisation and culture, many schools of art and architecture which yet succeeded in fitting into the general Indian type of civilisation and culture. India's history throughout has been marked by a tendency, a constant effort to unite all this diversity of elements into a single political whole under a central imperial rule so that India might be politically as well as culturally one. Even after a rift had been created by the irruption of the Mohammedan peoples with their very different religion and social structure there continued a constant effort of political unification and there was a tendency towards a mingling of cultures and their mutual influence on each other; even some heroic attempts were made to discover or create a common religion built out of these two apparently irreconcilable faiths and here too there were mutual influences. But throughout Indian's history the political unity was never entirely attained and for this there were several causes first, vastness of space and insufficiency of communications preventing the drawing close of all these different peoples, secondly, the method used which was the military domination by one people or one imperial dynasty over the rest of the country which led to a succession of empires, none of them permanent, lastly, the absence of any will to crush out of existence all these different kingdoms and fuse together these different peoples and force them into a single substance and a single shape. Then came the
British Empire in India which recast the whole country into artificial provinces made for its own convenience, disregarding the principle of division into regional peoples but not abolishing that division. For there had grown up out of the original elements a natural system of subnation with different languages, literatures and other traditions of their own, the four Dravidian peoples, Bengal, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Punjab, Sind, Assam, Orissa, Nepal the Hindi-speaking people of the North, Rajputana and Behar. British rule with its provincial administration did not unite these people but did impose upon them the habit of a common type of administration, a closer intercommunication through the English language and by the education it gave, there was created a more diffused and more militant form of patriotism, the desire for liberation and the need of unity in the struggle to achieve that liberation. A sufficient fighting unity was brought about to win freedom, but freedom obtained did not carry with it a complete union of the country. On the contrary, India was deliberately split on the basis of the two-nation theory into Pakistan and Hindustan with the deadly consequences which we know.

In taking over the administration from Britain we had inevitably to follow the line of least resistance and proceed on the basis of the artificial British-made provinces, at least for the time; this provisional arrangement now threatens to become permanent at least in the main and some see an advantage in this permanence. For they think it will help the unification of the country and save us from the necessity of preserving regional sub-nations which in the past kept a country from an entire and thoroughgoing unification and uniformity. In a rigorous unification they see the only true union, a single nation with a standardised and uniform administration, language, literature, culture, art, education,—all carried on through the agency of one national tongue. How far such a conception can be carried out in the future one cannot forecast, but at present it is obviously impracticable, and it is doubtful if it is for India truly desirable. The ancient diversities of the country carried in them great advantages as well as drawbacks. By these differences the country was made the home of
many living and pulsating centres of life, art, cultures, a richly and brilliantly coloured diversity in unity; all was not drawn up into a few provincial capitals or an imperial metropolis, other towns and regions remaining subordinated and indistinctive or even culturally asleep; the whole nation lived with a full life in its many parts and this increased enormously the creative energy of the whole. There is no possibility any longer that this diversety will endanger or diminish the unity of India. Those vast spaces which kept her people from closeness and a full interplay have been abolished in their separating effect by the march of science and the swiftness of the means of communication. The idea of federation and a complete machinery for its perfect working have been discovered and will be at full work. Above all, the spirit of patriotic unity has been too firmly established in the people to be easily effaced or diminished, and it would be more endangered by refusing to allow the natural play of life of the subnations. The congress itself in the days before liberation came had pledged itself to the formation of linguistic provinces and to follow it out, if not immediately, yet as early as may conveniently be, might well be considered the wisest course. India’s national life will then be founded on her natural strength and the principle of unity in diversity which has always been normal to her and its fulfilment the fundamental course of her being and its very nature. the Many in the One, would place her on the sure foundation of her Swabhava and Swadharma.

This development might well be regarded as the inevitable trend of her future. For the Dravidian regional peoples are demanding their separate right to a self-governing existence; Maharashtra expects a similar concession and this would mean a similar development in Gujart and then the British made Presidency of Madras and Bombay would have disappeared. The old Bengal Presidency had already been split up and Orissa, Bihar and Assam are now self-governing regional peoples. A merger of the Hindi speaking part of the Central Provinces and the U. P. would complete the process. An annulment of the partition of India might modify but would not materially
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alter this result of the general tendency. A union of States and regional peoples would again be the form of a United India.

One of the great advantages of the recent re-organisation of the federal units in the country is that on the whole the country has been divided into large viable States.”
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This Assembly recommends to the Government to impress upon the Government of India to amend the Constitution so as to confine Foreign affairs, Defence,
Communications, Planning and Finances to the Centre and to greatly enlarge the State list to ensure democratic decentralisation.”

Andhra is not only alphabetically first but is advancing rapidly in Community Development.”
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To amend the constitution, the following provision is proposed:

To ensure democratic decentralization. 

The provision is as follows:

1. The constitution shall be amended to provide for the devolution of powers, responsibilities, and resources to the states, municipalities, and other local authorities. 

2. The provision shall be implemented within one year from the date of its enactment.

3. The amendment shall be ratified by a majority of the states and the centre.

The provision is necessary to ensure that the democratic principles of the constitution are upheld and that the people are empowered to participate in the governance of their communities.

The amendment shall be tabled in the constituent assembly for discussion and ratification.
Resolution re:

Amendment to the Constitution to

Ensure Democratic Decentralization

12th December, 1959

280
In a recent speech delivered in the Harold Laski Institute of Political Science in Ahamadabad, the Union Minister for Industries Manubhai Shah is reported to have said that the trend towards increasing concentration of power, authority and functions in the Union Government was detrimental to the interests of both people and the Government. The Centre is becoming a steam-roller and the States appear to be in a pitiable position, he is reported to have stated.
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Article 363, Constitution Committee, ‘It is hereby declared that it is essential for the maintenance of a democratic constitution that certain subjects shall be exclusively list subject to the approval of the President.

(1) Union List (2) State List (3) Concurrent List. Concurrent list subjects shall be subject to the approval of the President except those subjects which are in the Concurrent List. State List subjects shall be subject to the approval of the President except those subjects which are in the State List.

essential match the criteria specified in the Constitution.

Article 363. The President shall have the power to pass such bills after the consideration of the Cabinet.

The President shall have the power to pass such bills after the consideration of the Cabinet.

Merit in the examination of Concurrent List subjects shall be given to those candidates who have obtained the highest marks in the examination of Concurrent List subjects.

Merit in the examination of Concurrent List subjects shall be given to those candidates who have obtained the highest marks in the examination of Concurrent List subjects.
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who pays the piper will call the tune. He
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mental as well direct recruitment should be a matter of course. Central Secretariat is 
now accepting applications for the entire list of positions. The contribution of the 
Ambassadors' representation will be 
important. The Department will ensure that I.A.S. and other 
direct recruitment as well I.A.S. and other 
positions are filled as per the list. I.A.S. recruitment 
will be to the extent of 
their representation. Agency 
will be following the 
instructions of the 
authority. There will be 
additional quotas for 
impressing the 
authority. The 
authority has 
accepted the 
recommendations. It 
will be a matter of 
course.
Madam; I am supporting the resolution moved by hon. Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnayya. The resolution has been not only cautiously worded but a balanced view has been taken when this resolution was framed. I am surprised to note how this could be opposed on the strength that we are having some Azad Government slogan of the erstwhile Hyderabad State, when Lord Mountbatten was there and when a document was to be signed on a dotted line. The progress that we have now made is perfectly different. I fail to understand how my hon. friend, Sri V. Ramachandra Rao could not make out the spirit behind it.

We have never said, or the resolution does not say that Centre is not to be there, the State is not to be Federal or the Centre has to take up only these four items and none else. What I would stress upon is this. How did the National movement begin? Let me take him back to the movement of partition of Bengal, let me take him back to movements of the various States when they fought for their own development. What did Andhra and what did Maharashtra fight for? They thought that whatever was required by them, they...
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should gain for themselves. But they did not concentrate upon only restricting to their own province or State. They said “while fighting for our own development, we want the development of the whole of Bharat i.e. India.” They concentrated more on the development of India, while at the same time saying that language, status, social reforms, planning features, etc. should be allowed to be developed by themselves. So, before having Swarajya or before having independence, every State fought for its own development. But keeping the National movement in view, could we not do so similarly now? We want our own planning. We want our own States to develop on our own lines, on our own methods, and on our own methods of administration. I think if my hon. friend Sri V. Ramachandra Rao had noted well, that is the only thing there that we want, namely, “we want to develop on our own lines, please allow us to develop, while keeping to yourselves all the powers of communications, planning, finance and whatever is said in the resolution here”. While planning is given what is left over? While planning is left to the Centre, could it be said that anything is yet to be taken over from the Centre? While we have given them such a wide scope of keeping every thing to themselves, could we not ask “Please allow us to administer ourselves”?

I am surprised how hon. Sri V. Ramachandra Rao has understood our hon. Chief Minister when he said that for small things or forgetting small items sanctioned they have to go to Delhi once and again. That was the intention behind what the hon. Chief Minister had spoken. I am not translating him but I am sure I have understood him in that line. The object behind his speech was that while every bit of planning was given to the Centre and when the plans were completely drafted and approved, why for every administrative sanction, send it to the Planning Department again and try to get the matters delayed. That is not the way in which my hon. friend Sri Ramachandra Rao has understood him when he said that there was something like an Azad Hyderabad Slogan seen in this.

*Sri V. Ramachandra Rao* : For the information of hon. Sri Vasudeva Naik........
Resolution re:
Amendment to the Constitution to
Ensure Democratic Decentralization

Sri Vasudeva Krishnaji Naik: I am not yielding, Madam. Let me finish. Otherwise I would divert myself to something else.

The resolution moved by hon. Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnayya tells us that after having seen for ten years the administrative delays, to avoid these delays, to avoid red-tapism, to avoid all obstacles that might have been placed in the progress of the States or the growth of the States, we should ask that some powers should be retained with the Centre and other powers should be given to the States.

Therefore, I feel that the resolution has been very wisely phrased, has been very orderly in manner and has been worded with due concentration of thought and feeling. I feel we shall be one in giving our wise vote or give our all support to the resolution and see that the States are developed on the same lines as before the National Development movement. I feel the Resolution is necessary and essential and I hope every hon. Member would give his or her approval to it.

Temporary Chairman: (Smt. T. Lakshmikanthamma): No, it is not necessary to give any explanation.
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"Resolved that the Central Government may promulgate an Amendment to the Constitution to provide for
Communal representation in the Constituent Assembly..."
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Taxes on Estate Duty, Expenditure Duty.

(1) Estate Duty: (1) under the... (2) under... (3) under... (4) under...

(ii) Expenditure Duty: (1) under... (2) under...

(iii) Other Taxes: (1) under... (2) under...

(iv) Miscellaneous: (1) under... (2) under...
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(The House, then, adjourned till Nine of the Clock on Monday the 14th December, 1959.)