

Clause 9

(3) Page 6, line 17, for "1969" substitute "1970"

Clause 16

(4) Page 9, line 36, for "ship" substitute "vessel"

(5) Page 9, line 37, for "ship" substitute "vessel"

(6) Page 10, line 5, for "ship" substitute "vessel"

(7) Page 10, line 8, for "ship" substitute "vessel"

Clause 19

(8) Page 21, line 46 for "1969" substitute "1970"

2. I am, therefore, to return herewith the said Bill in accordance with the provisions of rule 11 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha with request that the concurrence of Rajya Sabha in the amendments made by Lok Sabha be communicated to this House."

(II)

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith the North-Eastern Council Bill, 1970, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 11th May, 1970."

Sir, I lay both the Bills on the Table of the House.

RE CIRCULATION OF THE PRIVY PURSES BILL

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Sir, I have a submission to make. I understand that the Privy Purses Bill is going to be introduced in the other House on the 18th. Surely, before the introduction I have circulated this Bill to the Member of that House. In this case the Government should make copies of the Bill available to us also in advance.

SHRI OIS MEHTA (Jammu and Kashmir) : 'We will do that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : And tell them not to give compensation to the former ruler.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : That is irrelevant at this stage.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI (Rajasthan) : Compensation for the copies of the Bill?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I know that you are interested in compensation because the Rajmata is with you. Sir it is better to give compensation directly to Mr. Sundar Singh Bhandari. Why indirectly all this thing? We are against compensation.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : We know why you are against it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Mr. Raju.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 176 REGARDING THE DEMAND FOR A SEPARATE TELENGANA STATE

SHRI B. V. RAJU (Andhra Pradesh) : Sir, I beg to raise a discussion on the latest developments in relation to the demand for a separate Telengana State.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we are now discussing the present situation in Andhra Pradesh with particular reference to Telengana. I request the House to bear with me for a few minutes and remind themselves of the happenings that took place in the year 1969.

Sir, before I go into the merits of the case of Telengana, I would like to remove any misunderstanding about the Telengana area and the people of Andhra Pradesh or the people residing in the Telengana region. It has come to our notice that in some quarters this agitation is being represented as a hatred campaign against the people of the other region. I would like to correct it. It is not so. It is far from the truth. Secondly, we hear here and there that this is an agitation engineered and encouraged by a class of landlords and capitalists. It is far from the truth. I would like to remove these two misunderstandings or misapprehensions about this agitation.

Sir, I am a public worker, as you know, to which you have been a witness for the last forty years. Sir, it has been your

[Shri V. B. Rajan]

good fortune to be in politics in the erstwhile State of Hyderabad. I am also a humble worker for the last 34 years. I would like to recall the sacrifices made by the people residing in that area. Sardar Pate! used to say that Hyderabad is the belly of India, is the stomach of India. It gives nourishment and also it worries us with all the disease. So let us take care of the belly and we take care of everything.

Sir, if Hyderabad was not integrated in 1948, what would have been the fate of India, where would have been India's unity and integrity, physically and otherwise? It was the 14 months' sacrifice by the people of Hyderabad, the Marathi-speaking people from the five districts, and the Kannada-speaking people from the three districts, and the Telugu-speaking people in the remaining eight districts. Sir, they had sacrificed for 14 months. For what? For two objectives: integration of the State of Hyderabad into India, and democracy.

Sir, this cannot be forgotten by the people residing in the rest of India. Hyderabad through its struggle produced two great personalities, one a great leader, Swami Ramananda Tirtha, the great fighter, who was also in the Lok Sabha for some time and, another, the able administrator, Shri B. Ramakrishna Rao, who happened to be a Member of Parliament, but who is no more. These two great personalities were cosmopolitan in their outlook. Swamiji is still with us. The people of Telengana are reputed for two things, Sir, for their cosmopolitan outlook and for their hospitality. I would turn to this side and remind the Members of the ruling Congress Party when they attended the Congress Session in 1967 what hospitality they received. I would like to remind the leadership of the Congress ruling party that when Maharashtra was in a difficult situation because of the Koyana earthquake and could not hold the Session, it is the people particularly from Hyderabad who hosted it. I represented them and I said I would host the Session within a week. They know how we came to the rescue of Delhi. Now when we are in difficulty, if Delhi is silent and if Delhi is indifferent, where should we look to? We have no other father, only one father, that is, the sacrifice that was made for the political integration and unity of the country.

Sir, I do not want to take much time of the House. The history is known to everyone. We left our homes. We were away for 14 months at the borders of our State. We used all types of technique that Gandhiji taught us and we were able to kick the ball into the goal.

In 1946 when our leaders approached the Delhi leadership what our leaders were told was that it was possible that in 1947 the British might leave India. Therefore, they wanted us to see if the Nizam could come to Delhi for talks. What we did was we actually brought down the feudal dynasty. We did not stop there. I would now turn to this side and address the Communists: friends and congratulate them. It is the people of Telengana who actually were the pioneers in agrarian revolution. The 1947 Telengana Movement shall not be forgotten. What was the result of that? The revolution was not a failure. It gave us in 1953 a piece of legislation, land reforms for India...

[*Interruption by Shri K. P. Subramania Memon*]
I am giving the historical facts, and not an opinion. I am not casting an aspersion on anybody. That piece of legislation is the model for the rest of India. Swami Ramananda Tirtha from Marath wada was the leader for all of us. The friends from Karnataka, the three districts, and we from Telengana, we sat for days and nights and produced what we call the Bhagwadgita for the peasantry. Now this is the achievement of the Telengana area and this is what it has contributed to the agrarian economy. I am going into the history only to reveal the true facts behind the present agitation, what exactly it is and what are the motive forces. That is the only purpose of my saying all this.

The third thing is, Hyderabad is a bridge between the South and the North. We never entertained any feelings of South and North or East and West. Even when the great agitation was going on against Hindi, we were not partisan. We were neither pro-Hindi nor anti-Hindi. We held the balance and we were actually the people who said that bilingualism must be there, that the two languages should be there, that is, Hindi and the regional language; they should be there and they should have equal status, and it is necessary for every student to pick up these two languages. In fact, in Hyderabad, as you know, every one of us is in the know of four languages. My mother tongue is Telugu. I speak.

English, I speak -Jindi and I speak Urdu. And I can write in all four languages. This is common. Now such a brilliant people, fighting people, sacrificing people, are to-day in difficulties. Why? Sir, this is a movement going on all over the country. But it is not perceivable. It is not being recognised in the manner as in the Telengana area. This is an agitation coming from a backward area. And I am sure all the backward areas in this country will witness such a war against oppression. This is my speculation. Unfortunately, some incidents have happened in such a manner that they are capable of being misunderstood. Sir, it is not a movement for a break-up of linguistic States. It is not a movement for bringing back multilingual States. And it is not a boundary dispute. Everybody in this House who comes from the Marathwada area or the Karimnagar area is a witness—Kollur Maliappa who is a Member of this House knows about it. Mr. Sher Khan knows; I too—it was that when we broke up Hyderabad, we did it very peacefully. We sat round a table and evolved two principles—majority in the village and co-titrit; we took village as the unit, we laid down the principles and gave them to our subordinate officers. They drew the line and we accepted it. And there has not been any murmuring, any trouble, till now. We behaved in a democratic way. So if the Telengana people are narrow-minded, how did they adjust themselves to this pluralistic socio-cultural existence? Telengana is not second to any area in maintaining tolerance.

Now, Sir, what happened? It is in 1956, after having existed separately in the Hyderabad State for eight years after the *polio* action, we in Telengana wanted a bigger State. One thing should not be forgotten, *i.e.* the coastal area and Rayalaseema, known as Andhra area, and the Telengana area, with a population of more than 10 million, these two areas, politically had existed separately under two systems for 150 years. Rayalaseema and the coast; I am sure that area happened to enjoy whatever good whatever benefit that came from the liberal British democracy, whereas this area . . .

SHRI A. T. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal) : Liberal British democracy? Did it ever exist?

SHRI V. B. RAJU : I used the word "whatever."

6—33 R. S./70

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Do not use words loosely.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : The so-called British democracy gave the Nizam to your area.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : I said relatively speaking.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : It was only a casual observation.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : That only shows where the wind is blowing "Liberal British democracy" for "British imperialism"—these are the words he is using.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : They were democrats at home and might be they were autocrats or imperialistic outside.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, the Nizam's harem was certainly democratic—highly populated.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : This area suffered under the Bahminis, the Qutb Sahis and the Asaf Sahis; it suffered terribly. Sir, it is backward not in terms of economy only. Education was denied. There was not even one high school in a district. That was the state of affairs. The area was so backward. Everybody who visited the Hyderabad city, looking at the palatial buildings there used to carry a wrong impression that it was a rich area. The rural area was so neglected that the people always suffered . . .

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIAM MENON (Kerala) : Now they suffer under the present regime.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : It is not a movement against anybody. Let me not be misunderstood. It is we who tried for the formation of a bigger State of Andhra. What was known as Visalandhra—finally it became Andhra Pradesh. There were some friends who wanted it to be called Telugu Nadu. I think it would have been all right, similar to the name of Tamil Nadu. But the word Andhra was imported and ultimately it became Andhra Pradesh. Then what happened? There were all these troubles at that time. It was the people of Telengana, one small section of the people, including yourself and myself, who wanted a bigger State. It is not by the sacrifices of friends from Andhra . . .

[Sfiri V. B. Raju.]

That this bigger State was fo-med. If it were so, then I should like to say that in 1953 when the Anihra State was separated from Madhya Pradesh, for reasons known to themselves—I do not want to go into them now—the view of Telengana were not associated and the people of Telengana were not part of that movement. Only in 1956 when some of us said that a bigger State of Andhra Pradesh where more than 30 million Telugu-speaking people could live under one roof, would be interesting and quicker development would be there, that it happened. It is the people of Telengana who were actually responsible for the formation of the bigger State. Sir, at that time an agreement was entered into by eight people, four from the Telengana area and four from the Andhra area. Out of these eight gentlemen, two are no more—Shri Ramakrishna Rao and Shri A. Satnarayana Raju. Among the remaining six, one is Shri Gopala Reddy and as a Governor, he may not be able to express any views. Among the remaining five, only one says that the State should continue as a big Unit. The remaining four have their own views, particularly Konda Venkata-ranga Reddy and D. Ghenna Reddy want a separate State.

"SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh) : Who is the one who is against separation?

SHRI V. B. RAJU : Shri J. V. Narasimha Rao, Shri Konda Venkataranga Reddy and Dr. Chenna Reddy want Separation. Of the remaining two, Gautu Latchanna, who belongs to the Swatantra Party, is for a separate State. Mr. Sanjiva Reddy feels that it does not matter if the Telengana people want to separate. I can say that out of the eight signatories, two are no more and out of the remaining six, one is a Governor and four of the remaining five would like the matter to be decided to the best Satisfaction of the Telengana people. This is the factual situation.

Now, Sir, who started this agitation ? It was started by the intellectuals of this area. As I have said, the rural people of the Hyderabad State were denied all facilities. Only the city had all the facilities. As I said, there was not a single high school in one district. After Hyderabad attained its freedom, after the formation of Andhra Pradesh, education facilities were provided and the advance-

ment in education was considerable. There was horizontal mobility. The children of the rural peasantry who for the first time had received education in the lifetime of their families began to march to the urban areas for higher education and for employment opportunities. And these young men who came into the urban areas had no social mooring. When they had no employment there they could not go back to the rural areas and fit in there. Thus there was a big gap between the declining generation and the new generation. When they came expecting that they would get employment, they had no jobs. When they asked for jobs, somebody said, the jobs have been taken away by the Andhra friends. The youngman felt aggrieved. According to the Wanchoo Committee report, 4388 jobs which were due for Telengana were filled by non-domiciles. So the youngman felt aggrieved. I am not giving my comments. The youngman felt that the politicians broke the agreement. The man who was suffering from unemployment, who is angry, he does not look to all these things. He might be misled. He felt aggrieved. He felt that the breach of the agreement has taken place. Sir, if that agreement were not there, nothing would have happened. For all the mischief, the agreement is responsible. It is a double injury. First of all, you deny and secondly you break your promise also.

Sir, that agreement was entered into when there was an agitation for a separate Telengana. The Fazl Ali Commission recommended a separate Telengana. The Fazl Ali Commission said that Telengana could be a separate State for five years and after five years' experience, if two-third majority of the Assembly decided to merge, then it could be done. The Delhi leadership, particularly Panditji advised for a bigger State and these four leaders from Telengana agreed in spite of their stand in favour of a separate Telengana. They tell me, it was all oral, nothing in writing. Panditji seems to have told them, live together for five years and if you do not feel happy, you can change your opinion later on. That is what they say. But there is nothing on record. It is certain that Panditji was in favour of smaller States; later on, he changed his opinion for bigger States. That is a different matter. Sir, if this matter of bigger State was put before the people and if the people had agreed, I think, it would have been better. The people were not told. Only a few

leaders, four from his side and four from that side, agreed a Delhi. The four gentlemen from Telangana pleaded for a separate State in the beginning.

The youngman, who is denied a job, feels aggrieved because the agreement provided two main things—one is employment and the other development. And Sir, this agreement is not for give and take. The people of Telangana wanted nothing from Andhra; this must be made known to the House. Even today the people of Telangana do not want anything from Andhra. What the agreement provided was that Telangana's surpluses should be spent in Telangana, i.e. the poor man's money should be spent at poor man's place and the Telangan jobs should be given to the Telangana people. This is not actually placing a heavy burden on Andhra. Sir, today, if Telangana people want to stand on their own feet, reap their own *jin'O'ir*, how can you say they are against Andhra? I am not a separatist, as I said, it was I who stood strongly for integration, I was assaulted by the followers of the senior gentlemen who now want actually the integrated State. That was politics.

But the question is, Sir, what is it that the Telangana people want and what has been agreed upon? They did not want anything from Andhra area, even though they were poor. They did not want only one thing—exploitation. They were apprehensive, so they said, to avoid any possible exploitation, that these two things be provided.

What has been revealed between 15 November, 1956 and 31st March, 1968—nearly a period of twelve years—what has happened? Sir, people say that Telangana has developed. Yes, it has developed, it has considerably developed; compared to the previous decade, it has developed considerably and wonderfully. But it should be studied from two angles. Relatively, how I was ten years ago and how I am now. I have improved, but how my friend was ten years ago and how he is now. India has developed wonderfully, but in comparison with Japan or in comparison with the U.S.A., Russia, how much it has gone ahead? So the two types of comparison are taken into consideration in the matter of development. So, you should not misunderstand when we say that the Telangan people feel that they have not developed considerably in comparison with the Andhra area.

Sir, what has been the result of these twelve years? As I said, the jobs which were due for Telangana people were not available to them; they have been actually filled by some others. Now they put a question. Has any man from Telangana employed in Andhra? We have no answer. Now it is no use sitting here and saying that these people are narrow-minded, these fellows have no broad national outlook. It is easy to remark, but the wearer knows where the shoe pinches.

The second aspect is about development. Sir, Telangana has yielded a surplus revenue in the revenue account to the tune of 64 crores according to Mr. Lalit in a period of twelve years and he worked out taking the capital account and investment in public undertakings and all these things. Forty-six crores of rupees which ought to have been spent in Telangana were not spent. This is the one figure he has given. The second figure, he has given, on which the Cabinet agreed and the Government of Andhra Pradesh agreed was that 29 crores should be additionally spent on Telangana for the reason that 58 crores have been spent as a deficit expenditure on Andhra on revenue account.

Sir, there is the third item on Telangana securities. The Telangana regional committee working on these figures has shown about 86 crores of rupees. Eighty-six crores of rupees should have been spent in Telangana which were not spent, not the 86 crores of rupees of today rupee value, but the rupee which had a different value ten years ago.

You will find, Sir, that the Telangana area could have developed more rapidly, if all this money had been spent and it cannot be disputed. But what has the Government of India done? It appointed Bhargava Committee.

Sir, the Home Minister is here. I would very humbly submit, Sir, the Home Ministry, Government of India, should be the custodian of the backward areas and poor people. Mr. Kumar Lalit, a senior officer of the Auditor General's branch came and worked out these figures. These figures were referred to the Telangana regional committee and when the matter is under discussion, the Bhargava Committee is appointed. Now what is the status of this Committee? How does it fit into the Constitution? How are its findings going to be accepted? Sir, as you know very well, the present law

[Shri V. B. Raju.]

provides that if there is any dispute between the regional committee and the Government of Andhra Pradesh, this matter will be referred to the Governor and his findings will be final. Mr. Bhai-gava is a great man, a great jurist, I am not disputing the person and his capacity, but the interpretation given by the Bhargava Committee is entirely wrong. I actually represented to the Home Ministry personally that the Bhargava Committee should take into consideration all agreements entered into originally by the eight persons and later on by the 45 leaders and also decisions arrived at by the Government of Andhra Pradesh which consisted of Ministers from both the areas and the understanding that had been accepted all these 12 years. The Committee seems to take a view—a very narrow view—we do not recognize all these things as agreements. Even the Andhra Pradesh Cabinet's decision for the provision of 29 crores for the Telengana area 3 P.M. has not been taken into consideration by the Bhargava Committee. Anyhow, if there is an opportunity to discuss that Committee's report, I can easily place all these matters before you. Now, what is going to happen to that Committee's recommendations? If anybody goes to the High Court and says, "How can the findings of this Committee be accepted by the Government of India and imposed upon the Government of Andhra Pradesh?", nobody can answer it. Anyhow, that is not as important as the matter to which I am making a reference. These items are the bedrock, the basement, on which Andhra Pradesh has been formed, and that basement has been now shattered by the violation of the agreement in respect of these two matters, namely employment and development. Let us take the figures of the Bhargava Committee. The Bhargava Committee said that Rs. 28 crores were due to Telengana. So the Telengana man says today, "Not a single pie of that area has been spent here in Telengana". He says, "The money of the poor people has been spent there; let it be even Rs. 28 crores." And what is my reply to him when he says, "I wanted to be here separately in 1956, but you took me and put me in charge of that area and in these twelve years even these Rs. 28 crores have been taken away and spent there. I have had no benefit of my being associated with that area. Why do you want me

to be tied down to that area?" I have no reply to his question.

And then, Sir, the third thing is very important...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Mr. Raju, usually half an hour is allowed for such discussions. And now you have taken half an hour already.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : Sir, this is an important matter. Please give him ten minutes more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : All right, I will give you ten minutes, Mr. Raju.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : I will finish it within that time.

The third thing is very important and that is politics. It is said that this movement has been started by urchins and frustrated politicians. That is the contention of the Chief Minister. There can be only one reply to that. If you say that this movement has been started by urchins and frustrated politicians, then, let us take the opinion of the people. If the people decide that not only should Andhra Pradesh be there as it is, but we shall have Madras also with us, we are ready...

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY (Tamil Nadu) : The Madras people will never agree to that.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : Let the people say that. It is not the urchins and the frustrated politicians who started it. It is actually the Osmania University teaching staff and the students who highlighted this. It is they who did it and there is a history for this. We, the politicians, do not know how to handle the intelligentsia of this country. And with the arrogance that is there in us, we try to mishandle them. It was the interference in the affairs of the Osmania University, by the Government which was responsible for this. This has been the beginning of the conflict. In 1957, you may remember, in the appointment of the Vice-Chancellor when Mr. Sanjiva Reddy was the Chief Minister, he appointed Dr. D. S. Reddy as the Vice-Chancellor, and the students and the teachers of the University burnt an effigy of Mr. Sanjiva Reddy at that time and said, "We do not want this man."

We want a local man. We want a man from our faculty". So, at that time some of us interfered and pacified the students and the teachers. That was in 1957. Again in 1966 the Government interfered with the autonomy of the University in the appointment of its Vice-Chancellor. There was a furore. It all developed as a personal quarrel between the Vice-Chancellor and the Chief Minister and the matter went before the High Court. The High Court decided in favour of the Government. What the Chief Minister could do was a different matter. But he appointed a person from his own district. You know what happened then. The teachers and the students joined together in preventing that man; from taking charge of this office. It is recorded in history. They physically prevented him from taking charge of his office as Vice-Chancellor. Meanwhile the Supreme Court gave a stay order. That is how the students and the teachers of the University were brought together against the Government by the Government itself. Then what happened in 1965? Very unfortunately some of my colleagues—at that time I was a Minister—interfered in the elections of the University students' union and took sides. The president was elected to be in favour of the Government and the whole executive was elected to be against the Government. These three instances were enough to provoke the students and the teaching staff of the University against the Government. And when the time came, they took it into their hands. The separate Telangana slogan was first made by the Students of the C. M. University in a jocular way on January 15, 1969. If I remember correctly. Even for this there is a history. And the foolish thing that the Government did was anticipating a movement of this nature; they encouraged some student to start an advance movement for safeguards—the Government itself did it. It is so funny that there are certain Governments which take a fancy to encourage aging people...

SHRI KOTA PUNNAIAH (Andhra Pradesh) : I think you were in the Government at that time.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : Yes, I was there and I said so. If I am guilty I deserve to be hanged. It is not a question of my personal interest.

AN HON. MEMBER : Were you not a party to it?

SHRI V. B. RAJU : I was not a party to all these ugly things. You can put any question and I am here to answer you...

SHRI M. SRINIVASA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh) : He does not want to be hanged alone, he wants others also to be hanged.

(Interruptions)

SHRI V. B. RAJU : The next generation is going to do it. There is no doubt about it. This should be a lesson to all the politicians. Now what has happened? There was mishandling of the students, there was interference in the University affairs. This is how actually we built up almost a potential force against ourselves. This is one section.

The other section is the N.G.Os., the non-Gazetted officers. The representatives of the N.G.Os. are here in this city today...

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON : To hear your speech.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : They have met the Prime Minister. They feel that their grievances can never be rectified by this Government legally. They have come to that conclusion. Why? Even after fourteen years integration lists have not been prepared. Some *ad hoc* lists have been prepared and some people were being promoted through favouritism. That is their charge. They have been denied their chance. Some of them have already retired from service and some of them are dead. So, this problem cannot be solved. They have come all the way to represent to the Prime Minister. They have been agitating since 1968. This is what the Wanchoo Committee also has recognised. In regard to service matters, recruitment, promotion, etc. we have a funny Constitution. Our Constitution is vague in respect of these matters. If you want to provide a safeguard for a backward area, you have to amend the chapter on Fundamental Rights which you cannot do because the Supreme Court judgement in Golaknath's case is there...

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : What prevents you from amending the Constitution?

SHRI V. B. RAJU : I would like to know whether you have the powers to amend it. That is what the Wanchoo Committee said, "_____because the Fundamental Rights cannot be amended". That is what the Supreme Court said. Anyhow, that is what the report of that Committee says. If you have to provide for safeguards for a backward area, you have to amend the Fundamental Rights. For creating an autonomous State, you can amend the Constitution by a two-thirds majority which we have already done in the case of Meghalaya. But you can create a separate State under Article 3- So, the Constitution has made it easier to create separate States, but...

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal) : The framers of the Constitution foresaw it.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : ... for amending the Fundamental Rights ...

SHRI KOTA PUNNAIAH : Sir, I want to seek one clarification from the honourable Member.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : No, Sir. If you allow him, for every such interruption you must give me five minutes ; otherwise, I cannot finish my speech, or else please do not allow any interruptions, deny them the opportunity of interrupting me.

SHRI A. D. MANI : Why deny them ? Do not deny them. You give five minutes to the honourable Member.

(Interruptions)

SHRI V. B. RAJU : Now about our Federation. It is not a Union of States as it is always said to be. There were no independent States before we constituted the Union. It was a unitary Government. Thro <rh our Constitution we created the States, Part A, Part B, Part C, and so on i,i 1950. We reorganised in 1956. As late as 1969 you did something more in respe/;¹ of Assam. Article 3 is Still there allowing yoi to reconstitute the States, to reorganise the States. Our federation is not a rigid one. I would like to put one question to the Home Minister. In Telengana agitation, many people died, many buses have been burnt and many families have suffered. How many more should die before they get the benefit under article 3 of the Constitution ?

What are the standards that the Parliament has laid down for actually invoking the provisions of the Constitution ? The Prime Minister came to Hyderabad. One evening suddenly she came to study the situation in the month of June. She said "Let the agitation stop". Then the Home Minister was there for two days and he appealed to the people to stop the agitation. From July the agitation was stopped but nobody has moved till today. Unfortunately, the newspapers also could not report it there is a *satyagraha*. If a bus is burnt, there is a report; the Home Minister takes note of it. While answering a question be said that the agitation has subsided because there is no violence, because there is no street fighting. Is that the way to do things, Sir ? For the last 8 months we have been requesting the Government of India to give the constitutional benefit to the people of Telengana. Sir, I am not pleading here the case for a separate Telengana. I am trying to find a solution for the Telengana problem. I would like that some solution must be found to this problem. Otherwise you will be driving many young people in this country to join many subversive movements.

Then, Sir, you know that the N.G.Os-had gone on strike for 35 days. How much sacrifice have they made ? Then 16 lakh students remained absent from their classes, for 8 months. Can you imagine such a situation anywhere in the world, 16 lakh students remaining absent for 8 months ?

SHRI KOTA PUNNAIAH : How much damage you have done.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : Sir, it seems that some friends- have come prepared to take a partisen view. I would request them not to take a partisan view. I am not taking any partisan view. I am speaking here with a full sense of lesponsibility and with a desire to find a solution for this problem. (Interruption) I never entered the movement. After four months all the political parties realised the gravity of the situation. We did not know what to do ; we were placed in a very unfortunate position. We lost our political life. Sir, I did not resign from the Ministry like *Ayarams* and *Gayarams* whose aim is only to get power. I resigned because I wanted to go nearer the people. As long as I was in office people disbelieved in me. The Government was going

far away from the people. I resigned from the Congress because it was also going far away from the people.

SHRI K. P. S. JBRAMANIA MENON : At least that you realise now.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : Certainly, Sir. If I commit a mistake, at least I have got the courage and wisdom to realise that I have committed a mistake, which others do not do. Sir, the point is that the intellectuals of our society are displeased with the present system of the Government, the present behaviour and the present high-brow attitude of the Government. They say "We do not want this system; we want to shape our own destiny; we do not believe in party politics". That is revolt. They say that politicians are not dependable. Volcano bursts, there is some energy released. This is something like a social volcano which has burst and new energy has been released. Now the politicians must come into the scene, and propose directly that energy. It is no use condemning them. The present Osmania University Vice-Chancellor himself presided in a convention. All the teaching staff, even the primary teachers joined in this movement; even the chaprasis and Government servants joined in this movement. Now can anybody ignore these happenings? If anybody wants to be a public worker, he must be able to influence the public mind or he should quit. I am unable to influence public mind today. I want actually Andhra Pradesh to be an independent State but I cannot do it, because the whole population has revolted saying "These are our suspicions". They feel that there is political domination. Why should all the Chief Ministers come from the other area? One day, Sir, my Chief Minister said "Telengana has no leadership." I was worried and I said that Telengana has better leadership than Andhra. Even my friend, Mr. Veerendra P. Mysore Chief Minister, is doing better than he was a young colleague of mine in Hyderabad and he is the Parly when I was a brilliant Chief Minister. I am not vindictive. I give a chance to Mahatma. The Telengana area that has produced such a revolutionary element can certainly give a Chief Minister. Sir, a politician has psychology of the people. The man who does not study psychology is unfit to be a politician.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It is difficult to understand the psychology of some leaders.

SHRI KOTA PUNNAIAH : Why all the Prime Ministers from Uttar Pradesh why not from other States? What is this psychology? I cannot understand it. You must allow me to seek certain clarifications.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : Sir, I am not mincing matters. I am putting one question to Mr. Punnaiah who comes from Telengana. If this has been said by Shrimati Yashoda Reddy, I could have understood it and I would have replied to her also but when Mr. Punnaiah . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : Let me tell my friend, Mr. Raju, that irrespective of the fact where I come from, when I try to act, I act as an Indian and nothing else.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : You act very well.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : I am only, Sir, saying that these are the suspicions created in the minds of the people there. The Regional Committee considered the whole thing and it has made some suggestions that there must be some political arrangements. Sir, it is on record. It was on the 5th of July that Shri Nijalingappa and Shri Kamaraj came there and the Chief Minister himself wanted a resolution to be unanimously passed in the party.

SRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What is your suggestion?

SHRI V. B. RAJU : My suggestion is that which you do not accept. Anyway, Sir, I have tried to explain the problem. By doing so I might have overdone it to the dissatisfaction of some friends on this side but I do not mind that because I must express my sincere feelings here. Now, Sir, my suggestion is this. The Telengana people by an overwhelming majority want to have their own State. *(Interruptions)* When I want to find a solution and want to bring the different forces together, it is no use condemning them. It is no use condemning the Telengana people.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What do you want?

for having brought this subject for a discussion here. This Telengana problem has been agitating us and the whole country as a matter of fact for more than a year or so. I must also appreciate and tell Mr. Raju that his presentation of the case has been extremely good, extremely analytical but may be it was one-sided—that is my opinion—but there is nothing from which I differ from him. On 99 per cent, of the things he has said I am one with him but I would like to place this Telengana issue in front of the House for very serious consideration both by the Government and the Parliament and to consider from two aspects. The Telengana problem—for want of a better name in English at my command I call it so—has two aspects. One is the problem of Telengana as a State or as a region or as a district itself. The second is the problem of Telengana. Why I want to differentiate these two problems is because I want to draw the particular attention of this House, the Parliament and the nation towards this one vital aspect which is far more paramount than the problems we are dealing with because Telengana is an absolutely integral part of India. Telengana in one aspect of it is representing what is happening in every backward area of India. When we have been discussing Telengana the whole of last year and of late

tst to or 15 days

after Mr. Raju's arrival in the Parliament—I am most grateful to him because of many meetings convened between our Members and certainly between the other parties he must have held meetings—two point⁴; came to my mind. One is, I will not say irresponsibly but certainly irrelevantly in my opinion, solutions have been thrown up fo>- a problem like Telengana like, let us have a separate State, let us have an opinion poll, let us have a sub-State like Meghalaya. On this aspect I am going to take more time because it is important and I would like Members of all parties and the Government to focus on it. This is a problem which, as I have said, is not isolated nor can Telengana be isolated. We know that to-day, if we have linguistic States, it was done under the provisions of our Constitution and we had the S.R.C. The reorganisation of India is the exclusive prerogative of the Parliament. No other body of people can have any decisive role in this matter. Only Parliament can decide in its ultimate wisdom what it should do about particular States, whether to divide it or increase it or subtract it or to add to it. It is the exclusive

or sole right and prerogative of the Parliament. The founding fathers of the Constitution have incorporated this provision in unmistakable terms so that the division of the territory of India into a constituent unit has to be entirely determined at the national level. It has to be done on national consideration for the national good, India being one country and not India being as it is of countries. Any other method of reorganisation of the States is a suggestion, may I humbly say, which is irrelevant if not derogatory to the constitutional power vested in the Parliament. It is against this background that I should like to see the question of opinion poll. I have nothing against opinion poll. Ultimately the people are the masters, whether you like it or not. The Indian Constitution nowhere has accepted the principle of self-determination, referendum, plebiscite, opinion poll, etc. in any matter whatsoever for any reason at any time and this must be very clearly kept in the minds of the members of all parties and more especially by the Government of India.

SHRI MULK/ GOVINDA REDDY :
There was opinion poll in Goa.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : I am coming to it. After all you have given one hour to Mr. Raju and you give me half of that time. The sovereignty of the Parliament cannot be denied by introducing this opinion poll and the question of self-determination in any shape or form in any matter, would militate against the basic structure of the Constitution and also it is bound to create complications by making the Constitution unworkable. Really the demand for an opinion poll, etc. is not only irrelevant but I warn the Government that it is fraught with dangerous implications. If it is conceded in one region, similar demands will come from other regions and even there in some States, not only regions but even districts, talukas and also villages will demand it.

My friend said about Goa. Correct, but was Goa the creation of the S.R.C. when India was divided and partition accepted? Goa as a unit had come into the Union and it had been given a chance to go to this State or that State but Telengana or Andhra was created after due deliberations of the S.R.C. as a national policy. At that time it was decided. Of course you cannot deny the physical facts. Maybe he is thinking of the Fazal

Ah Commission where people gave different views but may I ask hon. Members, was there an opinion poll in Maharashtra that it should be a bilingual State, was there an opinion poll in U. P. as to whether it should be divided into many parts?

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal) : U. P. should be divided.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : I have no quarrel at all, I am only placing the constitutional point of view. I am not against opinion poll.

AN HON. MEMBER : You are for it?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : Please listen to me. I say whatever you do has to be done within the framework of the Constitution; there must be constitutional propriety in the things you do. It should be as a formula for the whole country on a national basis and not in isolation. Opinion poll by itself has not been given to you by the Constitution. The sovereignty of Parliament I suppose is not so weak and certainly Parliament is not going to accept it. But why does this happen? I would blame the Government. Unless there is trouble, as has been very correctly pointed out by Mr. Raju, unless there is violence, unless there is damage to property, the Government does not think of acting at all. And the whole trouble, if I may say so, as I have said even from that side, has arisen from the division of India into linguistic States. It was wrong to have conceded Andhra Pradesh—though I come from Andhra Pradesh—originally in 1956. It is because of that we now find that every time there is some sort of violence and damage to property anywhere, you yield. It is this attitude of the Government which has been trying to take to solutions which are very easy at the moment that has led to all this trouble. It is a very wrong thing. You are not realising what complications you are creating and what implications they have on the national character.

My friend said Meghalaya. Certainly it is a very correct and pertinent point; especially Mr. Raju compared with the people of Meghalaya. Now Meghalaya is a sub-State. I am rather surprised at his suggestion. Sir, my experience in politics is certainly not even half as much as that of Mr. Raju and certainly I will never have the temerity to say that

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy.] I equal him in intelligence but certainly I am surprised at the absurd way of comparing Telengana with Meghalaya. Sir, nothing could be more fantastic than comparing Telengana with Meghalaya. To establish a sub-State within the State of Andhra Pradesh—I should not use strong language—is utter absurdity and I am amazed that even knowledgeable people try to press that point. In the first place Meghalaya is a sub-State for the hill tribes whose language, culture way of life and their problems and aspirations are entirely different from those of the plains people. In fact, the tribes of Meghalaya are as dissimilar to the plains people of Assam as the people of Telengana are identical with the people of the Andhra region and to compare the people of Telengana with the tribes of Meghalaya in Assam is to say the least uncharitable and untrue. Sir, our Constitution has accepted the principle of preserving the district features and facts of our tribal life and our colourful tribes and that is evident from the several provisions of the Constitution which seek to retain certain amount of autonomy for the tribal areas. And the State of Meghalaya is nothing but the further extension of this same principle. How, may I ask, can the same principle be applied to the Telengana area? What is the justification, I would like the Government to tell us. What is the parallel between the two? In fact, the very reasons which justify the creation of a sub-State like Meghalaya for the tribes would be contradicted in the case of Telengana. As I said, Meghalaya is, by and large, an extension of the principles of the Constitution—Sir, may I, with great deference to this House, draw its attention to the formation of the Andhra State? Andhra State has been formed, as has been very relevantly pointed out, after the great sacrifices of the people both of Telengana and the Andhra region, after nearly fifty years of struggle of the people of Andhra and Telengana. It was the culmination of the freedom struggle itself. What was the time when the Telugu-speaking people were divided in the democratic times of British India but when there was the imperialist policy of divide and rule. The Telugu-speaking people were divided when the Northern Circars were given to the French and when Rayalaseema was given to the Indian people to look after their problems. It was then that the Telugu-speaking people were divided and it was

after a struggle of 50 to 60 years, thanks to the sacrifice of millions of people both of the Telengana and the Andhra region and of many parties—he referred to the party of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta; your party, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, has also taken part in it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Very much.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : Thanks to the sacrifices of your party, thanks to the sacrifices of the people of Telengana and thanks to the sacrifices of the people of Andhra...

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Those" party members have come to us now.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : I thank you also. It was after all these sacrifices that they came back together.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Sir, as I have said, after nearly a hundred years of separation the Telugu people were given a chance, were given an opportunity to come back together and to compare them to Meghalaya and to say that the people of Telengana are different from the people of Andhra is something which I am not going to accept. And to say that we should have a sub-State is a very misleading way of tackling things. Sir, it is not only a question of linguistic oneness in the case of Andhra I say it is more than linguistic oneness.

SHRI KALYAN ROY : What is your solution?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : I am telling you this has to be tackled in two ways, but some proposals have been thrown up here, separate State, opinion poll, Meghalaya and all that. I am now dealing with each one of them and then I will come to the other things. As I said this has to be tackled in two ways, on Telengana as a whole, as part of the national scene and two, Telengana separately with all its problems and difficulties. At the moment I am dealing with the suggestions which are casually thrown about on the floor of the House like separate State, opinion poll or a sub-State of the Meghalaya type. All these things cannot come about. If I give an impression that I am against any separate State or any such thing, I am not. All that I am trying to say is you cannot deal with the

case of Telengana separately. If the Parliament in its wisdom, if the Government and Members of Parliament want to exercise their own right and want to give a separate State or divide the country into smaller States or if they want to reorganise the country in a different way, they are most welcome to do it and I will bow down to the wisdom of Parliament. There are some people who think that smaller States are better; they may be right though personally I do not think so. But if the question of a separate State or a sub-State or opinion poll is to be mooted it has to be mooted not in isolation but in exclusion but in a general way. Let the Parliament of the country do that taking into consideration the general question of States reorganisation and the problems of the backward regions. Let us have a separate SRC Committee or whatever it is and let us think of a way and decide on Telengana as a separate State or as a sub-State, but as part of the whole national scene and not in isolation. That is my respectful Submission before this House. This issue cannot be dealt with in isolation; we certainly have a right to deal with it as a national problem of all the States. Let us not do it piecemeal; we have no right to do it piecemeal. That is what I want to say here. Nobody has the right to do it piecemeal unless we in Parliament decide to do it piecemeal. This is the first point that I want to place before the House. The second thing is about the problems of Telengana. Here I must say that Mr. Raju was correct when he said that these things were started in January 1969 by the students. The two fundamental principles of the gentleman's agreement he stressed. I do not want to...

SHRI BHUPI SH GUPTA : Was there any lady in it ?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : There was no lady. Ladies seem to be creating quite a number of problems. We see the lady ruling this country creating quite a lot of problems.

SHRI AKBA1. ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh) : I think : Mrs. Yashoda Reddy, you better sit down. Otherwise, you will create problems.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : I ask can another Member ask me to sit down ? He is not in the Chair.

I MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He is not asking, but suggesting. May I say that you should wind up now ?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : No, no. I want my party's time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I think there is no distribution of time on a party basis in a Short Duration Discussion.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : I am not talking anything irrelevant. If the House wants it, I will sit down. The second and the most important thing which we have to take into cognizance is, what are the problems posed to us ? Mr. Raju has pointed out that there was the gentleman's agreement between Andhra Pradesh and Telengana. The students revolted in Telengana. Before I go further, I would say that it was innocently brought about by the students. I use the word 'innocent' because at that time the students never anticipated, never imagined, that it would come to this proportion—thanks to these people—of demanding a separate State or sub-State. Innocently and for very genuine reasons the students of Telengana agitated and very correctly too. They wanted jobs, but what Mr. Raju forgot to tell us is how did this come about. He said that, suddenly the students of Telengana came out of the universities and they found that there were no jobs for them. Agreed. I was one of the few. I said they had genuine reasons and they should get the utmost consideration, but how did it happen ? Was it voluntary ? Was it wanton ? Was it mala fide ? It is for the simple reason, as he himself said, that Telengana was not developed. There were no schools. There were no colleges. There were no hospitals. Within a period of twelve or thirteen years it has been developed a hundred-fold. More students came to the universities and they graduated. When they came out of the colleges they found that their places were blocked by other people. If you take the breakup, what were the posts ? The posts were those of teachers, doctors and nurses. The Andhra Pradesh Government found that these could not be filled by people from Andhra. They could not wait and they had to recruit people. Even here it is very unfair to say that they were all taken from the Andhra area. Most of them were from Kerala and quite a lot from Madras. It was not as if anybody wanted to deny opportunities to the Telengana people.

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy.]

When I say there has been a genuine reason, it was as a result of a historical process. When people were needed, they were not found and they had to be recruited. I do not want to bring in the names of any personalities, but Mr. V. B. Raju brought in the name of the Chief Minister. As far as I am concerned, it is immaterial who is the Chief Minister, and certainly I do not belong to his party.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : I have personally i nothing against him.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY :

But I must say that the Chief Minister had the sense of understanding to call all the parties and come to an agreement that they will give jobs, but unfortunately it was not upheld in the Supreme Court. I do not want to raise all these things, but afterwards any number of meetings were held, any number of agreements were made between the Central Government and the State Government. They are having the eight-point programme. I could quote a number of things which the Government of India did in consultation with the leaders of Telengana. The latest is on the 11th February, when the Government has given extra powers to the regional officers. Extra provision they have made for their employment in schools, etc. One thing Mr. Raju said...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have taken 25 minutes.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : I will just finish. He spoke about relative comparison. Certainly, but relative comparison has to be done not only between Telengana and Andhra, but also between the other regions and everywhere. If you take the relative comparison, it is not only that Telengana is backward. If I make a relative comparison between the coastal areas and Rayalaseema, if I make a relative comparison between Chittoor and the West Godavari district, things will be found to be different. It is not as if anybody is denying the backwardness of Telengana. It is not as if anybody is unaware of it. It is not as if anybody wants it. Mr. Raju said that they are not against the people of Andhra, but against the politicians and the Chief Minister. In this connection, may I also bring to the notice of the House the behaviour of the people of Telengana ? He said that Hyderabad

is famous for its culture, hospitality and cosmopolitan outlook. I love Hyderabad. If there is one place in India which I love most it is Hyderabad. Whatever may be our political differences, Hyderabad is my own city, but do you know to what extent the Telengana people and the so-called Students have gone against the Andhras in the name of the Telengana agitation ? It is a shame. The way they have behaved against the Andhra people is a matter of shame. The way they have written on the walls, the way they have reduced it to a dirty, mean, personal level, it is a shame. If it is a political agitation, if it is the honest work of a group of students, is it the way to solve the political and economic differences between the two people ? Are we going to do that, forgetting all manners ? Is there not even a human approach to it ? And still they say- they have nothing against the people of Andhra. Things were done which you would not do even to your next-door neighbour or to your neighbouring country. The people of Andhra are our flesh and blood and this is how they have been treated. That is no excuse to say that it is all one-sided and it is wrong. All that I want to say here is these things have been discussed for one year and nobody is able to come to any other political solution. No political solution has been arrived at. This is not the place, this is not the occasion and this is no way. Think about the whole country. Divide Andhra into a dozen States, but do it as a national policy. This is not the way to solve the economic problems. This is not the way to solve the backwardness of the region. In all fairness I must say that for once I would agree with the ruling party or the Government of India. The country's leaders have discussed it with the Telengana people and the Andhra people and with all parties, people who are for a separate Telengana and people who want a change of Government. If I may say so, change that one man, Mr. Brahmananda Reddy, but is Parliament competent to change a Chief Minister ? Be it Congress (O) or Congress (R), can they do it ? I would be very happy, but can Parliament do it ? Can the people from Delhi dictate ? It is the people of Telengana and it is the legislators of Telengana who can do it. If all the people of Telengana want the administration to change, let them do it tomorrow. The other day they they could not even get 33 votes against 179. We have no right. I would welcome it if you could change. After all it is not my party Chief Minister.

MR. DEPU' Y CHAIRMAN : You have taken more than half an hour.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : I am finishing.

MR. ' DEPU IY CHAIRMAN : That »S what you said about two minutes earlier.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : There is a way of developing of a backward region. All this does not mean that the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh or the Government of India is going to ignore this problem. All I am telling you or the people of Andhra Pradesh is if they are going to say, "No. We have done so much for Telengana. It should be stopped." this will never solve it. Special treatment has to be given. Special provisions have to be made ; though I would not in normal circumstances have said it, this region does need special attention as many other regions need- After all when these politicians of all parties met, they came to some agreement, whether it is about development or about services or about planning. Most of the things have just come to function. I ask this of Parliament. When we were faced with this problem last year, we gave some suggestions and the Government of Andhra Pradesh in consultation with Telengana and Andhra leaders gave some proposals. At least in all fairness should we not give them some more time to judge whether these proposals are enough before jumping into some other alternative ? That is all I want to ask my friends : at least give a fair time.

MR. DEPU *Y CHAIRMAN : Please finish.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I am finishing. Mr. J Laju said he has left everything so that he could go to the people. I hope he will do it. If he really wanted to go to the people, 197a elections are nearer ; he could have gone then instead of going to the people in 1977. That is beside the point. Still when he said he wanted to go to the people...

SHRI V. B. LAJU : Are you throwing any challenge

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : All that I said is as he was in the Assembly, the time was much nearer for going to the people than now when he has come to the Rajya Sabha.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra) : Membership here does not prohibit one from contesting elections in 1972.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : Even tomorrow he can contest.

{Interruptions}

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please wind up.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : As I have said, the Telengana problem has to be tackled at the national level. No special extra problem has come up from January 1969, last year. We must give enough time for the State Government, the Central Government and for the people of Telengana to see whether these measures which we have given will be able to help in solving their problem ; if not, something more can be suggested. To say that all people of Telengana want a separate Telengana is not true. All people do not want a separate Telengana. Then we can wait and see. If they want, the nation can decide on a national basis. That is all I have got to say.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I think we should discuss the problem frankly and with the perspective in view. I regret to say, Mr. Raju, who gave a long historical analysis of the Telengana problem as he understands it, was rather equivocal on two points. One, what does he think about the proposal that had been made by the Prime Minister on March 7 with regard to the Telengana question ? He had not given his opinion very clearly. The second point also he wanted to avoid, that is, what should be done. I could have understood him if he had said that he wanted a separate State, but he said that people wanted a separate State. But then I know there are people who do not want a separate State. At least one of such people acceptable is here, Shrimati Yashoda Reddy. Therefore, even at this time there is a controversy between two persons, one, a gentleman, and the other, a lady, coming from the same place, one demanding virtually separation, the other saying it would be very wrong. You can well imagine the same controversy must be there in the people of Telengana. Therefore, let us not now try to speak as if we are speaking in the name of the people hiding our opinion. I shall give my opinion, my analysis, and it is for the people

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta] of Telengana and of the rest of Andhra Pradesh to consider and the House to consider.

There is no denying the fact that great injustice has been done under the Congress regime for many years to the people of Telengana. That cannot be denied by anybody. Naturally these grievances have to be taken seriously and aspirations and urges which were roused must be fulfilled. There is also no doubt about that. I think here the indictment must go to the Congress regime and the Congress rule behind which stand the big landlords of Andhra Pradesh. Therefore, it is a matter between those who have come here from Andhra and those who are sitting there. I think between them they have made a mess of the situation in Telengana. Today simply because they have parted company it should not be thought as if they do not owe an explanation to the people and to the nation collectively.

I immediately express my full sympathy and support to the legitimate demands of the people of Telengana for their development, for their cultural and economic advancement and for the removal of their grievances and injustices which have been accumulating. That is quite clear, but then are we to accept the position that if there are injustices or if there are certain grievances in a certain area in a given State of India, that area should be carved out into a separate State? If we accept this principle, we would be heading to wards far greater trouble. Which State is there in India in which there is not some backward area, undeveloped area, where grievances and complaints have not mounted, have not piled up over the past years? Are we to accept then that they should be separated, or if somebody comes with the demand that on account of what there should be a separate State? You would not.

Therefore, ponder over this thing, it has serious national implications apart from the fact that it will not be good to the people of Andhra Pradesh as a whole because the problem of Andhra Pradesh is not one of carving out areas into two or three States. The problem of Andhra Pradesh is one of making the millions of peasantry happy and prosperous, masters of the land. The problem of Andhra Pradesh, whether it is in Andhra region or the other region is to do away

with the bated landlord system and the hangover of the shameful, disgraceful, degrading feudal and semi-feudal system. That is the problem. The problem of Andhra Pradesh is not primarily one of demarcating States so that Chief Ministers can come by turn and frustrated OHON can become Chief Minister. The problem of Andhra Pradesh in both areas is one of making the people of Andhra Pradesh, workers, peasants, employees, the masters of the land so that they shape their destiny and their future. That is how we view it. I did not hear any such thing from Mr. Raju when he spoke at length on the subject. Therefore, Sir, what they are suggesting would aggravate the situation.

Now, Sir, with your permission, a word about, our friend, Mr. Raju. He has spoken forcefully, I must say, and he is a forceful man. As you know, he can start an agitation, although he may not succeed in getting it very far. He has undertaken an agitation in Andhra Pradesh, the Telengana region. His eloquence is not matched by his agitation. One is rising and the other is falling off. Agitation is falling off; eloquence is rising. Why it is so?

It is because they cannot move the people unless there are artificial stimulants to move them. Mr. Deputy Chairman, the creation of Andhra Pradesh at that stage was a historic achievement. In this House I was there. Shri Potti Srirama-mulu died and the news came. Dr. Radha-krishnan, Chairman of the House, was sitting there. There began the historic unfolding of another chapter of the reorganisation of States on the basis of language, which had not been accepted by the so-called founding fathers of the Constitution. They did not provide for linguistic States. It is by the suffering, by struggle, by unity, on account of the more fundamental bonds, that the people of Andhra Pradesh got together and formed their Andhra Pradesh State, with Telengana and the rest of Andhra coming together, and gave it to the nation for the linguistic reorganisation of the whole country. This is part of the tradition of Andhra also. Let us not think of the divisions in the recent period among the people of Andhra Pradesh. The patriotic, fighting, militant Telugu speaking people got together in a mighty unity, fought the Nizam, fought the Razakars, as they had fought the Britishers in the earlier years, and fought even the Congress regime when it refused to accept their demands.

for the linguistic reorganisation of their State. They won their demand. Why should that be broken up today? Was it not something which they achieved because of certain more fundamental bonds and so on and did they not win their demand that these two parts should be blended into one single State? They did not sit across the table to discuss which was the back yard area or who would get the Chief Ministership or who would not get the Chief Ministership. At that time they thought that in a free India, in the Republic of India, people speaking different languages must get together and form their own State as in the past carving of areas according to the convenience of the feudal British rulers must be put an end to. And thus can Telangana come into existence Andhra Pradesh as we see it today.

"Why must we break it up? If there are grievances, as there are in certain regions, in Telangana, remove the grievances. And everything should be done. And it is well known that we stand for this thing. Instead of that, a suggestion has come for a separate State. Well, a separate State on what basis and for what reason? Simply to find employment for an aspirant for the Chief Ministership? Or simply to find some positions for some people who want to be in a higher authority in the Government? Or to accommodate some big vested interests who are interested in seeing that they are given a separate State so that they can plunder and exploit the people of Telangana by wearing the mask of something seemingly popular? This hypocrisy should not be encouraged. Some of the leaders who are talking about a separate State are guided by vested interests, not by the interests of the toiling people, either of the Telangana region or of the rest of Andhra. It is quite clear.

My friend, Mr. Raju, was part of the Establishment for a long time. You were a Minister, Mr. Raju. Why did you not fight for it then? I never heard that Mr. Raju had tendered his resignation to his Chief Minister because the grievances of the Telangana people were not being met. Why did not Mr. Raju make it a point to raise his voice against the discrimination that was going on in Telangana against the people there and when some big landlords and others were ignoring the legitimate interests of the Telangana people? Mr. Raju would have won much greater moral claim to speak today had he at that time, as a

member of the Council of Ministers in Andhra Pradesh, tendered his resignation. Well, when the Maharashtra demand was rejected or something happened, you saw that Mr. Deshmukh gave up his Finance portfolio, came and sat on these benches, with the Opposition. Mr. Raju thought at that time that the going was perhaps good; let us go together the Congress band wagon in the Council of Ministers.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : But he did resign in 1969 over Telangana.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That is all right. So many things happened in 1969. In 1969 the Congress Party broke up. What do you say?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Your party broke earlier.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That is all right. But my party did not break up either on Mr. Morarji's letter or on the Telangana issue.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : You broke up on Mr. Dange's letter.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : ... That is all right, you sit down.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : That is the unkindest cut of all.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That should be realised-

Mr. Raju had been the Vice-President of the Andhra Pradesh Congress, certainly a very powerful position. As you know in Andhra, if you are a Vice-President of the Congress, you are a very powerful man, a Reddy landlord in some other quarters. Therefore, Mr. Raju, you had all the qualities in you. Why did you not do such a thing? Therefore, I say that a little introspection is necessary.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I regret to say that this issue is getting involved in factional politics.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : You can take some other occasion to abuse us. But do justice to the Telangana people.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am not abusing you. I have great affection for you. I want to correct you. Why should I abuse you? I say, sometimes some

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta] friends should tell you where you are mistaken. I am not abusing you because to abuse you is a dangerous thing apart from other considerations. I am not abusing you, I am arguing with you.

Now, factional politics is involved. Mr. Raju does not like, I know, Mr. Brahmananda Reddy. Very good.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : I like you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You like me ? Hear me. If you want to get rid of him, there are ways. You, belonging to Mr. Brahmananda Reddy's party, join a minority, defeat the leader of the party and put somebody else in his position.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : I think, personally . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : If that is not possible, you come and sit with us here and* with the leftists and other...

SHRI V. B. RAJU : Now, today, I am with the Opposition.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Or you join us. Let us defeat the Congress Government there and set up a leftist and democratic Government. You can get rid of him. That is the only way. But do not try to involve the Telengana issue in factional politics.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHA-HI (Uttar Pradesh) : Why not here ? Why only there ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Let him do whatever he likes. Shrimati Yashoda Reddy was defending Mr. Brahmananda Reddy. Shrimati Yashoda Reddy in Hyderabad belongs to Congress (R) ; in Delhi she is Congress (O). Shrimati Yashoda Reddy is Congress (R.O.).

I say, take up the cause of the backward region. I entirely agree with you, I go full length with you for the improvement of the Telengana region. But for that matter, we need not create another State there. This is wrong, absolutely wrong, in concept. Why should there be some other State ? The Telugu speaking people have created their own State not by the gift of some high-up, but through their struggle, on account of their inner urges, through their desire to bring together all the Telugu speaking people, in order that their culture could

flower ; they wanted to create a beautiful Andhra Pradesh land where the common man would be the master of the land. That was their urge. You talk of that, rather than of other things.

I say, the Congress Government also failed. They did not allow adequate funds to go there. There is the so-called matching grant scheme as a result of which the people of Andhra Pradesh and particularly the people of Telengana region have suffered. I think the Central Government should make adequate funds available for the development of that important region of Andhra Pradesh, the Telengana region. There is nepotism, there is favouritism and also discrimination, I do not deny. But who is responsible for it ? Now those people who had practised these discriminations and favouritism there are divided amongst themselves, one side taking one line on the question of Telengana and another side taking another line. Mr. Raju knows very well that if the so-called "Gentlemen's Agreement" which had been signed, was implemented by the Andhra Pradesh Government, this trouble today would not have arisen. They could arrange things according to the spirit and letter of the Agreement for which the responsibility must be adequately borne by Mr. Raju himself and others also. That is why I say you failed on that score. You have starved Telengana. You have humiliated Telengana in some ways. You have denied them their due. Now you approach Parliament with a knife in your hand to thrust in into the heart of a great Andhra Pradesh of India, enabling the great Telugu-speaking people to become bifurcated, divided and involved in conflicts and so on. I do not stand for it. Mr. Deputy Chairman, I cannot accept his suggestion.

Now they want opinion poll. What is it for ? We had opinion poll when the Telengana people, when the Andhra Pradesh people rose for the reorganisation of Andhra Pradesh as a linguistic State. We saw the magnificent demonstration of the patriotic opinion of the patriotic people of Andhra Pradesh, the Telugu-speaking people.

Now why this opinion poll ? What has happened ? If you accept this principle of divisive forces, the Shiva Sena will come and demand opinion poll. Somebody else will demand another opinion poll. These are artificial devices to cover up

certain disruptive trends and tendencies in high places of leadership. In some quarters in the country the demand for opinion poll is really a slogan for separation. Opinion poll is a kind of subterfuge for arriving at a decision for a separate State. Hence, Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are opposed to this business of opinion poll just as we are opposed to the creation of a sub-State; it is an apologia for separation. Mr. Raju would not like to say, sitting in those benches, "Yes, I want separation". But then he has a more sophisticated way of putting things to his party and to the nation: "I want opinion poll." What is this opinion poll? You are leading a happy married life, Mr. Raju. I am talking figuratively. For example, if I ask you to have opinion poll between you and your wife, would it not be absolutely unjust? Therefore, this is not the issue at all. The opinion poll idea has been looted so that under this slogan an agitation can be created. I think if opinion poll is accepted, it would be an invitation to disrupting the Telugu-speaking people, it would be setting one Telugu-speaking man against another. It would perhaps mean brother fighting brother, when they should unite, sister fighting sister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Will you please include ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Therefore, I say it is entirely wrong. This kind of slogan is entirely wrong and I think it should be rejected by us.

Sir, I wanted to hear my friend, Mr. Raju, on the Prime Minister's proposal. I think it provided a basis for the solution of the problem. We have studied it carefully, and I have been seized of the problem for a long time. I think, by and large, it provides a solution, if sincerely implemented. That is what you should aim at. Provide the basis for a satisfactory solution of the problem. Certainly, there would be misunderstandings in the beginning. Certainly, there would be heartburning also. But, by and large, you must have certain common denominator for solving a problem like this. Here is a basis for the solution of the Telengana problem. In spite of a very strong sense of grievance let us come together and give this proposal a fair trial. I would expect a leader of Mr. Raju's standing to get up and display some courage and say, "Yes I am in favour of this proposal. Let us give a trial to this proposal." I have no doubt in my mind that if this

proposal is accepted without reservation, sincerely, with a view to maintaining the integrity of the State of Andhra Pradesh, which is fundamental, which is sacred, which is honourable in many ways, then I am sure you can avoid many of the things that are being done today.

It is no use blaming the students. We also conduct agitations, and we know that the students will fall in line if their leaders come together, instead of making direct and indirect speeches to incite them. I have no doubt about it. I have no doubt in my mind that if Mr. Raju, I along with Shrimati Yashoda Reddy, stand together on a common platform and appeal to the students to give a fair trial to this proposal, am I to understand that the people of Andhra Pradesh, the people of the Telengana region would reject our suggestion summarily out of hand, that there will be no impact upon them? Surely they will consider it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Will you please finish ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That is why I say there is a basis. Before March this year there was a vacuum. We criticised the Government for delaying things, for not coming out with certain constructive proposals. As a result of your legitimate agitation and pressure of public opinion, the Government was obliged to come out with certain proposals. Therefore it is necessary today to give this proposal a fair trial.

Before I sit down Mr. Deputy Chairman I would appeal in all sincerity and in all humility to those friends who do not share our views to ponder over this matter. We have formed the States in India on the basis of language. We got the States as a result of struggle, sacrifice and suffering. Since Independence there have been a number of amendments to the Constitution, one of which led to the formation of linguistic States. This has made possible the language groups to come together to run their affairs. Are we to break up this thing? Should we start to reverse the process again break up one State after another on the basis of this and that thing real or imaginary? Or are we to accept a position when these linguistic States have come to stay, that they should not be further divided; they should be defended. This is our fundamental faith within the Constitutional framework.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

We shall do everything possible to help those who are backward. The backward regions, undoubtedly, should be given additional help and assistance. That should be our approach. Let us not dissipate our energy, our efforts, in creating artificial movements that would lead to disruption, separation and break-up. On the contrary, let us unite our efforts so that we can get our things done. The linguistic States that have now come to stay must have a strong democratic base, must be States in which the people have fuller opportunities for life. That is what we want. Instead of taking this line, my friend is taking a different line. Andhra Pradesh must set an example because this demand of separation after the creation of a linguistic State through the toil and sacrifice of people like the late Shri Potti Sriramulu looks ridiculous. Would it not be a mockery of our homages to that martyr, Shri Potti Sriramulu if we today get up and say that the State we have created through his martyrdom and sacrifice is to be broken up now because some Congress Ministers, some landlords and exploiters of the people have created a situation when these disruptive and divisive forces can get an upper hand and exploit the situation? Well, I say ponder over this matter. To Mr. Raju I appeal and, through him, to the others, let us maintain the integrity of one of the greatest States in India whose tradition of struggle, whose tradition of bravery, was displayed not only in the days of the British but also in the days of the glorious struggle against the Nizam of Hyderabad. Maintaining the integrity and stability of the State is contributing to national integration, national stability and national unity. Therefore, in the large* context of things, with the larger perspective, Mr. Raju and others should view this problem, rather than be carried away by factional or other temporary feelings. These are great issues and we must rise to the occasion and face them in a manly manner and solve them in a manly way. Again I say, let the voice of Parliament be registered in favour of the defence of the integrity of Andhra Pradesh. This is the first thing. Andhra Pradesh is the creation of the people of the whole of India. It must live. At the same time, let us also give our pledged word here that every single legitimate grievance of the people of Telengana shall be removed and Parliament shall be generous in ensuring that these grie-

vances are removed and their legitimate demands are met.

Finally, we shall be failing in our duty if we do not also look forward to the day when the great Andhra Pradesh will be under the rule not of this or that group, this or that faction, Congress (O) or Congress (R), or for that matter Congress (R.O.), but will be under the leadership and rule of the true popular representatives of Andhra Pradesh who have built up such fine traditions and have been nurtured in the tradition of struggle against the Nizam and the British. I recall to my mind the great struggle of the Telengana upsurge. (*Time bell rings.*) These are the traditions which we should cherish. So I appeal to Mr. Raju to give up this wrong and dangerous idea and fall in line with the national thinking, which is also the thinking of the people of Andhra Pradesh, and see that the problem is settled once and for all, by giving, first of all, a fair, honest and sincere trial to the proposal of the Prime Minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I think I will have to call the hon. Minister at 5-30 to express the point of view of the Government.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL (Andhra Pradesh) : Let us go on till 7 o'clock. What is wrong.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There are a large number of Members who would like to speak.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : You cannot control now. You should have controlled from the very beginning of the debate. You have allowed some Members to speak for a longer time.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Om Mehta says that no Member from his party has been called. So, in that case, I do not think we will be in a position to conclude this debate even by 8 o'clock if we go on in this way.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Let it go on till 8.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I would like to appeal to the hon. Members...

SHRI CHITTA BASU : You are always late in making this kind of appeal. You should have made this kind of appeal at the very beginning. Every time you make this appeal at a late stage.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Anandam.

SHRI M. A. JANDAM (Andhra Pradesh) : I am thankful to you, Sir, for having allowed his motion to be discussed in the Rajya Sabha. I am also grateful to Mr. V. B. Raju for initiating the discussion on Telengana. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has made a very fervent appeal for maintaining the integrity of Andhra Pradesh. I suggest that copies of his speech are translated into two languages and circulated to the whole of Telengana so that the people might know what exactly is the spirit of the Members of the Rajya Sabha.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Mr. Raju is a very difficult man to understand. He has been an integrationist till very recently. I think it was he who drafted the resolution or agreement on January 19, 1960. He is one of the sponsors of this resolution. He has come to Delhi on a number of occasions to represent to the Prime Minister and the Home Minister and to various other leaders the necessity for maintaining the integrity of Andhra Pradesh. And in the Andhra Pradesh Congress Committee which met in March last year, he has made a very fervent appeal, giving out the history of the Andhras—how they had one common culture, one tradition and one custom—though it is necessary for the development of the entire State that all the people speaking one language must come together and live together. I do not know when exactly he drifted away from that view to an entirely extreme view of an opinion poll. I will say that he is still an integrationist but as I find from Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's speech, opinion poll is suicidal to the integrity of Andhra Pradesh.

SHRI V. B. E. J. : Asking the authorities to ascertain the wishes of the people is undemocratic. Is it against integration?

SHRI M. A. JANDAM : I will put it, Sir, that in this country we are having mobocracy and not democracy. It is these leaders who have been misleading the people with 11 types of slogans. Unless the people try to understand things, we should not allow anything like an opinion poll to go into this body politic at all.

Sir, there was also a reference to the resignation submitted by Mr. Raju and some of the Ministers of Telengana at the

height of the Telengana agitation. I must say here that the resignation given by Mr. Raju is not in favour of Telengana. He did not want it. The resignation letter clearly stated that the Ministers from Telengana were not in a position to be in the Cabinet and at the same time propagate the idea of integration of Andhra Pradesh, that they believed in the oneness of Andhra Pradesh and they wanted to come out of the Cabinet and then go to the people and impress upon them the need for maintaining the unity of Andhra Pradesh. It is for this purpose that they tendered their resignation to the Chief Minister. They also expressed at that time that they had full confidence in the administration of the Chief Minister Mr. Brahmananda Reddy. So, let me impress upon you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, and also on the Members of this House that the resignation tendered by Mr. Raju or anybody else was not because they were not satisfied with the way the Government is run. It is because they all felt that for the purpose of maintaining the integrity of the State, it was necessary, that some of these leaders should go out to the various corners of Telengana and propagate amongst the people the oneness of the State and the necessity for maintaining the integrity of the State.

Sir, he wanted a political solution to the entire problem. I would like to know what exactly is his problem. As Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has already said, he has neither stated the problem nor given any plausible solution. I will come later to the solution suggested by him—Meghalaya. But let me say that the problem has not been properly stated by him nor was it properly understood by him. The only diagnosis which we can make of the entire Telengana agitation is that it is one of economic problem. The people of Telengana are really backward. There are no two opinions about it. But is it now, after nearly 15 years, that we realise that there has not been any development in Telengana?—I just want to know. During the last 14-15 years, if at all there is any region that has been developed, it is more in Telengana than the two other regions. I might say that a number of Central projects have been taken over in the Hyderabad city itself. There is the Ramagundam Kothagundam complex. But for the vast destruction that has taken place due to the Telengana agitation, several other projects would have come into being in Telengana itself. In fact, the rest of Andhra has been complaining

[Shri M. Anandam]

that undue importance has been given to Hyderabad and other areas in Telen-gana, just because the capital of the State is situated there. But this is not a grievance that has been expressed by the people in Andhra and Rayalaseema, but all people felt that whatever has been done in Telengana has been done with a view to the development of the Andhra region and not any particular region.

Sir, it has been said that unless a separate State of Telengana is formed, there cannot be any improvement of the area. I must say that this is a very false cry and though it caught the imagination of some sections, when the agitation first began this idea is now being slowly but surely regarded as a retrograde step and the more moderate sections are now feeling that the talk of separation is not at all good for Telengana and this is they all feel, a move motivated by political rather than really worthwhile considerations.

Sir, much has been said about an opinion poll. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has also given his very right judgement on this matter of opinion poll. Mr. V. B. Raju said that this opinion poll is necessary to elicit the views of the Telengana people whether they would like to continue in the Andhra region or whether they should be formed into a separate State. I would only warn the Union Government that the idea of an opinion poll to decide the boundaries of States is a pernicious one. It is always possible to whip up the feelings of a group of people and seek changes in the territorial set-up. If tomorrow an opinion poll is really held and opinion is taken where is the guarantee that after four or five years there would not be another demand for resettling the boundaries? This is a matter which I want Mr. Raju to explain to us, whether there would be an end to this type of opinion polls to be conducted from time to time.

What is wrong in ascertaining the wishes of the people, ask the protagonists of Telengana. I must say that this is an oversimplification of the Andhra problem. In a democracy, the wishes of the people are ascertained through periodical elections and during the last General Elections, the overwhelming majority of the people who have been returned are for integration of Andhra Pradesh. I can say that Mr. V. B. Raju and his other leaders have formed this Telengana'

united front with only 31 members,, as against 73 members who are for integration. This itself shows that the majority of the Telengana legislators are not for separate Telengana.

I might also say, Sir, that in the very near future, we are holding the Panchayat Samiti elections in the whole of Andhra Pradesh including Telengana. That itself should provide an opportunity for the Government to know whether the people really want a separate Telengana or not. There is no need for an opinion pole, nor should we wait for General Elections to take place in 1972. In the course of the next few weeks, we are having the Panchayat Samiti elections and I consider that many of the seats are being fought on the basis of this very particular issue, whether people want a separate Telengana or not. This itself should afford an opportunity for the people to decide and this should be an eye-opener. If an overwhelming majority win on the basis of a separate Telengana, then the Government can consider afresh on this problem.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Will you please finish now ?

SHRI M. ANANDAM : I am the first speaker of the ruling Congress; I think, I must get some more time.

MR- DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : If you want that other members from your party should not get any time, I have no objection.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL : You can cut five minutes from my time, Sir.

SHRI M. ANANDAM : The Constitution itself has made a provision for the setting up of a Telengana Regional Committee which has been functioning very efficiently. Here is a Committee composed of Telengana legislators with a chairman and if one goes through the functions attached to it, one will be convinced of the enormous possibilities of the Committee. If, as has been said, the Committee is not effective, it is the Members of the Assembly coming from the Telengana region who have not exploited this Committee throughout all these years. If nothing has been said about it, it does not show that the Regional Committee has been futile, but it only shows that the Members of the Regional Committee have not been very effective. But, Sir, we have seen that the Regional

Committee even under the existing framework could be a influential body which could have a larger say in the affairs of the region. There have been persistent demands that statutory powers should be given to the Regional Committee and its decisions should be made binding on the Government, but it must not be forgotten that this is accepted, it is like investing the Committee with powers of a parallel Government. The development of Telangana should be viewed in the context of a larger Andhra Pradesh.

The Union Government has recently made an announcement enlarging the powers of the Regional Committee. I must say that a fair trial should be given to this. I would only appeal to my colleagues in Telangana not to view with suspicion or underestimate the value of the proposals outlined by the Government for the effective functioning of the Regional Committee. At present, the powers of the Regional Committee to make recommendations to the State Government suggesting legislative or executive action is limited to matters not involving any financial commitments other than expenditure of a routine or incidental nature. It has now been decided to enlarge this power so that the Committee can make recommendation not only relating to matters coming within its purview, but, as I said earlier overall financial arrangements contemplated in the annual budget or in the Five Year Plan. Provision is also made for the Regional Committee to discuss matters relating to university education and medium and large industries also.

Another important development is that following the recommendations made by the Wanchoo Committee, the method of recruitment and principles to be followed in making appointments to subordinate services and posts under the State Government in the Telangana region have also been added to the list of regional subjects. In addition, the Committee has also the power to suggest measures for securing adequate employment opportunities for the people of Telangana under the State Government, in the quasi-Government institutions and in the statutory authorities like corporations. To my mind, all this appears to be a very significant advance and given an opportunity, it should work extremely well. It has often been said that the Regional Committee has been ineffective in view of the inadequate powers to discuss the Budget. But this lacuna has been removed

by enabling the Committee to have a separate discussion on the annual Budget in so far as it relates to the receipts and expenditure in respect of the Telangana area. So there should not be any doubt why this particular thing should not be experimented and a sincere attempt made to see that all these proposals are put into effect. It has also been made possible now for the Central Government to keep itself informed of the various developments in the Telangana area and the Regional Committee is asked to send a report to the Governor who in turn sends a report to the Central Government for its review and examination.

I have recalled all these measures only to show that the Regional Committee has certainly been strengthened and if its members are vigilant as they ought to be, the accelerated development of the region is really assured. I will only say in conclusion that there is one point which Mr. V. B. Raju has made and that is that the question of employment has not been properly solved, and he said that that nearly 4,388 jobs in Telangana are occupied by the Andhra personnel. But he fails to realise that as soon as Andhra Pradesh was formed, a number of teachers were required in the various high schools in Telangana and at that time there was a dearth of trained personnel in the Telangana area. The Chairman of the Zilla Parishads themselves sought the permission of the Government to enable them to recruit people from the Andhra region to work in these schools. Nearly 2,800 Andhra teachers were appointed in the Telangana area. This is a major contribution, if I may say so, made by the Andhra region to the Telangana educational institutions. As a matter of fact, on the 19th January, 1969 when the gentlemen's agreement was drawn up, it was agreed that all these 2,800 teachers who were appointed in Telangana would be shifted to the Andhra region by creating supernumerary posts and this is one way in which the Government said, it is going to remove this type of imbalance between the Andhra and the Telangana regions. Apart from that, I do not think there is any injustice done to Telangana so far as employment is concerned. So far as seniority and other things are concerned, I understand that a Committee is going through the various proposals made by the Grievances Committee and it is examining them. And if there is really any grievance, I am sure, the Committee will make its recommendations to the State Government to follow it up.

[Shri M. Anandam]

In conclusion I would only urge the leaders of the Telangana area to view the problem in a very serious manner eschewing all types of factional politics. I know Mr. V. B. Raju would not agree with me when I say that this problem is tackled on the basis of factional politics. Bjit I must say that for the impetus given to this Telengana agitation. . . (Interruptions.) . . . the disgruntled politicians, who have assumed control of the entire situation, are responsible. And if they really have any interest in Telengana and its development, I once again appeal to all the Telengana leaders to go to every nook and corner of the Telengana area and if they still believe in integration, tell the people of the Telengana region that the various injustices that have been perpetrated previously are now under control, that the Central Government is looking into these things and that in the very near future all such things would be set right.

I thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, for having given me this opportunity of speaking on this motion.

श्री ना० कृ० शेजवलकर (मध्य प्रदेश) :
मान्यवर उपसभापति महोदय, सदन के सामने चर्चा है तेलंगाना के प्रश्न पर। मैं इस समस्या को केवल तेलंगाना की समस्या नहीं समझता अभी तक जितने माननीय वक्तागणों ने अपने विचार प्रकट किए हैं, उनमें से केवल एक को छोड़ कर आन्ध्र प्रदेश के ही माननीय संसद्-सदस्यों ने अपने विचार प्रकट किए हैं। मेरे विचार से तो वास्तव में वह सारे भारतवर्ष की एक समस्या है और इसलिए बड़ी गम्भीरता से इस पर विचार करना आवश्यक है। हम देखते हैं कि क्षेत्रवादी शक्तियाँ दिन-प्रति-दिन कोई न कोई नारा लगा कर आगे बढ़ना चाहती हैं। मान्यवर भूपेश जी नहीं हैं, मैं इस अवसर पर यह भी निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि जिस समय भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना की गई थी, वह निर्णय क्या सही था; क्या वह जन-भावनाओं के अनुकूल था; क्या वह भारत की एकात्मता के विकास की दृष्टि से उचित था? आज हमारे सामने ऐसे दो प्रदेश हैं जिनमें एक

ही भाषा है, एक ही जन है, परन्तु फिर भी उनमें असंतोष है। कुछ दिनों पूर्व जब आन्ध्र प्रदेश में, विशेषतया हैदराबाद के अन्दर आन्दोलन चल रहा था तेलंगाना के सम्बन्ध में तो वह टेक्नीक क्या है, आन्दोलन किस प्रकार से चलाया जाता है यह देखने के लिए विदर्भ के कुछ नेता लोग वहाँ पहुँचे थे। विदर्भ में भी और जो बाकी का महाराष्ट्र है, मराठी भाषा बोली जाती है। आन्ध्र के तेलंगाना के भाग में और शेष तेलंगाना में तेलुगु भाषा बोली जाती है। अगर भाषावार प्रान्तरचना सारी समस्याओं का हल होती तो झगड़ क्यों हुए? कहा जाता है कि कुछ इस प्रकार की परिस्थितियाँ हैं जिनमें इन्वेलेस पैदा हो रहे हैं, एक असंतुलन बन गया है। मैं इससे इनकार नहीं करता। अभी आन्ध्र के सम्बन्ध में, तेलंगाना के सम्बन्ध में जो आंकड़े चर्चा के प्रारम्भकर्ता महोदय ने प्रस्तुत किए हैं मैं समझता हूँ कि एक विशेष दृष्टिकोण के कारण उन्होंने उनको सामने रखा है। यह बात ठीक है कि प्रारम्भ में जो जो इनकम और एक्सपेंडीचर का गैप था वह काफी था, लेकिन मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि सन् 1967 में बांचू कमेटी की रिपोर्ट प्रकाशित होने के पहले और भागव कमेटी की रिपोर्ट प्रकाशित होने के पहले यह अन्तर कितना रह गया था? इनकम 60 करोड़ 4 लाख रुपया थी जबकि एक्सपेंडीचर 59 करोड़ 35 लाख रुपया था यानी बहुत थोड़ा अन्तर रह गया था। पहले अन्तर बहुत अधिक था, 6 करोड़ का अन्तर था। उन्होंने एक आंकड़ा बताया, लेकिन यह नहीं बताया कि आखिर में यह अन्तर कितना कम होता चला गया। इसी तरह से एम्प्लायमेंट के आंकड़े उन्होंने बताए और मैं समझता हूँ कि वे भी ठीक नहीं बताए गए। जो जस्टिस बांचू कमेटी की रिपोर्ट है, उसके पृष्ठ 9 पर बताया गया है कि मार्च, 1959 से लेकर सितम्बर, 1959 तक 92,555 पोस्ट्स भरी गयीं जो कि रेजीडेंशियल क्वालीफिकेशन

के आधार पर भरी गयी और क्योंकि समय कम है इसलिए मैं संक्षेप में ही बताना चाहता हूँ कि पहले तेलंगाना क्षेत्र में मुल्की क्लस् लागू थे और उनके अनुसार 15 वर्ष का बोनाफाइड रेजिडेंट होना उन लोगों के लिए जरूरी था। उनके अंतर्गत तेलंगाना क्षेत्र में अप्वाइंटमेंट हुआ करते थे। जब सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने उसको निरस्त कर दिया और कहा कि क्षेत्रीय आधार पर अप्वाइंटमेंट्स नहीं हो सकते तब यह कमेटी बनायी गयी और उस कमेटी ने जो सुझाव दिये वह मैं आपके सामने प्रस्तुत कर रहा हूँ। उन 92,555 पोस्ट्स में से 88,164 स्थान जो थे, वे रेजिडेंशियल क्वालीफिकेशन के आधार पर भरे गये। केवल 799 स्थान ऐसे थे जो नहीं भरे गये। क्या यह स्थान भरने का पर्याप्त आधार है? इस पर हमको और आप को विचार करना चाहिए।

श्री बी० बी० राजू : उसके बाद भी एक सेंटेंस है।

श्री ना० कृ० शेजवलकर : मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ एक समस्या और भी थी और वह लोगों के प्रमोशन की समस्या थी। किस तरह से उन को आगे प्रमोशन दिया जाये, इसकी समस्या थी; और शायद इसी समस्या के कारण इस आन्दोलन का एक भाग प्रारम्भ हुआ, मैं ऐसा ही समझता हूँ। मैं अगर गलती पर होऊँ तो श्री राजू अपने उत्तर में बतायेंगे। वहाँ एक तो अनइम्प्लायमेंट वाली बड़ी भारी समस्या थी, जिसके लिए वहाँ एक बड़ी वुलन्द आवाज उठायी गयी थी। दूसरी एक और समस्या जो चदन में बतायी गयी, वह वहाँ के डेवलपमेंट के बारे में थी कि डेवलपमेंट पर जो व्यय होना चाहिए था, वह नहीं हुआ। यद्यपि इसका एक और पक्ष यह बतलाया गया कि हैदराबाद में इतनी इंडस्ट्रीज पहुँच गयी हैं, लेकिन मैं फिर भी कहना चाहूँगा कि अभी भी वास्तविकता यह है कि जो आकड़े

हैं उनके आधार पर यह मानना पड़ेगा कि तेलंगाना को उसका ड्यू शेयर नहीं मिला। यह बात ठीक है, लेकिन क्या इन दोनों बातों के होते हुए हम यह स्वीकार कर लें कि केवल यही दो कारण हैं, जिन के आधार पर हम अलग अलग क्षेत्र बनायें, अलग अलग राज्य स्थापित करें, यह एक बड़ी विचार करने वाली बात है; क्योंकि मैं यह समझता हूँ कि अगर हम इन ऊपरी बातों पर ही विचार करके अपनी राष्ट्रीय समस्याओं का हल निकालने का प्रयास करेंगे तो हमारा कार्य और हमारा उद्देश्य कभी पूरा नहीं होगा और जैसा कि मैंने प्रारम्भ में ही कहा था कि भाषावार प्रान्तों का गठन किया जाये, इस आधार पर हम चले, लेकिन उससे हमारी समस्या का हल नहीं निकला। आज दुर्भाग्य से ऐसी स्थिति हो गयी है कि देश में जो आज बड़ा डेमोक्रेटिक और प्रोग्रेसिव होने का दावा करते हैं, अपने को डेमोक्रेटिक और न जाने क्या क्या कहते हैं, मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिन बड़े बड़े शब्दों का वह प्रयोग करते हैं, उनकी वे जरा परिभाषा तो बता दें। मैं तो यह समझता हूँ कि यह हमारा दुर्भाग्य है कि हमारा शासन आज एक ही सिद्धांत को मानता है और वह सिद्धांत है जिसकी लाठी उसकी भैंस; और आज यही बात दुर्भाग्य से हमारे देश के साधारण सोचने वालों के मस्तिष्क में जम गयी है। लाठी का मतलब यह नहीं है कि कोई मिनिस्टर अगर कहीं जाये, तो उस को लाठी मारी जाय, लाठी का मतलब यह है कि जो पार्टी इस प्रकार का आन्दोलन करे, गांधीजी का आदर्श अपने सामने रख कर, अहिंसा का नाम लेकर हिंसा पर उतरे, रेल में आग लगाये, घरों को जलाये, वायुयानों के जो अड्डे हों उन पर जाकर उनका ट्रैफिक बंद किया जाये और उनके द्वारा इस प्रकार के काम किये जाते हैं कि जिन के कारण सरकार पर ज्यादा से ज्यादा दबाव पड़े और शासन

[श्री ना० कृ० शेजवलकर]

मजबूर हो जाये, ऐसे रास्ते अपनाये जाते हैं आज कल। दुर्भाग्य की बात यह है और आज तक का इतिहास यह है कि शासन ने कभी भी सीधी बात को माना नहीं है। चाहे वह गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र का सवाल हो या पंजाब का सवाल हो या मेघालय का सवाल हो। आप आन्ध्र के प्रश्न को ही ले लीजिए। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उस समय श्रद्धेय पंत जी यहां पर विराजमान थे। रामूलू जी को अपना प्राणार्पण क्यों करना पड़ा? उनकी बात अगर सही थी तो पहले ही क्यों नहीं मान ली गयी। तो दुर्भाग्य से आज इस प्रकार की एक विचारधारा को बल मिलता जा रहा है जिस के लिए केवल शासन ही; और कोई नहीं, जिम्मेदार है कि जब कभी आप इस प्रकार के हिंसात्मक प्रदर्शन करते हैं और अपने बल का प्रदर्शन करते हैं तो आपका काम पूरा हो जाता है और इसी आधार पर तीसरा प्रश्न आता है कि यह जो भावना है, जो लोगों के अंदर उत्पन्न हुई है, उसका लाभ उठाते हैं, ये हमारे राजनीतिक नेता लोग। मैं किसी विशेष व्यक्ति पर दोषारोपण नहीं करना चाहता। आज राजनीतिक लाभ उठाने का तो जमाना ही है। हम लोग, जो नौजवान हैं, हमको यह देख कर बड़ा खेद होता है कि आज हमारी राजनीति किस दिशा में मोड़ ले रही है। एक ओर तो लोग इस प्रकार से अपनी शक्ति का प्रदर्शन करते हैं और उसके द्वारा शासन का मत परिवर्तन करने का प्रयास करते हैं और आज की राजनीति में एक दूसरा प्रयोग भी आजकल चल पड़ा है, जोकि आज की चर्चा में आया भी है और जिसे प्रस्तावक महोदय ने बताया भी है। यह ठीक है कि वह प्रयोग आज वहां पर लोग नहीं अपना रहे हैं, लेकिन गवर्नमेंट के लिए शक्ति प्राप्त करने के लिए उस प्रयोग द्वारा, अलग अलग स्टैंडर्ड से सरकारों को गिराने की कोशिश की जाती है। लोगों

से डिफेंशन करवाये जाते हैं, कहीं कुछ और भी किया जाता है। सत्ता हथियाने की दृष्टि से तेलंगाना के प्रश्न पर विचार हो सकता है, लेकिन उसके जो मेरिट्स हैं, उन पर कोई विचार नहीं करेगा। मैं तो इस पक्ष में हूँ, और स्पष्ट कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो जो पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्र हैं, उनकी समस्या को पहले हाथ में लिया जाये। उनकी समस्या का समाधान ढूँढ कर निकाला जाये, लेकिन मैं इस बात का घोर विरोधी हूँ कि इस प्रकार से साढ़े तीन लाख की आबादी का एक अलग प्रदेश बना दिया जाये, कुल 80 असेम्बली के सदस्य जिसमें हों, उसका एक प्रदेश बना दिया जाये। हम इस प्रकार करेंगे तो यह सोचने की बात है कि हम देश का क्या करने जा रहे हैं? हमारे सामने क्या लक्ष्य हैं? अगर मैं यह कहूँ तो अनुचित न होगा कि 1956 में जो हम लोगों ने निर्णय किया था रिआर्गनाइजेशन कमीशन के द्वारा उस पर पुनर्विचार करने का समय फिर आ गया है। उसके लिए हम एक हाई-पावर कमीशन बनायें और उसको फिर हम इस सवाल को सीपें, ताकि देश में जो आज समस्या पैदा हो रही है और जो अलग अलग क्षेत्र पैदा हो रहे हैं, उनका समाधान हो सके। आज मध्य प्रदेश में बेलाडीला का इतना बड़ा दावा है, उसका इतना बड़ा दावा और इतना बड़ा क्षेत्र होते हुए भी, उस क्षेत्र के पिछड़ा हुआ होने के बावजूद भी कारखाना दूसरे प्रदेश को दे दिया गया। मुझे दूसरे प्रदेश को कारखाना दिय जाने से कोई आपत्ति नहीं है, लेकिन जहां कारखाना दिये जाने की आवश्यकता थी वहां यह नहीं दिया गया और इसका कारण है पोलिटिकल कंसिडरेशन्स। आज हर बात के पीछे जो सोचने का राजनीतिक दृष्टिकोण हो गया है, उसके लिए मेरे पास आज कोई दूसरा शब्द नहीं है सिवाये यह कहने के कि यह एक प्रकार की अनैतिकता है। यह एक प्रकार की राजनैतिक अनैतिकता है। उसके

लिए मुझे कोई दूसरा पर्यायवाची शब्द समझ में नहीं आ रहा है और इस राजनीतिक अनैतिकता को बढ़ाने का उत्तरदायित्व अधिक से अधिक आज अगर किसी पर हो सकता है, तो वह जो हमारी रूलिंग पार्टी के लोग हैं, उनके ऊपर है। आज वह तथ्यों को छोड़ कर अपनी सत्ता बनाये रखने के लिए किसी भी पार्टी से समझौता करने के लिये तैयार है। इसलिए मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस राष्ट्रीय समस्या को हल करने का एक ही तरीका है कि आज कोई ऐसा हार्ड-पावर कमीशन बनायें और उसे यह सवाल सौंपें। किसी किसी स्थान पर यह सुझाव हम लोगों ने साल भर पहले ही दिया था और आज यह सुझाव भी प्रभावकारी रहेगा यह समझ में आना कठिन है, लेकिन फिर भी मैं समझता हूँ कि अभी भी देर नहीं हुई है; क्योंकि यह और जगह भी शुरू होगी, शुरू करायी जायेगी; क्योंकि इसके पीछे दलबाजी है, गुटबाजी है और अब तो गुटों में से भी गुट उत्पन्न हो रहे हैं, तो उनके कारण एक झगड़ा उत्पन्न किया जायेगा और कराया जायेगा। इसको हल करने का एक ही उपाय है।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान) : 50 मिनट से आप धीरे-धीरे आइये, कम से कम 15 मिनट तो दीजिए।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I expect co-operation from all the Members.

SHRI SUNDER SINGH BHANDARI : We also expect that the Chair will accommodate us.

श्री ना० कृ० शेखवलकर : इसीलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ माननीय सदस्यों से कि इसको केवल आंध्र की समस्या कतई न समझें। इसीलिए मैंने प्रारम्भ ही इस बात से किया है कि इसको सारे देश की समस्या समझ कर चलें। इस देश में सोलह प्रांत हो गए, उसका कोई हिसाब नहीं। उसका कोई आधार हो तो

हमें उसमें कोई दिक्कत नहीं है। अगर वह ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव परपज के लिए है तो मैं समझ सकता हूँ, लेकिन इस प्रकार से जनता में विद्रोह पैदा करने की कोशिश नहीं करनी चाहिए।

जहां तक इन्वेलेसेज का सवाल है; और प्रदेशों में क्या इन्वेलेसेज नहीं हैं? मैं तो समझता हूँ कि पोलिटिकल नेताओं का भी इन्वेलेस है। मध्य प्रदेश इतना पिछड़ा हुआ क्यों है? क्योंकि वहां के नेता कैबिनेट में नहीं हैं—उपमंत्री हैं, स्टेट मिनिस्टर हैं, लेकिन वहां पर कोई नेता नहीं है, जो मध्य प्रदेश की बात यहां पर जोरदार ढंग से रख सके। लेकिन इसका मतलब यह नहीं कि उसको केन्द्र से अलग कर दिया जाये। यह मांग करना उतनी बड़ी भूल होगी, जितनी कि तेलंगाना की मांग करना है। इस प्रकार की मांगों को करते समय इसका भी विचार करना चाहिए कि राष्ट्रीय एकता सर्वोपरि है। जो कुछ हम कदम उठाते हैं, उसका राष्ट्र के ऊपर क्या परिणाम होगा, यह देखना नितान्त आवश्यक है।

5 P.M.

SHRI KOTA PUNNAIAH : Mr. Deputy Chairman, at the outset I would like to pay my homage to the innocent Telangana people who were misled and misguided and who laid down their lives. There is no Telangana problem as such. If there is any problem, there is the problem of socio-economic backwardness. This problem is there throughout the country and more so in Telangana. As Mr. Raju said, the Telangana people are good, they are sober, they are cosmopolitan in thought, deed and action, they are innocent people. They were controlled by the feudals and exploited by them for the past so many years. Of course there is an agitation but what is the nature of the agitation and who is behind this agitation? Who are supporting this agitation? That is what I want to know. If this agitation is supported by one and all there then we must consider this problem very seriously. We have to apply

[Shri Kota Punnaiah.]

our mind to this. We must spend our time if this agitation has anything to do with the people of Telangana but this agitation is brought about if not by the landlords and capitalists, as my friend Shri Raju said, by the anti-social elements and the vested interests because in Telangana there is nobody to support this agitation. Both the Congress—Congress CO) and the Congress (Ruling)—are not supporting this agitation. The Communist Party belonging to both the Marxists or the Rightists, are not supporting. The Jan Sangh is not supporting this. The PSP is not supporting it. The SSP is not supporting this agitation. Not only that. The people and the Regional Committee of Telangana are not supporting this. Eighty-five per cent, of the Legislative Assembly and Legislative Council members are not supporting this agitation. If we want to discuss this agitation democratically as my friend Mr. Raju said, all these people are against this agitation. They are all for integration, not for separation. He gave the list of 8 people who signed the agreement. He wanted to explain it in a democratic way stating that two of them are out of the picture that means two have died and one is a Governor. Who cannot express any opinion. One person's opinion is not known. Two are for separate Telangana and one is for integration. He has built up his case on the basis that out of the 8 people, two are majority and they are for a separate Telangana. He has forgotten those who supported the case for integration. The Congress, the PSP, the SSP, all the parties supported integration. Everybody speaks of the people. I do not understand the meaning of 'people' because 20 per cent, of them are Scheduled Castes, 60 per cent, are of the Backward Communities and among that 20 per cent, advanced communities, 5 per cent, are poor, all put together 85 per cent, of the people are the sufferers for ages, particularly the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes. I cannot understand therefore the crocodile tears of these leaders. Have they brought any relief to them? You tell me whether the Scheduled Castes are suffering or not. Many a time Mr. Dharja and other friends here are fighting for the common people. The suffering classes are there and they are the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes and 80 per cent, of the people are economically backward and socially backward. Their lot is not improved after 20 years of independence. This is the common problem everywhere. Have

you ever thought of this problem? Have you brought any agitation for the improvement of these people before? I have sympathy for the N.G.Os, for the students, for the Telangana employees, I have more sympathies for the toiling millions of this country but I have no sympathy for the agitation. What is to be done for the amelioration of the suffering—of the Telangana people? You have to get more funds and additional grants from the Centre or from any other region. You have to spend the amount. I want to ask a question from Mr. Raju. He was the Minister there till yesterday. Was he not a party to all these disturbances? I am sorry, I am pained to hear about it and I am sorry for the Telangana people. In the name of the Telangana people, looting; take place and in the name of the Telangana people everything is taking place there but the Telangana people have nothing to do with this agitation. They are not concerned with any of these atrocities. They are in the villages. If you go to the villages, you will find that they want only help, not agitation. They are the exploited people and these agitationists want to exploit them further. That is their ambition. The feudals and the vested interests are working. Mr. Raju is a known socialist. I am requesting him to look at it from this angle. You try to remove the apprehensions and misunderstandings.

AN HON. MEMBER : How?

SHRI KOTA PUNNAIAH : You have to get more funds from the Centre and spend more from your own State budget otherwise how are you going to solve the problem? Is it by creating frustration and disturbance you are going to create a separate State? Is it on the basis of the 1956 agreement, Mr. Raju, are you going to ask Mysore and Maharashtra to give you back the parts which went to them at the time of formation of the Andhra Pradesh State? Are they willing to give?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : !
(Andhra Pradesh) : We are ready.

SHRI KOTA PUNNAIAH: Mr. Mulka Govinda Reddy may say so. I am a democrat and I want to consult the entire Mysore State people. I may not be misunderstood if I ask this. The agreement was signed by eight people and they all belonged to one party. Had they consulted the people then or the other political parties? After all I want to learn something from Mr. Raju. He was there..

Had they consulted the people then? You want to insult the people now. Even Shrimati Ashoda Reddy said: 'Let us wait till 1972 elections. It is not far off'. The people's verdict is final. They are the ultimate judges. Let us bow to their decision or verdict given by the people. Let us not create more problems. By creating more problems we are hampering our progress. What is it that you have done for the Scheduled Caste? In the name of the Telangana agitation so many buses have been burnt and so many houses have been looted and filthy language is written on the walls. So much damage has been caused in Telangana. It is not in the interest of Telangana that this agitation is being continued. It is in the interest of certain vested interests and in the interests of the anti-social elements. This should not be continued further. This Telangana problem is not really as I said. It is only a socio-economic problem that is to be tackled. If at all it is to be tackled, we must apply our mind. We must take the assistance from our friends from all the States. We must think on scientific lines. It is no use burning buses or killing people or looting properties or doing this kind of atrocities. The agitation is fizzling out there. As far as my knowledge goes, the people of Telangana are realising the facts. They say: 'What is this all?' What benefit the Scheduled Castes and the Backward communities are going to have? Supposing tomorrow a separate Telangana comes into being. How are they going to improve their lot? Has anybody ever thought of their sufferings all these years? Now something has happened to some people and they want to create all this trouble. The Telangana people should understand this. They realise it and they are coming to see the realities. They are not participating in this agitation. Therefore, the agitation has fizzled out. Let us forget about the agitation. If at all there is any problem in Telangana, it is the backwardness in Telangana and let us all join together and try to work for the welfare of the Telangana people and remove their backwardness and meliorate the conditions of the people in Telangana. That is more constructive. That would be a welcome gesture if it comes from Telangana. The Telangana people have nothing to do with any of this agitation. They believe in democracy. They believe in plain speaking but not in agitation. So far the development of Telangana is concerned, the Prime Minister of India has announced a eight point programme and they are

implementing it. If at all we want to implement it and if we want more money we should get it from the Centre or from the Andhra region to develop the backward area of Telangana. I want to ask a question. Is there anybody to say that the Telangana area should be taken back to 1956? In 1956 in my district we have only six high schools but today there are 103.

AN HON. MEMBER : What is the name of your district?

SHRI KOTA PUNNAIAH : My district is Khammam. I want to remind my friends here that unless they improve the lot of the suffering humanity there cannot be any progress. They want to take away the money of the Central Government in the name of this and that agitation and spend it for the benefit of the richer people not the poor. Even the Telangana Regional Committee is not spending the amount for the welfare of the Scheduled Castes. I told Mr. Brahmananda Reddy, the Chief Minister, that according to the population he has to spend the amount on the welfare of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes and the Backward Classes.

Thank you very much for your kindness. Before concluding I would earnestly request every Member of this House to see that the integration of Andhra Pradesh is protected and the tradition of Andhra Pradesh is protected. Thank you.

SHRI K. C. PANDA (Orissa) : Sir, after the detailed statement given by Mr. Raju it is needless for me to go into details on this issue but I would refer to the decision of the Fazl Ali Commission which decided to keep Telangana as a separate State. During 1956 there was an agitation in Andhra Pradesh and Telangana for integration; and why? To my mind it occurs that during those years out of 105 Members to the Assembly from the Telangana area fifty-five belonged to the Opposition group and fifty belonged to the Government. It is for the House to judge with what motive the agitation was taken up to merge Telangana with Andhra Pradesh. That was in order to make the ruling party a major party in the integrated Andhra Pradesh. The Congress Party was ruling in almost all the States during those days and they wanted the Congress Party to be in a majority in the integrated Andhra Pradesh also.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL : Sir, may I inform him very humbly that when he said fifty Members were for separation and fifty for integration it was not...

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh) : He did not say that. You have misheard him.

SHRI K. G. PANDA : The ex-Hyderabad State was broken up and according to the Report of the Commission two of its parts were merged with Maharashtra and Mysore and the third part was to remain as an independent State under the Union Government. In that area there were 105 Members who were elected to the Legislative Assembly—I am referring to the Telangana area—and the idea behind the agitation for merging it with Andhra Pradesh was for the Congress to become a major party in the integrated State. There was an agreement at that time which is called the gentleman's agreement, which in my opinion ought not to have been made without the approval of the Centre or the Parliament.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : No, no. It was placed before Parliament and it was agreed to by the Central leaders.

SHRI K. C. PANDA : If at all it was agreed to by Parliament it should not have been called gentleman's agreement. And subsequently that was violated.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : It is only a colloquial name.

SHRI K. C. PANDA : So much so the services which belonged to the ex-State of Hyderabad were not integrated. Hyderabad was supposed to be one of the biggest princely States. The services of those who were serving there, even after the independence of India, even after the last twenty years, have not been integrated in the general cadre. Should I know from the Government, through you, whether it is victimisation of the ex-State area people? Is it not neglecting Telangana? I do not think the intention was like that. But still it exists. It had aggravated, when? When there was a ruling relating to employment, it was ruled out by the Supreme Court as *ultra vires* in March, 1969. Taking advantage of the ruling of the Supreme Court and the circumstances—I would not mention names—without casting any aspersion on any gentleman or political leader personally, the Brahmananda Reddy Government

started doing things in such a way that the people of Telangana think that they have been neglected. It is a fact and it has been admitted by several Members, not only from Telangana, but also from the other parts of Andhra Pradesh.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : One clarification. It is not only the administration of Mr. Brahmananda Reddy. Actually it is a legacy which Mr. Brahmananda Reddy got. From the time of Mr. Sanjiva Reddy, Mr. Sanjivayya and Mr. Brahmananda Reddy it is there.

SHRI K. C. PANDA : I do not mean only the Brahmananda Reddy Government. . .

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : What I say is that even from the beginning this has happened.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order please. He has very little time.

SHRI K. C. PANDA : The predecessor-Governments and the successor-Government also.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : You mean to say that Mr. Sanjiva Reddy is equally guilty.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : I say all the Chief Ministers, from the time of integration, have been guilty.

SHRI K. C. PANDA : One more thing. The top politicians, when frustrated in different spheres, by a back-door method, set fire to the agitation. Subsequently, of course, they have come out with an open declaration. With all respect to Mr. Raju and without casting any aspersion, he has openly come out. The agitation has been fomented like that.

Now, the more important point is I would like to know whether we should presume, when the Centre is silent for such a long time even after the agitation in 1969, without solving the problem to the satisfaction of the people of both the areas, that it is being fomented by the Central Government also. As one of our friends has said, in order to satisfy the Andhra Pradesh Government, they are taking away iron ore from Bailadilla in Madhya Pradesh, where the employment requirement is more acute due to the settlement of East Bengal refugees

in the Dandakar, nya area. So far as safety and security is concerned, Bailadilla, in my opinion, would be a safer and more secure place for a steel plant than Visakhapatnam, where the iron ore has to be carried for the steel factory. I would mention another fact. In Orissa, in the district of Koraput there is a sugar factory. For the last one or two years, although the sugar factory has got its head office in Jeypore, the income-tax assessment is being made in Andhra Pradesh through the Commissioner of Andhra Pradesh. Now, the authorities of the mill are being pressed to take the head office to Andhra Pradesh, so that an income of Rs. 50 lakhs will go from the Orissa Government to the Andhra Government and in this way troubles are being fomented in different areas, as my hon. friend has already said, the problem of making bigger States into smaller States will grow from State to State. It is there in UP also. The Eastern area of UP is always demanding more facilities and they deserve it. So also in Madhya Pradesh. The Vidarbha problem is there in Maharashtra. The House will not be astonished that even in Orissa, the Western Orissa and Eastern Orissa problem is there. In Jammu and Kashmir also the same problem is there. Gradually it will develop throughout the country, which neither I nor any of my friends either from this side or that side would want. So, it has to be solved with a strong hand, duly vouchsafing the safety, security and development of the underdeveloped areas throughout the country. Although we are speaking so much about national integration, many of us, many of our politicians are working for disintegration! So, I would appeal to the House to take a serious view of the situation. I thank Mr. Raju for bringing forward the problem. The decision of Parliament will be final and we have to solve the problems of the underdeveloped people throughout the country. Thank you.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the happenings in Telangana and in Andhra Pradesh during the past few months are indeed most unfortunate. I can appreciate the feelings of Dr. Raju and others. These are not the feelings of only Telangana people. Such are the feelings in all the areas in the country which have remained backward and where the economic and social development has created several imbalances. It is against this background that we

have to look at the contentions of those who intend to have a separate Telangana or those who want some sort of arrangement like Meghalaya for Telangana. Even though one can understand their views, I feel that it is not going to provide a proper solution. I have no doubt whatsoever in my mind and this House will kindly allow me to be assertive that this country cannot afford to have any further division anywhere in any part of the country. There has been enough of division and we cannot afford any more division. Perhaps it may be argued, as the sound is coming from some other quarter. . .

SHRI B. T. KEMPARAJ (Mysore) : What about the Mahajan Commission's Report ?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : I am coming to it. You have got a contrary view. I will now touch both of them. So far as Vidarbha is concerned, this issue was raised by the Nag-Vidarbha Andolan Samiti in the elections of 1962 and 1967 and the people from Vidarbha, by an overwhelming majority, have rejected the claim for a separate Vidarbha. So, that problem is over. It does not now exist. In a democracy I believe in the wishes of the people. Ultimately if we are to run democracy and if it is really the wish of the people, then naturally as representatives of the people we shall have to take cognizance. Whether it comes from Vidarbha or from some other area, it is immaterial. It is in this context I would like to make it very clear that this country should not have any further division of any of its territory.

Coming to this problem of Telangana, again I hope this House will allow me to say that those who ruled Andhra Pradesh unfortunately neglected Telangana. I feel that Telangana deserves some special treatment, but as it was not given there is a lot of resentment in Telangana, and this cannot be denied. If that resentment is to be won over, the only alternative is to see that the arrangements made by the Central Government under article 371 of our Constitution are now so implemented whereby we can grant relief to the people from Telangana. If we can create that sort of confidence in the minds of the people from Telangana that under these arrangements Telangana can have proper development and these imbalances could be cured, I feel and I am sure that it is again possible to regain the confidence wherever it is lost. Unfortunately

[Shri M. M. Dharia]

in the case of Telangana this issue did not arise at the time of the 1967 general elections, and now thereafter this issue has suddenly taken a serious turn. But in spite of it, as was pointed out by other colleagues, I feel that in 1972 again the people shall have their own voice and their desire shall have to be taken into consideration. But so far as the issue, of a separate Telangana is concerned the majority of the people's representatives elected directly by the people have not yet accepted this concept, and under these circumstances my appeal to my friend, Mr. Raju, and other colleagues— for whom I have the greatest regard; these are people who do not want disruption of the country; they are patriots; but they are making this demand because of the degree of feelings of the people; and we shall have to look at it from an absolutely constructive point of view. This would be my appeal to the Government that the Government should take into consideration the problems of the backward areas all over the country and should see that more and more funds are made available to such backward areas for their progress. If it is not done, it is likely that such sort of demands will come forward from all backward areas. I come from Konkan, I am born in Konkan. I know the problems of the people of Konkan. If they are not rendered justice, I know it is likely that they may come forward with a similar demand. The cure should be to prevent such sort of diseases wherever they are likely to come up. It is in this direction that the Government of India shall have to look at it.

My friend, Mr. Raju said, "Well under article 371 there is a separate, budget; there is a separate Committee; there are so many things separate; and now we want political separation". I appreciate in these days of divorce a demand for political separation. But this problem is ultimately decided in the cause of the people.

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR : You are not progressive in this matter.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : This matter should be decided by the vote of the people. Even though I am progressive, all my progressiveness depends on the desires of the people and here the nation will have to be consulted.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : I accept it.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : With all my sympathy, my submission to those who are agitating for a separate Telangana or for a Meghalaya type of arrangement, my appeal to them would be that they should try to see that the present arrangements succeed so that proper relief could be given and the present backwardness could be removed. If it is not possible, then of course the country shall have to take cognizance of it also.

Reference was made to the Mahajan Commission. That problem is absolutely different. Here again Maharashtra does not want to grab anything. These are Marathi-speaking people on the border areas. We only say that the desire of the people should be respected in democracy. If this democracy is not going to respect the desire of the people, it will not be possible for it to function, for any democracy in the world to function. How can we forget that? It is in this background we say this without having any idea of expansion or aggression. It is the demand of those people living in those areas which should be fulfilled. That is the only thing.

SHRI SHERKHAN (Mysore) : What about Kannada-speaking people in Shola-pur ?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : If it is the desire of the people, I will not object. Please let me be very clear about I believe in democracy. I believe in the desire of the people, if it is their desire. It is not their desire. I would like to make it very clear that these issues were raised on several occasions, and from these border areas.

Marathi-speaking M.L. As. were elected to the Mysore Assembly. In Belgaum out of 40, 35 such representatives were elected • .

SHRI SHERKHAN : Only 5.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : I am speaking of Belgaum Municipality. Out of 40, 35 representatives are elected like that. Unfortunately my friends who are crying in the name of democracy are not prepared to accept the desire of the people. That is the whole tragedy. I wish the country and friends like Shri Sherkhan would realise this difficulty. Again I appeal to all friends of Telangana not to agitate in the way they have been doing but to kindly take into consideration the desire

of the country, and they should also see
tha' in y is not further disinte-
grated.

Sir, I have done.

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : उपसभापति महोदय, अभी तक जितने भी व्यक्ति इस पर बोले हैं सभी ने यह कहा कि तेलंगाना के लोगों के साथ अनजस्टिस हुआ है और कोई ऐसा शब्द यहां पर नहीं बोला, जिसने यह कहा कि तेलंगाना के लोगों के साथ ज्यादाती नहीं हुई। अगर इतने सालों के बाद तेलंगाना के लोगों को जस्टिस नहीं मिल पाता है, तो फिर तेलंगाना के लोग अगर वहां पर कोई आन्दोलन खड़ा करें तो कोई ताज्जुब की बात नहीं है। (Interruption.) मैं तो यही कहूंगा कि जहां पर भी अनजस्टिस होता है वहां पर आन्दोलन होना चाहिये और सबसे पहले मैं वहां जाकर असर हूंगा। इसलिए इसमें कोई ताज्जुब करने की बात नहीं है, सिर्फ यह देखना है कि इसका परिणाम क्या होगा और उसका क्या हम हल निकाल सकते हैं।

यहां पर कई चीजें बतलाई गई। कुछ लोगों ने यह कहा कि तेलंगाना को अलग कर दिया जाना चाहिये, कुछ ने यह कहा, खासकर श्री वी० बी० रावू ने कि मेघालय टाइप की कुछ ऐसी चीज वहां पर हो तो उनके लिए संतुष्टकर होगा। जहां तक हमारी पार्टी और हमारा सवाल है, हम पहले से यह कह चुके हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान का अभी जिस तरह का ढांचा है, और जिस ढंग से आज सरकार चल रही है उससे इस तरह के प्रालम्भ हमेशा सामने आते रहेंगे। इसमें कोई ताज्जुब करने की बात नहीं है; क्योंकि जब तक हमारा रेवेन्यू का बंटवारा ठीक ढंग से नहीं होगा, जब तक जो पैसा आता है उसका खर्च ठीक ढंग से नहीं होगा, तब तक इस तरह की डिमांड आती रहेगी।

हम यह बात पहले से ही कहते आ रहे हैं। कि यहां पर चौखम्बा राज्य होना चाहिए है सेक्टर, स्टेट्स, जिला और गांव, इनकी जो इकाइयां हैं और इन चार इकाइयों का जो हमारा रेवेन्यू है, उसका बराबर बंटवारा होना चाहिये, बराबर उसका खर्च होना चाहिये और खर्च करने का अधिकार भी होना चाहिये। अगर हमने इस तरह की व्यवस्था कर दी तो फिर इस तरह के सवाल हमारे सामने नहीं आयेंगे। लेकिन आजकल जो व्यवस्था है उसमें जरूर ही इस तरह के सवाल आते रहेंगे और न सिर्फ तेलंगाना, बिहार बल्कि और कई जगहों से जो बैकवर्ड एरियाज हैं चाहे वह उत्तर प्रदेश का हो, चाहे किसी और प्रदेश का हो, वहां से इस तरह की डिमांड आती रहेगी।

आज देश में जिस तरह का ढांचा है, अगर आप उसको कायम रखना चाहते हैं तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन्हें मेघालय टाइप का पैटर्न दे देना चाहिये, वे चीज से संतुष्ट हो जायेंगे और तब जाकर वहां के लोगों के दिमाग में असर पड़ेगा। अगर आप यह न देकर कोई अलग चीज देंगे, चाहे आप वहां की जनता को कितनी ही मारपीट क्यों न दे दें, रीजनल कमिटीज द्वारा चाहे कितनी पावर क्यों न दे दें, केन्द्र से कितने ही आश्वासन उनको दे दें, लेकिन जो साइकोलोजी उनके दिमाग में मौजूद है, वह दूर नहीं हो पायेगी और इस चीज से कोई नतीजा नहीं निकलेगा। इस तरह के आन्दोलन आपके सामने आते रहेंगे और इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप इसका हल चाहते हैं तो जो मेघालय टाइप का पैटर्न है, उसको आप मंजूर कर लें। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे सामने जो मसले हैं वे मेघालय टाइप के पैटर्न से हल नहीं हो सकते हैं। इनका हल तो उसी तरह से हो सकता है, जैसा मैंने

[श्री गोडे मुराहरि]

अभी चौखम्बा राज्य के बारे में बतलाया। हिन्दुस्तान के सारे रेवेन्यू का बंटवारा हो और वह बराबर चारों इकाइयों में बांटा जाये और उनको खर्च करने का पूरा अधिकार दिया जाये। वे अपना प्लान खुद करें। जिले वाले अपना प्लान खुद करें और उसके लिए एक-चौथाई आप दीजिये। गांवों को आप आधा पैसा दीजिये, ताकि वे अपना प्लान खुद कर सकें और जो अपनी अपनी जरूरत है वह पूरा कर सकें। एक-चौथाई आप सेक्टर में रखें। आज जो सेक्टर में सारी सत्ता का केन्द्रीकरण करके रखते हैं, उससे हिन्दुस्तान चलने वाला नहीं है। बहुत हो चुका, अब आपको हिन्दुस्तान को समझना चाहिए। जब द्रविड़स्तान का नारा लगा था तब ही आपको समझ लेना चाहिए था कि सत्ता के केन्द्रीकरण से काम चलने वाला नहीं है, यहां पर विकेन्द्रीकरण होना है, सत्ता का भी होना है, धन का भी होना है, खर्च का भी होना है और प्लानिंग का भी होना है। जब पावर सेंट्रलाइज होगी तब जाकर हिन्दुस्तान के सारे मसलों का हल हो जाएगा, वरना कोई हल नहीं निकलेगा। इसलिए मैं जो श्री बी० बी० राजू साहब का सजेशन है उसका साथ देता हूँ; क्योंकि दूसरा हमारे सामने हल दिख नहीं रहा है। मैं चाहूंगा कि आन्ध्र प्रदेश जैसे का तैसा रहे, उसका कोई विभाजन न हो, लेकिन हमारे चाहने से क्या होगा, वहां पर जो जनता है, जो एजीटेशन हो रहा है उसको भी मद्देनजर रखना है। मैं जानता हूँ कि श्री राजू साहब काफी समय तक इस राय के रहे हैं कि विभाजन नहीं होना चाहिए।

श्री बी० बी० राजू : मैं अभी भी चाहता हूँ कि आन्ध्र प्रदेश एक हो जाये, लेकिन मेरी बात चलती नहीं है; क्योंकि अवाम नहीं चाहता है।

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : मैं भी वही कह रहा हूँ।

शायद राजू साहब इस नतीजे पर इसलिए आए; क्योंकि अवाम इसके पक्ष में नहीं है कि वह इस ढंग के ढांचे को चलाए। तो उनके साइकोलोजिकल सेटिस्फेक्शन के लिए उनको मेघालय पैटर्न का और कोई पैटर्न दिया जा सकता है। जब तक जनता को साइकोलोजिकल सेटिस्फेक्शन नहीं होता तब तक जो एजीटेशन चल रहा है उसका अन्त होने वाला नहीं है। यह कह देना बहुत आसान है कि जब एजीटेशन तेलंगाना का शुरू हुआ था तो वह बहुत जबरदस्त था, आज कुछ नहीं है। आज एजीटेशन कराने वाले चाहें तो उससे भी जबरदस्त एजीटेशन करा देंगे। जो वहां पर एजीटेशन हो रहा है, उसका कारण है और वह कारण मौजूद है।

एक जेंटलमैन एग्रीमेंट का जिक्र किया गया। वे सब अनजेंटलमैनली रहे हैं, किसी ने उसे इम्प्लीमेंट नहीं किया। वे जेंटलमैन आज भी सत्ता में बैठे हैं। अगर वही इम्प्लीमेंट करेंगे तो लोगों के दिमाग पर क्या असर पड़ेगा। किस तरह से लोगों को महसूस होगा कि इसका सही पालन होगा? असल में सरकार को चाहिए कि जनता को साइकोलोजिकल सेटिस्फेक्शन देने के लिए कोई इस तरह का ढांचा निकाले जिसमें आन्ध्र प्रदेश टूटे नहीं और लोगों को यह महसूस हो कि हमारे जो प्रॉब्लम हैं उनको हम खुद हल कर रहे हैं और हमारा जो पैसा है उसको खुद व्यय कर रहे हैं, प्लानिंग हम खुद कर रहे हैं। यह उनके दिमाग में है। जैसा उन्होंने बताया, सारी गारंटीज दी गई हैं कि आपका अलग प्लानिंग हो, सब कुछ दे रहे हैं तब यह साइकोलोजिकल सेटिस्फेक्शन क्यों नहीं देते। शायद असेम्बली और उसके मेम्बर्स का फर्क पड़ेगा। वहां पर असेम्बली रहेगी, शायद दो-तीन मंत्री बन जायेंगे, कुछ नेता लोग जिनका अभी सत्ता

में हिस्सा नहीं है वह वहां पर बैठ जाएंगे। शायद यही एक फर्क पड़ने वाला है। अगर यही फर्क पड़ने वाला है तो इसको कर दें, बाद में हो सकता है कि तेलंगाना के लोग कहें कि इसको खत्म करो, फिर एक प्रदेश बनाओ। इसलिए मैं इस चीज को पसन्द करता हूँ। इसलिए नहीं कि मैं यह चाहता हूँ, बल्कि इसलिए कि वह मजबूरी है वहां पर एजीटेशन खड़ा हुआ है, उसका अन्त करना है और उसका अन्त तभी हो सकता है, जब इस तरह का सोल्यूशन निकले, वरना अन्त होने वाला नहीं है।

जैसा मैंने शुरू में कहा, तेलंगाना में एजीटेशन जबरदस्त है। मैं वहां गया हूँ, हमारे लोग भी एजीटेशन में हैं। दुर्भाग्यवश हमारी पार्टी में वहां दो रायें हैं, कुछ आन्ध्र के लोग हैं वे चाहते हैं कि आन्ध्र टूटे नहीं, जैसे का तैसा रहे, लेकिन वे यह भी महसूस करते हैं कि वहां पर इनजस्टिस हुई है, उसको किसी न किसी तरह से दूर करना चाहिए और जो तेलंगाना के लोग हैं वे इस एजीटेशन में शरीक हैं। यह हालत हमारी पार्टी की भी है, लेकिन यह सही बात है कि तेलंगाना में जबरदस्त जन भावना है कि तेलंगाना को अलग कर देना चाहिए। अलग करना हम नहीं चाहते, इसलिये कोई न कोई सोल्यूशन, जैसा राज साहब ने बताया, हो सकता है और उसके बारे में सोचा जा सकता है। मेघालय का उन्होंने नाम लिया, मैं नहीं चाहता मेघालय जैसा ही बने।

श्री वी० वी० राजू : मेघालय पैटर्न मैंने कहा।

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : अभी रीजनल कमेटी है, उसको कुछ अधिकार देकर कुछ नाम दे दीजिए, अलग कर दीजिए, तो भी चल

सकता है, लेकिन साइकोलोजिकल सेटिस्फेक्शन होना चाहिए। तब तक यह मसला हल नहीं हो पाएगा।

साथ साथ मैं यह भी कहूंगा कि जो चौखम्बा राज्य की बात है उसको भी सोचना चाहिए। इसके साथ ही जो कांस्टीट्यूशन है उसको हमें बदलना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि जिस ढंग का कांस्टीट्यूशन बना है, उससे हमारा काम चलने वाला नहीं है। नई कांस्टीट्यूएंट असेम्बली बना कर नया कांस्टीट्यूशन बनाएं, जिसमें चौखम्बा राज्य का समावेश करें। तब जाकर हिन्दुस्तान में कोई चीज बनने वाली है, वरना जो पिटा-पिटाया रास्ता है, उस पर चलेंगे और उसी को कहेंगे कि इसी रास्ते पर चलने से उन्नति होगी, तो वह बात चलने वाली नहीं है। बहुत-सी नई नई फोर्सेज आ रही हैं, आगे जाकर पता नहीं हिन्दुस्तान में क्या होने वाला है। जहां पर राजनीतिक वातावरण में फर्क आता है वहां पर जनता में भी कुछ क्रान्ति आती है और फिर आगे जाकर उनका उद्देश्य बदल जाता है। आगे जाकर हिन्दुस्तान में क्या क्या चीज आने वाली है उसकी हम कल्पना भी नहीं कर सकते, लेकिन हमको अपने कांस्टीट्यूशन को ऐसे बनाना है जो हिन्दुस्तान की साधारण जनता के अनुकूल हो। मैं तो यह कहता हूँ कि हमारा कांस्टीट्यूशन दुर्भाग्यवश ऐसे बना कि उस वक्त ब्रिटिश हुकूमत थी, यहां पर उन्होंने उस वक्त के जो राजनीतिक लीडर्स थे उनको जमा करके कांस्टीट्यूएंट असेम्बली बनाई और उसने कांस्टीट्यूशन बना दिया, लेकिन हमने कभी भी इस कांस्टीट्यूशन को जनता के सामने नहीं रखा, जनता का समर्थन इसके लिए प्राप्त नहीं किया। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि कोई भी कांस्टीट्यूशन जो हिन्दुस्तान का बने, वह पूरे जन-समर्थन से बने और जनता का उसमें हाथ हो। इसलिये

[श्री गोडे मुराहरि]

मैं इस चीज के पक्ष में हूँ कि नया कांस्टीट्यूशन बने। उसमें इसका भी हम इन्तजाम कर सकते हैं कि जो धन है और जो व्यय है, वह चौखम्बा राज्य के हिसाब से कर दें ताकि ज़िला अपना अधिकार समझे, गांव अपना अधिकार समझे और जो स्टेट है, वह अपना अधिकार समझे, लेकिन स्टेट और सेंटर की एक-चौथाई सत्ता हो, उसकी जो ज़िम्मेदारी हो वह भी एक-चौथाई हो, नीचे की इकाइयों पर अधिक ज़िम्मेदारी हो। यह होना चाहिए। जब तक यह नहीं होगा, तब तक जो भाषा-वार प्रान्तों का मामला है, उसमें भी गड़बड़ी होगी। यह कहना कि जो भाषावार प्रान्त बनाए, वही ठीक है, उसमें कोई तब्दीली नहीं होनी चाहिए, यह भी सही नहीं है। हम देखें भाषावार प्रान्त कहां बनाए हैं। हिन्दी-स्पीकिंग स्टेट्स पांच हैं और उनमें एक भाषा बोलते हैं। जब हिन्दी-स्पीकिंग पांच स्टेट हो सकती हैं, तो दूसरी चार या दो हो सकती हैं, सुविधानुसार हो सकती हैं। हमने कहा कि जो प्रान्त बनेगा उसमें एक ही भाषा बोली जानी चाहिए, बाइ-लिंग्वल स्टेट नहीं होनी चाहिए, एक प्रान्त में दो भाषाएं नहीं बोली जा सकती, लेकिन एक भाषा के दो प्रान्त तो हो सकते हैं।

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Why five Hindi-speaking States?

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : मैं भी वही कह रहा हूँ। मैं यह नहीं चाहूंगा कि जो भाषावार प्रान्त बने हैं, वे टूटें लेकिन यह कहना कि इसको ऐसा बना दें कि कभी तोड़ना नहीं चाहिए वह ठीक नहीं होगा। यह सही है कि हमने काफी कुर्बानियां देकर आन्ध्र प्रदेश बनाया, विशाल आन्ध्र का काफी बड़ा मूवमेंट था। उसके बाद आन्ध्र प्रदेश बना, दूसरे भाषावार प्रान्त बने। इसलिए हमें देखना चाहिए कि ये प्रान्त टूटें नहीं, लेकिन साथ साथ जो जनता है,

जो बाकी रीजन्स हैं, उनकी मांग को देखना चाहिए। जनता की सहूलियत को सामने रख कर हम जो भी सका हल निकालें वह उचित हो।

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Sir, I come from Rayalaseema, an area which is famous or notorious for famines completely unirrigated, rainfall scanty, natural resources undeveloped and scarce, for more backward, if I may say so, than Telangana. I am not saying this to minimise the backwardness of Telangana. I concede it. Many Members will agree, today after 15 years since its integration, the position of Telangana is far, far better, twenty, thirty, forty times better than it was before. But because my area of Rayalaseema is backward, I am not going to insist upon an opinion poll, whether Rayalaseema should remain with Andhra Pradesh or not. I am not going to insist that the demands of Rayalaseema must be taken into account and its grievances removed. I would rather subordinate the interests of Rayalaseema to the higher interests of the State, the higher interest of unity, integration and general well-being. It is from that point of view, Sir, that I approach this question.

Since many Members have spoken about the Telangana grievances with facts and figures, and Mr. Raju has given a historical background of the movement, it is unnecessary for me to say any more on the subject. As a matter of fact, this debate which has taken place on a high level with the great objective of national unity in the forefront in the minds of everybody, this is not the time to speak more on the subject either denigrating the demand or accentuating the many grievances that have been expressed from different quarters.

Sir, the debate has almost unanimously showed that this House is unequivocally in favour of integration, that nothing should be done to impair the unity of the State and that nothing should be done by this process to impair the unity of the country. This House has almost unanimously and unequivocally also shown that regional or factional interest must be subordinated to the higher purpose of unity of the State as well as the unity of the country. Therefore, I do not feel called upon to speak any more on the subject. There is only one word I would like to add. Mr. Raju is a friend of mine, I make a public admission, a very great persona! friend of mine. And in

that spirit, I would like to appeal to him, after his having listened to the speeches in this House, not to bring up this matter again and again which will accentuate the agitation in Telengana, accentuate the differences between Telengana and Andhra, and accentuate the unconsciousness of the grievances of the people in Telengana. If you do that, the danger is that there will be a "stin ulu" to these kinds of agitations and less likelihood of the possibility of a settlement and solution to this problem, if any, to this question of Telengana. After all, if we have to live as a united State, as an integrated State it requires mutual understanding, a mutual appreciation which calls for living together. If we separate—I hope not—there would still be need for harmonious working between the two neighbours and, therefore, it should be our endeavour always not to accentuate such differences. Rather we should bring about an understanding and a solution by a mutual discussion and argument. I know that is a difficult process, a process which has been tried for long for over two years. But two years is not too long. It is a period to despair. I hope Mr. Rajuwi will appreciate my appeal. Undoubtedly, because of the spirit of the debate that has taken place, a new atmosphere will be generated throughout the country that this question has to be settled from an entirely different angle.

SHRI A. P. (HYTTERJEE: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, our party's position has been very clear from the very beginning. Our party even at the height of the struggle, at the height of agitation for a separate Telengana State in Telengana itself carried on a propaganda among the people, its own line of propaganda among the Telengana peasants, among the Telengana workers that it is not in the interest of the Telengana toiling people to be victims of a conspiracy that was being hatched out by certain vested interests particularly landlords of those areas, to create fissiparous tendencies amongst the Telugu-speaking people so that they might be diverted from their struggle against the landlord-capitalist clique which was wanting to suck them dry, which was waiting to exploit them more fully and more concretely. During the Telengana struggle we carried on this line among the Telengana people.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, in fact, it is the Telugu-speaking people in Telengana who have built up a different image for

themselves, so to say. They have still that image for themselves throughout India. That image they have built for themselves of selfless struggle, particularly by the peasants and the toiling people against the landlords and the exploiters of the area. Who does not know the famous struggle of the Telengana peasants against the Nizam autocracy, Nizam feudalism? You know, Sir, when that struggle reached its peak, Sardar Patel sent his troops from India, not so much against the Razakars and the Nizam, but against the Telengana peasants because Sardar Patel was afraid that the fire, that the spark that had been lighted and kindled by the Telugu-speaking peasants and workers in Telengana, might kindle a fire throughout India. And that was why in a rather unseemly haste, the troops were sent not so much against the Razakars and the Nizam as against the peasants of Telengana so that the peasants' struggle might be stopped. And even though the struggle of the peasants of Telengana stopped at that time, it has risen in crescendo again and again. We have found that the Vatsalandhra movement was also a movement mainly of the peasants and workers of Telengana. By their blood, by their sacrifice, they got the State. Even in the height of the struggle for Telengana, when we found that these landlords in the different districts of Telengana were inciting certain young people and students in the towns of Telengana to agitate for a separate Telengana, the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, Mr. Brahmananda Reddy, was carrying on his infamous *pada yatra* through Nalgonda district and was telling the landlord, of Nalgonda "Do your goondaism against the peasants. Do not give them their rights." And the goondas and the landlords of Nalgonda began to beat up the peasants, began to kill the peasants of Nalgonda district. That is why you see two pictures. The same landlords who were inciting the youths and students of the towns of Telengana against the Andhra Government on a particular issue, on the issue of a separate Telengana, were at the same time joining hands with Mr. Brahmananda Reddy and his policemen in putting down the movement of the peasants of Telengana so that the peasants of Telengana do not raise their heads and get their rights. These are the two pictures of Telengana that we find. In order to divert the people from the struggle of the toiling people, of the peasants and the workers, the vested interests, particularly the landlords of the Telengana area and of the non-Telengana area have been inciting certain immature youths and

[Shri A. P. Chattetjee]

also certain students to (igljt for the fiassiparaous tendency, for a separate Telengma State, so that this agitation might cause a «'ift, a permanent rift, between the workers of Telengana and the workers of the non-Telengaaa districts, between the peasants of the Telengana districts and the peasants of the no n-Telengana districts, so that their exploitation may be carried on absolutely free, so that they might set the people of one district against the people of another. In . that way, they •wanted to have their own regime of ex-p'oitrH'^ri completely free fr«im any restriction, free from any obstacle.

Now, when the question of the movement, etc., comes, who does not know that the Birias. who have their factories there, who have their workshop; there, ciosed their factories in the early month; of 1969 in order that the employees in those factories, might participate in the struggle for separate Telengana? It is comoon knowledge and it has come out in the press how the Birias ciosed their factories in order that the emp'oyee; might participate in the separate Telengana movement. Therefore, Sir, the p isition is quite clear—actually in whose interest the separate Telengana movement was being carried on. I am cognisant of the fact that this movement has resulted in much bloodshed and this movement has resulted in a number of deaths. But it is also quite clear that this bloodshed and these deaths have been caused by unscrupulous persons w'ho want to divert the attention of the people from their p 11-7 demands so that they may be misguided and taken on a wrong track. After ali, after ^5 years, of independence, the Congress leaders who represent certain particular interests there—some Congress leaders of Telengana districts represent the landlords of their di»ti|cts and some Congress leaders of nan Telengana districts represent the landlords of their districts—have not been able to solve a single problem of Andhra Pradc: h. They are now creatng a r j ft among themseive:. They are making the people of one set of districts fight against the people of another set of districts in order to hoodwink the masses, in order to mislead the people, in order to shut out the real problems from the eyes of the people. That is the game, and to that game no doubt the people of Telengana had fallen victims for some time. Therefore, the attitude of our party, the policy of our party, the line of action of our party j_s that w' i have to try and tell the toiling people not to fall at all victims to the fissiparous ten- I

demy which is being created by certain vested interests and their Congress representatives in both parts of Andhra Pradesh.

Now, it has been said by Mr. Raju that the youths have supported this movement. It is true that youths have fallen victims to such propaganda in many places. Who does not know about the Shiv Sena activity in Maharashtra? We also find that the Slvv Sena has been able to win the allegiance of a lot of young people. Who does not know of the Lachit Sena in Assam? The Lachit Sena of Assam was also able to win the alityiince of many young people of Assam. This Lachit Sena is turning ihe wrath of the people of A am, to a certain extent the young people of Assam, from their real object, viz-, the landlord-capitalist cliciue, to the non-Assamese. The Shiv Sena is also doing the same thing. It is trying to turn the wrath of the young people of Maharashtra from their real object, namely, the landlord-capitalist clique, to hatred of non-MaharashU;ans. It is the young people who have fallen victims to the nefarious propaganda of the Shiv Sena. It is these young people who are now beating up and killing people of non-Maharashtrian origin. And they are even killing Muslims in Maharashtra. Therefore, it i, no! a question of young people being i n a particular movement or not. The young people have been missMidcd, are being misguided, by certain interested people, by certain interested circles.

It is being said that Telengana is a backward region. Now, Sir, we do not understand this kind of logic. As has been pointed out by many speakers who have preceded me, there are many places, many areas, many regions, wh'cn are backward. Now, if on the plea of backwardness, separate States or ub-States or mini-States are to be created, then India will be divided into r,ooi mini-States or sub-States. Look at our own State of West Bengal. Look at Calcutta. Nobody will say that Calcutta is not a developed region. It is a developed region. After all, Calcutta is a place which secures half the foreign exchange earnings of India. Calcutta is a place in which almost half the capital of India is invested. Lis a developed region.' But what do we find? Calcutta is a big slum. Most of the people are unemployed. About one million people are deprived of the amenities of life, not to speak of modern amenities. {Time bell rings} I will take some time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are many other speakers.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Whenever I speak, you always begin to say....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not only you, I have requested at least half a dozen Member.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: You should have done it in the beginning.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do not allege that I am doing it only to you. This is unfair, you should not say such things.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: I will take some more time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already taken 12 minutes. I have requested almost every Member and every Member has been responding to my request.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: After the 10th minute you began to say this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Alter the 12th minute.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: After the 10th minute. I do not understand this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Samuel finished in 8 minutes, Mr. Dharia in 9 minutes and Mr. Panda in 11 minutes. And I have asked you after 12 minutes. This is unfair, you should not make such observation.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: We have got a special issue and we have to say that. I shall take just that time which is necessary for saying that. Then I shall sit down; I shall not take more time.

Therefore, the question of backwardness is absolutely a relative question, as I was saying just now. I was referring to Calcutta. Now it is developed from the economic point of view, but as I was saying, one million people are deprived of amenities of life, even though it acquires half the foreign exchange. We find that most of the people are unemployed. So, the question is not this that whether a particular State will be a separate State; the question is not this whether a particular set of industries will have to be shifted there; the question is not this whether a

separate budget will have to be made for a separate region of the country, but the question is this that the poverty and misery which has been imposed on the people and that poverty and misery is the creation of a particular class of people and if that particular class of people is not uprooted from the social life of the country, this kind of problem will always arise. Those who are now agitating for a separate Telangana or some such separate State or sub-State, they actually want people of India to forget this. That is why it is in their interest and the vested interests whom they represent when they are saying and they have been insisting that a separate Telangana will solve all the problems.

Sir, our line of action is quite clear and it is this that the problem of the people of Telangana can be solved if the Telangana people along with the people of other districts of Andhra Pradesh outside Telangana wage a united struggle against the landlord-capitalist clique. After all, the capitalists, particularly the Birlas, who have several factories in the Telangana region and the Andhra region, they are behind this movement. They are starting this movement, they are financing this movement, they are inciting this movement and after inciting this movement and after starting this movement, they are creating such problems, such situations, such tension in the country in which they think that the workers and peasants' movement will perhaps lose all its force. That is why they are after this kind of separate movement.

Sir, as far as the Telangana people are concerned, our party has appealed to them from the beginning of 1969 and even in the height of the movement, our party workers went to them and told them not to be misled by this mischievous propaganda of the landlord-capitalist clique. Though some section of the youth and some section of the students of Telangana fell victims to this mischievous propaganda by the capitalist-landlord clique, but I must tell you with satisfaction that the great masses of the workers and the peasants never fell victims to it. On the one hand, as I said, we saw that the youths who fell victims to such propaganda were burning buses in the town of Telangana, but on the other hand, we found in the district of Nalgonda and other districts of Telangana that the peasants, when the separatist movement was going on at the same time, were waging on their bitter struggle against the landlords. Shri Brahmanda Reddy, who was at loggerheads with Shri

[Shri A. P. Chatterjee]

Ghenna Reddy went on a *padayatra* to Nalgonda in order to incite the same landlords who were against him on another level to set their goondas against these peasants so that the peasant movement is stopped. Our point of view is and I would appeal to the people of Telengana, particularly the student and the youth section, not to fall a victim to this kind of mischievous propaganda. Let them fight shoulder to shoulder with the toiling people of Telengana, with the peasants and workers, let them fight not for a separatist movement, but join the united struggle for a better life. Let them fight to exterminate the landlord bourgeoisie rule in the Telengana itself, in Andhra itself and throughout India and only then they can bring about a happy and prosperous life for the people of that region. That will also be a signal for happy and better life throughout India as Vishwananda was a signal for the linguistic provinces throughout India. Similarly, the Telengana peasants and workers should begin their struggle against the landlord-bourgeoisie clique and try for a better life. That will be a signal for an acute struggle.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. Member now conclude? You are a senior Member of the House, you must cooperate.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: I am respecting the Chair, but you did not say anything when Shri Bhupesh Gupta was speaking. Where was your ruling at that time? But you are disturbing me from the tenth minute onwards. I do not understand this. I am absolutely dissatisfied by the way you treat me. I express my dissatisfaction.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I rang the bell after the twelfth minute. This charge is unfair. Members have completed their speeches in 8 minutes, 9 minutes and 10 minutes. Every body has to express his views.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Our party has a separate line and we have to express it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Everybody has got his point of view. Now, Shri Akbar Ali Khan.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the Parliament and to all concerned that

recognizing the delicacy and importance of the problem of Telengana and Andhra Pradesh, they have fixed this debate. I am glad to say, by and large, the standard of debate has been very high and has been helpful to find a solution in good spirit and in a very brotherly manner.

Now, Sir, I would just mention one or two things because probably I am the only person who was in that meeting when this "gentlemen's agreement" was signed in 1956. Sir, two things are very clear. One was that the Fazl Ali Committee unanimously had recommended that Telengana should be a separate State for five years and after that if a two-third majority desires, then the integration could come in. Let it be very clear. The other thing was, the decision of the High Command, the Working Committee of the Congress which resolved that if the decision of the Fazl Ali Committee was unanimous, in such a situation the Government of India would not interfere with that recommendation unless the people unanimously ask for the change of that decision. In that connection, Sir, there was a separatist movement for Telengana when we had, more or less, final talks with the late Prime Minister—I was there. Shri Ranga Reddy was there, Shri Chenna Reddy was there—and he appealed to us in the greater interests of India and the Telugu speaking people to join Andhra and said "let us work together, let us try this experiment instead of joining after five years."

Sir, considering the question that all Telugu-speaking people should be one—it is true that we should be one but we had been divided for the last 200 years—so it was the desire, unanimous desire, from all sides that there should be one State but at the same time it was felt that on account of this long period, certain customs, certain conditions have arisen apart from the backwardness which do require certain adjustments. Then Sir, I tell you, just like brothers, we sat in the Hyderabad House. There was a gentleman's agreement. Now people try to find out, well, this condition is not there, that condition is not there. The Supreme Court has also come on us saying that it does not conform to the provision of the Constitution. In the brotherly spirit, we entered into that agreement and it was a question of confidence between two brothers and that was finalised. I would also remind my friends to remember the speeches that Shri Gopala Reddy, Shri Sanjiva

Reddy and other leaders who were the prominent leaders of the Andhra Assembly gave at Kurnool, where they said "We will give more than this gentleman's agreement". We -v -ill really treat them as our brothers. We atever it is, somehow that gentlemen's agreement was not kept up. And as pointed out by Mr. Raju and by some other Members, many lapses have come in. Let me tell you that I do not blame my Andhra brothers for that. I am equally guilty, Mr Raju is equally guilty. All the Telangan leaders, all the Telengana Ministers, all the Telengana M.P.s and M. L. A. s are equally guilty. We were not alert. We were also indifferent. We were also not careful to see that everything went nicely. To that extent I do not apportion the blame. I think we are also to blame. Now the question is we have to find out some way or how and where we can live with the same brotherly feeling. You know here and out of me I have expressed my view and I am definitely of the view that we should live together but only if you restore confidence. I do not agree with some of my friends who said that this has been a cooked-up movement. No. My own reading is—although I do not agree with it—this is a genuine movement and what Mr. Raju has expressed is a genuine feeling of the people of Telengana.

SHRI V. B. RAJU: Sir, you will excuse me for a small interruption. If anything has been exaggerated here, we may be kept aside and let a House committee consisting of Mr. Chatterjee, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and some other friends, to study the situation there and let them suggest to us if we have exaggerated even a bit of it. We agree to be kept out.

SHRI AKBARALI KHAN: As I said, so far as the question of the feeling of the Telengana people I am concerned, my own reading is that a feeling for separate Telengana is strong.

SHRI K. P. SIBRAMANIA MENON: Our party unit is herein Telengana and...

SHRI AKBARALI KHAN: No, Mr. Menon, I am not yielding. Please do not interrupt.

SHRI K. P. SIBRAMANIA MENON:.. it is very much in the knowledge of the situation there and we have expressed our view. We do not have to tour that place.

SHRI AKBARALI KHAN: I want to express the feeling of the people there as I studied. And what I am afraid is that if a realistic approach is not there, there will be more sacrifices, there will be more bloodshed, there will be more difficulties, and in 1972 I am not sure what the result will be. My assessment is that 80 per cent or more of the Telengana people will support a separate Telengana. I do not want a separate Telengana. But I think the statesman like view demands, wisdom demands, that we sit together and try to bring about some solution which would be in the interests of both the regions and which at the same time would not create a bad feeling and lead to a separate State. That is my approach and regarding that I would not go into details because we have already sat late. I would give only two things which I demand the Home Ministry should give its immediate and practical attention to.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: What is your suggestion?

SHRI AKBARALI KHAN: I am coming to that. One thing is this. We decided six months back in the Consultative Committee representing all political parties that there should be a round-table conference immediately called. Mr. Chavan was presiding over that meeting. I do not know what the position now is. According to our understanding, the unanimous decisions of the Consultative Committee are obligatory and the Government has to implement them. My point is let not only the Telengana leaders, but the Andhra leaders also come and sit for discussions. I do not agree that only the Telengana leaders be consulted because the other day when I was speaking in connection with the functioning of the Home Ministry, Mr. Chavan said, "Well, we met them".

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: That will be injecting life into a movement which is already beaten out.

SHRI AKBARALI KHAN: No, you are wrong there, Mr. Chatterjee. You come with me...

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: The Prime Minister had called a round-table conference last year and hammered out some proposals.

SHRI AKBARALI KHAN: I am coming to that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. j Akbar Ali Khan, you have got very little | time.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN ! What about these interruptions ?

What I submit is that the Prime Minister wanted this conference, but that was a separate thing. I do not think there was a meeting—I am saying this subject to correction—where the Andhra leaders and the Telengana leaders sat together and tried to discuss the matter. No. From the very beginning, since March, 1969 when the PGC meeting was held in Hyderabad which was attended by about 500 people from both the regions, I said and I repeat today that it is a matter of two brothers and neither the Central Government nor the State Government will be able to do anything, let us sit together, some representatives from the Andhra region and some representatives from the Telengana region, and try to solve this problem. And I stand by it. Since things have not come in that way, I demand from the Government of India that a round-table conference of the leaders of both the regions should be immediately called under the chairmanship of the Home Minister or the Prime Minister. Now, it is true that the Prime Minister and the Government of India have discussed this matter and the latest situation is that the 7th March, 1970 announcement has been gazetted in which more powers have been given to the Regional Committee. My own view is, let them sit together and consider these powers. Now, they have left it to the discretion of the Governor which I do not want. *(Interruption)* But I am sure when the leaders of both the regions sit together and have this before them, I have no doubt that they will come to some settlement. Let the Government make the decision of the Telengana Committee obligatory, statutory, if necessary, by an amendment of the Constitution. That is my practical proposal and I do hope that they will give consideration to it.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL : Why do you object to the Governor being given the discretion in the matter?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : It is because we know what the position of the Governor is. You must remember that I will have to go to the people to tell them and satisfy them. Even the Ministers cannot go and address public meetings...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You must finish now.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : And I am grateful to Mr. Raju; although h> other friends want a separate State, he suggested a sub-State. I am sure I will be able to do something, though I do not want to say positively these powers are given constitutional and statutory authority; in that position we can face the public Mr. Raju will face the public, but I know we will have difficulty. But as we have been working for so many years in public life we will be able to do something. It is true as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta suggested...

(Zntempti-Mt By Shri A. P. Ckutterjet)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : No interruptions please.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN . Please sit down, Mr. Chatterjee. If you do not understand, please keep quiet.

What I want to say is that we have an uphill task and if they do not do it now, in 1972 they will repent it. All my friends here may please take this warning from me because in that case probably a separate Telengana will be unavoidable, and I want to avoid that and in order to avoid that, let us come and sit together and come to some amicable conclusion.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : I rise on a point of order. My point of order is this. It is a point of procedure. For how many minutes did Mr. Akbar Ali Khan speak? The point is this ..

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I will tell you, he has spoken for twelve minutes and I reminded him three minutes earlier.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN; : Let us not waste the time DOW.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : My point of order is this. I was speaking on behalf of my party and I was the sole member of behalf of my party and I was giving my own party's attitude to the problem. Mr. Akbar Ali Khan is a member on the Congress Party and the Congress Party's attitude has already been made known. And now you gave him twelve minutes without disturbing him. When I had hardly spoken for ten minutes you rang the bell. I am only drawing your attention to it. You gave one hour to Mr. Raju.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I was not in the Chair. I think the Congress Party was entitled to two hours but it took only 64 minutes.

SHRI A. P. C. JATTERJEE : Why did you give more time to Mr. Raju? Sir, it seems I have been misunderstood.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : According to the allotment of time your party would have got ten minutes and even then you are making allegations; this is not proper.

SHRI A. P. JATTERJEE : Sir, you gave one hour to the man who began and when I was giving my party's line, you rang the bell when I had hardly spoken for ten minutes. I express my dissatisfaction over it. I am of course bound to obey you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Un- fortunately you are not obeying the Chair while speaking.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : I think the Chair is not responsible for this. I am responsible for it because I was in the Chair and I gave that much time to Mr. Raju because I thought he was representing that school of thought.

SHRI A. P. C. JATTERJEE : I also represent a school of thought and this school of thought we have been representing since 1946.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Villalan.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, when our hon. friend Shri V. R. Raju, argues the case for a separate Telengana. I see a very good lawyer arguing a very good case. He advanced argument after argument to justify the demand for a separate Telengana. I heard with rapt attention all the arguments advanced by the other Members also. Nobody denies the backwardness of Telengana; nobody denies the genuine grievances put forth by our friend Shri V. R. Raju.

SHRI SANI NARAYANAPPA (Andhra Pradesh) : They have taken Rs. 22 crores from the Central Government to remove backwardness and still it is said that backwardness continues.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN : Sir, I may be allowed to have my say without

any interruption by any member. My submission would be that the demand of the people of Telengana would be clearly understood if I read the following passage from this book "The Telengana Movement" and I would seek the indulgence of the House for doing so. It says:

"The problem is to see whether Telengana will pose a threat to national integration. Telengana is not the sole example of a historical sub-culture suffering under a system of administrative and constitutional repression. There are several such sub-cultures, like the Vidarbha in Maharashtra, Saurashtra in Gujarat, Madhya Bharat in Madhya Pradesh, Jharkhand in Bihar, Coorg in Mysore, Jammu in Kashmir and several such attitudinal sub-cultures in the bigger States like U.P., Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan. The fear of the majority is counter-balanced by the hopes of others. In such a situation the point of relevance is to find out a solution not for Telengana alone but for all such other sub-cultural units which are suffering and grumbling in the present set-up. Several courses are open to meet this challenge. The problem is not a regional one and to identify it with regionalism will be as erroneous as to identify it with national disintegration, for regionalism is the latest casualty of ideological confusion in India. Telengana, politically speaking, is not a problem of national disintegration or integration, but a problem of national reorganisation. It therefore cannot be called subversive, disintegrative or anti-national, unless of course national integration is equated with the perpetuation of the *status quo*, a pseudo-political unity and annihilation of these attitudinal sub-cultural autonomous units. Such an equation can find any sort of justification, moral, social, political or economic, only in a society where people have been reduced to servility under a strong and corrupt and demoralising establishment.

* * * * *

Telengana therefore is a beginning of national reorganisation. The argument from history cannot hold because historical achievement is always subject to historical reversal. There is nothing like permanence in history as well as society. History has to change, if the changes are compulsive and such

[Shri Thillai Villalan] compulsive reasons seem to be quite obvious in case of Telengana. The arguments of the economic viability are equally trite. Any State is not viable by itself economically or other wise, it is viable by the will of its people. Telenffana is a sad example of political failure in our national life. It has proved that the caps between our institutions' processes and procedures, and between our cherished goals of social justice, equality and progress is quite wide. It shows how manipulative policies can throw back millions of people in the process of development. The wounds in case of Telengana are too deep to be healed by remedial measures for they have become permanent through historical perpetuation.

Telengana therefore needs a surgical treatment of which separation may be one of the parts. But the remedy suggested in one case may not be applicable in others. The other sufferers like Telengana may receive political treatment according to their individual political diagnosis. Telengana therefore cannot be made a scapegoat for the prophets of national doom or the champion of *status quo*, conformism and establishment. In a dynamic democratic society change is an inevitable consequence and those who fail to see the writing on the wall are either washed away in tide of change or are thrown into oblivion by time. The wisdom of any society and of its leaders lies in their capacity not only in anticipating change but also in guiding the lines of change in such a way that the basic values of that society are not lost. How Telengana as an attitudinal sub-culture will preserve its identity will not be decided as much by what the nation thinks about it, or by considerations of viability or economic feasibility or administrative convenience etc., as by the ways and wisdom, through which the people of Telengana will find a meaning in the present wind of political change."

From this, Sir, we find the real mind of the people; they want remedies for their grievances. (*Intertupli.m*) You can get a copy of the book from the sponsor; of the movement, if you like. So, Sir, my submission would be, the solution suggested by the people themselves is there; that is the demand for separate Telengana. Our hon. friend, Mr. V. B. I Raju, was very hesitant in suggesting his

own view or solution for this problem. He often says it is the demand of the people, it is the demand of the people; I am for integrated Andhra but the people demand it. Anyhow, Sir, the position is this. The patient is now coming forward to prescribe the treatment he wants. Why has this situation arisen? It is because the agony of the disease is not felt by the doctor or his own relatives. The agony of the disease is not removed by any treatment, whether it is medicinal or surgical but the patient is feeling the agony of the disease, the pain of the disease and no doctor is prepared to attend. Then he says, you give me some pills, you give me some medicines and then he goes to the extreme extent and says, you do some operation, you do some surgical treatment to remove the pain. That is the real position. And who is the doctor? The doctor is the Central Government. It is always delaying the solution of problems. For the past two years we see in papers that there are four or five burning problems in the country and one among them is the Telengana problem. Chandigarh, the Central Government should decide, Telengana, the Central Government should decide, the Privy purse, the Central Government should decide, but the doctor always delays. Delay is always dangerous. You know, Sir, in the field of judiciary there is one maxim, justice delayed is justice denied. My point is this and my accusation is this. If the Government takes proper steps at the proper time there will be no such extreme step by the Telengana people. You know, I am one of the advocates for separation from the country itself; we were once, not now. But I myself feel that this is not the treatment required for the Telengana people. For a mere headache there is no necessity for an operation, for a mere flu attack there is no necessity for a surgical operation. But the demand is there because the pain is so much. That is why they demand. Because patients are not doctors, they do not know the nature of the treatment required for them. They want to be relieved from the pain, so they want a surgical operation. Therefore my submission would be that a proper treatment should be given by the Central Government. They have failed in this and that is why the extreme stand is taken by the people of Telengana. I would request in this connection that the people of Telengana should wait. This is all due to non-implementation of the terms of the gentleman's agreement. Of course, nowadays gentlemen are very rare in the country. That is why the terms of the

gentleman's at-cement are not honoured, and are not inplemented. We can have some other honourable men's agreement to settle this problem of Telengana within a short time. With these words I conclude, Sir.

SHRI MULA GOVINDA REDDY

(Mysore) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it was expected that the Planning Commission would look into the regional imbalances in the different States and chalk out a solution for removing these regional imbalances. What has happened in Telangana is that that area which was backward, which was neglected under the rule of the Nizam, was not given proper attention. The SRC had recommended that this Telangana area should be a separate State for five years and afterwards if they so desired they can merge with Andhra but at that time good tense prevailed on the leaders of both the parts, Telangana and Andhra Pradesh, that they should come together and that they should form Vishal Andhra. I was one of the persons associated with that. Mr. Raju was also there on the usual Andhra Committee and Vishal Andhra came into being. While this Vishal Andhra came into being an agreement was signed and safeguards were incorporated in the Constitution but unfortunately those terms of the agreement have not been fulfilled at all. There was an agreement that the Government services in Telangana should be given proper protection; there was an agreement that the income derived from Telangana should be spent for the development of Telangana; there was an agreement that a Regional Council should be constituted; there was an agreement that there should be a Deputy Chief Minister from Telangana if not a Chief Minister from Telangana. But only once there was a Deputy Chief Minister from Telangana. So from the very beginning till 1969 these terms of the agreement were never fulfilled by the rulers of Andhra. It is unfortunate that they did not agree to implement the terms of the agreement to which they were a party. Apart from this, the regional imbalance that was there in Telangana was not properly looked after and proper solutions were not found to solve the backwardness of this area and as has already been pointed out by some friends even in the services their grievances were not met. They were not given proper opportunities with regard to promotions, with regard to increments, etc. So this culminated in the agitation

which was started in the early part of 1969. But what has happened. I do not agree with Mr. Chatterjee and others that this was a propped up agitation; this was a genuine agitation. This has got the backing of the people of the Telangana area. Schools were closed for more than a year. Sixteen lakh school and college students boycotted the schools and colleges for nearly a year. The police resorted to firing more than 200 times and more than 300 people died on account of police firing. Today, Sir, prohibitory orders are in force in the cities of Hyderabad and Secunderabad for the last one year or so. The Assembly cannot meet freely; the Members of the Assembly cannot move about freely. Even the Chief Minister and the Ministers of the Andhra Pradesh Government cannot move about freely. They have always to be accompanied by the police force. That is the situation in Telangana. What I am driving at is that this demand for separate Telangana is backed up by the entire people of Telangana. We may dispute it but the fact is that it is backed by the entire people of Telangana. So what is the solution for this? The grievances, the real grievances of the peasantry of Telangana, the real grievances of the middle classes in Telangana should be met. And they have not been met. The announcement made by the Prime Minister with regard to the eight-point programme has not met with the acceptance of the leaders of Telangana. The unanimous Resolution of the Consultative Committee of the Home Ministry which had said that a round-table conference should be convened to thrash out this problem once and for all has not been respected. So much so there is a crisis of confidence. The people of Telangana have lost confidence in the rulers of Andhra Pradesh; the people of Telangana have lost confidence in the Central Government as well. It is the bounden duty of the Central Government to see that the Constitution is properly implemented, that equal opportunities are provided to all sections of the people. So this demand has grown in strength and in depth and therefore it is wrong to brush it aside saying that it is a movement backed by disgruntled politicians. There might be disgruntled politicians and always the disgruntled politicians will try to fish in troubled waters but this is a movement which is backed by the entire people of Telangana. Schools have been closed, colleges have been closed, factories do not function and people cannot move about in the Telangana area. That is the position. Therefore I suggest that

[Shri toulka Govinda Rcaddy.] an immediate solutuion should be found for this problem. A round-table conference of leader.s o'p'al! political parties and leaders of both the regions should be convened. Parliament cannot sit idle in this matter. We cannot be simply spectators of what is happening in Telengana.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) In the Chair]

You must take into account.the feelings of the Telengana people when you find a solution. It is the bounden duty of this Parliament to find a solution. A committee of Parliament should go to the Telengana area and see for itself the happenings that are taking place in Telengana. We should also try that this Committee meets leaders of political parties, leaders of Telengana as well as of Andhra region, and they should formulate a solution which should be acceptable to boih the regions. That is my suggestion.

Thank you.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Sir, I think I am the last speaker.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : No, there is one more, Mr. Mallikarjunudu. I hope that you will both co-operate with the House and . . .

SHRI CHITTA BASU : You cannot expect my co-operation alone. Since you disregard our plea for co-operation you cannot claim co-operation from us. You did not co-operate with me.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, as you know, I am one of those who belong to the mainstream of the democratic mass movement of our country. You know that I am one of those who have never approached a problem from a parochial or communal or a regional point of view. But here is a problem called the Telengana problem which has been described by many as if it is a parochial problem, as if it is a regional problem, as if it is the result of a fratricidal war between two groups of people belonging to the same State. Permit me to state that it is no' such a problem. Had it been a fratricidal war I would not have come forward to take part in the debate at all. I would have condemned it with all the emphasis at my command. Sir, since I have not got much time at my -I I will only discuss the most relevant and

the most important points which are I think related to the present issue. As you yourself have mentioned while you were speaking the merger of Telengana and Andhra was not merely on the basis of the SRC recommendations. If you accent that the SRC Report was the basis for the reorganisation of the States of India the matter would have been entirely different. But history shows—and I have got all the documents at my disposal to prove—that it was a merger between Telengana districts and the Andhra region on the basis of certain pre-conditions. As a matter of fact, if you permit me to read the relevant portion of the SRC's recommendations you would naturally find that the SRC recommendation was not for immediate merger. The merger was to be made after same time after fulfilling certain conditions. I read paragraph 386 of the SRC Report :

"It will be in the interest of Andhra as well as of Te'engana ...

And this is for Mr. Chatterjee to note.

"...if for the present Telengana area is constituted as a separate State with a proviso for unification with Andhra after the general election likely to be held in or about 1954 if by a two-thirds majority the legislature of the residuary Hyderabad expressed itself in favour of such unification."

Naturally there has never been any pre-condition for reorganisation of any linguistic State in any part of the country. Again, I would say that in the reorganisation of the States the SRC's recommendation has not been the last word. Even after the reorganisation of Punjab as a bilingual State there has been Haryana, there has been Nagaland, there has been Megha'aya. I think the recommendation of the SRC is not the last word in the matter of reorganisation or reforming of the States in the country. Anyway, Sir, as you have pointed out rightly and as many other Members have also pointed out rightly, the merger took place on the basis of certain pre-conditions and that pre-condition was the gent Ionian's agreement. Whether they were gentlemen or not is a matter that can be discussed. Since I do not belong to Andhra State I have got no personal likes or dislikes of any of these so-called gentlemen; nor am I associated with either this faction of the Andhra politics or that, faction of the Andhra politics. Therefore I have no predilections with regard to the internal

politics of Andhra but I have got facts to suggest that there has been violation, violent violation of this gentleman's agreement. I think you would not permit me because my time is very short but I have a catalog or a list showing how each and every item, how each and every clause of this gentleman's agreement has been honoured more in breach than in implementation—Mr. Raju might have mentioned some but the major question is regarding service guarantees and the income which is diverted from the Telengana region to be spent on the development of the Telengana area. Apart from other things, these two constitute the most important points of the gentleman's agreement. Sir, it has been found not only by the Andhra Pradesh Members of the Assembly or Va - Ministers there but also by the Committee set up by the Government. And the person who was authorised by the Comptroller General of India has also found that there have been surpluses of Telengana which ought to have been spent for the development of Telengana but which have been diverted to the Andhra region and the amount which they have calculated—Mr. Kumar Lalit says—is Rs. 46 crores. This is based on some criteria but if certain other criteria are accepted it comes to Rs. 80 crores or something more than that as has been suggested by the Regional Committee for Telengana.

7. P. M.

Now, the Bhargava Committee was there. They also said that the surplus was to the tune of Rs. 28 crores, I have got no time to elaborate, but because of this diversion of funds derived from the Telengana region—it was a surplus region before the merger and the Andhra State was deficit by Rs. 1 crore—there has been a different kind of development pattern in agriculture, in industry, in education, in irrigation, in the use of inputs for the development of agriculture. I can show by facts and figures and everybody knows how a different pattern of development was there between the region of Telengana and the region of Andhra. Now, the question arises. In spite of all these things, the Government of Andhra Pradesh and the Government of India remained silent over what was happening there. It has to be borne in mind that it was not merely a gentleman's agreement, but it also got some statutory shape by way of the Public Employment (Requirement of Residence) Act, 1957 and article

371 of the Constitution was amended to give the gentleman's agreement statutory shape and the Telengana Regional Committee was set up. The gentleman's agreement was also given some statutory shape. In spite of this, I was no parity of development between the two regions, although it was agreed upon the gentleman's agreement and subsequently given statutory shape. IBM has become the root cause of the unrest and dissatisfaction of the people of Telengana.

Now, some of our friends have said, particularly Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and Mr. Arun Prakash Chatterjee, that the movement which has been launched by the people of Telengana is not a popular movement or a people's movement. Because his communist party does not support it, because Mr. Bhupesh Gupta as communist party does not support U* movement, they have come to this conclusion. Any movement which is not supported by the communist party is not a popular movement.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : I think Mr. Ghitta Basu is distorting what we have said. We have said that this is certainly a movement, but it is a misguided movement, it is a movement by the youth and students in the interest of the landlord bourgeoisie clique.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Do not come to the conclusion that any movement which is not supported by the communist party is not a people's movement, it cannot help you.

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA (Orissa) : Because the Shiv Sena is not supported by the communist party do you mean to say that it is not a popular movement?

SHRI CHITTA BASU : It would be wrong to say that. It would be also wrong to equate the Shiv Sena movement and the Ekaikya Sena movement with the movement of the Telengana people. It would be absolutely wrong, because the Shiv Sena movement is based on a particular thing, whereas the Telengana people's movement has as its aim a dilhi Hone! They want justice. They want to remove regional imbalance within the framework of the Constitution.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : What about the Telengana movement, which is the name of a separate Telengana, is raping women and scrawling obscene things on the walls?

SHRI V. B. RAJU : This is very unjust.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : This is a very serious charge. Mr. A. P. Chatterjee does not know where Telengana is. I know where Telengana is and I have myself taken the trouble of travelling the different districts of Telengana *in cognito*, not letting it known to the people that I belong to a particular party, that I am a Member of Parliament, that I have come to discuss things with them. I saw with a great sense of pride peasants and workers in their thousands courting arrest. The Government could not get them arrested and take them to jails. Schools and colleges were converted into jails. For one year or for more than eighteen months all the educational institutions were either converted into military barracks or jails. There was a huge mass upheaval and if I may be permitted to say it, he has brought in certain things, whether the Birlas have financed it, etc. It is reported that Mr. Justice Basu is also to a certain extent..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Please leave that.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : All these extraneous matters are brought forward in order to divert the attention of Parliament from the real issues involved. Therefore, I seriously disapprove the characterisation made by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta or Mr. A. P. Chatterjee as regards the movement of Telengana. It is a genuine, people's, democratic movement, for the fulfilment of the hopes and aspirations of the people of Telengana. It is a part of the vast, democratic movement in our country. As one of those who have ever defended democratic movements in the country, I am proud of the movement launched by the people of Telengana. It is not a fratricidal war. It is not a movement launched by the vested interests. It is a movement by the Telengana people for a new Telengana to be built by the workers and peasants, not in the interests of the Birlas or the Tatas or the vested interests. It is the new generation which can bring about the rebirth of Telengana and with the coming into being of a new Telengana the hopes and aspirations of millions of people of Telengana, whom we have denied so far opportunities, will be fulfilled.

Now, the question comes, what is the solution ? I would have been glad if there had been a viable solution to the

problem without separation. He has spoken very much about the integration of the nation. Is it not his party which supported the Muslim League to have Pakistan on the basis of communal slogans and on the basis of religion ? They always speak and wax eloquent about the integration of the nation. The Telengana people do not want to go outside the framework of the Constitution or outside India. They want to have an Assembly of their own, a High Court of their own, to shape and frame policies of their own for the development of their own area in the interests of the workers and peasants and the toiling millions in that part of the country. Where is disintegration in that? Where is the divisive force in that? I do not find there is any divisive force in that. Are they going to take a portion of this country out of India? Are they going to declare freedom? No. They want to have the constitutional safeguards. They want to have the rights guaranteed by the Constitution as free and equal citizens of this country. Therefore, I think that kind of divisiveness should not be imported into this, if you really want the integration of the country. You cannot have integration of the country by means of majority, by brute majority votes, nor can any democratic and mass movement be annihilated, suppressed and silenced by the sheer force of the police or by the prestige of the Chief Minister of any State. Therefore, if you are really interested in emotional integration..

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : What is the solution?

SHRI CHITTA BASU : It is through the fulfilment of the hopes and aspirations of the people of the region which can cement integration, which can cement the unity of the people of Andhra. I do not find any reason why the Telengana people should not have one State. If the Hindi-speaking people have got four or five States, although they speak the same language, what is wrong if the Telugu-speaking people, for administrative reasons, for some genuine and legitimate reasons, organise themselves into two separate administrative States? Does it dwindle the sense of unity of the Telugu people? Does it in any way hamper the growth of the Telugu culture or in any way tarnish the unity, traditions and the magnificent and splendid history of the Telugu people? I do not think so. Merely by having a separate administrative

apparatus the unity of the Telugu culture | the flowering of the Telugu culture, the tradition of its magnificent splendour, if it be so, is in no way affected, is in no way tarnished. Therefore, the unity of the Telugu people would be here, shall be here and I have to be here by the fulfilment of their hopes and aspirations of the people.

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA : Will you agree to Calcutta having a separate State?

SHRI CHITTA BASU : I think the people of West Bengal cannot be satisfied by raising this kind of slogan, because you have not understood the basic point here. The S.B.G. has not said that Calcutta should have a separate State. The S.R.C. has not said that the rest of the portion of West Bengal will not receive justice from the Government of the day.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Jalpai-guri and Alipur Dooar which are separate from the other parts of West Bengal, would you ask for a separate State for them?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHANI : Mr. Basu, you have only three minutes more.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Only one last point in conclusion. I refer to some constitutional amendment to provide the safeguards. The Hon. Member, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, suggested that the eight-point proposal of the Prime Minister constitutes the basis of a solution. I do not think so because the eight-point programme of the Prime Minister is couched, in the language of Mr. Brahmananda Reddy, proposes the same thing, and approach; the problem from the same angle. The Regional Committee's powers are enlarged, but it remains to be an advisory Committee. The Governor is to intervene only when there is a difference between the Regional Committee and the Council of Ministers. This was their* in the gentlemen's agreement, this was there as I have mentioned earlier, but that did not work. Therefore, that safeguard cannot really guarantee the safeguard the people of Telengana want today in the context of the injustice being perpetrated on them. Again he has referred to the constitutional amendment. I think he has been pleased to go through

or he has taken the trouble of going through the report of the Committee of jurists on Telengana safeguards, the Wanchoo Committee. If you have the time to read it, you will find that they had said that constitutional amendment is not possible because we have to amend article 16(2) which cannot be amended unless we pass Nath Pai's Bill restoring the supremacy of Parliament to amend the chapter on Fundamental Rights. Secondly, he has also taken the trouble to say that if we amend in this way, then we shall reduce this kind of safeguard into an absurdity, that is, that kind of safeguard can be demanded even by a taluk, even by a district, even by some other smaller region. Therefore, constitutional amendment as you suggest or somebody suggests is not I think going to guarantee the necessary safeguards the people of Telengana demand. If there is any other alternative, I am not dying for separation. It is not a question of dying for separation. If you can provide any other alternative which can really, genuinely, statutorily, constitutionally guarantee the safeguards you have agreed to give to the people of Telengana in 1956, I am not dying for separation, because I am not really interested in the matter of having that kind of approach to satisfy the egoism of somebody. Anyway, I would appeal to the Communist Party if they are really a Communist party, if they really want that the hopes and aspirations of the people are to be looked after, then you have to move with the people and bring about a solution in amity and love. With these words I conclude. The time is up for the Government to provide adequate constitutional guarantees and safeguards or you will have to agree to give them Statehood. There is no other alternative.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : I can assure him that our party is in the villages and in the factories, among peasants and workers.

SHRI K. P. MALLIKARJUNUDU (Andhra Pradesh) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, speaking as I do at the far end of the debate, I shall be not only the last speaker but the least speaker. I come from a region called central Andhra which is a part of Andhra Pradesh and which is commonly known as coastal Andhra. I have been a humble Congress worker for the last four decades. I had the good fortune of moving a resolution in the composite Madras Legislature that the

[Shri K. P. Mallikavjunudu] then composite province of Madras should be split up into four constituent linguistic units. That resolution of mine was supported by the late Shri Jogayya Pantulu the father of our revered President of India. Ever since I entered public life I had an idea that Telugu-speaking people, wherever they, should be brought under one political administration. With that end in view I moved that resolution and it was passed unanimously by all the parties concerned. I am saying all this not in any spirit of self-praise but only to place my credentials before the House to offer my views on this important question.

Sir, the Telugu language is considered to be one of the most beautiful languages of India. It is called the Italian of the East. I can also tell you that Krishna Deva Raya who once held sway over the entire southern peninsula stated that Telugu was the best of all languages. Apart from that I may also quote the opinion of one Appayya Dikshitar of Tamil Nadu, who was a very great scholar and a man of great erudition, who was only considered next to Shri Sankarāchārya in the expounding of the Advaita philosophy. He said "To be an Andhra and to speak Telugu is not the result of any small merit, it should be the result of great Tapas." That was the opinion expressed by no less a person than Appayya Dikshitar of great eminence. That is the kind of language we speak, and we feel justifiable pride in speaking that Telugu language.

Then what about the character of the people? Andhras, you know, Sir, are a virile people. It is not my testimony. It is the testimony of Mahatma Gandhi when he toured the whole of India in the year 1930. He made a remark that Andhras are a virile people and that the whole country expects much from them. And that is the kind of people that live in what is called the Andhra Pradesh. And apart from that, in every political administration, in every political regime, tracing back to the Kakethiya Empire coming down to the present times, except during the short period of 350 years during the Nizam's regime, all the Telugu-speaking people were under one single administration. They were one politically, culturally, traditionally and linguistically also. And when these people are bound by the ties of language, culture, tradition and also by the ties of one political administration, is it unreasonable for us to ask that all the Andhras should be united

and should pull together in their political development? That is my simple question. So, I am in favour of an integrated Andhra. I do not want that the Telengana people should get separated.

Sir, I know that there is a sense of injustice having been done to the Telengana people. I do not know if it is done, whether it is done wittingly or unwittingly. If any wrong is done to the Telengana people, I believe genuinely that it was done unwittingly without any *mala fide* intention. If any such thing had happened to those people and if we, from the coastal Andhra or from the other Andhra areas are responsible, I apologise to them, I beg their pardon, I want to atone for all the happenings that caused some discontent and dissatisfaction among the people of Telengana. I am very sorry for it. I appeal to them in all earnestness and sincerity that they should be one with us. If any injustice is perpetrated, let us remove it; let us come together; let us understand each other; let us remove all the difficulties, all causes for discontent and dissatisfaction. That is my humble appeal to my Telengana brethren. We belong to the same soil. We drink the waters of those holy rivers, the Krishna and the Godavari. We are the sons of the same soil. We are bound by so many ties which I have already mentioned. And under these circumstances, I earnestly make an appeal to all my Telengana brethren to forgive us if we committed a mistake and live with it happily and in a contented manner. That is my humble appeal to the people of Telengana.

Then, Sir, with regard to the solution, I agree with the one proposed by you, Sir, and also by Mr. Mulka Govinda Reddy. I have been entertaining this opinion for so many months. Ever since this agitation was started, I was of the opinion that all these people should be brought together at a round-table conference and a solution should be arrived at. In this connection, I want to say that any attempt by any person to hold a round-table conference will not succeed. In my opinion, it must be convened by the Prime Minister with all the authority, stature and influence she has got. If she calls a conference, I have no doubt that it will succeed. It may take some time. There may be difficulties. But if a such a conference is convened by the Prime Minister where all the representatives of the political parties as well as other leaders of the various interests

are asked to meet and if they are brought together at a round-table conference convened by the Prime Minister, I have no doubt that his question can be solved and will be solved.

So, with these few remarks, I submit that the Prime Minister should take the initiative immediately without losing time. It is no use saying that there is no problem. There is a problem, it is an existing problem. Let us not ignore it. And once we recognise that there is a problem, a remedy has got to be found. What is the remedy? According to me, the convening of a round-table conference by the Prime Minister where all the parties are represented is the only remedy that I can conceive of.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we should all be grateful to Mr. V. B. Raju for having raised this discussion and given an opportunity to discuss. Members to voice not only their opinion and views but by and large, the views of all the major political parties and also of the nation. We all know that we have discussed this Telangana question in this House several times and the major problems that have faced the Telangana people and the people of Andhra Pradesh as such have been discussed in great details and therefore, I do not propose to go into the merits and demerits of those questions which have prompted a certain section of the people in Telangana to demand a separate State.

Sir, this question has to be tackled either as a political question or an economic question. As I personally feel, and as the speeches of other Members have also reflected, that this is essentially an economic question, a question of development which, of course, as times passed, assumed the shape of a political question. And whenever an economic or financial question or a question of development becomes involved in a political controversy, then it really becomes a very complicated question and then the merits and demerits of that question are lost sight of and political positions and political rivalries come to the fore and disturb the entire settlement; and this is what seems to have happened as far as this particular question is concerned.

We know that a series of actions have been taken by the Government of India, and, on the advice of the Government of India, by the Government of Andhra Pradesh. This has not been disputed by anybody that some injustice has been done to the Telangana region. Nobody has even denied that they deserve special consideration. This is conceded on all hands, that the region of Telangana in Andhra Pradesh deserves very special assistance and very special help to overcome the backwardness that it has. It has also been acknowledged that things which should have been done in pursuance of agreements and the various understandings unfortunately were not done because of various reasons. As one of the speakers here said, even the people of Telangana who should have been vigilant about their rights and the demands that were made by them, were not very vigilant about them. And I am not apportioning any blame between the Telangana people and the Andhra Pradesh people. But what I am trying to prove here is that this question was more or less neglected. But then when it came to the fore, it started off as an economic question and question of development and got involved in a political controversy and became a question of personalities. Therefore, it is necessary that this question is completely removed from this angle of personalities and I am sure that the debate in this House will help us to assess this problem in a proper light and that personal ties and politics will be shut away, for the moment, so that we can really determine our view towards it.

Government here have thought very deeply about this whole matter and we found that certain very quick actions were necessary. As you know, the press communique of 18th February has laid down the action that the Government has taken and the Government proposes to take. The Regional Committee has been given very many additional powers. Various Committees were set up under the chairmanship of very distinguished people of our country, with serving Judges of the Supreme Court and the retired Judges of the Andhra Pradesh High Court and the Chief Minister himself, many other Committees of that kind were set up for the purpose of finding out what could be done to answer the immediate as well as the long-term needs of the people of Telangana. Those Committee Reports have been received, action has been initiated.

[Shri Vidya Gharan Shukla]

ted. I would not be able to say whether the action is quick and efficient on all these question. May be there is slackness here and there and I can assure the honourable House that we are keeping a watch over it and we are trying to see that the commitment that has been made by the Andhra Pradesh Government at our suggestions and the commitment made by us are also cuickly implemented and efficiently implemented within the time that is required. There should be no undue delay in this connection because the whole complexion has arisen because things were not done in time there. I would not attribute any motive to anybody. And the general question of the State reorganisation and the merits and the demerits of the linguistic States should no' be brought into this question. As a matter of fact, it was because of the national consensus and the national decision that the linguistic States have been formed in our country which is a multi-lingual country. If the administration cannot be carried on in the language of the people, than we cannot profess or practise democracy in a proper manner. If there are three or four major language groups in a particular State, then one of the languages will have to be used or English, which is a neutral language, will have to be used, which means a lot of difficulty for all those who are concerned in that area. Therefore, the linguistic States are all right. Linguistic States are not only necessary but they ultimately strengthen the unity of the country. There is no doubt about this matter in my mind. As far as having more than one linguistic States is concerned, nobody says that one language group cannot have more than one State, but it has to be seen whether that is justified, whether that is in the interest of the people, whether it is really necessary or whether it will really help if done in momentary passion and momentary frustration? Have we enjoyed what we have achieved after long struggle and sacrifices which is an ideal situation or have we bifurcated our combined strength? I do not think it will ultimately help the people either, of Andhra Pradesh or any other part I of our country.

Here, Sir, I want to again reiterate the determination of the Union Government to see that due justice is given to the people of Telengana. We also want to assure the honourable House and, through the House, the people of Telengana and Andhra Pradesh that we shall be at the beck and call of the people of Telengana so that all necessary help that can be given by the Union Government is given to them through the Government of Andhra Pradesh. We also want to say that if the various schemes and various moves that have been initiated go through successfully, I am quite sure all the legitimate grievances of the people of the Telengana region in Andhra Pradesh would soon disappear and they Would find themselves as equal partners in the State of Andhra Pradesh. Therefore, Sir, I would without going further into this matter, again request the hon'ble Members that they should convey the feelings of this House, the consensus that has developed during this debate to the people of Telengana, particularly, my honourable and respected friend, Shri V. B. Raju, who has come, I suppose, especially to voice the feelings and sentiments and to represent the aspirations of the people of Telengana, to tell them how the national representatives feel about this question and what is the national consensus in this matter so that they create a proper atmosphere lor amity, goodwill and combined development of Andhra Pradesh. I am sure you will join me and you will convey my feelings to all hon'ble Members for keeping a very high standard during this debate and for doing an excellent job as far as this dealing and analysing this particular matter is concerned. I would again like to thank Mr. V. B. Raju for raising this debate here.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : The House stands adjourned till A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at thirty-four minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 14th May. 1970.