

MR. SPEAKER: Most of the time he does'nt.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: That is a matter of opinion.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: The C.A.G. has agreed—the Accountant General audits everything—as they have mentioned certain specific auditing to be done, to do it on certain conditions. (Interruptions) The C.A.G. certainly is competent to interpret the Act and he has correctly interpreted it. He has agreed that on certain definite conditions. One of the conditions is that the man of the status of Accountant General, as a special officer, will go and look into the matter, only about the specific charges regarding the Electricity Board, not other things. The specific charges about the Electricity Board will certainly be gone into. That will be done by a very independent person of the status of the Accountant General. (Interruptions). What is wrong about it? You want a certain independent authority..

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: That cannot be a substitute for an inquiry committee.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: That is a matter of opinion. As to what the C.A.G. has done there is nothing wrong about it.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: What about the constitutional powers or the legal powers of the Comptroller and Auditor General? Would you like him to be brought into the arena of controversy? We will doubt the integrity and findings of such a body in a matter like this. This is a political thing... (Interruptions).

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Corrupt persons are being shielded.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: This is to shield the corrupt Chief Minister of Haryana. The C.A.G. who is an officer for the entire country must not be a party to give clearance.... (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. We go to the next item now.

14.04 hrs.

MULKI RULES BILL

THE MINNSTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for certain amendments to the Mulki Rules so as to limit their operation, for the validation of certain appointments and for the repeal, in a phased manner, of the said rules and for matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration."

14.04½ hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

The Honourable Members are aware of the circumstances leading to the introduction of this Bill. The House has had occasion to discuss the Mulki Rules issue earlier on a call attention motion, and on November 27 the Prime Minister made a statement before the House on the decisions to meet the situation arising out of the Supreme Court Judgment given in October last. I therefore propose to mention briefly only the general scheme of the Bill at this stage.

The Bill is a very short one, consisting of 7 clauses and 2 schedules. The provisions of the Bill fall broadly into three parts. The first part, or the preliminary part, consists of the short title and the definitions clause. The second part relates to the past, and it consists of clauses 3 and 4. The third part relates to future, and it consists of clauses 5, 6 and 7 and the schedules. The provisions relating to the second part, namely, clauses 3 and 4, seek to amend the Mulki Rules for the duration of the period commencing from the formation of the State of Andhra Pradesh and ending with the commencement of the proposed legislation, and

[Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha]
 validate the appointments made during this period in contravention of the Mulki Rules. As the House is aware, there has been considerable doubt and uncertainty during the period to which these clauses relate with regard to the application or otherwise of the Mulki Rules. Right from the coming into force of the Public Employment (Requirement as to Residence) Act, 1957, till the Supreme Court struck down section 3 of that Act by its judgment, dated 28-3-1969 in *A. V. S. Narasinga Rao's* case, it was assumed that section 2 of the Act had operated to repeal the Mulki Rules, and that the only law as to application of requirement as to residence was that provided for by the rules made under the Act. From the decision of the Supreme Court in *A. V. S. Narasinga Rao's* case till the recent judgment of the Supreme Court also it was assumed that the Mulki Rules were not in force. I need not refer to the various decisions of the Andhra Pradesh High Court on the question as to whether the Mulki Rules were repealed or not. I am referring to these facts only for emphasising the need for having suitable provisions for validation of appointments which were made in the past on the basis that the Mulki Rules were not in force.

Permit me to explain clauses 3 and 4 in a little greater detail. Clause 3, by a temporary amendment, seeks to confine the operation of the Mulki Rules during the period from the formation of the State of Andhra Pradesh till the commencement of the proposed legislation only to these posts in respect of which a requirement as to residence in Telangana was prescribed under the Public Employment (Requirement as to Residence) Act, 1957. It validates appointments to all other posts. Clause 4 makes an amendment to the Mulki Rules for the duration of the period from the formation of the State of Andhra Pradesh till the commencement of the proposed legislation so as to make them directory in their application to the posts to which the residential requirement was applicable under the Public Employment (Requirement as to Residence) Act, 1957. As already explained, there were different judicial decisions holding the field at different times, and there were some cases

in which the residential requirement was not complied with even though the posts were those notified in the 1957 Act. The idea in making the Mulki Rules directory in regard to the various posts for this period is to ensure that while the validity of appointments made in accordance with the residential requirement is not in any way affected, the validity of appointments made without compliance with residential requirement is ensured.

I now pass on to explain the scheme of clauses 5, 6 and 7 of the Bill, that is, the clauses relating to the future. Clause 5 of the Bill seeks to repeal the Mulki Rules in so far as they relate to appointments other than the appointments to posts in respect of which, according to Government's decisions, the residential requirement is to be continued. Sir, these posts will be found enumerated in Schedule I and Schedule II. As a result of clause 5, Mulki Rules will continue in operation only so far as the posts mentioned in the Schedules are concerned. I would like to make it clear at this stage that we are not, by this legislation, prescribing any residential requirement in respect of the posts mentioned in the Schedules. The residential requirement applies in respect of those posts because we have not repealed the Mulki Rules in relation to those posts.

Clause 6 of the Bill seeks to repeal the Mulki Rules in so far as they relate to posts specified in the Schedules and which are located within the capital area, that is to say, the cities of Hyderabad and Secunderabad. The repeal will take effect from the expiration of the 31st day of December, 1977.

Clause 7 of the Bill seeks to repeal the Mulki Rules in their application to the posts specified in the Schedules and which are located in other areas of Telangana. The repeal will take effect from the expiration of the 31st December, 1980.

Sir, an analysis of clauses 5, 6 and 7 would reveal that these clauses adopt the device of a partial repeal of the Mulki

Rules so that what remains after such repeal would be relevant only in respect of the posts for which the residential requirement is intended to be continued.

At the end I may briefly mention that authority for the Bill is derived from Article 35(b) of the Constitution which has continued, after commencement of the Constitution, the residential requirement for Government Employment provided under the Mulki Rules framed by the Nizam, until altered or repealed or amended by Parliament. The Bill does not contravene the provisions of Article 16 of the Constitution as no new requirements as to residence for public Employment is being created.

The Bill only seeks to restrict the operation of such requirement under the Mulki Rules which have continued in force under Art 35(b) and to repeal the rules in a phased manner under powers given to the Parliament under that rule.

I request the House to consider and to adopt the Motion which I have moved.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to provide for certain amendments to the Mulki Rules so as to limit their operation, for the validation of certain appointments and for the repeal, in a phased manner, of the said rules and for matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration"

SHRI J. RAMESHWAR RAO (Mahabubnagar): With your permission, Sir, I rise on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: On what point?

SHRI J. RAMESHWAR RAO: On this Bill which is just now the matter for consideration.

Sir, the Bill which was circulated, has an annexure which contains extracts from the Hyderabad Civil Service Regulations taken from the latest official edition published in 1950 incorporating corrections

and additions upto the end of Azar, 1359 F., viz., October, 1949 in English calendar. I am afraid this annexure is not relevant to the present Bill because the Mulki rules were adapted after 1st November, 1956 by the Andhra Pradesh Government as valid laws and applicable to Telengana region under the provisions of Andhra Pradesh Adaptation of Laws Order, 1957. These rules were continued in their operation by virtue of the provisions of Sections 119 and 120 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956, read with Art. 372 of the Constitution. What should be included as annexure to this Bill are these adapted Mulki rules and not the present annexure. I wonder how this Bill could be fully considered without the change of annexure.

There is one more point, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Mulki rules circulated to us does not appear to be complete. I would like to refer to Clause 2(d) (ii) which reads:

"Any post of Police Officer as defined in clause (b) of Section 3 of the Hyderabad City Police Act, 1348: F" Now, Sir, as this is a material part of the Bill, there should have been an annexure giving the Hyderabad City Police Act, 1348 F. This is a State Act. We have not got it...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I understand that this one has been put in the Library. This particular Act that you refer to, that is, the Hyderabad City Police Act, has been placed in the Library, for the reference of Hon. Members.

SHRI J. RAMESHWAR RAO: This is a pre-independence Act. It could have been added to the Annexure. This is my submission.

On both these points, the Bill as introduced is incomplete and I request your ruling on this point whether an incomplete Bill can be taken up for consideration.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Mirdha, have you anything to say on this?

SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA: Sir, as you yourself explained, we have put the extracts from the Hyderabad City Police Act (which defines a Police Officer) in the Library and that should meet with the needs of the situation. Actually the annexure is not specifically a part of the Bill as such. It is just there as an information for the guidance and facility of the hon. Members, so that it may serve as a ready reference. We have placed this Act which he has referred to in the Library so that those hon. Members who want may have a look at it and see as to what we want to do.

Also it has been mentioned that the Eighth Edition should have been mentioned and not the Seventh Edition. My reply is very brief. The Eighth Edition does not contain the original concept of the Mulki Rules which is the basis of this Bill. The Eighth edition relates to certain other purposes. Now, our main purpose here in having the extract is to see as to what the concept of the Mulki rule is, which is being sought to be amended under the proposed Bill. It is therefore not the Eighth Edition, but the Seventh Edition which is the proper reference material to fall back upon and this is exactly what we have done.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I agree that annexures are not really part of the Bill; they are there only for the reference of the Members. With regard to the particular Act that the hon. Member had referred to, it has been placed in the Library for his reference. If the hon. Minister says that the proposed amendments are in relation to the extracts that are relevant, which have been given at the end of the Bill, I do not see any irregularity in that.

SHRI R. V. BADE (Khargone): Here, annexure is part of the Bill.

SHRI J. RAMESHWAR RAO: With your permission, may I say that under the Andhra Pradesh Adaptation of Laws Order the earlier laws have been adapted, and they are no more valid?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member can make use of this point in his speech. I see that his name is there on the list. When he speaks, he can refer to this.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): May I seek your guidance regarding the procedure? Already, the motion for consideration of the Bill has been moved here. Some of us have given amendments to this consideration motion, to the effect that the Bill may be circulated for eliciting public opinion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I shall ascertain from him whether he will be moving his amendment.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I would like to know from you at what stage we can make observations on that. Would you give priority to those who have tabled such amendments, because that is a very basic point?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is a very well known and accepted procedure that soon after the motion for consideration is moved, amendments to that motion are moved. I shall ascertain from the hon. Member whether he is moving those amendments, and then in the course of his speech, he can speak on both the amendments and the motion for consideration. That is the accepted procedure.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I had raised some other point. It appears to me that the procedure being followed absolutely varies from the general procedure. That was why I was asking for a general clarification. For instance, while moving this particular amendment that the Bill may be circulated for eliciting opinion thereon, if we feel that we can make some observations at the initial stage, if we are allowed to do so, that may help in the discussion. Can that not be done?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is not the practice.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO (Bobilli): I have tabled a motion for reference to the Supreme Court....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I shall ascertain from him whether he is moving it. We have not come to that stage yet. I am dealing with points of order now.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): May I make a submission?.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have already given my ruling on the point of order.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I am not referring to that. With your permission, I want to make a submission which will perhaps lessen the burden or pressure on the time fixed for this debate.

Our party has decided to boycott the debate on this subject. We had earlier been opposed to its introduction. We stick to the basic position....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member needs not make a speech then.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Instead of solving the problem....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, he is making a speech.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Instead of solving the problem, it would lead to further accentuation of the trouble. No element in Andhra Pradesh seems to be in support of this measure.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member is entitled to his opinion.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: We have also another complaint, against the Chair. Although doubts have been expressed about the legality and constitutionality of the measure, the Chair did not think it fit to give us the benefit of the advice of the Attorney-General.... We, therefore, find ourselves in great difficulty, so far as the legality and constitutionality of this particular measure is concerned....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That question had been disposed of already.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Government have not been well advised in bringing forward this motion without doing political and human engineering. So, our party has decided to boycott the debate on this Bill.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra and some other Members then left the House.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): I would also like to disassociate myself and my party from this Bill. As I had said when the Bill was introduced, this Government with its eyes open is going in for a public blood bath in Andhra Pradesh and Telengana. I cannot see how this Bill is being welcomed by anybody except for Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma. Therefore, I shall not associate myself in any way with this Bill. I feel that the Bill should never have been introduced. I thought that we had succeeded in stopping the Government from introducing it; I thought that we had persuaded them to see the wisdom of not introducing this Bill, but since the Government chooses to ignore all such protests, I and my party cannot associate with this debate.

Shri Piloo Mody and some other Members then left the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am sorry in all this confusion I forgot to ascertain from the members who have given notice of amendments to this motion. Shri K. Narayana Rao.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO: I move

"That the President of India may be requested to refer the Mulki Rules Bill, 1972, for the advisory opinion of the Supreme Court under article 143 of the Constitution of India". (1)

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO (Karimnagar): I move:

"That the President be requested to refer the Mulki Rules Bill 1972, to the Supreme Court, under article 143 of the Constitution for its opinion". (31)

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI (Shajapur): My amendment is in list No. 1.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am going according to the list given here. This must have been rearranged.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: I move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 15th February, 1973". (2)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 4th April, 1973". (3)

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: I move:

"That the Bill to provide for certain amendments to the Mulki Rules so as to limit their operation, for the validation of certain appointments and for the repeal, in a phased manner, of the said rules and for matters connected therewith, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 30 members, 20 from this House, namely: Shri R. V. Bade, Shri Bhagirath Bhanwar, Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu, Shri Madhu Dandavate, Shri R. N. Goenka, Shri Jagannathrao Joshi, Shri Hukam Chand Kachwai, Shri Mallikarjun, Shri P. G. Mavalankar, Shri Piloo Mody, Dr. Laxminarayan Pandeya, Shri K. C. Pant, Shri Dhan Shah Pradhan, Shri M. S. Purty, Shri Ramkanwar, Shri M. Satyanarayana Rao, Shri Shiv Kumar Shastri, Shri Rana Bahadur Singh, Shri G. P. Yadav, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, and 10 from Rajya Sabha;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the first day of the next session;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House do recommend to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of 10 members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee". (4)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Everybody is so much confused. Members are confused. The Chair is also confused

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Distribution of confusion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We are all human beings with all our failings.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN (Palghat): What about my amendment?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Your amendment is to clause 2. This is the motion for consideration. We are all confused.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wandiwah): At least there is socialism in confusion.

***SHRI B. N. REDDY** (Niryalguda). Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am speaking on behalf of the Communist Party of India of which the great Shri P. Sundaraya. Our party lead by Sundaraya struggled hard for the establishment of Andhra Pradesh. In the first place I want to make it clear that it is disgraceful and shameful on the part of the Government to bring forward this Bill before this august House. The Government are reviving their feudalistic tendencies which existed before 50 years. This does not contribute to the unity of India. The Government ignored the opinions of learned jurists and other section of society and brought forward this Bill. The so called socialist Government have ignored everything arbitrarily and compulsorily brought forward this Bill. They have utilised their brute majority for this purpose and actually imposed this Bill on the august House. This is really shameful act on the part of the Government.

I would like to ask the circumstances in which this Bill has been brought before this House. The Congress Party instead of maintaining the unity and integrity of Andhra Pradesh have thought it fit to disintegrate it. This is regrettable. Let us examine the 5-point formula of the Prime Minister. We all know about the 8-point formula. This 5-point formula has been brought about to satisfy the people of Andhra Pradesh but only to encourage their ruling warring groups of Andhra Pradesh. This 5-point formula has assumed a new form. This formula does not help in solving the problem of unemployment or the backwardness of Andhra Pradesh. (*Interruption*) Let us examine the circumstances under which this Bill has come about. Andhra Pradesh has been called the granary of the South. But today it is effected by drought conditions and threatened famine. It is a very backward State. It occupies the 5th place in the matter of population but in the matter of industry this occupies the 10th place. Among the students lakhs of students are unemployed and there are so many about the streets. For all these things the ruling party is responsible. They run counter to the aspirations of the people of Andhra Pradesh and endanger its unity. This is how this 5-point formula has come about. But we should examine, whether this Bill helps in maintaining the integrity and unity of Andhra Pradesh. No, it does not help in it. In one word I can say that this 5-point formula has only enflamed the passions of Andhra Pradesh. Even the State Government were so divided into two warring groups and they are settling it on the streets.

Sir, it is really establishing to find that the Congress Party is saying that 5-point formula of the Prime Minister is a panacea for the ills of Andhra Pradesh. This is a blessing.

It is misleading on the part of the Government to say that this Bill which encouraged regionalism to the worse possible limits is a Bill which will do good to the people of Andhra Pradesh. The Government have only taken an opportunist view of the problem and have utilised to serve its own ends. It is the duty

of the Government to explain as to how this Bill encourage the unity of Andhra Pradesh. It seems to me that this Bill which encourages Mulki and non Mulki in one State is perhaps the socialist view of the Congress party. According to this Bill they have put up another regional Committee in rivalry to already existing regional committee. I could not understand how these two regional committees can help in maintaining the unity of Andhra Pradesh.

The ruling party cries from roof tops that they always want to maintain the unity and integrity of Andhra Pradesh. But judging by the recent disturbances in Andhra Pradesh it is very clear that this Bill did not help in maintaining the unity of Andhra Pradesh. It only helps in disintegrating it.

I want to mention the most shameful and disgraceful act of the Congress Government. What is the source of this Bill. The ruling party always says that it is wedded to socialism but this bill only revives the old feudal tenets of Nizam of Hyderabad. The Congress party have used the Mulki rules which existed 50 years back to suit their own purpose and let us see as to why the Nizam of Hyderabad introduced this Mulki rules. The Nizam introduced these Mulki rules, only to accentuate differences between Andhra, Maharashtra, Karnataka. He wanted to stop the migration of the people of Andhra Pradesh to other States. This Congress party have revived these rules only for their own purpose. *Prima facie* this Bill is a out moded Bill. This is a shameful and disgraceful Bill.

Sir, I want to mention the political implications of this Bill. This Bill only encourages the warring groups of the ruling party in Andhra Pradesh. Mrs. Indira Gandhi has brought forward this Bill only to maintain the prestige of the Congress party. This Bill does not help in the unity of Andhra Pradesh but only helps the ruling groups of Andhra Pradesh.

They are setting up one regional committee after another regional committee to suit their own ends. It is really hard to think as to how unity can be brought about as a result of this Bill. Again we

find in this Bill an exception has been in the case of Hyderabad. This does not help in improving the welfare of the people. This Bill only helps in maintaining the power of the ruling party. (*interruptions*) We have got our own views on this problem but you have got no courage to accept the suggestions offered by us. It is well known that Andhra Pradesh and Telengana are backward States. Some time back I wrote a letter to Mrs. Indira Gandhi asking her whether she is prepared to give all possible assistance to the backward areas of Andhra Pradesh and Telengana. She has replied stating that I need not worry when the Central Government will take all possible steps to remove the backward region of Andhra and Telengana. The Central Government are not prepared to promote the welfare of the 4½ crores of people of Andhra Pradesh and improve the backward region of the State.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Reddy you please speak on the Bill all generalities.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is speaking on the Bill Sir.

SHRI B. N. REDDY: The Central Government should give liberal assistance and funds for the development of backward regions of Andhra Pradesh. Take concrete steps to remove unemployment, start more industries in Andhra Pradesh. They should take long term steps to remove these problems.

I want to state categorically that the Government of India should faithfully and sincerely implement the 2 : 1 formula in the whole of Andhra Pradesh. If you are really interested in maintaining the unity of Andhra Pradesh you should definitely implement 2 : 1 formula. But today that formula does not suit the purpose. These Mulki rules only suit your purpose. This is a shame on the part of the Government wedded to the policy of socialism.

In conclusion it is my duty to bring to your notice the political game played by the ruling parties in Andhra Pradesh. The State Government has been divided into

two warring groups and they have encouraged regionalism and separatism. They are responsible for these disturbances. They want to destroy the unity of Andhra Pradesh.

Sir, Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao, Shri B. V. Subba Reddy is leader of another group. Both of them are faithful allies of the Prime Minister and both of them are still Ministers. They want to create separate States for themselves to suit their own purpose. (*Interruptions*) People who supported separatism some time back have turned integratist and people who supported integration some time back have turned separatists. These tactics are purely for the sake of power only. For the sake of power these groups are spreading discontent among the people of Andhra and enflame their passions. This political gamble is against all canons of propriety and politics. But Mr. Indira Gandhi has supported this because she belongs to the Congress party which is a ruling party. If I want to say in one word the people of Andhra Pradesh have been held to ransom by these ruling groups in Andhra Pradesh only the people are suffering as a result of this and nobody else. (*Interruption*). I want to state that even ruling party cannot turn back wheels of history. They will get the punishment which is due to them. We all know how the Nizam of Hyderabad has been taught a severe lesson by the people. That State has been broken up. (*Interruption*) I warn that this Congress Government will also be punished in the same way as the Nizam of Hyderabad was punished by the people. I want to emphasise the punishment which will be given to Congress party will be much more severe than that. I want that these white cap Congress men should note this. As a Communist party member who has shed blood for the removal of the Nizam and for the establishment of Vishal Andhra I am issuing this warning. I want to emphasise that this 2 : 1 formula should be faithfully implemented. The Central Government should give all possible assistance to the backward and undeveloped areas and take steps to remove unemployment. Mrs. Indira Gandhi has given two months time to these warring groups to fight among themselves. I want to state

that the 4 1/2 crores of people of Andhra Pradesh will not forgive this Government for their misdeeds and they will throw them in the Indian Ocean. This 5—point formula is like the formula of the monkey settling the disputes of two cats. This is all for the sake of power.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH (Guntur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support this Bill, and I do so with a great sense of responsibility. I will explain one reason why I am supporting this Bill, and that will do away with the arguments of my friend, Shri Reddy, of the CMP straightway. While criticising the contents of the Bill, he has formulated an alternative proposition for the solution of the Mulki problem and that is the perpetuation of the division of the jobs between Andhra and Telengana on a 2:1 basis for all time to come. I ask Shri Reddy: is it a modern conception of Mulki-isation? While the Bill seeks to stop the application of the Mulki rules to Hyderabad city by the year 1977 and to the rest of Telengana by the year 1980, what my learned friend, Shri Reddy, is suggesting is a perpetual reservation of one-third of the seats for all times to come. If this is what you call integration of a State, by socialism, democracy and modernisation, I do not know what you mean by these words. I am only making the point that whether the proposal mentioned in the Bill is satisfactory or not, it is certainly much more satisfactory than the alternative which the CMP has suggested, which means in effect the perpetuation of the Mulki rules for all times to come. I know that some of my friends from Telengana want the perpetual application of the Mulki rules.

SHRI S. B. GIRI (Warangal): We do not want perpetual Mulki rule at all. We do not want a dispute within the State. We want a separate Telengana..... (Interruptions).

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: I am not saying that he is in the same box with Shri Reddy.... (interruptions). I am not yielding. Let me finish my speech. The point that I am trying to make out

is this. With the so-called radicalism, Shri Reddy is in the same box, as some friends from Telengana who want a perpetual application of the Mulki Rules, including inferior, superior and all types of jobs.

Why I am supporting this Bill is that I have a moral responsibility to support it. There is a historical reason for it. The question is not whether some of my Andhra friends are satisfied with it. That is not the question. The question is that the Prime Minister left it to us, and to the leaders of Andhra and Telengana, to come to an agreement as to how to solve this problem. We sat for days and days together. I am one of those who urged that the Mulki Rules should stop so far as the capital city is concerned, because we consider it a great anomaly, by the year 1974 by which time the Public Employment Act, had it been in operation, would have ended. We wanted the Mulki Rules application to Hyderabad capital city to be ended by 1974 and to the rest of area a little later, perhaps, according to whatever justiceability of the case may be. But we failed to arrive at an agreement. It is the utmost tragedy that we failed to arrive at an agreement.

Then, all of us went to the Prime Minister and requested her to make an adjudication on the issue. When she has given a decision, whether I may like it or not, whether it is in consonance with what I feel is correct or not, I for one feel morally bound to follow the decision that she has given.

I will say one thing more here. The people who are now asking... (interruptions). I am the man on whose question Pandit Nehru announced the formation of Andhra State. I have fought many bottle—many battles... (Interruptions). I have faced many bottles on my head; I am a fighter and I have fought many battles. I feel this is a case where I must tell the public my point of view boldly and state what it is.

Who has started the ball rolling? The Mulki Rules is a bad thing. But who

[Shri K. Raghu Ramaiah]

started them? I find one of the signatories to the gentleman's agreement is Mr. Latchanna, the leader of the "Separate Andhra" movement. Where was the need? If you say that Mulki Rules is a sin, if you say that reservation of jobs is a sin, what the separatists are saying now, and I agree, I may say it is the same Mr. Latchanna, the leader of the movement who subscribed to the 1956 gentleman's agreement which contains all these things. (Interruptions). I ask: Have you had the courage all these years to condemn all this? Now you want to fish in troubled waters. Have you had the guts all these years to come forward to say what happened in Andhra so far is wrong? You have taken full advantage of it. Now, because we are in difficulty, you want to fish in it.

As I said, I am not one of those who think that this kind of reservation is good. I am of the opinion that it was bad, but it was bad *ab initio*. Now the Bill seeks this reservation by a certain date. Hence my support for the Bill.

At the same time, while supporting the Bill, I say that I am doing it with a heavy heart. I come from an area where only recently 30 innocent lives were lost. There was indiscriminate firing. I would like to pay my tribute to the memory of those innocent lives, which were lost only recently. I come from an area where the agitation at the moment is at the highest pitch. The people are very much agitated about it. But I would like to say why. I would explain to you why the people are feeling that something more should be done in order to make this Bill acceptable to the people. I too humbly submit that something more has to be done. It is my duty to place that before this august House. And, what is that something to be done? But before I do so, I would like to make it clear that this kind of agitation in the Andhra State is not caused by landlords as some hon. Members are saying. This kind of a light treatment of the problem is the surest way of accentuating the sorrowful

state of affairs there. If somebody wants to create trouble, that is the best way.

Sir, the movement has spread not only to the villagers but to all the intelligentsia of the Andhra country, the lawyers, the doctors, the engineers, the students and the officers—Gazetted and non-Gazetted. Why has it spread? Let us think it over? Why has it spread? This is where I would like my Telengana friends to ponder over. I would like to have their co-operation in this respect because it is you and I.... (Interruptions.) It is tragic that some of our Telengana friends who were once for integration are now for bifurcation, of course some others who were previously for bifurcation are now integrationists. But, Sir, I have always been for integration. I fought for Andhra, I fought for Visala Andhra and I if I can now save this Visala Andhra, I would like to do so.

Now, the point is: What is the cause for so much agitation in Andhra? And this will give a clue to what more should be done. They feel that they are second-class citizens in their own capital city. I must place it before you. If you ask any Andhra gentleman who is staying in Hyderabad, he will tell you, "My son can get a job in the Bombay Corporation but not here. My son can get a job anywhere else but not in Hyderabad. My son can get admission into any college in the Madras University but he cannot get admission in the Osmania University at Hyderabad."

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN (Madras South): We are happy about it.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: ...My son cannot get a job in my own capital city. These are some of the burning issues. It is no use to hide the facts. How long are you going to put up with it? On the top of it, in many of the districts of Telengana, I am sorry to say, feelings are running so high—I do not know if I should do—but I must tell the facts with the hope that my Telengana friends will do everything possible to bring down the temperature there. Sir, in the Telengana districts, there is a virtual social boycott

of the Andhra people. No peons to help the officers, the clerks do not put up the files. Students go 'and say, 'Get out of this place. This is not for you.' My Telengana friends, if they want this integrated State to continue....

SHRI S. B. GIRI. We do not want.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: If you do not want, you go away. This is our State and we are going to keep it whether you like it or not and I say.... (Interruptions). Not only that...

SHRI S. B. GIRI. We did not know your attitude at that time... (Interruptions).

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: Better you can walk out. Sir, I have given him an escape.

Sir, besides this now there are certain vestiges of a State within a State. Of course, there may be certain historical reasons. But I am not going into that again. There is a separate Regional Council. There is a separate Budget. Technically you may not call it a separate budget. Actually, there is a separate calculation—for instance milk is produced and manufactured in Vijayawada but because it is sold in Hyderabad the sales tax, paid in Hyderabad goes to the credit of Telengana. There is thus separate accounting—two sheets actually. There are two sheets of paper. Where the electricity is generated the costs of manufacture must go to that account and where it is consumed, it must come into this account. There are so many items like that. This is not a very healthy state of affairs. It is a State within a State to have a separate budget, to have a separate regional council, etc. The Chief Minister is now from Telengana. People say, and justifiably say, in such a situation what is the need for a State within a State. I appeal to the Prime Minister to help us to remove also such last vestiges of a State within a State at her own time, but as quickly as possible, to see that there is only a single Budget for the whole of

Andhra as in the case of Bihar, U.P., Mysore and so many other States. What is the crime which we have committed that for all time to come there must be a State within a State?

About the regional council, whatever may be the origins of the regional council, they have made a great mistake, a tremendous mistake. The other day in the regional council meeting in Hyderabad many of the MLAs met there. They had that forum. The Andhra MLAs had no forum. Of course, you may say, it is a minor matter. It is not minor matter. It is a psychological matter. There is no forum. Sir, for the Andhra Members to meet and express their opinion, to state their point of view on the Bill, to make representations separately while the Telengana Members, could meet in their own forum. Andhra Members could not have even that forum.

I would request the Prime Minister to realise one aspect. I appeal to her in all humility and say that the movement in Andhradesa is not confined to one district; the movement in Andhradesa is not confined to the landlords; the movement in Andhradesa is not confined to one area or district, but it is spread over all the districts of Andhra and they have got their own legitimate grievances. It is not as though they are against an integrated State. If anybody says they are not for integrated State, I am not prepared to accept that. The Ministers who resigned talk of integrated State. In the latest statement they say, if certain conditions are satisfied, if certain clarifications are given, they will stand by the integrated State. We have seen some of the letters by some of my colleagues here. They say, they are for an unconditional integrated State. Certain sections of people treating others as second class citizens. Sir, it is this atmosphere that must be changed. This Bill is a step in the right direction.

You may agree with the date or you may suggest another date. Somebody else may suggest an immediate ending. But in the circumstances in which this Bill has come about, I certainly believe, this is a

[Shri K. Raghu Ramaiah]

step in the right direction. But the other obstacles to integration must go too.

We shall leave it to the Prime Minister to find a way out as to how to remove the other various obstacles also standing in the way of integration. It is true we have waited all these years, for 16 long years, and these are not new things which are there today. These have been there for 16 years. But now we feel that it is high time they go. Now, that the decision has been taken to end some of them, we shall look forward to ending the other too soon. In 1977 the Mulki Rules will end in Hyderabad. In 1980 they will end everywhere. It is our earnest hope that the Central Government will end all the other vestiges that is, separate budget and separate regional council also within that period.

15 hrs.

The point is this that in the separate budget or separate account or whatever you call it, there are certain anomalies, and every Andhra is asking 'How long are we going to tolerate this?'. I shall place before the House these anomalies, and you will see for yourself how far I am right.

The revenues of the Hyderabad city amounting to Rs. 36 crores are *in toto* credited to the Telengana budget or account. It is the revenue of the capital city. How does it arise? It arises out of sales tax, out of excise duty, out of various other incomes that arise in the city, because it is the capital city. Industrialisation is there on behalf of the whole State, and heavy industries are there. There, you will find also mobile population, people coming from the Andhra area and from the Telengana area. They contribute also to sales tax and excise duty. Also the Andhra people in the Hyderabad city, pay their own municipal taxes. There are, I believe, some lakhs of them. Even those are made part of the Hyderabad city revenues, and the entire revenue of the Hyderabad city amounting to Rs. 36 crores is credited to the Telengana fund.

But what happens to the expenditure? That is where I would like you to see the anomaly. If Rs. 36 crores is the expenditure on Hyderabad city, the Andhras bear Rs. 24 crores of the expenditure...

SHRI S. B. GIRI: It is wrong... (Interruptions).

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: These are my figures. I am not yielding. I am not going to yield now. The hon. Member may contradict these figures later when he speaks.

2:1 is the ratio of the expenditure in the capital city; out of Rs. 36 crores of expenditure, we pay Rs. 24 crores; the Andhras are paying Rs. 24 crores....

SHRI S. B. GIRI: He is misleading and misguiding the House... (Interruptions).

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: Every pie of this total revenue of Rs. 36 crores is being credited to the Telengana fund. My friends say that out of this, they maintain schools, they maintain colleges, and they say, well, the Andhra boys cannot apply here, because their expenditure has come out of the Telengana budget. And what is that Telengana budget or corpus of the Telengana fund except this, apart from other things, which comes from the Rs. 36 crores which is raised in the Hyderabad city?

So, having collected this money, having established or maintained institutions out of it, they say, 'This is not your money, this is not your budget; send your boy to Bombay or Calcutta or Mauritius, but certainly not to the capital city of Hyderabad'. So, you can understand the agony of the Andhra people living there in the capital city itself. Of course, I am not blaming anybody in particular, because we are all responsible for this. It is easy to blame others. For the last seventeen years or so odd years, each one of us has contributed to this deplorable condition. Chief Minister after Chief Minister has made concession after concession....

SHRI S. B. GIRI: By looting the Telengana people....(*Interruptions*).

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: You have taken full advantage of this for sixteen years. For this sorry state of affairs, I am not one of those who blame X, Y or Z. I think that every Andhra and every citizen of Andhra Pradesh is responsible for this, and it must be the joint effort of all of us to bring our intelligence together, our brains together, our patriotism together, our sense and love of an integrated State together and see how best, how soon, how quickly and how honourably to end this and to give that sense of equality which the people of Andhra Pradesh so badly need.

In the end, again, I would like to pay in all humility my tribute to those innocent lives which have been lost in the recent scuffle, in the recent firing, unnecessary and unjustified firing by the police. I have asked and other Andhra friends and MPs have asked for a judicial inquiry into it. I hope the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh would have the courtesy and the rationality of appointing a high judicial officer to go into these tragic things and see that such a situation does not recur.

***SHRI Y. ESWARA REDDY** (Cuddapah): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill is a belated one. Although this is a belated Bill and that is inexcusable, this Bill is to be welcomed. But it requires some modifications and clarifications. If this Bill has been suitably modified and further improved then it would have been much better. In spite of the fact there is inexcusable delay on the part of the Government to bring forward this Bill, this Bill deserves to be welcomed. This Bill would go a long way to keep the unity and integrity of Andhra Pradesh if some more satisfactory explanations follow it during the discussion.

I am not inclined to agree with Mr. B. N. Reddy, who has just stated before me that this Bill does not help in the unity

of Andhra Pradesh and the solution which he has given for the unification of Andhra Pradesh is not acceptable to me. The 2:1 formula enunciated by Mr. Reddy does not help in the matter. This formula only relates according to population figures but Telengana has got a long history behind it which requires something more. There are certain backward areas in Telengana and therefore it is absolutely necessary to give essential safeguards concessions for those areas. Protection is the method of integration. Hence it becomes necessary in the interest of national integration to give safeguards and protection to all the backward and drought affected areas, scheduled castes and scheduled tribes in this respect. There is no other ulterior motive in giving such safeguards to these classes. I also oppose the Mulki rules as they stand. They are medieval, out dated and obstructionist. But at the time of formation of Andhra Pradesh necessary concessions and safeguards were given by the Andhra leaders although nobody accepted the Mulki rules, to the Telengana area because of its backwardness. It is only with this backwardness in mind the Telengana region was given some concession. In this connection I completely endorse the views expressed by Shri K. Raghu Ramaiah. But in regard to his assessment of the situation in Andhra and the role of landlords I fully disagree with him. I will come to him later on.

During the past 2½ months so much disturbances have taken place in Andhra Pradesh. There has been a spate of agitations, hartals, processions and demonstrations. On November 21, 25 to 30 innocent persons were killed as a result of police firing. I take this opportunity to offer my heartfelt condolences to them. I also request the Andhra Pradesh Government to institute a judicial inquiry into the causes of these disturbances. In spite of the fact that there have been persistent demands from the people of Andhra Pradesh to institute inquiries into these disturbances, the Andhra Government has

*The original speech was delivered in Telugu.

[Shri Y. Eswara Reddy]

not taken any action. I am sorry they have not done it. I hope atleast now they will order a judicial inquiry taking into account the sentiments of the people of Andhra Pradesh

Who is responsible for these disturbances? I lay the blame squarely on the shoulders of the Congress party and the Congress Government. When disturbances are going on for the past 2½ months it is a great pity that the Andhra Pradesh Government was divided. The Cabinet was divided to the point of regionalism.

As soon as the judgment of the Supreme Court came the first statement made by the Chief Minister that finality has been reached was very provocative. Its finality has been ditched. Everybody in Andhra Pradesh felt unhappy about it. It is regrettable that without understanding the social, economic and political implications and without any forethought of its repercussions such a statement has been made by the Chief Minister. As regards, the decision of the Supreme Court nobody came out explaining what the judgment really means. Thus misled and misinformed, the students and unemployed youth suddenly and naturally too felt that they have no chance of employment and they have no future. Even non-gazetted employees felt like that. These things are mainly due to the fact that the Congress Party and the Minister could not take a decision at the appropriate time. The Ministers were only shuttling and planes here and there. The landed gentry communalists vested interests and disgruntled elements who were waiting in the wings for such opportunities took charge of the situation and increased the discontent among the people. They took the situation to alarming dimensions and spread regionalism to the worst possible extent. Reasonable regional aspirations were turned into disruptive regional antagonisms.

In this keen conflict, there has been nothing pertaining to the interests of the 80 per cent of the Andhra people. This conflict has nothing to contribute to the

welfare of the poor people, rural and urban and the agriculturists, etc. Their needs have nothing to do with this Mulki business. As the Congress Party could not come to the decision quickly and properly reactionary elements landlords and communalists took over the situation, became its leaders and made it worse and disruptive.

In these circumstances the Andhra Congress Parliament Members could not give a helping hand to the Central Government. Some of them wanted to have their own pound of flesh under the covering of integration. The grand alliance which was routed in 1971 also took advantage of the situation. They brought forward unrealisable demands. The Jan Sangh, the Swatantra and the Syndicate Congress, the landed agriculturists all these people took leadership of these disturbances. The most pitiable phenomenon in these disturbances is that the grand alliance has taken a new shape in the form of extreme right, and extreme left. It is a very dangerous development.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE

You are in alliance with them.

SHRI Y. ESWARA REDDY: The difference between 1971 and now is that the Congress Party was united at that time but now it is not. The Syndicate leaders had no base previously in Andhra Pradesh but it is god-sent opportunity for them to exploit the students and other classes for their benefit and they did it to their hearts content. *(Interruption)*.

I am pained to see that even some leaders of the Nehru Forum also—*(Interruption)*. I did not say that whole Nehru Study Forum, but only some members, some leaders of the forum—

SHRI VIKRAM MAHAJAN: Then, why don't you say "some members of the Congress?"

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE: If it is the official policy of the Nehru Forum then you can accuse us.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Bring in Moscow.

SHRI Y. ESWARA REDDY: Forum periodically called by the name of the late revered Nehru. While Nehru was alive, he suffered a lot from these sorts of people. I request them all: why don't they at least allow him to rest in peace in the other world? Why do you take his name and do all these things?

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE. You are also doing the same thing.

SHRI Y. ESWARA REDDY: As result of these disturbances the future of the four and a half crores people of Andhra Pradesh, who were once the prisoners of formation of linguistic States, has become bleak and black.

The root cause of this whole problem is extreme and serious unemployment for the present. There are a few opportunities for educated and uneducated. Even if you take the per capita income it is very low. But if you take the population below poverty line, Andhra Pradesh tops the list having more than 40 per cent while in Punjab it is only 20 per cent. As regards the unemployed figures supplied last September the number of educated unemployed three lakhs, sixty thousand, out of which one lakh 20 thousand are Matrics and 26 thousands are Graduates. Therefore we find unemployment situation in Andhra is very serious and alarming and these Mulki Issue has been taken advantage of to create more fears and despair.

The youth of Andhra Pradesh think that the Mulki rules are the cause of their unemployment and people of Telangana think that with Mulki rules alone their unemployment problem will be solved. Assessment of both are not correct. Enormity of unemployment problem is due to the lack of sufficient number of industries and projects in Andhra Pradesh and the backwardness of the State. Employment can be increased only by creating more job opportunities, rural and urban

and by setting up of more industries. These Mulki rules will not solve the problem of Andhra Pradesh.

In Andhra Pradesh another issue has been taken up and that is the categorisation of first class citizens and second class citizens who are second class citizens? The people of Telangana are of the opinion that inspite of safeguards to them like Mulki rules regional Committee etc., they think they are second class citizens because the Andhra Assembly is dominated by Andhra Pradesh by the proportion of 2:1. In the same way people of Andhra Pradesh are made to feel that they are second class citizens because of the Mulki rules and inspite of the fact they have a commanding majority in the State Assembly. But both of them are not correct. The landed agriculturists, factory owners and other richer classes of people whether they belong to Andhra or Telengana are the first class citizens. The second class citizens are the poor people and the workers whether they belong to Andhra or Telengana. Whether you take the case of employment or admission to colleges and universities or any work from the official it is only the first class citizens of both these regions who get these benefits and not the poor classes who are actually treated as second class citizens in both the regions. We have been giving certain safeguards to Telengana in 1956, 1969 and also the 8-point formula. To think that because of their safeguards given by us, we have become second class citizens, is a mistake.

People are speaking of the bifurcation of Andhra Pradesh. If so, I want to emphasise that necessary safeguards should be given to the development of Rayalaseema which is a chronically backward and drought affected area of Andhra Pradesh before bifurcation takes place. In this connection I want to state the things which have happened since independence even as late as 1937 the Sri Bagh Pact has given plans to give priorities for the development of Rayalaseema and also a separate High Court for Rayalaseema, etc., and if the landlords of coastal Andhra think then that they are second class citi-

(Shri Y. Eswara Reddy.)

zens in that bifurcated Andhra State what will be the fate of Rayalaseema people. Therefore, this ionception of second class citizenship is not correct. In unity alone our salvation lies and solution of our problems.

Andhra Pradesh is rich in natural resources and it has got a long coastal line. There is Visakhapatnam port, Kothagudem mines, Telengana industries and the rivers of Godavari, Krishna, Pannar and Tung Bhadra. Every effort should be taken to tap these resources and increase production and prosperity. Then only we can solve the problem of unemployment, backwardness and drought conditions of Andhra Pradesh. There are no other alternatives to solve these problems. I am coming to the last point. If Andhra region is separated it will become the playground of casteism and communalism. We can see it from the classes and elements who have entered into this arena of conflict now? It is only the landed agriculturists and new rich classes of society. There is no doubt that there are genuine grievances for the students and the unemployed youth. But it is only these richer classes only that have twisted these problems and had spread their discontent in wrong direction to suit their selfishness. It is very clear that it is only the rich landlords who have taken over the leadership of these agitations. The rich landlords of Vuyyuru, Challapalli, Tanku, and also the sugar barons of Andhra Pradesh are personally leading these processions and have financed and encouraged these disturbances. Nobody can deny this. Those landlord elements are their politicians who tried to obstruct every progressive aspect of the recent land-ceiling Bill have joined this agitation and encouraging them so as to gain time and save their surplus lands. If there is bifurcation of the State we have to face many problems. Bifurcation will not solve the the problems of Andhra Pradesh. Along with the problem of capital so many other problems arise. Now the slogan is for an unconditional Andhra Pradesh, if not, separate Andhra State. If such a Andhra State is formed then the capital will have

to be shifted from Hyderabad. When that happens its construction itself costs us fifty crores of rupees. We have also to attend to the needs of backward districts of Visakhapatnam and Srikakulam. Already we are bankrupt and if we have to spend such a large amount of money on the capital itself where and when will we progress. The progress will be completely retarded. In spite of the fact that we have spent for a good purpose an amount of 180 crores of rupees on Nagarjuna Sagar Project, it has its regions effect on development of backward areas already for the past 10 years.

The transfer of assets is another headache. If we think of these problems our hearts cease to beat. The future of Andhra Pradesh will be sealed and doomed.

I have got great respect for Shri B. V. Subba Reddy, Shri P. Basi Reddy. They are the elders of Rayalaseema. One is the Chairman of Rayalaseema Conference and the other was President of the Rayalaseema Planning and Development Board. Some persons have expressed misgivings about the future of Rayalaseema if a separate Andhra State is formed. But these two persons have charged them as opportunists and selfseekers. I am not prepared to agree with them in this respect. As they are my elders, I am not prepared to speak in the same vein as they spoke.

If a separate State of Andhra Pradesh is formed we want to ask specific questions in the light of past experience of Rayalaseema, what about capital and what about the quota of our services? The future of 80 lakhs people of Rayalaseema is dependent on Krishna river waters and if the water of the Krishna should come to Rayalaseema it can come only when the Godavari waters are let down into Krishna. Only then the problem of famine in Rayalaseema will be solved. This Godavari is in Telengana and only when the people of Telengana will agree to this scheme this water will come to Rayalaseema. Coming to the provisions of Mulki rules I want to emphasise that these should not be extended beyond 1977 and 1980 and out of three posts it should be made clear

that two posts should be reserved for Andhra region and not left in vague terms. This should be made clear. I want an assurance about educational facilities in the city? If the State Government have got no funds to carry out the schemes of education then the Central Government should help them in this respect. There is also the Rayalseema Planning and Development Board. It is only an advisory body and it has not got sufficient funds. Every effort should be made to give full assistance to this Board for the development schemes and for eradication of famine. This Board should be made a Statutory body.

According to 5-point formula of the Prime Minister it has been stated that some mechanism will be created. I want to know what is this mechanism and in what respects it will function. The Government should take into consideration the views expressed in their talk with all the Members of Parliament from Andhra Pradesh and state the concessions proposed to be given. We should do our best to maintain the unity and integrity of Andhra Pradesh and not give encouragement to separatist tendencies only in unity lies the strength and the development of the State.

After 60 years of agitation in Andhra area and after 30 years of agitation in Telengana, Andhra Pradesh came into existence. In those days some thousands of Communist Party workers in Telengana who agitated against the Razakars and demanded visalandhra died a heroic death. Even in those days many from the Congress Party opposed these developments. After Visalandhra was achieved it came under the rule of Congress Party. But the Congress Party instead of devoting its attention to the development of Andhra Pradesh and its emotional integration, encouraged these separatist tendencies. As a result of this mis-rule of the Congress party this Visalandhra has been converted into a 'Vishadandhra'. I appeal to them not to inflict further damage by bifurcating it.

SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMIKANTHAM-MA (Khammam): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am a Mulki by birth and non-Mulki by marriage. So, I think I have a right to stop the quarrel between brothers and plead with them for the unity of the State.

I thank our beloved Prime Minister for giving a solution within the framework of an integrated State. Andhra can progress—the Telugu-speaking people can progress, I would say, if some people have an allergy for the word 'Andhra'—and go hand in hand towards development, rapid industrialisation and socialism only if there is one united State. Unity is strength. If we separate, the strength will disappear.

For the past four years Andhra Pradesh has been witnessing such regional bitterness which has hampered the progress of the State. The Mulki rules issue has affected the Telengana region for the past four years and there is once again that emotional pattern in that part of the Andhra region. For want of time, I cannot go into the details of the agitations on both sides. But it will be seen that the *modus operandi* and the motivation of the agitation present an extremely instructive study. The students and the NGOs first start it. Then the politicians are there to exploit it.

The Mulki rule has been described as a terrible demon. Some of the Jan Sangh members say that 'Mulki' means 'Muslim' and Shrimati Indira Gandhi is fond of Muslims and Mulki. This is the propaganda they are carrying on. It is depicted as a demon, an epidemic, a calamity and a curse. In fact, a Mulki is described as everything except what it is. Shri Mirdha has just now said that all the pre-Constitution legislations are survived by virtue of article 35B. The Mulki rules obviously require legislation by Parliament in order to be implemented in the spirit in which they are embodied in the Public Employment Act of 1957. It is also clear that article 16(3), which prohibits legislation prescribing residential restrictions, does not apply to the present legislation for the simple reason that this

(Shrimati T. Lakshmikantharama.)
Bill does not prescribe any restriction. It actually abridges the restriction already existing.

I want to say one thing about the unity of the State. This is not one day's affair. It is a thousand years' harvest. The formation of Andhra Pradesh, the unity of Telugu-speaking people, with a history of three thousand years, is a thousand years' harvest. How can you just say, we want to get separated; we want to get separated; we want to get separated. Like Jinnah, with swords in their hands, these old Ministers who have above 70 years' age, cannot divide the State. The future is for the younger generation of Andhra Pradesh.

In those days, they used to sing a lovely, a beautiful song: Mother of the Telugu-speaking people with jessamine garlands round your neck, with Krishna, Godhavarī and Tungabhadra and Pīnekmi, we bow to Thee. Where is that spirit, that attachment, that affection, for the people of one culture, one language, thirsting for the unity? When Andhra Pradesh became one, when the Telugu-speaking people joined as one State on 1st November, 1956, it was like the rivers joining the ocean, knowing no bounds. Everyone knows it.

Today for political reasons, the man is so selfish that for his own personal ends, he sacrifices everything. I agree with my hon. friend, Shri Raghu Ramaiah, in saying that we should pay our tribute to the memory of those who have lost their lives and sympathise with the bereaved families, and also the Cabinman who was burnt alive by the hooligans. There was violence and damage caused to the railway property. Mr. Mirdha was attacked. He did not say on his own. I was present at Guntur on that day. As I said, I am the daughter-in-law of Guntur. I have every right to go there. If they want to kill me, I am prepared to be killed for it. He did not say anything on his own. I was present there. The things were manipulated.

What happened? The Central Bank of Guntur is located in Tenali. I particular gentleman who belongs to the other House—I cannot mention names—is the President. He sits there for a few days. Another Swatantra Party member also sits there. Lakhs of rupees are collected in the name of demon of land reforms. These are the people who have lost power. Ultimately, it is a power game and others are just pawns in the chess—the students, the NGOs, the innocent people there. What happened then? All the liquor shops were kept open. Certainly, an inquiry should be made into that. Why were the liquor shops kept open? When there is a *bund* on that day, when all other shops were closed, why were the liquor shops kept open? Why were they drunk? Why was so much money spent? Why were they asked to go in a procession and attack the railway station?

The students are our future generation. The railways belong to them. We may die tomorrow, we are after all old. The Ministers who have resigned are older. Is the 5-point formula the reason for it? The 5-point formula of the Prime Minister has been welcomed by 85 per cent of the people, as Mr. Eswara Reddy himself said. (Interruptions) I fought with you also at that time on the floor of the House. But I succeeded, not you.

What happened at Ongole? There was a firing. Early morning, one jeep goes round and says, "Oh! Brother Andhras, are you still sleeping? The people of Andhra are burnt with petrol in Hyderabad. Get up, get up." This is the slogan. Who has done it? Let an inquiry be made into it. An ex-Minister was present at Ongole at that time. We know what things are. (Interruptions) What about your Andhra Mahabha, the unholy alliance of the Swatantra Party, the people who have come into Congress, not even one month back? Why should we take such people. I think, we should not take them. The Swatantra Party, the Jan Sangh and what not, all kinds of parties are bent upon creating trouble. (Interruptions) By

the time the Deputy Chief Minister resigns....(*Interruptions*) They have filled up all the Presidents' posts. It is not one President, it is a Presidium, so many Presidents. You take any number because you do not know who is going to be the Chief Minister of the future would-be Andhra. This is what has happened.

Sir, here is a letter of threat I must congratulate the MLAs that in spite of the threats they are getting hardened day by day. It is not correct to say that they are not going to their constituencies. They are going. Sir, the Andhra Ratna Bhavan where the meeting was held is today in the possession of Congressmen, not those who have deserted and who like cowards could not carry the message to the people. I asked one Minister, 'Why have you resigned?' The reply was: 'People are sending bangles.' I said, 'They are insulting bangles. People wearing bangles have fought battles like the great Jhansi Ki Rani. So, do not insult bangles by sending them'. Sir, cowards die every day but a heroic man dies only once. So, let the cowards in thousands live or die. It is immaterial for us. We will face the people. We will carry the torch of socialism to the people, may be, with one weapon that has been used, the land reforms, to which they are all opposed.

One day, Mr. Subba Reddy comes and say, I support the formula and I welcome it' Next day he changes. Sir, perhaps something must be wrong with their minds. After all age also counts, with all respect to them. How should we understand it? How should the people understand it? The five-point formula was welcomed by many people. 80 per cent of the students of Telengana have supported it. In Andhra the students try to understand it because the students from Andhra came to Hyderabad. They said, We will not allow ourselves to be used as pawns in the political game. Let us thrash it out. It is a matter concerning our future and the future of Telangana'. When they came what happened. The erstwhile separatists and the erstwhile integrationists sent rowdies to molest these students and so Police protection had to be given to them. We cannot blame the students.

3020 LS—9

After all they are innocent lives and we want to build castles on the graves and on the blood of these people and it is wrong, and the students are not going to allow it.

With regard to the NGOs' agitation, the five-point formula has done good both to Andhra and Telengana. As far as Telangana is concerned, non-gazetted posts upto the level of Tehsildar and the House Surgeon will be filled by Telangana people. So, the bulk of the posts go to Telangana. Otherwise, the Mulki Rule was only upto 5 years, but it has now been extended as per the Prime Minister's five-point formula. It would have ended in 1974 but the Prime Minister has extended it till 1980 in the districts and in the capital till 1977. Three years is nothing in the history of a State. If you want to maintain the unity of a State, three years is nothing. I understand the feelings of my Andhra friends. They want the ownership because when they go to Bombay, when they go to other places when everybody feels that it is his capital, the feeling is genuine. It is understandable. After all, this State came into being under an agreement to which they all agreed and that the Mulki rule will be there till 1974. Now, it is extended upto 1977. Only three years. Three years is nothing in the history of a country. After all, even in human lives, three years is nothing.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon Member's time is up. There are so many speakers from her Party.

SHRIMATI T. IAKSHMIKANTHAM: The Press, the *joor* press I would call it, it is really a *joor* press, has been coming out with wrong reports and fanning the flames. I do not know for what? They have been giving all wrong information. The integrationists also have held meetings. The Congress MLAs held a meeting supporting the five-point formula and the Communists also supported it and held a meeting, but nothing comes in their press. Sir, if you make a statement, it does not come in their Press. The Chief Minister gave a press interview. That did not come up in the Press. Even

[Shrimati T. Lakshmikanthamma.]

one sentence did not come in the Press. The Chief Minister is a small person for the Press magnates. He is following the socialist path. I appeal to the N.G.Os. Bulk of them come from poor families. Why should they not understand the situation? Let them not participate in this destruction. Let them not be pawns. I have seen the statement that the educated youth will occupy their seats. I am quoting from this statement:

"An association of the educated unemployed youth today warned the Govt. employees, who are frequently resorting to strikes, that the unemployed youth would occupy the seats of those employees who are on strike.

The association, which met here last night, decided to give a call to all the educated youth who were seeking employment to occupy the chairs of the striking employees, according to a Press Note issued jointly by its President K. V. Gopala Rao of Guntur and General Secretary R. Ramaiah of Hyderabad.

The association also appealed to the unemployed youth to give an undertaking to the heads of the offices saying they would discharge their duties honestly and be loyal to the Government and the people."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: On a subject like this Members have many things to say and they want to unburden themselves, but even then, there is a limit of time. There is a good number of speakers from the Congress party. I think if we apportion 7 minutes to each speaker, then, everybody would have a chance. About the Members from the Opposition side, the time is already indicated here. I would request them that, when I give the bell one minute before the time is over, they should take it as a warning Mr. Jagannath Rao Joshi.

DR. G. S. MELKOTE (Hyderabad): I hope you will give me 20 minutes.

SHRI B.S. GIRI rose—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: These are the broad indications, it does not mean we shall go mechanically with them; we will see as we proceed with the business. Mr. Giri I find your name is here. Now Mr. Jagannath Rao Joshi.

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी (शाजापुर) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो विधेयक इस सदन के सामने पेश है उसको जनता की राय जानने के लिए प्रसारित किया जाय, यह संशोधन में दिया है। इस का मुख्य कारण यह है कि इस विधेयक से आन्ध्र के किसी भी भाग की जनता संतुष्ट होने वाली नहीं है। जिस को हम कोस्टल एरिया बोलते हैं या जिस को हम तेलंगाना कहते हैं दोनों भागों की जनता में इन रूल्स के बारे में असंतोष है, निराशा है। 1969 से लेकर यह मामला चला हुआ है और उस का जो मूल कारण है वह यदि मैं यह कहूं तो गलत नहीं होगा कि शुरू से सोच समझ कर समय रहते ही समस्या का हल निकालने की क्षमता इस शासन में नहीं है। यह बुनियादी कारण है। क्योंकि आन्ध्र का जो फार्मेशन हुआ वह पोर्टी श्री रामूलू के देहान्त के बाद हुआ, हाचपाच हुआ। उस के पीछे कोई सिद्धांत नहीं था जैसा कि बाद में फाजिल अली कमीशन के अपनी सिफारिशें देने के बाद नवम्बर 1956 के अन्दर व्यवस्था बनी। अगर करना था तो सोचसमझ कर करना चाहिए था। किन्तु पहले एक आन्ध्र बना। 1956 में समस्या खड़ी हो गई। फिर दोनों में जेटिलमैन्स ऐग्रीमेंट हुआ। यह ऐग्रीमेंट करने वाले दोनों ओर से कांग्रेसी थे। लेकिन वह जेटिलमैन्स ऐग्रीमेंट बर्क नहीं हुआ। यह सब स्वीकार करते हैं। कोई ऐसा नहीं है जो यह कह सके कि इस को अच्छे तरीके से बर्क आउट किया है। यह बर्क आउट क्यों नहीं होता? जब हम कालेज में थे तो जमनादास मेहता एक नेता थे, वह कहा करते थे कि

There are two classes of men, one is a gentleman, the other one is a Congressman. (Interruptions). I am saying this in a lighter vein. Let them not take it seriously.

जहाँ भी इन्होंने ऐग्रीमेंट किया है वह ऐग्रीमेंट फेल हुआ है।

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: (Serampore): They are all gentlemen.

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : यह जो समस्या तेलंगाना में खड़ी हुई यह आज की नहीं है। यह सन् 1967-68 से लगातार सामने है। लोगों के मन में असंतोष था। वास्तव में जो दोनों के बीच में समझौता हुआ था उस के अनुसार जो विकास होना चाहिए था वह हुआ नहीं। और इस दोष को मैं आंध्र को नहीं देता। सारे देश के अंदर आज यह भावना बनी हुई है। प्रधान मंत्री यहां बैठी हुई हैं तो मैं यह बता देना चाहता हूँ कि आज उत्तर प्रदेश में भी यह भावना बनती जा रही है कि रायबरेली की ओर ज्यादा ध्यान दिया जा रहा है। हर दो तीन महीने के अंदर डा० के० एल० राव वहां जाते हैं, बिजली के मामले में वहां प्राथमिकता दी जा रही है, सिंचाई के मामले में प्राथमिकता दी जा रही है। देश भर में संतुलित आर्थिक विकास जो होना चाहिए था योजनाबद्ध तरीके से वह हुआ नहीं...

THE PRIME MINISTER MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF ELECTRONICS, MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS, MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND MINISTER OF SPACE (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Anyhow, we have no Mulki problems there.

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : भले ही आज न हो कल पैदा हो सकता है क्योंकि संतुलित आर्थिक विकास की ओर हम ने ध्यान नहीं दिया तो पंत जी के क्षेत्र में उत्तराखंड की मांग बहुत जोर पकड़ रही है। ऐसा नहीं कि यह एक बीमारी है। यह एक बीमारी का कारण खड़ा हुआ है। इट इज जस्ट इ सि पटम।

यह मूल रोग नहीं है, मूल रोग और है। पिछले 25 साल में आजादी के बाद योजना बनाते एक, दो तीन, चार पांचवीं तक पहुंच गए। योजनाबद्ध तरीके से देश का विकास नहीं हुआ। इसकी वजह से यह गड़बड़ हुई।

आंध्र की थोड़ी सी पृष्ठभूमि भी है। इसे भी समझ लेना चाहिये। 1953 से 1956 तक एक अलग आंध्र था। उस समय तेलंगाना और हैदराबाद की स्टेट के पार्ट थे। जब वे दोनों एक हो गए तो उन्होंने जो समझौता किया था उसमें वे कहते हैं कि हमारी एक अंडरस्टैंडिंग थी। यदि यह समझौता ठीक चला तो आगे चलाएं, ठीक नहीं चला तो आप अलग और हम अलग। आज वे यह कहते हैं कि यह समझौता ठीक नहीं चला। हमारे साथ न्याय नहीं हुआ, हमारे साथ अन्याय हुआ है इसलिए हम इनके साथ रहना नहीं चाहते। अब यह मांग 1969 से तेलंगाना में थी किन्तु आज जो वास्तविकता है उससे आंखें मूंद नहीं सकते। स्वयं मिर्धा जी वहां गए थे और उन्होंने जो बयान दिया अखबारों में उसकी वहां बड़ी तीव्र प्रतिक्रिया है। मिर्धा जी ने कहा कि : "This movement is carried on by hooligans."

इस की वहां बड़ी तीव्र प्रतिक्रिया हुई। कोई अच्छी प्रतिक्रिया बिलकुल नहीं हुई। आज

[श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी]

आंध्र प्रदेश की स्थिति यह है कि तेलंगाना से ज्यादा जिसको हम कोस्टल एरिया कहते हैं वहां अलग आंध्र प्रदेश की मांग बड़ी तीव्र है। जय आंध्र के नारे लगाए जा रहे हैं, अलग आंध्र का झंडा बनाया गया है, उस झंडे के नीचे मभाए होती है, जितने भी मंत्रियों ने त्यागपत्र दिए हैं उम में मे आठ मंत्रियों ने अलग आंध्र कांग्रेस बनाई है। मामला बहुत बिगड़ गया है। 1969 में मैं इसी मदन में बोला था दिल्ली लोक सभा में जब तेलंगाना का मामला आया तो मैं ने कहा था—आम्क अज्ञानद रेड्डी टु रिजाइन। उस समय भी तेलंगाना को यह बना देने कि आप के साथ अन्याय हुआ तो उम क्व हम परिमाजन करना चाहते हैं। मध्य मंत्री त्यागपत्र देते, बैठते उन के साथ, कहा-कहा गडबड हुई हम को देखने। वह जा दो और एक का कानन था जिस को आन्ध्र प्रदेश में मजाक में कहते हैं आटा कानन—आन्ध्र तेलंगाना ए टी ए-आटा कानन वह ठीक बना नहीं।

उमलिए आज यह दो साल तीन साल तक जो समस्या ऐसे ही छोड़ दी और सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जजमेंट के आने के बाद आया तो आज परिस्थिति बहुत बिगड़ गई। अभी मैं वहां हो कर आया। मेरी सभा में बीच बीच में नारे लगते रहे—प्रत्येक तेलंगाना कावाली अलग तेलंगाना कावाली। यह बराबर होना रहा। मैंने जितनी बातें बताईं लोगों का ध्यान उम की तरफ था ही नहीं। आज लोगों की स्थिति इतनी बिगड़ गई है और मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि इस स्थिति को बिगाड़ने में

आप दोषी हैं। एक तो सतुलित धार्मिक विकास नहीं है और जनता के सामने जो आप ने एक परम्परा डाली है वह परम्परा भी गलत है। आप ने स्टेट्स रीपार्गनाइजेशन कमिशन की रिपोर्ट आने के बाद वास्तव में उस के अनुसार कुछ किया, कुछ नहीं किया। बम्बई गुजरात एक रहे, फिर अलग हो गए। पंजाब हरियाणा एक रहे फिर अलग हो गए। आज पंजाब हरियाणा हिमाचल प्रदेश तीन हो गए। आखिर कोई आप के सामने नीति है या नहीं? कुछ समय कर्नूल राजधानी बना। चार करोड़ रुपये खर्च हुआ। चंडीगढ़ पंजाब और हरियाणा दोनों के लिए बनाया गया था, आज चंडीगढ़ का झगडा आ कर खड़ा हो गया। फाजिल्का अमोहर का झगडा आ कर खड़ा हो गया। आप के सामने नीति क्या है? जैसे अंग्रेजों के जाने के बाद रेलवे के सामने कोई नीति नहीं रही—नेरो गेज, ब्राड गेज, मीटर गेज सब शामिल। वैसे ही अंग्रेजों के चले जान के बाद पठन तो रूनीयन आफ स्टेट्स थी, ए, बी, सी, डी उम के बाद यदि एक होने तो ममस में आना, लेकिन आप ने तो बी वर्गीय मध्यभारत को निकाल दिया, सीराष्ट्र को निकाल दिया, सी वर्गीय कुर्ग को निकाल दिया और मंमुर में मर्ज कर दिया, तो फिर छोटे-छोटे राज्य क्यों बना रहे हैं?

उदाहरण महीदय, कानं जब मैंने बिजनेस एडवाइजरों कमेटी की मीटिंग में ज्यादा सन्ध की मांग की तो मंत्री महीदय, ने वे यहाँ पर बैठ हुए हैं, कहा कि हमारी नफ़ से ज्यादा बोलेने वाले नहीं हैं। तब मैंने कहा

कि सारा समय विरोधी दलों को मिलना चाहिये । इस अग्रिम आप इस तरह समय को बांटेंगे तो नहीं चलेगा

संसदीय कार्य तथा निबन्धन और परिबन्धन
श्री (श्री राज बाहुर) : आप वहाँ की बात यहाँ क्यों कह रहे हैं

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी ऐसा तथ्य
किया है, इस लिये कह रहे हैं . . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is between you and the Minister. If the Minister wants to give you any part of his party's time, he may do so.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: So far as my party is concerned, I have said there is a limit of 7 minutes.

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : मैंने तो इसी लिये ज्यादा समय माँगा था, 10 घंटे के लिये कहा था, क्योंकि इस पर बहुत लोभ बोलेंगे लेकिन उन समय कहा गया कि ज्यादा बोलने वाले नहीं हैं । वह तीन घंटे रखना चाहते थे, मैंने 4 घंटे कहा, कम से कम एक घंटा ज्यादा दीजिये, क्योंकि हम बोलना चाहते हैं ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is the decision of the House, not just the recommendation of the Business Advisory Committee, that 4 hours should be allotted for this. You conclude now. Members can make effective speeches in ten minutes. I do not know why they cannot do it.

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, बात यह है कि सरकार ने लगातार गतिथि पर गतिथियाँ कर के हमारे जैसे लोगों को बड़ी मुसीबत में डाल रखा है । जब महाराष्ट्रवादी गोमन्तक दल पूरे बहुमत

से चुन कर आया और उस ने कहा कि 'हम को महाराष्ट्र में मिला दो तो आपने क्यों अलग रखा, उम का क्या जरूरत थी । पुदुचेरी या पाण्डचेरी मतों के झगडे नहीं हैं सो उन को तमिलनाडु में क्यों नहीं मिला दिया

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have gone to U.P. Maharashtra; you do not come to Andhra Pradesh. How can you finish it then?

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस का विरोध कर रहा हूँ और यह बता रहा हूँ कि इस की जड़ में क्या बात है ।

How can I make my points then? People are not satisfied with the Mulki Rules or the present Bill. They want a separate State, both for Telegana and Andhra Pradesh. They ask: "if we demand similar States, what sin have we committed?"

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It does not solve my problem.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: It does not solve my problem either. There are so many people unnecessarily dragging the Jan Sangh for nothing. I have to demand similar States, what sin have we unity of the country.

बिन्तु इस का मतलब यह नहीं है कि कल अग्रर आन्ध्र और तेलंगाना अलग हो जायें तो देश की एकता खत्म हो जाएगी । ऐसी बात नहीं है । यह बिल्कुल सिद्धान्त की बात नहीं है कि एक भाषा का एक ही राज्य होना चाहिये । उत्तर प्रदेश हिन्दी बोलता है, मध्य प्रदेश हिन्दी बोलता है, राजस्थान हिन्दी बोलता है, बिहार हिन्दी बोलता है, ये सब अलग अलग राज्य हैं, इस लिये इस का ऐसा मतलब नहीं है ।

[श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी]

जब यह झगड़ा चला, हमने उस के पहले ही अपने बम्बई अधिवेशन में इस बात को बता दिया था कि भाषा को प्रमुख आधार मान कर जो देश की पुनर्रचना हुई थी, इनने सालों के अनुभव के बाद यह बात सामने आई कि भाषा में ज्यादा महत्वपूर्ण बात प्रदेश का आर्थिक विकास है, जो हम समय हमारे सामने आया हुआ है। इस लिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस को पीएमपील या हीच-गीच करने के बजाय एक उच्च आयोग नियुक्त किया जाय जो इस मामले में जाय। इनने लॉग बहा आन्दोलन करें, फिर गोली चले और लोग मरे.....

गृह मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र पंत) : आर्थिक दृष्टि से यह राज्य ठीक है या नहीं ?

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : जो तेलंगाना है, वह कहता है कि एम० आर० सी० ने उस समय कहा था कि अलग तेलंगाना रह सकता है, इकानामिक वायाबिल्टी है, पोलिटिकल वायाबिल्टी है, डेढ़ करोड़ की पापुलेशन है, इतना ही नहीं वे कहते हैं कि जैन्टिलमैनज़ एग्रिमेंट में यह अण्डरस्टैंडिंग थी कि अगर यह एग्रिमेंट ठीक नहीं चलेगा तो हम जैसे थे वैसे हो जायेंगे। चूँकि वैसा नहीं हुआ, इस लिए वह माग करते हैं और यह तर्क देते हैं कि जब भारत सरकार छोटे छोटे राज्य बनाती है तो हमारा तो बड़ा है। इसलिये मैं माग करता हूँ कि पीएमपील कुछ करने के बजाय, जनता आन्दोलित हो, उत्तजित हो, की क्षति होने के बजाय, मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार

इस पर उच्च आयोग बैठायें और इस मामले पर फिर से विचार कर के कि देश की पुनर्रचना कैसे हो, उस के बाद सरकार इस पर निर्णय ले।

दूसरी बात—आन्ध्र प्रदेश और तेलंगाना इन दोनों क्षेत्रों में भावना इनकी तीव्र हो गई है—श्री रघुवैया जी ने उस के बारे में कुछ बताया है.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, Order. I would like to ascertain from you whether you are going to conclude

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: Two minutes. It is a gentleman's word. I will never break it.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: He is not a Congressman.

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : इस विधेयक में मुल्की और गैर मुल्की की जो भावना है, आज के दिन किसी के गले नहीं उतरेंगी। उन को लगता है कि हमारे साथ भेदभाव हो रहा है। इस लिये इस को फिर से उन पर अंकित करना बहुत न्याय नहीं होगा।

हैद्राबाद में जो कम्पोजिट पुलिस आप रखनेवाले हैं—इस बात को आप अलग से इन्ट्रोड्यूस कर रहे हैं—यानी बुद्धिया मरती है तो उस का दुख नहीं है, मृत्यु दर्वाजा देख लेती है, लेकिन एक बार यह भावना आगई कि हमारी रक्षा तेलंगाना की पुलिस करेगी, आन्ध्र की पुलिस रक्षा नहीं करेगी—

It is a very bad element that is being introduced in this Bill.

यह गलत है। इस लिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस बिल को जनता की राय जानने के लिये प्रचारित किया जाय, अभी न लिया जाय।

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO (Chatrapur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I support the Bill as it seeks to preserve the integrity of the State of Andhra Pradesh. Sir, the Mulki Rules problem is only a small problem. They apply only to the inferior services in the erstwhile State of Hyderabad now called Telengana which is part of Andhra Pradesh and also they relate to the admission to schools and colleges and some technical institutions. After all, what is the percentage of people that are covered by these Mulki Rules? It is an insignificant percentage. Should this small problem divide the State?

After all, if you go into the history of the Mulki Rules you will find that the erstwhile Hyderabad administration framed these rules because there were no educational facilities and the local people were not in a position to compete in open competitions to secure jobs. These Mulki Rules have been given the legal status. In 1956, when the States Representation Commission suggested that Telengana should be a separate State, the leaders from the Andhra region and the Telengana region met and entered into an agreement whereby they conceded the continuance of the Mulki Rules, the formation of a Telengana Regional Committee and a separate budget for Telengana, and alternatively the Chief Minister should be from Telengana. This agreement was given a constitutional sanction, and Article 371 of the Constitution has embodied all the terms of the agreement. Having none so, is it propose for the leaders and the people of Andhra Pradesh to complain about the Mulki Rules? After all, they are going to end in 1977 in the twin cities of Hyderabad and Secunderabad and in 1980 in the rest of Telengana region.

These Mulki Rules were not peculiar to the erstwhile Hyderabad State alone. A similar protection and safeguard was

there even in other native States in India. They were later integrated with the rest of India. You find in every State the demand for jobs for the sons of the soil, and the Mulki Rules are similar to that. These rules do not apply to the gazetted posts, and their life comes to an end in 1977 and 1980 as the case may be. It is a small matter, and the leaders and the people of Andhra region should realise this.

The leaders of both the regions could have come to an agreement, but no serious attempt was made to arrive at an agreement. Of course, they have faith in the leadership of the Prime Minister and they approached for a statement. She has given the award. The award having been given simply because the award does not satisfy them, can the award be set aside? I appeal to the Andhra Pradesh gentlemen not to feel too much, not to get agitated at all over a small issue. Likewise, I also appeal to the Telengana people to see that unless they stand together with the Andhra brethren from the Andhra region. Telengana as such cannot improve, cannot grow strong economically. (Interruptions) What has produced this tendency at the present stage in Telengana is because in the erstwhile Hyderabad regime, nothing was done except for the twin cities of Hyderabad and Secunderabad. If you go to the suburbs in Hyderabad you find backwardness, stark poverty—(Interruptions).

SHRI S. B. GIRI: For the last 15 years, the Andhras were responsible. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Giri, you will have your opportunity to speak.

16 hrs.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO: Therefore, Telengana could not develop today. What is the reason? Can they stand alone if the integrated State of Andhra Pradesh cannot develop the Telengana region? I am really sorry. That is why the regional committees were formed so that the backwardness could be removed. The Mulki

[Shri Jagannath Rao]

Rules and the safeguards given to the people as you know, are for a limited period. On these small points, should people quarrel and disintegrate into two units? You will find other States are clamouring for outlying areas but here peculiarly the people of this State want to divide on a small issue. I am surprised. The mulki rules have been given a legal status: they are valid under article 35(b) of the Constitution. The agreement between the leaders of both regions had been ratified and given a statutory basis under article 371 of the Constitution. Therefore, I appeal to the good sense of the Andhra people, particularly their leaders. Curiously enough nine Ministers headed by the Deputy Chief Minister who came here hailed the Prime Minister's award as the best solution to the problem. Having gone back to Andhra Pradesh, they changed their stand and say that they want a separate State. Is it the test of leadership? I appeal to the people of Andhra, M.P. friends who belong to both the regions to realise and appreciate that unless they stand together and preserve the unity and integrity of Andhra Pradesh State, it will be a sad day for all of them.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wand-wash): When Andhra was formed it was the first State on a linguistic basis. It is very unfortunate that after 16 or 17 years still we do not have an integrated Telugu speaking State. Regional loyalty has overtaken linguistic affinity and hence the talk of separation has started. When Andhra was formed in 1956, they agreed that they would be implementing the gentlemen's agreement and we are now in a situation when both sides agree that it has not been implemented. During these years we have been formulating many policies and programmes, point after point and finally all that has ended in a fiasco. When there was agitation in Telangana area the Prime Minister in this same House announced the eight points programme and afterwards then the Telangana Praja Samiti was elected to this House against the Congress Party, the Congress Party wooed them and gave them some assurances and they merged with the Congress. Even the six point programme has not solved the problem.

Now the Prime Minister has given the five point formula. That formula is not acceptable to both sides, I think. (Interruptions) I know pretty well that Members who oppose this Bill outside this House, in the Lobby and the Central Hall, are to support the Bill inside this House. That is the position regarding the Mulki rules. As regards the present Bill on Mulki rules, neither Telengana wants it nor do Andhras want it.

In regard to Mulki rules, Parliament enacted the Public Employment (Requirement as to Residence) Act 1957 and it went to the Supreme Court. It was Mr. V. S. Narasimha Rao—not the present Chief Minister Narasimha Rao, I shall come to it later—who went to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court held that it was invalid. The relative part of the judgment reads:

"We accept the argument of Mr. Gupta advocate of the petitioners) that the Constitution, as it stands, speaks of a whole State as the venue for residential qualification and it is impossible to think that the Constituent Assembly was thinking of residence in districts, taluqas, cities or villages. The fact that this clause is an exception and came as an amendment must dictate that a narrow construction upon the exception should be placed as indeed the debates in the Constituent Assembly also seem to indicate. We accordingly reject the contention of Mr. Setalwad (who appeared for the Government) seeking to put a very wide and liberal construction upon the words 'any law' and 'any requirement'. These words are obviously controlled by the words 'residence within the State or Union Territory' which words mean what they say, neither more nor less. It follows therefore that Section 3 of the Public Employment (Requirement as to Residence) Act, 1957, in so far as it relates to Telengana (and we say nothing about the other parts) and Rule 3 of the Rules under it are *ultra vires* the constitution."

Hence it was struck down by the Supreme Court and the old Mulki rules were saved by article 35(b), because it happens

to be a pre-constitutional law. Now the Minister claims that Parliament has power to enact this Bill under article 35(b). It is an incorrect statement. That is what we said when this Bill was sought to be introduced and we objected to it. Article 35(b) says:

'any law in force immediately before the commencement of the Constitution in the territory of India with respect to any of the matters referred to in sub-clause (i) of clause (a) or providing for punishment for any act referred to in sub-clause (ii) of that clause shall, subject to the terms thereof and to any adaptations and modifications that may be made therein under article 372, continue in force until altered or repealed or amended by Parliament.'

It is only declaratory and it does not confer any power on Parliament to make law. The power we derive is from article 35(a), which was interpreted by the 1969 judgment. They have said very clearly:

'The clause thus enables Parliament to make a law in a special case prescribing any requirement as to residence within a State or Union Territory prior to appointment, as a condition of employment in the State or Union Territory. Under article 35(a) this power is conferred upon Parliament but is denied to the Legislatures of the States, notwithstanding anything in the Constitution, and under (b), any law in force immediately before the commencement of the Constitution in respect of the matter shall subject to the terms thereof and subject to such adaptations that may be made under article 372 is to continue in force until altered or repealed or amended by Parliament.'

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What does this Bill do? Does it not seek to repeal or alter?

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: It is not mandatory. It is only declaratory.

It declares that they are in existence. We have to go to article 35(a) to get our powers to enact new legislation. This is what the jurists say clearly. I am quoting from the report of the Committee of Jurists on Telangana Safeguards. The Chairman was Mr Justice K. N. Wanchoo *ex-Chief Justice of India*. The other two members were Mr. Setalwad, *ex-Attorney General* and Mr. Niren De the present Attorney General. I quote:

'We have already indicated that in view of the interpretation placed by the Supreme Court on article 16(3), it is no longer possible to make any law or rule prescribing residential qualification in a part of a State for appointments within that part. Any law or rule so made would be bad and would be liable to be struck down as *ultra vires* the Constitution. No legislative measures whether in the form of law or a rule promulgated under the proviso to article 309 of the Constitution are now possible to continue the position obtaining under the Act of 1957 and the rules framed thereunder in 1959 with respect to the Telangana area. Therefore, if any law is to be passed providing for residential qualification within a part of the State, then first there will have to be a constitutional amendment of article 16(3) by which the words "or a part thereof" have to be added after the words "any requirement as to residence within that State or Union Territory." Without such a constitutional amendment, it would not be possible to provide for a residential qualification within part of a State or Union Territory either by law or rule.'

So, they are very clear. The present Attorney General is very clear in pointing out that the present Bill is unconstitutional and it will be struck down by the Supreme Court.

What is the case of the Government? Their opinion seems to be, the position has changed entirely after the incitement in the case of Directors of Industries and

[Shri G. Viswanathan]
Commerce, Government of Andhra Pradesh *Vs.* Venkata Reddy and others, wherein the Court has held that section 2 of the Public Employment Act is also bad along with section 3 and that the Mulki rules continued in force, even after the constitution of the State of Andhra Pradesh under the States Reorganisation Act, 1956 and are still operative.

This means that the protection given under article 35(b) of the Constitution still continues, and as provided under that article, the Rules 'continue in force until altered, repealed or amended by Parliament'. The assumption of the Jurists Committee, on which its advice was based, does not hold good in the light of the latest judgment of the Supreme Court.

Article 35(b) of the Constitution gives powers to the Parliament to alter, repeal or modify the Mulki Rules, and the Mulki Rules Bill has been framed under this power. There is, therefore, nothing unconstitutional about the Bill which does not seek to lay down any new requirement as to residence in part of a State for employment in public service, but provides for repeal in a phased manner of provisions which have continued to be in force under article 35(b).

In short, their argument is that we are not laying down any new requirement as to residence in any part of the State for employment in public service. Let me point out that the present Bill speaks of the capital area and the Telengana area, both of which have been defined. To be more specific, clause 6 says:

"The Mulki Rules shall, in so far as they relate to appointments to Schedule posts in the Capital area, cease to have effect on the expiration of the 31st day of December, 1977....."

Here it speaks of capital area and restricts employment to a particular area. Then, clause 7 says:

"The Mulki Rules shall, in so far as they relate to appointments to Schedule

posts in the Telengana area other than the Capital area, cease to have effect on the expiration of the 31st day of December, 1980, and shall stand repealed on the expiration of that day, but such repeal shall not affect the validity of any appointment previously made in pursuance of those Rules."

It means that we are amending the Mulki Rules and by that amendment we are enacting a new Act.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Can you amend something without an Act?

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: By amending the Mulki Rules, which is a pre-constitution law, we are almost enacting a new law, which attracts article 16(3) and so unconstitutional. We cannot enact a new law unless article 16(3) is amended, according to the Supreme Court and the jurists appointed by the Government of India.

If the Government do not want to consult the Attorney-General, they may refer it to the Supreme Court for its opinion. I want to know from the Minister why they are shirking their responsibility and why they are afraid of referring it to the Attorney-General, when a unanimous demand has been made by all the opposition parties that it should be referred to the Attorney-General.

Further, this Mulki Rules Bill does not satisfy either area of Andhra except some Members, and that also when they are inside the House. According to the Members from both Andhra and Telengana, the situation there is explosive. Nine Congress Ministers have resigned in Andhra and they have formed an Andhra Congress. The army, the CRP, BSF or the police can control the situation, but they cannot run the administration. Let us be clear on this issue.

The House should be convinced the people should be convinced about the five-point formula. Before convincing the people, let them convince the Congress Party. Let them do it, because it is the

major party in Andhra Pradesh. If they are able to convince the Congress Members, Congress Ministers and Congress MPs, inside and outside the House, I think it will be acceptable to all. But, unfortunately, it is not so.

They say that this will be ending in 1977. I do not know whether it will be possible.

Is it possible to end the Mulki Rules in 1977? It is a very auspicious year. The elections are there. Can you go and tell the people that the Mulki Rules will end when the elections are there. I want to get an assurance from the Government whether the Mulki Rules will end in 1977.

Again, as far as the leadership is concerned, it is not strong enough to get all the people around the table and convince them. It is a very weak leadership of the Central Government. By passing this Bill, this will not serve the situation because the "Made in Delhi" Chief Ministers cannot control the situation. Although we are in favour of the progress and development of the Telugu-Speaking State, ultimately, it is for the people of both the regions to decide the question.

DR. G. S. MELKOTE (Hyderabad): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to make certain observations today from the anguish of my heart. The two people speaking the same language Telugu, from Telengana and Andhra, are quarrelling over certain basic issues. It is not the number of people affected in the matter of services, though it is equally important, it is not any other factor, but what we in India are trying to do is to enunciate certain values for the progress of our country in which every citizen has a part to play and feel happy.

In this context, may I point out, even after Independence, in Hyderabad, we had a democratic Government only for a short period. The S.R.C. came in and said that Telengana is a viable unit and can

remain as such. But our Andhra friends felt that both of us should come together. The Mulki Rules were not enunciated in 1956. They were enunciated sometime back in 1918.

Before I proceed further, I would like to say that I really feel very sorry that on this question many innocent lives have been lost. The railway property has been damaged, whether in this region or in that region; should not matter. It is all ours. My hon. friend, Shri Raghu Ramaiah, said that he offered his condolences to the members of the bereaved families in Andhra area. I go further and say that we all of us from Telengana offer condolences to the members of the bereaved families in Andhra as well as in Telengana. We should have no such bias. We are all one. Human values have got to be preserved. What you and I are discussing here, it is shame to us that people who speak the same language should bring out their differences to be thrashed out before the Members of Parliament who may not understand clearly any of our problems. We ourselves can sit together and come to a certain settlement. It does not matter what time it takes.

The Mulki Rules were enunciated in 1918. The British Government thought that it was better to divide India into Hindu community and Muslim community, according to religious differences, the policy of divide and rule. The then Viceroy sent Sir Ali Imam as the Chief Minister of Hyderabad State. Then, he brought in an influx of Muslims from U.P. and, therefore, the few opportunities that existed for the many local Muslims and a few Hindus were affected.

We had very little educational facilities. The facilities were very poor. The university had just come up. Even in 1947 for the whole of the dominion we had only three intermediate colleges, one women's college, one university and one college affiliated to Madras University. In 1947, the total number of students in the University were not even 3000 in all the

(Dr. S. Melkote.)

faculties. This was the extent of our backwardness. One should try to understand the background of it.

The whole area of nearly 84,000 sq. miles could have then be divided into three parts one third of the land belonged to Sarfkhask, that is, Nizam's own land one-third belonged to noble-men, that is, *Paigahs* and *Jagirdars* and the remaining one-third belonged to the people of whom Reddies and Kapus dominated and who owned all the lands so that the people had no land left. Educational facilities were absolutely not available. Therefore, in 1947 we fought for ushering in a democratic government in Hyderabad and we got it and were getting along fairly well. In that context, the Tungabhadra project came in. The whole of the old Hyderabad area contributed towards the development of the Tungabhadra project which has gone out to either the Andhra area or to Mysore. We are not sorry for it but we have spent money, for the development of an area which is not in Telengana today.

In this context, I would like to say that in 1923 the Hindus and the Muslims, both joined together to see that Muslims from the UP did not come in there. The enunciation of the Mulki rule was the result. In 1928 the Nizamsagar project was constructed and the Andhra people with their money came in there, and started purchasing land. Then the Land Alienation Bill was brought in saying that without the permission of the Government no land can be purchased by outsiders. This was the background of the whole situation. And, in 1956 it is not against the Andhras that we fought, it was against our own Chief Minister whose car was damaged and there were firings in Hyderabad in Afzalganj area and in Bhongir—in Telengana and not in the Andhra for maintaining the Telengana as a separate entity. They, the Andhras said 'Why not we two people come together and come to some agreement?' Then the Andhras offered this gentlemen's agreement. It is not that we asked for it. This Mulki Rules was not asked by us. It is they who offered it to the Telengana people

to assuage the feelings and other sufficient protection to the Telenganes resulting in the gentlemen's agreement being signed here.

I do not know what has happened. It has been a surprise to us. I want to make a bold statement here today. This gentlemen's agreement entered into by both the groups in the respective regions and decided upon unanimously in the Andhra legislature in February and August, 1956 resulted in the enactment of Public Employment Act in Parliament in 1957 wherein all the items of the gentlemen's agreement do not find a proper place and they are modified. It has been tampered with. By whom? I told Mr. Pant yesterday that it was the responsibility of the Central Government to get it implemented properly. That is tampered with and if the bureaucracy here, with the help of anybody else—I do not know who have tampered with the gentlemen's agreement and frequently the Public Employment Act is being mentioned but in the gentlemen's agreement, please find out whether any mention of a superior service or inferior service have been mentioned. The whole services, superior and inferior, more or less, have been included but the same have been tampered with in the Act and they have now said only inferior services should be included in the Mulki rules. There were none to question them then as this was done in 1957 but implemented in 1959 as by this time the Telengana area had been merged and ceased to exist. In this Act, if the superior services are not mentioned, is it our fault, the fault of the Telenganes? May I know whose fault it is? How did this change take place? It is the values that are important. Promises held out are being broken. What is it that you are giving us today for Telengana? One thousand or two thousands or four thousands jobs.

Today, in that region, all the financial institutions, all the other institutions, the electricity Department the co-operative societies and the taccavi loans, the Land Mortgage Banks, even in the fertiliser

distribution in these districts are manned by 99 per cent by the Andhras and not by us. Teleganites have no place and Andhras are dominating everywhere.

What about the poor Muslims in our area? The Police Action came in and then they were 10 per cent of the population occupying 80 per cent of the services. They had no land, no other avenue of employment and no industry in that area. Then comes in a proposal after police action to reduce their strength to 10 per cent, in proportion to their population strength. They are decent gentlemen, very few people are really rabid or fanatic. You go to any part of India. You will see Hindus and Muslims living together but in separate bastees. But, in Hyderabad, the Muslims' houses and the Hindus' houses are side by side. We have lived together like brothers all these years. Today what is the position? They have become very poor. Is it not your duty to find out why this is happening? Is it not your duty to see why they are suffering? Have you looked into that? What have you done to ameliorate their conditions? On account of the agitation in Telengana in 1969, to get their support, the Government had one of their buildings restored back to them, the Darussalam. The then Chief Minister, Mr Brahmanandam Reddy, gave it back to them. A dead horse gifted back.... (*Interruptions*) The point is this that they are suffering and many of them were dismissed from the Government service and in this context the Police Services needed to be re-organised with the proper set of people so that the Hindus of Hyderabad may not take revenge against the Muslim population after police action for their past deeds. So, we sent our people to Vijayawada and other places for selection of people to the Police force and today 60 per cent of the police force then selected are already from Andhra area and the present Bill wants more of the Andhras to be recruited with regard to the police services in the Hyderabad city. Those people then recruited in 1953-54 already are on the Telangana pay list

Now, you say Andhra people have no protection in the City'. They have already 60 per cent of the police services in the city and you want now to have cent per cent in the combined Police Services? Is it that you want to smother us? What is this idea. The question is this: is it not a fact that we asked for this Mulki rule in the gentlemen's agreement. Andhras gave it to us. The gentlemen's agreement that was enunciated here has not been properly enunciated in the Public Employment Act of 1957 by the Government of India after Telangana ceased to exist as a separate entity. Whose fault is it? I would like to bring in a motion to make an impeachment against those people in the Central Government who have done this tampering with it in this manner. Have the Central Government officials connived with the Andhra Government services to have this change brought about in the enactment of the Public Services Employment Act in 1957. If it is so, it is a very serious matter. It is the Andhras and the Central Government who are responsible for this and not we. In this context and due to this enactment when the Telangana Services are suffering and appeal to courts to obtain justice from 1957-1969, everytime that the court gave a verdict in favour of Andhras they were immediately implemented but if it was in favour of Telanganitis, it was not implemented.

The Government of India lent support to the ICS officers at the Centre and in Andhra; they appear to have connived at the whole affair here and there. And then, when the Supreme Court gives a decision ultimately in our favour, is there any fool who would say that we would feel very satisfied if 12 to 14 annas in a rupee of this judgement is implemented? That is what is happening. What is it that you are talking about? It is not a matter of 2,000 jobs or 4,000 jobs. Our lands are gone; our financial and other institutions are in their hands; much of the money of the State Government is spent through PWD and work done through contractors, but in the Telengana area the Muslim and Hindu contractors have been completely elimi-

[Dr. G. S. Melkote]

nated and not even 1 per cent of them get any contract at all now. How can we exist? This is the problem that is facing us and therefore we want to separate. There is this unholy alliance in Andhra area between the bureaucracy, Andhra politicians and students and that is the bane of our trouble. The peasants there have nothing to do with it. This is the situation. What our Minister Shri Mirdha has said is correct. But in the Telengana area the whole population backs up the Mulki movement as it affects every individual. It is a mass movement. In 1969 as many as 350 lives were lost in the agitation in Hyderabad city.

In this Bill, in Clause 4, the Mulki Rules as it exists today is being invalidated and the irregular appointments for Andhras already made during these 17 years get validated. What about employment for us? We, the Telanganites, are not going to get any employment at all, either in the past or future. Whatever we lose due to validation, we lose; Whatever employment we may get in future till 1977 or 1980, we will not get, because the employment potential is very bleak. Therefore what is the idea of the whole Bill, Sir? Are there any human values given to our suffering? Under these circumstances we say, thank you very much, if you want to go, you may go, let us be left to live honourably. Where do we stand? What have they done to us? How much of their riches have been brought in to help us? I would like to ask them. I do not want to speak with emotion. I am speaking the truth.

What is necessary for them is to create the confidence in our minds. Let them say, have the Mulki rule for any length of time and we will behave like gentlemen. The Promises made will be fulfilled. It is after that that we may say, after some years when improvement takes place that things have changed and we may not want the Mulki rules any longer. Such a situation should arise, when alone the Mulki rules could be abrogated.

Sir, I do not want to take up much of the time. I have never exceeded my time

limit. These are things of value and until and unless confidence is created in our minds nothing can be done. They have placed the Prime Minister's prestige in jeopardy. We know that they have pressurised her to do certain things for them. If they desire, and we have offered it let there be a separate Andhra Regional Committee, separate Secretariat for Rayalaseema and Andhra, colleges and schools in Hyderabad with their money being spent. We have no objection. They do not want to look at all these things. They want to ride roughshod over our interests. These are the things that are happening. These things should be understood properly. I am afraid whether there would not be bloodshed if separation immediately does not take place. It should be avoided. We appealed to our people to be non-violent and to allow this question to be decided by democratic methods. In Hyderabad there is a complete control over the situation. Nothing serious has so far happened. But some Telangana men were lynched in Andhra area and in reprisal the Telanganites are saying that they were not going to Co-operate with Andhras in any matter in the Telangana area; but we have no desire to trouble them in any manner. If they want to go back let them go back. But we are not going to cooperate with them. So, our people are offering passive resistance and non co-operation with the Andhras. What is wrong about it? In Bardoli, in the British times, we offered such passive resistance against our own people who helped the British. What is wrong about it? We say to these gentlemen our Andhra M.Ps who are all our good friends, if you want to separate, which we also want, please do so. We would thank you very much for it. We would be grateful to you. We would give you a good send off I think possibly after separation we can live together better than what we are doing today. Separation is the best solution.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated-Anglo-Indians): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose this Bill. That we see today in this House and in Andhra Pradesh is an unspeakable tragedy for the

country, and the tragedy is heightened by the fact that in 1953 I had predicted what the country is paying for today was the original sin of Andhra Pradesh....

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Naudyal): He is very wrong.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: It was the original sin of Andhra Pradesh. Let me finish what I was going to say. My hon. friend does not know what I am talking about.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: He himself does not know what he is talking about.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: Alone in this House, long before my young friend began to wear pants or dhotis, I had opposed the formation of Andhra Pradesh in this House, and the *Statesman* at least in an editorial paid me the tribute of saying that what I had said would perhaps reverberate down the corridors of India, and that reverberation you have today. Dr. Katju was then the Home Minister.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: This is not a linguistic quarrel.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: Then, I told him 'For this tragedy that you are perpetrating against India, this crime that you are committing, this criminal hostage to disintegration, posterity will either burn or hang your effigy' Dr. Katju got up and left saying that I was abusing him. He forgot that I was and that I wanted to be a fairly good pastmaster in the art of parliamentary vituperation. Be that as it may, and that is the irony, this original sin of Andhra Pradesh has moved a full circle, and it has come home to roost for the whole of India. I see what is happening as a terrible unspeakable tragedy. I said that Andhra Pradesh would precipitate not only a multiplicity of linguistic States but ultimately those same linguistic States which they were then breaking the country into would in turn further break up, and that tragedy, as I said, is happening today. I also said this. But who listened?

AN HON. MEMBER: Better not to listen....

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: I do not know whether my hon. friends have had the courage to say what they are feeling. But I stigmatised the creation of the linguistic State, starting with Andhra Pradesh, not only as a criminal hostage to Indian disintegration, but I said that they were installing a more vicious variant of communalism that India had ever experienced, and now we have a new communalism worse than any of the old communalisms which had become fashionable to rant against. And what is it? They are now identifying political power with language-cum-region, and out of that, they are now getting a new evil chauvinism, the worst kind of linguism-cum-regionalism fortified by political power. And you are seeing it today, the tragedy in the country.

My hon. friend Dr. G. S. Melkote spoke with tremendous emotion, and I could appreciate what he was saying....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There were more emotions before the hon. Member came here.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: He spoke deeply with emotion, but he did not rant, and that was why his emotion for me was perhaps a little more persuasive.

And what happened? That is the tragedy. What I accuse the Government of today is that it is not only covertly but overtly affirming and sanctifying this new vicious variant of communalism, linguisable-cum-regional chauvinism.

What is the 'sons of the soil' movement? What are they doing about it? There is the Shiva Sena philosophy, not Marastha for the Maharashtrians, but Maharatta for the Marathi-speaking people. What are Government doing about it? Not only indirectly but directly they are affirming it.

SHRI SHIVAJI RAO S. DESHMUKH (Parabhani): All the leaders in the Shiva Sena are Brahmins by caste.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: What are they doing? As I say, they are not only indirectly but directly affirming it. This Shiv Sena philosophy has corroded every State Government in this country. And whatever their protestations are, you affirm it, the Central Government affirm it. Because unless you exercise this power under art. 16(3), no State Government can have quotas on a regional basis. You come in and get legislation passed. You are affirming this evil 'sons of the soil' movement.

I know what is happening. My friends are in millions. Hindus subscribing to the same language, the same religion, and they are oppressed. You know the unspeakable oppression of the other minorities. I am not going to talk about it. But we know. In the name of the 'sons of the soil' movement, in Gujarat they would give to the linguistic minorities, Maharashtrians, no jobs. But what about the smaller minorities? You say they do not belong to the State, because they have not lived there permanently, for 15 years. They may have been in government offices, transferable from one area to another, and so they have their homes there. Their fathers were there. But you say they are not eligible, their sons and daughters are not eligible. You go further and say, 'You cannot get into any State college'. That is the tragedy of the smaller minorities.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Does this Bill not seek to deal with that?

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: I will come to that a little later—I do not want my voice crossed.

The Centre is affirming this. I am told by MLAs in different States that the Centre now has issued some kind of directives: not only will the sons of the soil be the only people eligible for government service, the public sector has been given a directive that you will only

take in these people who qualify under the 'sons of the soil' concept.

As for private people, there is a friend of mine who runs a big business concern. He says, 'I have got a directive from the West Bengal Government to give preference only to the sons of the soil'. You know how the Hindi States are interpreting it. 'Sons of the soil' do not mean people in that State; it means people whose mother tongue is Hindi.

What does the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities say? You adopt a memorandum solemnly. Shri Pant's father, Govind Ballabh Pant was there. I had something to do with that. He placed it on the Table. Solemnly the State Governments accepted it, that you will not insist that those whose mother tongue is not that particular language will pass the entrance examination. What does the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities say about the Hindi State? And what does the Central Government do? It comes here, makes excuses. The whole attitude, I say with great respect to Shri Mirdha, was a disgustingly non-possomous attitude: 'What can we do?' What are our powers.

You see what is happening. As I say, it is a tragedy, not only for the people of Andhra Pradesh; it is a tragedy for the whole country.

You, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, asked me: are you not trying to deal with the 'sons of the soil' movement in this? It is even more vicious. At present, it is sons of the soil, that is, those who speak the language of a particular State. But you are applying it in an even more vicious form. Now you are saying that the 'sons of the soil' concept will only apply in a part of the State. I do not think it is going to stand up to challenge in the courts. I am not going to argue that, because the idea of art. 16(3) that you could have this evil 'sons of the soil' concept for the whole State, but you cannot apply this concept only to a part of the State. Anyway, be that as it may. Let Government cross that hurdle when it comes.

Is this not much more vicious than the old communalisms? You killed the old communalisms when you said: No more quotas. Those Muslims those Anglo-Indians and so on, we, the minorities, got quotas; they were only the crumbs we got. Today I do not know what is the position of the other minorities. I know about my community. No service at all is open in the States to a small minority because of this accursed 'sons of the soil' movement which the Government affirms and reaffirms, fortifies and re-fortifies. This is what is happening.

I told my hon. friend, Shri Bhandari: the day you give up your quotas, from that day not one Scheduled Caste will get into service anywhere. These unfortunate people come to me because they cannot get justice. When cases are being investigated they cannot get justice; Cases have been tried; and they cannot get justice when the cases go to the Supreme Court. That is the tragedy of the Scheduled Castes today. They have no quota in the promotion cadres. They come to me every other day. They are not taken into the promotion cadre. Not even God will help them when their quotas go. At least now they get it so far as some recruitment is concerned. But if they ever gave it up or are so ill-advised to give it up, I think the minorities will greatly suffer and even God, I think, will not be able to help them to get any kind of employment.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: How has all this got to do with the Bill. Mr. Anthony?

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: Yes; the Government is having this cleft-stick. This is a pernicious sanctification of the sons of the soil movement in a part of the State. I do not know; you are not going to stop it. It is like trying to close the stable door after the horse has bolted. You will not be able to stop it. Somebody asked me, "If we allow them to separate, what will happen to Vidarbha? What will happen to Saurashtra? What will happen to Chhattisgarh?" I asked, "What will happen?" Do you think this

is going to stop it? If by any chance—I do not think there is one chance in a million—you resolve this through the Mulki Rules, immediately, you will get the demands from Vidarbha, Saurashtra, from Uttar Pradesh, from Madhya Pradesh, for similar Mulki Rules for their areas.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: I am finishing. As I said, this is a cleft-stick of the Government. You cannot get out of it. What I say is this. Look at the tragedy. This is dangerous temporising because you are playing with human lives.

As I see, as I look around rather objectively, I see the extent to which the position has become absolutely irreconcilable. This Bill is going to be a dangerous exercise in temporising. All I can say is that it does not solve anything. There is going to be much more bloodshed and ultimately the Government will come and say, "Let these people separate." But what I say is, let them separate now. Let them go in peace, because the danger is this; all the smaller minorities will get the backwash. The danger is this: If you impose this and if it is not acceptable to either side, then feelings will become so inflamed and there will be utter tragedy: Hindus, belonging to the same religion and the same language, will become so utterly bitter and hateful towards each other that the Telengana person will not be safe; his wife and daughter will not be safe in the Andhra region. And the Andhra person in the Telengana area will be in the same position. What is the good? As I said, it is an exercise in temporising.

Take it either way. If it succeeds, you will get a similar demand. But if it is not going to succeed, the only consequence is that a lot of innocent people are going to lose their lives.

SHRI PATTABHI RAMA RAO (Rajamundry): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this linguistic States conception is not a new one. It has a history of more than half a century. The father of the Nation had given it his blessings as early as in the twenties of this century. Actually, ever since then, the Telugu-speaking people have been stressing to form a State of their own. Stalwarts like the Andhra Kesari,—Prakasam Pantulu,—Kaleswara Rao, from the Andhra region, and Madapathi Hanumantha Rao and Gurukula Ramakrishna Rao from the other region—I am just giving only a few names—all of them were doing their best to see that Andhra Pradesh was formed in the year 1956. 16 years have passed since the State has been formed, and during these 16 years there were governments there, and there was a peaceful atmosphere till three years ago.

Actually, the Telengana region was known to be backward. There is no doubt about it. That is exactly why more money was spent there. Many projects have come in there and if, today, there is such a clamour in the Andhra area that all the money has been spent there and that in spite of it they are not treating us properly, it only requires—

SHRI S. B. GIRI: Not from Andhra. The money spent there is not of Andhras.

SHRI PATTABHI RAMA RAO: Andhras also have contributed.

SHRI S. B. GIRI: Not a single pie; on the other hand they have looted us another Rs. 6 crores.

SHRI PATTABHI RAMA RAO: Andhras have been living in Hyderabad and money has been contributed by them and surely money has gone to both the regions. While so much money has been spent, why is there this feeling? The Andhras, the lawyers or doctors or others who are living in Hyderabad—their children cannot be admitted in the colleges of Hyderabad, in the State capital; they could not get facilities or jobs. Hyderabad is supposed to be the capital of that State. Do you see a parallel in

any other capital, anywhere in India? How long is that to be tolerated? That was the feeling in Andhra which is now bothering every one of them. That is why agitation started. The Ministry tried to adjust both the regions and it was not possible. Then they came to the Prime Minister; the Prime Minister asked them to resolve it among themselves and give her a solution. In spite of the best efforts of a stalwart and senior politician like Mr. Chavan visiting that place several times, they could not come to any agreement and finally they left the matter to the Prime Minister for her award and she has given an award after consideration, careful thought. One of my predecessors said that that award was morally binding on all of us.

Personally, I feel that the five point programme which she has given will serve the purpose certainly and in due course everybody will feel that in that State all are one and the separatist mentality will not be there after 1976 in the city and in the entire State after 1980. Personally I feel that we should live in Andhra Pradesh as one State. In Hyderabad city, when there is so much of development both culturally as well as economically, we should certainly try to see that Andhra Pradesh is not divided under any circumstances.

Legislation that has been brought forward after the Supreme Court judgment is absolutely necessary; otherwise there will be big confusion and orders that had been passed since 1956, some of them at least, will be null and void. This legislation is to be supported under any circumstance.

I am only surprised at the speech of Jan Sangh leader Shri Joshi who says that there can be small States and they will prosper. With the little Hindi that I could follow translated into English, for Telengana and Andhra he gives the parallel of Punjab and Haryana of Maharashtra and Gujarat. What comparison does he make? Gujarat and Maharashtra are not speaking the same language; similarly in Haryana and Punjab also. But in Andhra this is not the

case; we all talk Telugu and we are all Telugu people and we do not like to be compared like that and separated into small pieces. Probably Jan Sangh may feel happy if there is any trouble there and I can assure them that they have no place whatsoever there, even though he may dream that a such thing would happen and the State would be divided; it will not happen. I am surprised at Dr Melkote's remarks that the people of Telengana have been suffering at the hands of the people of the Andhra region all these years. If you see what is happening in Andhra, it is the other way about. But why go into that now? Now that the limits have been set at 1977 for the twin cities and 1980 for the other areas the whole State will be one after 1980 in every respect. We should feel happy with this Bill and support it. After all the Prime Minister has taken a lot of pains in giving such a good award. We must respect it. I come from a region where today the tempers are very high; they are not happy with the present situation. But if it is explained to them they will know in course of time what it is and they will calm down and support the idea of having a single Andhra Pradesh instead of having two separate States.

PROF. MADHUR DANDAVATE (Raipur). Sir, at the outset I would like to say that there are a number of honest differences of opinion on this issue and on the entire Mulki Rules Bill. I feel these differences in the House are really the reflection of acute differences of opinion that exist in Andhra, Telengana and other parts of the country and without challenging the bonafides of any point of view, it should be possible for us to debate calmly and coolly the various constitutional, socio-economic and political issues involved in this. There can be honestly different points of view about States reorganisation and we need not brand one school of politicians as integrationists and the other school of politicians as disintegrationists. We had for instance, the Greater Bombay State Patriots demanded on both sides let there be a Maha Gujarat and a Samvukt

Maharashtra. Movements on both sides were led by veteran nationalists whose progressive character could not be challenged.

16.53 hrs.

[**SRI MATI SHEILA KAUJ** in the Chair] But even at that time some suspicions were created and the demand for States' reorganisation on the basis of language, which was upheld by Mahatma Gandhi, was considered a separatist tendency.

When the demand for Punjabi Subha was made, many said, how can we take such a risk about a border State? But after the Chinese aggression it became evident that the very Punjabis whose patriotism was suspect in the eyes of some defended the borders of the country and the opposition to Punjabi Subha completely subsided. There is no challenge to nationalism in the Punjabi Subha that was carved out.

Therefore, let us analyse what are the constitutional, political and socio-economic implications. Let us see whether there is genuine cause for tensions in these areas. I am one of those who never take a doctrinaire view whenever tensions develop in various regions. As a nationalist a secularist and more than that a socialist I am more interested in seeing that the tensions are eliminated so that developmental activities are taken up and programmes of social revolution can be undertaken. I would like to analyse it from that point of view also.

I would also try to put forward before you one point which has not been brought before the House for discussion so far. While taking any decision of this type, as we are doing through this Bill we must try to respect the various democratic institutions, functions and traditions in the country. In our country under the provisions of the Constitution the Telengana Regional Committee was created under article 371 and orders were issued by the President of India in the year 1958. That statutory body that was created namely, the Telengana Regional

(Prof. Madhu Dandavate.)

Committee, has taken some decisions which you, in your wisdom, might not consider to be wise decisions. But here is a statutory body which has been created by the President under the provisions of the Constitution, and that statutory body has come forward with certain unanimous recommendations. Here we must remember that all the legislators coming from that region are members of that Committee. That Committee has stated, after going through the provisions of this Bill, that these provisions do not fulfil the aspirations of the people.

Here we are talking of various agreement. Formerly, there was the gentleman's agreement. Now a lady's formula seeks to replace the gentleman's agreement. I have nothing against either. But when various committees and commissions have expressed their views and when the Telengana Regional Committee have unanimously expressed the opinion, let us not side-track their point of view and say that a monopoly of wisdom lies with us, even though with our majority we can take that decision.

Just as we have given our point of view, the Telengana Regional Committee have also pointed out and categorically stated that there are certain complications that are involved, because of the Supreme Court judgment, as long as article 16(3) of the Constitution is not amended. I must submit that though I have always said that we must have the supremacy of the Parliament in amending any Act, at the same time we are not going to challenge the powers of the Supreme Court. When we discuss this issue and finally adopt this Bill, I have not the least doubt, I completely agree with Shri Frank Anthony, that when this matter goes to the Supreme Court, the legislative competence of this Parliament to enact this Bill itself is bound to be challenged. Therefore, I would take a sober note. I would not say that only what I have been saying is correct. I would not say that whatever Dr Melkote or Shri Giri is saying is the final truth. But when there are differences of opinion, when there is a Supreme Court about the interpretation of article

16(3) in terms of article 35A against certain restrictions placed by article 35B, we have to take legal counsel. The President, under his constitutional powers, must refer this matter to the Supreme Court for testing its constitutional validity. Therefore, let us not rush this measure; let us postpone this issue. Let us see that this particular Bill is circulated for eliciting public opinion. If that is done, we can know the *pros and cons* of this problem which we might lose sight of in the heated passionate discussion that we are having in Parliament and outside at the present time.

There are two or three constitutional aspects to which I want to draw attention. This is not the first time that such matters have gone to the court. The very basis of this Bill had gone to the court of law and there has been one important judgment. The Public Employment Act, 1957 was challenged before the Supreme Court as violative of article 16(3) of the Constitution inasmuch as the Public Employment Act relates only to a part of a State. Consequently, it was struck down as *ultra vires* the Constitution.

17 hrs.

As far as seeking the advice, opinion or viewpoint of the Supreme Court is concerned, there is a certain background Kerala Education Bill, 1957—Mr Anthony will be able to say whether it is wrong—Delhi Laws Act, 1951, the *Benarasi Union* case, 1960, these are all matters that were referred to the Supreme Court to find out whether the constitutional position was sound. Therefore, I would very much like that let some time be given to legal pundits to find out and explore the legal position.

To the sociologists and politicians, to see what is happening there, the political aspect is that instead of Mulki Rules Bill trying to settle the problem in Andhra Pradesh and Telengana, it is trying to perpetuate the tension. Andhra people who are opposed to the creation of Telengana for diametrically opposite reasons, and the politicians in Andhra and politicians in Telengana have come to the conclusion that rather than having

Mulki Rules, it is better that we bring about a bifurcation and, to a realist like me, I will keep even the door of bifurcation of Telengana open, rather than facing the danger of heightening the tension and causing serious damage to the economic developmental activity.

SHRI P. V. G. RAJU (Visakhapatnam): Madam Chairman, I rise to support the Bill.

On one essential issue, namely, history, I would not like history to repeat itself. I use the expression "repeat itself" because, as you know, Andhra was a united empire and, in 1562, in the battle of Khondur, the Vijyanagar empire was defeated by the Muslims and, from that day onwards, not only Andhra but the whole of India was broken up into smaller and smaller States. Therefore, I would not like to a party to the breaking of Andhra Pradesh again.

I feel, the ghosts of Bhamni kings are still stalking the land of Andhra Pradesh. As a matter of fact, Telengana is the residue of Nizam of Hyderabad. One can say, Nizam is an anachronism. But the fact is that Mulki Rules were created by the Nizam for the benefit of the local people in Telengana against people who have been coming from U.P., Bihar and Madhya Pradesh. I do not want to get into non-secular argument. But I am afraid, the whole idea was to give protection to local Muslims against the Muslims from Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Madhya Pradesh. Therefore, in an indirect sense, it has a communal background. I believe, by supporting Mulki Rules Bill, in any manner, we are supporting the residue or off-shoot of casteism and communalism.

I would support the Bill because I think it nullifies the question of reservations in employment. I would not like the history to repeat itself. As a matter of fact, if I may quote from history, the battle of Khondur was fought in such a manner that the Army at Khondur was

divided on the basis of caste. The fact is that Bhamni kings attacked Vijyanagar and the Army of Vijyanagar was divided because of the disunity and the break-down of Vijyanagar empire was the cause of the ruination not only of South India but the whole country. I am afraid of the residue of Bhamni kings, and the foreigners attacked India. Therefore, I feel, unless we support the Bill, we cannot undo that. Of course, my friends there may say that reservations will go on till 1980. But, I am afraid the time factor is such that we have to go on waiting upto 1980 because we cannot reverse the whole thing by one stroke of pen. I feel that we should support this Bill and allow for the linguistic States to fully fructify after 1980.

"SHRI MAGANTI ANKINEEDU (Gudivada): Madam Chairman, this Bill has been introduced because of the decision of the Supreme Court. I want to ask as to why this has been taken to the Supreme Court. Who will reply to this point. There is a regional committee for Telangana and we all expected that it will be under the State Assembly. But later on it happened that this regional committee has been divided into sub-committees etc., and Andhras had no voice in it. Later on it was found that they made political capital out of this regional committee and sub-committees and went to Delhi to suit their own purposes. Therefore Andhras had no quorum on which they can speak. If some 10 person is Andhra speak against this Committee then they are dubbed as separatists.

The present movement in Andhra is a spontaneous movement by the people and it is unprecedented. It is not inspired or encouraged by anybody. The other day Shri Indrajit Gupta also said that this movement is inspired by somebody but later on he withdrew it. This movement is spontaneous. Even Mr. Eswara Reddy said like this but I want to make it clear that this movement is unprecedented and

[Shri Maganti Ankinedu]

a spontaneous movement by the people I want to impress on the Central Government the gravity of the spontaneous movement by the people and I hope they will think over this problem deeply and take necessary action

I want to ask as to why whether these Mulki rules are applied to doctors, lawyers, engineers etc and then what will be their fate If these doctors, lawyers and engineers are transferred to Andhra Pradesh and those jobs are given to Telengana then what will be the fate of those doctors, lawyers and engineers who have been deprived of their jobs In this way there are many problems I want to state that these Mulki rules are not given effect to those who have gone over to Maharashtra and Mysore I want to ask this What is the necessity of applying the Mulki rules only in the State of Hyderabad and not to those regions which have gone to Maharashtra and Mysore During the recent disturbances in Andhra Pradesh many people have lost their lives It is not enough only if we offer condolences to them and I request the Government to order a judicial inquiry into the causes of those disturbances and come to a decision which will satisfy all parties We members of the Congress party MLA's and MPs requested the Prime Minister to give an award for the sake of maintaining the integrity of Andhra Pradesh Therefore, as members of the Congress Party we are all morally bound to support this formula of the Prime Minister Our forefathers and ancestors have struggled hard to maintain the integrity of Andhra Pradesh We are also bound to maintain that integrity But I want to state that people are not satisfied with this formula We can speak here sitting as Members of Parliament but tomorrow we have to go to our native places and face the wrath of the people We have to explain to the people of Andhra Pradesh that is our predicament Therefore, I request the Government to consider this problem seriously and take note of the explosive situation in Andhra Pradesh and come to an amicable solution of this problem.

श्री नाबू राम जिर्बा (नागौर) :
महापति महोदय, जिस विधेयक पर इस समय सदन में चर्चा चल रही है वह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण विधेयक है और उस को जल्दी से जल्दी पार करने की जरूरत है। मैं राजस्थान से आता हूँ और इस लिये मैं आन्ध्र प्रदेश के लोगों से एक अपील करना चाहता हूँ। राजस्थान 22 रियासतों का एक राज्य बना है। छोटे छोटे 22 तरह के राजाओं के कानून थे, 22 तरह के राजाओं के नियम थे और एक राज्य से दूसरे राज्य में जाने के लिये अलग अलग नियम थे जैसे एक देश से दूसरे देश में जाने के नियम होते हैं। इस तरह के हालात थे। कई इलाकों पिछड़े हुए थे और कई इलाकों उन में से आज तक पिछड़े हुए हैं। राजस्थान के इलाकों का पिछड़ेपन को ले कर एक दूसरे के खिलाफ शिकायत भी रहती है। पर अगर उन शिकायतों को ले कर हम आज राजस्थान का तोड़ने की बात साचे ता में समझता हूँ कि हम राजस्थान में रहने वाले लोगों की पीड़ितों के साथ इतना अन्याय करेंगे कि वह कभी भी तर्कशील नहीं कर सकेगा। बड़ा छोट छोट यूनिट्स बहुत से थे। अगर उन सब की तर्कशील होती तो उन में खुशहाली हार्ना क्योंकि आखिर हिन्दुस्तान के आजाद होने के बाद राजस्थान के एक बड़े सूबे होने का मतलब क्या है ?

आज आन्ध्र प्रदेश में जो स्थिति बन रही है उस की ओर हम का देखना पड़ेगा। आज उस सूबे की एक इज्जत है, उस का एक राजनीतिक वातावरण है। अगर उस राजनीतिक वातावरण को आप टुकड़ों में तोड़ना चाहे तो कैसे काम चलेगा ? इस से इस राज्य की जो एक पर्सनलिटी है उस को बड़ा धक्का पहुँच रहा है। इस लिये हम को इस पर गहराई से विचार करना चाहिये। आन्ध्र प्रदेश के लोगों को कुछ बातों के बारे में शिकायत हो सकती है कि उन की एक अलग

कौंसिल धनी हुई है, उन का एक भ्रमल वज्र है और वह भ्रमल तरह से चलता है, मुल्की नियमों के नीचे भर्ती में और सर्विस की सुविधाओं में कुछ इलाको को ज्यादा सुविधायी दी गई है ; हो सकता है कि आन्ध्र प्रदेश के बहुत से इलाके पिछड़े हुए हैं, आज भी राजपसीमा जैसे बड़ा इलाका है जो पिछड़े हुए है। वहां बहुत काम करने की जरूरत है। उन के लिये धन चाहिये, पैसा चाहिये। इसी तरह में तेलगाना के कुछ हिस्से पिछड़े हुए हैं। उन सारे हिस्सों को और आन्ध्र प्रदेश के हिस्सों को एक दूसरे से शिफायत हो सकती है और उन को पिछड़ेपन में आगे लाने की जरूरत है। लेकिन आज जिस प्रकार का वातावरण परिस्थितियों का बन गया है, मुस्लीम कांटे का जो जजमेत आया है, उस में एक नया तरीका का संश्लेषण खड़ा हो गया है, और वैसा आप ने कहा उस पर जन सब वाले अपना दृष्टिकोण रखने हैं, दूसरी पार्टियों वाले अपना दृष्टिकोण रखते हैं। कई तरह की शिफायतों का, यह मैं आप में से और हम में म कइ लाभ है। हार्ट में अपना फील्ड व्यक्त कर रहे हैं। लेकिन क्या इतनी बुद्धिमत्ता हम में नहीं है कि इन भारी चीजों को हम एक साथ बैठ कर हल कर सकें ?

इन के बारे में आप के लिये एक मोका था, प्रधान मंत्री जी ने, भारत सरकार ने और हमारे नेताओं ने बीच में पड़ कर कहा कि एक साथ बैठ कर, एक हो कर झगड़े को निपटाओ। लेकिन जब आप किसी नतीजे पर नहीं पहुँचे और फैसला नहीं कर पाये तब इन्दिरा जी ने फैसला कर दिया। उस के बाद आप सब लोगो ने साथ बैठ कर उस के लिये हाँ कह दिया लेकिन अब कोई इस्तीफा दे या तरह तरह की बातें करे, इस में मैं कोई राजनीतिक बुद्धिमत्ता नहीं देखता।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आप बड़े बड़े लोग हैं, मंत्री हैं, जन नेता हैं, आप को

इस के बारे में सोचना चाहिये। नेता वह नहीं होता जो जनता के हिलने पर उस के पीछे हिलने लगे और उस की ही भाषा बोलने लगे। नेता उन को कहते हैं जो जनता को सही लीड दे, सही दृष्टिकोण दे और जा कर उन के साथ साथ में बैठ सके। जो फामूला आप के मामले में पेश किया गया है, हो सकता है सब लोगो को मनोचर देने वाला न हो। लेकिन यह एक ऐसा मामला है जो हिन्दुस्तान का राष्ट्रीय मामला है और हम का और आप को सारे देश को दृष्टि में रखा पड़ेगा। अगर देश में वायवर मूनिट नहीं होगा तो हमारी कोई तरक्की नहीं हो सकती। वोटरों को ले कर झगड़ा हो सकता है लेकिन देश के लिये विकास के लिये ऐसा क्या हो ? अगर देश की तरक्की करनी है तो देश के बुद्धिमत्ता भिन्नता का मान कर चलना पड़ेगा।

आन्ध्र प्रदेश बनने का एक इतिहास है और दोनों भागों के लोगो ने एक साथ बैठ कर उस का बनाया है। मैं उन के लम्बे चाट इतिहास और भाग के झगड़े में नहीं जाना चाहता। जो ऐसी चीजें पता नहीं कहा की बात मुता रहे हैं। वह माउन्टेन्टी और लिगिक्चम में जा कर फेम गन कि पुराने नेताओं ने कहा और क्या नहीं कहा और उन के मन में क्या डर है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि वह क्या बात कह रहे हैं। उन के दिमाग में कोई डर नहीं होना चाहिये। हिन्दुस्तान में माउन्टेन्टी और मैन्त्राण्टी सब के साथ आराम में जियेंगे और रहेगे। उन की भाषा और संस्कृति कायम रहेगी, उन का विकास और तरक्की होगी, वह कोई डर न रखें। वह हर वक्त किसी न किसी मामले को ला कर खड़ा करने हैं, उन के दिमाग में पता नहीं कीनसे भूत दण्ड लगाते हैं। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि कोई खतरा उन को नहीं है। मुझे मालूम है कि आज जो हवा है वह वो चार दिनों में बह जायेगी।

[श्री नाथ राम मिश्रा]

मैं भारत सरकार से भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि उस ने जो फैसला किया है उस के मुताबिक कानून बनाने में किसी का नुक्सान नहीं होना चाहिये। आज कुछ लोग वदमाशी कर सकते हैं, लेकिन उन को दबाये रखना ठीक रखना सरकार का काम है। थोड़े दिनों में सब कुछ ठीक हो जायेगा। हमारे नेता थोड़े दिनों में कोल्ड हो जायेंगे और सही मानों जनता को आगे बढ़ायेंगे तथा हर एक वर्ग एक दूसरे के प्रति न्याय और इन्साफ करेगे। आज लोगो में कुछ बिखराव आ गया है, अलगाव से वह नजदीक आयेंगे। इसलिए मैं अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि सब लोग दिल मजबूत रखें और एक दूसरे के साथ बैठ कर ऐसा वातावरण बनायें सब काम शान्ति से हो सके। मैं जनता से भी अपील करना चाहता हूँ। आन्ध्र प्रदेश की जनता आम तौर से किसान है और खेती करती है। इधर भी करती है और उधर भी करती है, उनको इन झगडों से कोई मतलब नहीं है। आखिर तीन साल में नौकरियां के मामले में क्या हो जायेगा? कितने लोगों को मौका मिलेगा? बाद में हालात बदलेंगे और दोनों को बराबर मौके मिलेंगे, पर आज हम सही वातावरण जनता में बनायें, सही तरीके से उसको आगे ले चलें।

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO (Karimnagar): I rise to oppose this Mulki Bill, lock, stock and barrel, because it is not only illegal and unconstitutional but it is also irrational and immoral. I would not like to speak on the unconstitutionality of this Bill, because that has already been dealt with by

my hon. friend Shri G. Viswanathan and others. I would like to confine myself to the irrationality and immorality of this measure.

As you know, and as the House is well aware, the hon. Prime Minister and also the Central Government and other leaders in Andhra Pradesh have given so many assurances to the Telengana people. But, unfortunately, in this Bill, those assurances have not been given, but they have been completely forgotten. I do not know why. It may be under the pressure of Andhra MPs or others....

SHRI B. S. MURTHY (Amalapuram): No.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO: If they are going to act under the pressure of so many people, it is no use having this Mulki rules or anything else. It is better to have a separate State.

When we started our movement in 1969, it was said that that was not going to benefit our region, and we were given so many assurances. About developmental activities also, the Central Government had given us so many assurances.

SHRI R. S. PANDEY (Rajnandgaon): It has benefited them.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO: Even after 1969, do you think that any development has taken place there?

The most hopeless clause in this Bill is clause 4, under which the Central Government are going to validate all the appointments made since 1956 till today. We have complained to the hon. Prime Minister and the Central Government that the Andhra people have occupied our posts....

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Wrong.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO: It is not wrong; it is a fact. Their own Chief Minister Shri Brahmananda Reddy has agreed. There was an all-party accord in January, 1969 on this matter. How can my hon. friend say that it was

wrong? The Central Government had also accepted it, and the hon. Prime Minister had assured us that they would rectify the matter. But instead of rectifying the matter, now they seek to validate all the appointments made since 1956. I ask them how they are going to benefit our Telengana people. By validating these posts, I think they are causing the death-warrant for the people of Telengana. Today, they are passing the deathwarrant and tomorrow, after passing this Bill, they are going to execute the deathwarrant against our people. This is the situation. I am sorry that my hon friend Shri K. Raghuramaiah, a senior-most leader, who I thought was a very rational and reasonable leader was arguing and painting a picture as if the Andhra people had suffered.

It is not the Andhra people who suffered. He knows it well. The merger of Telengana with Andhra took place against the will of the Telengana people. At that time Panditji was alive; at that time Shri Govind Ballabh Pant was there. But unfortunately, the great daughter of Panditji and the great son of Pantji, instead of doing justice to us, are doing the greatest injustice to us.

You may say 'No, no. How are we doing injustice? This is definitely doing injustice to us. You are not benefiting our people. At that time, even before this merger, the people revolted. They said, 'No, we do not want merger with Andhra'. Then the Andhra leaders came forward, saying 'Baba, do not worry. We know what are your fears. We will protect your interests. We will give you safeguards'. On their own accord, voluntarily, they provided these safeguards. But after the merger, they have completely forgotten about these safeguards.

You know that before the merger, there were also so many assurances given. It was said that Telengana is a backward

area and after merger, we will see that an amount from Andhra is spent on Telengana for the purpose of its development and advancement. But instead of spending money, instead of bringing money from Andhra, they have taken away Rs. 107 crores of Telengana's surplus and they have spent it on their region. And here Shri Raghuramaiah says, 'We, the Andhra people have suffered.' He is speaking against facts. These are the facts which are before the people, which everybody knows.

The former Andhra Chief Minister, Shri Brahmananda Reddy, himself agreed and assured us that he would rectify the matter. They promised to spend the amount again in Telengana. Also about the services, they give us an assurance, 'Yes, we have got the services; I will transfer all these people to the Andhra area and appoint Telengana people in their place'.

Now by clause 4, you are validating these services. That means they will become part and parcel of the Telengana people and they are entitled even to promotions in the Telengana region after this. That being so, how are we going to be benefited?

The Prime Minister gave so many assurances not only at the time of the Telengana agitation but before that during the selections to the Assembly in 1971. Speaking at Warrangal, she said 'If necessary, I will amend the Constitution to protect the interests of the people'. Are you protecting our interests in this way? Is this protection? I ask this as the representative of the people there. You may not take this seriously because you belong to other regions and you are not having such difficulties there. But as a representative of my people, I know what are our difficulties. We have to repeat the voice of our people.

Shri Mirdha was saying, 'No, no. Even in Rajasthan there are so many things'. May be. But our case is different: (Interruptions)

[Shri M. Satyanarayan Rao]

In Rajasthan, these safeguards were not given. But you have given us these safeguards in Telengana. You gave us the Regional Committee. You appreciated the reality. But instead of appreciating the reality of today, you say, 'We are also having these problems'. This is not going to solve the problem. I can tell the House very frankly that it is not only my opinion, but it is the opinion of 90 per cent of the MPs of Andhra and of Telengana that there is no alternative except separation, except bifurcation. This is the view of the people. We cannot go against the will and wishes of the people.

I know the hon. Prime Minister is for the poor people. But at the same time, she must be democratic also. Her father was a great man. On the death of Poti Sriramulu, he agreed to the creation of Andhra bifurcating the Madras State into Madras and Andhra. But here 350 people have died in Telengana. So many people died in Andhra recently. Lakhs of people have gone to jail. In spite of that, she is not agreeing.

I know her difficulties also here. But your difficulties are not going to satisfy us. I think personally she is not against it. But the great Chavanji is there. I know that he is a great leader. He is not only a great leader but a great grand-son of Shivaji. Not only has he been following in the footsteps of Shivaji but he has exceeded that. (Interruptions) I know that he is a great leader. There is no doubt about it. I admit it. But in this, selfishness is guiding him. He is guided by his own selfishness. He is afraid of his own Vidarbha. I can tell him that there is so much difference between Telengana and Vidarbha. The SRC has recommended it. It is not that we wanted it. The SRC has clearly stated that there will be difficulties after the merger. The fears of Telengana people are real. Then, when the report came before Panditji, he appreciated it. That is why the regional committees were formed and they came to a gentlemen's agreement. To link it up with the question of

Saurashtra or Vidarbha is wrong. Morarjibhai recently gave a statement to the press in Bombay. I was really surprised at it. He has boycotted this. The Vidarbha problem worries Mr. Chavan and Saurashtra problem worries Morarjibhai. Why do you link it up with these things? Our case is real and reasonable. You gentlemen should appreciate it. So, in this matter, please do not be advised by Chavanji and others, because his own selfishness is there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO: Please give me three minutes.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is enjoying your remark.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO: It is not a question of his enjoying. It is a fact. You will have to face these facts. I know you will not concede this demand of the people from both the regions now. But you will have to consider it, if not today, tomorrow or three months or six months later. It is bound to come.

I think bifurcation is the only solution that has to be given. Everybody agrees. Shri Indrajit Gupta from the CPI—yes, I know your feeling is there, if, after all, you believe in democracy. If you do not believe in democracy, that is a different matter. (Interruptions) I know he agrees that the situation is like that. We cannot central the situation. You blame the other gentlemen that some jagirdars or reactionaries are behind this. But then I say your own people are demanding this. The Deputy Chief Minister and eight other Ministers are now coming out and saying that they want separation. Not only that. 80 Congress MLAs and the Congress President, and everybody is requesting Shrimati Indira Gandhi to bifurcate the State. Why don't you bifurcate? I am sure that this Bill is not going to solve your problem: either our problem or your national problem. You are always worried about your national repercussion. I think Shri Frank Anthony in a different manner said that these Mulki

Rules are going to harm you. But if anybody thinks like that, that still we can continue this integrated State, then I can only say that he is living in a fool's paradise. Please be real. I request this House and also request the hon. Prime Minister to come with a Bill to bifurcate the State. It is much better. This is nothing. I think this is going to be challenged before the Supreme Court again, and it will be definitely struck down. I am very sure about it. It is not only the opinion of the Members. This opinion has been given by Niren De, the Attorney-General, and other great jurists

The Supreme Court's judgment is very, very clear about this. In view of this, even now you can withdraw this Bill and come forward with another Bill to bifurcate the State.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a request to make. There are so many names of Members who wish to speak this afternoon. So, Members may kindly limit themselves to five minutes each. There are about five to six more speakers. We would like to give them a chance to have their say.

श्री हंस खन्ड कलबाय (मरेना) : समय बढ़ा दीजिये काफी लोग बोलने वाले हैं। कल इसको ग्राम चलाए।

सभापति महोदय : इसको आज ही खत्म करना है।

Shri Suryanarayana—absent.

SHRI J. RAMESHWAR RAO (Mahbubnagar): Mr. Chairman, it is with a feeling of anguish and regret that I have decided to put before the hon. Members of this House a very tragic situation that is now prevailing in Andhra Pradesh. My colleague Dr. Melkote has given the background to the problem, where it originated and how it has grown. Various references have been made about the possible unconstitutionality of this Bill

and the effect of article 16(3) and article 35(b). One aspect seems to have been over-looked. Even if the Mulki rules Bill becomes an Act and is not held ultravires on this account there is one other aspect wherein it might be considered ultra vires, that is under article 14.

17.31 hrs.

(MR. SPEAKER in the Chair)

The attempt to end the Mulki rules in one part of the territory in 1971 and in another part of the territory in 1980 as well as applying it to one set of services and not applying it to another set of services are all aspects which will come under the ambit of article 14. However, I shall avoid spending much time on the constitutional aspect of the Bill because when it becomes a law it will be challenged in the Courts and the Courts will give their verdict.

The Bill before this House is intended to bring into law the assurances that have been given by the Prime Minister as well as the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh over the years from 1969 right till the other day and provide safeguards for the people of Telengana in the matter of services. In this context it would be of interest if I quote from the debate of the Andhra Assembly before the Andhra Pradesh was formed. Mr. B. Gopala Reddi who was the Chief Minister of Andhra speaking on the floor of the Assembly on 25th November, 1955 said: "This Assembly would further like to assure the people in Telengana that the development of that area would be deemed a special charge and that certain priorities and special protections will be given for the improvement of this area, such as reservations in services and educational institutions on the basis of population."

I should like to draw the attention of my friend Mr. Raghu Ramaiah about this resolution sponsored by Mr. Gopala Reddi and passed in the Andhra Assembly before

SHRI J. RAMESHWAR RAO Andhra Pradesh came into being. While referring to his remarks I may also refer to two or three other matters which he raised while speaking today. Mr. Raghu Ramaiah spoke very eloquently but eloquence need not necessarily mean clarity. He spoke about how students from one area can go and study in others areas in India. He said he would like his children to study in Hyderabad, in Telengana. It would interest him to know that the schools and colleges in Telengana have been more or less closed from 1969 and our own children are not able to study in Telengana or in Hyderabad and have to go out.

AN HON. MEMBER: What an excellent argument.

SHRI J. RAMESHWAR RAO: It is true and one should know what is happening and there is no point in closing one's eyes to it. They are closed partly because of the whole episode that has been taking place. I was reading the other day that the Venkateswara University and the Andhra University have been closed indefinitely. There is no administration in Andhra or Telengana. No Schools and Colleges are working. No papers move from one office to another or from one table to another in the same office. Mr. Raghu Ramaiah will, I hope, forgive me if I again refer to him. He said with a certain amount of arrogance, if I may use that word, "this State is ours and if you do not want to say, you can go out of it." He was referring to my colleague Mr. Giri when he protested. He said, get out of the State.

AN HON. MEMBER: No; he said, get out of the House.

SHRI J. RAMESHWAR RAO: I do not think he has any business to ask any member to leave the House. The only person who has that right is you, Mr. Speaker. I am mentioning this because it is precisely this attitude of arrogance on the part of the Andhra rulers that has led to a feeling in Telengana that they cannot remain in that State. It is not a

few thousand jobs, I assure you but it is the general attitude and it is not possible for the people of Telengana to accept this kind of arrogant, dominant attitude. We are not used to it. We believe in democracy and democratic functioning.

Mr. Raghuramaiah made another very interesting observation. He said, the revenues of Hyderabad city are Rs. 36 crores. Because Andhras form two-thirds of the population and Telengana people form one-third of the population, he deducted that Rs. 24 crores are contributed by them. A very brilliant analysis! He is a great mathematician! and he said only Rs. 12 crores are contributed by the Telengana people. In actual fact, we have made a calculation of the contribution of Andhras to the revenues of Hyderabad and it comes to about Rs. 1.5 crores. As against this, the advantages they derive are worth Rs. 7 crores! Government can appoint a commission to go into this and give a report. We do not have to make conjectural statement to mislead the House or to give a certain emphasis which is not right.

Dr. Molkote has given you the background of the whole Telengana problem. I shall confine myself briefly to three or four matters. This Bill seeks to put into an Act the assurances, given in 1969, 1970 and 1971 before the Telengana Praja Samiti merged with the Congress and also the assurance given by Mr. Brahmananda Reddy, who was Chief Minister of Andhra, on the floor of the House in Hyderabad in 1970. The Prime Minister in a statement made in this House on 27th November, 1972 mentioned that the Mulki Rules are applicable only to certain posts under the State Government and are not applicable to the All India Services and to posts in Central Government offices and public sector undertakings. On this, there can be no controversy. We wholeheartedly accept this position. But if you examine this Bill, it does not seek to give effect to the Prime Minister's statement. It curtails the operation of the Mulki rules very much more drastically. One would have expected that the assurance of the

Prime Minister given on the floor of the House, at least would be respected.

I would like to refer to clause 4 of the Bill. Thousands of appointments have been made after 1956. In her 8 point formula, the Prime Minister assured us in 1970 that many of these promotions and appointments which may have been wrong will be gone into by various committees that have been appointed. These committees are at the moment seized of the matters. But this Bill seeks to validate all the appointments made from 1956 up to date. Then, why was that 8 point formula and assurance given in 1970? Why were those committees appointed to go into each individual case of discrimination or wrongful appointment or promotion, if the intention of the Bill is to validate all these appointments? It is my view that this Act will not benefit Telengana in any manner. It does not provide any protection to Telengana. All that this Act seeks to do is to validate a few thousand jobs that have been wrongly provided, or a few thousand people who have been wrongly promoted. Sir, it will also interest you to know that four or five days ago a Government Order has been issued by the Chief Minister of Andhra that no fresh appointments shall be made until those who have already been appointed in excess of requirement are absorbed. These excess appointments came out of super-numerary posts, mostly from Andhra, which means for the next four or five years there will be no fresh appointment from Telengana. Then, why this Bill and why this guarantee? Is it only to serve as a sop to public opinion? Or, are we seriously interested in solving this problem of Andhra and Telengana?

I do not have very much to say except that I would beg of the Prime Minister—I find the Prime Minister is not here, I hope my voice will reach her—I beg of her on bended knees that she concede a separate Telengana State. The people of Telengana cannot remain happy in a composite, Andhra Pradesh. She should concede, as early as possible, a separate Telengana State, which alone will bring

a certain stability to this region and security to the country.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: Sir, I would like to clarify a figure. During the course of my speech, I did not say that we are contributing Rs. 24 crores. What I said was.... (Interruptions).

SHRI S. B. GIRI: It could be examined from records.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: To the best of my recollection, what I said was that out of the expenditure of Rs. 36 crores, we are contributing Rs. 24 crores. That is to say, there is an income of Rs. 36 crores and an expenditure of Rs. 36 crores. Out of this expenditure of Rs. 36 crores, the Andhra region is contributing Rs. 24 crores. So far as the income of Rs. 36 crores arising out of the Hyderabad city is concerned, the entire amount is credited to the Telengana Fund.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI YFESHWANTRAO CHAVAN): Sir, I am intervening because of two reasons. Even in 1968-69 when the question of the separation of Telengana was raised, I had something to do with this problem. Then when this question was again raised this year after the judgment of the Supreme Court, I had the privilege of discussing all the pros and cons and complicated aspects of this problem with the leaders of both Telengana and Andhra, not only of Congress Party but non-Congress parties as well. Although the emotions have now reached a certain pitch, at that time people were cool-headed and they were in a mood to consider problems more dispassionately and objectively. I found that with some few exceptions—especially these two Members who are sitting opposite; except them—the overwhelming opinion was in favour of the integrated State, because all of them felt that after nearly a century all Telugu-speaking people have come together. It was a historical achievement not only for the Telengana people but for the entire Andhra. It was the Telugu-speaking people that have given a lead to the formation of

[Shri Yeshwant Rao Chavan]

linguistic States, which is certainly a step in the right direction. But I am trying to put the whole question in a proper perspective. As far as the people are concerned, the question is to approach the problem more rationally. Their overwhelming need and feeling is that it is in their interest to have an intergrated State.

Well, this problem has got its own history because no problem in India is without its history. So is the problem of Telengana. It was the spontaneous desire of the people of both the States that brought them together. Whether it was a gentleman's agreement or not is a different matter. Some arrangement was made. There were certainly some defects or certain deficiencies in the implementation of that agreement. Possibly, it may be so.

Many steps were taken last time when the Prime Minister announced 8-point formula which helped to bridge the differences and things were going on quite smoothly. Then came the Supreme Court judgment. I do not want to comment on the Supreme Court judgment because that is a different matter altogether. That is a matter that can be discussed at different levels.

As far as Mulki Rules are concerned, the feeling in Telengana was and is that, if at all there is going to be an integrated State, they should have a feeling of belonging to the State. That certainly is a very reasonable and a very rational demand. There is nothing wrong about it. But at the same time, Telengana people have a feeling that certain concessions were given to them, that they have some history and they have got some problems which needed to be solved. Therefore, this point was conceded to them.

There is one question which is very important for the integrity of the State and that is that this sort of reservation cannot have any permanency about it. I think, according to me, the most important aspect of the Bill is that having accepted the necessity of having Mulki Rules for some time and that also to a limited

extent, even when Telengana and Andhra came together, it was agreed that not all the Services but only specific Services should be reserved for Telengana people. But how long even this particular type of reservation should go on is certainly an important matter and, according to me, this Bill is a very important development and improvement towards a fuller integration of the State by putting some sort of a time-limit on the period for which these Mulki Rules will continue to exist.

I would like to put it before the leaders of Andhra separatist movement that there was one other point which was important and which was a very significant point that, if at all we want to integrate the State, then the people who come to the Telengana side, to Hyderabad, must feel that they belong to the capital of one State. That is why, if you see the Bill, the Bill makes distinction between the application of Mulki Rules for a certain period to the capital city of Hyderabad and to the rest of Telengana area. This is, really speaking, a recognition of the strong feeling of the people of Andhra Pradesh that they belong to one State. But, at the same time, it would be very difficult to completely forget the whole thing, the whole history. People say that 16-17 years have gone by, but nothing has happened. You cannot undo the history of 400 years within a couple of years or even within five to ten years. There will certainly be difficulties about it. Naturally, you cannot merely straightway say 'Remove this and remove that'.

Now, some people have raised the question of the leaders of the movement. They have raised this question of the Regional Committee and Mr. Raghu Ramaiah specially made a mention of that aspect. I think the Prime Minister will deal with this aspect probably a little later and I do not want to say any thing about it. That is a separate question altogether. That has to be decided and considered on its own merits separately. But one point is certain. Some colleagues made a reference to me, that it is because of my

interest in this State or that State that we hold this view. It is completely, I should say, unfair because we are not trying to look at the problem of Telangana from the point of view of my own State. Some members asked me a question as to why is it that the Mulki rules are not made applicable to Vidarbha or a part of Karnataka. May I tell them a very important factor? If the capital of Maharashtra would have been in some part of the area which was joined from Andhra to Maharashtra and Bombay was not the capital, the same trouble would have started there also. But, in case of Telangana, it happens that Hyderabad which was a part of Telangana became the capital of the whole State and that makes all the difference. Sometime or the other you will have to find out what exactly happened in this particular matter.

I would suggest that we may see what hon Member Shri Nathu Ram Mirdha, said and he was right, that it is time that the leaders who have to give a real lead in this matter. Linguistic issues, particularly, in our country and in the present context of things, have a tendency of becoming a very explosive issue, and it is the duty of every patriotic citizen and I would say, of those who are really interested in the integration of the country as a whole, that they do not allow these tendencies of further separation. If you start the re-drawing of maps again, I do not know how far it will go and where and when it is going to end.

We have got so many important problems before the country to-day. We are about to start the Fifth Five Year Plan of the country. We have many other economic responsibilities and the problems of development before us. We have to find solutions for these things. I think it is a luxury at this moment to start these new controversies and new difficulties for ourselves.

Therefore, I would certainly make an appeal, not only to the Members sitting here who hold some separatist views, but the real appeal has to be made to the people in both Andhra and Telangana

areas. Only because some of these people have made certain demands and in order to remain in logically consistence with this, they want Telangana? Now other people are asking for Andhra. I would suggest and I would request them that in the higher interest of the nation, in the name of the nation, we will have to keep back these secondary issues and think of the foremost problems which are very much more important. Here, we are fighting for a very limited point of Mulki Rules, and very limited sector of employment. But the real question is the question of finding employment to a large number of masses in the fields of agriculture, in the field of industry, in the field of self employment spheres. It is these matters which are more important. But unfortunately here we are fighting for the spoils of 1 per cent or 2 per cent of the Government employment, that too also in a limited field. Really speaking, it is only misleading ourselves and misleading the people. If it is a question of unemployment, it can be solved only by taking up most progressive steps in the economy both in agriculture and in industry. This process has already been started in this country and if we dedicate ourselves to these programmes and policies. I am sure this trouble of Mulki Rules and its implications will be completely forgotten after a few years' time. The two decades of seventies and the eighties, I am sure, is a very crucial period and with the progressive reforms with which we are pursuing the problem of unemployment, I think those people who are fighting for these minor causes will laugh at themselves realising was it for this thing that we were fighting? Was it worth our fighting for? If at all we are concerned about the employment of the people, both in the Telangana and the Andhra side, it is these important economic policies which have been accepted by the country and which alone can solve the real problem of mass unemployment. Need of our times is to pursue these major policies.

I do not want to take more of your time because we are already short of time. But looking into the history of this problem, it is necessary that leaders of both

[Shri Yeshwant Rao Chavan]

sides persuade themselves to come together....(Interruptions). It is said, it is a spontaneous thing, but spontaneity in these matters can be interpreted in many ways. In Telengana side also at one time it was said that it was a very spontaneous movement but ultimately,...

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO:
Because of you, because of the Centre.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN.
Ultimately, the test of the leadership is to convince the people of the rightness of the cause. Call of separation is a call of despair. By these agitations it is not that you are building something, but you are breaking something which was built with constant and patient efforts. Andhra unity is much more important. This Andhra Pradesh unity was brought about by the leaders of Andhra with the blessings of the then national leadership. There arose some danger to it some years back. Our Prime Minister tried to keep them together. Again, this time this five-point programme that the Prime Minister has put before the country, before the Parliament, and before these two regions, is to see that this sort of temporary aberration in the feelings of people should not undo something which we have built up patiently with a view to bringing the great people of these regions together.

I have tried to put before the House all the points which I had in mind. I hope this House at least takes this view because, when regional questions are at conflict with each other, we cannot expect that region to take a dispassionate view about it. It is very difficult for them to do so under pressure of emotions. I understand the difficulty of representatives of the people sitting here or people who are working there. I know the feeling of Ministers who have resigned now; at one time they themselves came and told me that, these are our views, but ultimately we will certainly accept the decisions that will be given by the Central leadership, particularly, by the Prime Minister in the interest of integrity of the State. Well, may be, because of local pressures they

might have done certain thing, reasonably or unreasonably. I have myself gone through the fire of these regional troubles. So, on such occasions it is the national leadership and more particularly the Parliament that has to give a lead in this matter. If on occasions like this we do not take an objective and dispassionate national view, who else is expected to take such a view?

Naturally, the Telengana people are excited. I understand their feeling, I have great respect for their feelings. I know that the people of Andhra are much more excited about it. I can understand that, because of certain provocations, people feel that way. But it is the national thinking that must be made ultimately to prevail. And, instead of the individual taking any view, if the Parliament takes in its Collective wisdom a view and gives them a direction, I think, that alone will solve the difficult problem.

In this matter, when Parliament passes this Act, it is not merely a piece of Act that we are passing. It is an intimate appeal that this national body is making both to the people of Telengana and Andhra: Please forget your differences; both of you are great people and are put together to work in the national cause, forget small things and make efforts to see that the integrated State, which is historically an accepted Constitutional fact, becomes an emotional reality. The passage of this Act is not merely adding one more Act on the statute-book, but it is one more important step taken in the matter of emotional integration of this country and therefore I support this Bill.

18.00 hrs.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Shri S. B. Giri But before he starts his speech, I should invite his attention to the fact that the Business Advisory Committee had decided to finish this Bill today, and they had fixed four hours for this. The time allotted is already over. About four more speakers are left, and I think that we should keep sitting till they are finally disposed of. I hope all hon. Members agree to this.

There is another matter, which is a somewhat unimportant thing which the Secretary has reported to me. There was some man shouting some slogan outside the galleries. He has turned out to be an unsound man. I have let him off. He was just shouting 'Vande Mataram', something very harmless, and I have let him go.

About ten or fifteen days back, one man came, and he was also shouting, and he said that he was a Member of Parliament and he should be allowed to come in, and he was taken away by the police. I do not know whether he was the same man or not.

When we turned him out, he came with a batch of about a hundred people before my residence, and he wanted to take the oath. I really was surprised that when one man was enough, he brought one hundred men along with him, and after about one hour's persuasion, we came to know that he had given some promises to many of them, and then he said that he belonged to the Opposition. I only told him that if he could secure a certificate either from Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu or from Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, I would think over it. His name was Paramatma.

Now, Shri S. B. Giri.

SHRI S. B. GIRI (Warangal): I rise to oppose this Bill on the ground that it does not fulfil the wishes and aspirations of the people of Telengana or Andhra, and it does not also fulfil the political and social problems of the Telengana people. The Telengana and Andhra problem is not just the question of Mulki rules. By en-

acting this piece of legislation, how are they going to help the people of Telengana? It is a human problem and it must be considered in that perspective. It was because of their experience of the last sixteen years that the Telengana people had started an agitation, and more than 350 people were killed like flies and not like human beings. They were not bribed, and they were not given brandy or alcohol as Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma was saying about what happened in Andhra. But the young people took up the cause of separation and fought, because they were convinced that they had been exploited and looted by the Andhra rulers. That was how the movement for a separate Telengana had come up. No political party was there at that time, and no political leader was in that movement at that time. Apart from that, I do not want to repeat what has already been said.

The regional committee which is a statutory body of the Andhra Pradesh State, immediately after the judgment of the Supreme Court passed a unanimous resolution in which all the legislators belonging to the Communist Party, the CMP and the Congress and other parties who were present said that judgment should be implemented *in toto*. I do not know what has happened to that unanimous resolution. It was a unanimous resolution passed by a statutory body set up under an enactment of Parliament. It was not only the Telengana Praja Samiti Members who were there, but the Congress Members were also there including the Telengana members and they had passed this resolution unanimously.

Again, after this judgment, the Members of Parliament elected by the people from the Telengana region had submitted a memorandum to the Prime Minister, and I would like to quote from what they have said in their memorandum.

"Any modification for any reason whatsoever would have serious repercussions in Telengana and other parts of the country and the confidence of the people in the government would be shaken."

[Shri S. B. Giri]

"Until and unless the Mulki Rules are implemented *in toto*, any further discussions with anybody cannot arise and would have little meaning for us. We have no desire to participate in such discussions.

"Telengana people, the really affected and who are the sufferers all these years are remaining peaceful with no agitational approach. We earnestly request you to implement the decision of the Supreme Court and earn the credit, confidence and gratitude of the people in the government and yourself.

"The question of reposing confidence in the Prime Minister does not arise as the whole thing is conceived as a mischievous move on the part of those who want to get the judgment of the Supreme Court modified. Such a move is ill-advised. We hope you would appreciate our stand.

"We, therefore, have to earnestly request you kindly to direct the State Government to immediately implement the Mulki Rules".

This is the memorandum which was given not by the Telengana Praja Samiti but 6 of the Members belonging to the Indira Congress Party and others.

Immediately after the announcement of the five-point formula of the Prime Minister, I said during the call attention motion here that it is impossible to work and that both the regions will not accept it. Today this is what has happened. Immediately after the announcement, many people were killed in the Andhra region. I pay my homage to those people who were victims of police firing in the Andhra region and also express my sympathy and condolence to the members of the bereaved families. In Telengana also, 350 people were killed and lakhs of people went to prison. It was not a political manoeuvre not for power by the landlords, as Shri Indrajit Gupta said. It was the people's movement.

The Government of India is a representative government. I am confident that

it is a democratic government that we are having in this country. We respect the representative character of this government. I hope the Government of India will respect the aspirations and wishes of the people there.

After the formula, we now see what has happened. Take the Telengana Regional Committee. Those Ministers from Telengana and Andhra and those MLAs from Andhra and Telengana assured the Prime Minister 'We are going to accept your verdict'. But what has happened? Immediately afterwards, the Telengana Regional Committee has passed a unanimous Resolution (on December 13) wherein they brought out a new formula, a 14-point formula. That means they have rejected the five-point formula. Also day before yesterday, nearly 87 MLAs belonging to the Andhra region and 8 Ministers held a public meeting representing the Andhra districts where they hoisted the Andhra State flag and demanded a separate State. Those Ministers had assured the Prime Minister that they were going to abide by her verdict. They have gone back on it now, because there was pressure from the people and they have bowed to that. I am glad they are real democrats.

After promising to the Prime Minister that they are going to abide by her decision, 8 Ministers have resigned from the Cabinet. This has to be noted.

AN HON. MEMBER: 9 Ministers.

SHRI S. B. GIRI: Also we saw in this morning's newspapers something. It is not about the opposition people in the Telengana Praja Samiti, but it is about 'an Andhra Congress.' It was headlined 'Andhra Congress takes birth'. Their leader is the Deputy Chief Minister, and leader of the Congress Party in Andhra. That means there is no Congress in Andhra Pradesh as such, but there is the Andhra Congress and for Telengana we are already having the Telengana Congress Committee.

I do not want to take more time. This Bill does not follow the norms of human life. I think this Bill goes against the

wishes of the people. I feel even the Government of India and the members of this Parliament, who are the representatives of the people. It should be for the people; it should not be against the people. But this Bill is against the people both in Andhra and Telengana. Therefore, I oppose the Bill.

THE PRIME MINISTER MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF ELECTRONICS, MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS, MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND MINISTER OF SPACE (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is really not much need for me to speak as my colleague, Shri Chavan, has brought a cooler and calmer atmosphere to prevail in the House and has dealt with the really important points. But some hon. Members even of the Opposition had earlier expressed the opinion that it might be misunderstood if I did not clearly state our views on some points which have been mentioned here before. They are not new, nevertheless, they thought I should do so and that is why I have got up.

Parliament discusses many important issues which are highly emotional, and the Mulki Rules have become one such issue. Matters which involve regional feelings quite often do arouse the emotions of the people in this country as in many other countries, and we certainly cannot ignore the emotions of the people. But I should like to stress what Chavanji has said, that no solution can be found while the atmosphere remains charged with emotion. Any solutions, any answer, has to be found in a very cool, calm and rational manner.

Therefore, although I was also, as were many other hon. Members, touched by the emotions expressed by hon. Members, by the difficulties of our friends from Telengana and friends from other parts of Andhra Pradesh, we were certainly touched by the difficulties and emotions—I should very respectfully say to them that all these matters have to be thought of not in terms of emotion but in terms of calm and collective thought. And not

in terms of today or tomorrow or the day after but of what it will mean to them and the country ten years hence, 20 years hence, a hundred years hence.

Hon. Member have been discussing here, and separately with me, the question of a few posts or a few matters like this. As Chavanji very rightly said, Does this really touch the lives of the people? It does not. The whole problem of employment has assumed vast proportions for us. There is unemployment all over the country. Not only in our country but in almost every country of the world. This is one of the phenomena of contemporary society. I am not saying this to excuse our own shortcomings or difficulties. The problem has to be faced. This is why this question has assumed such vast proportions.

Naturally, if you put to the people that a particular development has affected their employment, it has affected their rights they will become emotional. Anybody will become emotional. I do not know how many people have gone to the public at large and said, "Let us sit down and think about it, what difference will it make in terms of employment in terms of the other opportunities for the people in the Telengana region, for the people in the other districts of Andhra Pradesh?" So, I do not think that the issue has been fully and squarely put before all the people there. Therefore, the reaction today has to be also viewed in that light.

Now, the present debate, with all due respect to hon. Members, is not about socialism. It is not about the welfare of the country at large or many of the points which were raised, especially by the hon. Member who spoke first. This is a very limited issue; a very small issue. It deals specifically and only with the Mulki Rules, and the situation that arose because of the Supreme Court judgment. Some hon. Members said that nothing had happened. But I would respectfully say that a great deal has happened all these years. There was, if not to our entire satisfaction, certainly a degree of calm; not the calm of

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]
the graveyard as some friends are so fond of repeating; and the situation was moving towards improvement. I am not saying that it had vastly improved. But certainly it was moving towards improvement. Then this judgment on the Mulki Rules was delivered and suddenly it was as if a fire had been started all over the State. How did the whole situation with regard to the Mulki rules arise? The State of Hyderabad was the largest of the old princely States. One hon. Member has said and rightly that in this State there were individuals, there were families of very high culture. But for the vast majority of the people there was poverty, they had not had opportunities of education or social welfare or of public health, or any kind of amelioration of their living conditions. When the composite Andhra State came into being all sections of the people recognised that for greater cohesions certain special measures of a transitory nature were necessary. The leaders of the people unanimously arrived at a gentlemen's agreement which we all accepted.

Since Shri Joshi is here I should like to just remind him. He cut a joke, he thought at our expense, on the word "gentleman". But in those days "gentleman" was not a polite phrase at all; "gentleman" was used for a particular section of people who were completely divorced from the rest of the people. We have no objection not being counted in that section of the people. It is just like the earlier an argument over "lady" and "woman". I had then very categorically said that we were women, bearing burdens and responsibilities as well as wanting our rights, we did not want to be "ladies" and "gentlemen" sitting on some platform above everybody else.

So, there was this agreement. Now, regardless of any agreement we all know that even within a family there are differences and disputes. There is no State in India which does not have backward areas. Relatively backward and advanced areas exist not only in all States but in different regions of the same State. In

the Andhra region many Members have drawn attention to areas such as Rayalseema and Srikakulam. The Telengana region, may be a backward region but it does have better-off areas.

Merely because an area is comparatively backward is not reason enough for taking drastic or irreversible decisions. Where will this process end? I am not at all afraid of this being catching; that is not the point. But where does any one draw the line? Will each district want to be separate? Some people have advised the division of U.P. Where to divide into two, three, four, into how many areas do you divide it? Do you go back to the old, very small States, princely States, do you go back to that? Somewhere a line has to be drawn. You cannot just say that because of backwardness there should be division. As Chavanji has rightly pointed out, economic backwardness can go only through hard work and the effort of the entire nation.

While there will always be sympathy and understanding for the special hardship of the backwardness of any special group or any special area, I do not think that anyone should be allowed to develop a vested interest in backwardness.

This is really a general problem and it is a part of the very much larger problem of poverty itself. There is, I am afraid, no immediate solution to it. In the early stages of development it is always more difficult to allot resources because the general level is so low that any extra provision is extremely difficult, but in spite of this, an effort was made in the third and fourth Plans. As the House is aware, on the basis of the recommendations of the National Development Council 225 districts were earmarked for concessional finance from public financial institutions. In this are included district from the Andhra region as well as from the Telengana region.

In the Fifth Plan, it is our intention to launch a massive minimum needs programme. I do not want to go into the premise of this programme, some of which you know and some you will soon learn about. This is the only way in which a real solution can be found. While transitional measures may be necessary in some areas for historical or other reasons, I think we should all view the problem and the possibilities of its solution in the proper perspective.

So far as the present Bill is concerned, Shri Mirdha has already explained the scope of its provisions and I do not want to go into it again. However, I should like to make just a few general observations. As the House is aware, the Supreme Court held that section 2 of the Public Employment (requirement also residences) Act 1957 which sought to repeal the Mulki Rules, was bad. This was a complex situation. This was not the first time. In between many things have been going on. The Mulki Rules themselves were declared invalid and so on. It is not at all a static situation. But this has created a complex situation. It is obvious that the administration could not be run on the basis that Mulki Rules would apply to posts under the State Government at all levels. Certain appointments made in the past also had to be regularised. My friend opposite was much concerned about this. He felt that it might mean going back and reinstating people. I should like to re-assure him that this is not at all the case. I do not want to go into the details of this. But I think his fears are unfounded. We had also to consider the past assurances given to the people of Telengana area with regard to public employment and also their present needs. We have not at all gone back on any assurance given and I should like to re-assure the hon. members that we are deeply concerned with their problems. But we feel that this is not the way of solving them. In fact, as I said on an earlier occasion, merely talking of separation is not an end of the problem. It is the beginning of another very big problem, not for other States but also for that area, that State itself. The decisions which we announced on the 27th Nov-

ember, 1972 were in the response to the request by the leaders of the State; they themselves have said that we should do something.

Regarding this Bill, several members have suggested that we might circulate it for public opinion, send it to the Supreme Court and so on. They asked, what was the hurry? The hurry is in the immediate interests of the proper administration of the State. It is obvious that any delay would create serious complications. I stand very firmly for an integrated State, but I should like to say that so far as this matter is concerned, even had there been two States, it would have made no difference to this Bill because it deals mainly with the problem of the twin cities and also the rest of Telengana. That problem would remain no matter what other things you do because a large number of non-Mulk is there. Unfortunately, even in the speeches have some little bitterness crept in. It does not matter how many States we have, you still will be neighbours and you still will have to deal with one another in a hundred and one things. Thinking that just because you are separated, you can get rid of these people or we have got rid of this problem is a very facile way of thinking. Our experience has not shown that this comes true.

Rightly there is a strong feeling in the country that any residential qualification for public employment goes against the very concept of common citizenship which is enshrined in our Constitution. But at the same time, the framers of the Constitution did realise that the safeguards available to people who suffer from special hardships could not be abrogated straightway. This was one of the purposes of article 35. It kept alive the Mulki Rules, which had come to be looked upon as a valuable safeguards and had generated an emotional attachment. When the Telengana area was merged with Andhra, there were assurances from the Andhra region that this safeguard would be continued in certain respects. This approach was accepted by successive Governments in Andhra Pradesh all along,

[**Shrimati Indira Gandhi**]

even while there were different judicial pronouncements on the Mulki Rules.

This is a fact which some people tend to forget. The present Bill retains the Mulki Rules in certain respects but provides for their phased repeal. I should like to make it clear that it is not the intention of the Government to come to the House again to extend the time limits mentioned in the Bill. As I have said earlier, in the life of a State, a period of five to eight years is an exceedingly small one. Recognising the fact that the capital belongs to both regions, the Central Government has decided to repeal the Mulki Rules in the twin cities three years earlier than in the remaining Telangana region. Even during the intervening period, employment opportunities in the capital are being extended and educational facilities expanded for the citizens of the other regions of Andhra Pradesh also.

This again gives rise to certain doubts and fears in the mind of our friends from Telangana. I should like to assure them that the present Bill not only keep in tact the safeguards voluntarily agreed to in the Public Employment Act, which was struck down subsequently, but seeks to go a little way beyond that.

The Bill covers three of the five points mentioned in our decisions. The two other points do not require any legislation. I am mentioning this, because this matter was commented upon from the Benches opposite. Considerable work has already been done on the scheme of regionalisation of services, and the whole scheme will be finalised before long. The State Government will then make necessary amendments to their existing service rules and put the scheme into operation. The other decision related to the expansion of educational facilities in Hyderabad-Secunderabad. The Ministry of Education has already discussed this matter with the State Government and in the light of these discussions the State Government is framing specific proposals. Suitable machinery will be devised so that these measures are faithfully carried out.

While we were seeking a solution to this particular situation, other points have been raised. It is said that the continuance of the Regional Committee for the Telangana area impedes the integration of the State of Andhra Pradesh. Shri Raghu Ramaiah and others have spoken about the separate budget for Telangana. A third point was that Telangana is not the only backward area in the State.

As you know, the Regional Committee is a committee of the legislature itself, set up at the time of the formation of the State, to give confidence to the people of the Telangana region that the assurances given to them were being properly implemented. If provided for the closer association of the people of Telangana in the development of their area.

The budget, of course, is not really separate, as Shri Raghu Ramaiah said. There are two separate sheets, but it still forms part of the same budget. But the basic problem is not of mathematical calculations. It is a question of the overall economic condition. I can appreciate the feeling of those who want all barriers which stand in the way of the fuller integration of the State to be removed. I look forward to a day when all these walls are demolished and there is no need to have such special arrangements. Such a situation will emerge progressively with the disappearance of economic disparities. May I remind this House that even the Constitution visualizes them as temporary and transitional? Meanwhile, of course we are giving special thought to what to do for the other backward areas of the State. The speedy development of those areas is equally important and suggestions have been made for some special arrangements which we are looking into. We would also be quite willing to have one or more regional committees or development boards for such areas, if the people so desire, and the details of this can be worked out in consultation with the leaders of the State.

Perhaps, there is a feeling that the norms adopted in allocating receipts and expenditure under different heads could be improved so as to make them more equitable to both regions. This question can also be gone into and if any assistance from the Central Government is called for we shall try to provide it. Because what is really needed is the provision of adequate resources and this is always dependent upon how much Shri Chavan can find for the entire country. He also does not have a magic bag into which he can dip for resources.

It is obvious that the resources of the entire State will have to be mobilised for this purpose. This is generally the approach which we have adopted for the removal of imbalances in the development. Whatever resources the Central Government can provide for this purpose will, I hope, be forthcoming.

Mr. Frank Anthony is not here. I have just one rejoinder to make. He was speaking about minorities and our friends of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, and about their reservations. It is quite true that with all the reservations, everything that we had hoped to do has not been done. There are still many disabilities. But he addressed his remark to the wrong person, Shri Bhandare. Shri Bhandare is the one person who has always been elected from a general seat. He does not come from a reserved seat. So, his remark that "you will not be elected once the reservation is removed", was to the wrong person.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. B. B. Maurya also.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Yes, Shri B. P. Maurya also.

Sir, Parliament represents the will of the whole nation. Its duty is not merely to go into the rights and wrongs of a situation but also to view problems from the

national point of view. Shri Chavan has stressed this point. But I would like to repeat it. While all of us here are elected from particular constituencies, once we are here in this hall, I think we should consider ourselves not as merely the representatives of one little area but as the representatives of the whole country and the entire people of India. And each problem has to be viewed from that angle.

The very first article of our Constitution declares that India is a Union of States. Each State has had a long cultural and historical tradition and each State has become a political entity in its own special way. Andhra Pradesh has been a distinctive cultural unit for thousands of years. The name has been found in the earliest Buddhist writings. All the parts which now constitute Andhra Pradesh have been under one umbrella for long periods of history. Let us not look at just the immediate period of history.

Perhaps, it was this long history which inspired the Telugu-speaking people when they yearned and struggled for several decades to form a unified Andhra Pradesh. May I cite a little bit of my personal experience? I happened to be touring parts of the South just before the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission was made public and my ears are still reverberating with the full-throated cries of Vishal Andhra... (Interruptions). It was really the will of the Telugu-speaking people which prevailed over the proposal of some people to retain the old Hyderabad State.

I have taken a lot of time. I should like to make one more point. Mr. Frank Anthony is absent. He spoke at length and he has on previous occasions spoken about the great mistake of forming linguistic States. There are some things which are part of our national life. It is true that the question of linguistic States was very much a part of the national movement. There was no getting away from it. The units of every party which was in existence at a time, were formed on the

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]
basis of language in spite of the British Provinces having different areas. There is an overall rationality in the formation of our various States and we should be very careful not to break this foundation of rationality in momentary passions. As I said at the beginning we should consider the feelings of people but it would be very wrong for the Government to be swept away by feelings. We must see what is in the larger interest of the people themselves. We are not saying that the interest of the people of Telengana should be sacrificed for our interest or for the interest of other parts of India. But the Government must think in a very calm manner about the interest of the people of that very region and see what will serve their interest best.

The Telugu-speaking people have a reputation of forthrightness but they also have an unsurpassed tradition of service to the nation. I am sure that no Telugu-speaking person whether he lives in the coastal region or in Rayalseema or in Telengana will ever do anything even in anger or in desperation which is not in the larger interest of their entire State and also in the interest of the country as a whole. I can understand the emotions of our friends here. This has been a period of great agony for us all to watch the developments in Andhra Pradesh and the tragedies that are taking place. I also should like to express my deep sympathy with the parents and families of those who have lost their lives. But we must look at this matter in the larger perspective. This particular Bill of course does not touch the larger aspect at all. This is a very limited Bill but because hon. Members have talked about other things, I also had to give my views on them.

MR. SPEAKER: There is one motion of Mr. Narayana Rao for reference to the Supreme Court.

Mr. Narayana Rao are you withdrawing it?

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO: I want to speak on that....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: No question of your speaking on it now. Are you withdrawing it or shall I put it to the House?

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO: I am withdrawing.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the hon. Member the leave of the House to withdraw his Motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

Amendment No. 1 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: I will now put motion serial No. 31 standing in the name of Shri M. Satyanarayan Rao to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 31 was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 15th February, 1973."(2)

The Lok Sabha divided:

AYES

Division No. 9]

[18.44 hrs.

Agarwal, Shri Virendra

Bade, Shri R. V.

Banera, Shri Hamendra Singh

Bhattacharyya, Shri Dinen

Bhattacharyya, Shri Jagdish

Bhattacharyya, Shri S. P.

Chaudhary, Shri Ishwar

Chowhan, Shri Bharat Singh

Dandavate, Prof. Madhu

Deb, Shri Dasaratha

Dutta, Shri Biren

Gopalan, Shri A. K.

Goswami, Shrimati Bibha Ghosh

Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra

Joshi, Shri Jagannathrao

Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand

Kalingarayar, Shri Mohanraj
 Kiruttinan, Shri Tha
 Krishnan, Shri E. R.
 Krishnan, Shri M. K.
 Mavalankar, Shri P. G.
 Modak, Shri Bijoy
 Mukherjee, Shri Samar
 Pandeya, Dr. Laxminarain
 Ramkanwar, Shri
 Rao, Shri M. Satyanarayan
 Reddy, Shri B. N.
 *Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal
 Saha, Shri Gadadhar
 Samantan, Shri S. C.
 Saminathan, Shri P. A.
 Sezhiyan, Shri
 Shakya, Shri Maha Deepak Singh
 Sharma, Shri R. R.
 Subravelu, Shri
 Ulaganambi, Shri R. P.
 Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari
 Veeriah, Shri K.
 Verma, Shri Phool Chand
 Viswanathan, Shri G.
 Yadav, Shri G. P.

NOES

Achal Singh, Shri
 Afzalpurkar, Shri Dharamao
 Aga, Shri Syed Ahmed
 Agrawal, Shri Shrikrishna
 Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
 Ahmed, Shri F. A.
 Ambesh, Shri
 Ankineedu, Shri Maganti
 Ansari, Shri Ziaur Rahman
 Appalanaidu, Shri
 Arvind Netam, Shri
 Austin, Dr. Henry

Babunath Singh, Shri
 Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar
 Banamali Babu, Shri
 Banerjee, Shri S. M.
 Banerji, Shrimati Mukul
 Barupal, Shri Panna Lal
 Basappa, Shri K.
 Basumatari, Shri D.
 Bhagat, Shri B. R.
 Bitandare, Shri R. D.
 Bhargava, Shri Basheshwar Nath
 Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal
 Bhattacharyya, Shri Chapalendu
 Brahmanandji, Shri Swami
 Chandra Gowda, Shri D. B.
 Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri
 Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal
 Chandrappan, Shri C. K.
 Chandrashekharaappa Veerabasappa, Shri
 T. V.
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri
 Chaturvedi, Shri Rohan Lal
 Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
 Chavan, Shri D. R.
 Chavan, Shri Yeshwantrao
 Chellachami, Shri A. M.
 Chhotey Lal, Shri
 Chikkalingaiah, Shri K.
 Choudhury, Shri Momul Haque
 Daga, Shri M. C.
 Dalbir Singh, Shri
 Darbara Singh, Shri
 Das, Smti Dharnidhar
 Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
 Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.
 Deo, Shri S. N. Singh
 Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
 Deshmukh, Shri Shivaji Rao S.
 Dharla, Shri Mohan
 Dhusia, Shri Anant Prasad
 Dinesh Singh, Shri
 Dixit, Shri G. C.

Dumada, Shri L. K.
 Dwivedi, Shri Nagashwar
 Engti, Shri Biren
 Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
 Ganesh, Shri K. R.
 Gangadeb, Shri P.
 Gautam, Shri C. D.
 Gavit, Shri T. H.
 Ghosh, Shri P. K.
 Gill, Shri Mohinder Singh
 Giri, Shri V. Shanker
 Gogoi, Shri Tarun
 Gohain, Shri C. C.
 Gokhale, Shri H. R.
 Gomango, Shri Giridhar
 Gopal, Shri K.
 Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chandra
 Gotkhinde, Shri Annasaheb
 Govind Das, Dr.
 Gowda, Shri Pampan
 Gupta, Shri Indrajit
 Hansda, Shri Subodh
 Hanumanthaiya, Shri K.
 Hari Kishore Singh, Shri
 Ishaque, Shri A. K. M.
 Jadeja, Shri D. P.
 Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.
 Jagjivan Ram, Shri
 Jamilurrahman, Shri Md.
 Jharkhande Rai, Shri
 Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
 Kadam, Shri J. G.
 Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandran
 Kahandole, Shri Z. M.
 Kailas, Dr.
 Kale, Shri
 Kalyanasundaram, Shri M.
 Kamakshaiiah, Shri D.
 Kamble, Shri T. D.
 Kamla Kumari, Kumari
 Kapur, Shri Sat Pal
 Karan Singh, Dr.

Kasture, Shri A. S.
 Kathamuthu, Shri M.
 Kaul, Shrimati Sheila
 Kavde, Shri B. R.
 Kedar Nath Singh, Shri
 Khadilkar, Shri R. K.
 Kinder Lal, Shri
 Kisku, Shri A. K.
 Kotoki, Shri Liladhar
 Kotrashetti, Shri A. K.
 Kulkarni, Shri Raja
 Kumaramangalam, Shri S. Mohan
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati T.
 Laskar, Shri Nihar
 Lutfal Haque, Shri
 Mahajan, Shri Vikram
 Mahajan, Shri Y. S.
 Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini
 Majhi, Shri Gajadhar
 Majhi, Shri Kumar
 Malaviya, Shri K. D.
 Mallanna, Shri K.
 Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain
 Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad
 Manjhi, Shri Bhola
 Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
 Mishra, Shri G. S.
 Mishra, Shri Jagannath
 Mishra, Shri L. N.
 Mishra, Shri S. N.
 Mohsin, Shri F. H.
 Nabata, Shri Amarji
 Naik, Shri B. V.
 Negi, Shri Pratap Singh
 Oraon, Shri Kartik
 Oraon, Shri Tuna
 Pahadia, Shri Jagannath
 Painuli, Shri Paripoornanand
 Pandey, Shri Damodar
 Pandey, Shri Narasingh Narain

Pandey, Shri R. S.
 Pandey, Shri Sudhakar
 Pandey, Shri Tarkeshwar
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
 Pant, Shri K. C.
 Paokai, Haokip, Shri
 Parashar, Prof. Narain Chand
 Partap Singh, Shri
 Paswan, Shri Ram Bhagat
 Patel, Shri Arvind M.
 Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe
 Patil, Shri Krishnarao
 Patnaik, Shri Banamali
 Peje, Shri S. I.
 Pradhani, Shri K.
 Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shafi
 Raghu Ramaiah, Shri K.
 Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai
 Raj Bahadur, Shri
 Raju, Shri P. V. G.
 Ram, Shri Tulmohan
 Ram Dhan, Shri
 Ram Surat Prasad, Shri
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramji Ram, Shri
 Rao, Shrimati B. Radhabai A.
 Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Rao, Shri K. Narayana
 Rao, Shri M. S. Sanjeevi
 Rao, Shri Nageswara
 Rao, Shri P. Ankineedu Prasada
 Rao, Shri Pattabhi Rama
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Ravi, Shri Vayalar
 Reddy, Shri Kodanda Rami
 Reddy, Shri P. Ganga
 Reddy, Shri P. V.
 Reddy, Shri Y. Eswara
 Richhariya, Dr. Govind Das
 Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila
 Sadhu Ram, Shri
 Saini, Shri Mulki Raj

Saksena, Prof. S. L.
 Sambhali, Shri Ishaque
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.
 Sarkar, Shri Sakti Kumar
 Sathe, Shri Vasant
 Satish Chandra, Shri
 Satpathy, Shri Devendra
 Satyanarayana, Shri B.
 Sayeed, Shri P. M.
 Shahnawaz Khan, Shri
 Shambhu Nath, Shri
 Shankar Dayal Singh, Shri
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Sharma, Shri A. P.
 Sharma, Dr. H. P.
 Sharma, Shri Madhoram
 Sharma, Shri Nawal Kishore
 Sharma, Shri R. N.
 Sharma, Dr. Shankar Dayal
 Shashi Bhushan, Shri
 Shastri, Shri Viswanarayan.
 Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
 Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
 Shenoy, Shri P. R.
 Sher Singh, Prof.
 Shetty, Shri K. K.
 Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.
 Shivrath Singh, Shri
 Shukla, Shri B. R.
 Siddayya, Shri S. M.
 Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
 Singh, Shri Vishwanath Pratap
 Sinha, Shri Dharam Bir
 Sohan Lal, Shri T.
 Subramaniam, Shri C.
 Tarodekar, Shri V. D.
 Tayyab Hussain, Shri
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.
 Tombi Singh, Shri N.
 Ulkey, Shri M. G.

Unnikrishanan, Shri K. P.

Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.

Venkataswamy, Shri G.

Verma, Shri Balgovind

Verma, Shri Ram Singh Bhai

Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad

Vidyalankar, Shri Amarnath

Vikal, Shri Ram Chandra

Virbhadra Singh, Shri

Yadav, Shri Chandrajit

Yadav, Shri R. P.

Yadav, Shri D. P.

MR. SPEAKER: The result* of the division is: Ayes 41: Noes 231

The motion was negated.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think, Mr. Madhu Dandavate, you would like your Motion to be put, after this..

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, I want it to be put to vote. They might be prepared to circulate it upto the 4th April.

MR. SPEAKER: All right. This will be by voice vote.

The question is:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 4th April, 1973." (3)

The motion was negated.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put amendment No. 4 by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for certain amendments to the Mulki Rules so as to limit their operation,

for the validation of certain appointments and for the repeal, in a phased manner, of the said rules and for matters connected therewith, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 30 members, 20 from this House, namely: Shri R. V. Bade, Shri Bhagirath Bhanwar, Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu, Shri Madhu Dandavate, Shri R. N. Goenka, Shri Jagannathrao Joshi, Shri Hukum Chand Kachwai, Shri Mallikarjun, Shri P. G. Mavalankar, Shri Piloo Mody, Dr. Laxminarayan Pandeya, Shri K. C. Pant, Shri Dhan Shah Pradhan, Shri M. S. Purty, Shri Ramkanwar, Shri M. Satyanarayana Rao, Shri Shiv Kumar Shastri, Shri Rana Bahadur Singh, Shri G. P. Yadav, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee and 10 from Rajya Sabha;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the first day of the next session;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House do recommend to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of 10 Members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee." (4)

The motion was negated.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for certain amendments to the Mulki

*The following Members also recorded their votes for NOES:

Sarvshri M. Ram Gopal Reddy, Sarjoo Pandey and S. A. Muruganatham.

Rules so as to limit their operation, for the validation of certain appointments and for the repeal, in a phased manner, of the said rules and for matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2—(Definitions.)

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN (PALGHAT): I beg to move:

- Page 1, omit line 5. (6)
- Page 1, omit lines 12 to 16. (7)
- Page 2, omit lines 12 and 13. (8)
- Page 2, omit lines 14 and 15. (9)
- Page 2, omit lines 16 and 17. (10)
- Page 2, omit lines 18 and 19. (11)
- Page 2, omit lines 20 and 21. (12)
- Page 2, omit lines 22 and 23. (13)
- Page 2, omit lines 27 to 30. (14)

MR. SPEAKER: These amendments are now before the House.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: I would like to speak specially on my amendment which seeks to substitute for clause 3 the following:

"The Mulki Rules are hereby repealed",

and also my amendment No 116 which seeks to substitute for clause 4, the following, namely:

"All public appointments in Andhra Pradesh shall be in the proportion of 1:2 between Telengana area and the rest of Andhra Pradesh while due weightage is given to backward areas in both the regions as may be specified to the Rules."

I do not want to make a long speech. But I would explain what our position is as far as this question is concerned. I understand the difficulties, because I had been in Andhra Pradesh and I know the feelings of the people of Andhra Pradesh at least. The feelings are running very high, and the people are all divided. the

people of the Andhra region on one side and those of the Telengana region on the other, and the Government employees are also divided. All these things are there. But the proposal that has come before us is not the solution. For, what is the root cause of the division of the people of Andhra and Telengana? It is the question of employment.

There are not enough employment opportunities. As far as those who want employment are concerned, there are many. So, that is the root cause. In order to avoid unemployment, it is necessary that the people of both the Andhra and Telengana regions must unite together and fight against unemployment and starvation. That was the feeling which made the people unite together and fight for Vishala Andhra. Since they had the same culture and the same language, they thought that if they united together, it would be easier for them to fight against the British rulers as well as against poverty and unemployment.

This type of problem is there not only in Andhra and Telengana areas, but it is there in many other States as well. Take the case of Kerala, for instance. It is a separate State and it is a single State. But there are differences between one district and another district; there are differences between one village and another village. If there are employment opportunities, and there are industries in one village and people are recruited for the purpose, the people there say that the people from another village should not be taken. So, there is that type of feeling in one district against another and in one village against another. This feeling is there because the employment opportunities are very few, while the number of those who want employment is growing day by day. So, it is not a question of whether there should be a separate Andhra or Telengana State. The question is one of unemployment, and we have to fight unemployment. Even if the State were united, in today's condition, the problem of unemployment cannot be immediately solved. A separate Andhra or Telengana State can never solve the problem of unemployment.

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

It is highly regrettable that the Central Government have not done what they should have done. Instead of coming forward with a Bill of this nature to safeguard the interests of the people of both the region, they should have found some *via media* by which the passions of the people could have been assuaged, as soon as the Andhra High Court had declared the rules *ultra vires*; if they would have done so to safeguard the interests of both the regions, then the present situation where there are strong feelings between the people of Andhra region and those of the Telangana region would not have come about. So the entire responsibility is on the Central Government.

Secondly, our party is deeply disturbed over these disruptive developments in the State of Andhra and in the Telangana area. Our party is of the considered view that a just and reasonable solution is possible for this issue, provided the Central Government acts in time and enacts suitable legislation ensuring the legitimate rights and demands of the people of Telangana while annulling the out-dated Mulki Rules which, if persisted and implemented, would surely pave the way for the disunity of the people and the disintegration of Andhra Pradesh.

The Central Government must enact legislation, firstly to ensure employment in State government services at all levels in the ratio of 2:1 for 'Andhra' and 'Telangana' regions respectively and they be posted in any part of the State and not confined to each region. This reflects the real strength of the population in the two regions. This principle may be extended to all public corporations and semi-government concerns. Secondly, the allocation of all State resources including that of Hyderabad City and Central loans and grants for regular administrative and developmental activities in the State including 5-year-plans in the ratio of 2:1 while special attention should be paid and special allocation made to develop backward tracts and areas in both the regions.

Similarly seats in colleges and professional schools and institutions can be reserved in the same ratio.

Thirdly—I say this in reference to what Shri Raghuramaiah was saying that we want to perpetuate it—the time-limit for the two above-stated provisions should not be mechanically fixed. They should only continue until such time when mutual understanding and confidence develops between the two regions and the people living there and until the existing imbalance in the development between the two regions gets progressively reduced and eliminated. I press my amendments.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO: I move:

Page 1,—omit lines 15 and 16. (22)

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put amendments Nos 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 to vote.

Amendments Nos. 6 to 14 were put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put amendment No. 22 to vote.

Amendment No. 22 was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 4—(Validation of certain specified appointments.)

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: I move:

Page 3, for clause 4, substitute—

"4. All public appointments in Andhra Pradesh shall be in the proportion of 1:2 between Telangana area and the rest of Andhra Pradesh while due weightage is given to backward areas in both the regions as

may be specified in the Rules". (16)

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put this amendment to vote.

Amendment No. 16 was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Clause 6—(Report of Mulki Rules in respect of appointments to Schedule posts in the Capital area.)

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO: I move;

Page 3, line 44,—for "1977" substitute "1990". (23)

Page 3.—after line 40 insert—

"Provided that the Central Government shall make a review of the employment position in Telengana region every two years, from the date of commencement of this Act, in order to ascertain whether the object of providing safeguards in the matter of employment under State Government has been achieved in terms of filling up posts in Telengana region by persons domiciled in Telengana region". (24)

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put these amendments to vote.

Amendments Nos. 23 and 24 were put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That clause 6 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 6 was added to the Bill.

Clause 7—(Repeal of Mulki Rules in respect of appointments to Schedule posts in the remaining areas of Telangana.)

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO: I move;

Page 4, line 3,—for "1980" substitute "1990". (25)

Page 4, after line 6 insert—

"Provided that the Central Government shall make a review of the employment position in Telengana region every two years, from the date of commencement of this Act, in order to ascertain whether the object providing safeguards in the matter of employment under the State Government has been achieved in terms of filling up posts in Telengana region by persons domiciled in Telengana region". (26)

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put these amendments to vote.

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26 were put and negatived.

19 hrs.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That Clause 7 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 7 was added to the Bill.

First Schedule

MR. SPEAKER: We take up the First Schedule. There are some amendments.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO: I beg to move:

Page 4,—

for lines 12 to 14 substitute—

"(b) The post of Tehsildar, the post of Civil Assistant Surgeon, the post of Junior Engineer, the post of

[Shri Satya Narain Rao]

Veterinary Assistant Surgeon, the post of Munsiff Magistrate, the post of Junior or Assistant Lecturer in Government and aided colleges, the post of Assistant Radio Engineer, the post of Assistant or Police Prosecuting Officer, the post of District Inspector of Labour, the post of District Public Relation Officer, the post of Assistant Statistical Officer, the post of Drug Inspector, the post of Dairy Extension Officer, the post of Assistant Treasury Officer and the post of District Women Welfare Officer, in each case by whatever name designated, within Telengana area, under the State Government." (27)

Page 4, line 16,—

after "Other than a cantonment board)"

insert "or other authority" (28)

Page 4, line 18,—

for "three" substitute "five" (29)

MR. SPEAKER: I put amendments Nos. 27, 28 and 29 to the vote of the House.

Amendments Nos. 27 to 29 were put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the First Schedule stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The First Schedule was added to the Bill.

Second Schedule

MR. SPEAKER: Now we take up the Second Schedule.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO: I beg to move:

Page 2, line 22,—

for "Non-gazetted" substitute—

"First-gazetted and non-gazetted" (30)

MR. SPEAKER: I put amendment No. 30 to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 30 was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Second Schedule stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Second Schedule was added to the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Sometimes even two of you do not say 'Ayes'. I want to make you alert sometimes. The question is:

"That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

The Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed"

The Lok Sabha divided:

Div. No. 10]

[19.08 hrs.

AYES

Achal Singh, Shri
Atzalputkar, Shri Dharamrao
Aga, Shri Syed Ahmed
Agrawal, Shri Shrikrishna
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
Ahmed, Shri F. A.
Ambesh, Shri
Ansari, Shri Ziaur Rahman

Appalanaidu, Shri	Dharia, Shri Mohan
Arvind Netam, Shri	Dhusia, Shri Anant Prasad
Austin, Dr. Henry	Dinesh Singh, Shri
Babunath Singh, Shri	Dixit, Shri G. C.
Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar	Dumada, Shri L. K.
Banamali Babu, Shri	Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar
Banerjee, Shri S. M.	Engt, Shri Biren
Banerji, Shrimati Mukul	Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
Barua, Shri Bedabrata	Ganesh, Shri K. R.
Barupal, Shri Panna Lal	Gangadeb, Shri P.
Basappa, Shri K.	Gautam, Shri C. D.
Basumatari, Shri D.	Gavit, Shri T. H.
Bhagat, Shri B. R.	Ghosh, Shri P. K.
Bhandare, Shri R. D.	Gill, Shri Mohmder Singh
Bhargava, Shri Basheshwar Nath	Giri, Shri V. Shanker
Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal	Gogoi, Shri Tarun
Bhattacharyya, Shri Chapalendu	Gohain, Shri C. C.
Brahmanandji, Shri Swami	Gokhale, Shri H. R.
Chandra Gowda, Shri D. B.	Gomango, Shri Giridhar
Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri	Gopal, Shri K.
Chandrappan, Shri C. K.	Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chandra
Chandrashekharappa Veerabasappa, Shri	Gotkhinde, Shri Annasaheb
T. V.	Gowda, Shri Pampan
Chandrika Prasad, Shri	Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Chaturvedi, Shri Rohan Lal	Hansda, Shri Subodh
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh	Hanumanthaiya, Shri K.
Chavan, Shri D. R.	Hari Kishore Singh, Shri
Chavan, Shri Yeshwantrao	Ishaque, Shri A. K. M.
Chellachami, Shri A. M.	Jadeja, Shri D. P.
Chhotey Lal, Shri	Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.
Chikkalingaiah, Shri K.	Jagjivan Ram, Shri
Choudhury, Shri Moinul Haque	Jamilnrrahman, Shri Md.
Daga, Shri M. C.	Jharkharde Rai, Shri
Dalbair Singh, Shri	Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
Darbara Singh, Shri	Kadam, Shri J. G.
Das, Shri Anadi Charan	Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandran
Das, Shri Dharnidhar	Kahandole, Shri Z. M.
Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas	Kale, Shri
Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.	Kalyanasundaram, Shri M.
Deshmukh, Shri K. G.	Kamakshaiah, Shri D.
Deshmukh, Shri Shivaji Rao S.	Kamble, Shri T. D.
	Kamla Kumari, Kumari

Kapur, Shri Sat Pal
 Karan Singh, Dr.
 Kasture, Shri A. S.
 Kathamuthu, Shri M.
 Kaul, Shrimati Sheila
 Kavde, Shri B. R.
 Kedar Nath Singh, Shri
 Khadilkar, Shri R. K.
 Kinder al, Shri
 Kisku, Shri A. K.
 Kotoki, Shri Liladhar
 Kotrashetti, A. K.
 Kulkarni, Shri Raja
 Kumaramangalam, Shri S. Mohan
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati T.
 Laskar, Shri Nihar
 Lutfal Haque, Shri
 Mahajan, Shri Vikram
 Mahajan, Shri Y. S.
 Mahata, Shri Debendra Nath
 Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini
 Majhi, Shri Gajadhar
 Majhi, Shri Kumar
 Malaviya, Shri K. D.
 Mallanna, Shri K.
 Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain
 Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad
 Manjhi, Shri Bhola
 Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
 Mishra, Shri G. S.
 Mishra, Shri Jagannath
 Mishra, Shri L. N.
 Mishra, Shri S. N.
 Mohsin, Shri F. H.
 Muruganantham, Shri S. A.
 Nahata, Shri Amrit
 Negi, Shri Pratap Singh
 Oraon, Shri Kartik
 Draon, Shri Tuna
 Pahadia, Shri Jagannath
 Painuli, Shri Paripoornanand

Pandey, Shri Damodar
 Pandey, Shri Narsingh Narain
 Pandey, Shri R. S.
 Pandey, Shri Sarjoo
 Pandey, Shri Sudhakar
 Pandey, Shri Tarkeshwar
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
 Pant, Shri K. C.
 Paokai, Haokip, Shri
 Parashar, Prof. Narain Chand
 Pratap Singh, Shri
 Paswan, Shri Ram Bhagat
 Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe
 Patil, Shri Krishnarao
 Patnaik, Shri Banamali
 Peje, Shri S. L.
 Prabodh Chandra, Shri
 Pradhani, Shri K.
 Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shafi
 Raghu Ramaiah, Shri K.
 Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai
 Raj Bahadur, Shri
 Raju, Shri P. V. G.
 Ram, Shri Tulmohan
 Ram Dhan, Shri
 Ram Surat Prasad, Shri
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramji Ram, Shri
 Rao, Shrimati B. Radhabai A.
 Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Rao, Shri K. Narayana
 Rao, Shri M. S. Sanjeevi
 Rao, Shri Nageswara
 Rao, Shri P. Ankinedu Prasada
 Rao, Shri Pattabhi Rama
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Ravi, Shri Vayalar
 Reddy, Shri K. Kodanda Rama
 Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal
 Reddy, Shri P. Ganga
 Reddy, Shri P. V.

Reddy, Shri Y. Eswara
 Rishbhatya, Dr. Govind Das
 Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila
 Sadhu Ram, Shri
 Saini, Shri Mulki Raj
 Saksena, Prof. S. L.
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sambhali, Shri Ishaque
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.
 Sarkar, Shri Sakti Kumar
 Sathe, Shri Vasant
 Satish Chandra, Shri
 Satpathy, Shri Devendra
 Satyanarayana, Shri B.
 Sayeed, Shri P. M.
 Shahnawaz Khan, Shri
 Shambhu Nath, Shri
 Shankar Dayal Singh, Shri
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Sharma, Shri A. P.
 Sharma, Dr. H. P.
 Sharma, Shri Madhoram
 Sharma, Shri Nawal Kishore
 Sharma, Shri R. N.
 Sharma, Dr. Shankar Dayal
 Shashi Bhushan, Shri
 Shastri, Shri Viswanarayan
 Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
 Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
 Shenoy, Shri P. R.
 Sher Singh, Prof.
 Shetty, Shri K. K.
 Shinde, Shri Anmasahab P.
 Shivnath Singh, Shri
 Shukla, Shri B. R.
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
 Siddhaya, Shri S. M.
 Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
 Singh, Shri Vishwanath Pratap
 Sinha, Shri Dharam Bir
 Sohan Lal, Shri T.

Subramaniam, Shri C.
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
 Tarodekar, Shri V. D.
 Tayyab Hussain, Shri
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.
 Tombi Singh, Shri N.
 Ukey, Shri M. G.
 Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
 Venkatswamy, Shri G.
 Verma, Shri Balgovind
 Verma, Shri Ram Singh Bhai
 Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad
 Vidyalankar, Shri Amarnath
 Vikal, Shri Ram Chandra
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri
 Yadav, Shri Chandrajit
 Yadav, Shri R. P.

NOFS

Bade, Shri R. V.
 Banera, Shri Hamendra Singh
 Bhattacharyya, Shri Dinen
 Bhattacharyya, Shri Jagdish
 Bhattacharyya, Shri S. P.
 Chaudhary, Shri Ishwar
 Chowhan, Shri Bharat Singh
 Dandavate, Prof. Madhu
 Deb, Shri Dassaratna
 Datta, Shri Biren
 Gopalan, Shri A. K.
 Goswami, Shrimati Bibha Ghosh
 Haider, Shri Krishna Chandra
 Joshi, Shri Jagannathrao
 Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand
 Kalingarayar, Shri Mohanraj
 Kiruttinam, Shri Tha
 Krishnan, Shri E. R.
 Krishnan, Shri M. K.

Mawalankar, Shri P. G.
Modak, Shri Bijoy
Mukherjee, Shri Samar
Pandeya, Dr. Laxminarain
*Patel, Shri Arvind M.
Ramkanwar, Shri
Rao, Shri M. Satyanarayan
Reddy, Shri B. N.
Saha, Shri Gadadhar
Saminathan, Shri P. A.
Serhiyan, Shri
Shakya, Shri Maha Deepak Singh
Sharma, Shri R. R.
Subravelu, Shri
Ulaganambi, Shri R. P.
Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari
Veeriah, Shri K.
Verma, Shri Phool Chand
Viswanathan, Shri G.
Yadav, Shri G. P.
*Yadav, Shri D. P.

mittee of the Houses on the Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, made in the motion adopted by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 14th December, 1972 and communicated to this House on the 15th December, 1972 and do resolve that the following 30 Members of Lok Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee, namely:—Shri P. Ankineedu Prasada-
rao, Shri Banamali Babu, Shri R. V. Bade, Shri H. K. L. Bhagat, Shri Muhammed Khuda Bukhs, Shri B. E. Choudhari, Shri Khemchandbhai Chavda, Shri Madhu Dandavate, Shri G. C. Dixit, Shri Tarun Gogoi, Shri Dinesh Joarder, Shri Z. M. Kahandole, Shri G. Y. Krishnan, Shri Yamuna Prasad Mandal, Shri Piloo Mody, Shri F. H. Mohsin, Shri Niti Raj Singh Chaudhury, Shri D. K. Panda, Shri R. Balakrishna Pillai, Chowdhury Ram Sewak, Shri K. Narayana Rao, Shri M. Satyanarayan Rao, Shri Vayalar Ravi, Shri Shanker Rao Savant, Shri Shambhu Nath, Shri B. R. Shukla, Shri Ram Shekhar Prasad Singh, Shri S. N. Singh, Shri G. Viswanathan, Shri R. P. Yadav.

MR. SPEAKER: The result** of the division is: Ayes 233; Noes 40.

The motion was adopted.

19.05 hrs.

INDIAN PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): I beg to move:

"That this House do concur in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha that the House do join in the Joint Com-

MR. SPEAKER: The question is...

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAEYEE (Gwalior): No discussion on it?

MR. SPEAKER: This is a motion for concurrence for the appointment of a Joint Committee. If you do not want to concur, it is all right.

The question is:

"That this House do concur in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha that the House do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, made in the motion adopted by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 14th December, 1972 and communicated to

*Wrongly noted for NOES.

**The following Members also recorded their votes for AYES:—

Sarvshi D. P. Yadav, Maganti Ankineedu, B. S. Murthy and Arvind M. Patel.