

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at five minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair].

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) Sir, I have given notice about a serious thing that has come to our attention. The Modi Flour Mill was raided and two persons were arrested under the Essential Commodities Act; there were two charges against them. After they made contribution to a political party, they were allowed....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order please.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: These Modis are the close relative of Surajmal Modi. It is a serious matter

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order please. There should be some way of raising it; there are ways of drawing the attention of the House. If you had written that would be considered by the Speaker; I cannot tell you offhand what happened to it

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Why do you not ask them to make a statement if they have taken a political donation

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kondur): I am sure you must have read in the newspapers today, *Hindustan Times* and others that that Pav panel's proposals may cost Rs. 200 crores

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have raised it in the morning

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Whatever has appeared in the newspapers seems to be correct. It means the Press knows it. I should like the Government to make a statement if the Pay Commission had finalised its recommendations and submitted the report. It is leaked out to the Press. Are we not concerned? Parliament is being reduced to nothing....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You raised it in the morning; you have raised it again; they have heard it and it should be enough now.

14.06 hrs

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE:
PROCLAMATION IN RELATION TO
THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS
(SHRI K. C. PANT): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 18th of January, 1973 under article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Andhra Pradesh".

On 17th January, 1973, the Governor, Andhra Pradesh, reported to the President that the Chief Minister, Shri P. V. Narasimharao tendered the resignation of himself and his colleague in the Council of Ministers. The resignations were accepted by the Governor. Keeping in view the relative strength of the various political parties in the State Legislative Assembly, the Governor came to the conclusion that it would not be possible for a leader of any opposition party to form an alternative Government and the Governor recommended that the State should be brought under the President's rule as contemplated under article 356 of the Constitution. The Governor further recommended that during the period of President's rule the Legislative Assembly may not be dissolved but only kept suspended. The Proclamation under article 356 was made by the President on the 18th January on the basis of the recommendations of the Governor.

Sir, the Governor in his report which has been placed on the Table of the House had recommended that

[Shri K. C. Pant]
 the Presidential proclamation under article 356 may be issued with immediate effect and expressed the hope that it would help to ease the tension in the State and in restoring normalcy.

This House is fully aware of the happenings in Andhra Pradesh. Following the Supreme Court ruling pronounced on October 3, 1972, proclaiming the validity of the Mulki Rules, some agitations were sparked off in the Andhra region of Andhra Pradesh. In some parts of the State there were violent incidents resulting in loss of life and damage to public property. Unfortunately, the leaders of the State could not come to any agreement during discussion among themselves. It was then that the Chief Minister, his other ministerial colleagues and also other leaders of public opinion and Members of Parliament from Andhra Pradesh, wanted the Central Government to take decisions on matters related to Mulki Rules. Following discussions by the Central leaders with the Andhra Pradesh leaders and representatives of different sections of the people and with a view to providing satisfaction to the expectations of all the regions a five point formula was announced in Parliament on 27th November 1972, and thereafter the Mulki Rules Act, 1972 was passed. I need not elaborate the provisions of the Act. But I would like to point out that the provisions of the Act, follow, in the main, the scheme of safeguards mutually agreed to in 1956, with only some marginal adjustments. The Act regularises the appointment made since November 1956 of persons from the Andhra region and other non-Telengana people to posts in the Telengana region. It also provides for the total repeal of reservations by the end of December 1977 in respect of all posts in the twin cities and by the end of December 1980 in respect of all posts in other parts of Telengana.

The immediate effect of the legislation was to assuage the feelings of the people in Andhra Pradesh. But unfortunately, agitation was soon stepped up in the different parts of the State, more particularly, in the Andhra region. It did not take long for the agitation to take the ugly form of violence and lawlessness. It was in these circumstances that, in order to help resolve the mounting political and law and order crisis in the State, the Chief Minister tendered the resignation of his Ministry and the President's rule was subsequently imposed in the State.

I have no doubt that the House will fully appreciate the constitutional propriety—I would even say inevitability of the President's Proclamation in Andhra Pradesh. But that will not be enough. What is required is since concerted, efforts on the part of one and all to ensure that the primary objectives of the President's rule namely, the restoration of normalcy and order in the State is speedily achieved.

There can be no substitute for dispassionate and rational discussion, even when emotions are running at a high pitch over complex issues. A recourse to agitation which leads to lawlessness and violence cannot produce any enduring solution. Such methods would only serve to undermine the basic premises of democracy and political activity in the country. The Prime Minister has already made a fervent appeal for restoration of normalcy and it will not be necessary for me to say anything more this aspect. Our sympathy goes out to those who have suffered. Andhra has witnessed serious damage to public property. The economy of the State has suffered grievously. Communications and other public utility services had been completely dislocated. All sections of the people have been affected by these happenings but none more grievously than the poorer sections.

Sir, I take this opportunity to appeal to all sections of this House and to all leaders of opinion to work for the restoration of order and normalcy in Andhra Pradesh, which alone can pave the way for a calm and objective consideration of the individual and collective grievances of the people of different parts of the State. It is of no less importance that the students, the Government servants in different rungs of the administration, the doctors and other professions lose no further time in resuming their duties and thus put an end to the distress and harassment of the people at large.

This is the paramount need at this juncture and it is this which should be endorsed, in no uncertain terms, as this august House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 18th of January, 1973.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 18th January, 1973 under article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Andhra Pradesh."

SHRI S. B. GIRI (Warrangal): May I seek some clarifications?

MR. DEPUTY--SPEAKER: Your name is here and you want to speak at the time when you speak, you can raise all these issues.

Shri B. N. Reddy.

*SHRI B. N. REDDY (Niryalguda): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I would like to ask this House as to why the situation has been created that 4½ crores of people of Andhra Pradesh have been made to suffer this President's rule. That is the most important question. The Government there is supposed to be most stable of all the

Governments in the South. It was also a Congress Government with an absolute majority. If such a situation has arisen when that Government had to yield place to the President's rule we have to consider very coolly for the reasons behind this. It has not been spelt out by the Minister in his statement as to why their own party Government has to be superseded and President's rule imposed.

I would like to state that this is the result of the failure of the Government in State as well as in the centre here in solving the problems of backwardness, regional imbalances and employment problems. I can boldly state that the failure of the Government in the State and the Government in the Centre has clearly reflected in the imposition of President's rule in the State of Andhra Pradesh. Shrimati Indira Gandhi in her statement yesterday said that her Government is determined to implement those policies which were stated earlier. They are proclaiming everywhere they go that they are going to bring radical reforms in order to solve the problem of poverty, unemployment, economic disparity etc. Today the Government of Shri Narasimharao failed to implement these policies and had to yield place to the President's rule. I am absolutely sure that the President's rule would also would not be in a position to solve these problems. That is why the imposition of the President's rule is a shameful reflection of the utter failure of the Congress Government in the State. Here I would like to state what Shri Dikshit is said to have stated:

"He also conceded that the Andhra politicians who initially welcomed the Prime Minister's formula had failed to gauge properly the feelings of the people. He acknowledged with equal candour the shortcom-

*The original speech was delivered in Telugu

[Shri B. N. Reddy]
ings of both the Central and State Governments in making a timely assessment of the possible reactions to the formula in the Andhra region."

This is not a truthful self-criticism. I would say that it is hypocritical.

Today President's rule is proclaimed because, it is stated, that the separatists movement has assumed threatening proportions. This President's rule is not a political solution of the various problems that are being faced by the State. To put it in nutshell it is only a continuation of the CRP and military Government that had been perpetrated by the Government of Shri Narasimharao which is completely unconnected and unaware of the problems of the people.

I would to submit that even during the President's rule rivers of blood have flown in the towns of Vijawadda and Guntur. A state of terror has been created in the minds of the people. That is this President's rule. Not only that; the State's economy has been shattered. What is worse, Andhra Pradesh, the rice bowl of the south is now begging for food. Because of the disruption of communications the distribution of fertilizers for the rabi crop may fall by 15 per cent, resulting in production loss of 9 lakhs tonnes of rice in coastal districts. Industrial production has been affected by interruption in power supplies. I don't have time to go into details. I have received information that in Nalgonda district 600 villages are facing an acute shortage of water supply due to power shortage. The crops are drying up. This is due to the strike by the employees and engineers of the Electricity department. Secondly, because of the failure of the road transport system paddy could not be transported to the required regions thereby increasing the prices artificially. The common man is the sufferer. The situation has deteriorat-

ed to such an extent there is an acute shortage of drinking water in the twin cities of Hyderabad and Secunderabad. Kerosene is also not available. Who are the sufferers? 4½ crores people of Andhra Pradesh. There is nobody who could be made responsible for such a sorry state of affairs.

Yesterday, Shrimati Indira Gandhi has stated that this problem is not a creation of theirs. It is Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, a very audacious statement on her part. I accuse the Centre and the State Congress Government as responsible for such a situation. This problem has been created by their shortsighted policies. How did the Prime Minister deal with the problem? She tried to appease a particular region in the beginning by imposing Mulki rules against the wishes and aspirations of another region, when one region fought the election on that issue and came out successfully. Then she manipulated their come back into the Congress party fold subsequently. Now, by her implementation of the 5-point formula she become instrumental in rousing the passions of another region to such an extent that they are demanding separation. Who is responsible for shelving consideration and solution of the problem of unemployment and economic backwardness, which aggravated and resulted in the present condition of the State? It is this Prime Minister and her Congress leadership in the State which is responsible. When such a situation has been created and the opposition parties are accused of succumbing to the pressures of regionalism, I am surprised at the hypocrisy of the Congress party. She also stated that she would safeguard the integrity of the State at any cost. That is not a correct appreciation of the problem. Instead of correctly appreciating the problem they cajoled and persuaded the members of their own party not to press for separation. She further stated that there will be due consideration of all aspects, it may be bifur-

cation, it may be integration. This policy of the Centre of maintaining Mulki Rules and sending CRP there has landed our State of Andhra Pradesh in troubles and is encouraging regionalism directly and indirectly. What is the reason? What is the secret behind this? Does it not help the two factions in her party to bring the ultimate disintegration of the State not only geographically, but politically and economically? She is giving encouragement to such separatist tendencies by her utterances. If you try to see the reasons behind this mishandling of the situation we can easily come to the conclusion that this is meant to achieve the political ends of her party. It is easily proved that it is so from her utterances at various junctures.

She is afraid that if she sticks to the stand of integration, her party's sway may be lost in both the regions of Andhra Pradesh. I would not be surprised if they ultimately decide on bifurcation. This is their policy of national integration.

I would therefore suggest that the employment problem should be solved on the basis of population in ratio of 2:1. But unfortunately, the rulers are engrossed in bargaining for continuation of their power instead of solving the problems objectively. I hope the so called drama of consultations would not deal a death blow to the integration of the State.

Here I would like to state my party stand, while concluding. My party always stood for integration and will fight for it. I would add that the policy of the Prime Minister would encourage disintegration instead of strengthening integration.

SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Bangalore): **MA. Deputy-Speaker.** Sir, I was fortunate enough indeed today to follow the speech of my previous speaker. I followed his speech because I understand Telugu. Sir, that

is a bond between me and Andhra Pradesh.

It is not merely that my State happens to be a neighbouring State, but I have taken real interest in the formation of Andhra from the very beginning.

Sir, 20 years ago, the Congress Working Committee moved a Resolution in the Nanalnagar session of the Congress held at Hyderabad that no linguistic State should be formed for the present. In fact, the Working Committee people wanted me to support that Resolution. I stood alone against that resolution. I said, if you carve out the State of Andhra, it is not as though it is going to fall in the Bay of Bengal or the Arabian Sea. I said, the people's will must be conceded. And, subsequently, within a few months, the Andhra State was established, in the wake of some violence and agitation. When Petti Sriramula died, the Government of India conceded the demand. I felt personally, though I was a small man, that that was a very bad precedent to lay, and people came to know that it is only agitations demonstrations and violence that will yield results. And the same violence erupted in the case of Haryana, in the case of Meghalaya, in the case of Nagaland. But, all this is past history. Sir. You will see, a concession to violence is the surest way of down-grading democracy. If the Congressmen have committed a mistake in laying down a bad precedent, it is time for us to revise our own doings.

Hereafter, this new leadership, this massive majority which Congress has obtained, must be used to see that violence does not pay and that demonstrations can do nothing.

When the Andhra State was inaugurated, the first Chief Minister, Mr. Prakasam invited me to the function as I happened to be the Chief Minister of the neighbouring State. I attended the function. I saw the great

[Shri K. Hanumanthaiya]

happiness shining on the faces of the huge crowd of people who had assembled, there. Nehru made a very good speech. Even sentence of his speech was applauded. Because, the people were all really happy seeing that the State was formed after all.

Now, Sir, what has happened to spoil this atmosphere of happiness? To this the answer must be convincingly given. To whom? It is not to the Prime Minister alone individually, Sir. It is not to Andhra State, all of them put together. But the authority to create a new State is vested in whom? In this Parliament. In this Parliament, the majority of Members here must be convinced on the basis of merit, on the basis of impartial judgment, that the creation of a new State is needed. If you cry wolf in your own State, nobody is going to take you seriously. You have to see that these demonstrations and violent activities are not the ones that will weigh with Parliament. They will not weigh with any one of us, I should say. On the other hand, Sir, if democratic procedure and ways are to be respected, whether it is one section of the Andhra leadership or the other, have to convince by sweet reasoning, by impartial approach to problems that the creation of a new State will do good to the concerned Andhras as well to the whole of India. That has not been done.

Most of them are content with creating some kind of trouble in some town or some villages, or some railway stations. It is that approach that the Government of India is rejecting. We do not want to encourage any fissiparous tendencies regional or lingual.

I was asking, as a student of research, every Member of Andhra whom I met: What the reason for this upheaval is? Why, what pleased the 4½ crores of people the other day, be considered as a poison today? One set of people answered in one way,

another set of people answered in another way. I found the true reason in the speech of Shri B. N. Reddy who happened to let the cat out of the bag, as they say. We used to cut a joke in my part of the country. There was a big nawab saheb, and he had a big beard, and he had a friend also; they were walking together, and when he was smoking, the beard of the bara saheb caught fire, and he wanted to extinguish the fire, but the friend told him 'Don't do so, I want to light my cigar also in it'. It is something like that which the CPM and other votaries of violence are doing all the time. All the time, Shri B. N. Reddy spoke nothing about the merits of the case. He was all the time attacking the Government of India and their policies and programmes politically.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER (Ausgram): Give jobs to all the Telengana people and all the Andhra people. Then, it will be solved. After 25 years, Government have done nothing. And yet they are accusing our party? This is absolutely wrong.

SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA: Let him think over this for a minute. If his argument is sound, then there should be agitation in every part of India, because the problem of unemployment is there in every State, whether it be Madras, Mysore or UP or any other....

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER: Every part of India will be agitating soon.

SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA: So, how does he convince us that it is only in Andhra that the agitation is there?

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE (Rajapur): His desire will be fulfilled, and there will be agitation in every part against unemployment.

SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA: I may assure my hon. friend that threat will be digested by this party which has got the true spirit of patriotism,

courage and the wisdom to deal with the situations....

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER: Patriotism is not the monopoly of his party and himself only. We are also patriots.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He can criticise the Opposition, but he cannot criticise our *bona fides*.

SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA: The whole speech of my hon. friend from the CPM was not concerned with the Andhra people, but it was concerned with the promotion of his party interest, namely to create chaos....

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER: Absolutely wrong.

SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA: and to bring into existence proletarian dictatorship.

So far as our party is concerned, we see that there are only two parties, the votaries of violence and the votaries of non-violence. Democracacy for which we have bargained, for which we have worked, and which we have established and for which we have taken a solemn oath can be carried on only by discussion, persuasion, vote and democratic methods, and these extremist methods of violence, demonstration, abuse etc. Will not pay in a democracy, and the profits the strength of the Opposition parties in the House. I am sure the people of Andhra, wise as they are, will completely eliminate all the votarious of violence, and that will be shown probably by the time we face the next general elections.

We read generally reports of violence in the papers. But have we assessed the size and seriousness of the violence? Up till now, 68 people have been killed....

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM (Srinagar): By the police, as a result of police firing.

SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA: Government have been very sympathetic to the families of people who have been killed, and the relatives of every-one of them have been given ex-gratia payment of Rs. 1000 each, and about Rs. 250 to 500 has been given to these injured and disabled. Among the incidents of law lessness, the State Government have reported 2 murders, 290 incidents of arson, 47 incidents of sabotage, 85 incidents of attacks on Government offices, 116 incidents of attacks on Government vehicles and so on; one Government officer was killed, and 229 other Government personnel were injured in these incidents of lawlessness.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY (Kendrapara): By whom? By the Army.

AN HON. MEMBER: By the CRP.

SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA: The hostility of the CPI (M) and their friends against the CRP and other government forces, whether it is the military or police, is because of this reason that if they are removed, they can easily establish their dictatorship. These forces are the barrier that stands between violence and established order.

SHRI B. N. REDDY: Why are you covering the CRP killing? We cannot tolerate it. Why are you covering regionalism and chauvinism? Why are you covering your own party? (Interruptions).

SHRI MOHAMMAD ISMAIL (Barackpore): You send the army, you send the CRP and you are asking us to keep quiet, (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Why should you be is sensitive?

SHRI B. N. REDDY: What he is saying is not relevant.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: When you were speaking, there was no interruption at all. Why should you be so sensitive?

SHRI C. T. DHANDAPANI (Dharampuram): He was speaking the truth.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER: He is not Railway Minister now; he is derailed now.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Intervention and protest are all permissible, but not continuous shouting down. Then it becomes impossible to conduct the proceedings.

SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA: My friends of the CPI(M) have to be sporting when you attacked the Indira Government in such strong terms, did we not have the never to listen it patiently? Why should you lose your nerve if your case is strong?

SHRI B. N. REDDY: It is you who are losing.

SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA: So far as our party is concerned, I know that all sections, whether it is integrationist or whether it is separationist, agree on the fundamental policies of our party. They do not differ there. They have their own differences regarding carving out of another State called Telangana. All of them being Congressmen and followers of non-violence. .. (Interruptions).

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wardiwash): How do you say so?

SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA: It is their duty first to stop this violence even if it be at the cost of their lives. It is a kind of hesitancy to put down the forces of violence that is responsible for prolonging this agony.

How is Parliament to take a decision when people are being killed, when houses are being burnt, when railway property is looted or burnt? When there is death in the family,

you do not do such things. At least people sit quiet brooding over the happening for some time. Some such thing is happening to the House, after seeing all the catastrophe taking place in Andhra Pradesh. Parliament has not got the mood to give a decision. It has to be correctly appraised and appraised in an atmosphere of peace. If that is wanted by the Prime Minister, or by the Minister of State or by any one of us, it is simple truth. It is the eternal truth. Even today, I agree with Mr. B. N. Reddy in his concluding part of his speech that democratic methods have to be pursued. Understand it correctly. If there is a war we postpone the general elections. If there is such a kind of violence pervading the whole State as I have narrated, how can we take a decision on this important subject?

SHRI S. B. GIRI: The people of Telengana gave a democratic opinion in the 1971 elections, in spite of Shrimati Indira Gandhi wave, that we want a separate Telengana. Is not the Telengana formation democratic? Is it not democratic? (Interruption)

SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA: I will answer, what you asked is correct. What you say is correct. But I made the point in the beginning that it is not enough for the people of Telengana or Andhra to come to a conclusion. You have to convince the majority in this House.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: How is it possible?

AN HON. MEMBER: This is a very perverted opinion on democracy.

SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA: I am not saying anything off-hand. It is embedded in the Constitution; it is article 2

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order please. The moment a Member starts asking a question, if you sit down and yield, I become helpless. Then it becomes a kind of dialogue between you two.

SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA. Thank you very much. Therefore, I suggest, let us adopt democratic methods, for practical application, we must see that every village in Andhra Pradesh, every town and city in Andhra Pradesh is peaceful, so that this Parliament and its representatives from Andhra either here or in the State Assembly may be able to take a correct, impartial judgment on the issues involved. Therefore, all the political parties involved must see that violence is not the way of running democracy. All of us have to see that order and peace are established in order to take a correct decision. If I differed from the Government of India or the Prime Minister, I would say so. But this is such a simple proposition for every Member to understand and implement. Instead of doing it, if you go on raising extraneous issues like unemployment, backwardness of the State, and if you demonstrate, that is irrelevant to the whole situation. (Interruptions) With only one appeal which I want to make, I will end my speech. To the Jan Sangh—

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: Are you suggesting an opinion poll?

SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA: To an opinion poll, I have no objection provided the atmosphere is propitious enough for it. I appeal to the Jan Sangh. I want to make an appeal to the Jan Sangh not to encourage demonstrations and agitations which end in violence. I know we may have our own differences but I do not question their patriotism, and I do not question their anxiety to make India progressive and be unified. If you want to pursue those high ideals for which you stand, the first and foremost thing is to dissociate yourself from parties which are wedded philosophically to violence and all the time exploit violent situations for their party ends.

श्री जयन्नाथ राव जोशी (शाजापुर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आन्ध्र में राष्ट्रपति शासन

लाग है. उस का विरोध करने के लिये खडा हुआ है । विरोध इस लिये कर रहा हूँ कि आन्ध्र में जो परिस्थिति पैदा हुई है, उस परिस्थिति का यह कोई उपाय नहीं है । मैंने हनुमन्तैया जी के भाषण का पूरे ध्यान में सुना । उन्होंने जनसभ के विषय में अपनी कुछ भावना प्रकट की, मैं उस का आदर करता हूँ ।

प्रजातन्त्र में जिनको विश्वास है और प्रजातन्त्र इस देश में बड़े आगे यह भी हम चाहते हैं, किन्तु इस की सब से बड़ी जिम्मेदारी राज्य शासन चलानेवाले दल पर आती है—इस को वह न भूँनें, क्योंकि हम जो भी करे उस के पीछे एक सिद्धान्त की जरूरत होती है । जैसा हनुमन्तैया जी ने बनाया —1953 में आंध्र की जो निर्माति हुई, वह श्री रोमूलू के देहान्त के बाद जो गडबडी हुई, उस के बाद हुई । वह पूरा आन्ध्र नहीं था, केवल मद्रास में जितना हिस्सा था, वह अलग हो गया, किन्तु उस में हैदराबाद में जो तेलगु बोलने वाले थे, वे हैदराबाद स्टेट के रूप में अलग थे । इस लिए 1953 में जो हो गया वह किसी सिद्धान्त के आधार पर नहीं हुआ था । न कोई भाषा का सिद्धान्त था, न कोई एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव कर्बोनिपेन्स की बात थी और न कोई रीजनल डेवलपमेन्ट था, कुछ भी नहीं था । यह जो गलत परम्परा आप लोगों ने डाली है, उस का मुकाबला कैसे करे यह हम को समझ में नहीं आता । डेमोक्रेटिक—वे कहना आसान है, किन्तु उसका व्यवहार कौन करेगा । पुर्तगाली शासन से मुक्त होने के बाद क्या गोआ में चुनाव नहीं हुआ ? क्या महाराष्ट्रवादी गोमान्तक दल उग की महाराष्ट्र में मिलाने के सवाल पर चुन कर नहीं आया, सभी कांग्रेसियों की जमानतें वहाँ पर जव्त हुईं । जब जनता की राय प्रकट हो गई तो फिर उस को महाराष्ट्र से क्यों नहीं मिलाया

[श्री जगन्नाथराव जोशी]

गया ? डेमोक्रेसी क्या है ? जनता की राय जानने का और क्या साधन है ?

मैं एक बात और पृष्ठना चाहता हूँ—स्टेट्स रिफॉर्मिजेशन कमीशन के बाद बलबाव का विवाद चला। वह विवाद आज भी चालू है। अब बनलाइय डेमोक्रेटिक-वे कौन सा है। या ता चुनाव में जा गय प्रकट होती है, उस को लीजिये—1957 का चुनाव हुआ, 1962, 1967, 1972 के चुनाव हुए, सब चुनावों में वहाँ की जनता ने अपनी राय प्रकट की। चूँकि जनता की राय आपको नहीं माननी थी इसी लिये आपने महाजन कमीशन बैठाया। महाजन कमीशन की सिफारिश आई, लेकिन अब आप महाजन कमीशन की सिफारिश लागू करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। न महाजन कमीशन की सिफारिश लागू करने के लिये तैयार हैं और न जनता की राय मानने के लिये तैयार हैं—अब आर क्या रास्ता है, वास्तव में वहाँ कोई भी झगडा नहीं है लेकिन आप उस को भी नहीं करते हैं। आप लोगों को बीच में लटकाने हुए हैं—किस लिये ? यह अनिश्चितता ही समस्याएँ उत्पन्न करती है।

प्रजातन्त्र के आधार पर आप कोई काम करना चाहते हैं तो उस का कोई ढंग भी होना चाहिये। चण्डीगढ़ की निर्मिति आप लोगों ने की—पंजाब, हरियाणा, हिमाचल प्रदेश सब को लेकर—50 लाख लोगों की राय आप के सामने थी, लेकिन शाह कमिशन बना दिया गया। उस की रिपोर्ट आई तो आप उस पर भी झमल नहीं करना चाहते, वह झगडा आज भी चालू है। कृष्णा-गोदावरी का झगडा 1951 से चालू है—यह नदियाँ हमारी लोक माता हैं लेकिन अभी भी ट्रिबुनल चल रहा है। कुछ समझ में नहीं आता, राष्ट्रीय सिद्धान्त, राष्ट्रीय हित सब भूल गये। पानी का उपयोग कैसे करें पानी का बटवारा कैसे

करे। कोई निश्चित सिद्धान्त नहीं बना सकते। काबेरी का मामला है, नर्बंदा का विवाद है—कोई सिद्धान्त तय करे। वास्तविकता यह है कि आप करना नहीं चाहते। कोई सिद्धान्त सामने रखकर नहीं चलना चाहते।

कल मैंने प्रधान मंत्री जी का भाषण सुना। मैं मानता हूँ कि आप कोई अच्छा उदाहरण प्रस्तुत करना चाहती हैं तो कीजिये या कल प्रधान मंत्री जी यह कहती हैं—

"No bifurcation, come what may I may not agree with it At least I may feel that the Government would like to follow a new precedent hereafter No premium will be put on violence"

लेकिन ऐसा उन्होंने कहा नहीं।

'Government will consider all shades of opinion How long will you take?'

ऐसा नहीं कहा—इसी लिये आज यह स्थिति पैदा हुई है। यह स्थिति हमने पैदा नहीं की है यह स्थिति आपने पैदा की है, कांग्रेसियों ने की है। आप श्री वी० वी० सुब्बा रेड्डी को बुला रही हैं जो आन्ध्र के डिप्टी चीफ मिनिस्टर थे, उन्होंने रिजाइन किया 9 अन्य मंत्रियों ने भी रिजाइन किया व सब कांग्रेस-मैन थे। इतना होने के बाद भी यह कहना कि विरोधी दलों ने ऐसी स्थिति पैदा की है—हम क्यों ऐसा करेंगे, यह स्थिति तो आप के लोगों ने पैदा की है। यह कोई घर का मामला नहीं है—वी० वी० सुब्बा रेड्डी को समझाओ, इस को समझाओ, उस को समझाओ—मुझ को तो कुछ समझ में नहीं आता है। श्री बल्लाप और श्री जयजीवन राम आन्ध्र जाने वाले थे बीजित जी नये मंत्री बने हैं, वे क्यों नहीं गये, प्रधान मंत्री स्वयं क्यों नहीं गईं। आज हर एक को अपनी बात कहने का अधिकार है, आप को उस पर गम्भीरता से विचार करना होगा।

जब मैं मध्य, देश में चुन कर आया तो मध्य प्रदेश के जो पुराने मुख्य मंत्री थे, उन्होंने मेरे खिलाफ आरोप लगाया कि यह तो बाहर का व्यक्ति है - यह कांग्रेसियों की नीति है । भारत का आदर्श ही नहीं जा सकता है, उद्योग कर सकता है, हम बार-बार माग करते हैं कि जम्मू काश्मीर से धारा 370 हटाओ—लेकिन आप नहीं मानते

श्री एस० ए० शर्मा यह बिलकुल नहीं होगा ।

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी वह एक अलग बात है । आम जनता की बात करते हैं, लेकिन पीस-मील एकता नहीं चलेगी । जब एकता की बात चलती है —तो बम्बई में शिवसेना ने आवाज उठाई कि नौकरी अकेले मराठी-भाषी को मिले, हम ने उस के खिलाफ आवाज उठाई, शिव सेना की बात को हम ने नहीं माना, क्यों नहीं माना ? इस लिए कि ऐसा नहीं चल सकता, रोजगार सब को चाहिये, अकेले मराठी भाषी को नहीं । बम्बई में सब को आम का अधिकार है, सब को रोजगार पाने का अधिकार है

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER You have spoken about everything except Andhra and your time is up

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO JOSHI: He referred to democratic ways and he appealed to the Jan Sangh I have to reply to it You allowed him to say all those things It directly relates to Mulki rules

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER He was using this as an example in relation to Andhra.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO JOSHI I am also doing the same.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER But your time is up. If you do not make good use of your time, I am helpless.

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी जिस समय पंचसूत्री कार्यक्रम के रूप में मुल्की रूल्स का कानून पास हुआ, हम ने उसी समय उस का विरोध किया था और यह कहा था कि इसमें किसी भी मन्तव्य नहीं होगा । 1909 में पृथक नेलगाना की जा माग आई और जा लोग चुन कर आये उन्होंने शान्ति पूर्ण तरीके से अपनी बात आप के सामने रखी कि आप लोगों ने यह तय किया अभी जो जैसा है, वैसा ही रहेगा । मैं अभी हैदराबाद गया था, दो दिन पहले मैं वही था । जब सब काम बहा होने लगा तो आप कहते हैं कि एजीटेशन डाइट-डाउन हो गया है । जब शान्तिपूर्ण तरीके से जनता की राय प्रकट की जाती है तो आप उसका गलत अर्थ निकाल कर यह कह देना शुरू कर देते हैं कि एजी-टेशन बिलकुल समाप्त हो गया है । आप की इन बातों से जनता फिर वही काम करने के लिये उताह हो जाती है । इस सब के लिये कौन जिम्मेदार है —इस को जिम्मे-दारी आप के ऊपर है । इन सब बातों का ठीक प्रकार से विश्लेषण करते हुए आप उस में जनसभ या आर० एस० एस० को घसीट कर ले आते हैं —मानो यह सब हम करा रहे हैं । हम ने अनेको आन्दोलन चलाये हैं, गोवा का आन्दोलन चलाया, बंगला देश का इतना भारी आन्दोलन चलाया, जेलो में गये—क्या इन में कहीं पर भी वायलेस था ? हम कभी भी वायलेस पसन्द नहीं करते । मैं हनुमतीया जी को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि वायलेस में विश्वास करने वाली जो पार्टियाँ हैं, उन में से एक तो कांग्रेस के साथ ही है और दूसरी जो को पार्टी है—यह जो आन्ध्र का मामला चल रहा है, वे उस का विरोध कर रहे हैं । हम वायलेस में बिलकुल विश्वास नहीं करते और डेमोक्रेटिक तरीके से चलने में ही विश्वास करते हैं ।

इस लिये मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जनत की राय जानने के लिये शोषी-नियन -पोल लीजिये, वहाँ की असेम्बली को

[श्री जगन्नाथ जोशी.]
 फिर बुलाया जाय, जितने सदस्य हैं उनकी
 राय लीजिये, शान्ति पूर्ण तरीके से मामले
 को हल कीजिये, राष्ट्रपति का शासन इस
 का उपाय नहीं है ।

15 mrs.

SHRI B. S. MURTHY: (Amalapuram): Sir, I rise with a heavy heart because what has happened during the two to three months in Andhra are things which I never expected in my life. Andhras were known as empire builders. Andhras were known as persons who were prepared to suffer and sacrifice themselves for all good causes. As Mahatma Gandhi has said, they were patriots to the core. Their language is very sweet. A people whose language is sweet cannot afford to be violent and get a very bad name. Therefore, what has happened during the last three or four years has made me feel sorrowful. Even Members of Parliament are divided on this issue, which is purely a domestic matter. Even the hon. Member from Kashmir is getting into this *kalata*. As my time is limited, I would request them to allow me to have my say.

The whole thing arose because of anger by a section of people in Andhra. Anger has been condemned by all religions, including Hinduism.

त्रोघाद्भवति ममाहः

समोहात्पुतिविभ्रमः ।

स्मृतिभ्रशाद्बुद्धिनाशो

बद्धिनाशात्प्रणश्यति ॥

A section of the Andhras were angry because of certain things. They have a right to be angry. Do not deny their right. But they have been carried off their feet by this anger. That is the rub. After all there were only two problems—the Mulki rule and the position of the Circar Andhras in Hyderabad.

SHRI S. B. GIRI: What about Rayalaseema?

SHRI B. S. MURTHY: Are we incapable of attending to these two issues? But, as I said, something went wrong somewhere and this great havoc was done to the people of Andhra, especially to the people of Circars.

This trouble has crept into even Members of Parliament. My hon. friend, Shri Suryanarayana and myself have been colleagues for the last 30 years. But today he tells us "you people, the integrationists, are staying in Delhi and talking. Why don't you go to Andhra?" Had we gone to that area and did what they have done, there would have been a blood bath in the fight between two sections of people.

Shri K. Suryanarayana knows that we have not been helpless spectators. I am one of those who can proudly claim that my contribution is also there in building India as an independent India. But "revolutionary" does not mean that you jump into any fray. We must try to lead the people. We must be led by the people, no doubt. I am a democrat to the core. But does democracy say that you join wherever there is a fray and try to make hay while the sun shines? No, Sir. I am against it.

SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA: Where the fire shines?

SHRI B. S. MURTHY: I am the people's man. You will be happy to know that I have stood second in the country in getting my votes.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: The voters are sorry.

SHRI B. S. MURTHY: I never thought that Mr. Shamim will become a Rip-Van-Winkle of the House. On a matter like this, if certain Members of this House are so frivolous, I

am afraid, I have to beg their pardon and say, at least for five minutes, please lend me your ears.

Therefore, we have not gone there and created another section of people and made both the sections fight and see the fun and say, "Here is Andhra; look at it." Andhras do not deserve such sort of treatment.

What have we been doing all along? We have been writing to our friends, speaking to them, saying, "Whatever you want, you please tell us without violence. The Government is ours; the people are ours; the Members of Parliament are cur. Why do you think that only violence will make them think that they should listen to you?" We have been doing that.

Not that we are afraid of the people. The other day, he gave me a challenge and I accepted the challenge, "Yes, I am here ready. I will go with you." Because the people know me and others also know me. What is necessary today is that all of us, all Members of Parliament, from Kashmir down to Kanyakumari, have to see that normalcy is restored. After all, as I said, there are only two problems and these problems can easily be solved. For forty years, the Andhras fought for a separate State and they got it. Today, it is one of the major States of the country and the record of Andhras was never bad. They never troubled any of their neighbours, for this or for that. Some people have said about river waters. Even when the Nizam was alive, when the Nizam Government was there, Andhras from Madras had gone and made him understand that the waters of Godavari, Krishna and Cauvery must be used for all people and not only one State or one part of the States. In the same way, we are now ready.

Mr. Subba Reddy was a colleague of mine when we were in Madras State. He went to my own constituency and

delivered a philippic and said, "Where is Mr. Murthy?" "Where is some other man?" I do not want to name the other man. Then he said that these people should have been here! Who is he to order me?

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: Mr. Subba Reddy should have been a sensible man.

SHRI B. S. MURTHY: Like you.

I will tell the story of Mr. Subba Reddy. He came here along with his other eight colleagues. All the Andhra Members of Parliament went to him. We had a nice breakfast at a friend's place. Then what happened? They were going to see the Congress President. They said that they had their resignations in their pockets. I told them as we were going, "Please do not handover the resignation letters. Speak to him, discuss with him and come back. Let us decide here. Why should you resign? We shall all resign, if necessary."

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: Very good. I hope, you will.

SHRI B. S. MURTHY: Not at your command.

These are some facts. It is very good if people know them. All these days I was silent. Because an occasion has come, I am speaking now. This is not to speak anything ill of others. These are facts.

Then, they did not meet us again. They went away and announced in the Press that they had resigned.

Then, what happened? When the Prime Minister's five-point formula was accepted here, the Andhra Cabinet passed a Resolution accepting it and praising the Prime Minister and asking the Andhra to accept it. (Interruptions). They accepted. The meeting was kept at Vijayawada. All these Ministers went there, drafted a Resolution accepting the Prime Mi-

[Shri B. S. Murthy]

nister's formula. The they went to the meeting. By that time, the meeting was not in the hands of Congressmen, Congress leaders, Congress Ministers; some other people came....

AN HON. MEMBER: Who?

SHRI B. S. MURTHY: Your relations. They kept these resolutions in their pocket....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You are going into too much detail and taking too much time.

SHRI B. S. MURTHY: They accepted resolutions drafted then and there. Therefore, I do not want to go further into this.

Then another point that has come into this thing is the other day .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There are also other friends from the Congress Party who want to speak.

SHRI B. S. MURTHY: The other day, we were in a meeting. I asked my good friend—we have been colleagues, even to-day we are colleagues and shall be colleagues in future also—I said, 'Mr. Surayanarayan, do you know my house was burnt, my paddy was burnt and they tried to demolish the house which my mother gave me as a gift.' He said 'Yes' I asked him, 'Did you make any statement condemning such thing?'

Then, again, Mr. Subba Reddy wants me to come to that place. In Kurnool what did he say? 'Those people who do not join us, catch them, kill them and tear them to pieces and throw them to wolves....'(Interruptions)

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi): But the same Subba Reddy is being invited here.

SHRI B. S. MURTHY: 'Love thy neighbour as thyself?', says the Bible and we say that even those who hate us must also be loved

(Interruptions). Even Mr. Shamim is a good friend.

My appeal is this. The Congress President and the Central Government have always been telling these agitators, 'We have not made up our mind....'

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI B. S. MURTHY: With an open mind we are inviting you, the door is not banged, the door is not closed.' Therefore, I appeal to this House and to the people who fought that they should have a separate Andhra for themselves to come here, discuss with the persons concerned, convince us. Do not run away with your booty, take us also with you so that it will be a State where Telangana, Andhra and Rayalaseema—all the Andhras who are known for so many sacrifices, can live peacefully and make India stronger than it is to-day.

SHRI S. B. GIRI (Warangal): I have said in this very House at the time the Mulki Rules law was enacted and when the five point formula was placed before this House, I said that it is impossible to satisfy both the regions. I have also said that we cannot convince both the region and a demand for a separate Telangana has already been voiced by the people of Telangana and also of Andhra, especially as Andhra Pradesh has come into existence by force or by compulsion on the Telangana people. Before the formation of Andhra Pradesh, the Telangana people rejected it and they wanted and also they said that they did not want to join Andhras and they wanted a separate State. Accordingly, the States Re-organization Commission recommended a separate State of Telangana and we knew because from Andhra region 183 legislators will be elected and only 100 legislators will

be elected from Telangana, therefore, democratically also Andhra region people will have a right to have their own Chief Minister and will not be allowed to develop our political personality in Telangana. That is the reason why we objected to the formation of Andhra Pradesh. Now, the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, to help the Telangana people, gave an opportunity to the Telangana people to have a Telangana Chief Minister but the Andhra people and particularly, the legislators and others who have lost power and I must say that because Mr. Brahmananda Reddy was removed and Mr. Narasimha Rao, was installed in the *gadi* of Chief Minister, but this the people of Andhra could not tolerate even for nine months. That is why all this crisis. Therefore, in future also, if this Government of India and the Congress Party want to impose their decision on the people there as they have imposed in 1956, the same things will continue and there will be violence. I blame the Government of India for the imposition of the Presidential rule and the loss of crores of rupees worth of property and loss of so many innocent lives. Therefore, my submission is that even now it is not late, if you immediately concede a separate Telangana and allow us to live as a free people like any other people in the country. That is the only solution for the problem, not by President's Rule. I wanted one clarification but the Chair did not allow me. I want to know whether the legislature has been convened before President's rule was imposed. Is this not an undemocratic way of functioning? This point has to be clarified. If violence has come about, who is responsible? It is the Government of India which is responsible for this sort of violence. The five-point formula was imposed on the people of Telangana and Andhra which was rejected by both the regions. I have said that it is impossible for you to bring any other solution

except the solution of a separate State of Telangana. It is not the legislatures decide about the fate of this State. The legislature, as I said, was not convened. They should have taken the vote in the legislature. They should have consulted other Members of the Legislature asking them whether they could form the Ministry, but that was not done.

Sir, my submission is that the Government of India must act according to the wishes and aspirations of the people. This solution of President's Rule has not solved the problem; on the other hand, it has aggravated the situation. In the Telangana region, Sir, for the last 4 years, we have had no political administration at all for the past 4 years in Telangana and for the last 4 months in Andhra, there is no administration. There is no Government worth the name. The people are suffering in Telangana for the last four years due to lack of rains and due to drought conditions. No adequate relief has been given so far. There is no drinking water. There is no rice available. When the Collector of my Constituency asked for some minimum quota of rice and wheat they could not supply them and people are on the verge of starvation. For providing drinking water, Government must immediately consider some schemes.

Lastly, my submission is this. Immediately, without further delay, the Government of India should carve out a separate Telangana so that the people of Telangana can enjoy at least from now on, the freedom which has been denied to them for the last 16 years, so that they can build up their own political personality and they can really establish a socialist State of Telangana in India. Thank you.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO (Chhatrapur) Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this is really an unfortunate case where the party in power which had absolute majority had to go out of office because it could not control the situation which erupted as a result of the Supreme Court judgment. The Supreme Court judgment of the 3rd October, 1972 declared Section 2 of the 1957 Act as void as a result of which the Mulki rules were reviewed. The Andhra Cabinet was a house divided in itself. They could not come to a settlement on this issue. If they had said that we will stand by the gentlemen's agreement of 1956, nothing would have happened but they could not come to a settlement. The Chief Minister of Andhra and other Andhra Ministers came to Delhi and met the Prime Minister and she heard different views. After hearing different views, she gave her award after taking into consideration the interests of both the regions

This award was hailed by the Andhra Ministers, as the best solution for the problem. They went back to Andhra region and they could not convince the people and they started the separatist agitation. These 10 Ministers or 9 ministers, having failed to convince the people started the agitation. That is how this movement got momentum. The engineers and doctors joined the movement. It was because the Mulki rules originally did not apply to these two cadres, but now, they are included in the Scheduled to the Mulki Rules. Telengana and Andhra NGOs also joined the movement. They complained that a grave injustice had been done to them in the matter of confirmation and promotions. This has to be gone into. Now that the Government of India is directly in charge of the State Administration, it is time that some preliminary steps are taken by Government of India to allay the fears and misgivings of the people and whatever grievances are there should be

rectified. The complaints of doctors and engineers have to be looked into. If these things could be set right, I am sure, normalcy would be restored. Otherwise, simply appealing for restoration of normalcy will not yield results. The Government of India must take steps because it has now jurisdiction over the State. When a movement starts, several elements join it for their own reasons. Now violence has occurred on a large scale which could not be controlled. No leader could control the movement in any State in any agitation.

So as a result, the CRP had to be used and the Army had to be called in. Naturally there were killings. Now it is not right to complain that the CRP was vindictive and mercilessly killed people. Violence was there, public property was burnt or destroyed, arson was there, even persons killed. Naturally it had to be resisted. This has to be. There may be excesses here and there. I do not deny it. It happens in every such situation.

First, the Andhra leaders in 1956, having tried to have a Vishal Andhra or Greater Andhra entered into an agreement with the leaders of the Telengana region and agreed to certain conditions. One is the Mulki Rules. The second is the Regional Committee for Telengana to look after its development and a separate budget and so on.

Having entered into the agreement, the Telengana people agreed to join them. In these 15-16 years, the complaint of the Telengana people is that these commitments were not honoured.

Here again, in 1969, the Supreme Court struck down sec. 3 of the 1957 Act. Then the Telangana people started agitation. The Andhra region people did not join them. They complain that the commitments are not

honoured and therefore, they would be like to be away from that State. Somehow or other, the then Chief Minister persuaded them. There was again a reaffirmation of the earlier agreement. They were made to believe that certainly the agreement would be fulfilled and implemented.

On 3rd October, 1972, the Supreme Court judgment was delivered. Then the people from the Andhra region said 'We are now being treated as second class citizens in these areas'. Till the judgment on Andhras made a public complaint that they were being treated as second-class citizens. It is true the children of people from the Andhra region are not able to get admissions in the medical and engineering colleges. This problem, hardship or headache should be removed medical college there and throwing it open mission for students from both regions. If an engineering college could be opened and admission thrown open for student from both regions, perhaps this headache would be removed.

These are the preliminary steps the Government of India should take before any settlement of this problem could be decided. Without taking any initiative, I do not think mere appeal for normalcy or cooling down of tempers would solve the problem.

The real question is the backwardness of the people. It is admitted on all hands that Telangana is economically backward and also educationally backward. That was why even the Nizam in 1919 thought of the Mulki Rules to prevent people from other States coming and taking away all the jobs. That protection was there. It is there in every State. In Orissa we have the Domicile Rules....

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY: No, no.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO: We had them in the beginning.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY:
Not now.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO: We had them in the beginning when Orissa was formed in 1906. I belong to a part which was tagged on to Orissa in 1936. Till then my area was a part of Madras. We were born there, we were bred there and we would die there. We had the Domicile Rules. We had to obtain a Domicile certificate.

The difficulty would be there in the initial years. But after 10—15 years, people just forget about it. Therefore, this is a necessary condition or safeguard intended to protect the interests of the backward people. The Andhra leaders then rightly agreed to these Mulki Rules.

In the ordinary course, but for the Supreme Court judgment, these rules would have come to an end December, 1974. They are now extended to Hyderabad and Secunderabad till December, 1977 and to the rest of Telangana till 1980.

I had discussions with the Andhra people in the coastal districts in December last. They were not very much opposed to extension of the Mulki Rules till 1980 in the rest of Telangana. Their worry is about Hyderabad and Secunderabad, for two reasons. Firstly, doctors and engineers were not originally covered by the Mulki Rules. Now they are brought in. Secondly, till 1977 when appointments are made in these three or four years, for thirty years the avenues are blocked because a person recruited now retires only after 30 years.

These are some of the difficulties which could be sorted out by the Government of India. I feel the Proclamation has come in time. It should be continued for six months, and if necessary for a longer period, for

[Shri Jagannath Rao]

another six months, so that the preliminary steps could be taken by Government and they could see the reaction of the people. Now there is a crisis of confidence in the State. The Telangana people have no faith in the people of the Andhra region. Likewise, the Andhra region people have no faith in the Telangana people.

There is no leader who commands the respect and confidence of the people in either region. To whom are we going to hand over the administration of the State? If we hand it over to anybody, then there will be trouble again. Therefore, my request is that this President's rule should be continued for full six months, and if necessary, for another six months.

In these circumstances, after the tempers cool down and reason prevails, I am sure the people from both the regions will appreciate the view point of the other, and a satisfactory solution could certainly be found. It is no good blaming one or the other. Unfortunately, a situation has arisen, and now that President's rule is there, we should take advantage of the situation and see that a satisfactory solution is found, which would be satisfactory to both the regions including Rayalaseema.

Meanwhile, now that President's rule is there, the backward areas of Telangana, Rayalaseema and the backward agency districts or tracts of the Northern Circars should also be developed. Since the Andhra Pradesh budget is going to be presented here in March, special care should be taken to see that development work in Telangana, Rayalaseema and the agency tracts of the Northern Circars of Andhra is taken up with special allocations for that purpose, so that the development work could be taken up in right earnest.

Though for the last fifteen or sixteen years, the Andhra Govern-

ment has been proclaiming that they have taken charge of the development of these backward areas, yet the people of Telangana say that nothing has been done. Therefore, this question has to be gone into.

In conclusion, I would say that there should be integration if possible and separation only if it is inevitable.

SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO (Mahendragarh): It is very distressing and painful to see that Government have kept their eyes deliberately closed to what has been happening in Andhra Pradesh. They have stood on false prestige while the patriotic blood of the Indian citizens has been freely flowing on Indian soil during the past few months. I believe Government have failed to see the reality, because the Prime Minister acting on certain misleading counsels hastily pronounced a formula. I fail to understand how the people of Andhra and Telangana have to express effectively their wishes if they want the separation of the State's two zones. The people of Telangana fully expressed their wishes during the last poll. Unfortunately, the members selected on the Telangana Praja Samiti ticket did not stand by the people, and that is mainly responsible for this trouble today. The people of Andhra today have expressed their wishes through their popular representatives. A large majority of them are saying openly, sitting on the Treasury Benches, that they want a separate Andhra. As regards those who are in favour of integration, I have been talking to some of them, and I know that they have been hiding inside their homes in Delhi...

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH: (Nandyal): Nonsense. Let him not say things which are not facts.

SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO: They have not been able to go amongst the people, and here we see

very strange things. These are very hard realities, I would submit.

Now, there has been violence in Andhra. I also condemn violence. But then we have to understand and think coolly over the sentiments of the people. They have not forgotten that because one man died of hunger-strike, Andhra was created by this very Government, because one man threatened to immolate himself, Punjab and Haryana were created, because one man died of hunger-strike, the Prime Minister gave an award in favour of Punjab, promising Chandigarh to Punjab; these awards so hastily pronounced, I am very sorry to say, do not solve the problems. through you, Sir, I would appeal, to the Prime Minister that she should remain out of the controversies. These matters should be settled according to the wishes of the people in consultation with their representatives. The Government should take a cool view of everything. If a Commission had been appointed, as was done in the case of Punjab, it would have been good. A Parliamentary Committee was appointed, as you know, for Punjab. There was no trouble. There was a peaceful division of Punjab. If the same thing had been done in Andhra, there was no need for the President's proclamation. The very fact that a constitutional government could not run in Andhra Pradesh shows the popular feeling of the people. There is a strong sentiment behind the demand for bifurcation of the State. If the Prime Minister has to enunciate any formula, I would very humbly request that it should be a formula laying down how many lives, how much blood, how many sacrifices, have to be given by the people to get any justifiable, reasonable demand accepted by the Government.

There are strikes every day. There are agitations. Different standards are applied. As you know, Bombay was divided. Gujarat and Maharashtra

were created as the people wanted it. Andhra Pradesh was created because there was a popular demand. Nagaland, Mizoram, Arunachal Pradesh have been created. Would it be right to say now that the Centre would be weakened if more States are created? I firmly believe that the Centre would be strengthened if more such States are created, if the people's views are taken into consideration and popular feelings are respected. Our federal structure is the same as that of the United States. The United States has over 50 states. Can anybody say that the United States has become weak? In Russia, which is again a union of republics, every ethnic group, every linguistic community, has a separate republic. Would anyone say that the Soviet Union is weak because of so many ethnic or linguistic republics there?

I was really surprised at the arguments of my very able friend, Mr. Hanumanthaiya. He has been a Chief Minister and Chairman of the Administrative Reforms Commission. He happened to say here a few minutes ago that he accepted, he conceded that the people of Andhra and Telangana wanted separation; but he said the people of the south have to be convinced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: People of this House.

SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO: I am sorry I misunderstood him; the Members of this House. If the Members of this House have to be convinced, then, we hear the views of the Treasury Benches every day, and we know how Ministers have been picked up to keep the people of Andhra Pradesh calm. The best way of ascertaining the wishes of the people would be to hold a referendum in Andhra Pradesh.

AN HON. MEMBER: Opinion poll.

SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO: Yes; opinion poll. So, if such troubles

[Shri Birender Singh Rao] are to be avoided in the future, I would suggest that there should be a standing commission to look into such demands. Why can't the people have smaller States? In the case of Haryana it has been proved they are good. Our Ministers and our Prime Minister have always been praising the speedy development in Haryana because it is a small State. The day the Prime Minister's award on Andhra Pradesh was announced, I expressed my opinion that it would not solve matters. Subsequent events have proved that if larger States are divided and made smaller, it would strengthen the Centre. Secessionist tendencies would be discouraged. The country would be more united and stronger. That is why I say that it should not be an appeal by the Government to the people of Andhra Pradesh to keep calm and cool. The Government should in a cool manner, taking into confidence the representatives of the people from Andhra Pradesh, decide the matter soon and announce that the Government, as a result of these consultations is considering the bifurcation of the State because the people of the State are convinced that this would lead to their progress and prosperity.

DR G S MELKOTE (Hyderabad) One does not feel very happy to participate in the discussion on the promulgation of the President's rule in Andhra Pradesh. I say this because I have been in the Congress for fifty years and more and am still a member of the Congress. (Interruptions) what do we see in India today, is a very unprecedented affair, a State with a majority Government, with majority of Members in the ruling party has come under President's rule; something very serious must have occurred. For the past thirty years for us in Telangana, we, the people have had no respite, the period has been one of anguish. During 1942-48, it was the feudal system and the ruzakars of Hyderabad that gave the people

trouble, then Independence and for a short period from 1952-56 democratic rule by the people of Hyderabad and from 1956 onwards till today since we merged with Andhra Government not a single moment any Telanganite, I could say has lived with a semblance of happiness. Should not the Government of India go out and find out why this is occurring? Have not the people of Telangana spelt out all these things in clear terms? In spite of all this has not Telangana remained peaceful and declared its will in a democratic manner? From 1957 to 1969, in fact from 1960 onward, we have been making representations, taken deputations to the Home Ministry. Mr M R Krishna Mr Burukul Ramakrishna Rao who was ex Governor of UP and our own ex-Chief Minister Shri Akbar Ali Khan now Governor in UP every one of us had gone to the Home Ministry and said this is what is happening in Telangana please see that it is rectified. The Constitution and the Parliament guaranteed that the services would be treated fairly and decently. No sooner did Telangana merge with Andhra then the trouble started. I was told by the leader, the late Mr Ranga Reddy that the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in 1956 before merger sent for some Telangana leaders and asked them what do you desire? Shri Venkataranga Reddy replied that ninety per cent of the people do not want to merge with Andhra. Panditji was silent, at which Dhebarbai the then Congress President, is supported to have asked him you have called them to advise them to merge with Andhra. Panditji said to have replied when 90 per cent do not want it—the leader for whom I have great respect says that ninety per cent of the people do not want to merge with Andhra—I have got to take into account the democratic wishes of the people, how can I advise against it. Shri Venkataranga Reddy immediately replied I should not be found wanting, if an opinion poll was to be taken, not ninety per cent, but 89 per cent would say that they did not want to join Andhra.

The gentlemen's agreement came in and as Mr. Jaganatha Rao has rightly pointed out, if the gentlemen's agreement entered into between Andhra and Telangana had been implemented right from 1957, things would have been different. Till 1969 what happened? We were compelled to go to the courts; in spite of favourable decisions to us nothing was done. Who is responsible for this? May I ask the Home Ministry? Did they not take responsibility for implementing it? Since the times of Pandit Nehru, Lal Bahadur Shastri and now Shrimati Indira Gandhi, the Home Ministry in the Centre—what did they do? They said here was a special committee appointed by the Ministry, and they would look into all the grievances and give their verdict. It is your Government that did not give a verdict. The bureaucracy there and the bureaucracy here kept quite all the time, for the past 12 years, from 1957 to 1969. Now for the past three years only there is the agitation in Telangana. Today a very queer thing has happened. In 1969 we faced so much trouble. 350 people were killed by the police and thousands were put in jail. We demanded promulgation of President's rule in Telangana. One and a half million people are no minority. We have 44,000 square miles of area. But at that time President's rule was not imposed because the two-thirds majority in Andhra did not want it. Mr. Brahmananda Reddy's hands were strengthened and he became a hero and a strong man. But now when a Telangana Chief Minister was there, even when Telangana has not asked for President's rule, it is being imposed because the Andhras want it. Why did you not strengthen the hands of Dr. Narasimha Rao?

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY (Nizamabad): Dr. Chenna Reddy demanded President's rule.

DR. G. S. MELKOTE: In Telangana there is no disturbance now. The whole area is very peaceful. Why

should we come under President's rule? I cannot understand.

Differences of opinion between Andhra and Telangana are there in galore. Mr. Murthy was saying, "We are one. Why not we come together?" I want to ask him, how many times he came to Hyderabad when our people died.

SHRI B. S. MURTHY: I went.

DR. G. S. MELKOTE: When I say Mr. Murthy, I mean the Andhra people as a whole. If this imposition by the Andhras goes on, how can we live with them? In Telangana, they cannot live with this kind of attitude. We would not allow them to live like that. If we allow them, again there will be strikes and so on. The Government of India says it stands for non-violence. But everybody knows how Maharashtra and Gujarat were separated, how Haryana and Punjab were separated and how Andhra Pradesh itself was created. The Government of India must think twice and evolve some methods by which these things can be done in a democratic and non-violent manner. We do not want violence. But if it is peaceful, you do not agree for separation. The Congress Benches, the Home Minister and the Prime Minister have to consider and evolve methods and norms by which these things can be settled in a democratic and peaceful manner. That is the crux of the problem.

I find there is a pleasant change in the attitude of the Prime Minister. I understand today in the Rajya Sabha she has said, "Yes, supposing I concede the bifurcation of Andhra, why should I concede the creation of another States Reorganisation Commission?" If these are indications, we are very happy. The Telangana people have taken the decision to see that there is separation. The separatist Andhras also have taken the decision that there should be separation. Hence we have become friendly.

[Shri G. S. Melkote]

I do not want to say anything against Mr. Murthy or anybody else. Let the Government of India consider this question. Let there be seminars and discussions all over the country as to what is the method by which we can assert our democratic aspirations in a peaceful manner. During the last parliamentary election, out of 14 seats, we won 10 seats. Today some people are saying that we are reactionaries and we have vested interests. We, the seven or eight members, are prepared to part with all our wealth, the so-called reactionaries and let the integrationists give all their wealth in exchange.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Sir, on a point of order. I can answer Dr. Melkote. But I never wanted to interfere.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is not yielding.

DR. G. S. MELKOTE: People talk all kinds of things. We are progressive people.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not from Andhra.

DR. G. S. MELKOTE: I was born in Berhampur, then part of Andhra. During the salt satyagraha in 1930, I participated in it at Ramachandrapuram in Andhra. For the last 51 years I have been fighting for the betterment of Telengana. I am a real Mulki. Every time during the elections there Andhras are saying that I am not a Tetanganist. I am born in Andhra and have worked for Telengana. To which area do I belong then? With this kind of parochial sentiments.... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: He is emitting poison. He is preaching parochialism of the worst type.

DR. G. S. MELKOTE: We will have to consider what is the best method by which we the separatists from both

the regions, can stand united and achieve the goal of separation while remaining non-violent.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY (Kendrapara): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I rise to support the Proclamation because I feel that if ever there was a case for a Presidential Proclamation it was this case, and this alone. The Congress Party, in spite of its massive majority in Andhra, had almost crumbled down in the face of the popular agitation and perhaps there was no other way out except imposing President's rule. But it is not the Proclamation that we are considering, as much as the genesis which led to it.

Much has been said about violence. We are all opposed to violence and we all condemn it in no uncertain terms. But I ask this House to consider which is more heinous—organised violence of the State or the anger of the people? I record here my emphatic protest against the use of the army in Andhra. The army should henceforth never be employed to quell popular disturbance. The army for which we have the highest regard and affection should not be employed for shooting down people in a trigger-happy mood. If the army indulges in this trigger-happy mood, a time may come when the people of India will also rise against its own army, and that would be a very bad day indeed for India. I have no objection to the CRP and the Border Security Police being deployed to deal with such situations. But I emphatically protest against the use of the army. The army should not have been deployed. I think the government should take a lesson from the Andhra situation in deploying the army for quelling popular movements.

Coming to the genesis, I am of the opinion that had the Central Government not dragged its feet over this issue, had the government not betrayed its responsibility, perhaps this situation would not have arisen. May I draw the attention of the hon. Home

Minister to the States' Reorganisation Commission Report of 1955? At page 109 the Commission has stated that notwithstanding the *raison d'être* for integrating Telangana with Andhra, under the present circumstances Telangana should continue as a separate unit till the elections of 1961, after which if two-thirds majority of both legislatures passed a resolution, then both the units could be integrated and united.

But then came the gentleman's the hon. Minister is waxing eloquent could have been met if the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission would have been met fully.

But then came the gentleman's agreement. But it has already been said on the floor of the House that the gentleman's agreement has not functioned as gentlemanly as it was conceived. There was the Sri Baug Pact between the people of coastal districts of Andhra and Rayalaseema under which the Rayalaseema people had been assured of their jobs and of their economic interests, by the coastal people of Andhra. But the States Reorganisation Report had clearly said that such arrangement is not going to function satisfactorily in the present case unless the Government of India took up the responsibility of seeing that it has implemented.

Here, I would like to read out paragraph 384 from the States Reorganisation Commission Report on P. 107 and ask the Minister to reply to that. It says:

"We have carefully gone into the details of the arrangements which may be made on these lines. It seems to us, however, that neither guarantees on the lines of the Sri Baug Pact for constitutional devices

such as, 'Scottish devolution' in the United Kingdom will prove workable or meet the requirements of Telangana during the period of transition. Anything short of supervision by the Central Government over the measures intended to meet the special needs of Telangana will be found ineffective and we are not disposed to suggest any such arrangement in regard to Telangana."

These forebodings of the States Reorganisation Commission have been proved to the hilt.

Only this year I had an occasion to pass through Telangana territory extending over 120 miles. What did I find? I found on both sides of the roads poverty which is even more pitiable than what I have seen in Orissa. I have never seen any development work throughout that territory except one canal that was being dug. Everywhere I have seen apathy I have seen disgust, I have seen anger and, if this anger and frustration is erupted today in violence, I hold only the Central Government responsible for that.

Now, it is time enough that you please give up your politicking; please don't try to divide and rule, put one against the other for your political ends; please see that the State is separated, bifurcated, in peace, in amity and in goodwill.

*SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA (Eluru): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir as stated by all our friends here I also feel sorry for the State and people of Andhra Pradesh who are made to suffer under the President's rule.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You may continue tomorrow.

*The original speech was delivered in Telugu.