

[श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा]

होते है, जो अच्छी तरह से काम करते है, राष्ट्रीय पुरस्कार मिलना चाहिए। हमें उन की हौसला-अफजाई करनी चाहिए। तनख्वाह तो बढ़ा नहीं सकते है लेकिन हम उनकी इज्जत तो बढ़ा ही सकते है। जब हम प्राइवेट सेक्टर के इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट को इज्जत देते है तो फिर वे लोग जोकि पब्लिक सेक्टर के कारखानों में काम करते है उनको अगर हम इज्जत नहीं देते है तो मैं समझता हूँ उनके साथ यह अन्याय होगा। इस के अलावा पब्लिक सेक्टर के बारे में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि पब्लिक सेक्टर की इमेज बनाने के लिए इस मंत्रालय का सब से बड़ा काम है क्योंकि इस के पास 14 कम्पनियां हैं उन के बारे में जनता का विश्वास हो कि पब्लिक सेक्टर में जो हमारा पैसा लगा हुआ है, हमारे खून की कमाई लगी हुई है, वह हमारा पैसा सेफ है, हिफाजत से है और देश की बेहतरी में लगा हुआ है। इस तरह की इमेज बनायी जानी चाहिये। इसलिये मैं यह जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ कि पब्लिक सेक्टर की कम्पनियों की इमेज साधारण जनता के पास बहुत अच्छी जानी चाहिये।

एक खादी और विलेज इंडस्ट्रीज कमीशन है, उस का जिक्र कर दूँ। मैं भी खद्दर पहनता हूँ और बचपन से पहनता हूँ, लेकिन मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि 14 करोड़ 85 लाख रु० उस कमीशन को हमने दिया लेकिन उसकी हालत यह है कि अगर आप यहां खादी ग्रामोद्योग की दुकान में जायें और उस में एक बार केश मोमो बनवायें तो उस में आप को सात गलतियां मिलेंगी। जितने निकम्मे और जाहिल आदमी हैं उन को इस में रख रखा है और जो कपड़ा पांच रु० गज दूसरी जगह हम को मिल सकता है यहां 15 रु० में मिलता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि मंत्री जी इस तरफ ज्यादा ध्यान देंगे कि जो लोग खद्दर

पहनते हैं उन्हें यह जुमाना नहीं भरना चाहिये, उन्हें खद्दर पहनने की सजा नहीं मिलनी चाहिये कि हमें ज्यादा कीमत देनी पड़े, वहां निकम्मे आदमी रखे जायें, ओवर स्टाफिना हो और सारा गड़बड़ घोटाला हो। इसलिये उस को बन्द किया जाना चाहिये।

मैं आप का आभारी हूँ कि आप ने मुझे समय दिया। यह सब कुछ होते हुए भी मैं मंत्रालय की मांगों का समर्थन करता हूँ।

18.07 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN TELENGANA AND OTHER AREAS OF ANDHRA PRADESH-Contd.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very grateful to you for giving us some more time to consider some of the points that were raised in yesterday's debate. When I agreed to take more time, my idea was not to make any long speech, but, as I said earlier, we wanted to give very careful thought to some of the suggestions that were made.

Sir, the debate can be divided into two parts: one part deals with the analysis of what has happened before, the causes of the present trouble and so on and so forth. And the second part of the debate can be treated as to what should be done,—the operative part—in which direction we should go, etc. As far as the causes are concerned, I do not think there is any basic difference as such, because it is very obvious that the present trouble started because of the discontent in the mind of the students, because of the question of the integration of the services and the Mulki problem, and the question of economic development, and finally, the non-implementation of the political aspects of the gentlemen's agreement that was reached. These are the basic reasons. Therefore, I have agreed, as I already said earlier when I replied to the debate on the Home Ministry's Demands, that we have no doubt that we have to

accept that there is a genuine feeling of grievances in the minds of the people of Telengana, and it has to be approached from that point of view.

So, efforts in that direction will have to be undertaken to hold consultations with the leaders of Telengana or the leaders of Andhra also in that matter, because our approach should be to help the different parts of Andhra Pradesh to remain together. Our emphasis should be on keeping the integrity of the Andhra State. I do not think we can go in the direction of having further divisions of the State. I know some senior Members expressed the view, but if you permit me to say so, let us not take a cynical view of the matter. But sometimes misunderstandings do arise in these matters. But it is the responsibility of the friends of the State to find out a solution. Some members suggested the resignation of this man or that or of the Chief Minister. This would be a negative approach to the problem. How can we, sitting here, say that somebody who is the accepted leader of the elected members of the Assembly there should go? It would be very wrong. If it helps somebody to ask for the resignation of the Chief Minister of one State, somebody else might start asking for the resignation of the Chief Minister of another State. This is not the way we should go about this matter.

Prof. Ranga spoke about an all-party Government. He seems to see a panacea for all the ills in all-party Government. That is a separate matter. Some others pleaded for small States. I entirely disagree with that proposition. That is not the direction in which we should go.

Ultimately the suggestion came about committee. Let me make it very clear at the outset that I do not want to oppose it. At the same time, I must express my misgivings about it. What will be the purpose of a committee of this type? Does it want to go and start functioning as a sort of a States Reorganisation Commission? Not at all. (*Interruptions*). Let me say what I have to say. I am not replying to this debate in the spirit of replying to a debate I am trying to put before the House our thinking about this matter.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI (Kendrapara) : The Parliament sent a parliamentary delegation to Assam during the disturbances there.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : In this matter, the problems are some what different. The situation there is still fluid in this matter. Some members have made up their minds about certain issues, that the resignation of the Chief Minister should be accepted, that Telengana State should be created, etc. With these attitudes if people go there, what exactly will happen there, we cannot say. Members of this House enjoy the most important right of freedom of speech and there is nothing wrong about it. But I have got serious doubts whether such a committee would help to bring about that sort of confidence or understanding which we desire. This is my misgiving about it. But if you, Sir, in your judgment feel that such a committee should be appointed, we will give you our cooperation. This is our attitude in this matter. I must say what is our thinking. We have weighed the *pros* and *cons* of the matter and I have said what we honestly feel about it. You, Sir, know the Andhra situation better. If you weigh the *pros* and *cons* and if you feel that it is going to serve the cause of putting all the people together in a friendly spirit and keeping the integrity of Andhra State, certainly we will give our cooperation. But it is my duty to honestly and frankly place before the House our misgivings in this matter.

I have nothing more to say.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे एक मिनट दे दीजिये ।

SOME HON. MEMBERS *rose*-

MR. SPEAKER : Yesterday itself this was my fear that if the Home Minister replies today, again the discussion will start. If allow one minute to Mr. Limaye, I will have to allow one minute to all the others also. Where will it end?

श्री मधु लिमये : यह तो मैं आ से कह रहा हूँ उन से थोड़े ही कह रहा हूँ । उन को जवाब नहीं देना है ।

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai) : Sir, when the Naxalbari discussion was going on here and a proposal was made that a parliamentary committee must be sent there, he categorically said, "Yes; we are in agreement with the proposal to send a parliamentary committee." But now he says he is not opposed to the proposal, but he leaves it to you. How does he distinguish between that position and this? (*Interruptions*)

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कल आप ने उन से कहा था कि वह राय दे दें अपनी। अब वह आपको कह रहे हैं। इस का क्या मतलब है? आज वह कह रहे हैं कि आप ही दिमाग बनायें।

SHRI UMANATH : What are the misgivings?

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : Sir, the House desires that there should be a parliamentary committee. I would appeal to you, Sir, that you should go ahead with the formation of this committee.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज (बम्बई दक्षिण) : आप सदन की राय की तो इज्जत कीजिये।

श्री मधु लिमये : कल हुआ क्या था और आज यह क्या कह रहे हैं? आप ने सरकार को दिमाग बनाने के लिये कहा था, लेकिन उन्होंने ऐसा नहीं किया। आप ने उन के ऊपर डाल दिया था। स्पीकर साहब आप ने कहा था कि चूँकि आंध्र का मामला है, इस लिये आप के लिये एम्बैरेसिंग है। आप ने कहा था कि मेरे लिये निराण्य करना कठिन है।

MR. SPEAKER : The Home Minister is not going to reply to all these. I am also not committing myself now.

SHRI UMANATH : Sir, this is not a mere procedural matter. More lives will be lost in Telengana and we cannot be just sitting here quiet.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह आप को एम्बैरेस कर रहे हैं। आप ने कल कहा था कि यह आप के लिये एम्बैरेसिंग है।

SHRI UMANATH : At the time of the peasants' struggle in Naxalbari he readily agreed to have a parliamentary committee. Now when it is a question of millions of people losing their lives and when there is a consensus on the appointment of a committee he does not agree.

श्री मधु लिमये : ब्रह्मानन्द रेड्डी नाराज हो जायेंगे, इस लिये वह इन्कार कर रहे हैं। यह सदन का प्रिविलेज है। (व्यवधान) मुख्य मंत्री नाराज हो जायेंगे इसलिये यह नहीं कर रहे हैं। यह सदन के विशेषाधिकारों की अवहेलना है। (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER : He has left it open. I have not said anything (*Interruptions*). Will you give me time to study the implications at least (*Interruptions*). The hon. Minister has given his reply. I must have time to study the implications.

SHRI UMANATH : They do not want to embarrass Shri Brahmananda Reddi, they want to embarrass you.

MR. SPEAKER : That is why I said that I must study the implications. Now we will continue the debate on the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Industrial Development, Internal Trade and Company Affairs.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : फिर यह सरकार क्यों चलाते हैं, स्पीकर के हाथों में क्यों सरकार नहीं देते हैं?

MR. SPEAKER : I call on Shri Bedabrata Barua to speak on the Demands for Grants.

18.19 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS--*Contd.*

Ministry of Industrial Development,
Internal Trade and Company Affairs--
Contd.

SHRI BEDABRATA BARUA (Kaliabor) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, in this debate