

13.07 hrs.

CONSTITUTION (THIRTY-THIRD
AMENDMENT) BILL
AND
MULKI RULES (REPEAL) BILL

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : we now take up the Constitution (Thirty-third Amendment) Bill and Mulki Rules (Repeal) Bill. Shri Uma Shankar Dikshit.

SHRI S. B. GIRI (Warangal) : I rise on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He has not yet moved. Please wait.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT) : Sir, I beg to move :^a

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, be taken into consideration."

Before I go into the provisions of the Bill, I would like briefly to state the circumstances in which this Bill is being brought forward.

SHRI S. B. GIRI : Please hear my point of order.

MK. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Let me hear his point of order.

SHRI S. B. GIRI : My point of order is this. This Bill, this Thirty-third Constitution Amendment Bill is against the fundamental rights of the people of this country. Article 35(b) makes it clear that prior to the Constitution if there is any law protecting the interests of the people of a territory, that would be valid. It has already been decided by the Supreme Court that for Telengana people 35(b) is applicable because it was before the commencement of the Constitution.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : What is the point of order about it? Please submit only your point of order.

SHRI S. B. GIRI : This Bill is against the Constitution of India. Therefore, this Bill should not be allowed. If it is allowed, the rights which are being enjoyed by the people of Telengana will be curtailed. That is the Supreme Court judgment.

श्री मधु लिमये (बांका) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप का ध्यान में संविधान के अनुच्छेद 14 की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ। उस में यह कहा है कि :

"The State shall not deny to any person equality before the law or the equal protection of the laws within the territory of India."

साथ-साथ उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप अनुच्छेद 16(1) का देखें :

"There shall be equality of opportunity for all citizens in matters relating to employment or appointment to any office under the State."

और आगे इसी धारा में कहा है कि राज्यों के लिये अगर निवास की शर्त लगाना चाहते हैं, रेजीडेंट, क्वालिफिकेशन, तो वह लगा सकते हैं। लेकिन अभी गृह मंत्री जी ने जो विधेयक हमारे सामने रखा है इस के चलते आन्ध्र प्रदेश इतने इलाकों में बट जायेगा जितने आंध्र में जिले हैं। इससे मेरी राय में समान अधिकारों के बारे में जो 14वीं धारा है और समान मौका एम्प्लायमेंट का (राजगार के बारे में),

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : What is the point of order? These are matters of detail. They have nothing to do with the order.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ।

मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि 14वीं और 16वीं धारा का, बुनियादी अधिकारों का हनन होता है। इसलिए मंत्री महोदय का यह विधेयक यहाँ नहीं रखना चाहिये और कोई ऐसी याचना

^aMoved with the recommendation of the President.

बनानी चाहिये जिससे राष्ट्र की एकता बचें और विभिन्न प्रदेशों की आकांक्षाएँ भी पूरी हों और किसी भी हालत में मौलिक अधिकारों का हनन न हो।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I do not know why Mr. S. B. Giri and Shri Madhu Limaye have thought it fit to raise it at this stage. The first stage when this was raised was when the Bill came before the House to be introduced. They had raised these points at that time and I had given a ruling. All these things that they have mentioned, namely whether this Bill is constitutional or not, whether certain provisions in it are against the Constitution or not are matters for discussion. These are matters for consideration. Hon. Members are quite at liberty to make their submissions at that stage. But it has nothing to do with the order. The order now is that this Bill be taken into consideration.

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT: As the House is aware, the Telegu-speaking people of our country had aspired for many years to have a large Telegu-speaking State which they used to call Vishala Andhra. Their desire fructified in 1953 to some extent when the Telegu-speaking areas of then State of Madras were carved out into a separate State by the name of Andhra.

When the States Reorganisation Commission considered the question of further reorganisation of the States, they suggested the division of the State of Hyderabad. They had some reservations regarding the immediate merger of the Telugu-speaking areas of Hyderabad known as Telengana area with the State of Andhra, and, therefore, recommended that these areas might remain as a separate State for some time. However, it goes to the credit of the people of Andhra Pradesh that through discussions among themselves, they succeeded in allaying the doubts which the States Reorganisation Commission had expressed. After prolonged discussion, an agreement was reached between the leaders of the people in Andhra and Telengana areas for safeguarding the Telugu interests. . . .

SHRI S. B. GIRI: It is a wrong statement. There was no public agreement. The people have not accepted the formula at all. . . .

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT: I do not know whether the hon. Member has understood the reference. I am referring to 1953.

SHRI S. B. GIRI: The people who had accepted it do not have the courage to own it. . . .

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT: One of the safeguards proposed was the constitution of a regional committee for the Telengana area. There was also an assurance that posts in the subordinate services in the Telengana area might be reserved for some time for being filled by persons satisfying domicile conditions, that is, Mulki Rules as they were in vogue in the erstwhile Hyderabad State. There was also an understanding that regulation of admissions educational institutions in the Telengana area should be within the purview of the Regional Committee so as to ensure that educational facilities available to the students of Telengana area were not diminished but improved further. All these measures were intended for the transitional phase, and it was expected that special efforts would be made during this phase to accelerate the development of the Telengana area. For this purpose, there was also an assurance to the people of Telengana that the revenue surpluses of that area would be utilised only for the development of that area. I must say that this agreement was welcomed all over the country as an act of statesmanship and led to the immediate formation of Vishala Andhra which was known as Andhra Pradesh.

In pursuance of the agreement reached between the leaders of Andhra and Telengana, this House included a special provision in art. 371(1) of the Constitution for the constitution of a Regional Committee for the Telengana area. In 1957, a special law known as the Public Employment (Requirement as to residence) Act was also passed by this House. By sec. 2 of that

Act, the Mulki Rules were repealed and by sec. 3 special safeguards in the matter of public employment for the Telengana area were provided. These arrangements continued for several years without any complaint from any side. Difficulties, however, arose when the Supreme Court struck down in 1969 sec. 3 of the Public Employment (Requirement as to residence) Act in so far as it related to the Telengana area. At the same time, there was the feeling in Telengana that the other safeguards were also not being implemented satisfactorily. The entire matter was reviewed. The powers and functions of the Regional Committee were reviewed and enlarged; measures were taken for ensuring that adequate developmental resources were made available for the Telengana area. Steps were also contemplated to secure employment opportunities for the people of this area by localising recruitment. As things were settling down, in October 1972, the Supreme Court held that sec. 2 of the Public Employment (Requirement as to residence) Act 1957, which sought to repeal the Mulki Rules could not stand after s. 3 of the Act in its application to the Telengana area had been struck down. The result was that the Mulki Rules revived and that too with retrospective effect and without any limitation. The House is fully aware of the agitation which followed this judgment. The agitation continued, sometimes in violent form, and finally Andhra Pradesh was brought under President's rule on the 18th of January, 1973.

The situation was rather complex and sometime had to be allowed for passions to cool down before a final solution could be found. I am glad that the old spirit which helped the Telugu-speaking people to realise their vision of Vishal Andhra asserted itself (*Interruptions*). Let me complete my statement. After a series of discussions, the leaders from both the areas were able to identify the problems which had given rise to the repeated strife and hammer out a solution which would not only provide answers to the basic problems but also further promote the emotional integration of the people of all the areas of the State.

A basic problem which has been troubling the minds of the people of Telengana was their continued backwardness in spite of the efforts made during the last several years in the field of development. It was realised that backwardness was not a problem peculiar to Telengana. There were other areas in Rayalaseema and even the coastal districts which needed accelerated development. Keeping this in view, the State leaders agreed that there should be identification of the backward areas all over the State and a special mechanism should be devised to accelerate the development of these areas with the closer co-operation of representatives of these areas.

Secondly, there was the feeling among the people that such of them as had settled down in the State capital were not getting adequate facilities in the matter of admissions to institutions of higher learning. This was attributed to the reservation of a large number of seats in these institutions for candidates possessing domicile qualifications. On the other hand, there was the fear among the Telengana people that the opportunities available to them would be diminished in case such restrictions did not operate. It was in this context that the State leaders came to the conclusion that while adequate preference should be given to local candidates in the matter of admission to educational institutions, this should be done on a uniform basis throughout the State. They also suggested that a Central University should be established at Hyderabad to augment the existing educational facilities.

The third major issue which agitated the minds of the people was the continued operation of the Mulki Rules in a part of the State only. During the discussions there was appreciation of the fact that a certain proportion of jobs at the lower level should be available to the people of the local areas in which these jobs exist and that this principle should apply uniformly throughout the State.

It was in this context that the State leaders agreed that preference to a specified extent should be given to local candidates in certain types of posts. It was also

noticed that many writ petitions had been filed by the employees of the State Government to seek redress to a variety of service grievances on account of seniority, promotion, etc. and often these had led to unsettling several administrative decisions. The State leaders, therefore, suggested the setting up of an Administrative Tribunal to deal with such grievances and also to limits being imposed on recourse to judiciary in matters falling within the purview of the Tribunal.

The four-fold approach mentioned earlier can be put through if there is adequate constitutional cover. In the context of this approach . . .

SHRI S. B. GIRI: He is always mentioning 'leaders.' Who are the leaders? I want to know the names of those leaders who formulated this.

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT: Let him have patience. He has got opportunities to speak. Some of the State leaders finally issued a statement on the 21st September, 1973 setting out what has been called the six-point formula. Later, some of them had further discussions among themselves and elaborated the more basic aspects of the formula in a statement issued on the 22nd October, 1973.

The formula has been widely welcomed and has received convincing support in all parts of the State. It is only when we were satisfied that there was genuine support to this formula from almost all sections of the people that it was decided to revoke the President's rule. The ministry which was constituted immediately thereafter has fully endorsed this formula and has requested the Central Government to undertake necessary constitutional amendments as envisaged in the formula. This Bill has been brought forward in response to that appeal.

I would now like to quickly run through the provisions of the Bill. As stated earlier, the suggestion is that the Regional Committee need not be continued. Clause 2 of the Bill, therefore, seeks to omit

article 371(1) of the Constitution. Clause 3 of the Bill seeks to insert two new articles, 371D and 371E, which are special to the State of Andhra Pradesh. Clause 1 of article 371D makes a general provision enabling the President to provide by order equitable opportunities and facilities for the people belonging to different parts of the State in the matter of public employment and in the matter of education. Clause (2) of this article spells out the various details which may be provided in the order by way of localising Statewise cadres, where necessary, specifying local areas in respect of different local cadres and educational institutions and prescribing the criteria for determining local candidates for the purpose of giving preference in the matter of recruitment to local cadres or educational institutions in different parts of the State and the extent of such preference.

Clause (3) of the proposed new article 371D provides for the constitution of the Administrative Tribunal and also its jurisdiction, power and authority being defined by a Presidential Order. Clause (4) makes some more provisions in respect of the Administrative Tribunal. The six-point formula provides that the decisions of the Administrative Tribunal should ordinarily be binding on the State Government. In other words, in exceptional circumstances where the acceptance of the decision is likely to prejudice the interests of the State, it was intended that the State Government should have the authority to modify or cancel the order. We cannot overlook the possibility of such situations arising.

At the same time there has to be measure of assurance to the employees that the orders of the Tribunal will not be lightly set aside or modified. It has, therefore, been provided that if the State Government consider it necessary to modify or annul the order, they should do so within three months and while doing so the reasons for such action should be stated in writing. Provision has also been made in clause (6) that the order made by the Tribunal should be laid before the State Legislature.

[Shri Uma Shankar Dikshit]

Clause (7) provides that except the Supreme Court no other court or Tribunal shall have jurisdiction, power or authority in respect of matters falling within the purview of the Tribunal. In other words, the Tribunal will be a high powered forum whose decisions will not be lightly set aside or altered. We also expect that the Tribunal need not be a permanent feature. When the various problems relating to service matters have been sorted out to the satisfaction of the employees, there may be very few occasions for them to resort to the Tribunal and at such a stage it may be considered unnecessary to continue this body. Clause (8) of article 371D provides for a such a contingency.

As I have stated earlier the law relating to Requirement as to residence in the Telengana area has undergone repeated changes. Apart from this, the scope of the Mulki Rules has still not been finally settled. According to an interpretation given some time ago by the State High Court persons born in the Telengana area cannot possibly be Mulkis. The matter is now *sub-judice* in an appeal but still there is no finality. It is, therefore, desirable that there should be no doubt left regarding the validity of the appointments, postings, promotions or transfers, made in the past on the ground whether such appointments were made in accordance with any law providing for requirement as to residence or not. Clause (9) makes necessary provision in this behalf.

Clause (10) of article 371D naturally has to be there because the special provisions of this article have to over-ride the normal provisions of the Constitution.

Establishment of a University is normally the function of the State Government. However, the Six-Point Formula suggests that there should be a Central University in the State. Article 371E, therefore, seeks to confer on Parliament the necessary legislative competence to establish such a University.

Clause 4 of the Bill makes only a consequential amendment in entry 63 of the

Union List so as to make a reference to the university established under the Proposed article 371E.

The Bill does not refer to the establishment of the State Planning and Development Board and Planning and Development Committees for the backward areas. This is a matter which the State Government can pursue within their powers. I understand that the State Government are seized of this matter and I hope this part of the Six-Point Formula will also be implemented soon.

Sir, I am happy to commend this Bill to the House, which seeks to confer the necessary constitutional authority on the Parliament and the President for implementing the consensus arrived at by leaders of Andhra Pradesh for promoting their unity and well-being.

I suggest that the other Bill also might be taken up along with this Bill.

I also move :

"That the Bill to provide for the repeal of Mulki Rules be taken into consideration."

SHRI S. B. GIRI : I have got some information. Let him clarify it. He is now moving the second Bill also.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Both the motions, as suggested by the Business Advisory Committee and agreed to by the House, will be discussed together. Motions moved :

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, be taken into consideration."

"That the Bill to provide for the repeal of Mulki Rules be taken into consideration."

Shri Limaye has tabled some amendments. He is not here. Is Shri Giri moving his amendments ?

SHRI S. B. GIRI: I beg to move my amendments Nos. 1 and 2 to the Constitution (Amendment) Bill and amendments Nos. 2 and 3 to the Mulki Rules (Repeal) Bill. I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 20th February, 1974."(1)

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 23 members, 15 from this House, namely:—

- (1) Shri R. V. Bade
- (2) Shri Khemchandbhai Chavda
- (3) Shri Jambuwant Dhote
- (4) Shri Samar Guha
- (5) Shri Diresb Joarder
- (6) Shri Jagannathrao Joshi
- (7) Shri Madhu Limaye
- (8) Shri P. G. Mavalankar
- (9) Shri Prasannbhai Mehta
- (10) Shri Piloo Mody
- (11) Shri F. H. Mohsin
- (12) Shri Birender Singh Rao
- (13) Shri M. Satyanarayan Rao
- (14) Shri P. Narasimha Reddy
- (15) Shri S. B. Giri

and 8 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 last 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 8 members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."(2)

I beg to move :

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 20th February, 1974."(2)

"That the Bill to provide for the repeal of Mulki Rules, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of 15 members, namely:—

- (1) Shri R. V. Bade
- (2) Shri Khemchandbhai Chavda
- (3) Shri Jambuwant Dhote
- (4) Shri Samar Guha
- (5) Shri Diresb Joarder
- (6) Shri Jagannathrao Joshi
- (7) Shri Madhu Limaye
- (8) Shri P. G. Mavalankar
- (9) Shri Prasannbhai Mehta
- (10) Shri Piloo Mody
- (11) Shri F. H. Mohsin
- (12) Shri Birender Singh Rao
- (13) Shri M. Satyanarayan Rao
- (14) Shri P. Narasimha Reddy ; and
- (15) Shri S. B. Giri

with instructions to report by the last day of the next session."(3)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: As the first Bill is a Constitution (Amendment) Bill, it requires a special majority, that is to say, two-thirds of the members present and voting and a majority of the total membership of the House. The motion for consideration will have to be adopted by a

[Mr. Deputy Speaker] special majority. The clauses will have to be adopted by a special majority and the passing of the Bill has got to be done by a special majority. We have allotted 6 hours for the discussion of these two Bills and we have begun at 1.15.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH): The Business Advisory Committee has recommended that it should be finished today. At 6 o'clock there is a function in the Central Hall where all Members of Parliament would like to go.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): When we are amending the Constitution, the House must be given full liberty and freedom.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: May I suggest for your consideration that the voting on the motion for consideration may be at 4.30. After that we may take up the clause by clause consideration and at 6 o'clock the Bill may be put to vote after the third reading.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is a new suggestion. 6 hours have been allotted and we have started at 1.15. If we calculate on that basis, it will go up to 7.15. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has made an alternative suggestion. I think it is a little unfortunate that we should refer to some other thing outside the House as one of the factors to be considered. When we are in the House, we consider only the business in the House. But he has made the suggestion. We shall try our level best. If possible, we will try to take up the consideration motion at about 4.30 for voting. Whatever it is, we will finish this Bill today.

*SHRI B. N. REDDY (Niryalguda): Mr. Deputy Speaker, as far as Andhra Pradesh is concerned, the most important problem facing is the problem of integration. During the past 4 years, this problem of integration

has threatened, our own existence. Agitations have come up for one reason or the other whether it is due to the backwardness of the area of Andhra Pradesh or for some other things. Taking these facts into consideration this Bill is a welcome step in safeguarding the integration of Andhra Pradesh. Our party have from the very beginning fought for the integration of Andhra Pradesh along with the common people. It is only the common people of Andhra who stood steadfastly for the integrity of Andhra Pradesh and the people have been rewarded for their efforts.

SHRI S. B. GIRI (Warangal): Do not say that the people are supporting for integration.

SHRI B. N. REDDY: This Bill is therefore to be welcomed because it maintains the integrity of Andhra Pradesh. This is also to be welcomed because it also abolishes all regional tendencies and ideas like the regional committees and other things which does not help in integration. In this Bill also, there are so many provisions which do not help in unity in Andhra Pradesh but encourage separatist tendencies. There are no provisions in this Bill that develop industries and development of backward areas in Andhra Pradesh. There is no provision in this Bill for all round development of Andhra Pradesh.

The Minister of Home Affairs has stated in his speech that Government has brought forward this Bill for the prosperity of Andhra Pradesh. Although this welcome step is taken by the Government, our party is not congratulating the Government in bringing forward this Bill. We are not prepared to look in this Bill what the Home Minister sees in this Bill. We are not agreeable to the perspective of the Home Minister. Behind the back of this Bill there have been a spate of agitations, bloodshed and loss of young lives. So many humiliating incidents have taken place.

*The original speech was delivered in Telugu.

The ruling Congress party is squarely responsible for encouraging the separatist tendencies in Andhra Pradesh. Today the Home Minister says that he is bringing forward this Bill for the prosperity of Andhra Pradesh. It is only the Congress party who exploited the backwardness of the area and the unemployment problem for their own ends for encouraging separatism. It is only the Congress party which brought forward the other day the five point formula and the Mulki rules. It is only the Congress party which wanted to revive the feudalistic concept of Mulki rules initiated by the Nizam. It is only the Congress party in Centre and in State which was a silent spectator and encouraged the agitation for Jai Andhra and Jai Telengana. The Congress party and Government in Centre were actually enacting a drama at that time. During the past four years this Congress party could not come to a decision. Today the Home Minister says that he attaches the greatest importance for the unity of Andhra Pradesh. The Congress party was actually playing for some time with the cause of separation and for some time with the cause of integration. That party had actually encouraged the separatist leaders of Andhra Pradesh. It is only the Congress Party which came into some compromise with Telengana separatists at one time and the Andhra separatists at one time. Later on the situation got out of control and the very concept of the unity of Andhra Pradesh was threatened. The Congress party was also divided into two extreme factions one for separation and the other for integration. The very future of the Congress party was threatened with a great division. Because of this, the State unity was also threatened. When the Congress party saw in these incidents of Andhra Pradesh a threat to their own existence then they came to terms with the formula of integration. I dare say that it is only the people of Andhra Pradesh who fought for maintaining the integrity of Andhra Pradesh and the credit goes to the people and our party which stood along with them.

The Congress party which should own all the responsibility for those incidents did

not take steps at the opportune time. I am sorry to state that Government have brought forward this Bill after so much has happened and if it had taken steps earlier much of the unpleasantness, bloodshed and painful process would have been avoided. The Congress party woke up only when the situation become very dangerous.

In this connection I would like to state it is the Communist Party of India (M) who from the very beginning opposed the separation and supported integration. It is our party which have all along maintained that steps should be taken by the Central Government to resolve Andhra—Telengana employment dispute and the improvement of backward areas of Andhra Pradesh. We have already asked the Central Government to solve the unemployment problem. Some of the welcome provisions have already been suggested by our party. It is only the Communist Party of India (M) which stood like a mountain in the face of these separatist agitations to maintain the integration of Andhra Pradesh. Even 25 years back, our party's great leader Sundariah had called for people's Raj in Vishal Andhra. At that time we had already warned that as long as the Congress party is there the unity of Andhra Pradesh would be threatened. The events which occurred during the past six months have proved what we have been saying all through. When you introduce this Bill now you should take all these considerations into account. The Congress party is plagued by factional quarells. Their main idea is to keep power at all costs and it is they who introduced power politics into this game. As a result of the policies of the Congress party 42 crores of people of Andhra Pradesh were put at ransom. I want to state categorically that this is the most cruel thing which happened to the people of Andhra Pradesh.

I would like to submit in this connection that although in this Bill there are some provisions which encourage unity in Andhra Pradesh at the same time there are some provisions which encourages separatism.

[Shri B. N. Reddy]

Provisions which encourage separatism. They have introduced a concept of local candidates and these things do not help for integration. As a result of this provision in this Bill some provisions of the Mulki rules have been incorporated if not the whole Mulki rules. That is the provision for district and local candidates. This encourages regional and local tendencies. The most dangerous result of this provision would be the division among the districts of Andhra Pradesh. This is very serious. While there is abolition of the Mulki rules for the whole State, there is now the danger of their retention in the 20 districts of Andhra Pradesh. We have all along been stressing certain principles for the solution to this problem but the Government have not taken any action in this respect, they have now introduced regional tendencies. The second problem is the problem of the development of backward areas in both regions of Andhra Pradesh. It is against the background of backwardness of the areas of Andhra Pradesh that agitations have taken place. Our state occupies 12th place in India in the field of industry. Since 1965-66 all the projects in Andhra Pradesh have been suspended. Although Andhra Pradesh has got 1/5 of the total population of India it is a famine and drought affected area. It is because of these conditions that unemployment problem has increased to magnifying extent in Andhra Pradesh. This has encouraged the spate of agitations there. The Central Government instead of taking efforts to remove these famine conditions was only a silent spectator in this drama. I would urge upon the Central Government to take immediate and concrete steps in removing the famine and drought conditions and improving the backward areas of Andhra Pradesh. I am sorry to state that in this Bill and formula, provision has not been made in removing these things.

In this Bill a provision has been made for the establishment of a Central university in Andhra Pradesh but that will not alone solve the problem. The most important problem facing Andhra Pradesh is its backwardness. I once again wish to emphasise this point and urge the Government

to remove the backwardness industrially, agriculturally and financially. Previously the backwardness was supposed to remain in Telengana and Rayalaseema areas. But now for the first time it has been admitted that backwardness exists in both the two regions. The formation of a committee or a Board to look into these things will not help in solving this problem. The bureaucratic machinery, which is to be established, would not help in solving this problem. It was only authoritarian. In this Bill and formula, the foundation for removing the backwardness of areas of Andhra Pradesh has not been made. The Government should take efforts to remove the regional imbalances. This Bill does not guarantee it.

If we want to avoid regional imbalances and encourage unity in Andhra Pradesh then a complete all round development of Andhra Pradesh is necessary. The Government should guarantee these provisions in this Bill. The Government should take this problem seriously and take concrete steps in this direction. I am sorry to state that either in this Bill or in the speech of Home Minister this point has not been made. Therefore, in the interest of the future prosperity of Andhra Pradesh the Government should take extraordinary steps in solving the problems which I have mentioned above. It is absolutely necessary to make these provisions in this Bill and then only it will guarantee the future prosperity of Andhra Pradesh. All the projects which have been suspended in our State should be completed.

I would like to submit once again the backwardness in Andhra Pradesh covers the whole State and not particularly to Andhra and Telengana. There is no Constitutional machinery provided for in this Bill to remove the regional imbalances and backwardness. The Central Government should take urgent steps in providing this machinery. I hope special steps will be taken by the Government to solve this problem. It is surprising that Government has not taken this problem seriously before.

As regards Andhra, Telengana employment dispute is concerned we have all along been maintaining that there should be democratic principle to solve the dispute. We want to ask why such a democratic principle was not formulated in solving this dispute. The 2:1 formula is a justifiable solution to this dispute. I want to state that this 2:1 formula will go a long way in encouraging unity in Andhra Pradesh and Government should take steps to bring forward and implement this formula.

I hope even now the Central Government will, without any hesitation, without any bogus angle about our State's integration, about our State's future, take such a course which will help in emotional integration and at the same time bring in all round development of the State and at the same time bring in urgent development in the backward areas also.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandyal): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, at the outset, I will thank the Honourable Home Minister and his colleagues who have come to the House with this Bill.

Unfortunately our State has passed through critical times, subjected to various agitations, involving loss of human lives, destruction of property and causing misery to the large sections of our people. The economic development came to a standstill and popular Government ceased to function; President's rule had to be imposed and this was done at a critical time when we have had to formulate our schemes for the Fifth Five-year Plan. Emotions were aroused, base instincts in human beings were fully and freely exploited, slogans were raised, not for any constructive purpose, but for disintegrating the State which was brought into being by the selfless sacrifice of several of our distinguished sons, and the great soul, Shri Potti Sriramulu, had to perform self-immolation.

SHRI S. B. GIRI: That was really for an Andhra State; not for Andhra Pradesh.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Even this emotional integration did not come about because of Mr. S. B. Giri raising certain issues; this emotional integration was in vogue even when Hyderabad was under the Nizams rule. The Andhra Mahasabha in Hyderabad State had pioneered a movement for linguistic division of the State to bring in the Vishal Andhra as its objective. Many leading persons of the erstwhile Hyderabad State had taken a leading role to bring together the Telengana speaking people whether they are in Andhra State or Hyderabad State. This was brought about when the State of Andhra Pradesh was brought into being in 1956.

SHRI S. B. GIRI: How it was brought about?

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: It was brought about because the majority of the Telugu speaking people wanted to be united, not by the sophisticated urbanised people living in Hyderabad, who don't belong, who don't respond, to the aspirations of the Telugu speaking people.

SHRI S. B. GIRI: It was opportunist leaders who have done it. The people had opposed it and this was brought about when there was opposition from the Telengana people.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: It was unfortunate that when the State was to be integrated, in some parts of the Telegu-speaking people, nobody shared the wishes of the common people, but certain leaders, in order to establish and in order to safeguard their own interests, wanted a separate Telengana State. It was not the common people. Unfortunately at that time, for various reasons, because of various pressures that were brought about, in so far as Andhra Pradesh was concerned, the regional committee had been constituted, and a statutory status had been given to that regional committee. Under the reorganisation of States, when linguistic States were formed, it was not Telengana

[Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah] alone that joined with the rest of Andhra, but the Marathwada area and Karnataka area were also joined with Maharashtra and Karnataka. They never wanted safeguards as was done in the case of Telengana. We had some historical reasons for this. I do not want to question the wisdom of our elders who thought that the fears and suspicions of the people of Telengana had to be allayed and the affluent districts of Andhra should function in such a fashion as to leave no room for any suspicion or misgiving on the part of Telengana. That was the reason why the Telengana regional committee had come into being.

Before this Bill was drafted, many consultations had taken place. It is not as though this formula has been superimposed. It has come as a result of consensus arrived at with various sections of our people who are very much involved. The Prime Minister had taken great pains and she was very much agitated because an important State like Andhra Pradesh was locked with agitations and strikes involving mob violence and other things. She wanted to bring about a sort of amity and brotherliness between the various sections of the people. My hon. friend Shri K. C. Pant has himself taken great pains in going through this process to understand the feelings of the people. I congratulate him on the fact that he was able to succeed in his attempts. History will record that at this crucial juncture, the Prime Minister, ably assisted by Shri K. C. Pant and the Home Minister was able to preserve the integrity of Andhra Pradesh. To destroy is an easy thing but to construct is a very difficult problem.

This Bill envisages the giving of a statutory status to the decisions arrived at by the people who are vitally concerned with this problem.

SHRI S. B. GIRI: Who are these people who accepted it? Not the common people.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: The people who have been elected by the people have taken this responsibility. I do

not know why my hon. friend should take the name of the people. It is the people's representatives who have taken this responsibility. (Interruptions). This Bill envisages the abolition of the regional committee, the abolition of Mulki Rules and the location of a Central university at Hyderabad and also giving opportunities as much as possible to the local people.

My hon. friend Shri B. N. Reddy had raised a very pertinent point. He said that while we had abolished the Mulki Rules on the one hand, on the other, every district was going to have that type of Mulki rule. But I want to tell my hon. friend that whether the Mulki rules operated or not, up to a particular post, the local people were naturally to be given due preference. But that should not come in the way of merit, that should not bar or prevent other people from seeking employment.

14.00 hrs.

SHRI B. N. REDDY: On a point of clarification. The question is not that, but again it will be the old element coming.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: In the working of it, given the goodwill, given the mutual trust, we will be able to surmount even that difficulty and all sections of the people will get the benefit of it. As for giving preference to local candidates, I know how much of dissatisfaction it has caused in other areas. I know there are certain in-built difficulties in this problem. These were created not by the people but by the bureaucracy. I know that even in the public sector if a person from a State goes to another, he would like to have his *chaprasi* also from his State. We should not give more prominence to these aberrations and distortions. We must allow all sections of people equal opportunities.

Another important factor I would like to stress is with regard to the appointment of tribunals. They have taken away the jurisdiction of the courts in regard to disputes arising out of the formula being put

on the statute book. I know there is an enabling clause, 8, which clearly says that if these tribunals outlive their utility, they can be removed. So I hope there will not be any reason for the employees to go to the tribunal for more than it is necessary.

Coming to the development part of it, I feel some of these mutual distrusts and misgivings will arise because of the regional imbalances. These regional imbalances have been created over a long period. They have to be removed. But is the recent agitation due to regional imbalances? In 1969, of course, the agitation came from Telengana. You know the composition of Hyderabad City. There are various elements which have femented this agitation. There are people who do not like the Telugu people coming up. They have settled there and formed a sort of vested interest. That was also one of the reasons. Big business had a direct hand in it. They have incited this type of violence.

SHRI S. B. GIRI: It was done by Congressmen themselves, not big business people.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: They had a vested interest. I know in the history of Hyderabad, till a few years ago, no Telugu-speaking persons was able to dominate the political scene.

SHRI S. B. GIRI: The Andhra are dominating us.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Even Giri was not allowed to have a major say in Hyderabad City. I am not speaking about Andhras; I want to be called a Telugu-speaking person.

SHRI B. N. REDDY: In the interest of the integration of telugu people and honour of the House, these Andhra-Telengana exchanges must not be allowed. I am making a request to both of them. These exchanges will have adverse effects.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: I am not quarrelling with my friend, Shri Giri. (Interruption) I appeal to the hon. Member; let him have his say afterwards. Why does he interrupt me. I must have my say.

SHRI S. B. GIRI: I have the greatest respect for you, but do not mis-state the principal facts.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: I am not able to put forward my viewpoints if you go on interrupting me, and have a running commentary. It is very difficult for me.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will call you next, Mr. Giri. Please do not interrupt.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: He must respect my wishes as much as I respect his wishes.

SHRI S. B. GIRI: He has no right to speak about Telangana.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Every hon. Member in this House has a right.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: I am a citizen of India.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, please, please.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: He is very much excited because he knows that people are against him. He is very angry. I cannot help it.

SHRI S. B. GIRI: I am also elected by the people.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: I will make an appeal to him. Please do not interrupt me. If he has got anything, let him controvert my facts and say whatever he likes when his turn to speak comes.

Now, Sir, on these regional imbalances, suspicions were created in Telangana. After the police action they created this sort of animosity. It was the bureaucracy. There is some historical background about

[Shri P. Venkatasubaiiah]

it. The people at large who are living in the coastal areas or living in the Rayalaseema area or in Telangana—their interests are common. They do not want to cut each other's throats; they want to live like honest citizens as everywhere else.

Speaking about the regional imbalances, of course, even in the erstwhile Andhra, there was a sort of grievance against the coastal districts which are considered to be the affluent districts. In the Rayalaseema district wherefrom I come, we never wanted this: as a matter of fact, when the Andhra State was to be formed, we wanted to be with Madras because we felt that the affluent coastal districts would submerge us and will not give assistance for our economic development. So, our leaders had to enter into a pact even in those days. It was not given statutory form but a pact was entered into, known as the Sri Baug Pact. I would like to quote the relevant points from the Sri Baug Pact. It is only for allaying the fears of the people of Rayalaseema. They said:

"To ensure the rapid development of the agricultural and economic interests of Rayalaseema and Nellore to the level of those in the coastal districts, schemes of irrigation for a period of 10 years or such longer period as condition may necessitate be given a preferential claim;—especially in respect of the utilisation of the waters of Tungabhadra, Krishna and Pennar—be given for 10 years an exclusive attention in respect of major projects beneficial to these areas; that whenever the question of sharing of waters arises, the needs of the aforesaid areas be the first to be met and that this policy be implemented as from today for the administration of the State."

Sir, this was one of the clauses of the so-called Sri Baug Pact, but it met with an abortive death. Even after the State

was formed, the sharing of Krishna waters came up because there was a project by name Krishna-Pennar project. There was an agitation that if this project was constructed the waters would be diverted to Madras, and there was therefore an agitation. Though that scheme was really beneficial to the people of Rayalaseema, we had to fall in line with our friends of the coastal districts for agitating against this scheme. What happened afterwards in the allocation of waters? According to the reports of various experts, when the allocation of water comes up the area which is drought affected will be taken into consideration in determining the share and Rayalaseema was shown and the share had been obtained but the benefit did not go to them; the waters of Krishna are not beneficial to the people of Rayalaseema; they had gone to the coastal district; There are several instances like that.

The total cultivable land in Andhra Pradesh is 316 lakhs of acres of which 114.68 obtain in the coastal districts, 77.52 in Rayalaseema and 124.10 in Telangana. Of the irrigation facilities 56.92 per cent is in coastal districts, 15.65 in Rayalaseema and 27.19 in Telangana. Even in the matter of irrigation Rayalaseema is backward; it comes last in the utilisation of electricity. I am not highlighting grievances. But regional imbalances such as these create all sorts of problems giving rise to mutual suspicion and distrust. People from Rayalaseema taunt us: since you do not have such a regional committee or safeguards, you are backward. I do not say that because there are regional imbalances we should part. I feel that the interests of backward areas will be better served in an integrated State with vast resources. So I make an appeal to the hon. Minister and other friends here. It is not enough to say that there should be accelerated development of backward areas; it should be done in concrete terms. The Centre must come in a big way to assist such backward areas. Of course there is the Rayalaseema Development Board. It is neither a board nor development; it is

just like a black board. Nothing has been done. It should be the first charge on the Central Government to see that backward areas are economically developed. It should not be assumed that the entire State is affluent because some four or five districts have advanced in some respects due to pre-Independence irrigation and other facilities. Srikakulam and Visakapatnam districts are as backward as any other district though the rainfall is 42" whereas in Rayalaseema the rainfall is 15.20" and in Telangana is more than 40". But it has immense mineral resources. There is no big mineral based industry in that area. In pursuance of the decision taken by the Central Government to give incentive to backward areas, you must persuade industrialists to set up industries in backward areas. They must also see that public sector units are as widely dispersed as possible and are located in backward areas. They should not be concentrated either in Hyderabad or Visakhapatnam only. They should be widely dispersed.

I once again whole-heartedly support this Bill. I once again thank the Prime Minister, the Home Minister and Shri K. C. Pant for the immense service they have done to the cause of the Telugu-speaking people and for having maintained the integrity of the State.

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी (शाजापुर) : यहाँ पर 32वां संविधान संशोधन विधेयक उपस्थित किया गया है। इससे आंध्र प्रदेश के दोनों भागों की जनता को कोई ख़री नहीं होगी बल्कि इसकी वजह से और भी कई नई समस्याएँ खड़ी होंगी। इसका फल यह होगा कि अन्ततोगत्वा उनको हल करने में और भी ज्यादा कठिनाई पैदा होगी। आज दुहाई यह दी जा रही है There is general agreement.

किन्तु वास्तव में भगड़ा तो कांग्रेसियों में है। उनको केवल साथ बिठा कर यह बतलाया जा रहा है कि इस छः सूत्री कार्यक्रम को अपनाओ और उन्होंने ही इनको अपनाया है। वास्तव में जनता की राय क्या है इसको आपने देखा ही

नहीं है। हम ने कई बार यह विषय उठाया है। यदि आप जनता की राय जानना चाहते हैं तो जैसे आपने गाँवा में ऑपिनियन पोल लिया, वहाँ की जनता की राय ली, जैसे ही आंध्र प्रदेश में भी आप ऑपिनियन पोल क्यों नहीं लेते हैं। यदि आप ऐसा करें तो आपको पता चलेंगा कि वहाँ की जनता क्या चाहती है। अभी अभी आंध्र में जा कर आया हूँ, दोनों भागों का मैंने दौरा किया है, तेलंगाना का भी और जिस को आंध्र का कोस्टल एरिया कहते हैं, वहाँ का भी। दोनों जगह मैंने जनता से पूछा है कि क्या वे सन्तुष्ट हैं। तेलंगाना में तो इसके खिलाफ प्रतिक्रिया बड़ी जोरदार है। वे तो सन्तुष्ट बिल्कुल नहीं हैं। जब तक अलग तेलंगाना स्टेट नहीं होती है तब तक तेलंगाना की जनता ख़ुश नहीं होगी। ऐसी स्थिति में मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि यह बिल क्यों लाया गया है। सरकार को सारी बातों को देख कर के मुझे तो ऐसा लगता है कि शक्सपीयर के नाटक में एक पात्र कहता है:

Time is out of joint.

Oh! cursed spite,

It ever I was born to set it, right!

यह केवल एक ही जगह नहीं। सभी जगह वहाँ असन्तोष है। पन्त जी फिर वापिस आ कर बैठ गए हैं। मुझे पता नहीं कि इरिगेशन और पावर से ये फिर यहाँ वापिस आ गए हैं—

सिंचाई और विद्युत् मंत्री (श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र पन्त): कोई एतराज तो नहीं? मैं बँठा था तो श्री वेंकटसुबैय्या जी ने इरिगेशन और पावर की बात कह दी थी।

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी: जब तक आप बैठेंगे तब तक आशा थी कि कुछ न कुछ हल निकल आएगा। आप चले गए तो वह आशा भी चली गई।

सरकार के सामने कोई लक्ष्य है या नहीं इसका कुछ पता नहीं चलता है। आखिर वह इस देश का क्या बनाना चाहती है? एह हाक काम बहुत हो गए। कोई चीज दो चार साल

[श्री जगन्नाथ राव जांशो]

के लिए हां तो उसका माना जा सकता है। आपने संविधान में जो अस्थायी तर्र पर रखा है, उस अस्थायी का क्या मतलब है यह आप हम लोगों को समझा दें। पच्चीस साल के बाद भी कोई चीज वैसे ही रहने दी जाए तो सांचना हांगा कि कौन सा ट्रिप्टिकाण हमारे सामने है और कौन सा वह ट्रिप्टिकाण है जो हम लोगों के अपनाने के लिए कहते हैं। संविधान ने जो अधिकार दिए हैं, मूलभूत अधिकार दिए हैं, उनके विरोध में जो चीज है उसको ये कैसे उपस्थित करते हैं? इसलिए आब-अकशन हमने उठाया था लेकिन किसी ने माना नहीं। मुझे तो ऐसा लगता है कि फिर यह सुप्रीम कोर्ट में जाएगा और सुप्रीम कोर्ट इसकी क्वेश्चन करेगी क्योंकि किसी भी व्यक्ति को कहीं भी जा कर रहने की, काम करने की, शिक्षा पाने की छूट है, उसको ऐसा अधिकार संविधान ने दिया हुआ है। उसके विपरीत यह है। धीरे धीरे यदि केन्द्र ही ऐंगी गलतियाँ फेरता जाएगा तो हम कहां पहुँचेंगे एता नहीं। आपकी स्टेट की ही यह खबर है।

मंग्रालय में अन्य राज्यों के लोगों के निवास पर प्रतिबन्ध यह नया मुल्की वहां शुरू हुआ है। मुझे सन्तोष यह है कि वहां के कांग्रेसियों ने फम से कम इसका जनता की राय के लिए सुपुर्द करने की बात कही। उन्होंने उनकी इस बात को माना नहीं, इसलिए उन्होंने वाक आउट किया। वहां के कांग्रेसी अब यहाँ के कांग्रेसी अलग अलग हैं क्या? मुझे तो ये अलग अलग दिखाई देते हैं। जो खबर छपी है, वह यह है,

“मंग्रालय विधान सभा ने आज उस नाजुक मंग्रालय निवासी अनुमति विधेयक पारित कर दिया जिस में सरकार को राज्य में गैर स्थायी आवासियों के ठहरने के लिए अनुमति प्रतिबन्ध लागू करने के अधिकार की व्यवस्था है।”

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You know there is difference between Meghalaya and Nagaland.

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जांशो:

Yes, Sir. I have extensively toured both Meghalaya and Nagaland and I know the difference. This is about Meghalaya, where they have staged a walk-out.

इस विधेयक में यह व्यवस्था है कि इसके पारित होने के पहले जो वहां बागह साल रहे होंगे। इट इज एनदर पार्ट ऑफ मुल्की।

आखिर हम इस देश में क्या करना चाहते हैं, यह हमारी समझ में नहीं आ रहा है। भगवान् ने इतना बड़ा भारी देश दे दिया, तो हम को उस पर आपूर्ति हाने लगी। विविधता का मतलब यह तो नहीं है कि इन देश को अलग अलग रूप से बाँटते चले जायें और आगे चल कर सब दरवाजे बन्द हो जायें। सारी इनिया साथ आने के लिए कोशिश कर रही है। आर्थिक विकास के लिए कामन मार्केट बन रही है। तेल के सवाल पर सब अरब देश इकट्ठे हो रहे हैं। भगवान् ने मुक्त हस्त से हम को सारे साधन दे दिये हैं। अगर इस के बावजूद हम अलग अलग दीवारें खड़ी करते जायेंगे, तो हम कहां पहुँचेंगे?

सब का विकास होना चाहिए था। जो गड़बड़ हुई, उस का कारण यह है कि तेलंगाना का जो विकास होना चाहिए था, वह नहीं हुआ है। किसी ने उस पर ध्यान नहीं दिया। अगर इन पच्चीस सालों में सब लोगों को काम मिलता और सभी राज्यों का संदुलित आर्थिक विकास होता, तो यह समस्या खड़ी न होती। लेकिन हमारे सामने समस्या यह है कि कांग्रेसियों ने कांग्रेसियों से जो वादा किया था, वह भी पूरा नहीं किया। इस स्थिति में उन्होंने देश से जो वादा किया है, उस को वे कैसे पूरा करेंगे? वे आपसी वादों को भी पूरा नहीं करते हैं। यह तो तेलंगाना के कांग्रेसियों और आन्ध्र के कांग्रेसियों के बीच एक जेन्टलमैनज एग्रीमेंट था, लेकिन उस पर भी अमल नहीं हुआ।

श्री वेंकटसुब्बा ने कहा,

What is development; there is a big board. He wants the Central Government to come in a big way. When he expects

the Central Government to come in a big way, they will bring in a bigger board. That is all.

करना-धरना कुछ नहीं हैं। वास्तविक बात यही है कि आन्ध्र के कांग्रेसियों ने तेलंगाना के कांग्रेसियों को वह विश्वास दिलाया था कि वे पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्रों के विकास को पूरी कोशिश करेंगे, लेकिन वह नहीं किया। शिक्षा और नौकरियों में उन को जो उचित स्थान मिलना चाहिये था, वह नहीं मिला। इसी लिए उन में अविश्वास है। और मुझे नहीं लगता कि आज भी वह गया है।

श्री दीक्षित और श्री पन्त कुछ धर वहाँ हो आये हैं। उन्होंने केवल कांग्रेसियों को साथ बिठा कर सब कुछ किया। आम जनता क्या चाहती है, इस की तरफ उन्होंने ध्यान नहीं दिया।

मंत्री महादय ने हैदराबाद में सेंट्रल यूनिवर्सिटी का जिक्र किया है। उस की बात इस लिए आइ कि आन्ध्र वालों को यह भ्रमने लगा कि उन के साथ सेंट्रल क्लास सैमिटरिजन्ज जैसा व्यवहार होता है, क्योंकि वे अपने ही प्रदेश की राजधानी के शिक्षा संस्थानों में प्रवेश नहीं पा सकते हैं। हांनो यह चाहिये था कि जो भी शिक्षा पाना चाहता हो, उस को सारी सुविधायें मिलें।

प्रीजिडेंट को यह तय करने का अधिकार दिया गया है कि लोकलाइज्ड एरियाज कौन से हैं। इस स्थिति में मरे जैसे आदमी के लिए वहाँ जाना, रहना, शिक्षा और काम-धंधा पाना बिल्कुल मुश्किल हो जायगा। इसी भनावृत्ति के कारण मंधालय ने यह कानून बनाया है। सब राज्य अपने अलग अलग कानून बना रहे हैं।

मैं श्री पन्त को बताना चाहता हूँ कि जब मैं पूना में चुनाव के लिए खड़ा हुआ, तो एक मज्जिन ने पूछा कि आप कर्नाटक वाले हो कर यहाँ क्यों आये हैं। जब मैं चुनाव के लिए मध्य प्रदेश में खड़ा हुआ, तो वहाँ श्री शंकर ने मुझे से पूछा कि कर्नाटक के होने के यहाँ क्यों आये हो। मैंने कहा कि कर्नाटक के हनुमान

जी यहाँ आये, इस लिए मैं भी चला आया। अगर कर्नाटक में किष्किंधा का हनुमान मध्य प्रदेश में आ सकता है, तो मैं भी आ सकता हूँ। हम अपने देश में इस तरह की दीवारें क्यों खड़ी करते जा रहे हैं, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रही है।

मैं मंत्री महादय से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि उन के सामने लक्ष्य क्या है। काश्मीर, हैदराबाद, बड़ोदा और मसूर आदि विभिन्न स्टेट्स में अलग अलग कानून, और अलग अलग फीसिलिटीज थीं। जैसा, बड़ोदा में डार्डवॉर्स का कानून उपलब्ध था। इस लिए बम्बई वाले वहाँ जा कर दो दो शाहियाँ कर के आते थे और डार्डवॉर्स ले लेंते थे। मसूर में तो महिलाओं के लिए एम.ए. तक शिक्षा फ्री थी और मुसलमानों के लिए आधी फ्री थी। हमारे तीन जिले, गुलबर्गा, बीदर और रायचूर, हैदराबाद का हिस्सा थे।

मुल्की का सवाल इस लिए उठा कि लोगों को नौकरियों और शिक्षा संस्थाओं में स्थान नहीं मिलता है। यही असली समस्या है। इस समस्या को हल करने में हम असफल रहे हैं, इस को हम स्वीकार नहीं करते हैं। जो अविश्वास पैदा हो गया है, उस को दूर करने के लिए हम ने पहले भी कई बातें बताई थीं। जब पहली बार 1969 में यह मामला उठाया गया, तो हम ने कहा था कि वहाँ के मुख्य मंत्री, श्री बृहम्मनन्द रेड्डी को त्यागपत्र देने के लिए कहिये। ऐसा नहीं किया गया। लेकिन बाद में वही हुआ। फिर श्री नरसिंह गव आये। उन को भी कहा गया कि चले आओ। लेकिन व्यक्तियों को बदलने से कुछ नहीं होने वाला है। जब तक सरकार अपनी वृत्ति और अपना विचार नहीं बदलती है, जब तक वह यह निश्चित नहीं करती है कि क्या करना है क्या नहीं करना है तब तक यह सारी गड़बड़ी रहने वाली है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह एडहोकिज्म कब तक चलने वाला है।

जहाँ तक काश्मीर का संबंध है, एक नागरिकता का अधिकार सबको मिला हुआ है। काश्मीर का वातावरण उसका चिन्ता होने की

[श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी]

वजह से हमने बात-बात इस प्रश्न को उठाया। प्रश्न यह है कि मैं पूरे देश का गणितिक हाने के नाते काश्मीर में कोई सम्पत्ति खरीद सकता हूँ या नहीं। सरकार इस रोक को हटाये। लेकिन वह ऐसा करने के बजाये अलग-अलग द्वीवारों का निर्माण कर रही है। कहीं लोकल का सवाल आ रहा है, कहीं भूमि पत्र या सन्ज आफ दि सायल का सवाल आ रहा है। लेकिन वास्तव में सब जगह बीफारी एक है और उसका इलाज यह है कि सड़क का काम मिलना चाहिए।

बम्बई में शिव रांजा वाले कहते हैं कि ये "यहू, गुंड" वाले क्यों यहां आते हैं। इसलिये आते हैं कि उनको काम नहीं मिलता है। वे कोई प्यार के कारण नहीं आते हैं। सरकार को गहत नीतियों की वजह से तर्मा, अफ्रीका और श्रीलंका से लोग विस्थापित बनकर यहां आते हैं। यह देखना चाहिये कि उन नीतियों का कैसे ठीक करें। जब कहा जाता है कि मराठी लोगों को काम मिले, तो क्या इसका मतलब यह है कि दूसरे लोगों को काम न मिले? स्थिति यह है कि रोटी एक है और भगाड़ा करने वाले दो हैं। (व्यवधान)

प्रेफरेंस का सवाल क्यों पैदा होता है? एक राजा की दो औरतें होती हैं। एक आवड़ती-फेवरिट या प्यारी—हो गई और दूसरी नावड़ती—नान-फेवरिट—हो गई। वास्तव में ऐसी कोई जरूरत नहीं है कि अगर दो औरतें हों, तो एक आवड़ती और दूसरी नावड़ती हानी ही चाहिये। अगर सब को समान रूप से मिलता, तो प्रेफरेंस का सवाल ही पैदा न होता। कोई प्रेफरेंस न मांगता। जो कोई चाहता, तो उसको नौकरी मिल जाती, या शिक्षा संस्थाओं में जगह मिल जाती, तो प्रेफरेंस का प्रश्न न उठता।

श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र पन्त : माननीय सदस्य ने यह उदाहरण अच्छा नहीं दिया है।

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : यह बात मैं मान लेता हूँ, क्योंकि मुझे कोई अनुभव नहीं है।

हम यही चाहते हैं कि संविधान ने सब लोगों को जो अधिकार दिये हुए हैं, काश्मीर से लेकर केरल तक उनका कार्यान्वयन हो, न कि उनका भंकोच हो। लेकिन इस विधेयक के द्वारा हम उनका संकोच करने जा रहे हैं। इसलिये न तो आन्ध्र वाले संतुष्ट हैं और न तेलंगाना वाले संतुष्ट हैं, क्योंकि इस छ-सूत्री फार्मूला से उनकी समस्या बिल्कुल हल नहीं हुई है। मैंने कई लोगों से बात की है और उन्होंने मुझे कहा कि हम इसका ट्रायल देने जा रहे हैं, लेकिन यह काम नहीं करेगा। अगर सरकार ने इसका ट्रायल दे कर कुछ समय बिताना ही है, तो भले ही वह ऐसा कर ले, लेकिन उसका एक क्लीयर-कट और बॉल्ड डिक्लैरेशन लेना चाहिये।

अगर एस. आर. सी. की सिफारिश के अनुसार अलग तेलंगाना बना दिया जाता, तो कोई गड़बड़ न होती। अनुभव से भी यही पता चला है कि तेलंगाना की जनता चाहती है कि हम अलग से अपना भविष्य बनायेंगे, अपने सारे साधनों को लगा कर अपने पांव पर खड़े होंगे। तो फिर उसका रास्ते में बाधक बन कर हम देश की क्या भलाई कर रहे हैं, यह समझ में नहीं आता है। अगर आन्ध्र और तेलंगाना अलग हो गये, तो क्या इसका मतलब यह है कि देश की एकता पर कठाराघात हो गया? राज्य का प्रशासन सुचारु रूप से चले और समुचित विकास हो। अगर इस बात को ध्यान में रख कर राज्यों की पुनर्रचना हो, तो देश की एकता के लिए कोई खतरा उत्पन्न नहीं होता है।

जब शुरू में श्री गिरि इस विधेयक का विरोध कर रहे थे, तो वह तेलंगाना की जनता की भावना को व्यक्त कर रहे थे कि वह इसको स्वीकार नहीं करती हैं, वह इससे संतुष्ट नहीं हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आन्ध्र की जनता भी इससे संतुष्ट नहीं है। उपर के जो लोग इस एजिटेशन में थे, उन सबको मंत्रि-मंडल में ले लिया गया है। श्री राजाराम राजमल्लू, श्री सुब्बा रेड्डी, श्री वसी रेड्डी, सब को मंत्रि-मंडल में ले लिया गया है। मुझे ऐसा कोई नाम नहीं दीखता, जो

मीत्र-मंडल से बाहर रहा हो। आखिर यह सारा भगड़ा इस लिए थोड़े ही था कि मीत्र-मंडल की पुनर्रचना में गंभीर भी गम्बर लग जायें ?

इस विधेयक के दो पहलू हैं : एक तो यह कि इससे किसी का भी समाधान नहीं होने वाला है दूसरा यह कि यह सांविधानिक आपत्तियां खड़ी करता है, और साथ ही देश में अलगाव की प्रवृत्ति को रोकने के बजाये उसको बढ़ावा देने का खराब काम करता है। इसलिए मैंने वह मंत्रालय वाला कोट किया था। आखिर समय भारतवर्ष एक है, विविधता से भरा हुआ है। इसलिए मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे विधेयक लाने के बजाए कठोरता से एक निर्णय ले लें—आन्ध्र और तेलंगाना दो अलग प्रदेश हों और दोनों सुख और शान्ति के साथ अपना पूरा विकास कर सकें।

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO (Bobilli) : At the outset, I must express our gratitude to the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi for taking an elaborate care and great interest in preserving the integrity of Andhra Pradesh. I must also express my gratitude to the Home Minister, Shri Dikshiti and Shri Pantji for evolving the six-point formula which has been accepted by an overwhelming majority of the people as just and equitable without at the same time affecting the susceptibilities of the three wings of Andhra Pradesh...

AN HON. MEMBER : Not all the people of Andhra Pradesh.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we always speak in terms of people. Even if I come from one constituency, I have the audacity to speak on behalf of the people of the entire Andhra Pradesh, not only that, on behalf of the people of entire India. That is how we have been using this concept of people. Therefore, let us be honest and clear enough when we are speaking in terms of people.

Just now, my friend, Shri Joshiji has been referring in a casual manner : what

is there if you just divide it into Telangana and Andhra? Coming as it does, at this juncture, when the Kanada-speaking people and the Marathi-speaking people have been quarrelling about their border, it is really surprising as to how he can easily say that the Telangana people can have it.

By and large—I am coming to that point—Telengana, Andhra Pradesh and also the border dispute that has been now exercising the minds of the Government of India, came out of the common factor, that is, the States Reorganisation Act. So, even when in the name of linguism, they are not in a position to adjust themselves in regard to the border areas, is it not painful for us, the people of Andhra Pradesh, the Telugu-speaking people who have been aptly described by the Prime Minister as a people with a hoary past, to separate? Therefore, we are sincerely concerned and honestly interested in preserving the integrity of Andhra Pradesh because it is not merely the question of dividing a chunk of land here and a chunk of land there, but the people are involved, their emotions are involved, their history is involved and their culture is involved. Especially, the Telugu-speaking people, as you know, Sir, form, the second largest linguistic group in the country—more than four crores of people. It will certainly be a painful task for anybody to say that such a State and such a people should be divided, not on any economic grounds but on mere political grounds. This is my humble submission.

Many people wanted to make out that the backwardness of Telangana was the reason for this agitation. No, Sir. Economic backwardness is not really responsible for this. It is all politics. If economic factors are responsible, why is there no simultaneous agitation in Vidarbha or even in the erstwhile parts of Telangana, namely in Marathwada and the Karnataka area of Hyderabad State? The present Telengana is hundred times better than those parts. Let us, therefore, forget that economic factors are the primary cause of this agitation.

[Shri K. Narayana Rao]

Now, let us try to identify as to what are the political factors. We have been trying to find a solution at that level and in times to come we are going to be one of the prosperous and glorious States of the Union of India.

Now, coming to certain of the constitutional points, take for instance the localisation. Here, I must submit that there is a lot of confusion. The hon. Member opposite has been confusing localisation with the concept of movement of people. Mr. Joshi is always welcome to Andhra Pradesh. He can come to Andhra and settle anywhere in Andhra Pradesh. He can have a right to own property. He has a right to do business. Not only this, he is most welcome to contest from any part of the country provided he belongs to my Party and we will vote for him...

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior) : He was in the Swatantra Party and now he has joined the ruling Party.

THE MINISTER OF IRRIGATION & POWER (SHRI K. C. PANT) : Therefore, he is inviting Joshiji now.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO : The concept of localisation here should not be over-exaggerated. One thing, it is not applicable to all categories of employees. It is only in the context of some of the inferior work force which has always been understood in the Six-Point formula which is applicable.

There is nothing extraordinary about it which we have been provided with. We give legal cover to what existed in the State. They cannot go for long distances. Even for a post of clerk or LDC the people cannot come to Delhi. From Sreecakulam the persons are not willing to go to Hyderabad even if they get employment. They always try to be as near their homes as possible. Therefore this concept of localisation should not worry us too much. We should not be over-exercised over this matter.

The Andhra issue has come before us several times and I hope this will be the last, Sir. But I am not reassured in this respect. I am not sure whether our understandings have been correctly translated.

I have certain things to say on this Bill. This Bill is brought forward obviously to get over certain of the difficulties. I won't say it contravenes the constitution, but it runs counter to certain provisions of the Constitution. The powers of the High Court are affected by this Bill. This difficulty is to be got over by amendment of the Constitution. In doing so, this object is frustrated. The Bill says that in matters relating to the employment, the powers of the High Court is taken away. It provides also certain special provisions. The Bill provides that under the orders of the President the State Government may specify certain category or classes of posts or specify local areas, etc. Like this he can delegate powers to the State Government. But they are not protected by this Bill and they can be questioned. Like that there are certain powers which I am afraid will come in conflict with the provisions of the Constitution. If they come in conflict, I am sure that the protection envisaged in this Bill, is not available.

Another infirmity in this Bill is this. They have been creating administrative tribunals in lieu of the high court, to exercise the powers of the high court. After the administrative tribunal passes an award or gives a decision, the Govt. can modify the verdict of the tribunal. This is wrong in principle. No cannon of jurisprudence or quasi-judicial process can be rendered subject to the executive control of the Government or the State. How can the State Govt. modify the decision of the quasi-judicial tribunal? Once State Govt. modifies or amends the award of the quasi-judicial tribunal it ceases to be quasi-judicial verdict and it becomes an executive instrument. Once it becomes executive order it becomes subject to the provisions of Article 226 of the Constitution. I have given an amendment to get over this difficulty and I have said that this reference to State Government should be deleted.

Another infirmity in this Bill is this. The powers of the High court are taken away in connection with promotion, appointments etc. But the powers of the High Court over the tribunal are not, in fact, taken away.

Similarly, the provisions under article 226 giving powers to the High Court to pronounce on the awards of the administrative tribunal are not also touched by this. Therefore, to get over that difficulty, I have tabled a specific amendment to achieve the object in view, to clause 7 of the proposed new article 371D. As I have submitted already, this would protect the provisions contained in this particular Bill and also the orders made by the President by virtue of this Bill. But any order or any scheme or any classification or any specification made by the state Government in pursuance of the orders of the President is outside the purview of the protective provisions of this Bill. With these reservations and clarifications, I support the Bill.

*SHRI Y. ESWARA REDDY (Cuddapah): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wholeheartedly give our party's support to the Constitution (Thirty-third) Amendment Bill 1973. There has been an enthusiastic welcome by the people of Andhra Pradesh after the introduction of the six-point formula. I would also like to share in this enthusiasm after the holocaust which has taken place there. It is indeed very heartening that many Members of Parliament and legislators have wholeheartedly welcomed this Bill. As a result of the six-point formula I hope the backwardness of the areas of Andhra Pradesh will be removed and more industries may be stepped up in that State. Provision has also been made for the establishment of a central University at Hyderabad which will further the educational facilities in the State. Any disputes arising in implementing this formula can be settled in a constitutional and orderly manner. Provision has also been

made to provide equitable distribution employment opportunities throughout the State. I hope the opportunity arising out of this formula would be properly utilised to develop Andhra Pradesh. I also hope that by taking this opportunity all obstacles that stelled the progress will be removed and Andhra Pradesh will be benefitted by it. It is the duty of the new Government of Andhra Pradesh who successfully implement this six-point formula.

Let us find out the reasons for the agitations which developed in Andhra Pradesh before the introduction of the six-point formula. If we do not learn a lesson from those agitations then I am afraid we have to face the same type of agitations again and again.

Why the agitation of Andhras against Andhras was started? The British regime formulated their policy of: "Let Indians fight against Indians" and brought forward the partition of India. The British by the formulation of this policy had brought disaster to India. Later on the American imperialists, world's No. 1. enemy, formulated the policy of: "Let Asians fight against Asians". With this policy Americans brought civil war in China and Indo-China. In these intrigues, their plans are understandable. But the most surprising thing is to find some Andhra leaders following almost a similar policy and making Andhras to fight among themselves, who belong to one State, speak one language and in herit same history and culture. It is really deplorable that these leaders have succumbed to this policy. This is a dangerous signal. What are the reasons for this? It is a fact that there are disparities and regional imbalances in Andhra Pradesh which have been often exploited by the trouble shooters. There is also one more reason. Since 1971, there has been a marked change in the political climate of India. Some vested interests did not like this. Hence they attempted to reverse the direction by disrupting and

*The original speech was delivered in Telugu.

[Shri Y. Eswara Reddy]

weakening democratic forces inciting regional Chauvinism. It is they who brought forward this slogan of separatism. At first the reactionary and the communal parties started this. But unfortunately later on one of the powerful factions in the Congress party took over the leadership for the cause of separation. They were bent upon to settle their scores against one another. I would like to state with all the emphasis at my command and with great pride that it is only the Communist party of India which stood like a mountain in the face of these agitations and strived for the integration of Andhra Pradesh. Every member of our party in all the 21 districts from top to bottom worked very hard for integration. I want you to take note of this fact. The Jan Sangh and Swatantra party have not much following in Andhra Pradesh. It is only because of this powerful faction of the Congress party which supported the cause of separation, the agitations had assumed dangerous proportions. Therefore, it is the Congress party that should learn a lesson from this agitation. So much progress has been halted in Andhra Pradesh, because of these elements in Congress.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We do not accept it. It is not correct.

SHRI Y. ESWARA REDDY: While the agitation was going on in Andhra Pradesh the common man and peasants and workers could not understand the reason behind the agitations. Later on they come to understand the real nature of these agitations. They found out that the public property has been destroyed, schools have been closed and a lot of damage had taken place in Andhra Pradesh. They also saw with their own eyes that this agitation was led by big landlords and businessmen. Then they found out that this movement did not belong to them and since then they stood like rock to maintain the integrity of Andhra Pradesh. The Central Government also took into account this feeling of the people of Andhra Pradesh and brought forward this six-point formula for the integration of Andhra Pradesh. It is thus

clear that because of the sufferings and sacrifices of the people alone, integration has become now an accepted fact.

While congratulating everybody who contributed for the introduction of 6-point formula I would like particularly to congratulate the poor workers, the peasants and people of Andhra Pradesh for their contribution to this cause. I would also like to congratulate the integrationists of the Congress party for having stood firmly althrough. If they too had joined their 'separatist' brothers in their party then integration would have become more difficult.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Thank you.

SHRI Y. ESWARA REDDY: If you want to implement the six-point formula successfully you should take efforts to remove the regional imbalances. Disparities should be removed. Efforts should be taken to promote industries and agricultural output. Besides these steps, measures of fundamental nature should be taken for the welfare of the people of Andhra Pradesh. If you do not take these efforts then that will again encourage the cause of separation. What are these measures? The most important thing is ceiling on landholdings as recommended by the Central Government. Secondly these lands should be distributed among the landless agricultural labourers. The wholesale trade in rice should be taken over by the Government. During the President's rule this issue was successfully shelved. Now it should be taken up. Commodities of daily use and necessities of life should be sold at controlled rates at fair price shops.

The ryots should be supplied manures, agricultural fertilizers, impliments, cement and oil at controlled rates at fair price shops. The ceiling on property Bill should be brought forward the slums in the cities should be removed. It is only when you bring forward these and similar measures, integration of Andhra Pradesh would be protected.

Since 1965 there has been virtual economic stagnation in Andhra Pradesh. There has been absolutely no progress. And in addition, these agitations have further impeded the progress. Compared with other States, Andhra Pradesh has become very backward. So many projects under construction have not been completed. For example steps should be taken to complete the Nagarjunasagar, Pochampad, Tungbhadra high level, Srisalem projects. These projects should be completed before the completion of the Fifth Five Year Plan.

As regards the backwardness of some areas in Andhra Pradesh, only lip service is being paid by the Central and State Government. No concrete action has been taken by the Government to improve the backward areas of Andhra Pradesh. Everybody knows that Rayalaseema along with Telengana is a backward area in Andhra Pradesh. It is also generally agreed that Rayalaseema is the blackest spot on the economic map of India. What has been done to Rayalaseema during the past 20 years? It is a area inhabited by 80 lakhs of people. The Central Government have not introduced any industrial progress in Rayalaseema. Even during the time of 2nd Plan period, there has been a proposal for a cement factory at yerraguntla in Cuddapah district but up till now no action has been taken in this regard. This project has been promised in elections after elections but nothing has been done so far. This remained only as an election promise. The water from the Krishna river does not flow into Rayalaseema, although it passes through it. Unless and until waters of Krishna river are diverted, famine in Rayalaseema cannot be permanently eradicated. I can cite any instances like this. There is a radio station at Cuddapah. Although it is there for the past 10 years the transmission line do not work in day time. This shows the callous indifference exhibited by the Central and State Governments against the Rayalaseema.

I would like to say a word regarding Pulivendala Channel. This is in drought affected area. Even before the project has

been started advance betterment levy has been imposed for the execution of that project. It is really astonishing how this sort of levy is imposed on a chronically drought affected area. Of course, after series of agitations, it has been abolished during President's rule. Reasons like these are responsible for encouraging separatism. Therefore I urge the Government to make special efforts in removing the chronic backwardness of Rayalaseema. So I hope that all sections of people in Andhra Pradesh will cooperate in implementing the six-point formula successfully.

Even now in Andhra Pradesh, Jana Sangh and Swatantra party are opposed to this 6-point formula. In the new Ministry of Andhra Pradesh, prominence has been given to those persons who did not support integration. Those who made sacrifices for the cause of integration have been ignored. Anyhow the Ministry has been formed and the Chief Minister is issuing bold statements and making big promises. We should now see how the things are implemented in a successful manner. In conclusion, I hope that the State Government will take all steps necessary to make the six-point formula a complete success. With these words, I support this Bill.

SHRI J. RAMESHWAR RAO (Mahbubnagar): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, if I intervene in this discussion on the Constitution (Thirty-second Amendment) Bill, I do so with a certain amount of regret and a great deal of anguish. I had the privilege of placing my views before this hon. House on the 22nd February this year on the problem that was facing Telangana and Andhra. I then recalled that on the 19th December, 1972, I had begged the Prime Minister not to proceed with the Mulki Rules Bill which later became an Act of this Parliament. It is indeed interesting to see that very same Mulki Rules Act is now going to be repealed.

It will not be fair of me to say: I told you so. I may be forgiven for saying this but had the Government acceded to my

[Shir J. Rameshwar Rao]

request not to push through the Mulki Rules Bill, we might have been saved the happenings in Andhra Pradesh which resulted in the loss of so many lives and private and public property worth crores of rupees, with all the suffering that went with it. Now that Act is being repealed. If that is all that is being done, I would not have spoken today. But what is now sought to be done is something totally different and totally contrary to the very concept of the Mulki Rules Act, even though that Act was totally inadequate. We are now proposing to delete article 371(1) from our Constitution. That article has a history and a background which is not brought out in the Statement of Objects and Reasons appended to the Bill.

It would be interesting to recall briefly the history and the background to article 371(1). The States Reorganisation Commission headed by Dr. Fazl Ali had recommended the formation of a separate Telangana State. The people of Telangana wanted a separate State. I do not want to repeat what I said in this House on 22nd February this year. I did point out why they wanted a separate State and I also pointed out that the concept of one language one State was neither historically nor currently true either in this country or outside. Apart from a very, short period of 50 or 60 years, never in history, I repeat never in history were all the Telugu speaking people in one political entity. Telangana has not been in the same political unit as the rest of Andhra Pradesh.

In spite of the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission that Telangana should be a separate State, the then Prime Minister of India, the late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru for whom I have deep love and affection and great regard, and House in its wisdom decided that Telangana need not be a separate State. But it was conceded that Telangana needed safeguards and protection and hence article 371(1) was specially introduced in the Constitution. By this clause a separate regional committee was provided for Telangana.

14.58 hrs.

[SHRI S. A. KADAR on the Chair]

The discussions and deliberations preceding this decision were interesting. Many assurances were given to the people of Telangana and a gentlemen's agreement was signed by the then leader of both Telangana and Andhra.

The assurances given to the people of Telangana were never observed. The gentlemen's agreement was treated as a scrap of paper. It would be interesting to recall that during those discussions and deliberations, Jawaharlalji gave an assurance that if after five years the people of Telangana felt that they should not or could not remain in a single State of Andhra Pradesh, they would be permitted to form a separate State.

15.00 hrs.

Clause (1) of article 371 was included against this history and background. But then, people's memories are short and Government's memory is shorter still. What is sought to be done today is to remove the last vestiges of the assurances and safeguards given to the people of Telangana and to exercise them from the Constitution of India. A number of additions are proposed to be made to the Constitution for the purpose of services, appointments, administrative tribunals and a central university. Speaking in this House on 22nd February, I had pointed out that the arguments of backwardness, lack of development and neglect of an area may be rationalisations of the deep urge and desire of a people for the recognition of their separate identity and the recognition of their separate sub-culture, that this desire was emotional and psychological and if it was not recognised, it was bound to lead to psychological scars and distort the growth of the people towards their own cultural fulfilment further that it was the very essence of democracy that this desire should be recognised and the sub-culture of a separate group be permitted to be woven

into the national pattern. What is proposed to be done today is not only not to recognise the separate identity of a sub-culture but to create a situation by removing the last vestiges of protection whereby the separate identity of Telengana will be sub-merged and lost for all time. This is my deep anguish.

The statement of objects and reasons says that this Six-point formula, so called, would help in the integration of the State and accelerate the development of backward areas. I wish it were true. I should not be considered impertinent if I say that not only will the removal of clause 1 of article 371 and the consequential additions and alterations proposed not help integration but it will only lead to the total submergence and strangulation of the separate sub-culture of Telengana. It has often been said that the demand for small States or the desire of a sub-culture group for the recognition of its separate identity represent forces of disintegration and are anti-national. Permit me, Sir, to point out that on the contrary it is the large unilingual States that may in a moment of crisis when there is a weak Central Government be tempted to become anti-national and may even go to the extent of threatening secession and inviting foreign intervention, jeopardising the very unity and integrity of this country. The unity and integrity of the country cannot depend upon a single individual, however great the individual may be. The unity and integrity of the country must be institutionalised. Small States can never be a danger to the integrity of the country. They will be completely dependent on the Central Government. This will enable the Central Government to be a strong Government, irrespective of the individual who may for the time being head it. While I concede it will not be possible for us to go back to multilingual States, I am convinced that in the interest of the integrity of the country and the strength of the Central Government, we should move forward to the idea of more than one State in a language area and thereby prevent the emergence of linguistic nationalism and

linguistic chauvinism which has been in history and will continue to be in future the disruptive factor in the Indian Union.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai) : But then they say, as a small State you cannot have a Prime Minister.

SHRI J. RAMESHWAR RAO : If you would carefully follow what I am saying, you will appreciate that small States will strengthen the Prime Minister and the Central Government.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : I am saying something different.

SHRI J. RAMESHWAR RAO : Well, I do not understand your language and, obviously, you do not understand mine. The whole question is so clear that I do not see why people do not understand it.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra is an intellectual and he should understand it better than others.

The real problem is not employment opportunities; the real problem is the deep urge of the people of Telengana to be separate. It is a psychological and emotional urge. The demand for employment opportunities is important but it is a manifestation of this deep desire for a separate identity. Emotional integration cannot come by suppression or submergence; it can only come through a feeling of equality, and the feeling of equality can come only by the recognition of the separate identity of a sub-culture, i.e. of the people of Telengana and constituting them into a separate State within the Union of India. The people of Telengana want to have a separate State with their separate sub-culture and they want recognition of this.

That alone will make emotional integration between the people of Telengana and the people of Andhra possible and also emotional integration between the people of Telengana and the people of the rest

[Shri J. Rameshwar Rao]

of the country real. Suppression and submerging a people will distort the personality of the people of Telengana and drive underground into the sub-conscious all the anger, resentment and dissatisfaction which can do no good either to the people of Telengana or to the people of India. In what form this suppression and submergence may erupt I cannot foretell, but I feel deep down within me that what is being contemplated today may lead to consequences which all of us may regret.

We are today wanting to amend the Constitution by deleting clause (1) of article 371. I would like to caution the Government not to proceed with this amendment in haste. Even if Government feel that the so-called six-point formula will work towards what they feel is the emotional integration of the people of Telengana and Andhra, there is no urgency for this amendment. The six-point formula has been put forward; it is said that it has been accepted by an overwhelming majority of the members of the legislature, how sincerely I do not know, because the majority of them were the leaders of the separatist movement a few months ago. A Government responsible to the legislature has been installed in Hyderabad. Let the Government function, let the legislature meet, let us watch what happens for a year or even two and, if events prove that the Government is right and the six-point formula is moving in the direction of emotional integration, we can at that stage amend the Constitution. Then I will be second to none in supporting it. If the six point formula does move in the right direction of emotional integration, let us at that time come to this House and ask for a constitutional amendment. One year is not a very long period to wait in the history of a country or of a nation. If we amend the Constitution in haste what reactions it will have and what consequences it will lead to, no one can foresee. If things do not work out the way Government hopes that they will, shall we then come back to this House and ask for the re-introduction of this article, or would we ask this House

to accept a separate Telengana State, I do not know. As I begged of the Prime Minister on the 19th December 1972 not to proceed with the Mulki Rules Bill, I would like through you, Sir, to beg of her and the Government of India not to proceed with this Constitution (Amendment) Bill, but let some time pass. Let us watch how things work themselves out in Andhra before amending the Constitution. If things work in the right direction, we shall always have the right to amend the constitution. But I am afraid this six-point formula will go the way of the earlier five-point formula, eight-point formula and the nine-point formula.

Let us not remove the last vestiges of protection provided for the people of Telengana because it will have an adverse effect on the people of Telengana. We are told that all the leaders in Andhra and Telengana and an overwhelming majority of the members of the legislature have accepted the six-point formula. It is very strange that some leaders take up a public posture and have a different private posture, say something quietly behind closed doors and say something outside, demand separation one day, talk of the opposite on the secondly. I do not understand all this. Only they can explain why they take different views on different days. Obviously, they do not know the deep feelings, urges and aspirations of the people of Telangana. I feel convinced that the majority of people of Telengana want a separate State within the Union of India. They will not look upon with favour this Constitution Amendment Bill.

All I say, in conclusion, is that I once again beg of this Government to postpone consideration of this Constitution Amendment Bill lest we land ourselves in greater trouble.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Before I call the next speaker, I would like to say one thing. I have been told that at about 4.30 P.M. the voting will take place. I want to know what time the Minister will be for reply to the debate.

श्री मधु लिंगम (बांका) : इस पर पूरी बहस होने दीजिये। संविधान को बिल्कुल खत्म किया जा रहा है। जल्दबाजी की कोई जरूरत नहीं है।

सभापति महाशय : 4.30 की बात हाउस ने मानी है।

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I must say that this is indeed a bad day for the country when a Bill of such tragic implications has been brought before the House.

What apparently this Government seems to think about integration is that it means integrating some separatists who could be easily won over in the Government, in the Ministry, as if the whole was about loaves and fishes of office.

Sir, you will recollect that at one time, Bihar and Bengal wanted to be united . . .

SHRI D. N. TIWARY (Gopalganj): At the time of reorganisation of States.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : . . . at the time of the reorganisation of States. Those who were at that time working under great leaders, Dr. Sri Krishan Sinha and Dr. B. C. Roy, thought that probably the interests of the people of two States lay in the reunification of Bihar and Bengal. So far as we are concerned, we are basically in favour of as great unity as possible in the country sense of emotional integration. But when we find that this Government takes a completely erroneous view of unity, we have to categorically express our views against it.

We do not think that there can be unity under duress. And this is what is being sought to be achieved. If the plea is taken that the present Legislature is mostly in favour of six-point formula, I would like to submit with all humility and deference

that this Legislature did not have a mandate to do so. This Legislature is completely out of tune with the sentiments of the people of Andhra. Those who had fought till the other day in offices, in the corridors, in the fields, are expected to come together one fine morning! Can it happen like that?

No Government can excel this wonderful Government of ours in the art of illusionment. This Government, while it can keep itself in illusion, thinks at the same time that it can feed the people perpetually on illusions. That is what is at the root of most of our troubles.

To my mind, it is like killing the State of Andhra Pradesh as a whole and also the two entities which have been fighting against each other. It is like giving an injection to a cancer patient. You know that sometimes the cancer patient towards the end of his life suffers from excruciating pains. But the doctor hesitates to administer one injection which is probably the last one that lies in the medical armoury. The doctor never administers that injection. It may well be that the injection would penable the patient to survive for six months or one year or even two years. But after that injection is administered, there is no hope of survival left. That is what the present Government is doing. They are now killing the patient; the last thing that they are seeking to do. And for what reasons? It is only because of personal reasons, because of the false prestige that the Prime Minister has come to associate with herself. She thinks that what is more important for the country is the personal image of the Prime Minister and not the interest of the people concerned in those areas. I must say as a friend of the Prime Minister—because the Prime Minister the other day gave me the privilege of being called her friend and it is my duty as a friend to tell her: "The image of the country is more important than your image. Madam Prime Minister—one has, however, nothing to say so far as your personal image is concerned".

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

So, this is something which, I think, is going to be against the very grain of our country. It is going to be against the national assumptions, the basic assumptions on which the nation is built. What you are trying to promote is a religion of 'localism'. This is the religion which the country is asked to have—the religion of localism and not the religion of nationalism. So, I would say that, even at this late stage, if the Government has got the necessary flexibility and awareness of what it is doing after many hon. members have expressed their opinion on this, they should withdraw this measure even at this late hour.

Mr. Chairman, there is another point which has been tried to be pressed home but that has not, in fact, been realised by the other side. May I submit in all humility that the Chair is also not coming to our aid as it should? To my mind, this Bill is completely untenable from the Constitutional and legal point of view. And if I am able to establish it, should the Chair tell me, 'Mr. Mishra, it is for you to go to the court and test your point of view or test the legislation or law there'. Should it be like that?

Should not the Chair exercise its discretion or judgment in this matter? Today we are celebrating the 100th Birth Anniversary of the late Vithalbhai Patel, and you would recollect that, in this very House, the late Vithalbhai Patel had ruled the Public Safety Bill out of order in spite of what the Government of the day felt in the matter. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: During the British regime.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: When the present Government behaves worse than the British Government, what are you to do, Mr. Chairman?

Sir, this is a law which is bound to be truck down by the Supreme Court. You are taking away the fundamental rights of

the citizen. You are putting barricades at every point, so that one must not have the feeling of oneness of the country. What to talk of the oneness of the country, not even oneness of the district. A germ which was confined to a small area, a thing which was a minor disease, is now sought to be converted into an epidemic. This is going to be the great contribution and achievement of this Government! And this, I say, is against the every grain of our Constitution. You are going against the basic structure of the constitution because the basic structure of our constitution is built on the fundamental rights which are available to every citizen. Only the other day the Supreme Court in the fundamental rights case decided that the Parliament had no right, no authority to go against the basic structure of the constitution. And, now the hon. Members from the other side, particularly, the Law Minister assures us that it is never the intention of the Government to go against the basic structure of the Constitution. If that is so, what does constitute the basic structure of the constitution if not the fundamental rights available to the citizen? And the fundamental rights of the citizen are being nullified in this way.

So, I would submit that this Bill is of such a nature that it should be ruled out of order by the Chair and the Chair must also protect us from being found ridiculous in the eyes of the court later on. Now, if you are able to come to the judgment that the fundamental rights are indeed being sought to be nullified, then I leave it to you as to what is your duty in the matter.

So, I am against this measure because in the first instance, I think it is against the interests of the country and in the second, it is against the interest of Andhra and lastly it is against the interest of every citizen of the country.

THE MINISTER OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI K. C. PANT): First of all I must thank those friends who

have made personal references to me in the course of their speeches. It was very gracious of them and I feel that this whole experience of dealing with Andhra friends in this matter has in itself been a very rich reward for me.

Some of the Members who spoke referred to the fact that the Bill does not provide for the development of the backward regions of Andhra Pradesh or for the removal of regional imbalances. Now, the Home Minister, in his opening statement, has made it clear that in matters of development, the constitution of a Planning and Development Board for the whole State, committees for the backward regions and matters connected herewith like assistance from the Centre—all these things would be dealt with by the State Government because they have the powers to do so and it is not necessary to include this particular aspect in the Bill. But if they would see what is known as the six point formula, they would see that the first point begins as follows :—

"Accelerated development of the backward areas of the State and planned development of the State Capital with specific resources earmarked for these purposes and appropriate association of representatives of such backward areas in the State Legislature along with other experts in the formulation and managing of development schemes for such areas should form the essential part of the development strategy of the State."

So, really this is the first of the basic points which emerged out of the discussions between the Centre and the State leaders.

Shri Jagannatha Rao Joshi, in the course of his speech, said that in the whole world to-day, the tendency was for countries to come together. He referred to the example of the ECM and, in the same breath, he did not seem to approve

of Andhra and Telangana staying together. It is a little odd for a person who appreciates the efforts of countries to build bridges and to come together in economic and other matters as also political matters should, in this instance, have chosen, either out of political necessity or otherwise—I do not know—to take the view that here it would have been better to divide the State.

The Jan Sangh itself not so long ago was a votary of larger States.

श्री मधु लिमबे : वह तो राज्यों का ही विरोधी है ।

SHRI K. C. PANT: I am not aware of that. At the moment, he is propagating this point of view. At one time they wanted larger States. Now he had shifted from larger States to smaller States, and there are some who talk of Stateless society somewhere else, heading in that way. . (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Utopian. .

SHRI K. C. PANT: The point that I am making is this. It is a simple one. When Punjab was divided the representatives of Jan Sangh said, if you divide Punjab, you are dividing the country. Now the same Jan Sangh say that if you keep this State united you are dividing the country. I don't understand this logic and I think that in his cooler moments Joshi Ji will agree on the desirability to keep the State together.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: It was together, but you have disturbed it.

SHRI K. C. PANT: So, you agree on the direction which we are taking I think Shri Esware Reddy and other friends who have supported the Bill. I heard my friend Shri Rameshwara Rao very carefully. He is an old friend of mine. I do not want to enter into any arguments with him. I only wish I could drag him away from the past and replace his pessimism with some new confidence and

[Shri K. C. Pant]

new hope for the future. Because, that is essentially the problem, and unless I can take him away from the conditional reflex he has got, I will find it very difficult to put forth my point of view across to him, as far as his speech is concerned.

I do not want to go into the historical background because that has been brought out clearly in the Home Minister's speech. I have had the privilege of being associated with the Andhra Pradesh matters for some years and I saw the agitation in Telengana at its height in 1969 and by a queer coincidence within a few years the pendulum had swung the other way completely; whereas at that time there was a cry in Telengana for separation of the State, there was a very persuasive approach in the Andhra region to keep the State together and attempts were made by Andhra friends to go out of their way to accommodate the Telengana people so that the State may stay together. Now we found the pendulum swung the other way and they who were holding such view, were asking for separation. But ultimately the Telengana friends saw that point of view of friends from Andhra and agreed to accommodate them and so we have come to have one State in Andhra Pradesh. I would like to point out that the agitation was triggered off by judicial pronouncements. I would like to remind the House that in both cases matters were settling down. Once the provisions of the Public Employment Act were struck down and that led to Telengana agitation. Now in this particular case the supreme court judgment came which uphold the Mulki rules. That triggered off an agitation. So once this whole background understood it is easier to appreciate what led to the misunderstandings both in Andhra region and Telengana. There is no doubt there were misunderstandings, passions ran high, there was anger and at a particular stage there was reluctance to listen to each other.

This was definitely there, and this House is aware of all those facts. I do not want to go into them. It is because of this

misunderstanding, this distrust and the emotional approach to problems which held sway at that time that some voices were raised advocating the desperate remedy of separation. But even at that stage, even at the height of the agitation, even those friends who spoke of separation—I do not say all of them, but the majority of them—thought of it as a desperate remedy. They were still not completely free from the influence of the great ideal of Vishala Andhra, which has inspired the Andhra people for decades. Therefore, even while on the surface they were disturbed emotionally under the surface, this ideal still had a lot of attraction for them. In those days, I found that even when the agitation was going on, friends from Andhra did accept that if a way could be found, they would like to see the State remain together. This feeling was there even at the height of the tension. This was one of the happiest features of this whole episode. I would say that this was what had made it easier, this general statesmanship on the part of the friends there; and the attraction of the ideal of Vishala Andhra which has been very much one of the emotional factors in Andhra Pradesh and in history, which Shri Rameshwar Rao seems to ignore completely, has been there. This was there in evidence, and it was this which made it possible when discussions were started, to find areas of agreement.

Discussions were started, the moment normalcy was restored after the President's rule was ushered in, and, thereafter, progressively, we found greater and greater areas of agreement. On this occasion, I would like to express most sincerely my deep gratitude to all the friends with whom I had the good fortune to hold discussions at that stage and who had discussions with the Home Minister and the Prime Minister, for the patience, for the understanding, and for the generosity with which they approached this task, with which they helped us, with which they allowed us to help them, because ultimately whatever happened was not something which we did or they did, but it had

emerged out of the discussions themselves. It is a tribute to their spirit of understanding that it emerged in this manner. I would say this about the Andhra leaders; I am glad to say it today because this is an occasion when we can take stock of the entire series of developments—I would like Mr. Giri to note this—that even at the height of emotions, the Andhra leaders did not say that they wanted to take away what was rightfully belonging to Telengana. . .

SHRI S. B. GIRI : They had already taken away during the last so many years.

AN HON. MEMBER : He should not interrupt in this manner.

SHRI S. B. GIRI: I have every right to interrupt.

SHRI K. C. PANT : He has every right to interrupt, but it would be better if he interrupted in a manner which was understandable. The only point that I was making, and which is an important point, is that the Andhra leaders told us repeatedly. . . .

SHRI S. B. GIRI: The Congress leaders.

SHRI K. C. PANT: The Congress leaders, certainly. Does he hold against them? They told us repeatedly that they were not interested in taking away from any section of the people of Andhra Pradesh what was their due, what they could equitably ask for; they did not say that; and when it came even to the matter of employment or development, their insistence was on the principle of uniformity. They said that it should be the uniform in all parts of the State and there should be no discrimination in favour of or against any part of the State. This was the main point that they were insisting upon, and they did not say 'Please see that the Telengana people got less of employment or development or anything else for that matter, and this was the basis on which we later on developed this formula. The Telengana leaders also took a very big, and if I may say so, statesman like view of the problem. They were certainly interested

in safeguarding the interests of the people of Telengana. They were not unaware of the history or background of this question and the need to pay special attention to the problems of Telengana. But they knew, as my friend, knows, that the repeated interpretation of the Mulki Rules by the courts had made it difficult to understand what benefit had occurred to Telengana in all these years. He knows very well that according to the latest High Court judgment, a person born in Telengana is not a Mulki, that a person who has come from outside and stayed for 15 years in Telengana and did not propose to go back is a Mulki. It is only by virtue of residence can he be a Mulki, not by virtue of birth or marriage. Obviously, this is something which my friend would never accept.

So we have come to a point in this whole matter where I think Telengana leaders were only right in trying to see that a solution to their problems lay within the framework of an integrated State and within the framework of greater understanding between the people of the different regions of the State. For this a fresh approach was necessary.

I will remind him of something down to earth; it also matters. That is, the Rs. 45 crores which had been given as a special fund by the Bhargava Committee had been exhausted and the Telengana Regional Committee did not have any extra funds for the development of that region.

SHRI S. B. GIRI: It is Congressmen who have brought this out. Shri Chokka Rao as the Chairman of the Regional Committee brought out the fact that Rs. 110 crores of Telengana surplus was taken away to Andhra. It has been accepted even by the Regional Committee Congressmen, I do not speak of other parties. Then came the 8-point formula evolved by the Prime Minister. The Bhargava Committee had said that it is not Rs. 110 crores but Rs. 45 crores had been taken away.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Anyway, the Bhargava Committee went into the question and came up with a certain recommendation of which my friend is not unaware. Attempts were made by some friends both in Andhra and Telengana to reopen this matter. It was not reopened. The findings of that Committee were accepted *in toto*. So I do not think we need go into that at this stage.

The third point on which all were agreed was the need to give special attention to backward areas of the State. Today reference was made by Shri Venkatasubaiiah. Shri Reddy and other friends to the backward regions in the State, particularly to Rayalaseema, presumably because most of them come from Rayalaseema. But slowly as other friend also speak, you will find that even in the so called forward areas of Andhra Pradesh, there are backward pockets.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): What is he indicating? Because they have come from that area, that is a backward area?

SHRI K. C. PANT: The fact that there are regional imbalances was accepted by friends from Andhra also. All of them were very keen that all the backward regions should be developed. I do not recall one member from Andhra who had at any stage stated that Telengana is not a backward region and should not be given assistance to develop. I do not recall one friend from Telengana who claimed that Telengana was the only backward region in Andhra. There were other areas which also needed special assistance for development. Therefore, these were the basic, common areas of agreement. We tried to go into the areas of agreement, to identify the points of difference and slowly to evolve some kind of agreement on that basis.

One of the points which agitated the minds of people in Andhra Pradesh has been the preference given to Telengana people in the matter of public service

under the Mulki Rules. Some friends have said—I think it was Shri Mishra who has gone out and some others; I think Shri Madhu Limaye was about to say it—that by localising services, you are creating barriers and perhaps extending the principle of the Mulki Rules to other areas.

The point is we are not writing on a clean slate. This is a problem all over the country. People do want employment near their own houses or near their own homes to the extent possible. Particularly when we think of low-paid services, certainly all over the country people want that they get employment near their homes; they want to avoid two establishments if possible. I would say that even today, if one went into the position of low-paid employees anywhere in the country, any district, you would find that most of them are probably from that district or from that area. This is a matter of fact anywhere, and I think by administrative arrangements, practices, procedures, this problem could be taken care of formally. In the public sector undertakings, as the House knows, there is always a demand that the local people should get employment, and for posts below a pay of Rs. 500 the local people are given some preference. All these things can be done administratively, but here, we were faced with a situation in which in the past certain preferences had been given and people had become accustomed to a certain kind of reservation. Today, you may say "why you have continued this and you should have done away with this." It is simply not possible because we are not writing on a clean slate. And, therefore, we had to take into account the realities of the history of Andhra Pradesh and the manner in which the preferences for public services had grown and the fact that even today the people there wanted this to continue. What we have done here is that instead of preferences being applicable only to the people in Telangana, the same kind of preferences are being made applicable all over. In other words, there is

no discrimination in any part of the State, in any district, in any division. There will be no discrimination now, and we hope this will create a climate of understanding and harmony that is necessary. This is the background against which the provisions in relation to the public services have been included in the Bill.

Sir, I would also like the House to know that in Andhra Pradesh, arrangements for district-level recruitment for certain categories of posts have been earlier instituted, and the people and the administration were familiar with the implications of these arrangements. In other words, this is not something which we have introduced with which the people there are completely unfamiliar. This has been going on in one form or another. I think Mr. Narayana Rao referred to the fact that what we are doing is to give legal cover to the existing practice. That is what it really comes to.

Here, I would refer to another aspect which came out in the speeches of some hon. friends and that is, that we are creating watertight compartments; that is not so. In fact, if they study the elaboration of the six-point formula, this has been spelt out. The reservation will not be 100 per cent at any level. Even in Class IV posts the reservation will be 80 per cent, and for the 20 per cent, people can come from anywhere and compete for these posts. Similarly, for the gazetted posts, preference for the local candidates would be confined to 60 per cent only, and for the 40 per cent, people can come from anywhere and compete on an equal basis. So, mobility has not been excluded, and this is an important point on which there was agreement among the leaders of Andhra and Telangana. Among the gazetted posts, it is not as if all the gazetted posts are covered by preferences. It is only three gazetted posts which are covered by the preferences, and these are, Assistant Civil Surgeons, Junior Engineers and Tahsildars. These are the only three posts which are covered. I would like the House to understand this

because they should not run away with the impression that the whole thing has been done in a manner which will create watertight compartments which it does not do. Regionalisation of services which has been done is again something which has been done in Andhra Pradesh earlier also. This will ensure certain promotion benefits or preferences on a regional basis. Transfers from one district to another, from one division to another are also possible, in public interest or exigencies of public administration. This is again something which has been agreed to by the leaders of Andhra and Telangana.

Then, there are educational facilities. Everywhere the demand for new universities is growing. One has to understand it here in a particular background. In Andhra Pradesh there are three universities, one each in Rayalaseema, Telangana and Andhra. But there are certain restrictions prevalent today, namely, preferences on the basis of the local people in the matter of admission to Government colleges. The idea now is that these restrictions should be uniform. The other idea is that there should be a Central University in Hyderabad. Apart from other things, Hyderabad is a cosmopolitan city. Not only people from Andhra, Telangana and Rayalaseema live there, but people from other States also live there, many of them working in public sector undertakings. Even otherwise it is a city of culture; it is one of our great cities and it attracts people from all over the country. It is perhaps good that it should develop to its maximum capacity and this will be possible if a Central University is provided for education of the people coming from all over the country. This was one of the strong arguments and reasons in favour of putting up a Central University there. It is our hope that this Central University will be a focus for national integration in that part of the country and for the integration of the various parts of the State.

With regard to the question of development, I should like to assure hon. friends

[Shri K. C. Pant]

that the development of the backward regions of Andhra Pradesh is according to the Central Government one of the necessities of the situation; it has to be done and we recognise it. In fact the first of the six point formula refers to this matter. Attempts which have so far been made to develop the backward regions whether through the Rayalaseema Development Board or Telangana Regional Committee, have not given full satisfaction. But I should say that no development board anywhere in the country has given full satisfaction. There are backward regions in all parts of the country and one has to recognise this fact that ultimately whether it is employment or development of the backward regions, backward areas in Andhra Pradesh will also get over their problems to the extent that India can grow and develop and create resources that are required for the development of the backward regions.

In our discussions we did feel that additional resources would have to be given from the Centre for the development of the backward regions and that a planning board will have to be created for the whole State and under it development committees for each of the backward regions. We have accepted this. Work is going on, on this. For specific backward regions, assistance would be earmarked, that means special Central assistance and it cannot be diverted by the State for any other purpose; it would have to be spent for the purpose in view in the backward regions. Backward regions would need to be identified. We went into the problem during our discussions and we felt that it was not possible straightaway to identify backward regions. The Planning Commission will have to be involved and certain criteria would have to be applied. It is not enough to say that Telengana is a backward area or Rayalaseema is a backward area. There are pockets in the Circars which are also backward. There is no reason why they should also not be assisted in a special manner when we are assist-

ing the whole State. These are the provisions that are there in the six-point formula and as I said, the Centre and the State will now strive to give effect to them.

The last point I want to touch upon is with regard to the possibility of repercussions, of which Joshiji spoke. He had repercussions of one kind in view. He completely ignored the fact that if there was bifurcation in Andhra Pradesh, there could possibly be repercussions of another kind also. It could have triggered off similar demands in different parts of the country and other States could also have become embroiled in the same kind of agitations, demands and counter-demands for bifurcation. At a time when all our energies are to be devoted to getting over our immediate economic or social problems, whether it would be a wise thing to allow many States to get embroiled in disputes of this kind is a point to ponder over. I personally think this is not the time when our energies should be diverted from the main task of economic growth and development. Then, if something has got to be done which is right and which is in the interests of the people of Andhra Pradesh and the country, regardless of the repercussions, Government has to go ahead with it. It is in that spirit that these provisions have been made in the Bill and it is in that spirit that we have come today before the House.

It is very gratifying for me to be given this chance to speak on this Bill. I was at one stage deeply immersed in it. When I recall, as Shri Venkatasubbaiah did, the kind of violence which was prevalent in Andhra Pradesh not so long ago, the kind of daily information we got of firing, shooting, trains being burnt, people not being allowed to move about etc., it is almost a miracle today that we are standing here with this Bill, after the leaders of Andhra and Telengana had agreed to a formula for continuing the State as an integrated State, that President's rule has ended, that a new popular Government has taken over in the State and today we can

look forward with some hope and confidence to the proper implementation of the six-point formula, so that the State can be kept together. I would be failing in my duty if I do not express my thanks to the Governor, the officers, Mr. Sarin and Mr. Rao, Mr. Sarin in particular with whom I was in touch, for the splendid job that they did in a very critical time. I would express my gratification at the wide welcome that this formula has received here and the overwhelming support which it has received in the State. It is no use Mr. Reddy saying that this was supported by Congress leaders when he also stands up and supports the same. This is an indication of the sweep of support from him, from the CPI(M) friends and others. This is the time for us to convey our best wishes to the State of Andhra Pradesh and I can assure them that the Centre would continue in every possible way to help the State to get over the problems and difficulties that may still remain after this Bill is passed.

SHRI H. M. PATEL (Dhandhuka): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I realise why this amending Bill is necessary, but I am not at all certain about the future of the six-point formula, which has been arrived at, which the Government of Andhra Pradesh propose to give effect to, and to enable them to do which this Bill has been brought forward. What I am afraid of is the repercussions of the arrangements which this Bill provides for upon the conditions in other States.

Upto now, we have had linguistic States; now we are proceeding to have virtually districtwise arrangements; worse, we are virtually having employment reserved for the people belonging to a district. The definition of words like "local" have not yet been made clear. It is difficult to see what the difference is between the expressions "local" and "mulki". For all practical purposes they will mean the same thing.

The Constitution has provided that an Indian may move from one part of the

country to another and be eligible for employment, for pursuing business, in any part of the country. Now that is going to be replaced by saying that employment in each district will be open only to the residents of that district. It may be that this may not be something which other States may welcome, but, as has happened before, it may happen again and they may follow suit. This particular point in the six-point formula is a potentially dangerous point that has been agreed upon.

I can only hope that the Andhra Pradesh Government will find it possible to work this arrangement in practice. My fear is that it is going to create precisely the same difficulties because of which troubles arose before under the five-point formula. There is very little difference between what was previously provided and what is now provided. The dice still seems to be loaded against the Andhra Pradesh area, as against the Telengana area. I would not be surprised if the residents of the Andhra Pradesh districts find that they are debarred from many things to which they were entitled to before.

The definition of "backward areas" has not been indicated and, therefore, it is difficult to say precisely how that provision will work. There is an apprehension that Hyderabad and surrounding areas would probably receive by far a major share of the developmental funds as compared to the other areas, which also stand in need of such development.

In other words, this agreement which has made possible the reinstatement of a representative Government in Andhra Pradesh may be welcome from that point of view that it has at any rate led to the termination of President's Rule and has brought in once again a democratic government formed by the representatives of that State. From that point of view, we may welcome the evolution of this formula. But this formula from all other points of view seems to me to be full of potential dangers not only to Andhra Pradesh but also to the rest of India.

[Shri H. M. Patel]

16.00 hrs.

In Andhra Pradesh, I think, there is every apprehension that it may not work however optimistically one may view the situation today, however optimistically the case for the six-point formula has been presented by the Government. A very large section of people in Andhra Pradesh remain dissatisfied. They are only waiting for a suitable opportunity to come out, once again, in protest against what has been arranged today.

I can, therefore, only sound this note of warning that these are the two provisions, special arrangements for backward areas and district-wise restrictions of employment, which are likely to create many difficulties hereafter. The administrative tribunal is a device which to my mind is not at all an unsatisfactory device. But it has never been worked in this country before. Therefore, one can only hope that it will be worked in the spirit in which it has been designed to work it.

I do not wish to say more except to express the hope that effective as the six-point formula is from many points of view, it will be possible to work it, to bring to an end the dispute and that it will help in making possible the working of a democratic Government in Andhra Pradesh.

I have pointed out the dangers that lie in this whole arrangement. Nevertheless, one hopes that it will work.

प्रो. एम. रामगोपाल रेड्डी (निजामाबाद) : सभापति जी, हमारे माननीय श्याम वावू ने अपना भाषण इन अल्फाज से शुरू किया कि this is a very bad day.

मैं भी कहता हूँ कि हकीकत में यह बँड डे है। बँड डे देश के वास्ते नहीं, बल्कि विरोधी दलों के वास्ते है। विरोधी दल यह चाहते थे कि आन्ध्र में हमेशा टंशन रहे, भगड़ रहे, कोई सरकार वहाँ न बन सके, कोई अच्छा काम न हो ताकि उन को एक, आध सीट मिल सके। अब आन्ध्र में नॉर्मलसी आयी है और

अच्छी और मजबूत सरकार बनी है तो उन को दिल्ली तकलीफ हो रही है। हमारे देश में वकीकस्मात से अपोजीशन का भगड़ फसाद में वेंस्टेड इंटरस्ट रह गया है। कोई रचनात्मक काम करने को नहीं है। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि देश में सिर्फ रोज स्टेट ही बनेगी, और नई नई स्टेट पैदा करना फिर उन को तोड़ना, फिर डिवीजन करना क्या यही काम रह गया है? मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि मुल्क में कितनी स्टेट्स बनायी जायें? एक दफा एक एक्सपर्ट कमेटी ने स्टेट्स का रीआर्गनाइजेशन किया, उस के बाद यह भगड़ा खल्ल हो जाना चाहिये। अगर आन्ध्र और तेलंगाना में लोग यह समझते हैं कि बहुत से डिफरेंसज हैं तो मध्य भारत में 200,300 स्टेट्स कैसे एक साथ हैं और वहाँ सरकार अच्छी तरह से चल रही है? फिर आन्ध्र प्रदेश में ही क्यों भगड़े हो रहे हैं? मंसूर महाराष्ट्र में क्यों नहीं होते। सिर्फ आन्ध्र प्रदेश में ही क्यों होते हैं? यह इस वास्ते हो रहा है कि... (व्यवधान)

राजा रामेश्वर राव ने कहा है, उन के तिके कोई शक नहीं कर सकता है और वह जो सही समझते हैं वही चीज कहते हैं, मगर उन का यह कहना कि तेलंगाना का एक सत्र-कल्चर है मैं माननीय जगनाथराव जोशी जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वह इस को मानने वाले हैं? पूरे भारतवर्ष का एक ही कल्चर है। यह कहना कि आन्ध्र और तेलंगाना का अलग-अलग कल्चर है, यह गलत है। आन्ध्र ही, तेलंगाना ही या रायलसीमा ही, इन सब का एक ही कल्चर है और वह हमेशा से सम्पूर्ण भारत के कल्चर से मिलाजुला रहा है। राजा रामेश्वर राव जैसे पढ़े लिखे आदमी का यह कहना ठीक नहीं है। वहाँ के लोगों में कोई फर्क नहीं है। हमारे कम्युनिस्ट मंत्री पूछ रहे हैं कि भगड़ा किन में हुआ, क्यों हुआ? भगड़ा उन लोगों में हुआ जो ऊपर के 5 परसेंट हैं। 95 परसेंट लोगों को भगड़े से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है।... (व्यवधान) लाखों में नहीं वहाँ हजारों में जरूर है, और हजार 5 परसेंट से भी कम होते हैं। यह मैं कहना चाहता हूँ।

अभी जो 6 सूत्री फॉर्मूला है वह अच्छा है और देश और स्टेट के हित में है। अब सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से जो यूनिवर्सिटी कायम की जा रही है, जिस को हमने कभी मांगा नहीं था। लेकिन केंद्रीय सरकार अपनी तरफ से एक सेंट्रल यूनिवर्सिटी हैदराबाद में कायम कर रही है। उस के लिये मैं सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट और गृह मंत्री को मुबारकवाद देता हूँ, और चाहता हूँ कि यह सेंट्रल यूनिवर्सिटी हिन्दी की हो क्योंकि अभी तक हमारे पास अंग्रेजी और तेलगू माध्यम की यूनिवर्सिटीज मौजूद हैं। सेंट्रल यूनिवर्सिटी सिर्फ हिन्दी की होनी चाहिये। अगर हिन्दी की यूनिवर्सिटी कायम हो जाय तो उस से देश की एकता बढ़ेगी।

राजा रामेश्वर राव की धरारी यह थी कि छोटी छोटी स्टेट्स होने से सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट मजबूत होती है और हमारा इंट्रेंशन बढ़ता है। मैं उन से कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत-वर्ष में हर आदमी देश की इंट्रिग्रिटी में विश्वास रखता है। हजारों साल से हम इस श्लोक को पढ़ते चले आ रहे हैं—आसेत्, हिमाचल पर्यन्तम्। यानी कश्मीर से ले कर कन्याकुमारी तक यह मेरा देश है। तां लोगों को किसी तरह का शक नहीं करना चाहिये। हम इंट्रिग्रिटी चाहते हैं। कोई भी नहीं चाहता देश से अलग हो जायें। जो डी. एम. के. पार्टी देश से अलग होने की बात करत थे वह इंट्रिग्रिटी में सब से आगे हैं। तां इंट्रिग्रिटी को कोई धक्का नहीं पहुँचने वाला है। आन्ध्र प्रदेश मौजूदा सूरत में रहे तो देश की इंट्रिग्रिटी भी मौजूद रहती है।

यह कह कर मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ।

प्रो. मधु दंडवत (राजापुर) : सभापति महोदय, सीवधान में तरमीम करने के लिए जो विधेयक इस सदन में पेश किया गया है उसका आधार छः सूत्री योजना है। लेकिन मेरी यह निश्चित राय है और बड़े अदब के साथ मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कोई भी यूनिवर्सिटी या आधार इस बिल का हो लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि पिछले चन्द वर्षों में सरकार

के सियासी दिमाग में जो कुछ भाँति रही है उस भाँति का एक अच्छा सूत्र इस विधेयक के जरिये हमें मिलता है।

सभापति महोदय, आप तो जानते ही हैं कि चन्द साल पहले जिस का अंग्रेजी में कहा जाता है जेंटलमैनज एग्रीमेंट, शरीफ लोगों का समझौता, वह हुआ था। उसके आधार पर काम करने की कांशिश हुई थी। लेकिन उसके बाद पांच सूत्री एक योजना आई। उसके बाद अब हम देखते हैं कि छः सूत्री योजना हमारे सामने रखी गई है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सब कुछ करत वक्त सरकार यह नहीं समझती है कि जनता की जो आकांक्षाएँ हैं, उनके साथ वह गद्दारी कर रही है। वह नहीं जानता चाहिये। आखिर में सवाल यह है कि तेलंगाना और आंध्र ये दो अलग राज्य क्यों होने चाहिये। इसके बारे में जो दलील पेश की गई हैं, जो विचार रखा गया है, उस पर सरकार ध्यान देने को तैयार नहीं है। मैं इस सदन का ध्यान इस ओर खींचना चाहता हूँ कि आज जिन लोगों ने आंध्र की तकसीम की मांग रखी है, उसका मुतालिबा किया है उसका आधार क्या है, इस पर आप विचार करें। क्या वे चाहते हैं कि दो राज्य बनने चाहिये। उसका जो आधार है उसकी छांज आपको करनी है। जब तेलंगाना में भूदान आन्दोलन विनाबा भावे जी ने शुरू किया था उस वक्त उन्होंने जो तकरीर की थी, उसकी तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ। आज तेलंगाना का जो पिछड़ापन है उसके लिए विरोधी दल या उसके नेता जिम्मेदार नहीं हैं, वह उनके दिमाग की उपज नहीं है। लेकिन वहाँ हालात ऐसे हैं कि तेलंगाना की जनता समझने पर मजबूर हो जाती है कि हमारे खून से, हमारे पसिने से जो धन पैदा होता है वह हमारे विकास के लिए इस्तेमाल नहीं किया जाता है। यह जो तेलंगाना की आज दलील है, उसकी तरफ सरकार का ध्यान नहीं है। विनाबा जी ने पहली मर्तबा भूदान आन्दोलन शुरू करत वक्त तेलंगाना की भूमि में जब प्रवेश किया तो उन्होंने इसकी ओर इशारा किया था और चंतावनी भी दी थी कि अगर तेलंगाना के पिछड़े-

[प्रो. मधु दंडवत]

पन को तरफ ध्यान नहीं दिया जाएगा तो हो सकता है कि तेलंगाना की जनता आगे चल कर बग़ावत करने के लिए मजबूर हो जाए। यह चेतनावनी विनाबा जी ने जो गांधी वादी नेता हैं, जो शान्ति और अमन के रास्ते पर चलने वाले नेता हैं, उन्होंने दी थी। लेकिन उसकी तरफ भी आपने ध्यान नहीं दिया। वहाँ की जनता के पिछड़पन को दूर करने के लिए, उस इलाके का विकास करने के लिए कोई रास्ता आपने नहीं निकाला। तब उन लोगों ने, वहाँ की जनता ने समझा कि डकटू रहे कर हमारी तरक्की नहीं हो सकती है इस वास्ते अच्छा होगा कि तेलंगाना का अलग राज्य बन जाए।

उन्होंने जब आन्ध्र की तकसीम की मांग की तो इस देश की एकता का नारा लगाने वाले, सही नारा नहीं लेकिन भूटा नारा लगाने वाले, कुछ नेताओं ने इलजाम लगाया कि तेलंगाना के लोग, वहाँ के नेता देश का विभाजन करना चाहते हैं, देश का विभाजन करने वाले लोग हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि किसी राज्य की पुनर्रचना की मांग करना, उसकी तकसीम की मांग करना यह देश की तकसीम की मांग करना नहीं है। हमने जब संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र और महागुजरात की मांग की थी उस वक्त भी ऐसे तथ्याकीथत राष्ट्रवादी नेता थे जिन्होंने कहा था कि महाराष्ट्र के नेता आज विभाजन की तरफ जा रहे हैं और हम लोगों ने उस वक्त भी यह कहा था कि लोकमान्य तिलक का महाराष्ट्र और महात्मा गांधी के नेतृत्व में आगे बढ़ने वाला गुजरात दूसरे लोगों से राष्ट्रवाद का सबक लेना नहीं चाहता है। हम लोगों ने कहा था कि भाषा के आधार पर हम चाहते हैं कि हमारे राज्य की रचना हो। उसके मुताबिक हम तकसीम चाहते थे पुरानी बम्बई स्टेट की। आज उसी प्रकार की तकसीम की मांग तेलंगाना वालों ने की है।

आज कहा जाता है कि जब जबान के आधार पर जब आन्दोलन हुआ और जबान के आधार पर वह राज्य बन गया तो आज फिर उलटी गंगा क्यों बहा रहे हैं। यह कहा जाता है कि द्विभाषी

या बहुभाषी राज्यों को तोड़ कर जब एक भाषी राज्य बनाए गए हैं तो अलग तेलंगाना और अलग आंध्र की मांग क्यों की जा रही है। जहाँ तक जबान के आधार पर प्रान्तों की रचना का सम्बंध है, मैं इसका विरोधी नहीं हूँ। भाषा के आधार पर राज्य बनने चाहिये। लेकिन इस सिद्धान्त का आधार यह नहीं रहा है कि एक भाषा वाले एक से अधिक राज्य नहीं हो सकते हैं। उत्तर प्रदेश हिन्दी भाषा-भाषी है, बिहार भी है, राजस्थान भी है, मध्य प्रदेश भी है। इन सब हिन्दी भाषा-भाषियों का एक राज्य बन, यह आधार नहीं हो सकता है। एक भाषा बोलने वालों के भी अलग-अलग राज्य हो सकते हैं। तेलगु भाषा भाषियों के भी दो राज्य हो सकते हैं। इसके हक में आवाज उठाना मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि कोई बुरी बात है। मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि भाषावार प्रान्तों की मांग को मुखालिफत करना है—

श्री नरेंद्र कुमार सालूब (बेतूल) : संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र की मांग का आधार क्या था ?

प्रो. मधु दंडवत : भाषा के आधार पर राज्यों की रचना होनी चाहिये। संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के मामले में हमने इस आधार को माना, पंजाब में भी इसी आधार को माना। लेकिन इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि एक भाषा बोलने वालों के दो राज्य नहीं हो सकते हैं। अगर एक भाषा भाषी लोग एक राज्य में नहीं रह सकते हैं, किसी का विकास नहीं हो पाता है, कोई पिछड़ा रह जाता है तो उनकी सुविधा के लिए दो राज्य बन सकते हैं, आर्थिक आधार पर बन सकते हैं।

यह भी कहा जाता है कि अगर तेलंगाना राज्य बन जाएगा तो छोटे छोटे राज्य बनाने की आवाज उठने लग जाएगी—

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO: What about border disputes? Please rationally explain them.

प्रो. मधु दंडवत : मैंने उस पर चर्चा की मांग की थी लेकिन आपने कहा कि नहीं होनी चाहिये। हर सवाल का जवाब देने के लिए मैं तैयार हूँ। मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि मैं आपकी अपोजीशन की वजह से दबने वाला नहीं, आपकी आवाज से दबने वाला नहीं।

सभारत महोदय : आप इरलेण्ड सवाल का जवाब क्यों देते हैं ?

प्रो. मधु दंडवत : आपने कहा है कि इरलेण्ड बात है। अब मैं उसका जिक्र नहीं करना चाहता हूँ।

यह कहा जाता है कि अगर तेलंगाना और आंध्र अलग अलग राज्य बन गए तो छोटे छोटे राज्य बनने शुरू हो जायेंगे और ये दोनों छोटे राज्य होंगे। तब क्या आर्थिक स्थिरता इनमें आ सकती है जिसका अंग्रेजी में इकॉनॉमिक वायाविलिटी कहा जाता है, वह हंगी? मैं आप से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इस देश में पहले से और भी छोटे-छोटे राज्य नहीं हैं? मणिपुर है, त्रिपुरा है, गाँवा जैसी सेंट्रली एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव स्टेट है। दूसरी तरफ मध्यालय है, नागालैंड है। जब इन राज्यों का जिक्र किया जाता है तो उनके छोटेपन का कोई जिक्र नहीं करता है लेकिन जब तेलंगाना और आंध्र के दो अलग राज्य बनाने की मांग की जाती है उस वक्त आर्थिक स्थिरता की बात आप कहते हैं। मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपने जिस सूत्र को ले कर आगे बढ़ने की कोशिश की है इस सूत्र के आधार पर कुछ नहीं हो सकता है। जनतंत्र में जनता की जो राय है उसका प्राथमिकता मिलनी चाहिये। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि तेलंगाना और आंध्र की जनता ने जो आन्दोलन किया क्या उस आन्दोलन के जरिये जनता की आकांक्षाओं का आपको सबूत नहीं मिला। मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब संवैधानिक रूप में क्रान्ति हुई थी और जो फॉजी लोग यद्दुधभूमि से हट गए थे और जारशाही के विरुद्ध क्रांतिकारियों का जिन्होंने साथ दिया था उनके बारे में लेनिन ने कहा था कि इन फॉजी लोगों ने अपने पैरों से क्रान्ति के हक में मतदान किया है। तेलंगाना और आंध्र की जनता ने सत्याग्रह के जरिये, आन्दोलनों के जरिये सरकार के खिलाफ आवाज बुलन्द की और अपने साथ बहुमत का क्रिया और सत्ताया कि जनता की राय क्या है।

बार बार इस सदन में मैंने और दूसरे कई सदस्यों ने यह मांग की है कि आंध्र के अन्दर

जो चार बड़े इलैकशंस पॉइंटिंग हैं, उपचुनाव पॉइंटिंग है अगर आप में हिम्मत है तो उनको कराइयें। द्वितीय दल के लोगों की यह मांग रही है और उनका कहना यह रहा है कि अगर इनका करवा दिया जाए तो आपको यह पता चल जाए कि वहाँ की जनता की राय क्या है। लेकिन ये उपचुनाव पॉइंटिंग के पॉइंटिंग रहे उसी तरह में जिस तरह से बांडर डिस्प्टिस पॉइंटिंग रहे। आपने इनका इस वास्ते नहीं कराया क्योंकि आपको मालूम था कि इतने बड़े आन्दोलन के बाद अगर इनका कराया जाता है तो शायद कांग्रेस पार्टी के खिलाफ ये चले जाएँ।

पन्त जी ने कहा है कि बड़ी खुरी की बात है कि आंध्र और तेलंगाना के नेताओं ने एक जगह पर बैठ कर एक सूत्र बना दिया है, एक योजना बनाई है। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि एक बड़ी गलती हमारी सरकार कर रही है। पन्त साहब कह रहे हैं। फासिस्ट मुल्कों में समझा जाता है कि पार्टी की एकता और देश दोनों एक चीज है। यह गलती कम्युनिस्ट राष्ट्रों में हो सकती है, फासिस्ट राष्ट्रों में हो सकती है लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान में जो कि एक जनतंत्रीय देश है, लोगों को कभी यह नहीं समझना चाहिये कि कांग्रेस पार्टी के चन्द नेता एक स्थान पर बैठ कर, इकट्ठे बैठ कर कोई योजना बनाते हैं तो वह जनता की योजना है। यह योजना कांग्रेस के नेताओं ने बनाई। आप में हिम्मत हो तो बिल पास करवाने से पहले आप ये जो चार उपचुनाव आपने रांक रखे हैं, मुल्लवी कर रखे हैं इनका करवाइयें। आपको पता चल जाएगा कि वहाँ की जनता की राय क्या है। उसका समझने की आप कोशिश करें। जब तक आप यह नहीं करते हैं तब तक आप यह नहीं कह सकते हैं कि जनता की राय छः सूत्री योजना के हक में है। तब आप यह दावा नहीं कर सकते हैं। जनता ने अपनी राय आन्दोलनों के जरिये तथा अन्य मांगों से व्यक्त की है इस वास्ते यह ज्यादा मुनासिब होगा कि विधेयक को पास करवाने के बजाय आप जनता की राय समझ लें। मैं समझता हूँ कि एक तरह से वह आपीनियन पाल हो जाएगा और

[प्रो. मधु दंडवते]

यह ऑपिनीयन पोल आप आन्ध्र के अन्दर करवाना चाहते हैं तो आप हिम्मत दिखाइयें और जो पॉइंडिंग बाई इलैक्शन हैं उनको कराइयें, वहाँ की जनता की राय को जानियें। इलैक्शन के जरिये तथा अन्य साधनों के जरिये अगर जनता की आंर से यह व्यक्त हो जाता है कि वह छः सूत्री योजना के साथ हैं तो मंत्री राय कुछ भी हो लेकिन अगर जनता की राय उसके हक में जाती है तो मैं उसकी ताईद करने के लिए तैयार हूँ। क्योंकि आखिर जनता की आशाएँ और आकांक्षाएँ ज्यादा महत्वपूर्ण हैं।

आखिर मैं मंत्री प्रार्थना है कि सरकार यह विधेयक मंजूर करने के बजाये उन चार बाई-इलैक्शन को कराये और वहाँ ऑपिनीयन पोल करे। वह जनता की राय-चन्द कांफ्रेंसी नेताओं की राय नहीं-हासिल करने के बाद इस बारे में आगे बढ़े।

SHRI B. V. NAIK: Opinion poll does not give hundred per cent opinion. Only a small section gives the opinion poll.

प्रो. मधु दंडवते : जब ये लोग चुन कर आते हैं, तो कहते हैं कि हमारे पास मींसव मॉन्टे है, और जब हम आन्ध्र प्रदेश में उप-चुनाव कराने की मांग करते हैं, तो कहते हैं कि इलैक्शन में मंजोरिटी की ऑपिनीयन सामने नहीं आती है।

चूंकि ऑपिनीयन पोल नहीं हुआ है, इस लिये मंत्री महांदय ने जो विधेयक रखा है, मैं उसकी पूरी मुखालिफत करता हूँ।

SHRI P. NARASIMHA REDDY (Chittoor): At a time when this August House as well as the Central Government are making historic efforts to maintain the integrity of the State of Andhra Pradesh in a proper and conducive atmosphere, it is regrettable that some friends on the other side had chosen to make some out-of-the-place remarks. I am sorry to say that Shri Easwara Reddy had said that in the State Cabinet that had been inducted into power

after the lifting of President's rule, several separatists had been accommodated. Friends from that party or friends like him still think in terms of discriminating between separatism and integration. I do not know what sort of moral support they can lend to this effort at integration of the State. I would very much request that just as the Central Government leaders as well as the State Government leaders and Shri Vengal Rao have risen rightly above such petty considerations in an effort to carry everybody and every party and large sections of the people onwards to the goal of a fully integrated State of Andhra Pradesh, it behaves everybody, and it behaves every part and every person to lend his moral and material support and co-operate in every way to make a success of the effort that we have embarked upon.

I would like to share my apprehensions along with my friend Shri Narayana Rao regarding the exact clauses that have been incorporated in the Bill. When this attempt at an integrated State was being made, in fact, I was wondering why resort was not had to clause 2 of article 371 which is applicable in respect of Maharashtra to which State large chunks of the Telengana territory had acceded along with Andhra Pradesh. That clause and the provisions thereof would have sufficed to implement the intended purpose covered by the six-point formula. In fact, I hoped that while deleting clause 1 of article 371, we could have expanded clause 2 of that article to include Andhra Pradesh and make some similar arrangements for development committees, for educational opportunities and for employment opportunities, the three exact requirements which we are seeking to provide for in this amending Bill. That would have sufficed. But instead of that, we are now going in for a fresh complication in the form of the administrative tribunal.

My hon. friend Shri Narayana Rao, the legal expert that he is, had amplified and made explicit the legal pitfalls that were inherent in this sort of provision. As he

has already pointed out, this administrative tribunal to which Government are seeking to give exclusive jurisdiction, and excluding the jurisdiction of the High Court, may also land us into another legal pitfall. In fact, it may again be declared *ultra vires* the Constitution. That danger is very much there. It is not too late for the Home Minister to give thought to this matter and to do away with that sort of provision.

I support another point also which was made by my hon. friend Shri Narayana Rao.

Once you go in for this administrative tribunal and make its awards or findings binding and final on the State authority and everybody else, you cannot at the same time confer the confirming authority or discretionary authority again on the State Government to intervene to set aside or amend the awards of the administrative tribunal, in which case again we may land ourselves into a legal mess or a legal complication. This sort of complication we should not land ourselves into. As Mr Pant had explained in detail, it was the legal battles that were fought in the various courts that had kept the wounds open in the State and the sores of separatism open in the State and had been leading time and again to agitations in one region or the other.

In fact, I appeal to the Home Minister to give his thought to this and plug this loophole evident in the Bill so that we may make a success of this experiment. Given the goodwill, given the moral and material support of the Central leaders, of which ample evidence has been shown by the Prime Minister and other leaders of the Central Government, accelerated development of the backward regions of the State is possible. Thus we can overcome the crisis and avert the calamity of agitation in any of these regions. Without that massive effort, without that active support, without that initiative from the Government at the Centre, I am doubtful very

much whether this sort of constitutional amendment or the repeal of the Mulki Rules will, by themselves, serve any purpose or prevent agitations of the type we have seen in the past recurring. The issue is essentially and basically linked with the lack of development, poverty and unemployment rampant more than any other State in this State of Andhra Pradesh.

SHRI KARTIK ORAON (Lohardaga):
Mr. Chairman, Sir, thank you very much for this opportunity given to me. The six-point formula is a bold decision taken by the Government to bring about harmony in the various States. I would like to tell the Home Minister that this should not be confined only to Andhra and Telengana. This should be a model formula for the entire country, because I am sure, the Minister and others, all of us are aware that there exist many Telenganas all over the country in almost all the States, particularly where the tribals predominantly live. They have been subjected to serious exploitations. How has this situation come about? This has come out of exploitation. Let us accept this fact. There is no denying it. This only establishes the fact that exploitation does not recognise religion, does not recognise language either.

Therefore, I would say that when we are trying to apply this 6-point formula, we should apply it to wherever there is regional imbalance in the country.

In this connection, let us also try to be uniform. These Mulki Rules cover 16 districts, out of which 5 districts were Marathi-speaking, 3 were Kannada-speaking and 8 were Telugu-speaking. We are making provision for 8 districts alone which, fortunately or unfortunately, fall within Andhra. But what about the Kannada and Marathi-speaking districts? So on this basis, we should try and see that this is uniformly applicable everywhere.

I would like to invite your attention to a very serious regional imbalance existing between Bihar and backward regions of

[Shri Kartik Oraon]

Chota Nagpur and Santhal Parganas. We have exactly the same regional development board there, on the same lines as you propose to have in Telengana. There we have got the Chota Nagpur-Santhal Parganas Autonomous Development Authority. But that Authority has no authority. It has no funds; it cannot function. The State Government of Bihar are so negligent that even after sanctioning Rs. 50 lakhs as a nucleus fund for the Authority for the development of that part, they are going back on their decisions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are discussing Andhra.

SHRI KARTIK ORAON: The Prime Minister has kindly intervened so many times. On the 2nd October, 1972 at Ranchi, the Prime Minister had categorically told Chief Minister Kedar Pandey that if there were any lacunae in the Act, he must see that they were suitably amended with a view to furthering the cause of developmental works in those backward areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think he should utilise the short time available to him to speak about Andhra and not about Bihar, Orissa and other States.

SHRI KARTIK ORAON: It is a national issue and not a political one. This does not pertain to Andhra alone. This should be applicable wherever there is exploitation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has only 2 minutes. Let him conclude.

SHRI KARTIK ORAON: Lastly I again submit that this six-point formula should be applicable uniformly throughout the country wherever there is exploitation and regional imbalance. I would like to request the Home Minister to twist the arms of any State Government which is found wanting in trying to look after the interests of the backward areas in that State.

श्री एस. बी. गिरी (वारंगल) : सभापति महोदय, मैं इस फारमूले का विरोध करता हूँ क्योंकि यह बहुत ही अनइंफॉर्मेटिव फारमूला है, गैर-कानूनी फारमूला है और जैसा कि मेरे दोस्तों ने कहा था इस तरह से टुकड़े टुकड़े कर के सारे देश को कई डिस्ट्रिक्ट स्टेट्स में बाँट देंगे। इस तरह के कई फारमूले निकालते गए तेलंगाना और आन्ध्र को जोड़ कर एक रखने के लिए। इस की बँक-भ्राउन्ड जो लोग नहीं जानते कि यह आन्ध्र और तेलंगाना कैसे बना, उन बंचारों का समझना जरा मुश्किल होता है इसलिए मैं उन को समझाना चाहता हूँ। पहले हम हैदराबाद स्टेट के तहत थे। हम आजाद हो गए निज़ाम के रूल से तो हैदराबाद स्टेट के रूप में रहे। उस समय कन्नड़ और महाराष्ट्र ये स्टेट्स मिल कर एक मिनिस्टर इंडिया कहलाता था जिस में अलग अलग भाषा के लोगों के रहने के बावजूद भी हम ने 400 साल से एक अलग कल्चर बना लिया था, इस का कोई विरोध नहीं कर सके ता, यह हिस्टोरिकल फैक्ट है। उस समय हमें हैदराबाद स्टेट के रूप में ही रखना चाहिए था या अगर अलग बनाना चाहते थे, हमारी स्टेट को डिस्टिन्ग्विश करना चाहते थे तो फिर हमारा अलग तेलंगाना बनाना चाहिए था और इसी बॅसिस पर स्टेट्स रीऑर्गनाइजेशन कमीशन जब बना तो उस कमीशन ने वहाँ पर आ कर सारे लोगों से मिलने के बाद इस बात को स्वीकार किया कि तेलंगाना के लोग या तो हैदराबाद स्टेट के रूप में रहें या संपरेंट तेलंगाना उन का बनाना चाहिए, यह उन्होंने माना। लेकिन पीडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू बहुत बड़े आदमी थे। उन का मशविरा था कि कम से कम तुम एक ट्रायल दे दो, तेलंगाना और आन्ध्र दोनों मिल जाओ, उस के बाद अगर तेलंगाना के लोग अलग होना चाहें तो वह अलग स्टेट बना सकते हैं। लेकिन जो स्टेट्स रीऑर्गनाइजेशन कमीशन के विरोध में काम करने वाले थे वह फारमूले निकालते गए और अभी भी वही फारमूले वह निकालते जा रहे हैं। अभी पन्त जी ने अपने भाषण में एंडीमिट कर लिया कि 110 करोड़ नहीं 44 करोड़ रुपया तेलंगाना का आन्ध्र रीजन में खर्च कर लिया गया।

श्री रामाबलार शास्त्री : वह देश का पेंसा था ।

श्री एस. बी. गिरि : वह हमारी जनता का पेंसा था, तेलंगाना स्टेट का पेंसा था, आन्ध्र का नहीं था ।

एक बात और मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब आन्ध्र स्टेट बनी, पहले वह तामिलनाडु, में थे, मद्रास प्रान्त में थे, परन्तु आन्दोलन कर के उन्होंने अपना आन्ध्र स्टेट बना लिया. हम उस के लिए मुन्नारकबाद पेश करतें हैं लेकिन हमारे लोगों को मजबूरन, तेलंगाना के एजीटेशन के बावजूद भी उन के साथ जोड़ दिया गया । जेंटिलमैनस एग्रीमेंट कर के कि हम तुम्हारे तेलंगाना के लोगों को एक्सप्लायट नहीं करेंगे, लूट नहीं करेंगे, इस प्रकार का जेंटिलमैनस एग्रीमेंट कर के हम को अपने साथ मिला लिया । इस के बावजूद भी तेलंगाना और आन्ध्र में हमेशा अदालती भगड़े हातें रहे जैसे अभी नारायण राव ने और नरसिंह रेड्डी ने कहा कांस्टीट्यूशनल डिफेक्टस को बताते हुए कि हमेशा वहाँ अदालती जंग हांती रही ।

फिर जब दोनों रियासतों को, तेलंगाना और आन्ध्र को जबर्दस्ती मिलाया गया तो उस के बाद के 16-17 सालों में हमारे वहाँ का कोई विकास नहीं हुआ । वहाँ की जनता अपनी आजादी को पहचान नहीं सकती । वे अपनी परसनाल्टी को डेवलप नहीं कर सकते । इसी वास्ते हम ने कहा कि बेहतर है कि हमारा अलग स्टेट बना दिया जाय क्योंकि अभी भी चार सौ साल में हम लोग निजाम की गुलामी में थे, और अब आन्ध्र के साथ टैंग कर दिए गए तो क्यों न हम को आजाद कर दिया जाय ? हमारा आन्ध्र के लोगों से कोई वास्ता नहीं है । जहाँ तक जवान का संबंध है वह ठीक है, लेकिन हमारा रहना अलग उन का रहना अलग, हमारा सोचना अलग, उन का सोचना अलग, तो बेहतर है कि अलग स्टेट बना दिया जाय ताकि हम लोग सियासी जिन्दगी में एक आजादी की जिन्दगी अपनी बसर कर सकें और हमारे तेलंगाना के लोग आजादी के साथ अपनी आर्थिक तरक्की कर सकें । आन्ध्र के लोगों के

दबाव से हम अपनी आर्थिक तरक्की नहीं कर सकें यह बात सोलह साल के बाद साबित हो गई है । इसलिए क्यों न हम को अलग कर दिया जाय ?

ये जितने भी फारमूले आप लाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं, अभी फाइव प्वाइंट फारमूला था, सब से पहले तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर इंदिरा गांधी 8 प्वाइंट फारमूला लाई हैदराबाद के एजीटेशन के बाद, तब मैं ने उन से कहा कि यह आप का फारमूला चलन वाला नहीं है, यह बिलकुल बंकार होने वाला है, फाइव प्वाइंट फारमूला भी नहीं चलेगा, यह मैं ने कहा । वही हुआ । फाइव प्वाइंट फारमूले को जिन्होंने मान लिया था, आन्ध्र और तेलंगाना के कांग्रेसी लीडर्स ने, उन्हीं ने बाहर जा कर उस का विरोध किया और एजीटेशन हुआ । और उन्हीं ने आज सिक्स प्वाइंट फारमूले को मान लिया । जनता के सामने पहले वह उस फाइव प्वाइंट फारमूले को नहीं ले गए । उस का नतीजा क्या हुआ कि आन्ध्र में जबर्दस्त आन्दोलन हुआ । वहाँ के लोग बोलें कि जब भी हम हैदराबाद जाते हैं तो हम को गैर-मुल्की बोलते हैं, कभी जूलस निकालते हैं, इमीलिए अगना आन्ध्र स्टेट जैरी पहले था वैसे ही बना लें । इस के लिए वह एक आन्दोलन ले आए । इस के लीडर्स कॉन थे-वही सब लोग जो आज कैबिनेट में हैं । यहाँ के भी 12 कांग्रेस एमपीज बोलें कि हम पार्टी से अलग होते हैं, तीन चार महीने पहले वह कहने लगे कि हम अलग बैठेंगे, हम अलग आन्ध्र चाहते हैं । वहाँ पर कांग्रेस के एम. एल. एज. आन्ध्र रोजन के जो थे वह बोलें कि हम लोग कांग्रेस से इस्तीफा दे देंगे और उन्होंने अलग कांग्रेस कमेटी अपनी बना ली । यह तमाम होने के बावजूद इस तरह से फाइव प्वाइंट फारमूले से या सिक्स प्वाइंट फारमूले से क्या जबर्दस्ती दो अलग अलग लोगों को एक साथ आप रख सकते हैं ? अगर रखने की कोशिश करेंगे तो जैसे 16-17 सालों में तेलंगाना को बरबाद और तबाह कर दिया और उस के लिए गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया जिम्मेदार है, उसी तरह से आइन्दा भी अगर उन की तरक्की नहीं हांती है तेलंगाना के लोगों की तो उसके लिए भी वही जिम्मेदार होंगे । मैंने

पंत जी की तकरीर बड़े इन्टरेस्ट से सुनी। फाइव प्वाइंट फारमूले के समय उन्होंने जो तकरीर की थी वही तकरीर आज भी उन्होंने की। कोई फर्क उस में नहीं है। उस का क्या हुआ, वही हथ इस का भी होने वाला है।

इसलिए मैं आप से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ खास कर प्राइम मिनिस्टर से और दीक्षित साहब से भी कि वह हँदराबाद जा कर दें। लीडर्स से बातचीत करने का कोई मतलब नहीं है, वहाँ के लोगों से बातचीत कर के देखें ताँ मालूम पड़ेगा कि वे संपरेंट तेलंगाना चाहते हैं। एक मजदूर बात मैं बताता हूँ. दीक्षित साहब यहाँ बैठे हैं. वहाँ के कांग्रेसी लोगों ने उन का एक मॅमोरॅंडम दिया था कि बंगल गत्र तो सीटलर हैं, यह तेलंगाना के नहीं हैं, इन का आप कैसे बना रहे हैं? क्या यह बात सही नहीं है? इस हालात में तेलंगाना की कांग्रेस और आन्ध्र की कांग्रेस में कैसा यूनियन हो सकती है? जब उन की पार्टी के अंदर यह हाल है कि वह कहते हैं कि रो तो सीटलर हैं इन का कैसे बनाएंगे. जब पार्टी के अंदर इंट्रीग्रेशन नहीं है तो जबर्दस्ती तेलंगाना को अन्ध्र के साथ क्यों आप जोड़ना चाहते हैं?

इसलिए मैं अपील करता हूँ कि जितने भी फारमूले आए, जितने भी एर्योरॅसज हमकाँ दिए गए वह तमाम के तमाम तेलंगाना के लोगों का लुटने के लिए दिए गए। यह 8 प्वाइंट फारमूले के जरिए से मालूम हो गया। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि तेलंगाना के लोगों को सही माने में आज्ञा देना चाहते हैं, उन का आज्ञा पॉलिटीकल जिन्दगी देना चाहते हैं. उन को अपनी तरक्की के वास्ते माँका देना चाहते हैं तो जैसे स्टेट्स रीआर्गॅनाइजेशन कमिशन ने जो उन को संपरेंट स्टेट कर के डिक्लेयर किया था लेकिन उस को आप ने नहीं माना. उसी तरह की गलती घड़ी-घड़ी न करते हुए अलग स्टेट उस का बना कर के वहाँ की जनता को खुशहाल बनाने का काम करें। नहीं ताँ तेलंगाना में जिस तरह में दो साल तक यहाँ का एंडीमिनिस्ट्रेशन विलकूल स्टॅडीस्टल हो गया उसी तरह से, अगर संपरेशन नहीं

किया तो इस सिक्स प्वाइंट फारमूले के बाद भी होने वाला है, यह मैं गवर्नमेंट को बार्निंग दे रहा हूँ।

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT : My work has been made light by the informed speech which my colleague Shri K. C. Pant delivered, covering a wide range of issues which were discussed earlier in the day in this House. I shall, therefore, try to spend the valuable time of the House only over certain matters of substantial importance which should really give the correct perspective and also explain to the hon. Members the basic and convincing reasons why this legislation has been undertaken.

Before entering into that field, I shall refer briefly to the technical points which have been raised firstly by my friend Shri Shyamandan Mishra and other friends in this House on the other side who have raised the constitutional issues. They have said that this affects the fundamental rights of the citizens of India and, therefore, Shri Shyamandan Mishra requested the Chair not to allow this Constitutional (Amendment) Bill to proceed. But he himself answered this question very effectively and completely in my opinion. He said, "Probably you are going to ask me to agitate this issue in the competent courts of law". He has correctly understood the situation. It is not that the constitutional points which can be finally decided by the High Courts and Supreme Court can be settled here by a ruling of the Chair. There is also behind this question another unfortunate misunderstanding of the very nature of this amendment. Let us understand the meaning of the Mulki Rules. If it is accepted that Mulki Rules provide for employment and educational opportunities only to those who were defined as Mulks, if they did not abridge the fundamental rights, the provisions of the six-point formula do not abridge them at all. To the extent you may say nationally that the right of those people of Andhra Pradesh who want to go to different States and get their names enrolled in various employment exchanges are adversely affected.

this is a very imaginary objection, an imaginary abridgment of their rights. As explained by Pantji, probably the House is aware that informally instructions have been issued and circular sent to public sector undertakings suggesting that at the lower level, upto a salary range of Rs. 500 and below, preference should be given in employment to the local citizens, who live in the neighbourhood. There are instances where sometimes right up to the I.D.C.s or peons or cooks, employees are imported from other States. As Pantji explained, it is not that all employments will be restricted to locals only. All gazetted posts above Assistant Surgeons, Tehsildars and Junior Engineers will be open to any citizen of India. There is a problem which has to be solved and therefore, the constitutional objection that has been raised in my opinion holds no water at all. It is surprising that when actually the fundamental rights are being enlarged, when there will be less restriction on the people from outside Telengana region, to say that their fundamental rights are being abridged is a logic which is very difficult to understand.

I would request the House to understand the basic problem of Andhra Pradesh. We have to understand why in the first instance there was such a wide-ranging agitation on the Telengana side and an equally wide-ranging agitation on the side of the Andhra region. Is it because either side really wanted separation? If this is the opinion of any hon. Member, he has completely missed the understanding of the situation. As I have said in Hyderabad myself without being contradicted, there are really no separatists in Andhra Pradesh. There are only angry people, people who are dissatisfied with the manner in which the earlier arrangements worked.

Take, for instance, the people of Telengana. Originally, they were reluctant to join the Andhra Pradesh. Then Vishal Andhra became an emotional question for all Telugu-speaking people. The entire area was charged with that emotion and the Telugu people separated from Madras.

Why was it done? It was not for a joke. There were certain misgivings in the minds of the people of Telengana, but the leaders from the Andhra region went out of their way to persuade the Telengana leaders to have a united Andhra, assuring them good treatment, honest treatment and satisfactory conditions. That is why the Telengana people joined Andhra Pradesh.

But, in the course of subsequent history, the Telengana people felt that they were not getting a fair deal, their employment opportunities were not adequate and even in educational institutions their boys and girls were not getting proper admission, particularly in engineering and medical colleges. So, they were dissatisfied. Another important reason was, and still is, to some extent, that all the Government employees, not only non-Gazetted Officers but even Gazetted officers, without exception have had to go through a period of grave uncertainty and they do not know their future.

I was told by a high-placed Telengana officer during my last but one visit to Hyderabad that there were a few thousand cases which were undecided. Those cases had come up at various stages in various forums, before a high-powered committee, another local committee, before the High Court and the Supreme Court. So, a large number of employees did not know about their seniority, which was being constantly changed; they did not know when they will get promotion. The courts were also giving different judgments. I am not imputing any motives; naturally they were interested in giving a correct interpretation of the law, of the Mulki rules. What was the result? Every time the judgment of the High Court or the Supreme Court sparked a new agitation. Why? The Andhra people were not mad. They certainly realised their future would be uncertain; they did not know who will remain senior and who will get promotion. So, they were dissatisfied. More than all this, there was another reason. I am saying this with a certain amount of authority, based on my

[Shri Uma Shankar Dikshit]
knowledge of the affairs of Andhra Pradesh and Telengana, which I derived from a large number of meetings with a responsible cross-section of the people in both regions. The main reason for the present situation is that they were dissatisfied over the measure of economic development, social development, educational opportunities and employment opportunities.

The five-point formula would have worked but for the fact that the people in the Andhra region felt hurt. We must admit it as a fact that their susceptibilities were hurt. They were told, and they accepted this, that under the five-point formula their position in their own capital would be tantamount to or near to second grade citizens. Naturally, they reacted. Therefore, all that they wanted was that the irritants should be removed. When we had discussions with the responsible leaders of the Andhra region at the middle stage and final stage what they said was "remove the irritants". They did not want to have another separate State. Their leaders had given their lives and they had worked for this consummation of one Telugu-speaking State. After that, they certainly did not want that two States should come out of that integrated State.

What does this legislation that is before the House seek to do? It does exactly seek to solve those two problems. On the one side, it offers and assures larger employment opportunities, larger seats in educational institutions and, on the other side, it also removes the causes of irritation. Therefore, the basic reasons have been substantially removed by the Six-Point Formula which this amending Bill really tries to give shape.

Now, Prof. Dandavate was trying to explain to us that it is possible for people speaking the same language to be in more than one State. It is obvious. There is no difficulty about that. But here is a State which with difficulty has united itself and which has been trying desperately to work and see a way out. Are you going

to throw them into uncertainty, into suspense, into rebellion again? Would Prof. Dandavate like, for instance Marathwada to be separated? If a separate State starts to work, I may tell you, with a certain knowledge of human affairs that it will also open the Pandora's box. They will start asking for two States to come back again. If they cannot get from Mysore and in fact, it is not unlikely that about both the parts of Hyderabad, Nizam's dominions, which are joined with Mysore, now called Karnataka, the Maharashtra State would very likely raise the question again. Why do you want this? I am afraid, the seriousness of the problem has not been fully appreciated by our friends whose motives I do not doubt and I have respect for their anxiety to score a point over the Treasury Benches. The point that he made was too obvious for an hon. Member of his status and his reputation to raise it.

Now, Shri Rameshwar Rao said that we should not pass this amending Bill at all at this time and that we should work the Six-Point Formula for a period of six months or one year. It is a very innocent sort of suggestion. In fact, it seems very plausible. But how can you work the Six-Point Formula? From one end to the other, it is based on the need for legal change, constitutional change. I may take the House into confidence on one aspect of the discussions that were held over a long period. On the Andhra side, they wanted that various facilities and concessions that were being enjoyed by the Telengana people should be continued but that these should not have any legal or constitutional sanction. That is what they said. They were in favour of the reasonable concessions to the Telgana people. There is hardly a person whom I have met who has not said that. Even Dr. Chenna Reddy, for instance, who has not fully accepted it, is also not, in my opinion, opposed to it. Everybody said that. It is because they really honestly, did not want another period of uncertainty.

In my opinion, therefore, if we could work the Formula without this Bill, certainly, I would like to do that. There is no difference between him and us. But, I am afraid, he has not given thought to the subject at all. He is a highly intelligent person. I have regard for his intellectual attainment. He should have applied his mind to the simple question of how the Six-Point Formula could be worked successfully for a period of six months or a year so that, after that, if a trial is satisfactorily completed, we could take up this Constitution Amendment Bill. This is an absurd proposition which the House should reject.

Mishraji asked how is it that people who have been fighting like this for months will suddenly, one fine morning, try to be near each other. I cannot understand this. He should really have been happy. I am afraid, he has never met them, nor has he allowed anybody else to see them. Otherwise, he would not have put this question. They have gone through a period of agony and day by day they have looked up to the future with hope. As time passed and as we did our help, both the regions are now coming nearer. This has not come about suddenly; it has come after a long time—this six-point formula. You can ask Mr. Pant. I had a light work on this except for one or two crucial occasions. It is he who is the architect of the formula. You can ask him, how much time it has taken, how many people he had met. It has not sprung up suddenly from somewhere and then we are afraid that the people will again be at loggerheads with each other; that is not the proposition that we are placing before you.

The hon. members from CPI and CPM have actually welcomed this, and they have used their own language for it. The only grouse that they have expressed against this legislation is that we are trying to take all the credit for it. Nothing can be farther from truth than this. I take this opportunity to invite him and the

other members of the House to share this credit. Mr. Limaye is raising his hands in a negative fashion. . .

SHRI B. N. REDDY : We are not afraid that you are taking the credit. As a ruler, you should have avoided the bloody process which the Telugu people have undergone. It is due to your wrong and opportunistic policy that, after a bloody process, after a shameful process, this has come.

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT : I do not know why he is spoiling an excellent speech he made earlier. He had virtually compromised himself. I say this here for all to know that the members of the CPI have solidly and consistently stood by the principle of integration of Andhra Pradesh. We do not grade giving the credit where the credit is due. There were others who were trying to be on both the sides. Mr. Mishra was opposing this Bill. What has his own party done? The stalwarts of his party were supporting integration. In fact, that party came near the breaking point on this issue, whether Andhra Pradesh should be divided or integrated. I do not know to which section he belonged. But I know enough about it to say that his own party men, the important men, have publicly and privately taken this stand that they are for an integrated State.

श्री नरेन्द्र कुमार साल्वे (इंदूर) : कुछ ज़ांशी जो की भी खबर लीजिये :

श्री उमा शंकर दीक्षित : ज़ांशी जी जाँ हैं वह अपना राजनीतिक लाभ हाँने की हर समय चर्चा करते रहते हैं लेकिन आपको एक राष्ट्रीय तराजू भी रखनी चाहिए और उस पर चीजों को तौलना चाहिए। यदि आपका यह मत हो कि इस बिल के जरिये से वहाँ शांति हांगी पहले से कठिनाइयाँ कम हाँगी और भविष्य में इस देश में एक रहने की सम्भावना बढ़ जायेंगे तो

[श्री उमाशंकर दीक्षित]

मंरा कहना है कि अपनी राजनीति को भुलाकर आपका सम्पूर्ण समर्थन इसको मिलना चाहिए। ये समर्थन दंगे भी लौकन एक विरोधी दल होने के नाते यहां पर कुछ कहें भी नहीं तो फिर वाद-विवाद का अवसर ही न रह जाये। यहां पर कुछ न कुछ कहना भी है कि हमारे सी. पी. (आई) के मित्र ने कहा कि यह बिल लाये लौकन इतनी दूर से लाये। अरे आपको यह भी तो कहना चाहिए कि अभी ही राटी लौकन लाये तां।

17.00 hrs.

My friend, Shri H. M. Patel, although in his own language expressed certain misgivings, he said at the end that he is for the Bill and he said, 'My hope is that the provisions contained in the Bill will be worked successfully' and if that happens, he said, he would be happy. That is another way of his saying, 'I support the Bill.'

One important point I want to make. This question directly and primarily relates to the people of Andhra Pradesh and, therefore, all the hon. Members hailing from Andhra Pradesh, whether it be Telangana or Andhra, whichever side it may be, except with the brilliant exception of Mr. S. B. Giri who has been articulating himself in a rather peculiar way of standing up and sitting down all the time and finally he said certain things also, but except for that gentleman, not one Member from Andhra Pradesh, either from Telangana or Andhra, not only approved the Bill but they have solidly lent their support to this Bill. Therefore, I must express on behalf of the Government and myself my gratefulness for the support that the House has given and even those members who have opposed the Bill, have opposed it in a language which should not really come to mean opposition. It is a kind of that they have observed the rule and carried out their duty

as a member of the Opposition. Nevertheless, there has hardly been anything like serious opposition to the Bill before the House.

SHRI VIKRAM MAHAJAN (Kan-
gura) : Shadow-boxing.

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT :
Mr. Giri referred to *Adalat ka Jugada*.

अदालत के भगड़े। मॉने पहले भी कहा, लौकन अदालत के भगड़े क्यों हुए हैं। अदालत के भगड़े काई अलग होने के कारण, या मिलने के कारण नहीं हुए। अदालत के भगड़े इस-लिये हुए कि मुल्की रूलस की परिभाषा के अनुसार काम करने में अनेक कठिनाइयां आयीं, और जां एन. जी. आंज. थे उन को अपने भीष्य का पता नहीं था। उन को सैकड़ों को प्रॉमोशन नहीं मिला, उन की सीनियोरिटी कम हो गई, वाद को रू गई, फिर कम हो गई। ऐसी अनिश्चित परिस्थिति में वह बंचारे अपने हृदय में रो रहे थे। अपनी परेशानी में जां कोई उन के सामने आता था और कहता था कि यह करने से तुम्हारा लाभ होगा तां वह दैमें ही करने लगते थे। यही त्रिद्वारियों का हाल हुआ। जिन को इंजीनियरिंग और मीडिकल लाइन में, जहां से निकल कर जल्दी नौकरी मिल सकती थी, वहां अगर उन को पढ़ाई का अवसर नहीं मिलता था तां जां काई कहता था कि संपरेशन होने से यह सुविधा मिल जायगी तां वह वही करते थे और कहते थे। तां किसी का दोष नहीं है। परिस्थिति के अन्दर ऐसी कठिनाइयां थीं जिस के कारण यह सब हुआ। परिस्थितियों में निहित कठिनाइयां को इस त्रिधैक के द्वारा सम्पूर्ण रीति से दूर करने का प्रयत्न किया गया है।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं इस का समर्थन करता हूँ।

With these words, I am commending this Bill for the unanimous acceptance of the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Although we have discussed both these Bills together, they will be put to vote separately.

17.05 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER : Order please. There are two amendments moved by Shri S. B. Giri. The first one is for circulation of the Bill for eliciting opinion thereon. A simple majority is enough for these amendments.

Now I will put the first amendment moved by Shri S. B. Giri to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 1 was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : The second amendment by Mr. S. B. Giri is for reference of the Bill to a Joint Committee.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महादय, आप-
 नियम के तारों में गंरा भी हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महादय : आप का तां मूच ही नहीं
 हुआ ।

I will now put the second amendment moved by Mr. S. B. Giri for reference of the Bill to a Joint to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 2 was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : Now the question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be taken into consideration."

Let the Lobbies be cleared.

The Lok Sabha divided :

Division No. 19] [17.15 hrs.

AYES

Achal Singh, Shri
 Aga, Shri Syed Ahmed

Agrawal, Shri Shrikrishna
 Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
 Ahmed, Shri F. A.
 Alagesan, Shri O. V.
 Ambesh, Shri
 Ankineedu Shri Maganti
 Ansari, Shri Ziaur Rahman
 Appalanaidu, Shri
 Arvind Netam, Shri
 Austin, Dr. Henry
 Awdhesh Chandra Singh, Shri
 Aziz Imam, Shri
 Babunath Singh, Shri
 Banamali Babu, Shri
 Banerji Shrimati Mukul
 Barman, Shri R. N.
 Barua, Shri Bedabrata
 Basappa, Shri K.
 Basumatari, Shri D.
 Besra, Shri S. C.
 Bhagat, Shri B. R.
 Bhagat, Shri H. K. L.
 Bhargava, Shri Bhasheshwar Nath.
 Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal
 Bhattacharyya, Shri Chapalendu
 Bhuvarahan, Shri G.
 Bist, Shri Narendra Singh
 Brahmanandji, Shri Swami
 Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri
 Chakleshwar Singh, Shri
 Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal
 Chaturvedi, Shri Rohan Lal
 Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
 Chavan, Shri Yeshwantrao
 Chawla, Shri Amar Nath
 Chhotey Lal, Shri
 Chhatten Lal, Shri
 Chikkalingaiah, Shri K.
 Choudhury, Shri Moinul Haque
 Daga, Shri M. C.
 Dalbir Singh, Shri

Dalip Singh, Shri
 Damani, Shri S. R.
 Darabara Singh, Shri
 Das, Shri Dharnidhar
 Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
 Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.
 Deb, Shri Dasaratha
 Deo, Shri S. N. Singh
 Desai, Shri D. D.
 Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
 Dhamankar, Shri
 Dharamgaj Singh, Shri
 Dharia, Shri Mohan
 Dhusia, Shri Anant Prasad
 Dinesh Singh, Shri
 Dixit, Shri G. C.
 Dixit, Shri Jagdish Chandra
 Doda, Shri Hiralal
 Dube, Shri J. P.
 Dumada, Shri L. K.
 Dutta, Shri Biren
 Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar
 Engti, Shri Biren
 Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
 Ganesh, Shri K. R.
 Garcha, Shri Devinder Singh
 Gautam, Shri C. D.
 Gavit, Shri T. H.
 Ghosh, Shri P. K.
 Gill, Shri Mohinder Singh
 Giri, Shri V. Shanker
 Godara, Shri Mani Ram
 Gogoi, Shri Tarun
 Gohain, Shri C. C.
 Gokhale, Shri H. R.
 Gopal, Shri K.
 Goswami, Shrimati Bibha Ghosh
 Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chandra
 Gotkhinde, Shri Annasaheb
 Govind Das, Dr.

Gowda, Shri Pampan
 Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra
 Hansda, Shri Subodh
 Hanumanthaiya, Shri K.
 Hari Kishore Singh, Shri
 Hari Singh, Shri
 Ishaque, Shri A. K. M.
 Jadeja, Shri D. P.
 Jagjivan Ram, Shri
 Jamilurrahman, Shri Md.
 Jeyalakshmi, Shrimati V.
 Jha, Shri Chiranjib
 Jitendra Prasad, Shri
 Joshi, Shri Papatlal M.
 Kadam, Shri J.G.
 Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandran
 Kahandole, Shri Z. M.
 Kailas, Dr.
 Kakodkar, Shri Purshottam
 Kakoti, Shri Robin
 Kale, Shri
 Kamakshaiah, Shri D.
 Kamala Prasad, Shri
 Kamble, Shri T. D.
 Kamla Kumari, Kumari
 Kapur, Shri Sat Pal
 Karan Singh, Dr.
 Kasture, Shri A. S.
 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.
 Krishnan, Shri G. Y.
 Kulkarni, Shri Raja
 Kureel, Shri B. N.
 Kushok Bakula, Shri
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati T.

Lambodar Baliyar, Shri
 Laskar, Shri Nihar
 Lutfal Haque, Shri
 Madbukar, Shri K. M.
 Mahajan, Shri Vikram
 Mahajan, Shri Y. S.
 Mahata, Shri Debendra Nath
 Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
 Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain
 Mandla, Shri Yamuna Prasad
 Maurya, Shri B. P.
 Mehta, Dr. Jivraj
 Mehta, Dr. Mahipatray
 Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
 Mishra, Shri G. S.
 Mishra, Shri Jagannath
 Mishra, Shri L. N.
 Misra, Shri S. N.
 Modak, Shri Bijoy
 Modi, Shri Shrikishan
 Mohammad Tahir, Shri
 Mohan Swarup, Shri
 Mohsin, Shri F. H.
 Muhammed Khuda Bukhsh, Shri
 Mukherjee, Shri Samar
 Munsif, Shri Priya Ranjan Das
 Murmu, Shri Yogesh Chandra
 Murthy, Shri B. S.
 Nahata, Shri Amrit
 Naik, Shri B. V.
 Nanda, Shri G. L.
 Oraon, Shri Kartik
 Oraon, Shri Tuna
 Pahadia, Shri Jagannath
 Painuli, Shri Paripoornanand
 Pandey, Shri Damodar
 Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra
 Pandey, Shri Narsingh Narain
 Pandey, Shri R. S.
 Pandey, Shri Sudhakar

Pandey, Shri Tarkeshwar
 Pandit, Shri S. T.
 Pant, Shri K. C.
 Paokai Haokip, Shri
 Parashar, Prof. Narain Chand
 Parikh, Shri Rasiklal
 Pratap Singh, Shri
 Parthasarathy, Shri P.
 Paswan, Shri Ram Bhagat
 Patel, Shri Arvind M.
 Patel, Shri Natwarlal
 Patel, Shri Prabhudas
 Patel, Shri Ramubhai
 Patil, Shri Anantrao
 Patil, Shri C. A.
 Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe
 Patil, Shri Krishnarao
 Patil, Shri T. A.
 Patnaik, Shri Banamali
 Patnaik, Shri J. B.
 Peje, Shri S. L.
 Prabodh Chandra, Shri
 Purty, Shri M. S.
 Raghu Ramaiah, Shri K.
 Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai
 Raj Bhadur, Shri
 Rajdeo Singh, Shri
 Ram, Shri Tulmohan
 Ram Dhan, Shri
 Ram Prakash, Shri
 Ram Sewak, Ch.
 Ram Singh Bhai, Shri
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramji Ram, Shri
 Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
 Rana, Shri M. B.
 Rao, Shrimati B. Radhabai A.
 Rao, Shri Jagannath
 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
Rao, Shri Rajagopala
Rathia, Shri Umed Singh
Raut, Shri Bhola
Ravi, Shri Vayalar
Ray, Shrimati Maya
Reddi, Shri P. Antony
Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal
Reddy, Shri P. Bayapa
Reddy, Shri P. Ganga
Reddy, Shri P. V.
Reddy, Shri Y. Eswara
Richhariya, Dr. Govind Das
Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila
Roy, Shri Bishwanath
Roy, Dr. Saradish
Sadhu Ram, Shri
Saha Shri Gadadhar
Saini, Shri Mulki Raj
Saksena, Prof. S. L.
Salve, Shri N. K. P.
Samanta, Shri S. C.
Sanghi, Shri N. K.
Sankata Prasad, Dr.
Sant Bux Singh, Shri
Sathe, Shri Vasant
Satish Chandra, Shri
Satpathy, Shri Devendra
Savitri Shyam, Shrimati
Sayeed, Shri P. M.
Sen, Shri Robin
Sethi, Shri Arju
Sezhayan, Shri
Shafee, Shri A.
Shafquat Jung, Shri
Shahnawaz Khan, Shri
Shailani, Shri Chandra
Shambhu Nath, Shri
Shankar Dayal Singh, Shri

Shankar Dev, Shri
Shankaranand, Shri B.
Sharma, Shri A. P.
Sharma, Dr. H. P.
Sharma, Shri Madhoram
Sharma, Shri R. N.
Sharma, Dr. Shankar Dayal
Shashi Bhushan, Shri
Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan
Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
Sher Singh, Prof.
Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.
Shivnath Singh, Shri
Shukla, Shri B. R.
Siddayya, Shri S. M.
Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
Singh, Shri Vishwanath Pratap
Sinha, Shri Dharam Bir
Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore
Sinha, Shri R. K.
Sohan Lal, Shri T.
Stephen, Shri C. M.
Subramaniam, Shri C.
Subravelu, Shri
Sudarsanam, Shri M.
Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
Swaminathan, Shri R. V.
Swamy, Shri Sidrameshwar
Swaran Singh, Shri
Tarodekar, Shri V. B.
Tayyab Hussain, Shri
Tewari, Shri Shankar
Thakre, Shri S. B.
Thakur, Shri Krishnarao
Tiwari, Shri Chandra Bhal Mani
Tiwari, Shri R. G.
Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Tombi Singh, Shri N.
Tula Ram, Shri
Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.

Vekaria, Shri
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
 Venkatswamy, Shri G.
 Verma, Shri Balgovind
 Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad
 Vidyalankar, Shri Amarnath
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri
 Yadav, Shri Chandrajit
 Yadav, Shri Karan Singh
 Yadav, Shri R. P.
 Yadav, Shri D. P.

NOES

Bade, Shri R. V.
 Bhagirath Bhanwar, Shri
 Chowhan, Shri Bharat Singh
 Dandavate, Prof. Madhu
 Joshi, Shri Jagannathrao
 *Kader, Shri S. A.
 Limaye, Shri Madhu
 Mavalankar, Shri P. G.
 Mishra, Shri Shyamanandan
 Muhammed Sheriff, Shri
 Pandey, Shri Sarjoo
 Pandeya, Dr. Laxminarain
 Ramkanwar, Shri
 Singh, Shri D. N.

MR SPEAKER: The result of the division is:

Ayes: 299

Noes: 14

The motion is carried by a majority of the total membership of the House

and by a majority of not less than two thirds of the Members present and voting.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2

(Amendment of Article 371)

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: I beg to move:

For clause 2 substitute—

"2. For clause (1) of article 371 of the Constitution, the following shall be substituted, namely,—

(1) Notwithstanding anything in this Constitution, the President may, by order made with respect to the State of Andhra Pradesh, provide for the constitution and functions of regional assemblies of the Legislative Assembly of the State, for the modifications to be made in the rules of business of the Government and in the rules of procedure of the Legislative Assembly of the State and for any special responsibility of the Governor in order to secure the proper functioning of the regional assemblies".(10)

समय बचाने के लिए मैं अपने सभी 18 संसोधनों पर एक साथ भाषण कर रहा हूँ।

दीक्षित जी ने अभी फरमाया कि इस विधेयक पर विचार करते समय एक ही कसौटी हमारे सामने होनी चाहिये और वह है राष्ट्रीय एकता की और राष्ट्रीय हित की। मैं इस बात में उन से सहमत हूँ। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ

*Wrongly voted for Noes.

† The following Members also recorded their votes:—

AYES: Sarvashri Partap Singh Negi, K. D. Malaviya, B. Satyanarayana, Dattajirao Kadam, Sheopujan Shastri, T. Balakrishniah, S. Radhakrishnan, Genda Singh, Tha Kiruttinan, B. N. Reddy and, S. A. Kader.

NOES: Shri S. B. Giri.

[श्री मधु लिमयें]
कि दीक्षित जी की जां मंशा हैं वह इस विधेयक के चलते पूरा होने वाला नहीं हैं। कारण यह हैं कि आन्ध्र की एकता का बचाने के नाम पर आप आंध्र प्रदेश को बीस इलाकों में बांटने जा रहे हैं, बीस किस्म के कंटेस बनंगे, उनके लिए अलग-अलग नियम बनंगे और विशाल आंध्र की एकता की जो आप कल्पना करते हैं वह चूर-चूर हो जाएगी।

मैं कहूंगा कि आज के संविधान में जो मुख्य दोष हैं वह यह हैं कि उस में लचीलापन नहीं हैं। इस दोष को आप दूर करें। आज आप अगर किसी राज्य को बांट कर उसके दो या तीन राज्य बनाना चाहते हैं तो साधारण अधिनियम के, कानून के जरिये राज्य का निर्माण हो सकता है। लेकिन एक राज्य के अन्दर भी विभिन्न प्रदेश हैं जिन में गैर बराबरी हैं, असमानता है, कुछ हिस्सा पिछड़ा हुआ है, कुछ विकसित है। अगर अविकसित और पिछड़े इलाके को आप स्वायत्तता प्रदान करना चाहते हैं तो आपके संविधान में इसके लिए कोई प्रावधान नहीं है। समझ में नहीं आता कि जब 16 (3) के तहत निवास स्थान के आधार पर नॉकरियों में आप रिजर्वेशन कर सकते हैं तो क्या प्रदेशों के आधार पर एक ही राज्य के अन्दर आप रिजर्वेशन कर पाएंगे? मैं समझता हूँ कि जो सुप्रीम कोर्ट का निर्णय हो गया है उसकी रांशनी में इस तरह का आक्षेप सम्भव नहीं है। दीक्षित जी को 16वीं धारा में परिवर्तन करने के बारे में सांचना चाहिये था। जहाँ कहा है कि राज्य के निवास के आधार पर आरक्षण किया जायेगा वहाँ उनका इन शब्दों को जोड़ना चाहिये था कि राज्य के अन्तर्गत जो विभिन्न प्रदेश हैं, उनके आधार पर भी सेवाओं में आरक्षण किया जा सकता है। लेकिन उन्होंने यह नहीं किया है। आखिरकार आंध्र और तेलंगाना के मामले की एक ऐतिहासिक पृष्ठभूमि है। राज्य पुनर्रचना आयोग आप लोगों ने कायम किया था। अपनी रिपोर्ट में इस आयोग ने कहा था कि आंध्र प्रदेश की एकता का सपना एक आदर्शवादी चीज है लेकिन वस्तुस्थिति का स्थाल करने हुए तेलंगाना का राज्य कुछ वर्षों के लिए अलग बनाना अच्छा होगा और अलग राज्य

का अनुभव करने के बाद यदि तेलंगाना की जनता यह महसूस करती है कि विशाल आंध्र की कल्पना ही ठीक है तो दस वर्ष के बाद विशाल आंध्र बनाने की योजना बनायी जा सकती है। लेकिन कांग्रेसी नेताओं के बीच हुए समझौते के आधार पर विशाल आंध्र बना और जो आशंकाएँ राज्य पुनर्रचना आयोग ने व्यक्त की थीं वे आज सही साबित हुई हैं। उसकी रिपोर्ट का एक ही हिस्सा मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। इस में उन्होंने अन्त में कहा था :

"The real fear of the people of Telengana is that if they join Andhra, they will be unequally placed in relation to the people of Andhra and in this partnership, the major partner will deny all the advantages immediately while Telengana itself may be converted into a colony by the enterprising coastal Andhra".

यह राज्य पुनर्रचना आयोग जिस के तीन बड़े-बड़े सदस्य थे उन्होंने अपनी रिपोर्ट में कहा था। लेकिन क्या हुआ? अनुभव यह बताता है कि नॉकरियों में तेलंगाना को मुकीम्मल हिस्सा नहीं मिलता जो उनको मिलना चाहिये था, शिक्षण संस्थाओं में भी यही हालत रही और विकास का कार्य भी तेलंगाना के इलाके में नहीं हुआ। इतना ही नहीं। हैदराबाद में घर बनाने की जमीन और किसानों के खेत भी आंध्र इलाके के लोगों के हाथ में चले गये। यह वास्तविकता है जिस के उजर विचार करना चाहिये।

जब राज्य पुनर्रचना आयोग बैठे, तो तेलंगाना की फी-व्यक्ति आमदनी, पर कीपटा इनकम, आंध्र से अधिक थी। लेकिन आन्ध्र प्रदेश का जिस तरह संचालन किया गया, उस के फलस्वरूप तेलंगाना पीछे चला गया और आन्ध्र को विकास-कार्य में अधिक हिस्सा मिल गया।

मैं भी श्री दीक्षित से इस बारे में सहमत हूँ कि कांशिश यह होनी चाहिये थी कि प्रांत एक रहे, लेकिन उस के लिए वे क्या कर

रहे हैं ? मंत्री भी आन्तरिक इच्छा यह नहीं है कि उत्तर प्रदेश, कर्नाटक, आन्ध्र प्रदेश या महाराष्ट्र बंटें। लेकिन जो पिछड़े हुए इलाके हैं, उन के विकास के लिए संविधान में कोई गारंटी नहीं है। इस स्थिति में सरकार चाहे लाख छः सूत्री फार्मूले ले कर आये, यह बात चलने वाली नहीं है। मैंने चार साल पहले इस सदन में यह चर्चावनी दी थी कि सरकार रिजनल आटॉनामी, प्रादेशिक स्वायत्तता, के लिए कोई प्रावधान इस संविधान में रखे, जिस से वर्तमान सूबों की एकता बनी रहे। ऐसा करने पर आलाम का भी विभाजित करने की जरूरत न पड़ती।

आज मैं फिर कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार मरे संशोधनों का मान ले। उनमें मैंने इस बात पर जोर दिया है कि एक ही प्रान्त में दो या तीन रिजनल एसेम्बलीज रह सकती हैं। अगर एक ही प्रान्त में दो या तीन इलाके या प्रदेश हों—जैसे आन्ध्र प्रदेश में तेलंगाना, रायल सीमा और आन्ध्र हैं—तो उनके लिए रिजनल एसेम्बलीज का प्रावधान किया जाये, और दो या तीन कौंस की व्यवस्था की जाये। इस विधेयक के द्वारा तो आन्ध्र प्रदेश को बीस, इक्कीस हिस्सों में बांटा जा रहा है। और मंत्री महोदय इस का राष्ट्रीय एकता कहते हैं।

यह सब क्यों हो रहा है ? यह इस लिए हो रहा कि एक शक्तिशाली व्यक्ति ऐसा सांचता है कि यह तेलंगाना का आन्दोलन उस के खिलाफ है, और अपने अहम की पूर्ति के लिए, अपनी शान की रक्षा के लिए, अपनी प्रतिष्ठा के लिए, यह 6 पार्यट फार्मूला लाया गया है। लेकिन यह चलेगा नहीं। मैं श्री दीक्षित से विनम्र निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वह भी स्वतंत्रता के आन्दोलन के सिपाही रहे हैं। जैसे कि हम भी रहे हैं, और उन की पीढ़ी—और हमारी पीढ़ी भी—महाकाल के पंत में चली जा रही है, लेकिन विगत 26 वर्षों में हम ने इस देश का सारा मामला ऐसा बना दिया है कि यह देश जहन्नुम में जा रहा है, क्षीयता की ओर जा रहा है। इस लिए वह मेहरबानी कर के 6 पार्यट फार्मूले पर पुनर्विचार

करें। मैं जो सुभाव दे रहा हूँ, उसका स्वीकार करने से विदर्भ, मराठवाड़ा, रायलसीमा, तेलंगाना, भारखंड और पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश के मामले, हिन्दुस्तान के सभी अविकसित और पिछड़े हुए प्रदेशों के मामले, बिना प्रान्तों की पुनर्रचना किये और वर्तमान दायरे में ही हल किये जा सकते हैं। यह 6 पार्यट फार्मूला एक मृग-मरीचिका है। आज श्री दीक्षित उस के पीछे जा रहे हैं, और ये सब लोग बिना सांचे समझे उन के पीछे दौड़ रहे हैं। (व्यवधान) भंडू का एक कानून हांता है। ये लोग भंडू वाले कानून की बलि हैं। ये लोग इन बातों पर विचार नहीं कर रहे हैं। 6 पार्यट फार्मूले से कोई नतीजा नहीं निकलेंगा।

सरकार वर्तमान राज्यों के तहत प्रादेशिक स्वायत्तता की योजना बनाये। इस से संघाओं में, विकास-कार्य में और शिक्षा संस्थाओं में भी आरक्षण मिलेगा। मैं श्री दीक्षित से फिर प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह मरे इस सुभाव पर विचार करें और अनुच्छेद 16 और 371 में आवश्यक परिवर्तन करें इस से आन्ध्र प्रदेश की एकता भी बच जायेगी और तेलंगाना और रायलसीमा की जनता की आशा आकांक्षायें भी पूर्ण हो जायेंगी।

MR. SPEAKER : I shall now put amendment No. 10 to clause 2 by Shri Limaye to the vote of the House. The question is :

For Clause 2 substitute—

“2. For clause (1) of article 371 of the Constitution, the following shall be substituted, namely,—

“(1) Notwithstanding anything in this Constitution, the President may, by order made with respect to the State of Andhra Pradesh, provide for the constitution and functions of regional assemblies of the Legislative Assembly of the State, for the modifications to be made in the rules of business of the Government and in the rules of procedure of the Legislative Assembly of the State and for any special responsibility of the

[Mr. Speaker]

Governor in order to secure the proper functioning of the regional assemblies.' (10)

The Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 20]

[17.33 hrs.

AYES

Bhagirath Bhanwar, Shri
* Chaturvedi, Shri Rohan Lal
Chowhan, Shri Bharat Singh
Dandavate, Prof. Madhu
Giri, Shri S. B.
Limaye, Shri Madhu
Mavalankar, Shri P. G.
Ramkanwar, Shri

NOES

Achal Singh, Shri
Aga, Shri Syed Ahmed
Agarwal, Shri Shrikrishna
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
Ahmed, Shri F. A.
Alagesan, Shri O. V.
Ambesh, Shri
Ankineedu, Shri Maganti
Ansari, Shri Ziaur Rahman
Appalanaidu, Shri
Arvind Netam, Shri
Austin, Dr. Henry
Awadhesh Chandra Singh, Shri
Aziz Imam, Shri
Babunath Singh, Shri
Banamali Babu, Shri
Banerji, Shrimati Mukul
Barman, Shri R. N.
Barua, Shri Bedabrata
Basappa, Shri K.

Basumatari, Shri D.
Besra, Shri S. C.
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhagat, Shri H. K. L.
Bhargava, Shri Bhasheshwar Nath
Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal
Bhattacharyya, Shri Chapalendu
Bhuvarahan, Shri G.
Bist, Shri Narendra Singh
Brahmanandji, Shri Swami
Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri
Chakleshwar Singh, Shri
Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal
Chandrashekharappa Veerabasappa.
Shri T. V.
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
Chavan, Shri Yeshwantrao
Chawla, Shri Amar Nath
Chhotey Lal, Shri
Chhuttan Lal, Shri
Chikkalingaiah, Shri K.
Choudhary, Shri B. E.
Choudhury Shri Moinul Haque
Daga, Shri M. C.
Dalbir Singh, Shri
Dalip Singh, Shri
Damani, Shri S. R.
Darbara Singh, Shri
Das, Shri Dharnidhar
Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.
Deb, Shri Dasaratha
Deo, Shri S. N. Singh
Desai, Shri D. D.
Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
Dhamankar, Shri
Dharamgaj Singh, Shri
Dharia, Shri Mohan
Dhusia, Shri Anant Prasad

^oWrongly voted for Ayes.

Dinesh Singh, Shri
Dixit, Shri G. C.
Dixit, Shri Jagdish Chandra
Dube, Shri J. P.
Dumada, Shri L. K.
Dutta, Shri Biren
Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar
Fngti, Shri Biren
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
Ganesh, Shri K. R.
Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Garcha, Shri Devinder Singh
Gautam, Shri C. D.
Gavit, Shri T. H.
Genda Singh, Shri
Gill, Shri Mohinder Singh
Giri, Shri V. Shanker
Godara, Shri Mani Ram
Gogoi, Shri Tarun
Gohain, Shri C. C.
Gokhale, Shri H. R.
Gopal, Shri K.
Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chandra
Gotkhinde, Shri Annasaheb
Govind Das, Dr.
Gowda, Shri Pampan
Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra
Hansda, Shri Subodh
Hanumanthaiya, Shri K.
Hari Kishore Singh, Shri
Hari Singh, Shri
Ishaque, Shri A. K. M.
Jadeja, Shri D. P.
Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.
Jagjivan Ram, Shri
Jamilurrahman, Shri Md.
Jeyalakshmi, Shrimati V.
Jha, Shri Chiranjib
Jitendra Prasad, Shri
Joshi, Shri Popatlal M.
Kadam, Shri Dattajirao

Kadam, Shri J. G.
Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandran
Kader, Shri S. A.
Kahandole, Shri Z. M.
Kailas, Dr.
Kakodkar, Shri Purushottam
Kakoti, Shri Robin
Kale, Shri
Kamakshaiah, Shri D.
Kamala Prasad, Shri
Kamble, Shri T. D.
Kamla Kumari, Kumari
Kapur, Shri Sat Pal
Karan Singh, Dr.
Kasture, Shri A. S.
Kaul, Shrimati Sheila
Kavade, 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.
Krishnan, Shri G. Y.
Kulkarni, Shri Raja
Kureel, Shri B. N.
Kushok Bakula, Shri
Lakkappa, Shri K.
Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati T.
Lambodar Baliyar, Shri
Laskar, Shri Nihar
Lutfal Haque, Shri
Madhukar, Shri K. M.
Mahajan, Shri Vikram
Mahajan, Shri Y. S.
Mahata, Shri Debendra Nath
Malaviya, Shri K. D.
Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
Mallanna, Shri K.
Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain
Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad

Maurya, Shai B. P.	Paswan, Shri Ram Bhagat
Mehta, Dr. Jivraj	Patel, Shri Arvind M.
Mehta, Dr. Mahipatray	Patel, Shri Natwarlal
Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram	Patel, Shri Prabhudas
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti	Patel, Shri Ramubhai
Mishra, Shri G. S.	Patil, Shri Anantrao
Mishra, Shri Jagannath	Patil, Shri C. A.
Mishra, Shri L. N.	Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe
Misra, Shri S. N.	Patil, Shri Krishnarao
Modak, Shri Bijoy	Patil, Shri S. B.
Modi, Shri Shrikishan	Patil, Shri T. A.
Mohammad Tahir, Shri	Patnaik, Shri Banamali
Mohan Swarup, Shri	Patnaik, Shri J. B.
Mohsin, Shri F. H.	Peje, Shri S. L.
Muhammed Khuda Bukhsh, Shri	Prabodh Chandra, Shri
Mukherjee, Shri Samar	Purty, Shri M. S.
Munsi, Shri Priya Ranjan Das	Radhakrishnan, Shri S.
Murthy, Shri B. S.	Raghu Ramaiah, Shri K.
Murmu, Shri Yogesh Chandra	Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai
Nahata, Shri Amrit	Raj Bahadur, Shri
Naik, Shri B. V.	Rajdeo Singh, Shri
Nanda, Shri G. L.	Ram, Shri Tulmohan
Negi, Shri Pratap Singh	Ram Dhan, Shri
Oraon, Shri Kartik	Ram Prakash, Shri
Oraon, Shri Tuna	Ram Sewak, Ch.
Pahadia, Shri Jagannath	Ram Singh Bhai, Shri
Painuli, Shri Paripoornanand	Ram Swarup, Shri
Pandey, Shri Damodar	Ramji Ram, Shri
Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra	Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
Pandey, Shri Narsingh Narain	Rana, Shri M. B.
Pandey, Shri R. S.	Rao, Shrimati B. Radhabai A.
Pandey, Shri Sarjoo	Rao, Dr. K. L.
Pandey, Shri Sudhakar	Rao, Shri K. Narayana
Pandey, Shri Tarkeshwar	Rao, Shri M. S. Sanjeevi
Pandit, Shri S. T.	Rao, Shri Nageswara
Pant, Shri K. C.	Rao, Shri P. Ankineedu Prasada
Paokai Haokip, Shri	Rao, Shri Pattabhi Rama
Parashar, Prof. Narain Chand	Rao, Shri Rajagopala
Parikh, Shri Rasiklal	Raut, Shri Bholu
Partap Singh, Shri	Ravi, Shri Vayalar
Parthasarathy, Shri P.	Ray, Shrimati Maya

Reddi, Shri P. Antony	Shashi Bhushan, Shri
Reddy, Shri B. N.	Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan
Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal	Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
Reddy, Shri P. Bayapa	Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
Reddy, Shri P. Ganga	Shenoy, Shri P. R.
Reddy, Shri P. Narasimha	Sher Singh, Prof.
Reddy, Shri P. V.	Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.
Reddy, Shri Y. Esvara	Shivappa, Shri N.
Richhariya, Dr. Govind Das	Shivnath Singh, Shri
Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila	Shukla, Shri B. R.
Roy, Shri Bishwanath	Siddayya, Shri S. M.
Sadhu Ram, Shri	Siddheshwar Prasad Shri
Saha, Shri Gadadhar	Singh, Shri Vishwanath Pratap
Saini, Shri Mulki Raj	Sinha, Shri Dharam Bir
Saksena, Prof. S. L.	Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore
Salve, Shri N. K. P.	Sinha, Shri R. K.
Samanta, Shri S. C.	Sohan Lal, Shri T.
Sambhali, Shri Ishaque	Sokhi, Shri Swaran Singh
Sanghi, Shri N. K.	Stephen, Shri C. M.
Sankata Prasad, Dr.	Subramaniam, Shri C.
Sant Bux Singh, Shri	Sudarsanam, Shri M.
Sathe, Shri Vasant	Sunder Lal, Shri
Satish Chandra, Shri	Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
Satyanarayana, Shri B.	Swaminathan, Shri R. V.
Savant, Shri Shankerrao	Swamy, Shri Sidrameshwar
Savitri Shyam, Shrimati	Swaran Singh, Shri
Sayeed, Shri P. M.	Tarodekar, Shri V. D.
Sethi, Shri Arjun	Tayyab Hussain, Shri
Shafee, Shri A.	Tewari, Shri Shankar
Shafquat Jung, Shri	Thakre, Shri S. B.
Shahnawaz Khan,, Shri	Thakur, Shri Krishnarao
Shailani, Shri Chandra	Tiwari, Shri Chandra Bhal Mani
Shambhu Nath, Shri	Tiwari, Shri R. G.
Shankar Dayal Singh, Shri	Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Shankar Dev, Shri	Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Shankaranand, Shri B.	Tombi Singh, Shri N.
Sharma, Shri A. P.	Tula Ram, Shri
Sharma, Dr. H. P.	Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.
Sharma, Shri Madhoram	Vekaria, Shri
Sharma, Shri R. N.	Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
Sharma, Dr. Shankar Dayal	Venkatswamy, Shri G.

Verma, Shri Balgovind
Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad
Vidyalankar, Shri Amarnath
Virbhadra Singh, Shri
Yadav, Shri Chandrajit
Yadav, Shri Karan Singh
Yadav, Shri R. P.
Yadav, Shri D. P.

MR. SPEAKER : The result† of the
division is :

Ayes : 8; *Noes* : 312

The motion was negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The Lok Sabha divided :

Division No. 21 - [17.36 hrs.]

AYES

Achal Singh, Shri
Aga, Shri Syed Ahmed
Agrawal, Shri Shrikrishna
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
Ahmed, Shri F. A.
Alagesan, Shri O. V.
Ambesh, Shri
Ankineedu, Shri Maganti
Ansari, Shri Ziaur Rahman
Appalanaidu, Shri
Arvind Netam, Shri
Austin, Dr. Henry
Awdhesh Chandra Singh, Shri
Aziz Imam, Shri
Babunath Singh, Shri
Balakrishniah, Shri T.
Banamali Babu, Shri
Banerji, Shrimati Mukul
Barman, Shri R. N.

Barua, Shri Bedabrata
Basappa, Shri K.
Basumatari, Shri D.
Besra, Shri S. C.
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhagat, Shri H. K. L.
Bhargava, Shri Basheswar Nath
Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal
Bhattacharyya, Shri Chapalendu
Bhuvarahan, Shri G.
Bist, Shri Narendra Singh
Brahmanandji, Shri Swami
Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri
Chakleshwar Singh, Shri
Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal
Chandrashekharaappa Veerabasappa,
Shri T. V.
Chaturvedi, Shri Rohan Lal
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
Chavan, Shri Yeshwantrao
Chawla, Shri Amar Nath
Chhotey Lal, Shri
Chhuttan Lal, Shri
Choudhary, Shri B. E.
Daga, Shri M. C.
Dalbir Singh, Shri
Dalip Singh, Shri
Damani, Shri S. R.
Darbara Singh, Shri
Das, Shri Dharnidhar
Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.
Deb, Shri Dasaratha
Deo, Shri S. N. Singh
Desai, Shri D. D.
Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
Dhamankar, Shri
Dharamgaj Singh, Shri
Dharia, Shri Mohan

†The following Members also recorded their votes for Noes :—
Sarvashri Hiralal Doda and Rohan Lal Chaturvedi.

Dhusia, Shri Anant Prasad	Joshi, Shri Popatlal M.
Dinesh Singh, Shri	Kadam, Shri Dattajirao
Dixit, Shri G. C.	Kadam, Shri J. G.
Dixit, Shri Jagdish Chandra	Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandran
Doda, Shri Hiralal	Kader, Shri S. A.
Dumada, Shri L. K.	Kahandole, Shri Z. M.
Dutta, Shri Biren	Kailas, Dr.
Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar	Kakodkar, Shri Purushottam
Engti, Shri Biren	Kakoti, Shri Robin
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira	Kale, Shri
Ganesh, Shri K. R.	Kamakshaiyah, Shri D.
Ganga Devi Shrimati	Kamala Prasad, Shri
Garcha, Shri Devinder Singh	Kamble, Shri T. D.
Gautam, Shri C. D.	Kamla Kumari, Kumari
Gavit, Shri T. H.	Kapur, Shri Sat Pal
Genda Singh, Shri	Karan Singh, Dr.
Gill, Shri Mohinder Singh	Kasture, Shri A. S.
Giri, Shri V. Shanker	Kaul, Shrimati Sheila
Godara, Shri Mani Ram	Kavde, Shri B. R.
Gogoi, Shri Tarun	Kedar Nath Singh, Shri
Gohain, Shri C. C.	Khadilkar, Shri R. K.
Gokhale, Shri H. R.	Kinder Lal, Shri
Gopal, Shri K.	Kiruttinan, Shri Tha
Goswami, Shrimati Bibha Ghosh	Kisku, Shri A. K.
Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chandra	Kotoki, Shri Liladhar
Gotkhinde, Shri Annasaheb	Kotrashetti, Shri A. K.
Govind Das, Dr.	Krishnan, Shri G. Y.
Gowda, Shri Pampan	Kulkarni, Shri Raja
Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra	Kureel, Shri B. N.
Hansda, Shri Subodh	Kushok Bakula, Shri
Hanumanthaiya, Shri K.	Lakkappa, Shri K.
Hari Kishore Singh, Shri	Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati T.
Hari Singh, Shri	Lambodar Baliyar, Shri
Ishaque, Shri A. K. M.	Laskar, Shri Nihar
Jadeja, Shri D. P.	Lutfal Haque, Shri
Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.	Madhukar, Shri K. M.
Jagjivan Ram, Shri	Mahajan, Shri Vikram
Jamilurrahman, Shri Md.	Mahata, Shri Debendra Nath
Jeyalakshmi, Shrimati V.	Malaviya, Shri K. D.
Jha, Shri Chiranjib	Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
Jitendra Prasad, Shri	Mallanna, Shri K.

Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain
 Maurya, Shri B. P.
 Mehta, Dr. Jivraj
 Mehta, Dr. Mahipatray
 Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
 Mishra, Shri G. S.
 Mishra, Shri Jagannath
 Mishra, Shri L. N.
 Misra, Shri S. N.
 Modi, Shri Shrikishan
 Mohamad Tahir, Shri
 Mohan Swarup, Shri
 Mohsin, Shri F. H.
 Muhammed Khuda Bukhsh, Shri
 Muhammed Sheriff, Shri
 Mukherjee, Shri Samar
 Munsii, Shri Priya Ranjan Das
 Murthy Shri B. S.
 Murmu, Shri Yogesh Chandra
 Nahata, Shri Amrit
 Naik, Shri B. V.
 Nanda, Shri G. L.
 Oraon, Shri Tuna
 Pahadia, Shri Jagannath
 Painuli, Shri Paripoornanand
 Pandey, Shri Damodar
 Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra
 Pandey, Shri Narsingh Narain
 Pandey, Shri R. S.
 Pandey, Shri Sudhakar
 Pandey, Shri Tarkeshwar
 Pandit, Shri S. T.
 Pant, Shri K. C.
 Paokai Haokip, Shri
 Parashar, Prof. Narain Chand
 Parikh, Shri Rasiklal
 Partap Singh, Shri
 Parthasarathy, Shri P.
 Paswan, Shri Ram Bhagat
 Patel, Shri Arvind M.

Patel, Shri Natwarlal
 Patel, Shri Prabhudas
 Patel, Shri Ramubhai
 Patil, Shri Anantrao
 Patil, Shri C. A.
 Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe
 Patil, Shri Krishnarao
 Patil, Shri S. B.
 Patil, Shri T. A.
 Patnaik, Shri Banamali
 Peje, Shri S. L.
 Pradodh Chandra, Shri
 Purty, Shri M. S.
 Radhakrishnan, Shri S.
 Raghu Ramaiah, Shri K.
 Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai
 Raj Bahadur, Shri
 Rajdeo Singh, Shri
 Ram, Shri Tulmohan
 Ram Dhan, Shri
 Ram Prakash, Shri
 Ram Sewak, Ch.
 Ram Singh Bhai, Shri
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramji Ram, Shri
 Rana, Shri M. B.
 Rao, Shrimati B. Radhabai A.
 Rao, Shri Jagannath
 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
 Rao, Shri Rajagopala
 Rathia, Shri Umed Singh
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Ravi, Shri Vayalar
 Ray, Shrimati Maya

Reddi, Shri P. Antony	Sharma, Shri R. N.
Reddy, Shri B. N.	Sharma, Dr. Shankar Dayal
Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal	Shashi Bhushan, Shri
Reddy, Shri P. Bayapa	Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan
Reddy, Shri P. Ganga	Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
Reddy, Shri P. Narasimha	Shastri, Shri Sheoptujan
Reddy, Shri P. V.	Shenoy, Shri P. R.
Reddy, Shri Y. Eswara	Sher Singh, Prof.
Richhariya Dr. Govind Das	Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.
Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila	Shivappa, Shri N.
Roy, Shri Bishwanath	Shivnath Singh, Shri
Roy, Dr. Saradish	Shukla, Shri B. R.
Sadhu Ram, Shri	Siddayya, Shri S. M.
Saha, Shri Gadadhar	Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
Saini, Shri Mulki Raj	Singh, Shri Vishawanath Pratap
Saksena, Prof. S. L.	Sinha, Shri Dharam Bir
Salve, Shri N. K. P.	Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore
Samanta, Shri S. C.	Sinha, Shri R. K.
Sambhali, Shri Ishaque	Sohan Lal, Shri T.
Sanghi, Shri N. K.	Sokhi, Shri Swaran Singh
Sankata Prasad, Dr.	Stephen, Shri C. M.
Sant Bux Singh, Shri	Subramaniam, Shri C.
Sathe, Shri Vasant	Subravelu, Shri
Satish Chandra, Shri	Sudarsanam, Shri M.
Satpathy, Shri Devendra	Sunder Lal, Shri
Satyantarayana, Shri B.	Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
Savant, Shri Shankerrao	Swaminathan, Shri R. V.
Savitri Shyam, Shrimati	Swamy, Shri Sidrameshwar
Sayeed, Shri P. M.	Swaran Singh, Shri
Sethi, Shri Arjun	Tarodekar, Shri V. D.
Shafce, Shri A.	Tayyab Hussain, Shri
Shafquat Jung, Shri	Tewari, Shri Shankar
Shahnawaz Khan Shri	Thakre, Shri S. B.
Shailani, Shri Chandra	Thakur Shri Krishnarao
Shambhu Nath, Shri	Tiwari, Shri Chandra Bhal Mani
Shankar Dayal Singh, Shri	Tiwari, Shri R. G.
Shankar Dev, Shri	Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Shankaranand, Shri B.	Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Sharma, Shri A. P.	Tombi Singh, Shri N.
Shrama, Dr. H. P.	Tula Ram, Shri
Sharma, Shri Madhoram	

Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.
Vekaria, Shri
Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
Venkatswamy, Shri G.
Verma, Shri Balgovind
Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad
Vidyalankar, Shri Amarnath
Virbhadra Singh, Shri
Yadav, Shri Chandrajit
Yadav, Shri Karan Singh
Yadav, Shri R. P.
Yadav, Shri D. P.

NOES

Bhagirath Bhanwar, Shri
*Choudhury, Shri Moinul Haque
Dandavate, Prof. Madhu
Giri, Shri S. B.
Limaye, Shri Madhu
*Mahajan, Shri Y. S.
Mavalankar, Shri P. G.
*Pandey, Shri Sarjoo
Ramkanwar, Shri

MR. SPEAKER : The result† of the division is : Ayes 312; Noes 9.

The motion is carried by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3 (Insertion of new articles 371D and 371E).

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT : I beg to move :

Page 2, line 35, for "Thirty-third" substitute "Thirty-second" (6).

Page 4, line 9, for "Thirty-third" substitute "Thirty-second" (7).

The Defections Bill was numbered as Thirty-second because it was introduced earlier. Now that Bill will come up later. Therefore, the number of this amending Bill has to be changed as "Thirty-second".

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : I beg to move :

Page 1, line 15,—
for "different parts"
substitute "the two regions" (11)

Page 1, line 17,—
for "various parts"
substitute "the regions" (12)

Page 2, line 4,—
for "different local"
substitute "two regional" (13)

Page 2, lines 4 and 5.—
for "different parts"
Substitute "the two regions" (14)

Page 2, line 8.—
for "any part or parts"
substitute "the two regions" (15)

Page 2, line 9,—
for "local" substitute "regional"
(16)

Page 2, line 10,—
for "local" substitute "regional"
(17)

Page 2, line 13,—
for "any cadre" substitute "the two cadres" (18)

*Wrongly voted for Noes.

† The following Members also recorded their votes for Ayes :—

Sarvashri Kartik Oraon, Pratap Singh Negi, Yamuna Prasad Mandal, P. K. Ghosh, J. P. Dube, Moinul Haque Choudhury, Y. S. Mahajan and Sarjoo Pandey.

Page 2, line 14,—
for "any local" substitute "regional" (19)

Page 2, lines 21 and 22,—
for "any such cadre" substitute "the two regions" (20)

Page 2, line 28,—
for "local" substitute "regional" (21)

Page 2, line 42,—
for "local" substitute "regional" (22)

Page 2, line 47,—
for "local" substitute "regional" (23)

Page 3, line 5,—
for "local" substitute "regional" (24)

Page 4, line 6,—
for "local" substitute "regional" (25)

Page 4, line 10,—
for "local" substitute "regional" (26)

Page 4, line 26,—
(i) after "University" insert "each"

(ii) after "the" insert "two regions in the" (27)

MR. SPEAKER : I will put the Government amendments Nos. 6 and 7 to the vote of the House.

The question is :

'Page 2, line 35, for "Thirty-third" substitute "Thirty-second"' (6)

'Page 4, line 9, for "Thirty-third" substitute "Thirty-second"' (7)

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER : I will now put Shri Limaye's amendments Nos. 11 to 27 to the vote of the House.

Amendments Nos. 11 to 27 were put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : The lobbies are already cleared. The doors are still closed. We will have division on clause 3.

The question is :

"That clause 3, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Lok Sabha divided :

Division No. 22] [17.40 hrs.

AYES

Achal Singh, Shri
Aga, Shri Syed Ahmed
Agrawal, Shri Shrikrishna
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
Ahmed, Shri F. A.
Alagesan, Shri O. V.
Ambesh, Shri
Ankineedu, Shri Maganti
Ansari, Shri Ziaur Rahman
Appalanaidu, Shri
Arvind Netam, Shri
Austin, Dr. Henry
Awdhesh Chandra Singh, Shri
Aziz Imam, Shri
Babunath Singh, Shri
Balakrishniah, Shri T.
Banamali Babu, Shri
Banerji, Shrimati Mukul
Barman, Shri R. N.
Barua, Shri Bedabrata
Basappa, Shri K.
Basumatari, Shri D.
Besra, Shri S. C.

Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhagat Shri H. K. L.
Bhargava, Shri Basheshwar Nath
Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal
Bhattacharyya, Shri Chapalendu
Bhuvarahan, Shri G.
Bist, Shri Narendra Singh
Brahmanandji, Shri Swami
Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri
Chakleshwar Singh, Shri
Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal
Chandrashekarappa Veerabasappa,
Shri T. V.
Chaturvedi, Shri Rohan Lal
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
Chavan, Shri Yeshwantrao
Chawla, Shri Amar Nath
Chhotey Lal, Shri
Chhutten Lal, Shri
Choudhary, Shri B. E.
Choudhury, Shri Moinul Haque
Daga, Shri M. C.
Dalbir Singh, Shri
Dalip Singh, Shri
Damani, Shri S. R.
Darbara Singh, Shri
Das, Shri Dharnidhar
Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.
Deb, Shri Dasaratha
Deo, Shri S. N. Singh
Desai, Shri D. D.
Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
Dhamankar, Shri
Dharamgaj Singh, Shri
Dharia, Shri Mohan
Dinesh Singh, Shri
Dixit, Shri G. C.
Dixit, Shri Jagdish Chandra
Doda, Shri Hiralal
Dube, Shri J. P.

Dumada, Shri L. K.
Dutta, Shri Biren
Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar
Engti, Shri Biren
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
Ganesh, Shri K. R.
Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Garcha, Shri Devinder Singh
Gautam, Shri C. D.
Gavit, Shri T. H.
Ghosh, Shri P. K.
Gill, Shri Mohinder Singh
Giri, Shri S. B.
Giri, Shri V. Shanker
Godara, Shri Mani Ram
Gogoi, Shri Tarun
Gohain, Shri C. C.
Gokhale, Shri H. R.
Gopal, Shri K.
Goswami, Shrimati Bibha Ghosh
Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chandra
Govind Das, Dr.
Gowda, Shri Pampan
Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra
Hansada, Shri Subodh
Hanumanthaiya, Shri K.
Hari Kishore Singh, Shri
Hari Singh, Shri
Isbaque, Shri A. K. M.
Jadeja, Shri D. P.
Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.
Jaggivan Ram, Shri
Jamilurrahman, Shri Md.
Jeyalakshmi, Shrimati V.
Jha, Shri Chiranjib
Jitendra Prasad, Shri
Joshi, Shri Popatlal M.
Kadam, Shri Dattajirao
Kadam, Shri J. G.
Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandran
Kader Shri S. A.

Kahandole, Shri Z. M.	Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Kailas, Dr.	Mishra, Shri G. S.
Kakodkar, Shri Purushottam	Mishra, Shri Jagannath
Kakoti, Shri Robin	Mishra, Shri L. N.
Kale, Shri	Misra, Shri S. N.
Kamakshaiiah, Shri D.	Modi, Shri Shrikishan
Kamala Prasad, Shri	Mohammad Tahir, Shri
Kamble, Shri T. D.	Mohan Swarup, Shri
Kamla Kumari, Kumari	Mohsin, Shri F. H.
Kapur, Shri Sat Pal	Muhammed Khuda Bukhsh, Shri
Karan Singh Dr.	Mukherjee, Shri Samar
Kasture, Shri A. S.	Munsi, Shri Priya Ranjan Das
Kaul, Shrimati Sheila	Murmu, Shri Yogesh Chandra
Kavde, Shri B. R.	Murthy, Shri B. S.
Kedar Nath Singh, Shri	Nahata, Shri Amrit
Khadilkar, Shri R. K.	Naik, Shri B. V.
Kinder Lal, Shri	Nanda, Shri G. L.
Kiruttinan, Shri Tha	Negi, Shri Pratap Singh
Kisku, Shri A. K.	Oraon, Shri Kartik
Kotoki, Shri Liladhar	Oraon, Shri Tuna
Kotrashetti, Shri A. K.	Pahadia, Shri Jagannath
Krishnan, Shri G. Y.	Painuli, Shri Paripoornanand
Kulkarni, Shri Raja	Pandey, Shri Damodar
Kureel, Shri B. N.	Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra
Kushok Bakula, Shri	Pandey, Shri Narsingh Narain
Lakkappa, Shri K.	Pandey, Shri R. S.
Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati T.	Pandey, Shri Sarjoo
Lambodar Baliyar, Shri	Pandey, Shri Sudhakar
Laskar, Shri Nihar	Pandey, Shri Tarkeshwar
Lutfal Haque, Shri	Pandit, Shri S. T.
Madhukar, Shri K. M.	Pant, Shri K. C.
Mahajan, Shri Vikram	Paokai Haokip, Shri
Mahajan, Shri Y. S.	Parashar, Prof. Narain Chand
Mahata, Shri Debendra Nath	Parikh, Shri Rasiklal
Malaviya, Shri K. D.	Partap Singh, Shri
Malhotra, Shri Inder J.	Parthasarathy, Shri P.
Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain	Paswan, Shri Ram Bhagat
Maurya, Shri B. P.	Patel, Shri Arvind M.
Mehta, Dr. Jivraj	Patel, Shri Natwarlal
Mehta, Dr. Mahipatray	Patel, Shri Prabhudas
Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram	Patel, Shri Ramubhai

Patil, Shri Anantrao
Patil, Shri C. A.
Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe
Patil, Shri Krishnarao
Patil, Shri S. B.
Patil, Shri T. A.
Patnaik, Shri Banamali
Patnaik, Shri J. B.
Peje, Shri S. L.
Prabodh Chandra, Shri
Purty, Shri M. S.
Radhakrishnan, Shri S.
Raghu Ramaiah, Shri K.
Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai
Raj Bahadur, Shri
Rajdeo Singh, Shri
Ram, Shri Tulmohan
Ram Dhan, Shri
Ram Prakash, Shri
Ram Sewak, Ch.
Ram Singh Bhai, Shri
Ram Swarup, Shri
Ramji Ram, Shri
Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
Rana, Shri M. B.
Rao, Shrimati B. Radhabai A.
Rao, Shri Jagannath
Rao, Dr. K. L.
Rao, Shri K. Narayana
Rao, Shri M. S. Sanjeevi
Rao, Shri P. Ankineedu Prasada
Rao, Shri Pattabhi Rama
Rao, Shri Rajagopala
Raut, Shri Bhola
Ravi, Shri Vayalar
Ray, Shrimati Maya
Reddi, Shri P. Antony
Reddy, Shri B. N.
Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal
Reddy, Shri P. Bayapa
Reddy, Shri P. Ganga

Reddy, Shri P. Narasimha
Reddy, Shri P. V.
Reddy, Shri Y. Eswara
Richhariya, Dr. Govind Das
Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila
Roy, Shri Bishwanath
Roy, Dr. Saradish
Sadhu Ram, Shri
Saha, Shri Gadadhar
Saini, Shri Mulki Raj
Saksena, Prof. S. L.
Salve, Shri N. K. P.
Samanta, Shri S. C.
Sambhali, Shri Ishaque
Sanghi, Shri N. K.
Sankata Prasad, Dr.
Sant Bux Singh, Shri
Sathe, Shri Vasant
Satish Chandra, Shri
Satpathy, Shri Devendra
Satyanarayana, Shri B.
Savant, Shri Shankerrao
Savitri Shyam, Shrimati
Sayeed, Shri P. M.
Sethi, Shri Arjun
Shafee, Shri A.
Shafquat Jung, Shri
Shahnawaz Khan, Shri
Shailani, Shri Chandra
Shambhu Nath, Shri
Shankar Dayal Singh, Shri
Shankar Dev, Shri
Shankaranand, Shri B.
Sharma, Shri A. P.
Sharma, Dr. H. P.
Sharma, Shri Madhoram
Sharma, Shri R. N.
Sharma, Dr. Shankar Dayal
Shashi Bhushan, Shri
Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan
Shastri, Shri Ramavatar

Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
 Shenoy, Shri P. R.
 Sher Singh, Prof.
 Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.
 Shivappa, Shri N.
 Shivnath Singh, Shri
 Shukla, Shri B. R.
 Siddayya, Shri S. M.
 Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
 Singh, Shri Vishwanath Pratap
 Sinha, Shri Dharam Bir
 Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore
 Sinha, Shri R. K.
 Sohan Lal, Shri T.
 Sokhi, Shri Swaran Singh
 Stephen, Shri C. M.
 Subramaniam, Shri C.
 Sudarsanam, Shri M.
 Sunder Lal, Shri
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
 Swaminathan, Shri R. V.
 Swamy, Shri Sidrameshwar
 Swaran Singh, Shri
 Tarodekar, Shri V. D.
 Tayyab Hussain, Shri
 Tewari, Shri Shankar
 Thakre, Shri S. B.
 Thakur, Shri Krishnarao
 Tiwari, Shri Chandra Bhal Mani
 Tiwari, Shri R. G.
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.
 Tombi Singh, Shri N.
 Tula Ram, Shri
 Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.

Vekaria, Shri
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
 Venkatswamy, Shri G.
 Verma, Shri Balgovind
 Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad
 Vidyalankar, Shri Amarnath
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri
 Yadav, Shri Chandrajit
 Yadav, Shri Karan Singh
 Yadav, Shri R. P.
 Yadav, Shri D. P.

NOES

Bhagirath Bhanwar, Shri
 Dandavate, Prof. Madhu
 Limaye, Shri Madhu
 Mavalankar, Shri P. G.
 Ramkanwar, Shri

MR. SPEAKER : The result* of the division is: *Ayes* 314; *Noes* 5.

The motion is carried by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3, as amended, was added to the Bill

Clause, 4 (Amendment of Seventh Schedule)

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : I beg to move :

Page 4, line 29,—

for "the University"

substitute "the Universities" (28)

* The following Members also recorded their votes for Ayes :

Sarvashri K. Mallanna, Umed Singh Rathia, Annasaheb Gotkhinde, Yamuna Prasad Mandal, Nageshwara Rao, K. Chikkalingaiah, Genda Singh and Anant Prasad Dhusia.

MR. SPEAKER : I will now put amendment No. 28 moved by Shri Limaye to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 28 was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill".

The Lok Sabha divided :

Division No. 23]

[17.42 hrs.

AYES

Achal Singh, Shri
Aga, Shri Syed Ahmed
Agrawal, Shri Shrikrishna
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
Ahmed, Shri F. A.
Alagesan, Shri O. V.
Ambesh, Shri
Ankineedu, Shri Maganti
Ansari, Shri Ziaur Rahman
Appalanaidu, Shri
Arvind Netam, Shri
Austin, Dr. Henry
Awdhesh Chandra Singh, Shri
Aziz Imam, Shri
Babunath Singh, Shri
Balakrishniah, Shri T.
Banamali Babu, Shri
Banerji, Shrimati Mukul
Barman, Shri R. N.
Barua, Shri Bedabrata
Basappa, Shri K.
Basumatari, Shri D.
Besra, Shri S. C.
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhagat Shri H. K. L.
Bhargava, Shri Basheshwar Nath
Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal
Bhattacharyya, Shri Chapalendu

Bhuvarahan, Shri G.
Bist, Shri Narendra Singh
Brahmanandji, Shri Swami
Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri
Chakleshwar Singh, Shri
Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal
Chaturvedi, Shri Rohan Lal
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
Chavan, Shri Yeshwantrao
Chawla, Shri Amar Nath
Chhotey Lal, Shri
Chhuttan Lal, Shri
Chikkalingaiah, Shri K.
Choudhary, Shri B. E.
Choudhury, Shri Moinul Haque
Daga, Shri M. C.
Dalbir Singh, Shri
Dalip Singh, Shri
Damani, Shri S. R.
Darbara Singh, Shri
Das, Shri Dharnidhar
Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.
Deb, Shri Dasaratha
Deo, Shri S. N. Singh
Desai, Shri D. D.
Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
Dhamankar, Shri
Dharamgaj Singh, Shri
Dharia, Shri Mohan
Dhusia, Shri Anant Prasad
Dinesh Singh, Shri
Dixit, Shri G. C.
Dixit, Shri Jagdish Chandra
Doda, Shri Hiralal
Dube, Shri J. P.
Dumada, Shri L. K.
Dutta, Shri Biren
Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar
Engti, Shri Biren
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira

Ganesh, Shri K. R.	Kamala Prasad, Shri
Ganga Devi, Shrimati	Kamble, Shri T. D.
Garcha, Shri Devinder Singh	Kamla Kumari, Kumari
Gavit, Shri T. H.	Kapur, Shri Sat Pal
Genda Singh, Shri	Karan Singh, Dr.
Ghosh, Shri P. K.	Kasture, Shri A. S.
Gill, Shri Mohinder Singh	Kaul, Shrimati Sheila
Giri, Shri V. Shanker	Kavde, Shri B. R.
Godara, Shri Mani Ram	Kedar Nath Singh, Shri
Gogoi, Shri Tarun	Khadilkar, Shri R. K.
Gohain, Shri C. C.	Kinder Lal, Shri
Gokhale, Shri H. R.	Kisku, Shri A. K.
Gopal, Shri K.	Kotoki, Shri Liladhar
Goswami, Shrimati Bibha Ghosh	Kotrashetti, Shri A. K.
Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chandra	Krishnan, Shri G. Y.
Gotkhinde, Shri Annasaheb	Kulkarni, Shri Raja
Govind Das, Dr.	Kureel, Shri B. N.
Gowda, Shri Pampan	Kushok Bakula, Shri
Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra	Lakkappa, Shri K.
Hansda, Shri Subodh	Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati I.
Hanumanthaiya, Shri K.	Lambodar Baliyar, Shri
Hari Singh, Shri	Laskar, Shri Nihar
Ishaque, Shri A. K. M.	Lutfal Haque, Shri
Jadeja, Shri D. P.	Madhukar, Shri K. M.
Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.	Mahajan, Shri Vikram
Jagjivan Ram, Shri	Mahajan, Shri Y. S.
Jamilurrahman, Shri Md.	Mahata, Shri Debendra Nath
Jeyalakshmi, Shrimati V.	Malaviya, Shri K. D.
Jha, Shri Chiranjib	Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
Jitendra Prasad, Shri	Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain
Joshi, Shri Popatlal M.	Maurya, Shri B. P.
Kadam, Shri Dattajirao	Mehta, Dr. Jivraj
Kadam, Shri J. G.	Mehta, Dr. Mahipatray
Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandran	Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram
Kader, Shri S. A.	Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Kahandole, Shri Z. M.	Mishra, Shri G. S.
Kailas, Dr.	Mishra, Shri Jagannath
Kakodkar, Shri Purushottam	Mishra, Shri L. N.
Kakoti, Shri Robin	
Kale, Shri	
Kamakshaiah, Shri D.	

Misra, Shri S. N.	Patil, Shri S. B.
Modi, Shri Shrikishan	Patil, Shri T. A.
Mohammad Tahir, Shri	Patnaik, Shri Banamali
Mohan Swarup, Shri	Patnaik, Shri J. B.
Mohsin, Shri F. H.	Peje, Shri S. L.
Muhammed Khuda Bukhsh, Shri	Prabodh Chandra, Shri
Mukherjee, Shri Samar	Purty, Shri M. S.
Munsi, Shri Priya Ranjan Das	Radhakrishnan, Shri S.
Murmu, Shri Yogesh Chandra	Raghu Ramaiah, Shri K.
Murthy, Shri B. S.	Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai
Nabata, Shri Amrit	Raj Bahadur, Shri
Naik, Shri B. V.	Rajdeo Singh, Shri
Nanda, Shri G. L.	Ram, Shri Tulmohan
Negi, Shri Pratap Singh	Ram Dhan, Shri
Oraon, Shri Kartik	Ram Prakash, Shri
Oraon, Shri Tuna	Ram Sewak, Ch.
Pahadia, Shri Jagannath	Ram Singh Bhai, Shri
Painuli, Shri Paripoornanand	Ram Swarup, Shri
Pandey, Shri Damodar	Ramji Ram, Shri
Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra	Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
Pandey, Shri Narsingh Narain	Rana, Shri M. B.
Pandey, Shri R. S.	Rao, Shrimati B. Radhabai A.
Pandey, Shri Sarjoo	Rao, Shri Jagannath
Pandey, Shri Sudhakar	Rao, Dr. K. L.
Pandey, Shri Tarkeshwar	Rao, Shri K. Narayana
Pandit, Shri S. T.	Rao, Shri M. S. Sanjeevi
Pant, Shri K. C.	Rao, Shri Nageswara
Paokai Haokip, Shri	Rao, Shri P. Ankinedu Prasada
Parashar, Prof. Narain Chand	Rao, Shri Pattabhi Rama
Parikh, Shri Rasiklal	Rao, Shri Rajagopala
Partap Singh, Shri	Rathia, Shri Umed Singh
Parthasarathy, Shri P.	Raut, Shri Bhola
Paswan, Shri Ram Bhagat	Ravi, Shri Vayalar
Patel, Shri Arvind M.	Ray, Shrimati Maya
Patel, Shri Natwarlal	Reddi, Shri P. Antony
Patel, Shri Prabhudas	Reddy, Shri B. N.
Patel, Shri Ramubhai	Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal
Patil, Shri Anantrao	Reddy, Shri P. Bayapa
Patil, Shri C. A.	Reddy, Shri P. Ganga
Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe	Reddy, Shri P. Narasimha
Patil, Shri Krishnarao	Reddy, Shri P. V.

Reddy, Shri Y. Eswara	Shivnath Singh, Shri
Richhariya, Dr. Govind Das	Shukla, Shri B. R.
Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila	Siddhyya, Shri S. M.
Roy, Shri Bishwanath	Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
Roy, Dr. Saradish	Singh, Shri Vishwanath Pratap
Sadhu Ram, Shri	Sinha, Shri Dharam Bir
Saini, Shri Mulki Raj	Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore
Saksena, Prof. S. L.	Sinha, Shri R. K.
Salve, Shri N. K. P.	Sohan Lal, Shri T.
Sambhali, Shri Ishaque	Sokhi, Shri Swaran Singh
Sanghi, Shri N. K.	Stephen, Shri C. M.
Sankata Prasad, Dr.	Subramaniam, Shri C.
Sant Bux Singh, Shri	Sudarsanam, Shri M.
Sathe, Shri Vasant	Sunder Lal, Shri
Satish Chandra, Shri	Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
Satpathy, Shri Devendra	Swaminathan, Shri R. V.
Satyanarayana, Shri B.	Swamy, Shri Sidrameshwar
Savant, Shri Shankerrao	Swaran Singh, Shri
Savitri Shyam, Shrimati	Tarodekar, Shri V. D.
Sayeed, Shri P. M.	Tayyab Hussain, Shri
Sethi, Shri Arjun	Tewari, Shri Shankar
Shafee, Shri A.	Thakre, Shri E. B.
Shafquat Jung, Shri	Thakur, Shri Krishnarao
Shahnawaz Khan, Shri	Tiwari, Shri Chandra Bhal Mani
Shailani, Shri Chandra	Tiwari, Shri R. G.
Shambhu Nath, Shri	Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Shankar Dayal Singh, Shri	Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Shankar Dev, Shri	Tombi Singh, Shri N.
Shankaranand, Shri B.	Tula Ram, Shri
Sharma, Shri A. P.	Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.
Sharma, Dr. H. P.	Vekaria, Shri
Sharma, Shri R. N.	Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
Sharma, Dr. Shankar Dayal	Venkatswamy, Shri G.
Shashi Bhushan, Shri	Verma, Shri Balgovind
Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan	Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad
Shastri, Shri Ramavatar	Vidyalankar, Shri Amarnath
Shastri, Shri Sheopujan	Virbhadra Singh, Shri
Shenoy, Shri P. R.	Yadav, Shri Chandrajit
Sher Singh, Prof.	Yadav, Shri Karan Singh
Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.	Yadav, Shri R. P.
Shivappa, Shri N.	Yadav, Shri D. P.

NOES

Bhagirath Bhanwar, Shri
Dandavate, Prof. Madhu
Giri, Shri S. B.
Joshi, Shri Jagannathrao
Ramkanwar, Shri

MR. SPEAKER : The result* of the
division is :

Ayes : 312; *Noes* : 5.

The motion is carried by a majority of
the total membership of the House and by
a majority of not less than two-thirds of
the Members present and voting.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1 (*Short title and commencement*)

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT : I
beg to move :

Page 1, Line 3,
for "Thirty-third" substitute
"Thirty-second" (5)

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

'Page 1, line 3,—
for "Thirty-third" substitute
"Thirty-second" (5)

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That clause 1, as amended, stand
part of the Bill."

The Lok Sabha divided :

Division No. 24] [17.44 hrs.

AYES

Achal Singh, Shri
Aga, Shri Syed Ahmed
Agrawal, Shri Shrikrishna
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
Ahmed, Shri F. A.
Alagesan, Shri O. V.
Ambesh, Shri
Ankineedu, Shri Maganti
Ansari, Shri Ziaur Rahman
Appalanaidu, Shri
Arvind Netam, Shri
Austin, Dr. Henry
Awdhesh Chandra Singh, Shri
Aziz Imam, Shri
Babunath Singh, Shri
Balakrishniah, Shri T.
Banamali Babu, Shri
Banerji, Shrimati Mukul
Barman, Shri R. N.
Barua, Shri Bedabrata
Basappa, Shri K.
Basumatari, Shri D.
Besra, Shri S. C.
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhagat, Shri H. K. L.
Bhargava, Shri Basheshwar Nath
Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal
Bhattacharyya, Shri Chapalendu
Bhuvarahan, Shri G.
Bist, Shri Narendra Singh
Brahmanandji, Shri Swami
Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri

* The following Members also recorded their votes :

AYES : Sarvashri K. Mallanna, Modho-ram Sharma, Yamuna Prasad Mandal, T
V. Chandrashekharaappa Veerasappa and S. C. Samanta.

NOES : Sarvashri Madhu Limaye and P. G. Mavalankar.

Chakleshwar Singh, Shri	Gautam, Shri C. D.
Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal	Gavit, Shri T. H.
Chandrashekarappa Veerabasappa, Shri T. V.	Genda Singh, Shri
Chaturvedi, Shri Rohan Lal	Ghosh, Shri P. K.
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Shingh	Gill, Shri Mohinder Singh
Chavan, Shri Yeshwantrao	Giri, Shri V. Shanker
Chawla, Shri Amar Nath	Godara, Shri Mani Ram
Chhotey Lal, Shri-	Gogoi, Shri Tarun
Chhutten Lal, Shri	Gohain, Shri C. C.
Chikkalingaiah, Shri K.	Gokhale, Shri H. R.
Choudhary, Shri B. E.	Gopal, Shri K.
Choudhury, Shri Moinul Haque	Goswami, Shrimati Bibha Ghosh
Daga, Shri M. C.	Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chandra
Dalbir Singh, Shri	Gotkhinde, Shri Annasaheb
Dalip Singh, Shri	Govind Das, Dr.
Damani, Shri S. R.	Gowda, Shri Pampan
Darbara Singh, Shri	Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra
Das, Shri Dharnidhar	Hansda, Shri Subodh
Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas	Hanumanthaiya, Shri K.
Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.	Hari Kishore Singh, Shri
Deb, Shri Dasaratha	Hari Singh, Shri
Deo, Shri S. N. Singh	Ishaque, Shri A. K. M.
Desai, Shri D. D.	Jadeja, Shri D. P.
Deshmukh, Shri K. G.	Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.
Dhamankar, Shri	Jagjivan Ram, Shri
Dharamgaj Singh, Shri	Jamilurrahman, Shri Md.
Dharia, Shri Mohan	Jeyalakshmi, Shrimati V.
Dhusia, Shri Anant Prasad	Jha, Shri Chiranjib
Dinesh Singh, Shri	Jitendra Prasad, Shri
Dixit, Shri G. C.	Joshi, Shri Popatlal M.
Dixit, Shri Jagdish Chandra	Kadam, Shri Dattajirao
Doda, Shri Hiralal	Kadam, Shri J. G.
Dube, Shri J. P.	Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandran
Dumada, Shri L. K.	Kader, Shri S. A.
Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar	Kahandole, Shri Z. M.
Engti, Shri Biren	Kailas, Dr.
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira	Kakodkar, Shri Purushottam
Ganesh, Shri K. R.	Kakoti, Shri Robin
Ganga Devi, Shrimati	Kale, Shri
Garcha, Shri Devinder Singh	Kamakshaiyah, Shri D.
	Kamala Prasad, Shri

Kamble, Shri T. D.
Kamla Kumari, Kumari
Kapur, Shri Sat Pal
Karan Singh, Dr.
Kasture, Shri A. S.
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.
Krishnan, Shri G. Y.
Kulkarni, Shri Raja
Kureel, Shri B. N.
Kushok Bakula, Shri
Lakkappa, Shri K.
Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati T.
Lambodar Baliyar, Shri
Laskar, Shri Nihar
Lutfal Haque, Shri
Madhukar, Shri K. M.
Mahajan, Shri Vikram
Mahajan, Shri Y. S.
Mahata, Shri Debendra Nath
Malaviya, Shri K. D.
Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
Mallanna, Shri K.
Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain
Maurya, Shri B. P.
Mehta, Dr. Jivraj
Mehta, Dr. Mahipatray
Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mishra, Shri G. S.
Mishra, Shri Jagannath
Mishra, Shri L. N.
Misra, Shri S. N.
Modi, Shri Shrikishan
Mohammed Tahir, Shri

Mohan Swarup, Shri
Mohsin, Shri F. H.
Muhammed Khuda Bukhsh, Shri
Mukherjee, Shri Samar
Munsi, Shri Priya Ranjan Das
Murmu, Shri Yogesh Chandra
Murthy, Shri B. S.
Nahata, Shri Amrit
Nanda, Shri G. L.
Negi, Shri Pratap Singh
Oraon, Shri Kartik
Oraon, Shri Tuna
Pahadia, Shri Jagannath
Painuli, Shri Paripoornanand
Pandey, Shri Damodar
Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra
Pandey, Shri Narsingh Narain
Pandey, Shri R. S.
Pandey, Shri Sarjoo
Pandey, Shri Sudhakar
Pandey, Shri Tarkeshwar
Pandit, Shri S. T.
Pant, Shri K. C.
Paokai Haokip, Shri
Parashar, Prof. Narain Chand
Parikh, Shri Rasiklal
Partap Singh, Shri
Parthasarathy, Shri P.
Paswan, Shri Ram Bhagat
Patel, Shri Arvind M.
Patel, Shri Natwarlal
Patel, Shri Prabhudas
Patel, Shri Ramubhal
Patil, Shri Anantrao
Patil, Shri C. A.
Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe
Patil, Shri Krishnarao
Patil, Shri S. B.
Patil, Shri T. A.
Patnaik, Shri Banamali
Patnaik, Shri J. B.

Peje, Shri S. L.	Saha, Shri Gadadhar
Prabodh Chandra, Shri	Saini, Shri Mulki Raj
Purty, Shri M. S.	Saksena, Prof. S. L.
Radhakrishnan, Shri S.	Salve, Shri N. K. P.
Raghu Ramaiah, Shri K.	Samanta, Shri S. C.
Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai	Sambhali, Shri Ishaque
Raj Bahadur, Shri	Singhi, Shri N. K.
Rajdeo Singh, Shri	Sankata Prasad, Dr.
Ram, Shri Tulmohan	Sant Bux Singh, Shri
Ram Dhan, Shri	Sathe, Shri Vasant
Ram Prakash, Shri	Satish Chandra, Shri
Ram Sewak, Ch.	Satpathy, Shri Devendra
Ram Singh Bhai, Shri	Satyanarayana, Shri B.
Ram Swarup, Shri	Savitri Shyam, Shrimati
Ramji Ram, Shri	Sayeed, Shri P. M.
Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri	Sethi, Shri Arjun
Rana, Shri M. B.	Shafee, Shri A.
Rao, Shrimati B. Radhabai A.	Shafquat Jung, Shri
Rao, Shri Jagannath	Shahnawaz Khan, Shri
Rao, Dr. K. L.	Shailani, Shri Chandra
Rao, Shri K. Narayana	Shambhu Nath, Shri
Rao, Shri M. S. Sanjeevi	Shankar Dayal Singh, Shri
Rao, Shri Nageswara	Shankar Dev, Shri
Rao, Shri P. Ankineedu Prasad	Shankaranand, Shri B.
Rao, Shri Pattabhi Rama	Sharma, Shri A. P.
Rao, Shri Rajagopala	Sharma, Dr. H. P.
Rathia, Shri Umed Singh	Sharma, Shri Madhoram
Raut, Shri Bhola	Sharma, Shri R. N.
Ravi, Shri Vayalar	Sharma, Dr. Shankar Dayal
Ray, Shrimati Maya	Shashi Bhushan, Shri
Reddi, Shri P. Antony	Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan
Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal	Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
Reddy, Shri P. Bayapa	Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
Reddy, Shri P. Ganga	Shenoy, Shri P. R.
Reddy, Shri P. Narasimha	Sher Singh, Prof.
Reddy, Shri P. V.	Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.
Reddy, Shri Y. Eswara	Shivappa, Shri N.
Richhariya, Dr. Govind Das	Shivnath Singh, Shri
Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila	Shukla, Shri B. R.
Roy, Shri Bishwanath	Siddayya, Shri S. M.
Sadhu Ram, Shri	Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri

Singh, Shri Vishwanath Pratap
Sinha, Shri Dharam Bir
Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore
Sinha, Shri R. K.
Sohan Lal, Shri T.
Sokhi, Shri Swaran Singh
Stephen, Shri C. M.
Subramaniam, Shri C.
Sudarsanam, Shri M.
Sunder Lal, Shri
Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
Swaminathan, Shri R. V.
Swamy, Shri Sidrameshwar
Swaran Singh, Shri
Tarodekar, Shri V. B.
Tayyab Hussain, Shri
Tewari, Shri Shankar
Thakre, Shri S. B.
Thakur, Shri Krishnarao
Tiwari, Shri Chandra Bhal Mani
Tiwari, Shri R. G.
Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Tombi Singh, Shri N.
Tula Ram, Shri
Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.
Vekaria, Shri
Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
Venkatswamy, Shri G.
Verma, Shri Balgovind
Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad
Virbhadra Singh, Shri
Yadav, Shri Chandrajit
Yadav, Shri Karan Singh
Yadav, Shri R. P.
Yadav, Shri D. P.

NOES

Bhagirath Bhanwar, Shri
Dandavate, Prof. Madhu
Giri, Shri S. B.
Limaye, Shri Madhu
Mavalankar, Shri P. G.
Ramkanwar, Shri

MR. SPEAKER : The result* of the division is :

Ayes : 313; *Noes* : 6.

The motion is carried by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT : I beg to move :

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

MR. SPEAKER : Motion moved:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad) : Sir, in spite of the fact that a large majority of members sitting on the other side in the House are very restive and not wanting me to speak even for a few minutes, I wish to assert my right and speak. At the outset, I want to suggest that those of us who are opposed to this particular measure are most desirous

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

Sarvashri Yamuna Prasad Mardal, Shankerrao Savant, B. V. Naik and Amarnath Vidyalkar.

of seeing that our country is one nation. We are not against national unity. But the whole question is, how do you go about making India into one nation? Do you do it by foisting your own political decisions on the people or do you take the people into confidence, persuade them, ascertain their wishes and then legislate?

AN HON. MEMBER: We won a massive majority.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: That was in 1971. Since then much water has flowed under the bridge. This morning we read in the papers who won in Mhow in M. P. Don't talk of massive majority all the time. We are all for national unity, but do not impose things on the people on the plea that you have a massive majority. Assuming for the sake of argument that my friends have a massive majority in the House, have they got a massive majority in terms of votes polled? No. They got not more than 43 per cent of the votes. (*Interruptions*). Your shouting is not going to change the facts.

Indeed, the facts remain. I will tell you something, what might please you, that, unfortunately, the opposition is divided. The majority of votes in the country are distributed. But that does not mean that you have also the majority of votes along with the majority of seats. Of course, that is not the question in which I want to draw myself just now.

My point is that this measure is unconstitutional. It has been brought at the wrong time... (*Interruptions*) I want your protection, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am speaking in this honourable House. I am ready for interruptions. But I do not want these shoutings. If they interrupt me, I will reply to them. But I do not want them to shout. It is not becoming of this august House.

MR. SPEAKER: Please listen to him.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: If they do not interrupt me, I will finish in a few minutes.

My point is that if people want certain things for which they agitated for a long time, that is an important consideration. But even those who are voting with the Government today have said that they did not want it, that they wanted two separate States. Suddenly what has happened? Since 1956, from the beginning of the States Reorganisation Commission's Report, a separate Telengana demand was conceded. Surely, the S.R.C. was not thinking of political considerations. It was not in a hot mood. It was thinking in a cool, dispassionate, non-partisan objective manner. It had said that. Now, if these people in Andhra and Telengana feel that by their having a separate State, they should be able to develop better so that they become a part of the entire nation, why do you deny that privilege to them?

This is all I want to say. I want to say, finally, why are you afraid of small States. The argument given by the hon. Minister was, "If you go in for small States India will be divided into so many pieces."

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT: I did not say that.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: Have we not got small States? A number of small States are there. What is the harm in that? I am glad, the Home Minister said, he has not said it. I withdraw that. I apologise to the hon. Minister for having said that.

But, as regards the arguments advanced on the Congress Benches that the creation of small States will be wrong, I suggest that small States are not going to be bad if there is no idea of power or politicalisation in it. If the idea of having small States is to give administration in the hands of the people there so that the people can get nearer to one another and there is more decentralisation, what is wrong in that? Is that not what Mahatma Gandhi had said? If Mahatma Gandhi wanted decentralisation, he did not want it from the point of view of the division of the

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar]

nation. He wanted it because you cannot govern the country from one Centre, whatever that be.

I want to conclude by saying that if something is to be done, let it be done by first consulting the people and having their wishes. As my hon. friend, Prof. Dandavate, said, those wishes can be found out in the pending bye-elections. Then, if you feel that the people's wishes are with what you are doing, you do it. But don't do it at a time which is ill-timed. The provision is unconstitutional. The Six-point Formula is definitely unworkable.

With these words, I oppose this Bill. As I said in the beginning, and I repeat it at the end, I am all for national unity. But that must be done by a natural process, by a persuasive process, by a democratic process, not by forcing something on the people, without consulting them, without having their wishes duly ascertained in the matter.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The Lok Sabha divided :

Division No. 25]

[17.56 hrs.

AYES

Achal Singh, Shri
Aga, Shri Syed Ahmed
Agrawal, Shri Shrikrishna
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
Ahmed, Shri F. A.
Alagesan, Shri O. V.
Amesh, Shri
Ankineedu, Shri Maganti
Ansari, Shri Ziaur Rahman
Appalanaidu, Shri
Arvind Netam, Shri
Austin, Dr. Henry
Awdhesh Chandra Singh, Shri
Aziz Imam, Shri
Babunath Singh, Shri

Balakrishniah, Shri T.
Banamali Babu, Shri
Banerji, Shrimati Mukul
Barman, Shri R. N.
Barua, Shri Bedabrata
Basappa, Shri K.
Basumatari, Shri D.
Besra, Shri S. C.
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhagat Shri H. K. L.
Bhargava, Shri Bhasheshwar Nath
Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal
Bhattacharyya, Shri Chapalendu
Bhuvrahan, Shri G.
Bist, Shri Narendra Singh
Brahmanandji, Shri Swami
Chakleshwar Singh, Shri
Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal
Chandrashekharappa Veerabasappa, Shri
T. V.
Chaturvedi, Shri Rohan Lal
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
Chavan, Shri Yeshwantrao
Chawla, Shri Amar Nath
Chhotey Lal, Shri
Chhuttan Lal, Shri
Chikkalingaiah, Shri K.
Choudhary, Shri B. E.
Choudhury, Shri Moinul Haque
Daga, Shri M. C.
Dalbir Singh, Shri
Dalip Singh, Shri
Damani, Shri S. R.
Darbara Singh, Shri
Das, Shri Dharnidhar
Dassappa, Shri Tulsidas
Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.
Deb, Shri Dasaratha
Deo, Shri S. N. Singh
Desai, Shri D. D.
Deshmukh, Shri K. G.

Dhamankar, Shri	Jagjivan Ram, Shri
Dharamgaj Singh, Shri	Jamilurrahman, Shri Md.
Dharia, Shri Mohan	Jeyalakshmi, Shrimati V.
Dhusia, Shri Anant Prasad	Jha, Shri Chiranjib
Dinesh Singh, Shri	Jitendra Prasad, Shri
Dixit, Shri G. C.	Joshi, Shri Popatlal M.
Dixit, Shri Jagdish Chandra	Kadam, Shri Dattajirao
Doda, Shri Hiralal	Kadam, Shri J. G.
Dube, Shri J. P.	Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandran
Dumada, Shri L. K.	Kader, Shri S. A.
Dutta, Shri Biren	Kahandole, Shri Z. M.
Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar	Kakodkar, Shri Purushottam
Engti, Shri Biren	Kakoti, Shri Robin
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira	Kale, Shri
Ganesh, Shri K. R.	Kamakshaiyah, Shri D.
Ganga Devi, Shrimati	Kamala Prasad, Shri
Garcha, Shri Devinder Singh	Kamble, Shri T. D.
Gautam, Shri C. D.	Kamla Kumari, Kumari
Gavit, Shri T. H.	Kapur, Shri Sat Pal
Genda Singh, Shri	Karan Singh, Dr.
Ghosh, Shri P. K.	Kasture, Shri A. S.
Gill, Shri Mohinder Singh	Kaul, Shrimati Sheila
Giri, Shri V. Shanker	Kavde, Shri B. R.
Godara, Shri Mani Ram	Kedar Nath Singh, Shri
Gogoi, Shri Tarun	Khadilkar, Shri R. K.
Gohain, Shri C. C.	Kinder Lal, Shri
Gokhale, Shri H. R.	Kiruttinan, Shri Tha
Gopal, Shri K.	Kisku, Shri A. K.
Goswami, Shrimati Bibha Ghosh	Kotoki, Shri Liladhar
Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chandra	Kotrashetti, Shri A. K.
Gotkhinde, Shri Annasaheb	Krishnan, Shri G. Y.
Govind Das, Dr.	Kulkarni, Shri Raja
Gowda, Shri Pampan	Kureel, Shri B. N.
Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra	Kushok Bakula, Shri
Hansda, Shri Subodh	Lakkappa, Shri K.
Hanumanthaiya, Shri K.	Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati T.
Hari Kishore Singh, Shri	Lambodar Baliyar, Shri
Hari Singh, Shri	Laskar, Shri Nihar
Ishaque, Shri A. K. M.	Lutfal Haque, Shri
Jadeja, Shri D. P.	Madhukar, Shri K. M.
Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.	Mahajan, Shri Vikarm

Mahajan, Shri Y. S.
Mahata, Shri Debendra Nath
Malaviya, Shri K. D.
Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
Mallanna, Shri K.
Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain
Maurya, Shri B. P.
Mehta, Dr. Jivraj
Mehta, Dr. Mahipatray
Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mishra, Shri G. S.
Mishra, Shri Jagannath
Mishra, Shri L. N.
Misra, Shri S. N.
Modi, Shri Shrikishan
Mohammad Tahir, Shri
Mohan Swarup, Shri
Mohsin, Shri F. H.
Muhammed Khuda Buksh, Shri
Muhammed-Sheriff, Shri
Mukherjee, Shri Samar
Munshi, Shri Priya Ranjan Das
Murmu, Shri Yogesh Chandra
Murthy, Shri B. S.
Nahata, Shri Amrit
Naik, Shri B. V.
Nanda, Shri G. L.
Negi, Shri Pratap Singh
Oraon, Shri Kartik
Oraon, Shri Tuna
Pahadia, Shri Jagannath
Painuli, Shri Paripoornanand
Pandey, Shri Damodar
Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra
Pandey, Shri Narsingh Narain
Pandey, Shri R. S.
Pandey, Shri Sarjoo
Pandey, Shri Sudhakar
Pandey, Shri Tarkeshwar
Pandit, Shri S. T.

Pant, Shri K. C.
Paokai Haokip, Shri
Parikh, Shri Rasiklal
Partap Singh, Shri
Parthasarathy, Shri P.
Puswan, Shri Ram Bhagat
Patel, Shri Natwarlal
Patel, Shri Prabhudas
Patel, Shri Ramubhai
Patil, Shri Anantrao
Patil, Shri, C. A.
Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe
Patil, Shri Krishnarao
Patil, Shri S. B.
Patil, Shri T. A.
Patnaik, Shri Banamali
Patnaik, Shri J. B.
Peje, Shri S. L.
Purty, Shri M. S.
Radhakrishnan, Shri S.
Raghu Ramaiah, Shri K.
Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai
Raj Bahadur, Shri
Rajdeo Singh, Shri
Ram, Shri Tulmohan
Ram Dhan, Shri
Ram Prakash, Shri
Ram Sewak, Ch.
Ram Singh Bhai, Shri
Ram Swarup, Shri
Ramji Ram, Shri
Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
Rana, Shri M. B.
Rao, Shrimati B. Radhabai A.
Rao, Shri Jagannath
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

Rao, Shri Rajagopala
 Rathia, Shri Umed Singh
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Ravi, Shri Vayalar
 Reddi, Shri P. Antony
 Reddy, Shri B. N.
 Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal
 Reddy, Shri P. Bayapa
 Reddy, Shri P. Ganga
 Keddy, Shri P. Narasimha
 Reddy, Shri P. V.
 Reddy, Shri Y. Eswara
 Richhariya, Dr. Govind Das
 Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath
 Roy, Dr. Saradish
 Rudra Pratap Singh, Shri
 Sadhu Ram, Shri
 Saini, Shri Mulki Raj
 Saksena, Prof. S. L.
 Salve, Shri N. K. P.
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sambhali, Shri Ishaque
 Sanghi, Shri N. K.
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.
 Sathe, Shri Vasant
 Satish Chandra, Shri
 Satyanarayana, Shri B.
 Savant, Shri Shankerrao
 Savitri Shyam, Shrimati
 Sethi, Shri Arjun
 Sezhiyan, Shri
 Shafee, Shri A.
 Shafquat Jung, Shri
 Shah Nawaz Khan, Shri
 Shailani, Shri Chandra
 Shambhu Nath, Shri
 Shankar Dayal Singh, Shri
 Shankar Dev, Shri
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Sharma, Shri A. P.

Sharma, Dr. H. P.
 Sharma, Shri Madhoram
 Sharma, Shri R. N.
 Sharma, Dr. Shankar Dayal
 Shashi Bhushan, Shri
 Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan
 Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
 Shenoy, Shri P. R.
 Sher Singh, Prof.
 Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.
 Shivappa, Shri N.
 Shivanth Singh, Shri
 Shukla, Shri B. R.
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
 Siddayya, Shri S. M.
 Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
 Singh, Shri Vishwanath Pratap
 Sinha, Shri Dharam Bir
 Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore
 Sinha, Shri R. K.
 Sohan Lal, Shri T.
 Sokhi, Shri Swaran Singh
 Stephen, Shri C. M.
 Subramaniam, Shri C.
 Subravelu, Shri
 Sudarsanam, Shri M.
 Sunder Lal, Shri
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
 Swaminathan Shri R. V.
 Swamy, Shri Sidrameshwar
 Swaran Singh, Shri
 Tarodekar, Shri V. B.
 Tayyab Hussain, Shri
 Tewari, Shri Shankar
 Thakre, Shri S. B.
 Thakur, Shri Krishnarao
 Tiwari, Shri R. G.
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.
 Tombi Singh, Shri N.
 Tula Ram, Shri
 Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.

Shri. Veerana

Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
Verma, Shri Balgovind
Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad
Vidyalankar, Shri Amarnath
Virbhadra Singh, Shri
Yadav, Shri Chandrajit
Yadav, Shri Karan Singh
Yadav, Shri R. P.
Yadav, Shri D. P.

NOES

Bade, Shri R. V.
Bhagirath Bhanwar, Shri
Chowhan, Shri Bharat Singh
Dandavate, Prof. Madu
Joshi, Shri Jagannathrao
Mavalankar, Shri P. G.
Pandeya, Dr. Laxminarain
Ramkanwar, Shri

MR. SPEAKER : The result* of the division is:

Ayes : 311

Noes : 8

The motion is carried by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER : I shall now take up the other Bill also — the *Mulki Rules (Repeal) Bill*. There will be no question of compulsory division on it.

There are two amendments moved to the main motion for consideration, both

by Shri S. B. Giri, one for circulation and the other for reference to a Select Committee.

I shall now put Amendment No. 2 to the main motion by Shri S. B. Giri to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 2 was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, I will put the second amendment standing in the name of Shri S. B. Giri to vote.

Amendment No. 3 was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, the question is :

"That the Bill to provide for the repeal of Mulki Rules be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, we take up clause-by-clause consideration.

Clause 2 (Definition)

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 (Repeal of Mulki Rules)

SHRI B. N. REDDY : Sir, I move :

Page 1, —

after line 13, add —

"Provided further that the State guarantees employment in different departments and undertakings of

*The following Members also recorded their votes :

AYES : Shri Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Dr. Kailas, Shrimati Maya Ray, Sarvashri Yamuna Prasad Mandal, P. M. Sayeed, Devendra Satpathy, D. N. Tiwary and Ramavatar Shastri.

NOES : Shri S. B. Giri.

the Government of Andhra Pradesh at 2:1 (two is to one) ratio to the people of the Andhra and the Telengana region respectively." (1)

When the question of employment comes in this Bill there is the element of the old Mulki Rules being continued, that is to give preference only to the local candidates for every district. This will create 20 areas under Mulki Rules instead of the present two areas. We should discontinue the old Mulki Rules which create a very undesirable situation and will encourage the theory of sons of the soil. A democratic principle must be adopted in the matter of employment in public services and it should be Statewise and it should apply to the entire State not only to certain regions, that is to say, in all departments and undertakings of the Government. I have stipulated the ratio of 2:1 — two for Andhra and one for Telengana—which should be maintained on the basis of the entire State. I request you to kindly advise the ruling Party to accept my amendment.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, I will put amendment No. 1 of Shri B. N. Reddy to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 1 was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, the question is :

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT : I move :

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, the House stands adjourned till 11 a.m. tomorrow.

18.00 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, December 19, 1973/Agrahayana 28, 1895 (SAKA).