

it branches off to Kolhapur. I would say that the line would be remunerative and convenient to the public only when it is extended from Miraj to Bangalore via Hubli. A direct broad gauge link from Bangalore to Poona will provide uninterrupted communication both for traffic and passengers from north to the south. This must be remembered.

16 hrs.

Again, I have already pointed out, the conversion of metre gauge from Bangalore to Guntakal will give uninterrupted communication from Bangalore right up to Delhi. These are the points which I must submit and I must say that you must have a regular programme—does not matter if it takes 10 years, 20 years or 50 years—for conversion of metre gauge to broad gauge throughout the country.

16.01 hrs.

MOTION RE AGITATION FOR
SEPARATE STATE OF TELEN-
GANA—contd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta on the 18th August, 1969 namely:—

“That this House takes serious note of the agitation for separate State of Telengana and urges upon the Government to take necessary steps.”

Time allotted was 4 hours and 30 minutes; time already taken is 3 hours and we have got 1 hour and 30 minutes left now.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Mettur): I think the Minister is sent for; so let us continue with the Railway Demands till the Minister arrives here. I think, he will arrive in good time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with whether the Minister is here or not. We must carry on with it.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN: He must be there to reply. Telengana is such an

important affair and how can we carry on the discussion without the Minister being there?

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak): The Home Minister is there, Sir.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : सभापति महोदय, श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त जी के प्रस्ताव पर मैंने एक संशोधन दिया था, जो इस प्रकार है :

आंध्र के तेलंगाना भाग की हर क्षेत्र में व्यापक उपेक्षा पर असन्तोष व्यक्त करती है और सरकार से अनुरोध करती है कि वह पृथक तेलंगाना राज्य की सम्भावनाओं पर विचार कर शीघ्र ही अनुकूल निर्णय लेने की दिशा में पग बढ़ाये।”

ये शब्द मैंने “पृथक तेलंगाना राज्य के लिए आन्दोलन पर गहरी चिन्ता व्यक्त करती है और सरकार से अनुरोध करती है कि वह आवश्यक कदम उठाये” के स्थान पर रखने का संशोधन दिया है।

सभापति महोदय, आपकी स्मरण होगा कि जब जब इस सदन में इस प्रकार के प्रस्ताव आए हैं कि किसी राज्य के एक भाग को उस राज्य से पृथक किया जाए तो मैं इस सदन के उन सदस्यों में रहा हूँ जिन्होंने उस विचारधारा का या उस भावना का विरोध किया है। संसद के पिछले अधिवेशन में जब तेलंगाना की बात आई थी उस समय भी मैंने यह अनुरोध किया था कि तेलंगाना वासियों की जो कठिनाइयाँ हैं उनके ऊपर तो विचार किया जाए लेकिन तेलंगाना पृथक निर्माण की बात के ऊपर विचार करना देश के हित में नहीं होगा।

मुझे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने जब एक बैठक में बुलाया था तब उसमें मैंने अपनी ओर से तीन सुझाव दिये थे। पहला मेरा सुझाव यह था कि तेलंगाना क्षेत्र के किसी व्यक्ति को उप मुख्यमंत्री बनाया जाए। दूसरे वहाँ की क्षेत्रीय समिति के अधिकार बढ़ाये जायें और तीसरे यह कि वर्तमान मुख्य

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

मंत्री को जिनके विरुद्ध वहाँ की जनता में भयंकर असन्तोष है, अपने पद से हटा कर उनके स्थान पर जिसे दूसरे व्यक्ति को मुख्य मंत्री बनाया जाए।

लेकिन जब मैंने स्वयं अपनी आँखों से जाकर तेलंगाना की सारी समस्या को देखा और आठ दस दिन रहकर तेलंगाना की स्थिति का अध्ययन किया तो आज मैं बड़ी दृढ़ता के साथ तेलंगानावासियों की उस मांग का समर्थन करता हूँ कि तेलंगाना को पृथक करने में ही तेलंगाना का हित है और भारत का भी हित है। इस बात को मैं दो दृष्टियों से कहता हूँ। एक तो यह है निःसंकोच के जो लोग अब तक यह समन रहे हैं और जिनमें सम्भवतः गृह मंत्री भी हों कि यह आन्दोलन राजनीतिक आन्दोलन है और, राजनीतिक आधार पर इस आन्दोलन का समाधान ढूँढ़ने का प्रयास किया जाए यह ठीक नहीं है। यह राजनीतिक आन्दोलन नहीं है, यह जन आन्दोलन है। इसका प्रारम्भ अवश्य विद्यार्थियों से हुआ लेकिन आज यह आन्दोलन विद्यार्थियों के हाथ में नहीं, आज तेलंगाना की जनता का आन्दोलन हो गया है।

विद्यार्थियों का जहाँ तक सम्बन्ध है, आज स्थिति यह है कि तेलंगाना के छः लाख विद्यार्थी पिछले आठ महीनों से बेकार हैं

एक माननीय सदस्य : सोलह लाख।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : छः लाख से मेरा अभिप्राय कालेजों और यूनिवर्सिटी से है। जो प्राइमरी स्कूल से लेकर विश्वविद्यालय के स्तर तक के विद्यार्थी हैं उनकी संख्या 16 लाख है। आज तेलंगाना के 58 कालेज, दो यूनिवर्सिटीयाँ, तीन मैडिकल कालेज, दो इंजीनियरिंग कालेज और हायर सैकन्डरी स्कूल और दूसरे छोटे स्कूल तो बहुत हैं वे सारे के सारे बन्द पड़े हैं। एक ऐसा प्रकरण भी आया जब जितने भी नान-

गजेटिड आफिसर्स तेलंगाना के थे उन सब ने हड़ताल का निश्चय किया और लगभग डेढ़ महीने तक हड़ताल चली और सरकारी कार्यालयों के अन्दर वे नहीं गए।

एक और बात भी है जिसका पता शायद सदन को न हो। तेलंगाना के अन्दर एक और संगठन है जिसको वहाँ की भाषा में बतनदार एसोसिएशन कहा जाता है। ये लोग गाँवों से रेवेन्यू इकट्ठा करके सरकारी खजाने में जमा कराते हैं। यह बतनदार एसोसिएशन तेलंगाना के सारे गाँवों का प्रतिनिधित्व करती है और इसके दो दो चार चार प्रतिनिधि एक एक गाँव में रहते हैं। वे सारे इस पक्ष में हैं कि जब तक तेलंगाना के पृथक राज्य का निर्माण नहीं किया जाएगा तब तक वे रेवेन्यू इकट्ठा करके सरकार के खजाने में नहीं देंगे। इस तरह से तेलंगाना के नौ जिलों के अन्दर प्रशासन तंत्र आठ महीनों से बिल्कुल ठप्प पड़ा हुआ है। ऐसी स्थिति में यह सोचना कि राजनीतिक स्तर पर इसका समाधान हो जाएगा या चन्द बड़े आदमियों को भेज देने से समाधान हो जाएगा, मैं समझता हूँ कोई बुद्धिमत्ता नहीं है।

पिछली बार मेरे मित्र, श्री सुरेन्द्रनाथ द्विवेदी, ने तेलंगाना में पुलिस द्वारा किये जा रहे अत्याचारों के लिए 'जलियांवाला बाग' शब्द का प्रयोग किया था। सदन के कई मित्रों ने उस पर आपत्ति की थी। लेकिन 15 अगस्त को विवेकवादी कालेज में ध्वजारोहन के अवसर पर पुलिस ने लोगों पर जो अत्याचार किये, उन से श्री द्विवेदी के कथन को बल ही मिलता है। वहाँ पर सब दरवाजे बन्द कर दिये गये और केवल एक दरवाजा खुला रखा गया। जो लोग तिरंगा झंडा फहराने के लिए और राष्ट्रीय दिवस मनाने के लिए वहाँ आये उनको वहाँ से निबालते समय बुरी तरह से पीटा गया। केवल सामान्य व्यक्तियों

के साथ ही यह व्यवहार नहीं किया गया, बल्कि आन्ध्र विधान सभा की एक सदस्या भी पुलिस की मार-पीट का शिकार हुई, जिन्होंने आन्ध्र विधान सभा में खून से लथपथ साड़ी को प्रस्तुत करके उस घटना के बारे में बताया ।

अगर इन घटनाओं के बाद उनकी तुलना जलियांवाला बाग कांड से की जाये, तो वह कोई अतिशयोक्ति नहीं है । हालांकि यह सही है कि जलियांवाला बाग के कांड के उद्देश्य और तेलंगाना में की जा रही कार्यवाहियों के उद्देश्य में भिन्नता रही है । विवेकवर्द्धिनी कालेज में 15 अगस्त को जो घटना घटी, जिसके बारे में मैंने 16 अगस्त को स्वयं जाकर सुना और उस स्थान को देखा, उससे मुझे पता लगा कि आन्ध्र की पुलिस आज बिल्कुल काबू से बाहर हो गई है और इस प्रकार के हथकण्डों से इस आन्दोलन को दबाना चाहती है । लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अब वह मामला पुलिस और राजनीतियों के हाथों से निकल चुका है ।

नक्सलाइट कम्युनिस्ट देश के कुछ भागों में आज से केवल दो तीन साल पहले पैदा हुए । लेकिन उग्रवादी कम्युनिस्ट सबसे पहले तेलंगाना के क्षेत्र में ही सक्रिय हुए थे । कुछ समय बाद तेलंगाना में उन प्रवृत्तियों का अन्त हो गया था । सरकार की उपेक्षावृत्ति का परिणाम यह हुआ है कि आज तेलंगाना आन्दोलन की आड़ ले कर वही प्रवृत्तियां धीरे धीरे उभर रही हैं । मुझे मह देख कर दुख और आश्चर्य हुआ कि आखिर साम्यवादी भाई पृथक तेलंगाना की मांग का समर्थन क्यों नहीं करते हैं । उसके पीछे रहस्य यह है कि अगर वे इस मांग का समर्थन करें और पृथक तेलंगाना का निर्माण हो गया, तो वह आन्दोलन बन्द हो जायेगा । जिसका परिणाम यह होगा कि उसकी आड़ में वे लोग जो गतिविधियां कर रहे हैं और अपनी जड़ें जमा रहे हैं, उनके मांग वादा उत्पन्न होगी । इसलिए वे

चाहते हैं कि वह आन्दोलन बन्द न हों ।
(व्यवधान)

अगर एक पृथक तेलंगाना राज्य बनाया जाता है, तो उसकी स्थिति नागालैंड, हरियाणा या हिमाचल प्रदेश जैसी नहीं होगी । उसकी जनसंख्या डेढ़ करोड़ होगी, वह अपने पैरों पर खड़ा होने वाला राज्य होगा और उसको केन्द्र पर निर्भर नहीं रहना पड़ेगा ।

राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में जिस प्रकार हिमाचल प्रदेश को पंजाब से पृथक एक राज्य बनाने की सिफारिश की थी, उसी तरह उसने तेलंगाना का एक अलग राज्य बनाने की सिफारिश भी की थी । लेकिन उस समय के नेताओं ने एक बीच का मार्ग निकाला और इन दोनों क्षेत्रों के अधिकारों और हितों की रक्षा करने के लिए रिजनल कमेटियां बना दीं । तेलंगाना के लोगों का कहना है कि पंजाब की रिजनल कमेटी सफल नहीं हो सकी और उसी आधार पर पंजाब का विभाजन हुआ । इसलिए पंजाब, हिमाचल प्रदेश और हरियाणा को पृथक कर दिया गया । जब तेलंगाना की रिजनल कमेटी उस क्षेत्र की समस्याओं का समाधान नहीं कर पाई तो फिर वही मिद्धान्त और वही युक्ति तेलंगाना के विषय में क्यों नहीं लागू किये जाते हैं ।

श्री झारखण्डे राय (घोसी) : पंजाब और हरियाणा की भाषाएं अलग अलग थीं अविभाजित पंजाब एक द्विभाषा-भाषी राज्य था, जबकि आन्ध्र एक भाषा-भाषी राज्य है ।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : जिम प्रश्न को डी० एम० के० एक सदस्य ने उठाया था, उसी प्रश्न को मेरे मित्र, श्री झारखण्डे राय, ने उठाया है । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर एक भाषा-भाषी क्षेत्रों को एक साथ

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

ही रखना है, तो फिर प्रशासन की दृष्टि से बिहार और उत्तर प्रदेश अलग-अलग दो राज्य क्यों हैं, और इसी प्रकार राजस्थान और मध्यप्रदेश अलग-अलग दो राज्य क्यों हैं; जब कि उनमें एक ही भाषा बोली जाती है। इसका कारण यह है कि प्रशासन की सुविधा की दृष्टि से भी इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था की जाती है और इस प्रकार के निर्णय लेने पड़ते हैं।

गृह मंत्री, श्री चव्हाण, को याद होगा कि गुजरात के लोगों ने बुद्धिमत्ता से काम लिया और सौराष्ट्र के गुजरात में विलय के बाद दो मुख्य मंत्री सौराष्ट्र के बनाये और एक मुख्य मंत्री गुजरात का। इसी प्रकार विदर्भ के महाराष्ट्र में विलय के बाद दो मुख्य मंत्री विदर्भ के बनाये गये और एक मुख्य मंत्री महाराष्ट्र का। लेकिन तेलंगाना के सम्बन्ध में यह नीति नहीं अपनाई गई। न उस क्षेत्र से कोई मुख्य मंत्री बनाया गया, न उप- मुख्य मंत्री बनाया गया और न उसके हितों की रक्षा की गई। इस स्थिति में अगर उस क्षेत्र के लोगों का असंतोष पराकाष्ठा तक पहुंचता है, तो उसके पीछे कोई युक्ति है, कोई आधार है।

तेलंगाना के प्रति बरती गई उपेक्षा के कुछ उदाहरण मैं सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूं। जहां तक विकास कार्यक्रमों का सम्बन्ध है, 1956 से 1961 तक पहली योजना में आन्ध्र प्रदेश में 2072 गांवों में बिजली लगाई गई, जब कि तेलंगाना के केवल 490 गांवों में बिजली लगाई गई हालांकि आन्ध्र प्रदेश के कुल राजस्व में से 44 प्रतिशत आय तेलंगाना से होती है।

आन्ध्र प्रदेश में तेलंगाना की जनसंख्या 35 प्रतिशत से अधिक है और उसका क्षेत्रफल 41 प्रतिशत है। 1965-66 में पूरे आन्ध्र प्रदेशों में 1,58,64,293 एकड़ धरती पर खेती की गई, जिसमें से तेलंगाना में 1,13,03,669 एकड़ धरती थी। लेकिन

वहां पर किसानों को जो खाद दी गई, उसका 72 प्रतिशत से अधिक भाग आन्ध्र प्रदेश को मिला और 27 प्रतिशत से कुछ अधिक भाग तेलंगाना को दिया गया। तेलंगाना क्षेत्र के किसानों के साथ यह बड़ी बेइन्साफी की गई।

सिंचाई - कार्य में भी तेलंगाना के साथ इसी तरह का पक्षपात किया गया। तेलंगाना की धरती को कुल 16.6 प्रतिशत सिंचाई सुविधायें उपलब्ध हुईं, जब कि आंध्र प्रदेश को 48.3 प्रतिशत सिंचाई सुविधायें उपलब्ध हुईं।

इन आंकड़ों से अनुमान लगाया जा सकता है कि विभिन्न क्षेत्रों में तेलंगाना के साथ किस प्रकार का अन्याय किया जाता रहा है। लेकिन इसका दोष मैं आन्ध्र प्रदेश की जनता को नहीं देना चाहता हूं। इस का उत्तरदायित्व वहां की सरकार पर है, जिस का यह कर्तव्य है कि वह राज्य के सब भागों को समान सुविधायें प्रदान करें और उन सबके समान हितों की रक्षा करें। लेकिन ऐसा न कर के उस ने विकास-कार्यक्रमों में आन्ध्र को प्रमुखता दी और तेलंगाना की बराबर उपेक्षा करती रही।

मैं समझता हूं कि अब सरकार को इस समस्या को अधिक देर तक टालकर नहीं रखना चाहिए। बल्कि खुले मस्तिष्क से पृथक तेलंगाना के निर्माण की सम्भावनाओं पर विचार करना चाहिए। गृह मंत्री ने वहां जाकर कहा था कि मैं अपने मस्तिष्क में कोई रिजर्वेशन ले कर नहीं आया हूं, मैं इस समस्या के बारे में खुला मस्तिष्क ले कर आया हूं। आज भी उन्हें इस विषय में खुला मस्तिष्क रखना चाहिए।

16.13 hrs.

[SHRI GADILINGANA GOWD in the Chair]

गार्जुन सागर बांध पर जो पैसा लगा उस क तीन भाग तो आन्ध्र ने दिये

और दो भाग तेलंगाना ने । लेकिन दोनों क्षेत्रों को उस बांध से उपलब्ध सुविधा उस हिसाब से नहीं दी गई । आन्ध्र प्रदेश को 75 प्रतिशत और तेलंगाना को 25 प्रतिशत सुविधा दी गई ।

प्रारम्भ में, जब हैदराबाद स्टेट पृथक थी, पोचमपाव योजना 117 करोड़ रुपये की थी, लेकिन आन्ध्र प्रदेश में विलय के बाद उस योजना को घटाकर 29.85 करोड़ रुपये का कर दिया गया ।

आज तेलंगाना में स्थिति इतनी अशांत हो गई है कि विद्यार्थी इस बात पर अड़े हुए हैं कि जब तक तेलंगाना का निर्माण नहीं किया जाता है, तब तक हम विद्यालयों में नहीं जायेंगे । जो वतनदार रेवेन्यू इकट्ठा करके सरकारी खजाने में देते हैं, वे हाथ पर हाथ रख कर बैठे हुए हैं । तेलंगाना के नौ जिलों में प्रशासन-तन्त्र ठप्प पड़ा हुआ है । इसलिए पृथक तेलंगाना की मांग को राजनैतिक मांग कह कर टाल देना बुद्धिमत्ता और समझदारी की बात नहीं है । पुलिस के हथकण्डे इस्तेमाल करके तेलंगाना की जनता के साथ बर्बर व्यवहार नहीं किया जाना चाहिए । सरकार को बड़ी सहानुभूति और गम्भीरता के साथ उन लोगों की मांग पर विचार करना चाहिए और यदि उस मांग में कोई सच्चाई, कोई तथ्य और कोई आधार हो, तो पृथक तेलंगाना की सम्भावनाओं के बारे में खुला मस्तिष्क रख कर कोई ऐसा हल निकालना चाहिए, जिससे जनता का असंतोष दूर हो और नई पीढ़ी का, विद्यार्थियों का, भविष्य भी बिगड़ने न पाये । जो विद्यार्थी एक साल के बाद में आई. ए. एस. और आई. पी. एस. के एग्जामिनेशन में बैठने वाले थे यूनिवर्सिटी और कालेज बन्द होने से उसका एक साल खराब हो गया । वह तो जिन्दगी भर के लिए सरकारी

मर्जिस से महरूम रह गए । तो ऐसी अवस्था दूसरों के साथ न हो इस के लिए मेरा कहना है कि पृथक राज्य की इन भावनाओं पर विचार किया जाय और विचार करके तेलंगाना के साथ न्याय किया जाय ।

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA (Secunderabad): We are grateful to the Speaker to bring this Telengana issue down to earth from the time orbit in which our Minister for Parliamentary Affairs had put it. After 4 months we are getting this opportunity and I am grateful. I think it is common ground that the grievances accumulated during the course of 12-13 years of mismanagement, injustice and all that are genuine. I do not think the Home Minister will deny this.

I concede that some of us have not protested in time. Neither the Ministers from Telengana nor the Members of the Legislative Assembly or Members of Parliament have taken this matter seriously before this. I admit this. But at the same time I am proud that the student community have really taken up this matter and gone to the root of the matter and have unfurled the flag of revolt against these injustices and what have you done for that? While so many Ministers visited Hyderabad—the Prime Minister and the Home Minister—it never occurred to them to call these young people and ask them 'What is wrong with you? What are you worrying about? Why are you not going to schools and colleges? Why are you wasting your time?' Only they listened to the whisperings of the Chief Minister of the State. Then the 8 point programme was announced. Only after the plan was announced, some of the leaders of the Praja Samiti were called for a dialogue. I hope the Home Minister will also concede that this movement is not just by a few urchins or some frustrated politicians and all that. There is this genuine mass support for this movement. Our Home Minister is an old

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza.]

freedom fighter. He has seen many battles. Can he bring to his mind any time, any period in the history of the Freedom Movement when the boycott of schools and colleges has been so complete that for 6—8 months not a single school, not a single college, not a single University has been functioning in the whole of Telangana areas? I cannot think of anything of that having happened. Instead of that people go round and say that the movement has no mass basis. How is this problem being dealt with? At first it was dealt with as a law and order question. Police method and method of terror were utilised. Firings were resorted to. I do not know the number of firings. The other day, Dr. Melkote gave the number of firings that took place. Even then, is it not the duty of the Government to satisfy the people that the firing was justified? There was a demand for a judicial inquiry or a magisterial inquiry. What happened? The Collector of Hyderabad was asked to make the inquiry. He submitted a report which was never published. Because of adverse remarks it was kept in the drawer and the gentleman was transferred. They can say it is just a coincidence that the Collector has been transferred after the submission of the report. On this theory when a bullet touches a man's body he can also say it is an accident that the man died before the bullet struck him. This approach will not satisfy the people.

Another is the Preventive Detention Act. When Rajaji brought this Bill before this House I said that this was a measure which was putting a dark stain on our statute-book. At that time we were told that this was an emergency measure, it is only a temporary thing and so on. It has now become a normal instrument of working law and order. When you have preventive detention, you are not giving him his right for trial and you don't even accede to his request to get transferred from one jail to an-

other. Representations are made by MPs and others that they should be transferred from say, Rajahmundry to some other jail. It is a just and reasonable request but it is not acceded to. A sort of vindictiveness is there and these persons are still rotting in the same jail.

I now come to the solution. At one time the Home Minister conceded that there should be a political solution to the problem. What is that? The other day in the Rajya Sabha he asked what is the political solution. They have said they have set up various committees Wanchoo committee, Bhargava committee and other committees.

AN HON. MEMBER: 8 Committees.

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA: These committees are not going to solve the problem. It will create only more dissatisfaction. The administrative machinery has functioned in a way which led to the dissatisfaction of services. How can you set up another administrative machinery with the same personnel, with the same Chief Minister, and without statutory safeguards and expect better results? This way of dealing with the problem will lead us nowhere. This case is a serious surgical case and they want to deal with it by homoeopathic treatment. This is not at all going to lead to any fruitful results.

The basis of the movement depends upon the separatist demand; right or wrong, the people, numbering 1½ crores felt that they should have a separate Telengana. It is our duty to listen to what they have got to say. Is it not? We should not try to crush their demand or brush it aside and announce a dictum from the Centre saying, there should be no Telengana; we are afraid this will lead to disintegration of the country and so on and so forth. Pronouncements like that are not the way of solving this problem politically. How can dis-

integration of States lead to disintegration of the country? We have been forming one State after another not only on the basis of language, but also of community, caste and tribe. How can you say this in respect of one set of people who have none of these reasons, disintegrating reasons, asking for a separate State? How can you say that it is a disintegrating force? I would like to draw the attention of the Home Minister to this point. We have formed big linguistic States. What have we achieved? We have created a strong feeling of linguism. They are not completely integrated and intertwined as citizens of one great country. Sometimes they are set one against the other and so on. At any rate they can easily be split up and there is nothing cementing them except English and the army.

This is a very serious matter. Take a country like Canada. It is not a backward area. I mention this because the backward area argument has also been brought in to counter the demand for Telengana. It is said that Rayalaseema is much more backward and yet there is no demand for separation from the State there. Canada has an affluent society. We all know there is a demand for separation there. We also know that just a speech of De Gaulle about the linguistic demand there led to his being declared *persona non grata*. Can you conceive of a similar thing happening in India? What are you doing to bring the country together completely so that there is a feeling of oneness all over the country? I am sorry we are neglecting this factor.

Take another case. There was a demand in Madras for separation, that is moving away from the country and forming another State. There is another form of separation. If you do not allow people to come in and when the people already there want to throw them out, that also is a form of separation from the mainland.

What else is the Shiv Sena? It is nothing but another separatist force.

I warn Government that if the problem of Telengana is not solved within one or two years, a similar movement will make its appearance in Andhra Pradesh. I hope I will be here in 1972 to see this warning come true if steps are not taken betimes to solve the problem. But I give this warning.

This is a very serious question. If you have smaller States you have an advantage. There will be greater dependence on the Centre. There is greater mobility, there is not that feeling of separateness, because if there were two or three Marathi-speaking States, there would have been no Shiv Sena and there may not be any Bhim Sena in the Hindi-speaking areas.

Therefore, I plead with the Home Minister to once again consider this question of smaller States. We are having so many committees and commissions. Why not have a commission to examine this? After all, it is a question which deals with the whole country. Are you afraid of a demand for Vidarbha or a demand in Mysore for a split-up? What is the harm? In the US, they have 52 States. What is the harm if a country like ours with a much larger population has more States. I would plead with the Home Minister to examine this question very seriously.

What is the state of Centre-State relations today? It is nothing but trying to grab more and more from the Centre. There is a feeling of conflict between State and Centre. There is not that feeling of unity, of oneness that should be there in a big country like ours.

Therefore, I conclude by saying that first it is necessary to create the right atmosphere by releasing all the

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza.]

prisoners so that conditions conducive to starting a dialogue are created. The administrative machinery there today has failed. There must be a change. I do not say that there should be imposition of President's rule or that there should be a Telengana Chief Minister. It is not that. But there must be a change in the administrative machinery to create a new atmosphere. If there is a parliamentary committee constituted to look into it, I will welcome it. If there is a commission, I will welcome that also. (Interruptions). I plead very strongly for separate Telengana. Otherwise you will be having more suffering and bloodshed.

I hope that what I have said will be heeded by the Minister.

SHRI M. N. REDDY (Nizamabad): Before I speak on the grievances of Telengana I should like to pay my humble homage to all the martyrs, young men who have sacrificed their lives and who died in the police firing, so that their brethren in Telengana may live free from exploitation and discrimination.

श्री हुकम चन्द कलशाय (उज्जैन) :
सभापति महोदय मैं व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ ।
इतना सुन्दर भाषण हो रहा है परन्तु सदन
में गणपूर्ति नहीं है ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yet the Bell be rung—There is now quorum.

SHRI M. N. REDDY: Some hon. Members referred to the agitation as having been started by Dr. Chenna Reddy. As I submitted earlier, I want to put the record straight. Dr. Chenna Reddy and Konda Lakshman are as good or as bad Congressmen as you find in this House. They cannot take credit for this agitation and mass movement in Telengana. The movement started in the first week of January this year by the students all

over Telengana. Dr. Chenna Reddy came only on 7th May supporting separate Telengana—five months after the start while Shri Konda Lakshman joined this movement on 15 May, five months afterwards. There Congress Leaders were waiting for five months to make up their mind whether to join the mass movement or not. Then they jumped on the band wagon of the separate Telengana movement. Since they did not start that movement, they could not take credit for this. Therefore I request the parties represented here not to view this agitation with prejudice towards Dr. Chenna Reddy or any other leader to whatever party such a leader may belong. It is entirely a mass movement, started by students as the one we saw in Assam in May-June 1960, when a Parliamentary delegation went there and reported that it was started by the students. In the beginning when the students started the movement without a leader to espouse their cause, there were persons among them who came forward to lead the movement and thus created in the process new leaders who could replace the old guards of the past in Telengana today. That is the greatest thing that we have already achieved in Telengana. Therefore, I want to put the record very straight that no party or public leader here should view this movement with any prejudice on account of any particular personalities associating with this movement. It is entirely a popular, public and genuine movement with genuine causes. Even the Prime Minister, the Home Minister and the present Chief Minister have admitted that there are grievances and that there are injustices done to the Telengana people. All of them or many of us are only not agreed on the solution. We are all agreed on the basic causes of the Telengana movement.

Now, I would particularly like to thank Mr. S. M. Joshi who has given

us his support to the cause of Telengana. But he was doubtful because the Chief Minister sometime ago said that it will be an interference if a parliamentary delegation goes there. I am so sorry to say that even the leaders at the national level are not fully conversant with the genesis of the problem: how it is concerned with Parliament and the Central Government. In fact, the entire problem, and the solution, or the decision that has to be taken and should be taken to solve this problem, is in the hands of this hon. House as well as the Central Government. The State Government does not come into the picture at all. I would like to explain only on that matter.

Firstly, it is a demand for a separate State like the demand for Punjab Suba or any other State. Therefore, it is Parliament and the Central Government that are concerned with it and they have to consider under article 3 of the Constitution whether such a demand can be conceded or not. The demand for a separate State cannot be granted or even considered by a State or the Chief Minister or even the legislature. Therefore, it very much concerns the Parliament and the Central Government.

The second point is this. It is an agitation against the State Government for their misrule; it is a crisis of confidence in the State Government. Therefore, the Central Government has to come into the picture in order to remove that misgiving, mistrust and all that. The State Government, when it is made an accused, cannot become the judge to decide the issues that are involved.

Thirdly, when the Telengana area was merged with Andhra, it was not merged like any other part of any other State as a result of the States Reorganisation Act. It was merged with a condition precedent. The condition precedent is constitutional and other legal guarantees were given to Telengana people as a condition pre-

cedent to the merger, and as a result of those guarantees, we had to amend the Constitution in article 371. We may sometimes innocently ask, unless it is article 371A, how can it be an amendment. The present article 371 is a complete substitute for the previous article that was brought in 1956 as a result of the SRC Act. What is mentioned in article 371(1) is the regional council and so many other guarantees to the Telengana people. Now, the Constitution has come into the picture. As a constitutional safeguard, a provision was given to the Telengana people under the Constitution.

Then, I come to article 355. It is the function of Parliament and the Central Government to see whether the provisions of the Constitution are being worked out in a particular State. It is the constitutional duty cast upon the Central Government. Article 355 reads as follows:

"It shall be the duty of the Union to protect every State against external aggression and internal disturbance and to ensure that the government of every State is carried on in accordance with the provisions of this Constitution."

Now, the Parliament and the Central Government have to see whether the constitutional guarantees that were given to the Telengana people as a condition precedent for merger are really being worked out or not. No Chief Minister, however high or mighty he may be, can claim any protection under the Constitution saying that Parliament or the Central Government has no authority. Without knowing fully the provisions of the Constitution, we may sometimes believe what the Congress Chief Minister of a State may say. Therefore, it is our duty to see that the Constitution is being properly worked out there.

Secondly, another statutory guarantee, the Parliament had given is

[Shri M. N. Reddy]

in the shape of Public Employment (Requirement of Residence) Act, 1957, which was passed by this Parliament only for the purpose of protecting the interests of the Telengana people. This Act was struck down by the Supreme Court on the 28th March, 1969. When Parliament has given protection to the Telengana people and the Supreme Court has set aside that legislation, what are we going to do? Does it mean that the whole thing ends with the judgment of the Supreme Court? Are there not instances where the Constitution or other enactments have been amended as a result of the judgments of the Supreme Court? Have you done anything in this regard, after this judgment, I ask the Home Minister. Not only that, the State Government in an emergency Cabinet meeting held on the 31st March, 1969 decided to request the Central Government, and in fact requested the Central Government, to amend the Constitution in such a way as to continue the protection that was given to the Telengana people as a condition precedent to the merger. Have you done that? Have you acted upon that request of the State Government? If you have not done that, what right have you under any concept or slogan to say that this is a demand for disintegration and all that?

Then, you must understand and appreciate the inherent weakness of the merger of Telengana with Andhra. Telengana has a population of 1½ crores and Andhra has a population of 2½ crores. So, they have the same proportion of representation in the State Assembly. As responsible political leaders in this House, can you expect that any legitimate demand of the Telengana people could be passed by that legislature with two-thirds majority opposing? Then, is it not the duty and responsibility of this Parliament, in the name of justice and fairplay, to intervene in this matter, and set

right the whole thing by prevailing upon the State Government to do whatever is needed? They could have called for the leaders of all the concerned parties and seen how best the grievances could be redressed. That was not done. Therefore, the inherent weakness that is there in the very merger has to be considered by this hon. House. You cannot shut your eyes to that on the basis of some slogans.

Now I come to the slogan of national integration. We speak of integration and disintegration. We have had two integrations so far. After independence, from 1948 to 1950 we had political integration of the whole country, something which we had never witnessed in the past, thanks to the untiring efforts of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. Later on, we had emotional integration in 1956 on the basis of language, as a result of the SRC Report. The object of SRC, which was implemented in the shape of the States Re-organisation Act, has it succeeded in all matters? No. On a practical application of this linguistic principle what we have seen is that it has failed. So, what are we now wanting? We say that language cannot bind the people together for long. Emotional integration cannot last for ever because, after all, it is based on emotional considerations and not on rational or economic considerations.

Some people talk of common culture. We have only one culture. Indian culture, common to all. Bengal culture is as much my culture as it is their culture. To speak of a Maharashtrian culture, Tamil culture or Rajasthan culture is very wrong. It goes against nationalism and the common citizenship of this country. If we go on harping on this concept of common culture, we will be nowhere. You can say that Andhras were in Madras for a long time they had some "Mount Road culture" or Hyderabadis had the

"Abid Road culture"; but we have a common culture, that is, Indian culture. Let us be clear on that point.

Then, what is integration? Is the concept of integration that which was determined in Srinagar, Kashmir, which is not fully integrated with India, by the Integration Council? Can you keep 1,50,00,000 people opposed to 2,50,00,000 people in the same State fighting every day with each other? Where is solidarity and where is integration when people are in warring camps, opposed to each other, with daily quarrels, rioting, murder and bloodshed? Is that integration? Do you want to impose this kind of integration or do you want people to live harmoniously in friendship as good neighbours with each other which would bring about national solidarity and integration? That is the question that has to be considered by this Parliament. It is not that we should raise any false slogans or dogmas of integration and thereby shut out the popular claims and democratic demands of great number of people.

We say Parliament is sovereign and we often proclaim the concept of sovereignty of Parliament. But after all the sovereignty is derived from the people. If the wishes of an overwhelming number of people of a particular region—not a few people but 1,50,00,000 people—is not considered objectively and dispassionately, without bringing any political considerations whatsoever, where do we have the sovereignty? When we do not act according to the wishes of the people and when we are not responsive to the wishes of the people, are we democratic any more? Can we oppose democratic demands of the people? Can we oppose the demands of overwhelming number of people, not a few but crores of people, and yet claim sovereignty? When we do that then only the matter is dragged into the streets and people fight for it.

It is our failures that are encouraging agitations and violence, because we do not act in time. We do not take the pulse of the people before it becomes too late. It is our failure which is actually adding to, encouraging and aggravating such situations and violence all over the country. In this case also we have all failed.

Why have we failed? It is because we have not cared for the masses. We have cared only for the political bosses who maintain a very fine balance in the Centre. We have cared for a single man or for a group of a few men in the State. We have never cared for the wishes of the people, of more than 15 million people of the State.

What is the suffering that our people are facing? Let us consider it not only as public leaders or as great leaders of great parties but also as parents and as citizens of this country. Let us consider that 16 lakhs of students are not going to schools and colleges. Last year, and again this year, they have missed one academic year and one examination. What will be the fate of these people? Are they really free citizens of this country? Are they having any democratic rights? We are all silent on this. We are involved in bigger politics and controversies here. But they do not concern me personally because my people, 1,50,00,000 of my people, are suffering for the last eight months. They are living in actual hellish conditions. Therefore you have to consider, whether you solve the Telengana problem or not, how these students would go back to the colleges and schools and thereby do something to safeguard their own future.

95 per cent of the persons who have died were students. These students and other leaders asked for three things, alternatively and cumulatively: they wanted that the Chief Minister should go; they wanted

[Shri M. N. Reddy]

President's rule and they wanted separate Telengana. The hon. Home Minister or the Prime Minister or the Central Government as a whole said that except separate Telengana they would consider any demand. Have you considered any demand, apart from separate Telengana, so far? With the result, what has happened? We have gone back to December 1968 when the agitation was not started.

How would the students go back, to the schools and colleges? With what hope, with what achievement, after such a great suffering, would they go back to the universities, colleges and schools? I want to ask you that. You have viewed this problem from a party angle and have taken refuge in the misguided support given by the Opposition parties, because you said that the Opposition was also not for it. I would humbly correct it and say that the Opposition parties were not fully aware of the problem and they have become aware of it now because a number of hon. Members have visited Telengana and they were moved by what they saw in Telengana. Now they have very much changed their view.

How discrimination was started is very revealing to know. From the very beginning, you will all be shocked to know, when the S.R.C. Act was framed and introduced in Parliament, the new State or the corresponding new State was to be known as Andhra, Telegana. One can say Madhya Pradesh or Uttar Pradesh because that shows the direction or the orientation between the longitude and latitude. There was only Andhra State till 1956. With the merger of Telengana, it was to be known as Andhra-Telengana. I would like to refer to the relevant Section of the S.R.C. Act to show how injustice or discrimination started. It was all premeditated and calculated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be brief.

SHRI M. N. REDDY: I am allowed half an hour by the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have already exceeded the time limit. I am allowing only Members from Telengana. I want to allow as many as possible. The Minister will reply tomorrow.

SHRI M. N. REDDY: I quote Section 3 of the S.R.C. Act as introduced in the Lok Sabha:

"Thereupon, the said territories shall cease to form part of the existing State of Hyderabad and the State of Andhra shall be known as the State of Andhra-Telengana.

What happened then? The same S.R.C. Act was approved by the Andhra Assembly on 4th April, 1956 and in the same form, it was approved by the Hyderabad Assembly on the 12th April, 1956. But later on, on 11th July, 1956, this name was changed in the Joint Committee here, at the instance of some interested persons from Andhra-Telengana to Andhra Pradesh. That is an imperialistic concept. Somebody said that a hundred years ago, it was known as Andhra Pradesh. We claim to be democrats but we go to the imperialistic traditions and cultures. So, that was changed. That is how the betrayal started. It was all premeditated. They wanted merger not for the sake of merger but for all those injustices that were done, utilisation of surpluses, employment opportunities for their own men and all that.

Now, I would like to refer to only one observation made by the hon. Member from the C.P.I.(M), Shri P. Gopalan. Unfortunately, he is not fully aware of the problem. Fortunately or unfortunately, in Telengana, there is no Member represented by the C.P.I.(M). Therefore, they may not have full information. Added to that, the leadership of the Marxist Party, Mr. Sundarayya, Mr. Basupun-

naiah and Mr. Hanumantha Rao, comes from Andhra area and, therefore, they may not be having the real picture of the problem. So, he could say what he said the other day. Otherwise, the problem of Telengana is very genuine. Even the Marxist Party cannot have a difference of opinion if they really consider the problem objectively.

Another point that he raised was that there is the landlordism in Telengana. Fortunately, in 1950, six years prior to merger, we abolished landlordism. There is no landlordism any more. We had enacted a Tenancy legislation in 1950 which can serve as a model even to the States which are governed by the Communists like Kerala and West Bengal. It is such an advanced land reform measure which can very well be copied with profit. There is no landlordism and all that. It is all a propaganda by vested interests.

My main amendment is of sending a Parliamentary Committee. The leaders, even the Home Minister, may be under an illusion that the eight-committees plan of 11th April conceived by the Prime Minister, in that meeting, may work wonders. Because all of them were busy with other things, he may not have had an occasion to examine it very closely. I may tell him how it was done. A meeting was announced by the Prime Minister on 5th April when the Chief Minister came here. He returned on the 6th. On the 6th he rounded up hundreds of leaders all over Telengana who were associated with this movement under the P. D. Act. On the 9th he sent to Delhi for talks his three old Congress cronies, Dr. Chenna Reddy, Mr. Ramachandra Reddy and Mr. Chokka Rao as if they represented Telengana in those days. These arrests under the Preventive Detention Act were declared as illegal and against the interest of the public by the Andhra Pradesh High Court, by a Division Bench, on the 24th April. All of them were set free.

In this connection I would like to point out how Mr. Chavan forgot his own solemn assurance given to this House when the House discussed the Preventive Detention Bill last time that it would not be used for political purposes. I am quoting only one para. Mr. Chavan said this on November 29, 1966 in the Lok Sabha a few days after he had become the Home Minister regarding Preventive Detention Act:

"One can say so, but it was not meant or it was not used against any political party as such. It was not used against any ideology as such and it will not be used against any ideology or any political party. I would like to give the assurance with all the sincerity that I can command that this Act is not meant to penalise or suppress any particular political party or any political ideology or any thought..."

He was so kind and liberal!

"...any thought, political or otherwise, in this country."

Now what has his Chief Minister done? The Preventive Detention Act was used by the Chief Minister to arrest hundreds of persons who were associated with this demand, who were demonstrating peacefully and holding public meetings. Many persons were arrested under section 151 of the Cr. P. C. I am a practising lawyer and I know when the provision of section 151 Cr. P. C. is invoked. It is invoked against potential criminals and not against political leaders or public workers. We have no political leaders in the Praja Samiti; they are all public workers. Under section 151 Cr. P. C. some 25 to 30 thousand people might have been arrested and later sections 107 and 109 of the Cr. P. C. were applied. So far, there has been no inquiry into any police firing whatsoever and into any police excesses. I want to ask whether there is any democratic functioning in

[Shri M. N. Reddy.]

Telengana. Mr. Chavan may please hear me because you may not be fully conversant with all this. The elections which were to be held last year all over Andhra Pradesh for panchayat committees were postponed by an Ordinance: the term of those panchayat committees was extended by one year by an Ordinance. The elections to Samitis were also postponed; the term of the Samities was extended by an Ordinance. So also, the term of Zila Parishads was extended, because otherwise all these would be stormed by Praja Samiti people. The term of the Hyderabad Municipal Corporation was also extended by two years, so that the same persons who were there could continue. There was only one standing committee. Elections were to be held on 1st August. They had already put nine corporators who were wanting separate Telengana into jail under the P. D. Act and under section 151 Cr. P. C. Still the 'separate Telengana' corporators had a two-vote majority and the elections for the standing committee were to be held on 1st August. Those two corporators were sitting in the chamber of the Mayor on that day. At about 11.30, the police entered the Mayor's chamber, whisked them away and put them under detention, and after half an hour the elections were held and the 'integration' got the majority in the Committee.

17 hrs.

I would like to refer to a news item. I am referring to the popular evening daily paper 'Pledge' of 1st August:

"With Men Behind Prison
Integrationists Make Hay."

Where is democracy? Has it not been butchered in Andhra Pradesh, are some of the questions being asked by one and all after they heard the manner in which the election of members to the Standing Committee of the

Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad was held last evening.

In a House of 94 . . etc., etc."

The papers which were favourable to the Chief Minister said that the integrationists swept the polls in the Standing Committee elections. How did they sweep the polls? This is the real truth.

It is said that the Chief Minister will step down when normalcy is restored. That everybody knows because Mr. Kamaraj and Mr. Nijalینگappa came there on the 5th of July and re-installed the Chief Minister and put him on the 'gaddi' and acted like Laurel and Hardy. Now what is happening there? When the Vice-Chancellor, who was appointed by the Chief Minister, was asked by pressmen as to when he would open the colleges for the students, what a wonderful reply he gave! He said 'I am waiting for a signal from the Chief Minister'. What do you mean by signal? He said 'I cannot open the colleges without there being normally and Chief Minister said that he would step down the moment normalcy is restored. The moment Chief Minister steps down, I would think that normalcy is restored and I will open the colleges'. That is reported in the *Indian Express* of 31st July. This is the situation prevailing in the Telengana area.

I will not take much time. My amendment is for the appointment of a Parliamentary Committee. In passing I would only mention one thing. These 8 Committees plan was announced on 11th April. We wanted only a single committee. They did not agree. They appointed 8 Committees while we wanted only one Committee. If Mr. Chavan had time and inclination, let him examine these Committees to see whether they are legal because in my view, they are illegal and unconstitutional. I am saying this with all sense of responsi-

bility and with full knowledge of law in this regard. They have not appointed these Committees under the Commission of Inquiry Act. The Prime Minister said to these committees 'You go there and do this'. This statement was drafted by Mr. Huskar and Tuskar, that is, by Mr. L. P. Singh, the Home Secretary. This was drafted without knowing the provisions of law. A Committee was appointed to examine whether the Constitution can be amended. They examined it in Bombay. They said it cannot be amended. But the Home Minister has no courage to say to the House till this day that they have said so.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN): I just want to say one thing here. The hon. Member is very well informed on this matter. When this question was asked of me in the other House, I said what were the recommendations. The hon. Member is trying to keep himself acquainted with what happened in Hyderabad. He should also know what happened in Delhi.

SHRI M. N. REDDY: I have read the proceedings of that House also. But you only said that certain administrative arrangements are being worked out, but the Committee have said—this is my information—that Constitution cannot be amended. The State Cabinet also said that the Constitution should be amended. This they decided on 31st March 1969. Wanchoo Committee said Constitution cannot be amended. All right. We don't want separate Telengana; you restore the position to pre-28th March position. We are not mad people. What we are saying is this. We want that protection should be given to the Telengana people today. You have to restore the position as it obtained prior to the supreme court judgement on the 28th March and you have to restore the *status quo ante*. Are you

going to do that? Let a parliamentary committee examine whether that can be done. How can you resist this demand? You have given these things. Merely because court has set aside, how can you take away those things? You restore the position to Telengana obtaining prior to 28th March, 1969 on which date the judgement was given striking down the safeguards. Since we know that that cannot be done, let us separate with good relations, in good humour, as good and brotherly neighbours. This agitation should not continue upto 1972. Whether anybody wants it or not, the people are going to have separate Telengana in 1972; they will fight the election on that slogan.

About this Parliamentary Committee, I requested the Speaker last time on 1st April: while replying the Home Minister was good enough to say if it was unanimous demand it can be accepted, and he said, if Speaker appoints such a committee the Government are prepared to give all cooperation to it. The Speaker said, all right, I would decide about it. The next day Shri Brahma Reddy came here and said, this committee cannot go there and everybody got frightened. The next day Speaker said, I am going abroad, he will leave the matter in the hands of the House itself and the Deputy Speaker. After 2 or 3 days Mr. Vajpayee moved a motion. I think it was on 8th April. The motion was discussed. The Home Minister or some other hon. Minister wanted Mr. Vajpayee to withdraw the motion because Prime Minister was calling the conference on 10th April and she would talk with opposition leaders and take them into confidence and see that some workable formula can be adopted. That was the Government stand. They had committed and they had agreed to extend all cooperation to the Committee if it was appointed.

[Shri M. N. Reddy.]

17.09 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

In respect of Assam what happened? A parliamentary committee was appointed, known as parliamentary delegation to Assam. I think it was on 8-8-60 under the Presidentship of Shri Ajit Prasad Jain. It was set up to inquire into the disturbances which took place in Assam as also the language disturbances between Assam and Bengal people; there was no separatist demand for having a Suba or a State; but still a Committee had gone there; it had given a very good report; and certain measures were taken because of that report. Everybody knows this. I am just quoting precedents to show how they acted in the past. Are we sincere to ourselves? Or, are we hypocrite politicians acting according to our convenience and interests to suit the moment? So, in the past we have done this and how can anybody prevent now such a thing being done? Will it not be discrimination? If you prevent such a thing being done to these people; will it not be a discrimination not only by Andhra Government but also by the Central Government?

Another instance. A parliamentary committee known as Parliamentary Delegation to NEFA was appointed in 1966. Mr. Krishnamoorthi Rao was Chairman. They gave a report.

Another instance. For the Punjabi Suba, you all very well know, a committee under the Chairmanship of Sardar Hukam Singh was appointed. They went into the whole question and gave a report. Mr. Dwivedy is well aware of it. He was associated with that. Then ultimately the Punjabi Suba was formed. Without meaning any disrespect, I would say that on 28-8-61, the late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said in this House that the demand for Punjabi Suba was a communal demand. But the great

leader, Sant Fateh Singh, converted this so-called communal demand into a national demand, a secular demand. A committee was appointed which went into the matter and made recommendations. We have now three States—Haryana, Punjab and some districts of the old Punjab going to Himachal Pradesh. It is actually a trifurcation of the erstwhile Punjab State.

In the case of Bombay, what happened? Shri Chavan was Chief Minister then. In 1956, consequent on the SRC recommendations, it was said that the metropolitan city of Bombay would be centrally-administered. Shri Chavan used to say, that in spite of the Samyukta Maharashtra Samity, "the bilingual State had come to stay." But after three years, after killing 105 people in the agitation, a stage came when 180 MPs headed by the late Shri Feroze Gandhi addressed a letter to the Prime Minister that the idea of the Centrally-administered territory for Bombay City should not be there. That was acted upon by the then Home Minister, the late Shri Pant.

Later when Shri Chavan himself found it difficult to stay further as Chief Minister, he advised the Central Government that the experiment of bilingualism had failed during these three years and there should be separation. A nine-man committee under the chairmanship of Shri Pant was appointed. They recommended separation of Bombay. What were the words used in the Congress Working Committee resolution of 4 December 1959:

"In the context of the developments that have taken place, the reorganisation of the present State of Bombay involving its division has become necessary".

In the context of what is going on in Telengana for the last 8-9 months, in the context of the Supreme Court

judgment setting aside the guarantees given to Telengana, in the context of inaction and apathy shown by the Central Government and other leaders in regard to doing justice by Telengana, has it not become desirable, necessary and inevitable to have separation sooner than later?

In the case of Goa, with a population of 8-9 lakhs, the principle of opinion poll was accepted. Therefore, in the case of 1 crore 50 lakh people of Telengana, I do not see why it cannot very well be accepted.

Let us not stand in the way of the people. People have become very conscious, very mature. They know more than we do today: Slogans or dogmas to hoodwink them or throw dust into their eyes will not avail. Let us not talk of so-called integration or disintegration or national solidarity, but go in for a just and practical solution. Let us consider the problem on its merits without importing extraneous considerations into it. If the Government talk to the real representatives of Telengana without minding the reactions and attitudes of the bosses, if they start minding the masses and not the party bosses, a solution is easy.

The so-called autonomy of States or federation idea has been canvassed. We are forgetting the constitutional history of our country. There was no federation prior to 1919. When it was brought in 1919 as a move to suppress the majority, it was resisted by all Congress leaders. So where is that federation idea? Was any State independent and ever agreed to surrender its independence to form this kind of federation as in U.S.A.? So that will not work. We have become wiser and we have seen things. We can read through the minds of Shri Chavan and other leaders of the Central Government.

I say to him: Be frank and be sincere; do not continue this struggle and bloody clashes resulting in the

loss of innocent lives.....
(Interruptions.) I appeal to the newly found conscience of Congress Party to Mr. Chavan to search his heart. The only test for Mr. Chavan is what he did in the case of Bombay; he has to act in the same way in regard to Telengana. Otherwise they will all be known as provincial leaders, not national leaders. This is a decision that should be taken as a statesman does in the interest of the nation. They should not consider how it would affect some State. Unfortunately we are all provincial leaders; there are no more national leaders. At least on national issues, we should think of the national interest and in solving national problems. One should rise to be a national leader. Once again I appeal to Mr. Chavan to accept a Parliamentary committee because there is no reason why Government should not accept a parliamentary committee. You see for yourself; you go with an open mind and if you can satisfy the people that without a separate Telengana the problem could be solved, we are prepared to accept it.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA (Bangalore): I have not been participating in the debates of this House for some time now. Today I have been compelled to speak out, not by the issue of Telengana alone but by the situation confronting the country. In the last few years grave problems have arisen in almost every part of the country and we find that they are not dealt with in time; impartial assessments are not made and proper remedies are not applied. Many a time events drift because of irrelevant considerations. If our country had tried to solve various problems that arose on the basis of objectivity undiluted nationalism and impartiality in approach, problems which seemed almost insoluble would not have defied a solution, and dogged our footsteps.

The other day I went to Naini-caranya. According to Hindu scrip-

[Shri Hanumanthaiya.]

tures it is a holy place where it seems all our Puranas were written. Somebody told me that there was a good saint there and I had a talk with him in simple language he asked me: how long can Congressmen go on using lathis and police and govern this country? Gandhiji wanted to see that people managed their own affairs on the basis of non violence and persuasion. Now every day things are happening which compel the Government and the police to use force and violence. Is this the kind of Swaraj that Gandhiji and all of you fought for? That is what he asked. I came away in a penitent mood.

Everyday we see the paper. There is firing in some place or other, some beating and all kinds of violent things. I am not holding the Government alone responsible. It is not the Government that takes initiative in using violence. Some crowd of persons takes to violent methods and the Government necessarily intervenes to bring it under control. Why do these things happen?

In human relationship, especially in the political world, problems are bound to arise. It is only because problems arise that we constitute a government, that we have a Parliament, a legislature, so that they may immediately, without loss of time, apply remedies objectively and impartially. It is exactly here where we have not come up to the expectation of the people; we do not apply remedies either impartially or objectively or in time.

Most of us here including hon. Members of the Government have fought for freedom. Freedom did not merely mean freedom from foreign rule or from a set of people. We wanted a system of Government where people's voice should prevail where people would enact laws for themselves, where people, even if they committed wrong, according to Gandhiji, must have the right to go

their own way so that ultimately they may correct themselves. None of us has the moral or the constitutional authority to assume that we are the lawmakers, that what we think must be the thought that should pervade the minds of the 550 million people.

I have been in the movement not only for freedom but for the formation and reformation of the provinces. I have been seeing all this. There was, once an opinion in the Congress circles and also in the parliamentary circles that linguistic States should not be conceded. The best of leaders in those days thought that it would not make for unity and integrity of the country and that it would introduce some kind of disturbing atmosphere in the country. But the pressure of public opinion was so great that ultimately it had to be conceded. The first State to be conceded on these lines was Andhra Pradesh itself. It was also born out of violence there. As you know, leave alone the death of Potti Sriramulu, trains were looted and burnt in several towns of Andhra. The then Prime Minister thought it was far better to concede the demand of the people and bring about peace than to go on acclimatizing the people in the ways of violence, rebellion and disobedience. The linguistic States came into existence.

Then there was a resolution in the AICC that only one State, namely Andhra, could be formed into a linguistic State and the rest of India should remain as it was. I got up and opposed it, and asked, why do not apply the principle to the other not apply the principle to the other areas. Ultimately, that principle was accepted and the States Reorganisation Commission was appointed.

So, the basis or the motive force for the reorganisation of States along linguistic lines was the opinion of the people; the feeling of the people. We have no right to judge that a set

of people think wrongly or rightly. If you begin to think like that, you will ultimately end by being a Hitler or a Mussolini: that what I think is right; and what the opposition thinks is wrong. We have reached a situation where the evolution of political leadership in this country has become undemocratic; at best, it is plutocratic, that is, a few people posing as the real representatives of the people.

AN HON. MEMBER: Plutocratic means rich.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: Rich in political power; take it in that sense. As quoted by my hon. friend—I do not want to take the time of the House by repeating them all—in all that you have done, it is not a single policy or impartial approach that counts but it is the pressure of a particular individual and a particular set of people that is ultimately counted. Therefore, I would say this: a Minister takes the oath, it is to the effect that he will do justice to all manner of people without favour or ill will. Let that high approach be the approach in the matter of solving this Telengana problem or any other problem.

We should not go on thinking in terms of our personal power, prestige or continuance in office. We are here, not for the purpose of selfish ends, not to perpetuate ourselves in office, but to do justice to all kinds of people, as we have taken an oath in a solemn manner, to do that. If we adopt that high approach, the approach imbedded in the Constitution, you will find that if a particular set of people want a separate administrative unit, we do not get alarmed or start thinking that these people are going the way of national disintegration.

This very argument was advanced *ad infinitum* in the case of Haryana and Punjab, that this nation will be disintegrated if Punjab Suba is conceded. But, ultimately, it has been

conceded. I do not blame anybody for that. But, has it affected in any way the integration of the nation? We imagine many a time that a particular force may adversely affect our leadership at some future date and, therefore, we get alarmed. But leadership depends upon more solid qualities which inspire confidence of the people. These manoeuvres which are made from time to time fall like a house built with a pack of cards.

I do not want to take sides on this issue. I am not advocating that Telengana should be conceded straightway. Nor would I say that the unity of Andhra should be maintained; that is not my case. I would only like the government to apply the formula of popular sovereignty, the will of the people. If the people in that area feel that they should have a separate administrative unit, there is no harm in conceding that demand. If the majority of the people want to remain as united Andhra, let them continue; we have no objection. But an opportunity must be given to the people to express their opinion. It may be an opinion poll, or an election, or a parliamentary committee or a commission. So far as the means is concerned, I leave it to the good sense of the government.

For eight long months the people have gone on agitating. I do not justify all the violence that has taken place in the Telengana area. Dr. Melkote recounted facts and figures to show how the people of Telengana are suffering. At the same time, because he has become emotional, he has not disclosed the other side of the case, how many trains have been looted and burnt, how many buildings have been destroyed, how many policemen and public have been killed or wounded. Therefore, both sides have taken to ways that are not democratic, that are not legal.

However much I may disagree with the Home Minister personally, I place great faith in his innate good sense, common sense and anxiety to solve

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

the national problems at a national level. Eight long months delay is a sin committed by this Parliament. We are the forum of the nation and we have slept over the issue for eight long months, allowing things to drift in their own way. This is not the way Parliament has to work. We get excited over minor matters; we debate for hours and hours and abuse one another. But here is a case where one and a half crores of people have been writhing in pain and suffering and this is the first time we have ever had an impartial discussion.

Those of us who are charged with the responsibility of maintaining law and order should not take it in the sense of using police force or military force whenever the occasion arises. It is the positive aspect that we must consider. We must give room, occasion to people to express their grievances so that they may not have to rebel or revolt in that way. For eight long months these people have suffered. Whether it is the agitators, the police or the public, they are all our people. Therefore, I do not want this suffering to continue any more. Immediate application of the remedy is the thing that justice and humanity call for.

Then, there is the argument that if you concede Telengana, floodgates will be opened. Yes, Sir, as everyone knows, floodgates are meant to be opened when the floods come overflowing; otherwise, the dam itself will burst.

I recently read *The Last Days of the Moghul Empire* by Sir Jadunath Sarkar. I advise Shri Chavan to read that book. The Marathas, the Peshwas, were on the scene. If the Marathas had behaved a little more wisely, there would not have been a British Empire here; there would have been a Maharashtra Empire in India. They took a very parochial view, a personal view, a view that their view must prevail against the

wishes of every other sector, whether it was the Rajputs or the Jats.

Therefore, every time if any State or any area or any leader in India takes one's own view as the correct one, as the one that should be imposed on others, it will ultimately end up in bad days for this country.

Here, floodgates have to be opened. If there are two Andhra States, India is not going to suffer in any way. If there are two or three Maharashtra States by dividing up the present one, India will not be destroyed. If there is Gujarat divided into Saurashtra and Gujarat, it is not going to end India in ruin. It is merely administrative re-arrangement, contemplated in the Constitution.

The Constituent Assembly has made provision—we have made that provision; I was in the Constituent Assembly—when occasion arises, for re-adjustment of boundaries between State and State, for creation of a new State, for the abolition of old States. All these had been taken into consideration. We had taken note of the tendencies that might arise in future and have made provision for it. The founding fathers, whoever they were, had anticipated the developments and had made provision for it. Now, for us to get up and say that a set of provisions made in the Constitution should not be implemented or that we should stand in their way, is neither constitutional nor moral nor patriotic.

It may be, if we adopt the high level approach of considering problems objectively, the people themselves may not want two or three Maharashtras; they may themselves not want Gujarat and Saurashtra separately. Therefore it is the positive affection of the people that has to be the governing factor in the matter of making a State remain one or two and not the imposition of the will from Delhi. It is this that I am objecting to. Everywhere it is known

and it is believed that only three or four leaders make up their minds, decide whether a State should be divided or should not be divided and then easily take up this argument of floodgates being opened. If this flood-gate is not opened when the floods are very high, it will not only wash away the dam but with it maybe, all of us will be washed away. I do not want that great tragedy to take place.

The most fervent appeal I want to make is that if the Government of a few leaders cannot take a decision, if they have got any impediments in their way—personal, political or State—let it be left to the free will and the free vote of this House. I am sure the free vote of the House will make an attempt to be more objective, more national and more impartial than any decision given by me in particular or by anybody else. After all, Parliament will exercise its authority. I am sure, this big number of 520, even as the big electorate in a constituency, will ultimately do justice to the problem that faces the nation. Therefore, I am sure, having taken note of all these things, the Government will here and now make an announcement which will lead to the immediate solution of the problem, which is, not only putting Telengana into torture but the rest of India into anguish.

श्रीमती लक्ष्मीकांतम्मा (खम्माम): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे राज्य के बारे में जो इमोशनल स्थिति के बारे में चर्चा हो रही है उस पर हिन्दी में बोलना मुश्किल है फिर भी मैंने सदन को जो वादा किया है हिन्दी में बोलने का उसे मैं तोड़ना नहीं चाहती हूँ। मैं हिन्दी में ही बोलूंगी, अगर कभी-कभी अंग्रेजी में भी बोलूँ तो माननीय सदस्य मुझे माफ करेंगे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक ही भाषा बोलने वाले, एक ही संस्कृति में पले लोगों के बंधन आसानी से टूटते नहीं हैं। उसे तोड़ने की

बनावटी कोशिश करना प्रकृति के विरुद्ध है। कल परसों जो चर्चा हुई उसमें कुछ सदस्यों ने कहा कि पति चाहता है, पत्नी चाहती है तो इन्फोर्स क्यों नहीं देते हैं? मैं दूसरी बात कहना चाहती हूँ। What will be the agony of the couple who have been separated by circumstances for a long time if, after re-union, they have to think of separation? How will the couple shudder at that thought?

तेलंगाना की जनता की यह स्थिति है। आन्ध्र का इतिहास आज का नहीं है। उसका तीन हजार साल का पुराना इतिहास है। मैं इतिहास के बारे में थोड़ा सा पढ़ना चाहती हूँ।

"While the name of the Andhra race was first mentioned over 3,000 years ago in the Aitareya Brahmana, from the third century B.C. onwards, their empire extended over a major portion of India, far beyond the areas comprised in the Andhra Pradesh of today. The Andhra Satavahanas who ruled for 4½ centuries beginning from the 3rd century B.C. had a highly developed system of administration comparable to the Mauryan, as described by Kautilya. Then came the Ikshvaku who ruled over the Krishna and Godavari valleys with their capital at Vijayapuri where the giant Nagarjuna Sagar dam is now constructed. That was an era when the Mahayana Buddhism flourished with Acharya Nagarjuna presiding over the international university at Sriparvatha. Then came the Chalukyan kings followed by Kakatiyas in the twelfth century with Warangal, also known as "Andhra Nagara" as their capital and extending their sway upto Nellore and Cuddapah districts, for about two centuries."

[श्रीमती लक्ष्मी कांतम्मा]

यह तीन हजार साल का पुराना इतिहास है। 3,000 सालों से शातवाहन इक्ष्वाकर तथा काकतीय राज्य में एक साथ थे। आन्ध्र का इतिहास पढ़ने पर यह आपको मालूम होगा। कुतुबशाही नवाबों ने भी श्रीकाकुलम से लेकर गोलकुंडा तक सारे शासन को एक बनाया। राज्य में आसफशाही शासन में भी तेलगू लोग एक रहे। विदेशी शासन के आने के बाद ही तेलगू लोग अलग-अलग हो गए। सलावत जंग ने अपनी राजधानी में सेना बनाए रखने के लिए फ्रेंच लोगों को श्रीकाकुलम से लेकर कृष्णा नदी तक का भाग सत्रहवीं शताब्दी में दे दिया। टीपू सुल्तान के गिरने के बाद व जिले अब हम रायलसीमा कहते हैं। वे निजाम के अधीन में आए और निजाम ने अंग्रेजी लोगों के हाथ में दे दिया। इनको सीडेड डिस्ट्रिक्ट्स कहते हैं। इन कारणों से तेलगू लोगों का कृत्रिम रूप से विभाजन हुआ। भारत की स्वतंत्रता की लड़ाई के साथ-साथ तेलगू बोलने वाले लोगों को मिलाने का भी आन्दोलन चलता रहा। यह आन्दोलन जनता के मन में दृढ़ होता गया। हैदराबाद के विघटन के बाद जनता की यह राय सफल हुई। और बहुत दिनों की यह इच्छा पूरी हुई। जनवरी 19 को सभी दलों के प्रतिनिधियों की जो बैठक हुई उसमें भी इन सेन्टीमेन्ट्स को व्यक्त किया गया। अच्युत रेड्डी, बट्टी विशाल जो एस०एस०पी० के सदस्य हैं इन लोगों के भी उसमें दस्तखत हैं। इसमें कहते हैं

"With the formation of Andhra Pradesh State on 1-11-56, the long-cherished aspiration of the Telugu-speaking people for having a State of their own was achieved."

उन्होंने कहा कि लांग-चेरिश्ड एस्पिरेशंस आफ दि तेलगू स्पीकिंग पीपुल फलुफिल हो गए। इस पर उन्होंने दस्तखत किए हैं।

लेकिन बाद में क्या हुआ वह सभी को मालूम है। उनके दस्तखत की स्याही के सूखने के पहले ही इन्हीं में से कुछ लोग अलग तेलंगाना आन्दोलन चलाने लगे। असल में यह आन्दोलन तेलंगाना की जनता के खिलाफ पडयंत्र है।

श्री जी० बॅकटस्वामी (सिद्दिपेट) : 12 साल तक स्याही नहीं सूखी ?

श्रीमती लक्ष्मीकांतम्मा : 12 घंटे में सूख जाती है। मैं यह भी बताना चाहती हूँ कि यह पडयंत्र जमींदार और देशमुखों का, निहित स्वार्थ व्यापारियों और भ्रष्ट राजनीतिज्ञों का है। जो इसके नेता हैं उसमें राजा भी है, बड़े-बड़े पैसे वाले भी हैं और बिजनेसवाले लोग भी हैं और जैसा हमारे गोपालन साहब ने कहा बिरला के लोग भी हैं। मैं गृह मंत्री जी से मांग करनी हूँ कि वह इस बारे में जांच करवाए। एक तरफ कहा जाता है कि इतने लोग मार दिए गए लेकिन आप तस्वीर का दूसरा रूप भी देखिए।..... (व्यवधान)..... मुझे इटरफियर मत कीजिए। She has got a school there, an institution to which Government gives grants, and the school children are taken and put in the Satyagraha. I know about that satyagraha. I know the sentiments of the people. I did not want to attack personally, but since she interrupted, I had to say this.

गृह मंत्री इसकी भी जांच करवाए कि कितने स्कूल के बच्चे सत्याग्रह में हैं और कितना लोगों को पैसा दिया जाता है ? दो रुपये लेने वाले कुली को दस रुपये एक दिन में देकर सत्याग्रह में लगाया जाता है।

श्री जी० बॅकटस्वामी : झूठ है, झूठ है। कोई भी पैसा लेकर नहीं करता है। दो सौ लोग मर गए हैं। झूठ बोल रही हैं।

श्रीमती लक्ष्मीकांतम्मा : आप चुप रहिए। (व्यवधान).....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : दोनों ही चुप रहिए ।

SHRIMATI LAKSHMIKANTAMMA: I know the sentiments. It is a conspiracy against the people of Telengana by the vested interests and corrupt politicians. So I want to save the people of Telengana from the conspiracy.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप हिन्दी में बोल पाएँ ज्ञानि में बोलें ।

श्रीमती लक्ष्मीकांतम्मा एक मेम्बर ने कहा कि मैं झूठ बोल रही हूँ । मैं कहती हूँ कि तुम झूठ बोल रहे हो । इसकी जांच कीजिये कि कौन झूठ बोल रहा है ।

One day a driver without licence was driving a jeep going to the jail.

SHRI G. VENKATASWAMY: I am a Member of Parliament. She does not know anything.**

SHRIMATI LAKSHMIKANTAMMA: ** (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: That word is unparliamentary. It should not go in the record.

MR. SPEAKER: Please don't lose your temper. That word will be expunged.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMIKANTAMMA: Please get it investigated. There was an unlicensed...

SHRI C. K. BHATTACHARYYA (Raiganj): Mr. Dwivedy told you just now that it is an unparliamentary word and it should not be allowed to remain in the record.

MR. SPEAKER: I have already expunged it.

SHRI C. K. BHATTACHARYYA: Yesterday the same word was used

repeatedly by Shri Jyotirmoy Basu in relation to Shri A. K. Sen.

श्री मोल्लू प्रसाद (बांसगांव): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है । * जितना अन्तर है ज़रा समझा दीजिये ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : थोड़ा सा कन्चर में फर्क है । यह कह दीजिये कि आपने ठीक नहीं कहा, गलत कहा है ।

The word is definitely unparliamentary. Wherever it occurs it will be automatically expunged.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMIKANTAMMA: In this particular thing there is an allegation, a serious allegation and it is my duty and it is the duty of all members of Parliament to see if anything was wrong and if the life of an hon. member is involved. The person responsible should be punished and so I request the Minister to investigate into it and bring out the truth to the House. We do not know what it is, whether it is correct or not. There is the other version also. We want to know the truth. The other version says that it was an unlicensed driver driving a jeep with 15 persons and the same people who were encouraged to throw stones by satyagrahis at other threw stones at them, and the driver lost control. There are two versions. I do not want to give my opinion. How am I competent? The life of an hon. Member is involved. It is our duty to see how such things had happened and the guilty persons should be punished. Let there be an inquiry into it.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: Let a Parliamentary Committee go into it.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMIKANTAMMA: I do not want to go into the details of those lapses and Gentlemen's Agreement and what happened to the 8 points proposals of the Prime Minister and all that.

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

[श्रीमती लक्ष्मीकान्तम्मा]

लैप्सेज और जन्टिलमैन एग्रीमेंट के बारे में काफी चर्चा हुई है उसके बारे में मैं ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहती हूँ। मैं सदस्यों से पूछना चाहती हूँ कि लैप्सेज किसी भी एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में हो सकते हैं। लैप्सेज के कारण से राज्य का निर्माण बन्द करना उचित नहीं है। इस बारे में मैं सदस्यों से अपील करना चाहती हूँ कि इन समस्याओं का ब्रैठ कर फ़ैसला करना चाहिये न कि हिंसा से काम लिया जाये।

अभी माननीय नारायण रेड्डी जी ने कहा कि 16 लाख विद्यार्थी हैं जिनकी पढ़ाई का नुकसान हुआ है। मैं पूछना चाहती हूँ कि इसके दाँषी कौन हैं। यहां तक कि वहाँ के वाइस चांसलर की बीबी भी मृत्युग्रह में गयी, और सिन्डीकेट के मेम्बर भी हैं।

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा (हमीरपुर) : मेरा प्वाइंट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर है। यह सिन्डीकेट से क्या मतलब है।

श्रीमती लक्ष्मीकान्तम्मा : वहाँ के वाइस-चांसलर का स्टेटमेंट है कि करीब 95 प्रतिशत विद्यार्थी स्कूलों में जाना चाहते हैं और पढ़ना चाहते हैं।.....

SHRI M. N. REDDY: Which syndicate?

SHRI M. V. KRISHNAPPA (Hoskote): There are various syndicates, all-India syndicate; Andhra syndicate; Mysore syndicate and in every province there is syndicate.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMIKANTAMMA: It has come in the papers. I have read it. You can ask the Vice-chancellor.

SHRI M. N. REDDY: That is why we want a Parliamentary Committee.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMIKANTAMMA: If the will of the 5 per cent of the students were to prevail

against the will of the 95 per cent of the students, is it democracy? 95 per cent students wanted to go to the classes and 5 per cent were engaged in agitation. What is to become of the fate of the country? What is to become of the future of the State, of the future of the nation? I can show my fist. . . .

SHRI M. V. KRISHNAPPA: We are all afraid of it.

AN HON MEMBER: We seek protection.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMIKANTAMMA: The other day there was a meeting in my constituency. 50,000 people were there who are for integration. All are not for separation. Why do they set fire to petrol bunks, why do they incite people? I have visited many shops; I have talked to shopkeepers. What are they saying? They are disgusted with the agitation. There will be mob fury against agitation. They are organising and doing so many things. Because agitators resort to violence, Government resorts to firing; some people will have to die. This crime of death of so many innocent children, they may be my children or somebody else's children, is very serious. Telengana should be saved, should be protected, from these indiscreet decisions of the corrupt politicians. Why do you want to use children as gunfodder, why do you use violence, petrol, stones. Is this the way of functioning in a democracy, I ask. Mr. Krishnappa was talking yesterday about jail prisoners and saying Mr. Brahmananda Reddy was in jail but not Chenna Reddy. . . .

SHRI M. V. KRISHNAPPA: I asked who is in jail, whether Brahmananda Reddy or Chenna Reddy, because police was surrounding all of them.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMIKANTAMMA: I can answer that. Even before that what happened? Some children

were killed in police firing, the parents of children, the mothers, lots of these people went and raided Chenna Reddy's house and said, you are responsible for killing our children. This mob fury he could not stand. He was not even staying in his house. He vacated his house out of fear. He was in another house. He insured that house, I was told, and was staying with somebody else, from which he was arrested. Sir, I cannot allow the fate of Telengana to be decided by vested interests. These goondas should not be allowed to destroy democracy.

SHRI M. N. REDDY: On a point of order. I take serious exception to this. If every Congress leader is a goonda—because it is all created by Congress leaders—if she accepts that all the Congress leaders are goondas and rowdies, we will accept that.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMIKANTAM-MA: The hon. member was talking about what Shri Brahmananda Reddy was doing during election canvassing. What was its relevancy, I do not know.

Hyderabad has a history of goondas. There are about 5,000 of them trained, brought up and maintained by some of the business people. I am not talking of the political goondas. That is a different thing. But I am talking of the real goondas paid and maintained. During the Razakar trouble, these goondas were maintained by Marwari businessmen to provide for the eventuality of communal troubles breaking out. When there was communal fight, they used to make use of these goondas.

Another thing is that these people were lending money at very high rates of interest to small business people in Telengana and to farmers at the rate of 30, 40 or even 100 pkr cent. Then for collecting the interest, they had to employ goondas. They were pressed into service for this purpose. When the Andhras came there, the situation changed. The Andhras are enterprising people. They

were lending money at 2 and 4 per cent on easy terms. So those people found in the Andhras their enemies and competitors. They wanted to get rid of these Andhras who were really serving the people of Telengana.

Shri Prakash Vir Shastri talked about industrialisation. In the central sector, Rs. 110 crores were invested in Andhra Pradesh, Rs. 80 crores out of it has been spent in Telengana and only Rs. 30 crores in the rest of the State. We want more development. Due to the agitation, there has been a loss in this field. Otherwise, we could have had more development and more money spent.

As regards fertiliser, I am glad to say that in Telengana we are getting a unit in the public sector. The private sector was given a licence for starting a factory, but all these 8-10 years, they have not done it. The private sector has failed Telengana.

The people of Telengana are brave fighters. They have got the capacity to develop and prosper.

MR. SPEAKER: I have been repeatedly ringing the bell and appealing to the hon. lady member to conclude. I am feeling very helpless.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMIKANTAM-MA: The vested interests are creating all this trouble. Let them face facts. Let them face the people on the same platform and then we will see who will win the confidence of the people of Telengana. Instead of that, they egg on young children to go about with stones and petrol and indulge in destruction of property. They are adopting tactics reminiscent of the cow agitation here sometime back. Let them give up CIA tactics.

Let there be an investigation into all these things, and let justice be done. What is happening now is that in the name of the people of Telengana, all these things are done and unrest and confusion is created. We know who are the fighters. Violent

methods have been used. So let there be an investigation and let justice be done. If you dare to break these bounds of Telengana-speaking people, there will be a revolt among the people of Telengana for justice.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minsiter will reply tomorrow.

—
BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
THIRTY-NINTH REPORT

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-
 TARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING
 AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAGHU
 RAMAIAH): I present the Thirty-

ninth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is it about?

MR. SPEAKER: Two motions have been added, one concerning floods and the other about sugarcane prices and allied matters. Then there is a sitting proposed on the 30th.

18 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, August 22, 1969 | Sravana 31, 1881 (Saka).