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Resolution Regarding Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Mr. Speaker: Let us now proceed to the next item on the Agenda, namely, Resolutions.

Shri V. D. Deshpande (Ippaguda): Mr. Speaker, Sir, This suggestion came up on the other day; but we have since considered the matter and feel that the resolution regarding the disintegration of the Hyderabad State should be taken up to-day, as this is a very important problem of the day.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Shri K. L. Narsimha Rao may move his Resolution.

Shri K. L. Narasimha Rao (Yellandu-General): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this Assembly is of opinion that one State should be formed for all the Telugu speaking people living in Telengana, Andhra State and other adjoining areas, and it therefore..."
Mr. Speaker: Resolution moved.

Resolution: strongly urges upon the States Reorganisation Commission and the Government of India to take immediate steps for the disintegration of Hyderabad State and reorganisation of adjoining States to enable the formation of the State of Vishal Andhra for all the Telugu speaking areas, the State of united Maharashtra for all the Marathi speaking areas and the State of United Karnatak for all the Kanarese speaking areas.
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Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State
31st August, 1951

Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair

The Two States Theory was rejected by the Cabinet. After the election, the new Cabinet decided to implement the Two States Theory. This decision was made in consultation with the States. The Mills Commission unanimously approved the Two States Theory. The Cabinet also decided to implement the Mills Commission Report.
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Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State
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अशा भाषापाता ठार कांग्रेस ने केलेजा आहे. मला अंत्य सांगविण्यात आहे की हा ठार, जेणेकरी भाषापाता ठार तेलंगाना तलासा नल्लून पण आज सत्ता आध्यात्मिक कांग्रेस लोकांची स्वतंत्रता दिवसाच्या सह १५ इ. पहाट आहे व हा प्रत्ये डावलपाय्वाचा प्रस्ताव करत आहे. भावाचिक इतर पाच वर्षांच्या केलेजा ठार आतापरं परंतु अभं गतापण वातावरण पाल्ल्याने होटात पण भाष्या गाण्या फिक्यू टेक्निकाला असणा आज हा ठारावाचा डावलपाय्वाचा प्रस्ताव करण्याचा येत आहे. आज या कांग्रेस वेळेने हा ठाराव आणला आहे त्याळा माझा संतुष्ट पाळ्याचा आहे. कारण वांनी ह्या ठारावाच्या घटाने माझ्यांच्या समाजाळूटत जनतेची माफी करा आहे ह्याच्या केले आहे.
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Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In the light of the reports of the Committee appointed by the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan, it is hereby declared that the State of Hyderabad shall be disintegrated into three parts:

1. Hyderabad State
2. Composite State
3. Transformed State

The administrative machinery of the State shall be reorganised accordingly.
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Hyderabad is to be disintegrated

"Integrate ourselves with the Indian Union"
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Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State.

The resolution states that the disintegration of Hyderabad State is inevitable. The reasons for this are as follows:

1. **Point of view**
   - The point of view is that the disintegration is inevitable.

2. **Strong reasons**
   - The strong reasons for disintegration include:
     - **Telugu speaking areas**
     - **Strong Convictions**
     - **Welfare State**
     - **Uniform policy**
     - **Merger**
     - **Prohibition**
     - **Sea-port**
     - **Posts**
     - **Merger**
     - **Welfare State**

3. **Conclusion**
   - The conclusion is that the disintegration is inevitable because of the strong convictions and the welfare state.
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This being so, the logical proposal would be to merge the three linguistic regions with the contiguous linguistic areas of Andhra, Maharashtra and Karnataka.

The formation of Andhra, Maharashtra and Karnataka States is likely to result in pooling up of resources, greater concerted effort, and increased propriety. These States, when formed, will be in a better position than when they are continued in a divided pattern which exists today. The disintegrated areas, which will integrate with other contiguous and homogenous regions, will enrich themselves by addition of resources and manpower.

"The administrative set up is also not likely to be disturbed in a large measure. The All-India Services will continue to participate in the administration in the newly formed
States as before. The provincial or State Services now under the existing State Governments may have to undergo some change. But a reasonable adjustment between the integrating and disintegrating areas can be made without much difficulty."

"If the demand is not conceded, there is every likelihood, in our opinion, of the energies of the people being dissipated in agitation for achieving the goal of linguistic States. The best way, therefore, of saving the Five-Year Plan and inducing the people to implement it with zeal and energy, is to concede the demand without hesitation and delay."
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Amidst the disintegration of Blst August, 1954, the Hyderabad State, which had been a princely state within the Indian Union, was disintegrated into several smaller territories. This resolution outlines the process and the steps taken towards the disintegration.

The main points of the resolution include:

1. **Legal Basis**: The resolution is based on the Hyderabad (Alteration of Status) Act, 1950, which provided the legal framework for the disintegration.
2. **Territorial Division**: The state was divided into several territories, including the Deccan States, Hyderabad State, and the new states of Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, and Telangana.
3. **Administration**: The new territories were administered by the Indian government, ensuring a smooth transition of power.
4. **Economic Measures**: Actions were taken to stabilize the economy of the new territories, ensuring a fair transition for the people of the state.
5. **Political Reforms**: The resolution also included political reforms, aiming to establish a democratic system in the new territories.

This resolution was an important step in the unification of India, as it helped in integrating the princely states into the Indian Union, thereby strengthening the national unity.
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Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

The resolution on the disintegration of Hyderabad State is hereby adopted by the Indian Parliament. The resolution acknowledges the necessity for peace and stability in the region and calls for the establishment of a new state, known as the State of Hyderabad.

The resolution also emphasizes the importance of peace and cooperation between the new state and its neighbors. It is hoped that the resolution will lead to a more prosperous and harmonious future for all the people of the region.

Signed,
[Signature]

Parliament Chairman
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To the Governor of the Hyderabad State,

The subject of the resolution is the disintegration of Hyderabad State, specifically addressing the issue of Separate Telengana. The resolution outlines various administrative facilities and linguistic states, as well as two state theories: One Language, one Culture, one State (Practical Theory) and the Two State Theory (Reorganisation commission). The resolution also touches on the need for welfare state and police state perspectives.
Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

478

31st August, 1954

Di Khan - Agra disintegration was a fact.

Lije Juggwi, 1954

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Balkanize

Not established.

Not established.

Hyderabad State

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

In 1954, the disintegration of Hyderabad State was a fact.
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Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

Date: August 31, 1954

To: The Government of India

Subject: Resolution on the Disintegration of Hyderabad State

As the government of the State of Hyderabad has decided to disintegrate, the government of the State of Maharashtra has decided to accept the resolution on the disintegration of the State of Hyderabad.

The resolution is as follows:

1. The government of the State of Maharashtra hereby declares its full support for the disintegration of the State of Hyderabad.

2. The government of the State of Maharashtra hereby requests the government of the Union of India to take all necessary steps to ensure a smooth transition of power.

3. The government of the State of Maharashtra hereby requests the government of the Union of India to provide all necessary assistance to ensure a peaceful and orderly transfer of power.

4. The government of the State of Maharashtra hereby requests the government of the Union of India to ensure that the rights and interests of the people of the State of Hyderabad are fully protected.

5. The government of the State of Maharashtra hereby requests the government of the Union of India to ensure that the disintegration of the State of Hyderabad is carried out in a manner that is consistent with the principles of justice and fairness.

Signed:
[Signature]
[Name]
[Title]
Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

August, 1954

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

As soon as the issue was presented to the House of Parliament, the resolution moved by us was adopted by the House. It is to be noted that the resolution was moved by Mr. S.D. Agarwal, Member of Parliament from Hyderabad State. The resolution was adopted by a voice vote, and it is to be understood that the resolution was moved with the full support of the House. The resolution was adopted by a voice vote, and it is to be understood that the resolution was moved with the full support of the House.

The resolution, which was adopted by the House, was as follows:

"Be it resolved that the Government of India is firmly resolved to take all necessary steps to effect the peaceable and honourable disintegration of the Hyderabad State."

The resolution was adopted by a voice vote, and it is to be understood that the resolution was moved with the full support of the House. The resolution was adopted by a voice vote, and it is to be understood that the resolution was moved with the full support of the House.
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31st August, 1954

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State

The Assembly, after considering the report of the Parliamentary Committee appointed for the purpose, hereby resolves that:

1. The unity of the State of Hyderabad shall be preserved and the disintegration of the State shall be prevented.

2. The Assurances given by the Government of India to the people of Hyderabad shall be fulfilled.

3. The political, economic, and religious interests of the people of Hyderabad shall be protected.

4. The rights of all the communities shall be safeguarded.

5. The interests of the minority communities shall be protected.

6. The integrity of the country shall be preserved.

7. The constitutional rights of all the citizens shall be protected.

8. The disintegration of the State shall be completely prevented.

9. The interests of all the communities shall be protected.

10. The disintegration of the State shall be completely prevented.

Signed:

[Signature]

[Name]
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The House then adjourned for recess till Half Past Five of the Clock.

The House re-assembled after recess at Half Past Five of the Clock.

[Shri Anna Rao Ganamukhi, (Chairman) in the Chair]

Shri Devi Singh Chauhan (Ausa): Mr. Chairman, Sir I stand to support the resolution which is before this House for discussion.

While appointing the States Re-organisation Commission the Government of India in their resolution have desired that the Commission should make recommendations in regard to the broad principles which should govern the solution of this problem. While giving the terms of reference, in an indirect way the Government of India made it clear that language...
along with cultural and social homogeneity, should be the basic principle, or fundamental consideration for the formation of these new States. While accepting language and culture as the basis for the re-organisation of States, it has been made clear at the same time that considerations of preservation and strengthening of the unity of India, and financial, economic and administrative considerations, and the necessity of making changes as not to interfere with the successful prosecution of the national plan should be borne in mind. These are the three important conditions for the re-organisation of States.

The first consideration, namely, language and culture, I submit, has been broadly accepted by the Government and also it would be accepted by the States Re-organisation Commission. Some doubts, however, have been raised, while considering the question of the re-organisation of the States as to the preservation and strengthening of the unity of India. I may make it clear before this House that this is simply a reorganisation of States; it is simply changing the boundaries of certain States, so that it may be convenient—it may be suitable, for the administration of the country. The Dhar Commission, which was appointed in 1947 before giving final shape to the Constitution of India, observed that there were certain fissiparous tendencies in the Country. It had termed such fissiparous tendencies as creating of sub-nations or exclusive possessions or inviolate territories. They had also referred this demand of reorganisation of States as a sort of a right of secession. I would like to make it quite clear here that the re-organisation of States does not envisage even a semblance of any of these concepts. We, who stand here in support of these linguistic States, want to reiterate that we wish to remain in the same Republic of India, the same country and our loyalties are with the same nation; and nobody should give them the meaning of the nature suggested by the Dhar Commission. Some elements which oppose the formation of new States think that these tendencies will increase, but I wish to state that this is far from the truth.

Even today, if we glance at the present States in India, we will find that almost all the States—Part A States and Part B States—have been formed according to the language, more or less according to the language. There are 10 Part A States. Out of these 10 States, 8 States are more or less on the linguistic basis. I am saying 'more or less' with special significance; Madras is predominantly a Tamil area, Andhra
predominantly a Telugu area, etc., there may be some other areas included in these States, some border areas. There may be a little pruning so that these areas may be uniformly of the same language; some re-adjustment may be necessary, but predominantly these areas are of the same language. Out of the 8 Part B States, only Hyderabad is a multi-lingual State. I shall read out the names of the Part A States: Uttar Pradesh is a Hindi area, Bihar is a Hindi area, Orissa is a Oriya language area, West Bengal is a Bengali area, Assam is Assamese speaking area, Andhra is a Telugu area, Madras is a Tamil area and Punjab is a Punjabi speaking area. Bombay and Madhya Pradesh are the only two States in Part A States which have more than one language. In Part B States, Hyderabad is the only State which has three languages. So, the argument that if the States are mainly based upon considerations of language and culture, the unity of India would be disturbed is far from the truth and is a travesty of facts. Only such elements who do not belong to any of these regional groups or regional languages put forth this claim. In Hyderabad only those elements which do not belong to Andhra, which do not belong to Marathwada or which do not belong to Karnataka, have put forward this argument. I think when we consider this question, we should not be led away by the murmurs of grumbling of these stray individuals. What the mass or people say we must accept, and if we accept the demand of the masses nothing injurious to the prestige of the country is going to happen.

About the economic viability which has been put as one of the very important considerations in the terms of reference, I may submit that the States which will be created out of the re-organisation on cultural and linguistic basis would fulfil all the conditions which are necessary for a viable unit.

In the South some two or three States have to be disturbed for the creation of new boundaries—Bombay, Madhya Pradesh and Hyderabad. They will have to be re-adjusted. Out of this re-adjustment new States will arise—out of Bombay, Gujrath and Maharashtra and Karnataka will arise. It is an admitted fact that Karnataka with more than 2½ or 2½ crores of people would be quite a viable unit judged by the criteria of population or income and expenditure. Maharashtra would also be a viable unit with 625 lakhs of population and sound finances which the Bombay State commands at present. Similarly, Gujrath, from Bombay
State, will be merged with Saurashtra and it will be quite a viable unit. I think these new States, after re-organisation, would be sound financially, economically and administratively. Some objections......

An hon. Member: What about Bombay City?

Shri Devisingh Chauhan: Bombay will remain with Maharashtra. It goes without saying. I need not say that the sun will rise tomorrow. As much as we are definite that the sun will rise tomorrow I am also sure that Bombay cannot be detached from Maharashtra. If there are any considerations for separating Bombay city from Maharashtra, then the same considerations will have to be applied to Calcutta, Madras, Hyderabad and possibly to Nagpur, Cawnpur and other big cities of India. As much as Cawnpur is surrounded by Hindi speaking population, Nagpur by Marathi speaking people they are natural parts of W.P. and M.P. Bombay too is surrounded by Marathi speaking people and belongs to Maharashtra. We cannot detach or separate it from the mainland of Maharashtra.

About the economic viability of Maharashtra State, I may state that the State after re-organisation would be as big, as populous and as financially sound as the present Bombay State. No one has ever denied that Bombay is economically sound. No one has raised any objection that the Bombay State is financially unsound. Similar would be the position of the Maharashtra State. Therefore, the economic and administrative viability of these new States after re-organisation is based on valid grounds and the question of re-adjustment cannot be shelved any longer.

Some objections have been raised about the fact that the prosecution of the Five-year Plan would be disturbed if the States are re-grouped. At this juncture, it is a coincidence that the First Five-year Plan is ending by 1956 and we are also envisaging the creation of new States by the end of 1956. The first Five-year Plan would not therefore be disturbed. It can be as efficiently implemented as it is being implemented now. For the next Five-year Plan we may plan from now on, on the basis that new States would be created so that the next Five-year Plan would not be disturbed. One other consideration which is very important for the prosecution of the national plan is this: Today in these multi-lingual States there are many groups that have
some grudge or other against the existing Governments. One of the hon. Members, probably from Gadwal, read out a passage or a sentence about this. The Hyderabad Government has also accepted—that there are some areas in the State which have genuine grievances. That is a fact. If these States are re-organised, in the new set-up there will not be so many occasions for complaints. The complaints, made by the people would be attended to and rectified with full energy and with the support of the people. In Hyderabad certain areas have a complaint. These complaints have been brought before this House on many occasions. I would not go into the details, but the complaint generally is that certain areas have not received their due share in the irrigation projects, in education and in so many other respects. Hyderabad is not the only State where such complaints have been made. I may be permitted to read one passage from a memorandum given to the States Re-organisation Commission by the Mahavidharbha Congress Committee or on behalf of the Marathi Speaking Areas of Madhya Pradesh. They also complain that their State or areas have for a long time not been properly cared for or that a due share in the National Plan has not been given to them. This sort of a complaint is there in almost all the multi-lingual areas, where there are provincial or linguistic minorities.

"In the State five-year Plan, the proportion of expenditure for college and university development purposes for Maharashtra and Hindi areas respectively is glaringly unjust. Out of a total provision of 310 lakhs not less than 240 lakhs are earmarked for being spent in Hindi areas, while a mere pittance of 70 thousand rupees has been doled out to Marathi Speaking Areas. Similarly for the completed village Water Supply Schemes out of 17.8 lakhs, only 2.1 lakhs have been spent on Marathi districts. Similarly.

(Interruptions)

[Mr. Chairman rang the bell].

Shri Devisingh Chauhan: I hope, Sir, some more time would be given to me.

Shri Guruvà Reddy (Siddipet): Will the hon. Member throw some light on the Two States Theory also?

Shri Devisingh Chauhan: In course of time. The hon. Member may please wait.

Mr. Chairman: There is no time.
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Shri Devisingh Chauhan: "Out of the current Village Water Supply Scheme to which total provision of Rs. 12.4 lakhs has been made, only 98 thousand rupees are proposed to be spent in the Marathi Speaking districts. Out of a total provision of 2 crores for Road Development Works, a very small portion is being spent in the Marathi districts. Major Irrigation Schemes involving more than 3 crores of rupees have been located in Hindi areas and not even one in Marathi area. Even in Minor Irrigation Works, the Marathi areas have not received their due share. An Agricultural College worth 50 lakhs of rupees though not provided in the Five-year Plan, suddenly comes to be opened in the Hindi area, while the small demands from Marathi areas are turned down on the plea that money is not available..."

Sir, I would not go into the details about conditions in our State. If the figures are changed the same sentences quoted here would hold good and would give a correct and true picture about the complaints made in certain regions of this State. The same complaints have been made by the Kannada speaking areas of Bombay State. I would not here charge any Government with partiality or would I like to go into the merits of that case. But I would submit that this is a natural consequence of the conditions existing in these States. We should reform our States, re-organise our administrative units in such a way and on such principles that there should be no ground for complaints from minorities. That is the point. Some of the hon. Members who have spoken before me have charged the present Government. That is not true. The present Government also has been the heir or the successor to the Governments which have been continuing here for so many years. Since 1938 the Marathi Speaking Areas in Madhya Pradesh have been voicing these complaints and the same is the case with Kannada areas in Bombay State and the Marathi and Kannada Speaking areas in Hyderabad State. So, I would not charge or would grudge against the existing Governments in these States. This is the outcome of the conditions existing in the situation. Therefore, my suggestion is that we should re-organise multi-lingual States into Uni-lingual areas and thus remove the grounds for complaints from minorities. If we accept these broad principles for the re-organisation of the boundaries of our States, then the question of Hyderabad becomes a mere corollary. The issue of Hyderabad is not the main point, it is subsidiary. When we work a theorem in Geometry,
certain conclusions follow naturally. When we accept the broad principles for the re-organisation of States, then Hyderabad must naturally be dissolved, must be dis-membered, must be dis-integrated. That is a natural consequence.

An argument is sometimes placed before the people that there is some Hyderabadi culture or some Deccani culture. I think this is a false notion, a bogey created by the feudal Government which reigned in Hyderabad upto five or six years ago. The amalgamation or the coming together of two cultures, two languages, could have been there, but the natural conditions necessary for this fusion of cultures, did not exist in Hyderabad. That has been made quite clear in the memorandum submitted to the States Re-organisation Commission. I would not go into the details and waste the time of the House, but I may make it quite clear here that in the co-existence of more than 200 years, the Marathi people, the Andhra people and the Kannada people, have not evolved one single institution, which speak for the common culture in these three areas. The amalgamation of the ruling race with some elite, some educated people walking on the cement roads, cannot mean that there has been an amalgamation of different cultures. That is not the amalgamation of the cultures of the people. There may have some mixture of the language or the culture of the ruling class with the masses. A good idea is being imported and used for false purposes. This claim of Deccani culture has been placed before the people by non-Andhras, by non-Maharashtrians and non-Kannadigas. So this talk of Deccani culture should be taken 99 per cent discount.

We have always supported that there should be only one State based upon one language. That has been our consistent stand. We have stood for it since 1921 and even today we support it and stand by it. Some people, those who supported this one State for one language propose, have recently come out with a new idea that a new State, called Mahavidharbha, should be created. Their main plea is that the areas in Madhya Pradesh are very far of from the main capital, Bombay and therefore, they should be given a separate State. But, Sir, I can again repeat here that this demand of a separate Mahavidharbha has been made mainly by the non-Marathi people. Because they happened to live in the Marathi speaking area, they have been elected to the Legislatures, have been made Ministers and fill up some posts of prestige. They have utilised their posts of vantage for their interested
purposes. The main body of the Marathi people want one Marathi State. There was the Akola Pact, which had come into existence under different conditions. The Leaders signed the Akola Pact at a time when Hyderabad was under the thumb of the Nizam, when Berar was contributing 25 lakhs yearly to the Nizam. Therefore, the question of unification of all the Marathi areas could not have been taken up at that stage. The Akola Pact came into existence and the Biyanis and advocates of Mahavidharbha are clinging to the same old idea, which has already been discarded for good. There are some counterparts of the separate Mahavidharbha idea in this State also, but it is of very recent growth consistency and the reasonableness which can be associated with the demand of one State for one language cannot be attributed to these new persons giving support to the separate Telangana idea. Mahavidharbha with a population of only 80 lakhs and a finance of 7 or 8 crores cannot function as a viable unit in any sense of the term.

Similarly separate Telangana cannot function as a separate unit, if we place before us the benefits, advantages and welfare of the people. The demand for a separate Telangana is quite unnatural, based on false grounds and false arguments, and, therefore, it stands self-condemned. We cannot hope to contribute to the welfare of the people of Telangana with some 10 or 15 crores of rupees; and if we are to depend upon these 10 or 15 crores of rupees, the income coming from Excise should always be maintained. Unless that income from Excise is maintained at all times, this separate Telangana cannot function. In this enlightened 20th Century Democratic age we cannot hope that, as the British people sold opium to the Chinese and thus gained a sphere of influence of China, a separate Telangana can flourish and its people be governed with the income derived from Excise. We do not desire that the income from Excise should always be maintained. That is not our aim, nor can it be the aim of any Democratic Government.

On a consideration of all these factors, the demand of having only one State for one language is quite sound. In this House, I think there is a very great majority—I would say rather unanimity, on the question that Hyderabad State should be disintegrated and linguistic states should be created. The telugu-speaking areas of the State will go to Andhra; the marathi-speaking areas will merge with the other  
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areas and the Karnataka areas which are at present divided in 3 or 4 States would form one state.

**Mr. Chairman:** It is not 3, it is 6 (States).

**Shri Devisingh Chauhan:** Thank you, Sir. With the disintegration of Hyderabad State, these linguistic states should be formed. I submit that with the creation of these linguistic states, we would be creating an atmosphere conducive for the strength of our Republic. Today people have many complaints against the State Government about the execution of the Five-Year Plan. If we want to execute certain plans and implement them for the welfare of the people, we must have homogeneous and unilingual units, so that the energy of the people may well be diverted for creative purposes. This problem can only be solved by accepting the principle of formation of States on the basis of language and culture and reorganization of the States on that principle.

**Shri K. Venkatrama Rao (Chinnakondur):** Is the hon. Member going to vote for the resolution?

**Shri Devisingh Chauhan:** Still I am giving my views. The hon. Member may wait till the time of voting comes. I would however like to submit one thing. Many hon. Members while speaking on the resolution have tried to create bitterness. They have tried to condemn the ruling party. I would request them that on this problem at least—on the question of reorganization of States—no such criticism is warranted and such criticism would only create bitterness among the people....

**The Minister for Supply, Agriculture Development and Planning (Dr. Channa Reddy):** As the hon. Member has done.

**Shri Devisingh Chauhan:** I have done nothing. I have just given my views on the question. I have not mentioned any party. Some references have been made to some persons or groups; but I have not made reference to any political party. There are many parties and many persons composing each one of such parties; and they hold different views. I am not referring to any particular party or to any particular group. So I would request on this question at least hon. Members should not condemn the ruling party. I am sure this House will appreciate that the ruling party has done it...
best to solve the problem. A Commission for the reorganization of the States has already been appointed. The Commission visited our State. Most of the hon. Members sitting here have put their viewpoints before the Commission. In the face of all these, how can anyone say that the ruling party has not done anything in this matter? The ruling party is doing everything that it could in solving this problem; and within a very short time, the recommendations of the Commission would be known shortly the result of the Commission's efforts will be before us. So we should be patient and try to consolidate our position. It is futile and very dangerous to condemn other parties that they are not doing anything.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State.
31st August, 1934.
Resolution re. Disintegration of Hyderabad State.

21st August, 1954.

The Mr. President and Members of the Constituent Assembly: We, the members of the Constituent Assembly, do hereby solemnly declare that we have unanimously resolved that the State of Hyderabad be dissolved and its area接管 by the Union of India. This resolution was passed on the 21st August, 1954.
Resolution re: Disintegration of
Hyderabad State.

81st August, 1954.

Whether relevant or irrelevant, whether it is derogatory
to the House or not.
404 81st August, 1954.
Resolution re.: Disintegration of Hyderabad State.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State.

31st August, 1954.

"Whether relevant or irrelevant, whether it is derogatory to the House or not."
Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State.

31st August, 1954.

The decision regarding the disintegration of Hyderabad State.

A resolution was made to dissolve Hyderabad State as a result of the situation prevailing in the state. The resolution was adopted by the Assembly of the state.

The resolution was adopted by a show of hands, and the decision was implemented immediately.

The decision was made in consultation with the Central Government and the United Nations.
Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State.

(21st August, 1954.)

پرانتون کا راستہ دکھا کا اب اس سے مذکورہ جاہتے ہیں - گویا اطلاع درکی سے پہلے کے خلاف وہ نین کہ کوشش کر رہے ہیں - جبھی یہ دکھائے سامنے ہو گی جہذ آباد ورڈیش کانگریس کا روزولوشن وشال آندرہا کی تعلیم میں سے لیکن تعلیم کا جند لوج عفیف و غربی طریقے سے دیکھنے کی میجیاری

Delegate (کے باوجود خود مختار) (Minority) Majority

یہی جہذ آباد سے میجیاری کا جائه لینے کی کوشش کررہے ہیں - لیکن میں کیوں ہے ایسے لوجوں نے جو روزولوشن پہنچ انٹرویوشن

یہ پہچ کرنا ہے یہ وہ نہ صرف ورڈیش کانگریس کے خلاف ہے بلکہ یوکی ضمیر ہے جبکہ خلاف ہے -

لہذا اون لوجوں کو سوچنا چاہئے کہ ہم جو قلم انہارہ ہے وہ ماحول کے کسدر خلاف ہے ایک سو سال کی کوشش کے جو مختلف خانہ تاربہ وہاں ہے وہ ایک دن کی

سائٹ نئے حجت کے ختم نہیں ہوسکتا - اس وجہ میں اون سے التجکرتنہا کہ وہ

(Withdraw)

بھی اپنے نادانی کا اعتراف کریں اور اپنی اس مطالبہ کو وظیفہ (Sincere friends of the soil)

کریں اور حقیقتی میں سنجیر فرتن آدی سائل

کہا کہ مستحقر عوام نے اپوزیشن پارٹی کے کام ادارے یہ کہہ کے موضع میں ہیں کہ وشال آندرہا بنا

چاہئے - سیوکے سیاہیات بنا جاہتے اور اپوں کرنئکا بنا جاہتے کہدراپاد کے

جذبہ علاقوں آندرہا میں جاہتے ہو اندہوں میں جاہتے - جو اگلاع سیاہیات میں

جہذ جاہتے ہو سیاہیات میں جاہتے اور جو کرنئکا میں جاہتے ہو کرنئکا میں

جاہتے - برہموں مذکورہ تھا - غیرہ کانگریس کے جند لوگوں کو نظام کا راجا

پسند ہے - مگر چند لوگ اپنے سیاہیوں اور اپنے منحصری کی خاطر بورہ یہ قانون میں اکثر کرکے عوام کا راستہ وہاں چاہتے ہیں - میں نہیں سمجھتا کہ اون کے انفرادی ووجود کی خاطر وہ میں کچھ عوام کو یہ جیھن رکھنا جاسکتا ہے - میں میں اون کی اپنی انفی جات کہ میں سائیٹ نئے حجت کے سائیٹ نئے حجت کے عوام نے اون لوگوں کی درخواست کہا جاہتے ہیں کہ میں میں

Statistics

(عوام کے سامنے رہے کہر کر جیسکا ہے یہ کہ

رہے ہے میں ایوا کہ مینے کیوڑھا اس لئے (Let it be as it is) ایسے نے

کہیں - ہم اون کو یاد دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ جس وقت ہم میں انگریزوں نے ازائی لئی

تو اوس وقت هندوستان کے متعلق آئے اون کے سامنے رہے کرنا یہ بنا کہ کہیں وہ آزاد

ہوئیں جب بعد ائے انت کو وراجکس بناسمکی کے لئی نیا لئی - بلکہ اس کبھی کا کھاچک کہ

تیہا - هندوستان پر نااہل تھا اسکو دوسری کئی لئے بلکہ لئے اسے ایک اچھا یا اعدا و شاہر

ہم اوس لئی مین کرکے ہے - اوزار اس کی نتیجہ یہ ہوا کہ بالاخر اگزیون کو یہ

سیاہیا ہی دیا ہے اور واجہ اس کی نتیجہ یہ ہوا کہ بالاخر اگزیون کو

پابندی کا بعد جاہتے ہی لوگ بھول گے ہوئے ہو رہے ہوں اور واجہ اندر کا

بھائی یہ تو ہیں جو ہم پر حکومت کر ہوئے ہوئے - میں کو اس بات کی خوشی نہیں

خواہ مہدوزرین کو کوچونے لگائیں یا بچھی کریں (اور اپنی آورہ ہے) لیکن اس کے باوجود
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Mr. Speaker in the Chair

[Translation]

The Members of the House were referred to the Constitution of the Multi Language State of Hyderabad and the change in the Constitution of the State of Hyderabad. The Members were referred to the question of accepting the Resolution of the Government of India for the disintegration of the State of Hyderabad.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your notice the following points:

1. The Constitution of the Multi Language State of Hyderabad has been altered.
2. The Constitution of the State of Hyderabad has been changed.
3. The Resolution of the Government of India for the disintegration of the State of Hyderabad has been accepted.

[End of Translation]
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Psychologically it is the conclusion that one brother should join another brother, who has been separated for long.

Logical conclusion of mind and psychology should take place immediately.

"One can understand the position that Hyderabad should be as it is, i.e., status quo should be maintained; one can understand the plea that Vishalandhra should be formed; but one cannot understand this new theory of Dr. Chenna Reddy."

The paper is not with me just now, but I am prepared to quote the date on which this editorial was written.

The editorial further said that this would be just like the dreams of the Bahamani Sultannies and that Dr. Reddy wanted to make a Reddy Sultanite in Hyderabad. These are pungent remarks no doubt and I hope Dr. Chenna Reddy will reply to them; he seems to be eager to do so.

Bell was rung.
Shi V. B. Raju (Secunderabad-General) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, sometimes a good case is spoiled by bad arguments. I am afraid the friends on the Opposition are trying to bring in some tempo and antagonism by using certain words which they ought not have used while speaking on a problem concerning millions of people, a problem which is above the politics of parties, groups or communities or sects. I request the members of this House not to impute any motives. When we are living in a democratic age, let us concede the same honesty, the same conviction to the opponents as we claim for ourselves. That is not a policy of appeasement, it is a question of winning over the opponents. This must be the policy of the protagonists of Viskalandhra. They must realise that Hyderabad had a history and has still a history. 600 years of mis-rule cannot be obliterated by a few speeches from this platform.
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There are some clouds that are covering the minds of some people, which are not allowing them to see the perspective clearly. We should realise that we had passed through such a confusion which had been very unhealthy to Hyderabad and is still unhealthy. We have observed some of these in the last two or three weeks in our State. Let us be aware that enemies working against unification are still there and are winning over our friends to see that the mass of people of Hyderabad would not progress. If any of our friends fall a prey to this propaganda, it is our bounden duty to win them over and correct them. In the end, I am sure we will succeed. With these few remarks, I will touch a few points which have not been sufficiently emphasised by my friends.

Hyderabad State is claimed as a native State. It was an area retained for the sake of the Nizam, in the feud or in the battles that took place between the French and British. For their advantage they retained Hyderabad and only for the sake of the Nizam they have done so. With the quitting of the British, the Nizam and Hyderabad ought to have gone. But Hyderabad is still on the map. It is the duty of this generation to remove it from the map. Whether one agreed or not, it is going to be done. This historical process must be cherished and the sooner it is done the better. If anybody cares to study the political development of this great country—India—one would know how 600 and odd native States were integrated. That is the process of political integration which no one could have halted. Even at that time care had been taken, attention has been bestowed to see that Cochin is integrated with Travancore so as to conform to the principle of homogeneity. The area of Bellary has been integrated with Mysore. What was the factor behind it? It was to obtain the greatest amount of homogeneity in an administrative unit. That being the case, this House debating about the merits or demerits of linguistic States would be out-of-place. Already some of the friends on this side, particularly Shri Devisingh Chauhan, have said that political integration of India would be complete with the formation of linguistic States. In the South the States to be tackled are Madhya Pradesh, Bombay and Hyderabad. In other States only boundaries have to be adjusted. This integration of native States is followed by an automatic process of disintegration and re-integration. Only then will the political map of India be complete. This idea is not based on sentimental grounds; I am glad to say that the three linguistic groups of Hyderabad have lived
as brothers for long and want to separate as brothers for the purpose of re-integration. When people have failed to bring in antagonism among these three groups they are trying to divide the Andhras, Maharashtrians and Kannadigas.

This game cannot be allowed. We have seen in the past that people had opposed the integration of the Hyderabad State with the Indian Union. Such elements have always been there; and yet, we have won over those elements. We have not achieved the objective of integration of the State with the Indian Union with any violence. If Police Action had happened, that was for entirely other reasons. The people of Hyderabad remained one to the last excepting a few to achieve their goal of integration with the Indian Union and succeeded in their aim.

The same urge is there now among the Telugu-speaking people of the State to unite themselves with their brethren in the neighbouring State. One thing I would ask: Who is joining whom? It is not Telangana that is going to Andhra. If Tungabhadra and Krishna joined together and the ultimate name of the river is given as Krishna, it is not Tungabhadra that joined Krishna or Krishna that joined Tungabhadra. The simple fact is that one joined the other. Similarly, it is not Telangana that goes and joins the Andhra. Only, the two will merge together into one, which will be named as ‘Vishalandhra’. If you have any sentimental objection to name it as ‘Vishalandhra’—name is not going to make any difference at all—call it Telangana, call it Andhra, call it Vishalandhra, or call it Akhil Andhra, or by any name we choose. It is not sentiment that counts here.

Let us not forget the historical process that is taking place around us, namely, the urge among the people speaking the same language to unite themselves under one State.

There are three types of people and three types of thinking in our State. One is the Adwaita school, which advocates one state for one language. The second is the Dwaita school, followers of Madhwa who propagate the Two States’ Theory. The third is the Visistadwaita school, which wants to maintain the status quo, i.e., the Hyderabad State should continue as it is without being disintegrated. This sort of thinking is there. But let us not worry. The hon. friend on my right side may be a Visistadwaita; I am an Adwaita,
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while the hon. Member to my left is a Dwaita. But all of us are sitting here together. These three types of thinking could be there, and each type can have its own arguments to place before the House. But the ultimate question is, what is the best for the people?

I am going to place before the House the case that it is a composite Andhra State, a big state, alone, that could solve the unemployment problem; it is a big State like Vishal-andhra alone that could present a balanced economy and could sustain a modern state or modern administration of a State. I am going to place before the House material which would convince us all that there are definite advantages for the individual in being in a bigger State.

Hyderabad today which claims to be a big State with 82 thousand square miles of area and a population of one crore and 86 lakhs, has a budget of 29 crores of rupees expenditure. We should not be deceived by this figure of budget expenditure. I can prove that in the matter of administration the smaller the State the greater would be the per capita expenditure. I shall read to the House a statement which is not very long giving details of the per capita expenditure in each State and this statement proved beyond doubt that smaller the state, bigger is the per capita expenditure on administration. There are however two exceptions. Among the big States, Bombay is an exception and among the small States, Orissa is an exception. Leaving these apart, the figures of per capita expenditure in the other States are as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Per Capita Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madras (before it was divided)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utter Pradesh</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sourashtra</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travancore &amp; Cochin</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepsu</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mysore</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhya Bharat</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus if we compare Bihar with Sourashtra, in Bihar the per capita expenditure is 7.4, while in Sourashtra it is 21.3, i.e., 3 times what it is in Bihar. What is this due to? I have calculated to show the expenditure necessary to run the
ministrative machinery. At least it requires 3 crores of rupees for running a modern administration for a sizable State, as it is pictured by the protagonists of two States, a crore and a half of people and about 50 thousand square miles of territory will constitute an optimum size of a State. I tried to work out the figures. It would cost at least 3 crores of rupees to run the administration of that State. Now if we divide India on this basis, it will come to 30 States. As it is, we have now got 18 States, both Part A and Part B States. If this number plus the number of Part C States are re-grouped and are arranged to constitute 30 states, please see what the additional expenditure would be.

When Andhra State was being separated from Madras, there was a complaint that there would be unnecessary administrative expenditure which will go against the principles of planning and so during the Plan-period Andhra State should not be created. If that was so, having 2 Telugu-States—Is it not adding further to the unnecessary expenditure that is being already incurred? Let the protagonists of the Two States’ Theory realise that the facts and figures go to support the formation of Vishalandhra. I would not agree with my hon. friend Shri G. Sriramulu that statistics should not be considered.

Shri G. Sriramulu: I did not say ‘not at all’. I said they should not be the sole criterion or prima facie consideration.

Shri V. B. Raju: Still I do not agree. Sentiment has no place. In this age of scientific thinking, when we are confronted with the unemployment problem, when we are committed to raise the standard of living of the people, let us prove to our opponents that on those grounds alone—on economic grounds alone, we want Vishalandhra. Let the protagonists of the two States’ Theory adduce facts and figures which run counter to my contention and which show that Telangana can by itself stand.

I was just mentioning that it would require at least 3 crores of rupees to maintain Telangana even if the present level of administration is not to continue. After disintegration, if Telangana remains a residuary State, it costs 4.73 crores or nearly 5 crores of rupees will be the cost of administration if the present level of administration is to continue. Now the I. G. P. or the Chief Secretary or any other Head of a Depart-
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ment, is serving one crore and 86 lakhs of people. Tomorrow when it is reduced to a crore, can you ask the Chief Secretary or the I. G. P. to take only half the salary? Can you reduce the rent of the buildings? After all, you can remove some chaprasis, a few third-grade clerks. The axe will fall on those poor people. There will not be appreciable reduction in the cost of expenditure of the Government. So I submit that to maintain a separate Telangana State it will need at least 5 crores of rupees. Why should you tax for the fancy of running a State Rs. 5 a person? Is it good to levy a tax of Rs. 5 on each person? The same administration will be useful for 3 crores of people. The Andhra people and the Telangana people both can have the benefit of the same administration by the integration of the two. We will save the expenditure on one Government. That is my first point. If I am asking for Vishalandhra, it is only to save the cost of one Government, the benefit of which will accrue to the tax-payer.

About the Telangana budget, different calculations have been made. I would take a typical example. If we apply one formula, the income is about 15.5 crores. It comes to 16.5 crores; but on customs' account when the customs and surcharge are abolished, which we are going to do very early, it comes to only 15.5 crores. Calculated by the same formula, the expenditure would come to 17 crores of rupees. There will thus be a deficit of 1.5 crores for the Telangana State. This must be accepted. If you say we will have a common Governor, a common High Court and a common Public Service Commission, I would ask what harm is there in having a common cabinet. The only difference is a common cabinet. About the Hyderabad City being the capital, there is no dispute. So to reduce our expenditure if we are going to have common things, why sentimental objection to have a common ministry? If we maintain the same level of administration, we will undergo a deficit of 1.5 crores of rupees. I have placed these figures before the House and if they are disapproved, I shall be much glad to withdraw from my stand.

What is the deficit of Andhra? Somebody has put this question. How can two deficit States become a surplus state, when integrated? As in mathematics, just as minus multiplied by minus becomes a plus, two deficit states become surplus. It is a school-boy's mathematics. We are going to save the expenditure on one Government. There will not be two Governments and automatically the amount of 8 or 4
crores which we will save will meet the deficit. If Telangana and Andhra are both integrated, both the States will be free from deficit and the new State will be without a deficit. That is the only way to save this. Otherwise, both the States will undergo deficit. I therefore request the supporters of the Two States’ Theory to consider this aspect. It is no use of simply imagining certain figures and relying too much upon the excise income. I do not mean prohibition. Will the falling prices of agricultural commodities, this income dwindles. We cannot build up an expenditure of administrative structure depending upon the excise income.

Let us analyse the Telangana budget. More than 35% of the budget income is raised by excise. That being the case, when we join Andhra area, we are going to gain tremendously in this way also. The per capita administration expenditure will be 17 in the Telangana State. In this connection I would like to emphasize that national income is different from State revenue income.

Mr. Speaker : The hon Members taking more time.

Shri V. B. Raju : I will take 10 minutes more with your permission, Sir.

Mr. Speaker : Already exceeded 18 minutes.

Shri V. B. Raju : Unfortunately, I have built up my arguments in such a manner but I am confronted with the problem of concluding my speech.

Mr. Speaker : In that case, the hon. Member will not be able to conclude it today.

Shri V. B. Raju : The question is very important. You will give us 2 or 3 non-official days. On such a problem like this, I want to convince my friends or the so-called enemies of Vishalandhra about the benefits of integration. I have no other anxiety.

Dr. Chenna Reddy : First convince the friends.

Shri V. D. Deshpande : There are very few people to be convinced in the House.
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Shri V. B. Raju: I was just submitting before the House that the new Telangana State, if it is created, will, be collecting Rs. 17 per head while the Andhra State is collecting Rs. 12. There is a difference of Rs 5. In Telangana, we are taxing Rs. 5 more than in Andhra. Let us consider the problem from this aspect: if Telangana is integrated with Andhra and if uniformity of tax collection is to be brought about where is the scope for further collection?

We have already submitted that Telangana has reached the saturation point. It has reached the stage of Rs. 17. There is possibility in Andhra where you can collect Rs. 5 more per head. It comes to 10 crores of rupees and those 10 crores of rupees which could be collected from Andhra will be available to the whole of Vishalandhra. Not a pie will flow from Telangana to Andhra. If any pie flows, it will be from Andhra to Telangana. Let me be shown the figures of the protagonists of the two states who have already submitted before the Finance Commission and the Taxation Enquiry Commission that the Hyderabad State has reached the saturation point in taxation. Now, where is the money for future development?

They want to carry on the planning & development with surplus budgets or with the savings on the recurring account! It is not possible. No budget can be surplus in a planning era; and if a surplus is shown it means that they are not serving the people and that they have not been doing things the people want. In no country, during a period of planning, let my friends examine, the budget can afford to be surplus. It is good to show a surplus, during such period, but that can be done only by transferring certain items from the revenue account to capital account etc. It is just a manipulation of figures. It will be very difficult to show a surplus budget in a planning period.

In future if the Telangana people want to develop themselves, the money that will be available for the purpose is only in Andhra; it can be tapped only in Andhra. Let not the Telangana people be misled to understand that something from Telangana is being taken away. Nothing is being taken away from here, but something is coming here. The Andhra Government is going to come to Hyderabad; the High Court from Guntur will come to Hyderabad. Some people are being misled in this respect, particularly, the merchants, the students and the services, and some sort
of scare is being created. I do not like this. I do not want anybody to create a scare in anybody. This is a very dangerous tendency, because ultimately there will be two sections and they will be separatists and unionists and the whole population will be divided. I do not want to see that day. Secondly, separatism always breeds hatred. If one wants to say that this man is not one's friend or that this man is not one's brother, one will have to create hatred. If he creates that hatred history will not spare him. We have got an opportunity now in the history of India and in the history of Deccan after a period of 630 years to unite. Why should we forego this opportunity? Why should we lose this opportunity and allow our name to be forgotten. If we take this opportunity, our name will be written in letters of gold by posterity that we have been the cause for bringing about this union. I do not want to attribute any narrow-minded motives to my friends, but let them think over the matter.

Some of my friends are worried that the Andhra people might come here and exploit us. The same fear was there in the minds of the people of Rayalaseema also. I had the occasion to meet the leaders there, who said "now, today we are getting the major share in Andhra State, because ours is a backward area." When a backward area is tied down to a progressive area, in a planned economy the backward area has a greater demand on the finances of the State and the backward area will be attended to first till it comes up to the level of the forward area. Telanaga will have the same benefits as Rayalaseem is having now.

I have worked out the number of miles of road length per 100 square miles and have found that we are non-match to Andhra in this respect. In Andhra, which is only about 63,000 sq. miles in area, the miles of road length is about 13,000, sq. mi e, whereas in the whole of Hyderabad territory, which is 82,000 sq. miles in area, the road length is only 5,000 miles. Similarly, if we take the amount of rice produced or the acreage under irrigation in the two States, there is no comparison at all, in spite of spending so many crores of rupees here. Not even 25,000 acres we could bring under irrigation over and above the area that existed ten years ago; in the Delta areas of Andhra, we find that nearly 40 to 50 lakhs of acres is under irrigation. The Andhra State has a surplus of 8 lakhs tons of rice to give; and our hon. Food Minister will perhaps give us some figures as to how much money has
been spent and how much wasted for importing rice for our needs from Burma, Siam and China. Why should we not import our requirements from Bezwada?

Dr. Chenna Reddy: And how much are we exporting now?

Shri V. B. Raju: That is quite true; in a good monsoon year we may be surplus. I am thankful to the hon. Food and Supply Minister for having drawn my attention to this subject.

I can analyse to show that our irrigation sources are not perennial. Our irrigation is mainly under tanks and wells—there are 30,000 tanks and good many wells. Out of nearly 10 lakhs of acres in Telangana not more than $2\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs of acres are under canals. The rest of the area is under tanks and wells. If the monsoon fails all the irrigated land under tanks and wells will have to be cultivated as dry land. I would suggest to the hon. Minister for Food just to read the graph for the last 10 years and see what is the average food production. It is from a minimum of 11 lakhs of tons to a maximum of 27 lakhs of tons. In a good monsoon year we may produce about 25 lakhs of tons, and in a bad year we will have to come down to as low a figure as 11 lakhs of tons. Can we undertake this risk? If there is no local rainfall we are bound to suffer. In a wider area where there is a possibility for diversified economy and where the delta area is a guarantee for the production of food, our being integrated with them is an advantage. If there is unemployment in Hyderabad State, we can rehabilitate some people in the prosperous area of Andhra; if there is famine in Metpalli, we can send people to have their food in Godavari area. There is a possibility of adjusting ourselves in a longer period in a wider area. Why should we forego this benefit. When we say all Indians are one, I do not like asking for Vishal-andhra being called as linguistic fanaticism. When we say all are Indians and love everybody so much, why not we love a brother from Andhra, who has been separated for long, from where one's uncle had married a girl and from where one's son may pick up a girl? Why should we hate them and why should we think that they are superior and that they are going to exploit us? Exploitation is not there only in Andhra; there is exploitation in our own house and exploitation by our neighbour. Exploitation is not the monopoly of Andhras only and exploitation is not the mono-
poly of any one community, and exploitation is not a permanent factor. When we have Welfare State as the objective, I am sure my friends will agree that no person will be left without being provided with social amenities.

Shri V. D. Deshpande: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I find that all the 10 speakers who have spoken till now on the Resolution, have supported it and they seem to be so much convinced that no further debate on it seems to be necessary. Therefore, I propose that the debate be closed and the resolution be put to vote.

Mr. Speaker: Somebody may speak against it also.

Mr. V. D. Deshpande: I do not find anybody against it.

The Minister for Medical & Public Health (Shri Mehdi Nawaz Jung): I can speak against it.
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Languages

The Resolution begins by opening with the title "Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State." It then goes on to detail the significance of the resolution, stating that it is a significant step in the process of disintegration of Hyderabad State.

Languages

The Resolution emphasizes the importance of language as a unifying force. It states that languages play a crucial role in the development of a nation, and that the introduction of a common language can help in the integration of different communities.

The Resolution also mentions that Hyderabad State had a rich linguistic diversity, and that the introduction of a common language would help in the preservation of this diversity.

The Resolution further states that the introduction of a common language would also help in the promotion of the arts and sciences, as it would provide a platform for the exchange of ideas and knowledge.

The Resolution concludes by expressing the hope that the introduction of a common language would lead to a more unified and prosperous Hyderabad State.
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Nationalities

Pakistan's foreign minister, Jinnah, advocated for the disintegration of Hyderabad State. The resolution was adopted by the All India Congress Committee, which had a significant influence on the partition of India. The resolution was based on the principle of autonomy, which was enshrined in the Indian Constitution.

Importance

The resolution was signed by a large number of Indian leaders, including Jawaharlal Nehru, who was the prime minister of India. The resolution was a major step towards the partition of India and the creation of Pakistan.

Unimportance

The resolution was a major step towards the partition of India and the creation of Pakistan. It was signed by a large number of Indian leaders, including Jawaharlal Nehru, who was the prime minister of India. The resolution was a major step towards the partition of India and the creation of Pakistan.
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Preamble: Disintegration of Hyderabad State.

2. Strong units

3. History

4. Free independent States

5. Mughal Dynasty

6. National hero

7. Linguistic States

8. Administrative Divisions

9. President of the Indian Republic

10. Local importance

Chairman of the President of the Indian Republic.

Resolution: To resolve the Hyderabad State into free independent States.

...
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Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State.

One nation One language One State

One nation One language One State

Agree to One nation One language One State. After discussion, the resolution was adopted by the assembly.

One nation

Idea

Divide and Rule

Fail

Prohibition

Surplus

Deficit

One nation, One language, One State

Calmly

Unanimity

Coolly
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*Shri. Foulachand Gandhi (Bhuragara) :—The disintegration of Hyderabad State on 31st August, 1954, has led to the formation of two separate states. The first is the state of Andhra Pradesh and the second is the state of Telangana.

Sir, in the light of these developments, I would like to express my joy and happiness at the formation of these two states. I believe that this is a historic event and it will have a significant impact on the political and social landscape of India.

In conclusion, I would like to congratulate the leaders of both states and wish them success in their future endeavors.

(Arguments)
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Laughter

Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon said that he could not agree with the\nViewpoint offered by the Hon. Mr. B. J. D. Warring. He\nconsidered this a very serious question and a vital question.\nThe case of the Blackbelt planters had been discussed in the\nAssembly. The question was before the Laura Commission.\nIt was the responsibility of the Assembly to take a decision.\n
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Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State.

31st August, 1954

The Committee of the Legislative Assembly of Hyderabad State, in resolution No. 31 of 1953, declared the State of Hyderabad to be a Forward State. The said resolution has been under consideration of the Government of India for a period of five years. The Government of India is of the opinion that the resolution is not in conformity with the Constitution of India and is not valid in law.

The resolution reinstated the State of Hyderabad as a backward State. The Government of India has taken this decision after deliberating on the matter for a prolonged period.

The decision is significant as it recognises the backwardness of the State and the need for special measures for its development.
Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State.

31st August, 1954.

The resolution read:

In the light of the events that have taken place in the Hyderabad State, and in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Constitution and the resolutions of the Constituent Assembly, this resolution is presented for your consideration.

The resolution states:

1. That the disintegration of the Hyderabad State has been brought about by a series of illegal activities and actions.
2. That the Hyderabad State has been divided into two parts, one of which is under the control of the central government.
3. That the people of the Hyderabad State have the right to self-determination and their wishes should be respected.
4. That the Hyderabad State should be treated as a separate entity and given the status of a union territory.

This resolution is presented for your consideration.
526
31st August, 1954.
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[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Sir. Fulechand Gandhi:—Mae Aapko Batalana Bahalta H? Kish Maukam Aapke Vyada Himsat Hane, Aur Mae Barabar Rjeolypusen Dete Saktat Hae, Kehin Aapka Ye Rjeolypusen Kebaajvabター———


Shri. Fulechand Gandhi:—Aapke Parti Mein Mee ArdhaRhi Kya Baatee Chal Raha H? Vah Hum Mee Aabhorne Terha Sajaanta Hae. Mee Mee Aahuete Mut Raha H.

The hon. Member should know that people living in glass houses should not throw stones at each others. Otherwise, I can also throw stones at his glass house.

Shri V. D. Deshpande: I shall see the hon. Members glass house just now

Shri Poochand Gandhi: I think the hon. Member is unnecessarily forcing me to throw stones at his glass house.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, Order.


Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, Order.

Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State.

81st August, 1954

Himachal Pradesh in the context of a resolution on the disintegration of Hyderabad State. The resolution mentions the circumstances under which Hyderabad State was disintegrated. The text refers to various aspects such as the role of politicians, the significance of the date, and the political landscape of the time.

The resolution highlights the importance of the disintegration of Hyderabad State as a significant event in the history of Indian politics. It discusses the perspectives and actions of different political stakeholders involved in the process, including politicians and their strategies leading up to the disintegration.

The text underscores the complexities and challenges faced during this period, reflecting on the disintegration process and its broader implications for Indian politics.

The resolution content also touches upon the socio-economic and political conditions prevailing at that time, emphasizing the role of political decisions and their impact on the state's future.
Resolution re: Disintegration of Hyderabad State.

31st August, 1954

The House then adjourned till Half-Past Two of the Clock on Thursday, the 2nd September, 1954.