

[Dr. P. S. Deshmukh]

with various types of gear. A project for fisheries development has been sanctioned as part of the Norwegian aid programme for Travancore-Cochin at a total cost of Rs. 38 lakhs."

Then, so far as inland fisheries are concerned:

"...the stocking of the Mettur reservoir is in progress. In U.P., the State Government have undertaken to stock canal reservoirs. Steps have been taken in Orissa and Bihar for large scale collection of fry for stocking new area."

On our side, the Central Government has tried to discharge its responsibilities in the two spheres which I have mentioned, and the States are also being given advice from time to time. As I have said earlier, nonetheless much remains to be done, and there is considerable leeway to be made up which I assure the House I will try to do.

I am glad the Government have already promised to reconsider and revise the Five-Year Plan from the point of view of unemployment. If that happens I hope to take the opportunity of intensifying our efforts for the improvement and development of fisheries. I am not absolutely unmindful of this and whenever I have gone to these seaside places, I have seen the fisheries curing centre at Ratnagiri; I have visited also the Bombay deep sea fishing centre, and when I went to Cuttack I have also seen the Inland Fisheries Research Station there. So, I can assure the hon. Members that I attach the greatest possible...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Did the hon. Minister say Calicut?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Cuttack. There is a research station at Cuttack—the State Government research station at Cuttack. The Central Government has also a small organisation there.

So, I can assure them that I am conscious of the importance that

fishing and fisheries occupy in the nation's life, and I will try and give the utmost possible help and assistance.

I thank Mr. Nayar for having drawn the pointed attention of everybody in the House to the importance of this thing, and I am also thankful for the constructive suggestions that he and other Members have made.

RESOLUTION RE PRESIDENT'S PROCLAMATION ON PEPSU

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now proceed with the discussion of the PEPSU Proclamation resolution. The hon. Member Sardar Saigal wants to say a few words. What about the hon. Minister? He has no objection. Yes, Mr. Saigal.

सरदार ए० एस० सहगल: यूनिन के माननीय राष्ट्रपति ने ४ मार्च, १९५३ में जो आज्ञा विधान की धारा ३५६ के अनुसार जारी की है उसे यह सभा भवन मंजूर करता है, यह जो प्रस्ताव है उस के ऊपर आज यहां बहस हो रही है। इस बहस के दौरान में हमारे कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने पैंप्सू के जो दो अफसर हैं, मि० पी० एस० राव और मि० हरि राम मिश्र, उन के खिलाफ अपने विचारों को यहां रक्खा है। मैं उन माननीय सदस्यों से इस बात की प्रार्थना करूंगा कि जय वह अफसर यहां पर अपनी सफाई देने के लिये उपस्थित न हों, उन के खिलाफ कोई चीज यहां कहना इस सभा भवन के लिये अच्छी चीज नहीं है। मैं जानता हूं और विशेषकर मि० पी० एस० राव के बारे में कहने के लिये तैयार हूं कि जिस वक्त हम लोग मध्य प्रदेश धारा सभा के सदस्य थे, वह वहां पर चीफ सेक्रेटरी थे। जिस ईमानदारी से उन्होंने उस समय काम किया उस के लिये मैं उन को बधाई देता हूं। यही नहीं, सन् १९४० और १९४२ के दरम्यान जब हम और उस समय की सरकार आंबे

से आंख नहीं मिलाते थे, तब भी उन्होंने देश के साथ और देश के लोगों के साथ जो बर्ताव किया उस को हम भूल नहीं सकते। हो सकता है, जो कानून क्रायदे उस वक्त थे उस के मुताबिक वह चलते रहे हों, जो कांग्रेस के क्रायदे कानून थे उन के मुताबिक हम लोग भी चला करते थे। लेकिन यदि कोई क्रायदे कानूनों पर चलता है तो वह खराब आदमी नहीं हो जाता है, और उसकी सारी अच्छाइयां बुराइयों में नहीं बदल जाती हैं।

इसके बाद वह मध्य भारत गये। मध्य भारत के उन के काम का रेकार्ड मौजूद है, उसे देखा जा सकता है। हमारे माननीय सदस्य इस के बारे में मध्य भारत की जनता से दरयापत कर सकते हैं।

इसी तरह से मि० हरि राम मिश्र हैं। वह वहां कन्सालिडेशन अफसर थे। कन्सालिडेशन अफसर के बाद वहां सेटलमेंट अफसर हुये और उस के बाद ऐक्साइज अफसर हुये। उस के बाद वह मध्य भारत आये। कहने का मतलब यह है कि जो अफसर अच्छा काम करे, वह अगर किसी दूसरे प्रदेश में जा कर किसी कारण से लोगों की भलाई के लिये ऐसा काम करे जिस से वहां के कुछ लोगों को दिक्कत हो, यदि कड़ाई के साथ वहां के अफसर या वहां की सलतनत काम करे, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वहां के लोगों को उस को बर्दाश्त करना चाहिये।

उपाध्यक्ष जी, कोई भी सलतनत चाहे वह कांग्रेस की हो चाहे किसी की भी हो, जब तक कड़ाई के हाथ से, लोहे के हाथ से हर बुराई का दमन नहीं करेगी, वह सलतनत टिक नहीं सकती। इसलिये यदि इन अफसरों ने कोई काम किया है, और कड़ाई से किया है, तो बहुत ठीक किया है। वहां के लोगों ने

यदि कोई गड़बड़ी की, वहां की जो व्यवस्था थी, यदि उस में कोई गड़बड़ी हुई और उस के प्रतिकार के लिये यदि यूनियन के राष्ट्रपति जी ने कोई आज्ञा जारी की और कोई कानून लागू किया तो उस को हमें स्वीकार करना चाहिये और यूनियन की जो सरकार इस वक्त है उस की हमें मदद करनी चाहिये। हो सकता है कि कई चीजें हुई हों, मैं मान सकता हूँ कि कोई खामी हो, मैं मानने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि जो ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन वहां है उस ने कोई गलती की हो, लेकिन उस एक गलती की वजह से यह कहना कि सारी की सारी सरकार खराब है, सारा का सारा ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन गलत है, यह मैं मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं यह अर्ज करूंगा कि जो प्रस्ताव किया जा रहा है उस का हमें समर्थन करना चाहिये।

Dr. Katju: There has been a long debate upon this matter in this House. I do not regret the debate, but having regard to the element of time, there is no other alternative course, I respectfully suggest, than the approval of this Resolution which I have moved before you.

I shall take the main points at once. It has been suggested that there should be general elections. Very well. Supposing you have general elections, those elections will take at least four or five months. The Delimitation Commission Report will come; then there is the electoral roll, and under no circumstances whatsoever you can avoid a delay of many months—five, six, four—before the general elections. Now, what is it that is suggested is going to happen during this interval? Today there is no legislature, there is no Ministry and if an attempt is made: 'Very well, we are not going to extend it; we are not going to approve the Resolution', then what does the House require? I can understand that there must be some sort of lapse of time. I have been

[Dr. Katju]

noting what has been said here and I have been noting what was expressed in the other House and I find a general desire on the part of my hon. friends opposite that there should be a speedy election. It is said: 'Well, it should be held sometime in January, February, March'. I appreciate that. We are neither blind nor deaf. We know the feelings with which you are actuated. But under those circumstances, today the President's rule will continue; it is bound to continue. You cannot set it at rest today. Something has got to be done today. It was from this point of view that I was rather surprised at their very negative attitude.

I do not want to tire the House at this late hour and to keep hon. Members from probably more enjoyable pursuits elsewhere by going into the old history. My hon. friend, Sardar Hukam Singh instead of making—he will pardon my saying so—an original contribution of his own on one point, rather quoted an obviously misleading expression of opinion from another source. Probably he was attracted by the phrase. I think the poet Pope spoke about the rape of somebody, and Dr. Ambedkar quoted the 'rape' of the Constitution, and Sardar Hukam Singh was so much attracted by the phrase that he said it here 'The Constitution has been raped'. He did not elaborate the point. Now, if it was rape, the rape took place in the month of March last. It is absolutely wrong on the merits.

As I said, I do not want to tire you. But what was the condition in the month of February, 1953? I go by the very words of the Constitution—article 336. When the President is satisfied on a report received by him from the Rajpramukh or the Governor or otherwise that the Constitution has broken down or something like that, and is not able to function, then he may take appropriate action. I am making an absolutely impersonal observation. They are all my friends, in the last Ministry—good friends. You may not realise it. But what was the situation?

The House of the legislature consisted of 60 members. Twenty or twenty-two members at that date were likely to be unseated, out of which 14 had been unseated, three others had been unseated, the Chief Minister had tendered his resignation and the Ministry was left with two. Who were these two Ministers? One was, if I remember aright, a newly appointed Minister as a representative of the Harijan community. The other was a Minister—I attribute no motives at all—who had crossed the floor from the Opposition, come over to the Treasury side and had been appointed a Minister. I think on the 28th or 29th of December.

There were two Ministers left. So, could anybody say—I put the question fairly and squarely and not in a party spirit—that the President was not justified in issuing the proclamation and saying that in PEPSU the Constitution had ceased to function? In a House of 60, 40 people were left, the Leader had been unseated and the Leader had tendered his resignation. What was the President to do? We discussed all that and we discussed every aspect of it and the House was pleased to approve the President's Proclamation.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the good of going over all that matter? The simple point is whether there is any need to continue it, either on the ground of the continuance of the same law and order position or for delimitation etc.

Dr. Katju: You were not here, Sir, for some time and you really do not know what happened here. The Press Gallery there fully report every point and that was why I am quite fair and frank here.

Shri Nambiar: Are we to take notice of the Press Gallery?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Members spoke something he must have his view also expressed.

Dr. Katju: They said here is this point, here is that point. Take for instance, they said look here, here is the

Adviser, what a funny man he is! He has given away 1,000 bighas of land to such and such a Maharaja. He has given away Rs. 10,000 allowance to such and such Rajkumari or Princess or Maharani and is wasting money. I ventured to intervene but nobody would listen to me by way of intervention. Really, what are the facts? I have to tell them. If you ask me to sit down I will finish and sit down in five minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, no; I thought nothing had occurred. I never knew that all these statements had been made. I thought the point was different and the hon. Minister may go on.

Dr. Katju: If they had started by saying, "Well, you should have general elections", I would have said, "very well". It is a very reasonable point of view to put forward and I would have said that I would bear that in mind. It is not a question of opposition in disguise; it is a question of general importance. I should like to carry all of them with me and I repeat it again. Read my speeches in the months of March and April. I said then and I stick to it now that I am loathe to have this administration continued. I should like to have the elections as soon as I can, which will be sometime in January, February or March. Sir, I was asked, 'Are you going to hold the elections in 1954?' I said, 'Yes'. The newspapers said, 'Look at Dr. Katju; he is now taking the elections to December 1954.' Nobody asked him at that time what does 1954 mean. January is part of 1954 and December is also part of 1954. When you asked me, 'Will you have elections in 1954,' I said 'Yes'. A perfectly innocent question and a perfectly innocent answer.

Shri Punnoose: Actually the question was asked whether elections would be conducted in the first half of 1954.

Dr. Katju: I stand corrected. My recollection is, in 1954. You read the reports. This is serious. Take for instance this grant business. The Maharaja of Jind was, at the time of merger, allotted or allowed to have some-

thing about 1,400 bighas of land in his private property list. That was long before PEPSU was formed. Now he applied that he would like to exchange that. He has surrendered his 1,400 bighas and in exchange for these 1,400 bighas—that is not forest land but cultivable land—he wanted some other land. The question is under consideration whether he should be given and in what particular area. My hon. friend has omitted the word 'private property'. He says, 'Here is the Adviser's rule or the President's rule and Dr. Katju—who is being crucified before you—is there and he has given the land.' Then I was very sorry—it is not fair to mention a woman's name—you mentioned her husband's name.....

Dr. Rama Rao: You asked for it.

Dr. Katju: You gave them; listen to me. You gave the name of the husband and you mentioned that he was Deputy Secretary in some Ministry here and all that.

My hon. friend either does not know the facts or he has been mis-informed. A question has been raised. It is perfectly true Sardar Hukam Singh probably knows about it. It is perfectly true that that lady has been applying for several years for what she calls redress. I will tell you the facts. In this particular State—I do not want to name the State—the custom was, according to her, that no dowry was given. The Maharaja about 30 or 40 years ago had made it a rule that instead of giving a dowry which may be five lakhs of rupees or six lakhs to every princess on her marriage, he said he would give no dowry nor costly ornaments but only an annual allowance. She says, 'My grand aunts got an allowance, my aunts got an allowance and my sisters have also got allowance. I was married in such and such a year, 10 years or 15 years ago. There is an order, the Maharaja's order fixing a particular allowance for me. I got that allowance for many years before the merger; I got it after the merger. But it has now been stopped on the ground that no married

[Dr. Katju]

lady should be given any allowance.' She says, 'Look at the custom of my family and consider these circumstances'. These are the facts. She has given the names of her grand aunts, and aunts and all that and the matter is under consideration and no order has yet been made. When the late Ministry was functioning the matter was raised. They said, that 'if the circumstances are brought to our notice we will look into them' and the matter has been looked into. But my hon. friend Dr. Rama Rao thinks that all this is waste of money. This is not fair, I venture to say. Sir, I am here. My hon. friend can put a question in the formal way. Otherwise if there is any question of any particular individual, he can come over to me and find out the facts from me. If he is not satisfied then he can agitate it on the floor of the House. If he is satisfied that nothing unusual or improper is being done, then it is not fair to the other individuals who are not here to drag their names in this controversy.

Similarly, the two gentlemen to whom my hon. friend Sardar Saigal referred just now. I have got a list here of all officers. My friend Sardar Hukam Singh said that it was one of the heads of impeachment. The Adviser he said—he was sorry to say so—was behaving in a most communal-minded fashion. He had either suspended or transferred or done something to 13 Sikh officers.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : शिद्दूल्ड कास्ट के भी दो कम किये हैं ।

Dr. Katju: Now, the question is this. When the Adviser went on the scene he had the State Counsellor there, Mr. Pillai, who was acquainted with the entire surroundings and environment and all that. I only wish that hon. Members could read the newspapers of those days as to what complaints were there. I appeal particularly to my hon. friends opposite as to what was said about the integrity and disintegrity and so on and so forth. Now,

the Adviser, when he went there probably got information from Mr. Pillai. He passed some orders about transfer and then he passed certain transfer orders and some other things and suspended some other officers against whom enquiries are proceeding. It is too late now; otherwise I would have asked one of the PEPSU members to tell you as to what the charges were. Departmental enquiries were going on. Now, it is said that officers had been brought from outside. Somebody talked about permits and licences for imports. Now, the officers who have been appointed are altogether 15. Out of them 13 come from the Punjab. It is a matter of common knowledge that in PEPSU Punjab has always been drawn upon for the required supply of officers. Some of these officers are not new. They have been there for a long time. The Inspector-General of Police is one of those 13. He is a Punjab officer appointed not by me; he has been there for more than a year and in this way out of this 13, 9.....

Sardar Hukam Singh: We are talking about the President's rule.

Dr. Katju: I am also talking of the President's rule. We were importing eight or nine officers who were Sikhs and six were Hindus who were imported.

Sardar Hukam Singh: But ten are there who have been recruited from outside.

Dr. Katju: Yes, I know the names; do you mean to say that in PEPSU every Sikh should be there and nobody else should be there? What is the meaning of that?

Sardar Hukam Singh: Nobody is suggesting that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He need not be disturbed.

Dr. Katju: I naturally resent this remark.

Sardar Hukam Singh rose—

Dr. Katju: Sir, let me go on. You were not here, Sir, when the position was sought to be painted by my hon. friend Sardar Hukam Singh that the Government was functioning in a communal-minded way.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Yes.

Dr. Katju: I say that it is an absolutely baseless charge and should never have been made in this House.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I say that it is quite correct.

Dr. Katju: It should never have been made.

Shri Punnoose: Give us the facts.

Dr. Katju: What is the situation? In the Secretariat, the Chief Secretary is a Sikh. The Financial Commissioner is a Sikh. The Secretaries for the Law and Education Departments are Sikhs. The Development Secretary is a Sikh. The P.W.D. Secretary is a Sikh. (*Interruption*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This must stop. Should they go on making interruptions like this? Have they not got the patience to hear the Minister?

Dr. Katju: Really, it is an extraordinary state of affairs. In one breath, it is said that these are all small States; in the other, it is said that the Maharajas and Rajas and the big *biswedars* had the services filled with their relations; and that all the State services consisted of nobody but their relations. The rulers being Sikhs, the service people were all Sikhs. Now, if two Sikh officers are suspended for some delinquencies—what am I to do? They are Sikhs. The delinquent officers will be Sikhs. The intelligent officers will be Sikhs. The honest officers will be Sikhs. Anybody will be a Sikh there, if you do not draw from anybody else. This will be the position. I ask Sardar Hukam Singh: in PEPSU, there are Hindus—are there not? There are Harijans there, there are Christians there. Will he kindly tell me what was the proportion in the services before the President took over?

Sardar Hukam Singh: Yes, it was (*Interruption*)

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (जिला बनारस — मध्य) : हरिजन सिखों का उसमें अतुपात क्या है ?

Sardar Hukam Singh: 47 per cent. were Sikhs and 53 per cent. were others.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : मजहबी सिखों का भी जवाब दीजिये ।

Dr. Katju: तीन चार मँम्बर एक साथ खड़े हो जाते हैं। मैं किस किस को जवाब दूँ ?

As I said, it is a brave thing for my hon. friends to stand up and say, "The Central Government has been guilty of the worst form of communalism". What was there before it, I ask you.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I have told you. There were 53 per cent. others. If you ask me anything more, I will tell you.

Dr. Katju: I won't ask you anything, because you have said the very worst things. These things I never expected from you. You have said them, I believe, to go back and simply intensify the hatred and dislike. I think there must be a sense of responsibility on our part.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I have given you facts, and I can give you more.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. He is a learned and eminent parliamentarian. He ought to know that he cannot go on interrupting like this.

Sardar Hukam Singh: He asked me and then I stood up.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Naturally, he did. But there is a mode of saying things. At every stage, it is not right that there should be interruption. I have been trying to see that there is no interruption from this side when

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

Opposition Members are speaking. Similarly, have I not got a duty to see that there is no interruption from the Opposition side when the Minister is replying? The hon. Member has had his say, and it is being replied to. It is not as if every second minute he is called upon to give an answer. As I said, there is a mode of supplying information. Anyhow, I would ask the Minister to address me and not Sardar Hukam Singh.

Dr. Katju: As I said—I do not know how to go on, Sir—I feel so full of indignation. I expected such very high standards from my hon. friend, but I have been disappointed.

Sir, somebody referred to an individual and said, "Look at this man, Hari Ram Mishra. He follows Mr. Rau and is his favourite." Sir, nobody mentioned that he had been appointed Settlement Commissioner and he had a distinguished record in the Central Provinces from where he retired. Then he was employed in Jodhpur on settlement work and he worked as Settlement Commissioner of Rajasthan. He is a man whom we thought was specially qualified for this work, and therefore he was appointed, and here we find wild allegations being made and insinuations being made that Mr. Rau has made this appointment as a piece of nepotism. I resent these things. I am here: criticise me as much as you like, but I do not like other people to be criticised.

My hon. friend said something about compensation and agrarian reforms. Now, my complaint is this. Only last week, we had a meeting of the Parliamentary Committee which the House had appointed. The same Committee had met some time in May or June and we put before it these Bills and they were approved. This Parliamentary Committee consists of many Members, and it approved the three Bills, two of which have now been laid on the Table of the House. The third one dealt with non-occupancy tenants. It was also approved

by the Committee, and it provided a ceiling of 100 acres for every proprietor.

Shri Punnoose: On a point of order. He is referring to the proceedings of the Parliamentary Committee, and I do not know whether he is in order in doing that. That is one thing. The second thing is, he is stating things which are not facts. There were serious differences of opinion with regard to compensation, ceiling etc. but he says that the Committee had approved of the Bill.

Dr. Katju: Will you please listen? If you will only listen.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the majority had approved, even then it is approval. Now, so far as the proceedings are concerned, he is not giving what an individual said in the Committee.

Dr. Katju: I may tell him.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member opposite has raised a point of order and I am bound to give my ruling regarding it. Let him not interrupt.

As regards the proceedings of the Committee, the Government has acted on the advice of the Committee which is appointed by the Parliament. There is absolutely no disclosure of any secret, or of the individual observations of a member during the discussions which took place. Those observations are kept secret for the reason that if disclosed they may evoke protest or involve the member concerned in trouble. That is why, the quoting of the proceedings is not allowed. That is all. The hon. Minister may go on.

Dr. Katju: I was only going to say one word about the discussions in the Committee, namely, that the Bill was approved. Two Bills have already been enacted and have been placed on the Table of the House. So far as the third Bill is concerned, it is an important measure dealing with non-occupancy tenants. It was placed before

the Committee, and the Committee gave a certain general decision. Then, it was placed before the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission's Economic Committee thought that the ceiling fixed was much too high, that the ceiling should be lowered, and from 100 acres it should be brought down to 50 or 60 acres. The Committee also suggested some other amendments. Therefore, the Bill had to go back to the Law Ministry, and the Law Ministry is now going through that Bill and is re-drafting it in regard to those particular provisions. My only complaint is this, that this matter was mentioned in the Committee and I told the members, "This is the exact situation and within four or five days, or a week, or at the most within two weeks, we will enact that Bill", and yet in spite of the fact that hon. Members knew all this, nobody said a word about it, and all the blame is now put on us and we are told that the Central Government is sitting tight upon it.

So far as the two Bills already enacted are concerned, there again it is a question of policy. Why should anyone put it upon the Central Government? The House appointed the Parliamentary Committee. There, the House will recollect—I am referring to what is called the Superior Rights Bill—that the PEPSU Government had sanctioned a certain scale of compensation. The scale was one pie, i.e. one-twelfth of an anna, for every rupee of land revenue. Thirty-five thousand acres are concerned in this matter. The revenue is small; rents are also very small. On the calculation of compensation on the basis of one pie per rupee the amount came to exactly Rs. 40.

Now the question at once arose that the point can be raised in the Supreme Court or other courts of law that the compensation was illusory. Therefore, the President's intervention again came up. In similar circumstances the Punjab Legislature had allowed eight times the annual rent. We discussed this matter in the Parliamentary Committee and they decided that it should

be reduced to five times the annual rent.

Now, as I said, the annual rent there is a very small figure. The total compensation payable with regard to 35,000 acres came to Rs. 21,000—an insignificant sum. It is all a matter of public knowledge. Now my hon. friend contended that we are giving away compensation. If the House is of the opinion that there should be no compensation at all I can understand that but if some compensation is to be given it should be some compensation which you can take to a court of law.

Similarly regarding the other Bill, —about which nothing has been said *viz.* dealing with occupancy tenants,—the occupancy tenants have been made the full proprietors. The compensation rate has been laid down in the statute. It is to be much less than the compensation allowed by the Punjab Legislature. That Bill has also been enacted. There are two other Bills which we are considering.

It has been complained in this House that the Central Government has not been doing anything or it has been mismanaging affairs. I do not want anybody to say, "this is an old history. Before the proclamation the United Front was in majority and it should not have been dislodged from office". That chapter is now closed. The only question is about the current events.

Now another complaint was made by my hon. friend here and some hon. Members there regarding the realisation of arrears. In the White Paper I have stated the circumstances. In many villages land revenue has been in arrears for years together. Nothing has been paid. I think you are aware that throughout India the basic principle of land revenue is that the payment of land revenue is the first charge on the produce of the land. It was not a case in which the landlords were defaulting. They had realised the rents but were not paying the Government revenue. It was admitted that in certain areas the tenants had neither paid the land revenue nor the

[Dr. Katju]

rent. The arrears had amounted to 31 lakhs of rupees. The respect for law was completely gone. They were functioning as a sort of parallel authorities. Now it was the duty of the Adviser to take steps to realise the rent.

Then there was the current payment. One hon. friend said, "You realised 61 lakhs of rupees in six months". I say 31 lakhs of rupees was the old arrears and 30 lakhs of rupees was the current demand. The current demand was payable from the current crops. So far as the old arrears were concerned you had been pocketing and keeping everything. Nobody said anything regarding that. I think the Adviser would have been guilty of not properly discharging his duties if he had not taken steps to realise this amount.

There is another complaint regarding the retrenchment of so many officers. One of the hon. friends said that he had put down a question this morning. It was not read out because it was not reached. I have got that question here. It is true that many people have been retrenched.

Dr. Rama Rao: The tenants were demanding their rights to be settled before they pay the rent. Whereas Sardar Rarewala Government Bill wrote off this arrears by including definite compensation is it a fact that this Government have collected these arrears also?

Dr. Katju: Better ask this from Sardar Gian Singh Rarewala if he is your authority.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): If land revenue has been collected from the occupancy tenants then that is an illegal act.

Dr. Katju: My hon. friend knows law much better than I do. I can only advise that when an Act has been passed recourse may be had to the law courts.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister may look at me and not there.

I do not know why the hon. Minister is fond of them.

Dr. Katju: My complaint is that my affection is not returned. I wish it were.

What I was going to say is that this amount has to be realised and the amount could only be realised from persons who had got the money in their pockets. If any section of the House is in favour of the proposition that people cultivating land need not pay either revenue or rent, they should treat the land as their own, I have nothing more to say. I have got no answer.

There was another question raised by my hon. friend about retrenchment. I ventured to say this morning that the very fact that there has been no question in the House showed that the state of affairs is satisfactory. My hon. friend retorted by saying, "I did table the question for today". But it was not reached. If it was, it will be in the proceedings. Now I should like to read the answer here. Answer to (a) gives the number of retrenched staff. The people who have been retrenched are mostly from the Civil Supplies Department. Controls have been removed and, therefore, this Department has shut down. The number removed is altogether about 719. Then the answer goes on to say:

"The main reasons for effecting retrenchment are: relaxation of controls and consequent abolition of Civil Supplies Department, fixation of cadre strength in different departments and finalisation of integration of services, reorganisation of the Secretariat and administrative departments and reformation of Districts, tehsils and sub-tehsils. Government are endeavouring to provide alternate employment. The position regarding unemployment in PEPSU is more or less the same as in other States."

So, as has been mentioned in the reply, Government is endeavouring to provide alternative employment to suitable retrenched personnel in the Education, Development and other departments which are awaiting expansion.

What more can I do? There are two alternatives. One line of argument is that you must be frugal with public money. That would mean retrenchment. On the contrary, if the House is of opinion that we must carry the burden of the surplus staff, we are willing to obey.

Then comes the last question *viz.* the surplus districts. My hon. friend laid a personal blame upon me that I have been guilty of giving some incorrect information. I say and I deliberately say that I did nothing of the kind. Throughout I have been absolutely correct. If you were to go by the example of other provinces, then, in the whole of PEPUSU there will be probably two or three districts only. My friend from Bengal knows the size of the Bengal districts, say, Midnapore, but I do not know the exact acreage and population of that particular district. Take U.P. In U.P. the average population of a district is ten to fifteen lakhs. In many districts, it is much more. The area of a district is anything from 3,000 to 5,000 or even 7,000 square miles. Here, one district is 500 square miles with a population of a lakh and a half. Another district is 500 square miles with a population of two and a half lakhs. This matter has been under discussion by the PEPUSU Government for the last five years, and the Government resolution was published in the Gazette in 1950 which said that this was an urgent reform. The grievance of some of the hon. Members is that I started the abolition of the districts altogether from the map and made these districts, so to say, part of the adjoining districts, two fields here, two fields there, two *firkas* here and there and two *taluks* here and two *taluks* there: that I thought to myself that whether the district was small or whether it

was large, it gives rise to some factions for the district headquarters. Now, if you keep the district and if you keep in charge of the district a very highly paid officer, that means so much waste of public money. So what we did was, very well, for all administrative purposes the districts would remain, but the man in charge who would live on the spot would be an additional District Magistrate—a comparatively junior officer—or even say a senior officer in the State service. He will be there, and instead of asking X to be the District Magistrate of one place, he will now be described as the District Magistrate of Patiala as well as of Fatehgarh Saheb. He will go to Fatehgarh Saheb occasionally as a matter of administrative routine. The main point is this to which no one has paid any attention: can my hon. friend point out that a single resident of these districts will be inconvenienced by this arrangement that has been introduced? Is there a civil litigant who will not get justice as he was getting in the past in that very district? Is there any revenue matter which will have to be taken to any other district? The whole thing will be discussed in one and the same district. No one will be disturbed. I challenge—I say that no single resident of Fatehgarh Saheb, Barnala and Kandaghat will have to move out of his own old district headquarters, and he will get all his grievances redressed as he used to, in future also, in his own home in that very district. What more do you want unless you say that you are going to oppose every single measure of this Government. Instead of congratulating me or saying that “you have done very well,” many hon. Members are cursing me. I have brought about economy without causing the least disturbance in the economic or social life of any one in the district. I say it is a very fine thing. You want a senior officer; well, you can have him. But you cannot have a District Magistrate located in every *tehsil*, in every *jirka*. He will be only at the district headquarters. In Allahabad there are nine sub-divisions in a district. The district is an enormous one.

[Dr. Katju]

The District Magistrate lives at the district headquarters. He can go to the sub-division only when his services are required. Similarly, it is done here. But you get an additional Superintendent of Police located there. An additional District Magistrate is also located. Your treasury is there. Your prison, jail, is there; your medical facilities are there; your Sessions Judge is there; your civil judge or munsiff is there; everything is there; unless my hon. friend says: "No, no. We must have a District Magistrate at an expense of Rs. 1,200 a month"; doing what—doing nothing—looking after a district with a population of a lakh and a half in an area of five-hundred square miles. I do say, Sir, that this was a criticism without substance.

Then, one of my hon. friends said there were some restrictions on the Press. I really do not know what he meant; was it that the Press cannot act freely there? It was not elaborated as to what exactly the complaint was. If the complaint was that today it is not open to a press correspondent to walk into a public office and get information on public matters from every clerk, from every person employed in the office, in a proper or an improper manner, then of course, you may say that there has been some restriction put, because the Adviser had issued instructions that no one in individual offices is to issue or hand out press matters. The Press must go to the Director of Public Relations and get the information in a proper manner. Leaving that aside, where is the restriction? What is the harm? No one has said that. No one specified that. This is a free country. Everybody goes out; the press correspondents move about; hon. Members of Parliament are going about and instructing on the spot and getting all information; people come here and there and say their grievances and tell all sorts of stories. Well, where is the restriction? My submission, Sir, is that all these complaints that have been made are not well placed. So far as my hon. friend who always

speaks for the scheduled castes is concerned, I really could not gather what his complaints were. I think his complaint was very general, namely, throughout the length and breadth of India the scheduled castes are not getting a fair deal. He said they should be given jobs; I agree. "They should be given proper education." I agree entirely. What has that got to do with PEPSU? What he said would apply everywhere else.

Someone said that this was his main grievance: PEPSU had the one non-Congress ministry in the country, and therefore the Central Government has played the dodge with it. Now, you never said anything about the extent of help given by the Government of India in the past three years in the shape of loans and subsidies to the PEPSU Government. I gave the figures yesterday at another place, and I repeat them here for your information. Of all the 'B' States, the PEPSU Government has got the largest percentage of assistance from the Central Government. It has varied between 20 per cent. and 26 per cent. of the entire revenue of the State. The entire revenue is somewhere between four crores and five and a half crores. The Central Government's assistance has varied from one crore and a quarter to about a crore and a half. We did it, Sir, and the House may take it from me that, if anything, the Government of India have been more than anxious to help the PEPSU Government which was in existence before the President took it over, because we thought it should have a trial and when the thing absolutely became impossible, we had to intervene.

Then, lastly, Sir, may I say that there is no desire to postpone the elections—none whatsoever, and I do hope. —I cannot possibly bind myself and bind the House, and goodness knows what may happen—that in the current six months, by February or March,—I am personally anxious to have general elections as soon as possible in a free

and unfettered atmosphere. I do hope I may not have to come back again for a second renewal—I cannot do this again, and you see it is putting some sort of dirt around—I cannot anticipate all contingencies. But you only want elections; you will have them, raising a lot of dust, excitement, and I know all about these matters. You must manufacture grievances by whipping up. (*Interruptions*) I am addressing myself to you. I say that the experience of political parties shows that one must whip up grievances and manufacture grievances in order to (*Interruptions*).....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is this? The grievances have been pointed out. The hon. Minister has tried to explain away, stage by stage, the Government's point of view. Hon. Members know—whatever he said is not, cannot be, could not be applied to hon. Members. There are parties outside who may be interested in whipping up all sorts of grievances, and hon. Members are placing them before the House. Now, the hon. Minister says that they are all wrong. Therefore he said: "whipping up". You want orderly Government to be carried on, and no person need care for this whipping up of the grievances outside. Nothing is said. Always the present company is excepted.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Parties outside are represented in this House and the hon. Minister has actually pointed out individual Members as having manufactured grievances. I refer to Sardar Hukam Singh's example. In his case, the hon. Minister actually said in a somewhat heated fashion that he has brought certain charges which looked like manufacturing of grievances. I also ask your ruling in regard to the point as to the use of this kind of expression 'manufacture'. It definitely carries an insinuation, against grievances which are given expression to by the Members of this House with, I hope, a full sense of responsibility, if it is described as 'manufactured'.

6 P.M.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What I would only say is this.

Dr. Katju: It is only a light word.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So far as these matters are concerned, it is open to the Government to say when a particular point is placed before the House, that hon. Members are misinformed; raising them on the floor of the House without seeking sufficient clarification or making sufficient investigation creates a kind of disturbance in the mind of the people outside. The hon. Minister has got an emphasis of his own and he uses it. That is misunderstood. I do not think that there is anything in it.

Dr. Katju: My hon. friends know what I mean. My parting advice to them is.....

An Hon. Member: Why not all the parties.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They are the representatives of parties outside.

Dr. Katju: Let us have a sort of thick skin. You daily fling at us several expressions and you expect us to be absolutely indifferent to anything that may be said. Let my hon. friend the acting Leader of the Communist Group look at his own speeches. When I use one-tenth of what he says—I wish I were as eloquent as he—he rises in indignation and asks whether my expressions are parliamentary. What has it got to do with whipping up grievances?

Shri Nambiar: You said manufacturing.

Dr. Katju: Manufacturing grievances—don't you think it is a good industry?

Very well, Sir, let us finish this in an atmosphere of hilarity. I beg to commend this resolution to the approval of the House.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: If you will permit me to make an observation,

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

we quite appreciate your remark when you said that the hon. Minister has a particular way of expressing his views. The trouble is they are reported literally outside and the impression goes abroad in the country—as it did happen in the case of an interjection by a Member on this side—and the results are sometimes not very happy. That is why we want the hon. Minister to choose his expressions with a little more circumspection.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members on either side must be very careful about their expressions.

Dr. Rama Rao: Sir, I mentioned a number of cases. The hon. Minister said I could have gone to him and verified those things and that I was misinformed. He answered only two of them and in that he confirmed practically my statements.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has no right of reply.

Dr. Rama Rao: Then he must answer to my points.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has answered as far as he can.

Dr. Rama Rao: In that case he must withdraw that statement.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Nobody can be compelled to answer.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: The hon. Minister concluded his speech by saying 'in a spirit of hilarity I commend this resolution'. Things which happened in PEPSU are of a very serious character and we cannot take it in a spirit of hilarity.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is a fact that the PEPSU administration has been taken over by the Centre. Parliament has approved of it. Nobody claims that Parliament must pass a thing unanimously. It is passed by a majority.

When the resolution is before the House hon. Members are at liberty

to bring certain matters to the notice of Government. But once the resolution is passed by the House, no impression should be sought to be created that they are in any way trying to disturb a decision of the House. The hon. Minister's point seems to be that there are parties outside which are raking up unnecessary grievances when there are none. That was what he was trying to explain.

An Hon. Member: What about genuine grievances?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Genuine grievances he is bound to attend to. In these circumstances let nothing be said which will vitiate the atmosphere. A kind of impression is sought to be created by some persons that they are more interested in the government of this country than Government themselves are. That is a charge that they want to refute. Are we to go on allowing expressions of this kind in the House? I would ask for moderation on both sides, so far as expressions are concerned. This seems to be a vicious circle—the earlier it is cut the better.

Dr. Rama Rao rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Enough has been asked and said. So long as Parliament continues these questions will continue to be asked.

I will now put the hon. Member's amendment to the vote of the House. So far as further amendment is concerned, no further amendment to this has been tabled. So, I am going to put it in the form in which it has been tabled. Once a Proclamation has been issued it comes for approval. A Proclamation stands on the same footing as an Ordinance issued when the House is not in session. In the one case any hon. Member may move a resolution that the House disapproves of the Ordinance. In this case the Government itself must bring forward a resolution for the House to approve the Proclamation or to continue the Proclamation. Barring

this there is no difference between a Proclamation and an Ordinance.

In this case it seems to be the practice either to approve or to reject for reasons which hon. Members may have. But there is no amendment to this. Where an Ordinance is issued and is followed up by a Bill, hon. Members can table amendments to the clauses of the Bill. On account of this essential difference I am not going to allow any further amendment; nor is there any amendment before me.

I shall now put the amendment of Dr. Rama Rao. If that is carried the original resolution will be substituted by the amended resolution. If that is not carried, I will place the original resolution for the vote of the House.

The question is:

That for the original resolution the following be substituted:

"That this House after considering the situation after the Proclamation issued by the President on the 4th March, 1953 under article 356 of the Constitution assuming to himself all the functions of the Government of the Patiala and East Punjab States Union and approved by resolutions passed by the House of the People and the Council of States on the 12th March, 1953 and the 26th March, 1953 respectively, is of opinion that elections to the Patiala and East Punjab States Union Legislature be held immediately."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House approves the continuance in force of the Proclamation issued by the President on the 4th March, 1953, under article 356 of the Constitution assuming to himself all the functions of the Government of the Patiala and East Punjab States Union and approved by

440 PSD.

resolutions passed by the House of the People and the Council of States on the 12th March, 1953, and the 26th March, 1953, respectively."

Those who are for the resolution will say 'Aye'.

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Those who are against the resolution will say 'No'.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The 'Ayes' have it.

Some Hon. Members: The 'Noes' have it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The 'Ayes' will stand in their seats.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The 'Noes' will stand in their seats.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The 'Ayes' have it.

An Hon. Member: Division.

Shri Nambiar: There is so much of difference. They are in a minority, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have never hesitated to call a division if there is a chance of the hon. Members on this side ever reaching the number on the other side.

An Hon. Member: There is never any chance.

Shri K. K. Basu: Is it your intention, Sir, that unless the number is equal there should be no division?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have no objection. But hon. Members are not serious about the matter.

All right. The 'Noes' will please rise in their seats.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: You may also take down the names.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I need not take down the names. 'Noes' are 28.

Now the 'Ayes' may please rise in their seats. They are so many. The motion is carried.

Shri V. P. Nayar: You said, Sir, that the 'Noes' are twenty-eight. How many people support it? What is the number of 'Ayes'? Let us know.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: More than twenty-eight support it.

An Hon. Member: What is the number?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It does not matter. So the motion is carried.

The motion was adopted.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no other business before the House. But I have been informed...

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): The next item in the agenda is the Coir Industry Bill, Sir.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): Coir is still colling.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): Sir, understand that Government has an intention of bringing forward two Bills, the Coir Industry Bill and the Rehabilitation Finance Administration Bill for being passed in this session. But I fear, Sir, that we are at a stage when I do not understand how Government can do so unless you decide, Sir, that the session is to be continued for a considerable period.

Actually, Sir, on the 2nd September we were given a Parliamentary Bulletin which said that the Business Advisory Committee were informed that the Government considered the Estate Duty Bill and the Estate Duty Rates Bill to be so important that they should be passed during the current session. And Government

also told the Business Advisory Committee that the House had to find time for the Supplementary Demands for Grants and the resolution on PEPUSU. That is all that we were vouchsafed by the Bulletin of 2nd September.

Now, at this stage I understand the Commerce and Industry Minister is here to pilot his Coir Industry Bill. This Bill is at a very early stage of the proceedings. I think only the consideration stage has started and only one Member on this side, as far as I remember, has spoken and is in possession of the House. I looked at the Bill. It seems quite a considerable measure and the Statement of Objects and Reasons suggests that, naturally, it would have to be discussed with a certain amount of carefulness, because the clause by clause consideration would take, very naturally, a great deal of time.

I see also from the text of the Rehabilitation Finance Administration Bill that its objects are perhaps very laudable but extremely comprehensive, and it is very important for the Members of the House to express themselves on the different aspects of the administration of Rehabilitation Finance.

That being so I do not understand how Government can proceed with these measures—or any other which they might produce out of their hat—in the time at our disposal. As far as I can see, there is not any other time than the evening of the 18th. But I do not think by any stretch of expediency we could discuss these two Bills and dispose of them. I should say in fairness to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, whom I do not see here at this moment, that he talked to me about the possibility of these two Bills being taken up, and I had an impression, personally not knowing the texts of the Bills, that I told him I would not mind, if they were so important and so very beneficial to our people. But later I