

चाहिये। काश कि उस तरह का प्रेम वे इनके प्रति दिखा सकें।

श्री ३म महोदय सामनस्यं मविद्वेषं कृणोमि वः।
अन्धो अन्धमभिर्हृतं वत्सं जातमिवाध्व्या ॥
अथर्ववेद ॥

मंत्र में व्यक्त भावना यह है कि हमारे दिल एक में हों, दिमाग एक में हो, विचार एक में हों, सभी के दिलों में उनके प्रति सद्भावना हो और हम उनके प्रति मनुष्यता का व्यवहार करें और वैसा ही व्यवहार करें जैसा व्यवहार गाय अपने नवजात बच्चे के साथ करती है। उसे प्यार करती है। वैदिक भावना जो मानव के प्रति रही है, वही भावना अगर हमारी इनके प्रति हो जाये, तो समस्या आप के आप हल हो सकती है।

चाहता तो मैं यह था कि मंत्री महोदय मेरे इन विधेयक को स्वीकार कर लेते लेकिन कारणवश उन्होंने अपनी मजूरी जाहिर की है इसको स्वीकार करने में और कहा है कि इनके जीवन को सफल बनाने के लिये वह अपने कर्तव्य का पालन कर रहे हैं और करने जायेंगे, इसलिए मैं अपने इन विधेयक को वापिस लेता हूँ। अन्त में मैं सभी माननीय सदस्यों तथा मंत्री जी का हृदय में धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने इनके प्रति अपने विचार व्यक्त किये हैं।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Member leave of the House to withdraw the Bill?

The Bill was, by leave, withdrawn.

17 hrs.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL

(Amendment of Article 226 by
Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman)

Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman (Tan-
jore): Sir, I beg to move;

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

Sir, the amendment that I am seeking to move concerns article 226 of the Constitution. This article reads as follows:

"Notwithstanding anything in article 32, every High Court shall have power, throughout the territories in relation to which it exercises jurisdiction, to issue to any person or authority, including in appropriate cases any Government within whose territories directions, orders or writs, including writs in the nature of *habeas corpus*, *mandamus*, prohibition, *quo warranto* and *certiorari*, or any of them, for the enforcement of any of the rights conferred by Part III and for any other purpose."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may continue next time.

17.02 hrs.

INTEGRATION OF SERVICES IN PUNJAB*

श्री रामकृष्ण गुप्त (महेन्द्रगढ़): मेरा जो पंजाब की सर्विस के इंटिग्रेशन के बारे में सवाल था, उस का जो जवाब दिया गया, उस के बारे में मैं यह डिस्कशन रख करना चाहता हूँ। इस के बारे में मैं सब से पहले यह बात बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि इंटिग्रेशन में पहले यानी पहली नवम्बर, १९५६ के पहले जो पेंस्यू के प्रिन्सिपल चीफ मिनिस्टर थे और जो पंजाब के चीफ मिनिस्टर थे उन की एक कांफरेंस हुई। उस कांफरेंस में एक एग्जिट फार्मुला तैयार किया गया और माफ और पर इस बात का फैसला किया गया कि जितने भी एम्प्लोयीज हैं उन सब को कोरर टू कोरर बेसिस पर इंटिग्रेट किया जायेगा। और पे सू के जो बन्क हैं, प्रिन्सिपल हैं, प्रिन्सिपल इनचार्ज हैं या सुपरिन्टेन्डेन्ट वगैरह जो हैं उन को किसी भी हालत में उन शर्तों से कम नहीं समझा जायेगा जो कि पंजाब में उन्हीं शर्तों पर हैं। उन को बिल्कुल बराबर समझा जायेगा। इस जगह पर मैं यह भी कह देना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो फैसला हुआ, वह

[श्री रामकृष्ण गुप्त]

जो हमारी पार्लियामेंट ने स्टेटस रिआर्गनाइजेशन बिल पास किया सन १९५६ में, बिल्कुल उस के मुताबिक था। अगर मैं उस के क्लॉज ११५ और ११६ को हाउस के सामने रखूँ तो मेरी बात की ताईद हो जायेगी। क्लॉज ११५ में साफ तौर पर कहा गया है :

“(7) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to affect after the appointed day the operation of the provisions of Chapter I of Part XIV of the Constitution in relation to the determination of the conditions of service of persons serving in connection with the affairs of the Union or any State:

Provided that the conditions of service applicable immediately before the appointed day to the case of any person referred to in sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) shall not be varied to his disadvantage except with the previous approval of the Central Government.

116 (1) Every person who immediately before the appointed day is holding or discharging the duties of any post or office in connection with the affairs of the Union or of an existing State in any area which on that day falls within another existing State or a new State or a Union Territory shall, except where by virtue or in consequence of the provisions of this Act such post or office ceases to exist on that day, continue to hold the same post or office in the other existing State or new State or Union Territory in which such area is included on that day, and shall be deemed as from that day to have been duly appointed to such post or office by the Government of, or other appropriate authority in, such State, or by the

Central Government or other appropriate authority in such Union territory as the case may be.”

मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि इस सेक्शन के मुताबिक जो फैसला उन्होंने किया उस का साफ मतलब यह है कि सर्विसिज के इंटिग्रेशन के लिये दोनो स्टेटस के जो एम्प्लायीज हैं, उन में किसी किस्म का डिस्टिन्गुशन या इम्पेराज नहीं किया जायेगा। लेकिन बाद में जो कुछ हुआ उस का नतीजा क्या निकला? एक नया ग्रुपिंग फार्मूला बनाया गया। उस ग्रुपिंग फार्मूला में यह था :

“The grouping formula was, however, contrary to the decision of the two Chief Ministers that the posts of clerks, assistants, assistants-in-charge deputy superintendents and superintendents in PEPSU were to be treated as equal to those very posts in the Punjab.”

उस ग्रुपिंग फार्मूले में मन् बिल

“All services from the post of a clerk to that of the gazetted superintendents and superintendents were to be grouped together and their seniority was to be fixed according to their length of service.”

मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि सर्विसिज का जो इंटिग्रेशन क्लेयर टु क्लेयर बेसिस पर होना चाहिये था उसके बजाय तमाम प्राफिसर्स ने जिस जिस कैटेगरी के अन्दर सर्विस की थी, उस तमाम पीरियड को काउण्ट कर के फिर इंटिग्रेशन किया गया। इसके खिलाफ पेप्सू के जितने एम्प्लायीज थे, जिन की तादाद २०,००० के करीब थी, उन्होंने अपील की। मैं इस जगह यह साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ कि जो सेंट्रल कमेटी अपीलों का फैसला करने के लिये मुकर्रर की गई थी उसने जितनी भी अपील इस मामले में की गई थीं उन तमाम

को मंजूर कर लिया और पंजाब गवर्नमेंट के फसले को नाजायज करार दिया। मेरी इस बात को मानदीय मन्त्री जी ने भी अपने जवाब में मान लिया है और कहा है :

"The Central Advisory Committee did not approve of the method of fixing *inter se* seniority adopted by the State Government and recommended that seniority should be fixed on the basis of the length of continuous service in the equated grade."

यही नहीं, सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट की कमेटी का जो फैसला था उसको हमारी सरकार ने भी मान लिया है।

"The Government of India accepted this recommendation and passed orders on that basis and also cancelled orders which were passed on the recommendations of the State Advisory Committee."

मैं इस जगह पर यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो बात की गई वह कोई नई बात नहीं थी। हिन्दुस्तान के छन्दर और भी बहुत सी स्टेट्स मर्ज हुई थी। उनमें भी यह प्रिंसिपल फालो किया गया। मेरा यह भी क मवाल था और उसके बारे में यह कहा गया :

"In view of answer to parts (b) and (c) given in the attached statement, action will be taken to work out the *inter se* seniority on the basis of the formula now agreed to after they have been approved by the Central Advisory Committee. The principle generally adopted in other States for fixing *inter se* seniority is continuous length of service in the equated grade."

इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के लिये ऐप्रोप्रिएट कदम यह था कि वह सेक्शन ११७ को देखने हुए उन को हिदायत जारी करती थी कि जो फैसला हुआ है, सेंट्रल ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी का जो फैसला है, उसको बहूँ पूरा करे, उस पर ध्यान

किया जाय। सेक्शन ११७ में साफ़ीर पर गया है :

"The Central Government may at any time before or after the appointed day give such directions to any State Government as may appear to it to be necessary for the purpose of giving effect to the foregoing provisions of this Part and the State Government shall comply with such directions."

इस जगह पर मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो सेंट्रल कमेटी मुर्कर की गई वह भी उसी रिपोर्ट के तहत मुर्कर की गई थी। सेंट्रल के सेक्शन ११५ के सबसेक्शन ५ में निकल किया गया है :

"The Central Government may by order establish one or more Advisory Committees for the purpose of assisting it in regard to—

(a) the division and integration of the services among the new States and the States of Andhra Pradesh and Madras...."

मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि जब यह बात बिल्कुल साफ़ है, जो ऐग्रिमेंट हुआ उसके मुताबिक़ जो फैसला था, जिस को सेंट्रल ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी ने कन्फर्म भी कर दिया, और जिस का बाद में सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट ने भी मान लिया, उस सेक्शन पर फिर बहस करने की ज़रूरत मन्त्रियों को नहीं हो गई बाद में, जो यह कहा गया :

"The State Government pointed out their difficulties in giving effect to the orders passed on the basis of the recommendations of the Central Advisory Committee. The matter has since then been under discussion for resolving the differences of opinion on this point. An agreed formula has now been evolved."

मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती कि जब तीन तीन जगह फैसला हो चुका और

[श्री राम कृष्ण गुप्त]

एक्ट के मुताबिक सलाह हुआ, तो फिर क्या डिफीकल्टी थी। न क्वेश्चन के अन्दर स बात को साफ किया गया कि वह कौनसी डिफीकल्टी थी। जहां तक मैंने मालूम करने की कोशिश की है कोई डिफीकल्टी नहीं है, सिर्फ डिफीकल्टी यह है कि रीगिशन कर दिया गया। सका नतीजा यह हुआ कि जो पेप्सू में क्लर्क थे या मुपरिन्टेण्डेंट थे वह अब तक बकायदा मुपरिन्टेण्डेंट हैं। अब इजाजत दें तो मैं उनकी लिस्ट पेश कर सकता हूं। और जो जाब का क्लर्क था वह पुमुपरिन्टेण्डेंट हो गया। सिर्फ यही एक डिफीकल्टी हो सकती थी, जो डिफीकल्टी नसाफ की डिफीकल्टी थी। बाद में मैंने यह भी मालूम करने की कोशिश की। मेन क्वेश्चन में यह जाहिर किया गया कि एक एग्जिड फारमूला यो गया है, लेकिन मैंने जब सवाल किया कि वह एग्जिड फारमूला क्या है कम से कम यह जो बतलाने की कोशिश की जाए तो जवाब दिया गया :

It will take a pretty long time to give the details.

और मैंने यह भी पूछा कि एग्जिड पार्टीज हैं, जिनको नुकसान हुआ है, क्या उनसे कोई सलाह ली गयी, तो कहा गया कि उनकी हू तो पहले से मालूम थी, सलिये सलाह लेने की क्या जरूरत थी। तो मैं यह सवाल आज हाउस के सामने पेश करना चाहता हूँ। जब फैसला पहले हो चुका था तो उस फैसले पर अमल करवाने की कोशिश क्यों नहीं की गयी। इसलिये मेरी यह अपील है कि जो दोनों स्टेटों के चीफ मिनिस्टर्स ने एग्जी किय था, जिसको सैल कमेटी ने भी मान लिया था और जिसको सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट ने अमल में लाने के लिए आर्डर जारी किया उस फारमूले को मान लिया जाए। मैं यह बात इसलिये कहता हूँ कि यह २० हजार सरविसेज के साथ नसाफ का सवाल है। छोटी कोटी स्टेट्स बनी, उनमें जो रीगिशन के टाइम में डिफीकल्टीज आयीं उनको महसूस करते हैं ए इस

ेक्ट को पास किया गया और उसमें यह प्रावीजन दाखिल किया गया ताकि किसी भी स्टेट के साथ बेसाफी न हो।

दूसरे जब तमाम हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर कम्पैन्ड रतमाल किया गया तो जाब के अन्दर वें जहां २० हजार मूजिम्सों के साथ बेसाफी ई उसको ठीक करने में दूसरा तरीका क्यों स्वीमाल किया गया।

दूसरी बात में यह कहना चाहता हूँ, और माननीय डिप्टी स्पीकर मेरी इस बात की टाईड करेंगे कि जिन वक्त मरजर का सवाल था तो तमाम हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर पेप्सू एक ऐसी स्टेट थी कि जिसने अनाकौशनल सरेंडर किया वहां कोई कौपीटल के लिए या किसी और चीज के लिए कंटेस्ट नहीं किया गया। इसकी वजह यह थी कि हमारे जो पेप्सू के नेता थे उनके सामने एक ही खयाल था और वह खयाल देश के इंटिग्रेशन और बेहतरी का खयाल था। इसलिए उन्होंने इस फैसले को मंजूर कर लिया। तो मैं समझता हूँ कि सरविसेज के साथ इन्साफ किया जाये और मेरी अपील में यह अपील है कि इस मामले में सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट बोलड स्टेप उठाये, स्वाह कितनी भी डिफीकल्टी क्यों न हो, और तमाम सरविसेज को कांटर हू कांटर इकट्ठा करे और कांटर हू कांटर बेसिस पर उनका इंटिग्रेशन करे।

जहां तक नये फारमूले का सवाल है मुझे इस में भी कोई ऐतराज नहीं, अगर दूसरी पार्टीज इससे खुश हों। लेकिन जो सवाल दिया गया उससे मेरे दिमाग में डर पैदा हो गया कि उनको शायद कंसल्ट नहीं किया गया। इसलिए जहां तक स्टेट का सवाल था वह तो नहीं रहा। अब तो उन एम्प्लॉईज को कंसल्ट किया जाये और उनको कंसल्ट करने का तरीका यही है कि उनके जो रिप्रेजेंटेटिव हैं उनको बुलाकर उनकी राय से कोई ठबदीली हो।

भ्रगर ऐसा किया जाये तो मुझे कोई ऐतराज नहीं है। लेकिन जहाँ तक इन्माफ का सवाल है उसके लिए मेरी एक ही अपील है कि पुराने फैसेले को मनवाया जाये और पंजाब गवर्नमेंट को इस्ट्रक्शन जारी किये जायें कि वह उन पर अमल करे।

इंटीग्रेशन का सवाल बहुत अहम है। तमाम स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स और सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट का इन्तिजाम आफिसर्स के मोराल पर डिपेंड करता है। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि आफिसर्स के साथ जस्टिस की जाये ताकि उनका मोराल ऊंचा हो और वह तभी हो सकता है जब कि उन के साथ इंटीग्रेशन के मामले में इन्माफ किया जाये क्योंकि इसके बारे में वे बड़े फौनेटिक होते हैं। मेरा डम में कोई परमनल सवाल नहीं है। मैं ने तो यह बात इमलिये कही है कि यह २० हजार आफिसर्स के साथ इन्माफ का सवाल है। मुझे उम्मीद है कि मेरी इस दरखास्त पर जरूर विचार किया जाेगा।

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री (गुडगांव) : मैं दो प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूँ। एक तो यह है कि और बहुत सी रियासतों का दूसरे प्रान्तों के साथ विलय हुआ, और उन प्रान्तों की सरकारों ने उन रियासतों के कर्मचारियों के साथ जो उचित व्यवहार किया, क्या केन्द्रीय सरकार ने यह जानने का प्रयत्न किया कि पंजाब सरकार को उन प्रान्तों का अनुकरण करने में कौन सी कठिनाइयाँ थीं ?

दूसरी बात यह है कि पेप्सू के जो कर्मचारी थे, क्या केन्द्रीय सरकार ने यह जानने का प्रयत्न किया कि कितने कर्मचारियों को उनकी योग्यता और अनुभव के अनुकूल स्थान अब तक मिल चुका है और कितने इस प्रकार के कर्मचारी अब तक हैं जिनको उनकी योग्यता के अनुकूल स्थान नहीं मिला है।

सरदार इकबाल सिंह (फिरोजपुर) : मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या कोई ऐसी कमेटी बनी हुई है पंजाब में जिसमें कि पेप्सू

के एक्स चीफ मिनिस्टर और पेप्सू के और भी आदमी मेम्बर हैं जो सारे इंटीग्रेशन के सवाल पर गौर करती है।

दूसरे क्या ऐसी कमेटी बनी हुई है जिसमें पेप्सू की सरबिसेज के और पंजाब की सरबिसेज के मेम्बर हैं जो इस सवाल पर गौर करती है।

तीसरे मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह सच है कि पेप्सू का मरजर होने से दस दिन पहले बड़ी तादाद में आदमियों को कनफर्म किया गया था।

श्री भक्त बर्षान : श्रीमन्, क्या इस प्रकार की शिकायत केवल पंजाब में ही है या अन्य राजवाड़ों की भी जिनका वलय किया गया है, यह शिकायत है की उनके कर्मचारियों के साथ इस बारे में उचित कांवाई नहीं की गयी ?

श्री क० नौ० सेन (पूनिया) : हमारे यहां से जिन सरबिसेज का बंगाल को ट्रांसफर किया गया उनको इतने दिन हो जाने के बाद भी अभी तक रेगुलराइज नहीं किया गया है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आज तो सवाल सिर्फ पंजाब का है।

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, my hon. friend who has sponsored this discussion was needlessly critical, and to a certain extent, also, the information on which he built his case was rather inaccurate. The Government of India have some time before the reorganisation laid down four principles for the equation of services, and thereafter they have also laid down certain principles for the fixation of seniority in an equated grade. All these principles were sent to the various Governments, because on 1-11-1956 the new re-organised States were to come into operation.

[Shri Datar]

When this question was considered by the inter-State committee of the former PEPSU and the original Punjab Governments, it is not that they only relied upon, what my hon. friend called, the cadre-cadre equality. That is not what they did. I would like to point out to my hon. friend that that is how, unfortunately, a situation arose which has created a lot of, what can I say, representations and inconvenience also.

The representative of the PEPSU Government, after agreeing to the first principle in general of cadre to cadre equality, also pointed out, secondly, the point with regard to the grouping of services. We agreed that there was a lot of reason in it. We said that in a smaller State naturally the promotions were quicker and the cadre was smaller. Therefore, we agreed that we would consider the entire length of services in cases where the normal method of recruitment was by promotion.

I would like to tell my hon. friend that Government are fully seized of this problem. Government have before them a number of representations from the former PEPSU officers, and Government know what their representations are. But, for the information, or, rather the correction of what my hon. friend has pointed out, I would say here that the inter-State committee, both at the officers' level as well as at the ministerial level—that should be noted—considered both the views and evolved principles of integration on an agreed basis. They have pointed out:

"It was also decided, however, that in services where recruitment was normally done by promotion from the services below, the seniority list of the personnel in such services should be drawn up by grouping such services."

Therefore, I would point out to the hon. Member that at the time when this particular more or less general agreement was come to between the

representatives of the PEPSU and Punjab Governments, it is quite likely that the full implications of any such agreement, or in general of the group formula, might not have been realised at all.

I would point out the general history as briefly as possible. After this particular agreement was before the Government of India, the whole matter was considered and Government then tentatively pointed out to them that in as much as at a later stage under the States Reorganisation Act the matter has to come before the Government of India and a final directive has to be issued by the Government of India, therefore, Government would allow the various States concerned upon any formula that they might consider proper. Under these circumstances, the reorganised State of Punjab proceeded on the assumption that there was a general agreement, so far as the grouping formula was concerned. Thereafter, the Punjab Government issued what were known as Punjab Integrated Services Seniority Rules. They also were issued within some months or a year after the re-organisation and, thereafter, the question of the seniority of the various officers was also taken into account.

So far as grouping formula is concerned, it is not as if this question arose only in Punjab and PEPSU; there were certain other States also. So far as the Government of India were concerned, they agreed that, as far as possible, to the fullest extent, there ought to be seniority on the basis of cadre to cadre. That is the view that the Government of India took. But, as I pointed out, it was subject to an agreement between certain States. As I pointed out to my hon. friend at an earlier stage, here there was something like an agreement. I would not like to bind both the Governments to a particular course of action, but in as much as there was some sort of an agreement, the reorganised Punjab Government pro-

ceeded on the basis that the former PEPSU Government were also of the view that in suitable cases, especially when there was a promotion from a lower post to a higher post, the grouping formula might be taken into account. May I point out to the House that such promotion can be direct recruitment or can be by promotion, and the agreement was to the effect that the avenues of promotion from a lower post to the higher post was in this manner, namely, by considering the seniority and other things, and not by direct recruitment? That is how all this has started, and it would not be proper....

Shri Ram Krishan Gupta: As there was no PEPSU Government, with whom was the agreement reached?

Shri Datar: With the Punjab Government in which there were PEPSU officers as well. Let not the hon. Member needlessly blame the present Punjab Government. Under the present re-organised Punjab Government, there have been some officers of the former PEPSU state who have been dealing with the question of seniority. I would not mention their names but I would point out that this is how the grouping formula came into operation.

Subsequently when the matter came up before the State Advisory Committee, so far as the non-gazetted servants were concerned they also did not go into the propriety of this. They only wanted to know whether the formula was correctly passed and used in a particular case. Thereafter there were certain appeals. Those appeals could not be entertained on account of the fact that *prima facie* they were according to the State integration rules.

We also have a Central Advisory Board, as the House is aware. When this matter in respect of the gazetted or higher officers went before the Central Advisory Board not only in respect of Punjab but in respect of other States also, the Central Advisory Board took the view that any other formula than that of cadre to

cadre equation would not be proper. Therefore, they rejected what you can call the grouping formula so far as the cases before them were concerned. This was after the appeals against the decision of the Punjab Government on the advice of the State Advisory Board had been disposed of.

Then an anomaly arose, namely, that in certain cases the grouping formula had been followed and in other cases and so far as the rest of India also was concerned, the common formula had been followed. That was why the Government of India themselves took up this question. We received a number of representations from former PEPSU officers also. Thereafter there was a long discussion. We are extremely anxious to see that the rights that the services have, either in the States or in the Centre to the extent that the Centre comes into operation, are always safeguarded. Therefore, we wrote to the Punjab Government pointing out the difficulties as also the anomalies in the position. After that we had a meeting which went on for two or three days between the State's officers and the Central Government's officers. The whole matter was discussed fully. I might inform my hon. friends that there the officers, some of them, who attended were also from former PEPSU State and the interests of PEPSU officers were also taken into account because it was their representation that their seniority had been depressed. If, for example, there was going to be a cadre to cadre seniority then naturally they might not have lost to the extent that they have done. But by the operation of the grouping formula, it is true—and my hon. friend is justified in complaining—that there were certain cases where senior officers in PEPSU got their seniority below certain junior officers in the Punjab State. Certain District Judges, for example, in PEPSU were placed under Subordinate Judges. This is the case in a number of other departments. Therefore, Government had to consider the matter as carefully as possible. On the one hand, the position was that there was some

[Shri Datar]

sort of an agreement on behalf of the representatives of former PEPSU Government which naturally induced the present Punjab Government to go on with the implementation of this grouping formula and, on the other hand, it was also represented very strongly to us that a number of PEPSU officers had suffered in their seniority and that considerable hardship if not even injustice had been done to them.

It was under these circumstances that these opposing views had to be fully recognised. The interest of justice has always to prevail with us because ultimately under article 115 of the Constitution we are responsible for settling this question and under article 117 it is open to us to send a directive to the State Government. But, fortunately, after the recent conference held in February and March, it was found that both the groups agreed that some changes should be made. An agreed compromise formula, on behalf of the Punjab State which reflected, may I point out to my hon. friend, the views of both the Punjab officers as also of the former PEPSU officers was evolved. My hon. friend the other day as also today wanted to know the details of this formula. It is rather premature for me at this stage to disclose them. But that formula has the support not only of the Punjab officers, but also the former PEPSU officers. Let us try to remedy the evil; let us try to mitigate; if not completely eradicate, the evil. Let us not maintain this regional idea of former PEPSU officers and Punjab officers. We have to consider all of them as the officers of one State and on this basis a common formula has been evolved. I am very happy that the Punjab Government reflecting, as I pointed out, the views of both the officers, have evolved a formula which is fairly equitable.

The complaints which the hon. Member voiced have been before Government. Government are anxious to do full justice to all such complaints. They want to remove all complaints

to the extent possible. Now an agreed formula between the Central Government and the Punjab Government is before the Central Advisory Board. After their advice is received, Government will take necessary action and as I pointed out in my reply, if some reconsideration of the order already passed becomes necessary in the light of the compromise agreed formula, that also will surely be done. Therefore, I would point out to my hon. friend that he should not ask me at this stage to disclose the details of this agreement which has, as I said, the support of the State Government, reflecting both the views, and also the Central Government. We have sent it to the Central Advisory Board and they will also, I hope agree with this. As soon as they agree and express their opinion, Government will take necessary steps so far as the various representations that are before Government are concerned. Government will also consider whether there is any need for a reconsideration of the order that has already been passed. Thus, I would point out to my hon. friend that Government are fully seized of this problem. Government know the views of the various sections. I would not point out the pros and cons of both the views—what the Punjab officers' case was and what the former PEPSU officers' case was. That is all of academic interest only, especially when happily both the States have been fully reorganised.

So far as PEPSU is concerned, there has been reorganisation twice: first we had the PEPSU State round about 1947-48; then PEPSU remained a Part B State for a few years till 1-10-1956; then it has been merged in the Punjab; ultimately the whole area has become Punjab. Thus you will find that whatever is necessary, whatever is equitable will surely be done by the Central Government, because, under the States Reorganisation Act, it is the Centre's responsibility and the Centre are fully alive to this problem and they will take proper steps as early as possible.