DR. K. N. KATJU: Were acquired without paying any compensation? To whom?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: To the owners, of course.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I shall look into that.

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL: Probably he is referring to Ala Malkiyat Rights which were vested in the Ruler of Faridkot. But as soon as integration was brought about and the Union was formed, the Ala Malkiyat Rights were also abolished. The question of compensation could not arise because he was just the *ala* molifc; he was the Ruler of the State. And probably my friend is referring to that.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Really, it must be **a** matter of deepest gratification for the people of PEPSU that the whole of India is so vastly interested in their affairs. Let us not go very much deep. Land tenure is a very complicated problem. My hon. friend from Bengal knows what it is. They have got it there.

Sir, the last thing I would say about this integration of services is this. My hon. friend also mentioned about the Joint'Public Service Commission. Both these matters have been engaging our attention. So far as the integration of services is concerned, I entirely agree that it is a very live issue and something really ought to be done. There were eight States of different varieties. Sir, there is a committee and I am informed by the Adviser that by the end of the year very likely the Committee will be able to finish its labours and it may be possible for us to pass final orders for the integration of services.

Then comes the question of cadre— the integration of cadre between Punjab and PEPSU. It is an important matter and it is a question of major policy. We are trying—as a matter of fact some scheme has been prepared and is under our active consideration. Speaking personally, I welcome the idea and possibly we will put it through. But these are matters of detail. Sir, I think I have taken suffi cient time ......

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: May I ask a question for clarification? On page 5 of the White Paper, it is said "Leftist influence waned". Does the hon. Minister stand by that statement? That is a statement made by the Government.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Please read out the statement.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: This is what It is. "Leftist influence waned".

DR. K. N. KATJU: I am very glad.....

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: That it has waned'

DR. K. N. KATJU: My hon. friend perhaps has not gone there, but I have gone there. I went to Kishengarh village in August 1952. I remained there for two hours. All the tenants, J being a Punjabi myself, welcomed me. I made enquiries. I asked, "How are you living?" "Very happily, Sir," they said. The poor Biswedar was there too. They said he was a most admirable man. I asked what his chief quality was. They said. "Do you know what has happened? He has surrendered 1200 acres to us but we have allowed him to retain 300 acres in his possession. He can cultivate it without any objection on our part." Arcl I said, "What do you do about land revenue?" They replied, "How are we concerned with it? That is not our duty." As someone said, land revenue is regarded as something payable by the Biswedar. Then I askevl them, "Do you pay rent?" They said, "We do not pay. Nobody can come and ask us." It was an entirely Communist village. Every hon. Member from the opposite benches when he goes to PEPSU should visit Kishengarh as you go and visit a shrine. The leftist influence was not in the ordinary way: Go and vote for th«s

[Dr. K. N. Katju.] Congress, go and vote for the Praja Socialists. The leftist influence was: Do not obey the law; do not go to the courts, establish your own parallel institutions, your own parallel law courts; do not obey authority.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: What is leftist influence? Is it Communist influence? Or is it the influence of anybody who opposes the Congress?

DR. K. N. KATJU: I am not very good at argument. I do not know how to argue, but it is very difficult to mnke any distinction. The gentlemen there are all sitting together, and it is very difficult to distinguish. Some may be red, some may be of some other sort of colour. The poor Adviser sitting there is not a very competent man in this field and could not make in his drafting any distinction between red and ultra red, but this is what he meant.

Sir, I am grateful to the House for this great discussion and I am sure I am voicing the feelings and sentiments of the people of PEPSU—for all the great interest the Council of States has taken in their affairs. That shows conclusively that the Council of States is one of the rulers of PEPSU and the so-called President's rule is merely a nomenclature. I beg that the Resolution be passed.

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

[COUNCIL] the House of the People 2438

Those who are in favour of the motion may say 'Aye'.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Those who are against the motion may say No'.

HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the  $Aye_s$  have it.

HON. MEMBERS: The Noes have it

M,R. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Those who are for the motion may rise in their places.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: We want a division, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The rules provide for both. I am adopting the other method. (After *taking a count*) Ayes: 54; Noes: 24.

The Resolution is adopted.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

## THE ESTATE DUTY BILL, 1952

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the Council the following message received from the House of the People, signed by the Secretary to the House:

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 115 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the House of the People, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Estate Duty Bill, 1952, which has been passed as amended by the House at its sitting held on the 15th September 1953."

I lay the Bill on the Table.

The Council then adjourned till a quarter past eight of the clock on Wednesday, the 16th September 1953.

2437