

[Shri M. C. Shah.]

East Punjab States Union for the year 1952-53. [Placed in Library. See No. IV, O. 1(79e).]

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURE OF GOVT. OF INDIA (EXCLUDING RAILWAYS), 1952-53.

I also lay on the Table a Supplementary Statement of expenditure of the Government of India (excluding Railways) for the year 1952-53. [Placed in Library. See No. IV, O.1 (72f).]

RESOLUTION ON PRESIDENT'S PROCLAMATION RE PEPSU—contd.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Sir, I am one of those who believe that the State of PEPSU should never have come into being and who were dissatisfied with the manner in which it came into being and also the manner in which it has been functioning during the last five years. I was saying when I was interrupted that we must try to find out the history of the political personalities in the State of PEPSU. There was no justification whatsoever why this little State of PEPSU should have been brought into being, right on our border at a time when the relationship between India and Pakistan was even worse than it is today. In a situation like that, what justification was there that it should have been so? Apart from that, who are those who have been responsible for this state of affairs? Who were responsible for the state of affairs which existed even before? It is not as if the incidents given by my hon. friend, Mr. Sundarayya, are completely false. We know that the administration of any State under the old Rulers used to be conducted more or less under the patronage of the Rulers. Now, that state of affairs has continued even after 1947. In spite of the fact that we have had for three years a caretaker Government in PEPSU under the direct control of the Central Government, we find that there has been no improvement in the

situation at all.

Now we cannot say that the State of PEPSU suddenly found itself in this position which, the hon. the Home Minister says, is the reason for the President taking over powers there. This is a continuing state of affairs. What efforts have the Government of India made during the last five years after independence to see that things are corrected in the State of PEPSU? They have made no efforts whatsoever. A Government of your own choice has been there for some time and yet, what is the difference that they have made? Nothing. You find the same picture in PEPSU as you find in some States. Only unfortunately the picture of PEPSU is darker than in other States. The Congress Party, which is the Party in power, instead of rectifying the fundamental wrongs in the situation, compromised itself and tried to make alliances with people with whom it should have had nothing to do, people who had no claim whatever to the Congress Party, its traditions. You wanted to create your own dummies in that State. You wanted to create *chota* Congress leaders in the State, if I may say so, who could carry on the so called Congress mission. The Congress therefore is responsible for the situation that has been there during the last five years. Let them not shirk their responsibility. The Home Minister has protested that he is only interested in law and order and good administration in the State of PEPSU, and also in seeing that there is no danger to the security of India. If we are to believe what he says, then I should like to have an assurance from him as to how and in what manner he is going to do it. Is he going to do it through the same agency which has been responsible for this rotten state of affairs in PEPSU or, is he going to see that those people, that old administrative set-up, those corrupt officers and the Rajpramukh who have been responsible for this state of affairs are removed? If he is not going to do this, then nothing beneficial will be achieved by the President taking over powers there.

I do not know the details of the case, but the hon. Mr. Sundarayya has told us that so many officers, the great majority of them, nearly 70 to 80% of them, in every tier of administration, are the nominees or the 'subsidiaries' of the Rajpramukh of PEPSU. If we continue to administer the State through the same agency, what guarantee is there that this state of affairs is going to be remedied? I therefore say, Sir, that unless the hon. the Home Minister gives us sufficient reasons, more valid reasons than he has given us today, than what he had given in the House of the People the other day, which have made it necessary that Parliament should legislate for, and the Central Government should administer, the State of PEPSU, it will not be possible at least for me or for my party to accept his contention and to approve of the Resolution. But if he assures us that he is going to do certain things immediately to set right the root cause of the trouble, I for one and also, if I may say so, people who believe in the security of India and believe also that there is something radically wrong in the State of PEPSU which I want the Home Minister to place fearlessly before this House and before the country, would support this drastic action. As a proof of that, he should give us an assurance that the highest personage who has been more or less responsible for these manoeuvrings in the State of PEPSU will be removed immediately. This will be a good reason for starting a great revolution for the liquidation of the Rajpramukhs in the country.

DR. K. N. KATJU: On a point of order, may I respectfully suggest that it is not proper, nor desirable, to say anything against people who are not here and who are not in a position to defend themselves?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He will obey your suggestion.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: I thought I would follow the good example of the Minister himself who, usually a stick-

er for proprieties, cast reflections on the Speaker of the PEPSU Assembly.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I never cast any reflection on anybody.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: I thought I was an irresponsible Member but I find the hon. Minister is giving me a few lessons.

The second thing that I want to refer to is this. There was no reason at all why this little State of PEPSU should have come into existence. In this connection I may refer the hon. the Home Minister and also the House to what I was saying on another occasion when the linguistic provinces problem was being discussed. I said that while we believed in linguistic provinces as such, we did not mean that every single dialect should have a separate province. I even said at that time that I would support a move for the consolidation of Himachal Pradesh, the East Punjab and PEPSU into one State so that there will be a strong enough State on the frontiers of the country. The Government should see that this fusion takes place for the permanent security of the country, so that there is a certain kind of balanced advantage by putting together an old feudal State like Patiala with a fairly well-administered State like East Punjab or Himachal Pradesh. These are the two suggestions that I have given out and I know by the smiles of the hon. Home Minister that it was rash of me to expect that he could ever even listen to that suggestion or much less, act upon it but I am giving it for what it is worth.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I was just wondering whether it is relevant here.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Nothing is relevant according to him except the Resolution as such, but I am trying to show to the hon. Minister that just by taking over the powers of administration into his own hands he is not solving any problem. There are so many other inherent problems to which he himself has referred. He made a reference to the low standard of ad-

[Shri C. G. K. Reddy.]
ministration in PEPSU. He said the administration in PEPSU was not of a high order—even now it is not of a high order. I am trying to tell him that this is the way to do it. Merely by the Central Government taking over the reins of PEPSU the administration will not become clean and efficient. We will have to see that it is also changed. I am giving only a suggestion. But of course it is not within the province of the mind of the Home Minister although it is within the purview of the Resolution.

Therefore, unless the hon. Home Minister is going to tell us the entire truth of PEPSU and makes a better case than what he has attempted to do by screening certain facts and personalities, I am afraid that it would be our duty to oppose this Resolution. But if he gives us sufficient reason that this was necessary for the security of the country and for the good of the people and the State of PEPSU, then I would approve of it, provided the amendment which I have moved is accepted by the Home Minister.

SHRI K. RAMA RAO (Madras):
Mr. Chairman, Sir; Between Dr. Katju, the Home Minister and Shri Sundarayya, the Leader of the Opposition group, they have given us a complete, faithful and accurate picture of what has been happening in PEPSU for some time to justify the Resolution which has been moved in the House. I find a lot has been said against Dr. Katju, about screening this individual or that. But I thought the Leader of the Opposition was here to supplement the picture. Between them both they have given, as I have said already, enough material to justify the step that is now being taken.

Sir, for a wonder, I must ask why Shri Sundarayya is so anxious that this Resolution should not be accepted. I find that the Akalis are reconciling themselves to the new situation and are anxiously preparing for the next election. I find the Biswedars are raising funds for the purpose. The Congress certainly will have to fight

whether it wins or loses. The Government of India have their own duty to the people of PEPSU and have stepped in to prepare the ground for a general election after restoring law and order. Why are the Communists so worried about the changeover? Is it not a fact that they have been fishing in troubled waters? The more the trouble, the greater is the advantage to them. If elections are held tomorrow, it is possible that the Communists will be wiped out and therefore Shri Sundarayya is anxious that a new situation should not arise and elections should not be 'forced' on PEPSU.

Sir, Shri Sundarayya's picture is dark but helpful. The Biswedars are a dangerous lot. The Rajpramukh is an impossible and an atrocious person. The officials are incorrigibly corrupt. The Constitution is not functioning well. The Biswedars have no right to the advantages of rent collection. Lo and behold, there is at least one good feature, and that is the Communists have their little islands, kingdoms and empires. It is the beginning of the Welfare State, I suppose. Why should the Communists fear defeat? Even as a political party we are entitled to say that we shall not allow something to grow up which is directly opposed to the principles of democracy and constitutionalism.

Shri C. G. K. Reddy has said some excellent things, to which I shall come later. But I cannot understand his argument of an unholy alliance between the Congress and other parties. Politics, it has been said, is a game of second best. Certainly when a party is not in a properly strong position, it is entitled to help itself to all sorts of *ad hoc* alliances. The Congress has tried it in Madras under the magnificent leadership of Shri Rajagopalachari and it has completely retrieved the position, with the result that goodness knows where Shri Sundarayya's party, is today. In Hyderabad they have been trying to overthrow the Government, but Shri Ramakrishna Rao has been holding his own. In Orissa there has been a certain

amount of political assurance, which certainly.....

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa): Question.

SHRI K. RAMA RAO: In Travancore-Cochin, in spite of the shiftings about of the situation, it is fairly safe. Can it be said that in PEPSU the marked characteristic of the administration is political stability? It cannot be said. I know Dr. Katju emphasised both in the Lower House and here, this aspect of the situation viz., the lack of legislative equilibrium and therefore of political stability. That is a final, conclusive and overwhelming argument for this Resolution.

Take any democratic country. You will find that except in America where the Constitution lays down rigid conditions about the holding of elections periodically, there is no such provision in any Constitution of the world. The moment the President of the Republic feels that a certain awkward and dangerous situation has arisen, he takes necessary steps under the Constitution and one of this is a general election to ascertain public opinion. That right was there in the Government of India Act—Section 92A. That has been exercised in the West Punjab by the Central Government of Pakistan, which shares with us the heritage of the constitutional position created by the British in India. In the East Punjab where the situation was getting intolerable, politically detestable, and morally unsustainable, the local Congress Government was superseded by a Government of the Centre dominated by the Congress. In the interests of public morality things have got to be done mercilessly and ruthlessly and those things were done in the Punjab and we have got to take similar action today irrespective of the consideration whether the Government of PEPSU is Congress or non-Congress.

May I point out to my friends of the Communist Party and others who are sailing with them today that it is a totally false impression that they

are labouring under that the Congress expects to win in PEPSU, that the decks are being cleared for action in its interest and that the dice are being loaded to make it possible for the Congress to succeed? Sir, I have followed with some interest the political developments in PEPSU. The confusing changes make a jigsaw puzzle, a Chinese puzzle, rather a crossword puzzle and I am therefore unable to understand how any intelligent man can anticipate the verdict of the people of PEPSU. I personally think that the Congress is most unlikely to win. It's leadership has been criminally incompetent, disgracefully inept, and I for one, would not at all be sorry if the men who have let down the Congress do not return to office. It is a wrong and fallacious presumption that all that is being done is to help the Congress. Speaking constitutionally and historically it is not right to assume that in a federal policy, the Governments will be of the same political colour and complexion throughout. It is not. It is possible that in California the Republicans are ruling while the White House is occupied by the Democratic Party. We should expect similar developments in our country also. It is wrong to make a sinister hypothesis that the Indian National Congress wants to rule all over the country. Why do the opponents make the gratuitous assumption that Congressmen do not understand the elements of constitutionalism or federal polity?

It has been pointed out that the situation is not so bad in PEPSU. I am not sure at all of that—not after I have heard, the two excellent speeches, one by the Home Minister and another by the Leader of the Opposition group, well supplemented by the speech of my friend to the left. Now, whatever it be, the situation is sufficiently bad. If it is so, we have got to apply decisive remedies but it is stated—it was stated in the Lower House—that the action taken under a particular section is too drastic and what should have been done was to have taken action only under some other, and milder, section. May I remind

[Shri K. Rama Rao.]

Shri Sundarayya of the Telugu proverb: If you want to knock out your teeth, what does it matter with what kind of stone you do it? It is immaterial what section you apply so long as you are going to take action that will be effective.

Sir, to revert to the position of the Legislature, need of political stability is exceedingly impressive as an argument. Take the history of England. During the fifty years before 1910 the Tories and the Liberals had ruled the country almost with a sense of equilibrium. That is to say, they made politics a game of cricket. The Tories batted and the Liberals bowled. The Liberals batted and the Tories bowled. But as a result of the advent of new political forces on the British scene, you find that there has been a good deal of upset of the old order with the result that between 1923 and 1953, England has had almost biennial Parliaments. That is because of the new theory. The "mandate theory" or the "telephone theory" has come into operation and you have got to consult the electorate whenever major questions arise. On new issues the rights of the electorate to be consulted have got to be protected. Now, what are these rights in PEPSU? Here the political forces of every colour have been trying their worst to violate cardinal principles of democratic morality and popular rule. When that is the case, somebody has got to step in, and the Constitution gives the Centre the absolute right to step in. This is what has been done.

Now, I would like to refer to one or two points raised by my friend Shri C. G. K. Reddy, I must express my full agreement with one of them, namely, that Dr Katju has not made clear to us what the powers of the Adviser are. I want to know who is the senior partner and who, the junior? Is the Rajpramukh the senior partner or the Adviser? I happen to know personally the Adviser, who is an extremely able civilian, a competent administrator and a man

who can do things if he is given sufficient power and authority. I remember, Mr Chairman, that at the height of the glory of the British Empire in India, when imperial pride was at its highest, when Indians were being badly treated in the August 1942 disturbances Mr P S Rau happened to be the Commissioner in Nagpur and he saw to it, that his European subordinates did not lose their heads, and prevented civil excesses. I understand from the newspapers that he has already made some salutary changes in the administration. If given the necessary power, he will go forward. I should like to ask again the Home Minister what exactly are the powers of the Adviser. Who is going to sign on the dotted line? I trust it is not the Adviser.

Secondly, there is the problem of the B States. In India for some time to come these States are going to remain. In their case, under the Constitution the Centre is given the power to advise, to admonish, to warn and to supersede—just the sort of power which the King of England has in regard to his own government. I wonder how long reasonable and sensible men expect these Part B States to function. On the one side you give them the dynamics of a modern democratic constitution. On the other, you have got an ancient, outdated, outmoded, feudal set-up. How long is this going to function?

There is an additional difficulty. Dr Katju has laid down that the Government which has taken over the administration of PEPSU, is going to be only a caretaker government. I would request the Home Minister to take a more comprehensive view of the matter. I agree with Shri C. G. K. Reddy that it would not be enough if the Government of India merely took over a State whenever a crisis arises and just kept it going. They have to work it in a different manner and spirit, for the purpose of advancing democracy and they should also create forces that will make it possible for the State to forge ahead. Is the intention of the Government of India to

proceed along these lines in PEPSU or merely to allow things to drift for some time to come?

The question of land reform has been suggested. My heart is entirely with Shri Sundarayya and with Shri C. G. K. Reddy in this matter. There is no sense in calling ourselves a Welfare State, a progressive force, if we are not going to bring about drastic changes in the shortest time and in the swiftest manner. If it is to be done, all the powers of the President—emergency or otherwise—must be used for that purpose. Sir, one of the most glorious chapters of human history was the Presidential proclamation emancipating the slaves as a war measure by the President of the United States of America, Abraham Lincoln. I see no reason why the President should not make a reality of the cardinal principle of the Indian National Congress and allow a certain measure of land reform which will be quite radical. Let us not commit the blunders that were committed in Hyderabad, where we accepted a wretched situation and later allowed conservative forces to solidify and consolidate themselves. The result is that we are up against a very bad situation still. The State was conquered, but we did not take advantage of the conquest to advance the interests of the people.

4 P.M.

We should have taken immediate steps to efface the old order and bring in a new one. We did not do it. What is the use of taking responsibility for a very awkward situation in PEPSU as in Hyderabad and repeating the story of Hyderabad in PEPSU? Sir, the work of Sardar Patel is crying aloud for completion. Hyderabad must go, Pepsu must go and the work of integration which began with Dalhousie and rose to its height under Sardar Patel must be carried forward still. The "B" States in India have no place. The Rajpramukhs must be destroyed.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: Mr. Chairman, the Home Minister was all

sweetness and simplicity while narrating the insipid episode of PEPSU where Indian democracy has attained its first infantile disorder.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Infantile.....?

SHRI M. MANJURAN:.....disorder.

(MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN *in the Chair.*)

He has told us that there were insecure conditions. He told us that the Legislators have been crossing floors without adequate reasons. He told us further that everything in PEPSU was wrong; the law and order was not carried out. These were things, so far as I could remember, that were going on in PEPSU for the last so many years; these were not something very new that developed in PEPSU. Even in the past when, John Gunther wrote his 'Inside Asia' I believe, he has referred to the conditions prevailing in Patiala and some other Indian States. Nothing has very much changed from those days to this day because, the Congress Government, ever since it came into power, has not been able to correct these ancient order of autocrats and put them in their proper place. But, when the Home Minister, and a representative of the Congress was telling us that he had no intention that the administration of PEPSU should pass on to the Congress, I was surprised. For one thing, this is the only State where the Congress is not carrying on the administration and when that only State is taken out for the first Proclamation, I am not sure to believe him for all what he said. Well, Sir, I would like to remind myself of incidents that took place in Travancore-Cochin after the last General Elections which Mr. Rama Rao was just now referring to. Out of the 108 elected seats, 44 seats were secured by the Congress and this Congress has its authority there and they have got all the blessings of the Central Government, including the Home Minister who is also the Minister for States. At various times, Ministers and leaders of the Congress from Travancore-Cochin flew to Delhi to obtain the divine blessings of the Cen-

[Shri M Manjuran]
tral Government for the conduct of their Government in Travancore-Cochin. How did they get themselves installed, Sir when they were only 44 in number? They could not make out a majority in the Assembly. They bartered out for the support of the Socialist Party. The Speakership and got their silent consent for so many things. Again when they found things still difficult, they bartered out themselves for acquiring the strength of the 8 Members of the Tamil Nad Congress against whom they fought elections and gave a Ministership to the Tamil Nad Congress. And this Minister—who was he?—Mr Chidambaram Nath Nadar, was an accused in a criminal case on the day of his appointment as a Minister for having entered into a washerwoman's house to molest her. Not satisfied with beating her, he went out and molested her husband. That was the man, according to the proceedings of Travancore-Cochin Legislative Assembly who was offered the Ministership in Travancore-Cochin.

SHRI H P SAKSENA Are we discussing Travancore-Cochin or PEPSU?

(Interruptions)

SHRI M MANJURAN These are all related Indian questions, I do not think Pepsu is a separately isolated incident in India. PEPSU is one of the States in India, I believe.

But, in Travancore-Cochin, this minority party carries on the administration and that in PEPSU, a party which had greater strength than the Congress could not carry on the Government is rather a wonder. There is something, Sir, which we could not see. There are certain things which, for ordinary mortals it is difficult to find out, but, here have been pulls, machinations, wire pullings, all these as the Home Minister himself testified. How, by whom and who are the parties for all these? We see in Rajasthan an earlier Chief Minister resigning and a new Chief Minister

coming and ministries, like mercurial globes combining and colliding on the tilting table of Indian politics. These are recent events. Ministers from various States are occasionally running to Delhi to get things set right but no Proclamations are coming forward. In PEPSU there is the Proclamation. Is it because law and order has been singularly marked out to be demolished in this Union? I think law and order is not respected in Travancore-Cochin, it was not respected in Saurashtra, it was not respected in Rajasthan where dacoity, according to the Home Minister's statement in this House and in the other House, is prevalent. Why did not you issue a Proclamation in those cases and take up the administration of Rajasthan and Saurashtra where conditions were much worse than in PEPSU? Is it because that there Congress people are governing and here the Congress people are not governing? This is an obsession with the Central Government that anywhere only the Congress should rule. They have bartered with the Tamil Nad Congress in Travancore-Cochin who had, on the previous day, agreed with the United Front of Leftists for the formation of a Ministry. The next day, Congressmen got hold of these people. These are champions of independence and uncorruptible party loyalty, people who will not be carried away by communists, who will not take 80 villages for themselves. These were the people who were prepared to co-operate with the communists on the previous day, they were prepared to co-operate with every revolutionaries they were prepared to do anything, they had accepted the programme of the U L F and with such people the Congress compromised in Travancore-Cochin. Why did not you compromise with other people in PEPSU? There is something, Sir, which is very fishy over the whole transaction.

Now, there in PEPSU also, there is a Rajpramukh to whom you have given the entire burden of administration along with a very good Adviser. Let us take it for granted

from Mr Rama Rao that he is a very good Adviser. But, the Government machinery and this Rajpramukh, according to reports that were prevailing, have been the cause of all the intrigues and all the unsteadiness of PEPSU politics. He is there to whom now you have given the cash box and, like the wise man who shouted to the robber running away with the cash box: "All right, take away the cash box, I have got still the keys with me", you are shouting here, Sir, in this House, to convince us of your wisdom. It is a very unwise act that you have done. The unwisdom of the act is the retention of Rajpramukhs, whether it be in Travancore-Cochin, PEPSU, Hyderabad, Rajasthan or Saurashtra or anywhere. This institution of Rajpramukhs is a permanent menace to Indian politics. But, why are you so keen on maintaining these people at such high prices? What benefit are we going to get? When a place like the Bombay State or the Madras State could be governed by a Governor why should there be a Rajpramukh in comparatively backward places getting enormous sums for being Rajpramukhs? In all these Part B States, which were cockpits of feudal intrigues and communal entanglements you find these persistent wrangles in the ministerial posts. It happens in Rajasthan, it happens in Saurashtra, it happens in Hyderabad; it happens in Travancore-Cochin and it happens in PEPSU. These cannot be without reason. So, you have first got to find out the reason why all these Part B States are very badly administered. Why are there ministerial wrangles all over? Why could these quarrels not be set aside even by the whipping hand of the Congress at the Centre? Why should a Minister resign and why Ministers should accuse each other in the different Part B States? All these are things which you have to investigate and tell us and you should have brought forward not a Proclamation taking an individual instance of PEPSU but taking all the Part B States and doing away with this institution of Rajpramukhs entirely.

Again, Sir, in the President's Proclamation, it has been stated that the elections will be held sometime, as early as possible. This is very indefinite. It is true that there is a Delimitation Commission. The Commission can be given a directive to submit their report about PEPSU within a specified time. Early elections should be held there. Not that the people there would be benefited if elections are held there in the present atmosphere. Not that once elections are held in PEPSU, everything will be all right. The privileged classes are tyrannising over the people there, and the Rajpramukh is having his court intrigues still. But if elections are held, there would at least be confidence among the people who are living in other parts of India that India is not going to dogs. Today we feel very suspicious. We feel that the Congress is trying to take other parties on its side by offering ministerial posts. We have seen in the papers that the Prime Minister was negotiating with the Praja-Socialist Party leaders, and we also hear that as regards Andhra, the Praja Socialist Party leaders have given a blank cheque to Shri Prakasam to do as he likes in his relations with the Congress. I think some kinds of ministerial posts are going to be measured out in return for the loyal support of the Praja Socialist Party. It is not in the interests of democracy for the Congress to ask people to come and join them, because they have got certain ministerial posts to offer. Well, Sir, by these methods they have established themselves in Travancore-Cochin, and by these methods they have established themselves in Madras. By these methods they have tried to maintain themselves everywhere. This obsession with "democracy" is already manifesting itself in disorders, and this obsession is going to manifest itself in final paralysis of democracy and in tyrannical fascism. Is that the method that you are going to adopt in PEPSU in the name of democracy? If you are really interested in democracy in PEPSU, leave it to the people of PEPSU. Let social-

[Shri M. Manjuran.]
ism be there. Let communism be there. It is none of your business to object to a particular ideology, or to object to a particular political concept. That is fascism. You are obsessed against a particular ideology. It is driving you to the other extreme. You say that 90 villages are administered by local panchayats. What objection is there to that? The only objection from your point of view is that they are administered by communists. But in the publication "Kurukshetra" where all these community projects are boosted, you say that the people themselves are holding their courts, and the people are governing themselves very well, and so on. What harm is there if 80 or 90 villages in PEPSU are governed by local panchayats? This is after all the 'gram swaraj' of Mahatma Gandhi. The Home Minister is very much against Gandhism today. I do not know how many times he is contradicting himself in order to accommodate and compromise with all these antediluvian forces of India, all these reactionary stooges of British imperialism in India. You are afraid of them, because through them you are related to British imperialism; through them you are related to all the reactionary forces in the world. Otherwise, where is the necessity of keeping these chieftains who were only the creations of the Britishers? They have become your glory today, and you are spending money on their maintenance. Otherwise they would have been wiped away. You are giving them help. You are protecting them, you are helping them against human rights in this country. It is for you to decide that these Rajpramukhs should not exist, and that everywhere it is the wish of the people which should prevail. Whether it is communism, whether it is socialism, or whether it is some other political system, let the people themselves decide. It is for you to give them the system that they desire and not to impose your will on them. That is called fascism. I think the U.N.O. was very keen, while making out the Charter, that the people's wish should prevail.

It is not that your will should be imposed because you are in charge of administration for the time being.

We are told that we cannot achieve anything in the industrial field because we have got a democratic system whereas in Russia they could achieve so much because they have a totalitarian system. What is the democracy that prevails here? It is a mockery. To say that by a proclamation you can assume the responsibility of government and wipe out legislative bodies and create your own conditions for administration, is mere totalitarianism. Democracy has become a very convenient term for you whenever you have got to advance an argument. You then talk of democracy. But the maintenance of democracy has in history been the most expensive affair. It was after centuries of war that democracy was established in England. Democracy cannot be had for the asking. Just because people in high places say that they are going to have democracy, it does not mean that democracy will come. You talk of implementing your Plan and of co-operation being necessary on the part of the people. How is that possible? Man has to grow in conditions other than those which prevail today. Today the conditions are such that he has been suffocated. His growth, from start to finish, should be in favourable conditions. But what is the position? You have never allowed the people to start, and they are not going to finish. It is not possible for the Government to govern this land perpetually, whatever the machinations of the Congress might be, and however much they might wish to wipe away all the other parties. We are not going to be wiped away. We are the sons of the soil. We will stand and fight for our land, in PEPSU and in Travancore-Cochin and in every other place. We want the democratic system to flourish. We want early elections to be held, before the machinations of the Congress develop in PEPSU in order to instal the Congress in power. We are against those moves in politics. If you want to be in power, we do not mind;

by all means be in power, but let it be by the wish of the people, by the willing co-operation of the people. Otherwise, your Plan will be a wash-out. When people strike against the Ministries, when your Ministries are upset and set right every other day, how are you going to implement your Plan? The Ministers have no other job except making adjustments in the ranks of the Ministers, except participating in the wrangles and quarrels of the Ministers, every day of the week. How are you going to work in these conditions? In the Rajasthan Ministry, four Ministers resign one day, and seven Ministers are appointed another day. The same with the Travancore-Cochin Ministry, with the Hyderabad Ministry, and with other Ministries. You are not going to do anything, and all this high talk about democracy, planned development, etc. will be a wash-out, and the people of India will be the worse for all that.

Elections should be held immediately in PEPSU, so that all this talk of democracy that we hear may bring out something real at an early date, so that the people of India may have confidence in the Congress being at least a democratic body. It cannot be, but still we think that in order to avoid much worse happening, early elections should be held in PEPSU—within three months from today.

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL (PEPSU): Mr Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the Proclamation which the President has issued by which he has taken over the administration of PEPSU to himself.

From the speeches which have been made on both sides of the House, I think, it is established that there was in fact a need for some radical change in PEPSU. The only question is: Who was responsible for creating those conditions there? Well, when we are discussing the question of approval of the Resolution and when we are agreed that there was a need for the issue of Proclamation by the President, then it is immaterial as to who

was responsible for bringing in those conditions. As the Leader of the Communist Party has himself admitted, the situation there was very bad. He says that law and order had gone to dogs, administration was corrupt, but then he also says that the Communist Party was not to blame for it. Well, my submission to the House is that we are not trying to apportion the fault on one party or the other. I think, all parties in PEPSU have contributed their bit to bring in those conditions. The question whether it was the feudal set up or the influence of the Rajpramukh or the Rarewala Ministry which was responsible for bringing those conditions, does not arise at all. We are all agreed that the conditions did prevail and if those conditions did prevail, well, my submission is that if the Centre had not intervened; then the fault would have been on its shoulders. If the Centre has intervened, well, I think, we must all combine together in supporting that action. On our part, i.e., to say the Congressmen in PEPSU, our grievance has been that the Centre has woken up rather too late. Why did they allow things to grow so bad? We have always been of the opinion that the Centre was having a soft corner for the Rarewala Ministry, they were having a soft corner even for the Rajpramukh; they were having a soft corner for the leader of the United Front Party, Sardar Gian Singh Rarewala. That has been our grouse exactly because the Centre permitted so many things which normally they should not have permitted. Well, I would like to draw the pointed attention of the House to the fact that the Ministries in PEPSU had become an article of merchandise. They were on sale there and the price demanded was the sacrifice of party affiliations. The Leader of the United Front Party gloated very much when he succeeded in entrapping some Congressmen. He felt very happy. Well, I for one, would say that this was the least expected of Sardar Gian Singh Rarewala. Destiny had chosen Sardar Gian Singh Rarewala as the leader of PEPSU and, the Centre was trying to put him in power. Since the

[Shri J N Kaushal]

days of independence he was put in power as the Head of a Caretaker Ministry thrice. Well, I expected him to create conditions there in which democracy could function. On the other hand, the methods employed were a complete negation of democracy. It was not a matter over which anybody could feel happy and Sardar Gian Singh Rarewala could not at all avoid his share of responsibility in as much as circumstances were created there where legislators were made corrupt. It is not only that the Ministries were being offered. It is said in knowledgeable quarters that something more had been offered. Money also played its part. I say that if these things are true—and as a matter of fact, they are true to a great length—it is a matter of shame for everyone of us. When democracy is yet in its infancy, we should try to create such conditions in which people may begin to think whether the future of democracy is going to be safe in such hands. Well, I think, since the political morality in PEPSU had gone to the lowest extreme, no Government could function there in a stable manner. When the people could be made to cross the floor of the House by the mere fact as to who was in a position to pay more price, well, it was but obvious that no Government could function and we know it as a matter of fact that during the whole regime of the Rarewala Ministry the Legislature sat only for 27 days. Can we ever think of a responsible Legislature behaving in that manner? As has been very pertinently pointed out by the hon. Home Minister for States they were always fearful of their position. They never wanted any controversial legislation to be placed on the floor of the House and the most controversial legislation was the legislation regarding agrarian reforms and all progressive parties are at one that that legislation should be enacted. But what was the difficulty with the Rarewala Ministry? The difficulty was that that Ministry was dominated by the Biswedar Group. The Biswedar Group never wanted those legislations to come and I think it is precise-

ly for that reason that the unrest was growing and it was bound to, because the agrarian problem in PEPSU is the problem which will upset any Government unless it is properly tackled.

My submission to the House is that the political atmosphere there was so corrupt, so communal and it had degraded to such heights—I should say such depths—that all right-thinking men were feeling whether that was the democracy for which they had struggled.

Well, I think, the President has taken one step whereby it is hoped that better conditions will be created. But as was pointed by various sections of the House, this step by itself may not solve the problem. The real problem which is to be tackled is to bring about a complete change in the set up of services there, because whatever Government may come into power, it is the services who in fact rule and unless we have clean services, unless we have the officials who will carry out the policy of the Government in power faithfully, it is not possible for the masses to take these services into confidence. We are at one with Mr Sundarayya when he says that the majority of the people at the head of the affairs belong to that group which is directly under the influence of the Rajpramukh. I quite agree with him that unless we get rid of that group, it is not possible for us to make any progress whatsoever. It is impossible. These officers should have no say in the administration and unless we do that, it will not be possible for us to have any stable Government, any clean administration even in future. They should be removed; they should be dismissed.

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA: Along with the Rajpramukh.

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL: Now my submission to the House is, Sir, that some friends are taking the view that this step has been taken by the Gov-

ernment at the Centre because they want to put the Congress in power there. Well, I want to refute that charge. On the other hand, the position is quite the reverse. The fact was that the Centre never gave that liberty to the Congress party which ultimately they gave to Sardar Gian Singh Rarewala to stabilise his position. It is very unfortunate that he could not take advantage of that situation. The Congress Party was not allowed to have more than five Ministers, and six Ministers were allowed to Sardar Gian Singh. Ministers were being sworn in immediately when no confidence motion was there. And who were the persons who were allowed to become Ministers? Those were the persons who were in the Congress for quite a number of years. Telephonic approval was accorded to those persons becoming Ministers. If the anxiety of the Centre was to keep Congress in power there, they would not have behaved in that manner. The whole difficulty came when the Centre found that it was not possible to carry on the administration. The situation arose to such a length that the Rajpramukh had to write that it was not possible for him to carry on the administration in a democratic manner. Therefore, the full justification for the President's rule was created by these constitutional changes and also by the fact that there was a complete degradation of the political morality.

Now, the other question is that the law and order had also broken down in PEPSU. Well, my submission in this respect is that a Government which cannot create peaceful conditions, cannot maintain law and order, has no business to remain in power. That is the fundamental thing which a Government should do and if a Government is not in a position to achieve that one basic thing, we cannot expect that Government to achieve any progress. Now, in the present case, why did the Government fail to maintain law and order? They failed because they had no popular backing; they could not come to a proper decision and they did not have the courage

to take action against their own corrupt officials. They had to screen so many interests and naturally it was a weak administration. The officers felt that so long as they had the support of some influential M.L.A. or the other, nobody would be in a position to touch them. Naturally, law and order failed.

The other thing which has been repeatedly referred to is the running of more or less a parallel Government in about 90 villages. The leader of the Communist Party says that they only try and settle some petty civil disputes. He said that the allegation made in this respect is incorrect. I would only submit that this matter may be enquired into by an impartial agency. This will certainly prove that these people are trying to settle not only petty civil disputes but also cases of the most heinous type and are imposing almost ludicrous punishments. They do not allow people to go to the courts of law even in murder cases and dacoity cases. The administration has been so weak that they could not touch these people. As a matter of fact, the United Front Party also was in league with the Communist Party. They gave them certain promises when they thought that they could not carry on without their support. Now that a very good administrator is sent there, I would only hope that he would be given unbridled power to root out corruption from that State. Unless corruption is rooted out, it will not be possible for us even to have a stable Government there in the near future when elections are again held. The question was raised whether it would be the adviser who would be having the ruling power or the Rajpramukh. My submission is that this doubt should never have arisen. The Rajpramukh is to act on the advice of the Adviser. As we all know, under the Constitution, the Governor or the Rajpramukh has to act on the advice of the Ministry or the Adviser. The Rajpramukh only functions as a constitutional head.

There is one thing more that I would submit. The Government

[Shri J. N. Kaushal.]

should institute an enquiry into the allegations of the most scandalous type made against some of the Ministers. If anybody reads the judgment of the Tribunal disqualifying some of the Ministers, he will find that very grave charges have been made against these Ministers. The public mind in PEPSU, is greatly agitated over this and is demanding that they should be brought to book. They feel that these people should be asked to explain their conduct at the bar of public opinion, because grave charges are made against some of the Ministers. There is the Court of Wards scandal. There is the gram scandal. There is the scandal about the use of Ministers' cars for export and import of contraband opium. I say this with a great sense of responsibility that a responsible section of the public there is demanding that these persons should be brought to book. It is only then that we can hope to have purity of administration there.

LT.-COL. J. S. MANN (PEPSU): Mr. Deputy Chairman, today we are discussing the proclamation which the Congress Government, which is at the helm of affairs has asked the President to issue. We were told that the Congress Government was a very just and honest Government and after the freedom of India in which they had played a great part, they would allow complete freedom to every individual and every citizen, but, Sir, the PEPSU Government has been taken over by the President and the elected Assembly has been debarred from functioning. We could never expect this from people like our Prime Minister and his colleagues. I have got the greatest respect for our Prime Minister and the greatest regard for our President and also the Home Minister who is said to be one of the most eminent lawyers in India. For taking over the administration of PEPSU, the Home Minister has made out a big case to President to the members of the public, which is absolutely untrue and not according to facts. They have very much emphasised the lawlessness in the State which I can prove from the

figures that I have in my possession to be only similar to what it was in 1951 or 1952. I know that our Home Minister is an able lawyer and can make a case or unmake a case. He is capable of making a guilty man escape the gallows or of making an innocent man to be sent to the gallows. We may fight against this but I know that our arguments in this respect will not be heard. I may go as far back as 1948 when PEPSU and East Punjab States were united and made into one unit. A nominated Ministry of the Congress Government was installed there to administer in whatever way they liked according to the Centre's instructions. They carried on till 1951—not the same Ministry. That Ministry worked for about 6 to 8 months and they were not acceptable to the people and, the people agitated. They said that these people had made a lot of money. As a matter of fact the people at that time said "We used to have one Raja. Now we have to feed 7 or 8 Rajas. Unless and until their bellies are full, what will come to us? We will not be able to live and support ourselves." Then another Ministry came and that was the Interim Ministry and that also carried in the same way. Then 6 months before the elections the Congress Ministry was installed for the reason that elections were coming and they wanted the Congress to be the majority party. That Ministry did all sorts of things, passed some nominations, got some rejected as they wished. That is why we face today such a large number of election petitions in PEPSU.

Then the Election Boards were constituted. Unfortunately all the petitions which were pending against the United Front were decided first and their Membership was set aside. Naturally the strength of the party in power became lower and lower every day. I must say that the strength of the parties on the making of the Ministry was—Congress 26, United Front 23 and then there were others, Independents and Communists and today, when you break the Ministry and take over charge, the strength is, United Front 26, Congress 20 and

Communists 3. On the day the Government took it, 2 more seats were added and they were of the United Front, and the Congress failed miserably. That made their numbers 28 and 20. It has been said that it was not possible for these people to carry on the administration of the State, that they were not in a majority, nor were they able to keep up their majority, or to look after the interests of the people of the State. But, I ask, Sir, what more majority do you want in a House of 60 where 28 are on one side and 20 on the other; with three Communists in one group? If the Communists voted with the Congress that would make the numbers only 23 and 28. On the 16th April, when the Budget session was going to sit, another two by-elections were being completed and they were also to be of the United Front. Sir, the history behind this taking over is a simple one and I want to show the House—they may agree with me, they may not—what it is. From the very beginning when the Congress Party failed and found that they would not be able to form a Government and when the Democratic Front took up the formation of the government, the Congress Party tried their level best to decrease the numbers in the Democratic Front and tried that the decisions on the election disputes of the Democratic Front should be decided earlier so that they might be made a minority. By the decision of the two Kandaghat seats by the election tribunal the Democratic Front Party was just on the same level as the Congress Party and then an unfortunate impression was created that the Congress were absolutely sure of their victory and so the Democratic Front Party would not be able to carry on their Ministry. Two Members of the Congress then walked over to the other side and then there was no hope at all of the Congress taking over the Government in PEPSU for years to come. Then I am told by one of the Congressmen that about 60 to 80 signatures were taken in the House of the People and then handed over to the Prime Minister requesting him to take over the administration of PEPSU and not

allow things to remain as they were. What was the harm if Mr. Rarewala was unseated? A party of 28 could elect another leader. They were electing a leader when the Adviser went and told them that the Government of India had made a decision, that they were taking over just then and that the Proclamation had just been issued in Delhi. "So", he said, "You need not now elect a leader." Sir, as long as they were there, they had the right to take their chance as also the Congress, on the 16th of March when the House was going to meet. If they had a majority or anything of that kind, they could take their chance.

As regards those statistics, I mean the figures relating to law and order, I would like to show the Home Minister who may kindly verify these figures from his own reports, that taking the figures for February—one month—in 1952 and 1953, there has been great improvement. In February 1952, when the Congress was in power, the number of murders was 41 and in February 1953 murders numbered only 20. Dacoity in February 1952 stood at 10 and in February 1953 their number is 5. Burglary in 1952 was 137 and in 1953 only 99. Other thefts numbered 35 in February 1952 and only 12 in 1953. These show that there is a remarkable decrease in these crimes from 1952 to 1953. It is not as if crimes were actually increasing and the law and order position was in such a state that it was impossible to allow the Government to be run by these people. These figures that I have quoted are official figures and they clearly show that there has been a decrease of about 50% in crimes.

The fact that has to be remembered is only this. PEPSU was the only State where a Congress Ministry was not functioning in the whole of India. This was absolutely a sort of thorn on the side of these people. There it was a question of the urban people *versus* the rural people. The people from the rural parts had joined hands and went against the urbanites, and they formed a Ministry. It has been said that the whole thing is a communal one.

[Lt-Col J S Mann]

Let me point out that out of the 5 Ministers three were Hindu Ministers, 2 were Sikh Ministers. This shows that they were not communal in their attitude. Most of the money came from the rural areas and they said that it must be spent on the rural areas, as the urbanites had already had the advantages of better education, more hospitals, roads etc. Those in urban areas had already got these advantages and it was said that those in rural areas also should have their due share of these things. Sir, if you send out a commission to enquire into these things, you will find how many schools, how many colleges, how many roads, how many hospitals, how many of these things relating to the Five Year Plan have been started in PEPSU. An American who saw them praised them very high, and said that the Community Projects and other things of the Five Year Plan were getting on in PEPSU even better than in other parts of India. They wanted to do something for the rural people who were absolutely backward, down-trodden and uneducated. All the services were with the urban people and nothing with the people of the rural areas. That was because the people of the urban areas were much more educated. They could come to Delhi and poison the minds of the Home Minister and also poison the mind of the Prime Minister and tell them that things were not all right. The Home Minister visited PEPSU in the month of July last and saw things for himself. If there was lawlessness in PEPSU, he should have taken over the responsibility for law and order. He could have taken over this one item under his control. He could have told them, "Look here, you are not able to look after security of people." Where was the necessity for taking over the whole Administration? Why take all the rights of these people? Now it is said that the Delimitation Commission will first sit and reach conclusions and then the elections will take place. That will take at least one year. It will be at least one year before the elections are concluded. Is it right to take over the whole thing

and then postpone things in such a way that no one will be able to establish himself in power, rightly or wrongly? They had the experience of what happened before the elections, when the Congress Government was installed for six months. With that experience, they felt it was not possible to have in PEPSU what was possible in the Punjab. But now things are very different from what they were. People are much better educated, they are better aware of things. They can understand things. I would request the hon Home Minister to go round the villages and hear what the people say. They do not mind which Party is in power, let it be the Congress Party or the Socialists or the Akalis. All that they want is some real courtesy and real love and real benefits. Whichever government it be, they want some consideration to be shown to them. They want bread and butter and living wages. They do not mind whether it is this party or that party that is running the Government. They want something to live upon. Now the Centre has come forward and taken over all the powers. Let us hope that they will see that something is done for the rural people who are so much backward. I would request the Home Minister to ask the Administrator or Adviser to look to the interests of the rural people who are paying such a lot of revenue to the coffers of the Government of India.

(Time bell rings)

Thank you, Sir

THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL (SHRI C. C BISWAS): May I make a suggestion for your consideration, Sir, and for the consideration of the House? The House is meeting to-morrow and will have full day for the discussion of this matter which is now before the House. May the House, therefore, disperse now?

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is that the sense of the House?

AN HON. MEMBER. Why adjourn now?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Sir, there may be many who want to speak on this subject and they may not get a chance tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The whole of tomorrow is there.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: If only it can be assured that all the Members of

the Opposition will have a chance to speak.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think most of you will have a chance.

The House stands adjourned to 2 P.M. tomorrow.

The Council then adjourned till two of the clock on Thursday, the 26th March 1953,