

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: When shall we get an opportunity to discuss this matter, so that we can also press our viewpoint that the Andhra State should be formed earlier, on the 1st July?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: The report is being placed on the Table. I am sure the House would like to discuss both the report and the decision. An opportunity may be given as soon as possible to discuss both these matters.

—

**RESOLUTION ON PRESIDENT'S
PROCLAMATION RE. PEPSU—
continued**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Discussion on the Resolution to continue.

SHRI KARTAR SINGH: Sir, the hon. Member, Mr. Sundarayya, has spoken on a number of subjects. I say that the instances which he has cited and about which he spoke were brought to the notice of the hon. Home Minister not by Congressmen but by the representatives who had come in a deputation and waited upon the Home Minister. Further, going through these instances, there can be no doubt that the proper course was the suspension of the Constitution in the State. There is one point which has been raised by the leader of the Communist Group and which I want to answer. He says that the Akalis, the Biswedars and the Congress, all these three groups, joined hands and put their heads together against the Communists. I take exception to this. My case, on the other hand, is that so far as PEPSU is concerned, the Communists, the Akalis and the Biswedars joined together against the Congress, with the result that there could be no agrarian reforms in that State. The United Front Party's Ministry was actively supported by our Communist friends, for certain reasons. They knew that the Ministry was weak, and that the people were changing their allegiance every night. According to our Communist friends, the weaker the Government in a State, the more advantageous it is for them.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: That is why the United Front had the advantage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member should not interrupt. He was not interrupted during his speech.

SHRI KARTAR SINGH: They took maximum advantage of the unstable Government during the last ten months.

The people of PEPSU have welcomed this decision to suspend the Constitution. The only grievance of the people of PEPSU is that this was overdue and that it should have been done much earlier, and that if it had been done much earlier, so many cases of dacoities and other lawless activities would not have occurred.

If we refer to the Constitution, there are many grounds on which the Constitution can be suspended in a State. One of the reasons is that the Government of a State cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution. Another reason is that the Ministry that is formed is unstable and does not command a clear majority and the majority changes every other day. In such cases, certainly President's rule is justified. Even if there is a stable Ministry, if we find that that Ministry is guilty of gross misgovernment, gross maladministration, however stable the Ministry may be, there is a case for President's rule. And so far as this part of the case goes, there was so much maladministration that I could not make out a better case than has been made out by my hon. friend. So, my submission is that on the facts given, as well as on general grounds, this action should have been taken much earlier.

PEPSU has got its own special problems. Of all the Part A and Part B States, this is the smallest State. PEPSU has got a special importance also, which is not only the concern of the people of that State but of the whole country; and that is because of the political and strategic position of

[Shri Kartar Singh.]

the State. From the point of view of the defence of the country—this being the border State—the welfare of the people of the frontier regions is the primary concern not only of the Government of the State but of the Union of India.

So, Sir, when we find that in a small State, which has a population of only 3½ million, a State which is so very backward in education and in communications, there are all these instances which have been narrated in this House, of corrupt administration, of inefficient administration, etc., then it becomes the direct responsibility of the Central Government to intervene and see that a proper administration is set up so that the people of the State may get justice.

Another point which I wish to bring to the notice of the House is that the State Assembly there sat for only 18 days and the allowance of a member is Rs. 300 per month, which means that a member gets Rs. 3,600 for sitting for only 18 days. They were thus getting on the average Rs. 200 per sitting from the State which is so poor in its finances. Hon. Members of this House would well envy this position: they, living here in Delhi, are getting Rs. 40 per day, while those people in Patiala, where things are so cheap, are getting not less than Rs. 200 per day. The reason why they did not sit for more than 18 days has been given by the hon. Home Minister. It was because they feared lest the Ministry might be defeated. That is one aspect.

The other aspect is that in the United Front Ministry there were as many as 11 Biswedars. If those 11 Biswedars came out of that party, then the party would at once break down. And if agrarian reforms had been introduced in the Assembly whereby the people of the State had been benefited, then on the very first day the 11 Biswedars would have cut themselves off from that party, and the result would have been that that party would no longer have existed.

Biswedars and vested interests were the backbone of the party. That party shouted for agrarian reforms. But that was all for the sake of propaganda. As a matter of fact, they did not want to introduce any agrarian reforms. Now my submission is that the President would be well advised to introduce these agrarian reforms in his regime there so that people may know that ultimately they would get agrarian reforms. I would bring this fact to the notice of the hon. Home Minister and would request him to introduce at an early date the agrarian reforms in the President's regime. That would rather be a proof positive of our *bona fides* for the Presidential rule. It is no doubt very difficult for anybody to do anything in a few months' time. There is maladministration prevailing and if during this time there is an eradication of corruption in public services and if elections are held in a fair atmosphere, people would get a Government of their choice.

In the case of the Ministry, my submission is that the President could do nothing else than what he has done. There were six Ministers. Out of the six Ministers three were Sikhs who including the Chief Minister were all unseated. Two of the three Ministers were not only unseated, but they carried with them the disqualification for six years that they could not contest any elections. They were disqualified for having used corrupt practices and in this connection the judgments of the Election Tribunal may be gone into with advantage. So we find that out of six Ministers as many as four or five have been unseated and two of them carry these remarks about their disqualification. I therefore think that there was every justification for the President's rule in PEPSU. Sir, I fully support the Resolution that has been moved by my hon. friend the Home Minister.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Sir, the burden of my argument is mostly going to be confined to the terms of my amendment, but I should also like

to say a few things about the main Resolution

I thought, Sir, that a good lawyer as the hon Home Minister is, he could have, if he had wanted, made a better case even of a bad case which he seems to have in so far as this Resolution is concerned. I had the pleasure of listening to him in the debate which went on in the House of the People on the 12th. I had also the occasion to go through the entire published debate and I tried to find out from him today if he could better his argument for that case. But all that he was able to tell us was the coming in and going out of Ministers and what may be called the proselytisation of Congressmen or other men who were taken in as Ministers. But beyond that he was not able to tell us—unless he has got information which he does not want to give us—that there is a state of affairs in the State of PEPSU which calls for such a drastic action as he has taken already through the President.

Now, apart from these crossings of the floor in the Legislature, he touched somewhat on the law and order situation and some other matters. But it appeared to me that he seemed to have made a very big case of a very small matter because, as he knows, it is not only inside the PEPSU Legislature that such things have happened, but it has been happening all over the country. I am sure he will agree with me—unless he wants to make a big case for himself and his party—that in his own party there have been and there still are Members who have crossed the floor either to his own party or away from his party for the sake of positions. In fact, in any Legislature in India today and particularly in the States of Madras or Orissa or any other, you see this drama being enacted everyday. But that is not, in my opinion, a very big thing.

If the hon Home Minister thinks and if he is convinced that the law and order situation is such, the administrative machinery is such that some drastic measure will have to be taken to set things right, especially in

a frontier State, then I would say that although it is an extreme step, it could be condoned in the interest of security and well-being of the whole country and the State itself. But it appears to me, Sir, that he seems to be, for his own reasons, screening some things and some personalities and not giving us the true picture as it exists in the State of PEPSU. Apart from the crossing over, what is the law and order situation? Who are responsible for it? I do not believe, Sir, that even if the Communist Party has set up 70 or 80 panchayats, as he says, and if they are trying to attempt another Telangana in the State of PEPSU, that is a situation which calls for an extremely drastic action which he wants to take and I do not believe also—there is some reference made to the state of the administrative machinery—that a step like this could be justified on that ground alone. If we look at the history of PEPSU, if we look at the history of the personalities who have been in the political and administrative picture of PEPSU and who continue to be so, we will find that there is something more rotten than what the hon Home Minister wants to make out and what he thinks is the reason for the President to take over powers of the Government of PEPSU.

MR CHAIRMAN It is now 3-30 and the Deputy Finance Minister will present the Budget

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

BUDGET OF PEPSU GOVT FOR 1953-54

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR FINANCE (SHRI M C SHAH) Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a Statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Government of Patiala and East Punjab States Union for the year 1953-54 [Placed in Library See No IV O 1(79).]

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS OF PEPSU GOVT 1952-53

I also beg to lay on the Table a Statement showing Supplementary Demands for Grants for expenditure of the Government of Patiala and