

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is a statement.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Sir, this is very unfair. He gave a wrong reply on that day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. There may be some other procedure for that. Not now.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

DEMAND FOR GRANT OF STATEHOOD TO MANIPUR

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON (Kerala): Sir, I beg to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the Bandh observed by the people of Manipur on August 3, 1970, in support of their demand for grant of Statehood to Manipur.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS, AND MINISTER OF STATE, DEPARTMENTS OF ELECTRONICS AND SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH (SHRI K. C. PANT): Sir as the House is aware, we have a number of Union Territories. In considering the grant of Statehood to any of them, factors like area, population, terrain, level of economic development, financial resources and security considerations, if any, have to be carefully gone into before any conclusions can be reached. The question whether Manipur could be made into a State, has been engaging our attention. It will take some time for Government to come to a definite conclusion.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON: Sir, the Minister's reply betrays the colonial attitude of the Government of India. He says that the security aspect, financial viability, area, etc., are taken into account while granting Statehood. Now, if these considerations, especially what is called the security considerations, are taken into account, perhaps no border area in this country will be self-governing. This is a slur on the people of Manipur. I strongly protest against this slur cast on the people of Manipur. This movement for Statehood in Manipur is not a new one. As you know, Manipur already had a self-governing Assembly in 1948 before this Parliament came into existence. Therefore, in the matter of self-government, the people of Manipur were in the vanguard. But as soon as this Constitution came, the Government of India took over and they started their colonial mentality.

They just started to abridge their power and then took over the Assembly. The Manipuri people have been agitating for this off and on. It is not merely the demand of one party or two parties. Every party in Manipur has been demanding this.

May I know from the Government whether in the bandh which was conducted on the 3rd August, all the parties in Manipur, including the two wings of the Congress, the C.P.I.(M), the C.P.I., the S.S.P. and the P.S.P. had taken part and whether the bandh was an expression of the will of the Manipuri people to have their own statehood. I would also like to know whether this committee has said that if the Government of India is not going to give statehood to the people of Manipur, they would start a civil disobedience movement from August 1970. May I also know whether it is part of the Government's policy to alienate the people of the border areas and to create ill-will among them towards the rest of India and to break the solidarity and unity of this country by this stupid and stone-headed policy of the Government?

SHRI K. C. PANT: This Government and the Congress Government before at the Centre have a long record of their efforts to strengthen the unity and integrity of this country and to try to bring into the mainstream of life of this country all such pockets of population which earlier during the colonial days were kept apart. We did inherit a situation at the time of independence, but ever since then, we as a united family consisting of crores of people inhabiting all parts of the country including the parts referred to by my hon. friend, are trying to work out our destiny together and in harmony. Any statement made in this House which tends to spoil this atmosphere of harmony does not do any service to this country.

So far as the agitation goes, certainly it is an expression of a desire on the part of those who organised this bandh and they include both the Congress Parties. It is an expression of their desire to have statehood for Manipur. That is accepted and they have drawn up a programme which includes agitation in future. As I said in my main answer, we are considering the matter.

So far as the reference to the Legislative Assembly that came into existence in 1948 goes, I believe the Maharaja set up that Assembly. That was a kind of Assembly in which the Chief Minister was appointed by the Maharaja in consultation with the elected Ministers. You were accusing me of colonial attitude. But you referred to this kind of arrangement with approval.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Delhi): I want to know from the hon. Minister if the Government have laid down any basic principles or criteria to consider any demand for statehood. He has mentioned some factors in his statement, such as terrain, security, financial resources and all that. I am asking about any criteria or principles in relation to these very factors which he has mentioned. Have

[Dr. Bhai Mahavir.]

the Government considered the desirability of having an objective, expert body to determine whether those criteria are satisfied in any particular case or not? I would also like to know if the hon. Minister agrees with this that when there are no clearly laid-down criteria and when there is no announced procedure by which some body of experts can decide about these criteria, the impression, the Government gives by taking decisions in a haphazard or piecemeal manner such as giving statehood to Himachal Pradesh and at the same time denying it to Manipur is that decisions are taken on political grounds and on group considerations, sometimes even on the basis of personal likes and dislikes of the person concerned which in this case happens to be those of the Prime Minister.

I would like to know if the hon. Minister will satisfy the House that there are no such considerations because, for all I know, in Himachal Pradesh, the political image of the Chief Minister, Shri Parmar, was in a very bad shape after the NGO strike which led to the whole administration being paralysed and in order to resuscitate him politically, this Statehood has been conferred on Himachal Pradesh. I am not denying, I am not contradicting the claim of Himachal Pradesh. But, I want to know, if it was done, why is it that the case of Manipur or Delhi is being ignored. The factors that the hon. Minister has mentioned about are terrain, resources, etc. About terrain, there is no difficulty. About the financial resources, in Delhi, the Central Government gets 105 crores of rupees and spends 70 crores of rupees. There is no problem of security in Delhi unless the government wants to invent the problem of security just as the Prime Minister invented one. Unless such problems are invented, there is no reason why the unanimous resolution passed by the Delhi Metropolitan Council which included the support of all the parties' representatives there, why the claim of Delhi, is not being considered in this matter and why the people are being denied this consideration?

I would like to know, Sir, if the Central Government wants that the same position should be created in Delhi also and in Manipur also. The people should persist in 'bandhs', in 'gheraos' and in disrupting normal life. If that is the thing that is going to compel the government, then I think we are giving a very wrong direction to the people and to their sentiments.

Lastly, the government has many times said that this particular State is going to be the last. We know, when Nagaland was created, it was stated that it would be the last one. Then, Meghalaya and others have come and now Himachal Pradesh. Is there any sanctity in what the government says? I cannot see any. Why do you take decisions in a piecemeal fashion? Why don't you take

all the problems of the Union Territories, consider them on specifically laid-down, well-defined criteria, give it to a body of experts and consider the claims of Manipur as well as Delhi in this particular manner?

SHRI K. C. PANT: Sir, the first question that he raised is about a common criterion. In the course of that question, he made certain insinuations. But I was not very clear as to whether he opposed giving Statehood to Himachal Pradesh or not. If he was opposed to it, he should say so.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: For your information, I am not opposed to it.

SHRI K. C. PANT (addressing Dr. Bhai Mahavir): Yes, I heard you. Therefore, if you are opposed to it, say so and say that this has been done to create a better image for Dr. Parmar. That is the consistent position. But he says he supports it; he says it is justifiable and then he says it is done for political reasons. This is a very strange argument. This kind of an insinuation I did not expect from a respected and learned friend like Dr. Bhai Mahavir.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Sir, then I will have to give a personal explanation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. Not now.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: After he has spoken.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Sir, the question of having a common criterion is a different one. The reason is, as I stated briefly in my statement, that the Union Territories do differ very widely in area, in population, in terrain, in the level of economic development and so on, and in the field of administration, the problems faced by them are different. Even in the matter of communications, particularly in the islands, Nicobar and Andaman Islands and the other group of islands, there is a special problem in communications. Then, disparities in financial resources and their capacity to raise resources are also there. Also, there is the question of sensitive areas which are on the border, on our international border. All these factors have got to be considered and to have a common yardstick, to judge all these issues, is not easy and therefore, each case has to be gone into very carefully on its own merits.

So far as the question of Delhi is concerned, Delhi being the Capital of the country, it stands on a separate footing. And capitals of other countries also stand on different footings and therefore, this question has to be considered quite apart from the generality of questions with regard to other areas.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Sir, the hon. Minister said that he did not know whether

I was against the grant of Statehood to Himachal Pradesh or not. I have said that I am not against the grant of Statehood to Himachal Pradesh, but the way in which it has been done and the way in which the Government has been dragging on and the timing of the decision, all these things give the impression that the Government does not decide things on merits, but it decides things on political considerations and personal likes and dislikes and political future of the persons in favour of the Prime Minister. Now what I want is a common yardstick. I have said that certain guiding principles should be applied by an expert body in an objective manner. Now this is not being done. That is my charge. I would like to get a reply on that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, what has been stated is nothing new. Now Sir, all the parties, as has been pointed out, are united. In fact the people of Manipur are standing as one man in making this demand which is a very legitimate demand. Has it been brought to his notice that the Commissioners of Municipalities have resigned and there is a proposal also for M.P.s. to resign and carry on mass agitation? What exactly is coming in the way? Is it economic reason? If so, let it be stated. I should like to know which State in India is viable. None of the States which had been given Statehood after the Reorganisation of States has been, strictly speaking, viable. In fact no State in India is viable. It cannot get on on its own without abundant help from the Centre. That is why you see these Rs. 7,000 crores.

Then, Sir, we are also told that the Government would not like to tamper with the situation there because it is in a sensitive area. That argument also does not hold good for the simple reason that they have themselves accepted Nagaland; they have done a good thing and in fact they should give more rights to Nagaland. Therefore the formation of Nagaland, contrary to what was said before, has not led to the deterioration of the situation or the worsening of the situation; it is also a sensitive area. On the contrary it has led to the stability of that area. Why should then Manipur not be given full-fledged Statehood? It will lead to political stability there and the people of that area will remain contented. I should also like to know how long the Central Government—I would not use the word 'colonial' but I would use the indigenous language—would treat Manipur as a zamindari of the Union Home Ministry. When all the people make this demand, what comes in the way of it? Probably some bureaucrats and some Ministers do not like it. Is the Government prepared to face the Parliament on a motion? We are hearing about opinion poll in many places. Will you go by the opinion poll as to whether Manipur should

be given full-fledged Statehood, in this House or in the other House? Are you, Mr. Pant, ready to submit to the opinion poll in this House? Therefore, Sir, I strongly protest against this behaviour and attitude of the Government. We get things by doublets from this Government. I do not know what is its gestation period. It seems its gestation period is a very long one and the delivery period none at all in some cases.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): All the time you get false pams.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Anyhow, that you know very well, being an experienced man in that particular sphere.

I submit to your wisdom and your experience. Therefore I demand on behalf of the people of Manipur and, if I may say so, on behalf of this Parliament, as others also will do in the other House also, that Manipur should immediately be granted Statehood and the situation should be averted. It is heading towards a crisis and the Government will be responsible for whatever happens there if it does not grant Statehood. Immediately the Government should make in this very session, a categorical announcement that Manipur is entitled to have full-fledged Statehood. The brave, proud Manipuri people with their culture and civilisation should be integrated. It is contrary to the spirit of national integration. Here sits the Minister in charge of national integration, I am told. She should integrate Manipur with the rest of the country by granting Statehood. Therefore I say the Home Ministry, the Prime Minister and everybody should properly integrate himself or herself so that we may quickly get Manipur restored to full-fledged Statehood.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I do not really understand this question of linking the Statehood idea with integration. Is it suggested that the people of Delhi are not integrated because they are living in a Union Territory?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not suggesting

(Interruptions)

SHRI K. C. PANT: Therefore the two ideas should be separated.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Follow your father. You have asked the right question. 'Yes', if the people in a State are discontented and they want political rights and powers, restored to them in the context of the Indian Union, as a constituent of it, then this is a question of national integration also. Unity in diversity, there must be an orchestration of the aspiration of the people in a give and take on the one hand and the broad aspirations of the people of

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

India including those people on the other. If you have not understood this, Pantji, what can I say? Young friend, you should have understood it.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I am very glad he has clarified himself. So far as the broad question of the situation in Manipur and the sentiments of the people there, their aspirations and feelings are concerned, this Government is very sensitive to all those things. We are watching the situation very closely. We are well aware of the great contributions that Manipur has made to the culture of this country and as I mentioned earlier, we are examining this question in all its aspects. I am a little sorry that my friend referred to the Zamindari of the Home Ministry. It is the Houses of Parliament which, under a Statute, created the Union Territories.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The British House of Commons had a Cornwallis in India and Cornwallis had the Permanent Settlement and the Zamindari established.

SHRI K. C. PANT: The Union Territories Act was passed by the Houses of Parliament and it is under this that the Union Territories have been created. Some Ministry has to look after them and the Home Ministry is probably the best suited. If he has any other ideas, he may make those suggestions.

SHRI G. A. APPAN (Tamil Nadu): May I know from the Minister the number of States that existed in 1950 and the number of Union Territories which have been granted Statehood after 1950? I would not be an exception to the wishes of the Manipuri people and that of the majority of the Members here that Manipur should also be having its own Statehood in view of the fact that all the parties in Manipur have joined in the last Bandh. May I also know the area of the Union Territory which got Statehood after 1950, the population of each one of them, the resources of each and the expenditure on each one of them that got Statehood after 1950? I want these particulars about Manipur also.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Sir, I was just trying to recollect as to the existence of these States in 1950. In 1950, as far as I can recollect, there were Part C States, and it was only in 1963, I think, that the Union Territories Bill was passed, and it became an Act. And after that the Union Territories were created. In the case of Delhi, I think it was in 1966 that the Present structure of the Delhi Administration was created. Now, so far as the areas and population—these are the two he wanted to know—of the various Union Territories are concerned, in the case of Himachal Pradesh, which of course will now become a State, its area is 21,629 square miles and its population is

3,495 millions. These figures that I am giving now are those as they stood on 1-10-69. Manipur's area is 8,628 square miles and its population is 1,088 millions. Tripura's area is 4,036 square miles and its population is 1,179 millions. Pondicherry's area is 185 square miles and its population is 0.536 millions. Goa, Daman and Diu's area is 1,426 square miles and its population is 0.747 millions. Delhi's area is 573 square miles and its population is 4,090 millions. Andaman and Nicobar Islands' area is 3,215 square miles and its population is 0.090 millions. Dadra and Nagar Haveli's area is 189 square miles and its population is 0.071 millions. Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands' area is 11 square miles and its population is 0.027 millions. Chandigarh's area is 44 square miles and its population is 0.156 millions. These are the figures, I think, my hon. friend wanted.

SHRI G. A. APPAN: I asked about the gaps on Revenue Account.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Sir, the Union Territories came into existence in 1956 and none after the States' Reorganisation and none was made a State so far after 1956. But now this Himachal Pradesh is before you to attain Statehood. Then my hon. friend wanted to know. I think, about the gaps on Revenue Account.

SHRI G. A. APPAN: It is a viable unit, I think.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is all available in Government documents and he can refer to the Government documents.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS (Assam): Sir, the hon. Minister said that in the matter of granting Statehood certain factors have to be taken into consideration, for example, area, population, financial viability, security, terrain, etc. Now I would like the hon. Minister to say how Manipur, compared to Nagaland, is deficient in the matter of area. Manipur is bigger than Nagaland, and Manipur's population, by comparison, is also quite large. Financially, as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said, so many States are there in this country which are not financially viable. So far as security is concerned, if Nagaland can be granted Statehood—it was only a district of the State of Assam and there was a vigorous movement there against the country as a whole, they wanted a separate sovereign independent State of Nagaland—if such an area as Nagaland can be trusted with Statehood, I do not know on what ground the security of Manipur cannot be entrusted to the Manipuris by granting Statehood to Manipur.

SHRI DWIJENDRALAL SEN GUPTA (West Bengal): Because that one was violent.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: This is my first question. On all the factors which the hon.

Minister has pointed out, Manipur stands on very solid ground in its demand for Statehood, and there is no ground, there is no explanation and there is no excuse on which the Government can refuse the demand.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is its population?

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: It is definitely much more than that of Nagaland.

Before I come to the second question, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of this House very briefly to certain factors that are operating today in Manipur. I have been associated with Manipur through my political activities for the last twenty-five years, and I do not know if anybody is here 1 P.M. who knows about Manipur more than I do.

Now what I see today in Manipur is that economically Manipur's progress has been negative. Not a single item of industry has been developed in Manipur. There are only two things by which the Manipuri people used to live and thrive; one is rice trade and the other is handloom industry. In the matter of trade in rice it has become stuck up and the handloom industry is dwindling. There is no progress made in Manipur in the matter of industrialisation. In the matter of employment—recently I went there—their complaint is

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please ask your question.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: I have got to give the background; this is very important.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But not a long background please.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: Very briefly I am giving. This is for information of the Members.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are a number of Members who want to seek clarifications.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: In the matter of employment the Manipuris are not getting proper treatment. Particularly if you take the higher posts in that territory you will find that not a single Manipuri has got a higher post.

Thirdly, their complaint is, as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said, about the colonial attitude of the Government of India. I would put it in a different way and I would like the hon. Minister to kindly look into it. The people of Manipur feel that Manipur has become a bureaucratic paradise just as NEFA has also become a bureaucratic paradise of the Central Government officers. These bureaucrats rule Manipur as if they are imperial masters.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you please ask your question now?

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: Therefore I would like to draw the attention of this House to the fact that a new movement is growing in Manipur which is growing stronger every day and that movement is for separation of Manipur from India, for an independent Manipur. If you do not solve this problem, if you do not fulfil the political aspirations of those people, if you distrust them and say that they will not be able to run the State, my submission is that this movement for separation will grow still stronger. On the one hand the Burmese insurgents are there. . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do, you come to your question now.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: I am drawing the attention of the House to a very important thing, because the Minister did not reply to it when the question of integration came up.

On the one hand you have the insurgents of Burma and the Mizo hostiles on both sides of Manipur and the other you have the Naga hostiles operating inside Manipur. In these circumstances if the people of Manipur are denied their fundamental political right—and Statehood is a fundamental right of the people, everybody must enjoy statehood—my submission is that this movement for independent Manipur will grow and it will pose a very serious danger. It will be too late later on to repent. Therefore may I ask the hon. Home Minister whether by not conceding this demand for Statehood for Manipur they are not encouraging those forces which have already gone underground, which are getting training in Pakistan and which are developing the movement for an independent Manipur?

SHRI K. C. PANT: Sir, we trust the Manipur people to such an extent that we do not seriously regard the possibility of secession in that area ever coming up and we do not think that those elements which are inimical to this country would succeed in ever making the Manipur people take to the path of secession. This is the highest token of trust that I can show; therefore there is no question of distrust of the Manipur people. If there was any question of distrust we would not be considering these matters that we are considering today in this House. There is also no question of closing the door in this matter of Statehood because I have said this matter is under consideration. So I really think that it does not help matters if we bring in matters like distrust and sentiments of that kind into the debate which may be used by certain elements in Manipur to misguide the people.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: This comes out of your statement that on security grounds you are not granting Statehood to Manipur.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I am only appealing to my friend to realise the impact of what he says in the House. So far as the question of economic development goes I fully endorse the suggestion that economic development should be speeded up and the question of industrialisation, unemployment etc., are matters which must be dealt with expeditiously and with the maximum amount of sympathy.

Of course, their problems are, in a way, national problems. Unemployment is a national problem. Pace of industrialisation is a national problem, but within the framework of the whole nation wanting to take certain steps if something can be done to relieve the situation in Manipur, certainly that can be considered expeditiously.

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): While supporting the demand for full-fledged Statehood to Manipur, may I know from the Minister whether, in view of the fact that the demand for Statehood from the Union territories is increasing day by day and gaining momentum, creating a political situation, the Government of India is thinking of constituting a commission like the States Reorganisation Commission which will go into the details and all the points which have already been referred to in the statement and make its recommendations to the Government as to which of the Union territories may be given Statehood and which not? Secondly, I entirely agree with Dr. Bhai Mahavir when he says that the attitude of the Government is that only when an agitation takes place and there is some loss of property and the agitation takes a destructive turn the Government comes to a settlement. Otherwise, Government takes time and Government's time is never over. Therefore, may I know whether the Minister can think of establishing a commission consisting of experts who will go into all the economic, political and security aspects of the Union territories and make a recommendation to the Government as to which Union territories may be granted Statehood and which may not be granted Statehood according to their criteria?

SHRI K. C. PANT: As I have already said in reply to Dr. Mahavir, we are, for the reasons explained by me, considering individual cases on merit. So, the question of a commission of this kind does not arise at the moment. After all, we had a commission which went into this problem not so long ago. So many States were constituted and after that the remaining problems were also sorted out. Most of them have been sorted out. Certain things come up from time to time. In a large country like this

there are certain problems which need to be sorted out, but that should not be regarded as something very extraordinary or very unusual. In course of time, taking up problems as they arise and responding to the needs of the situation, we hope to bring all these matters under control and evolve a pattern which gives satisfaction to the maximum number.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): I have a simple question to ask. Will the hon. Minister be pleased to state the Central subvention being given to Manipur, to Nagaland, Himachal Pradesh and other Union territories? My figures say that in the case of Nagaland their revenue is only Rs. 1 crore, whereas the Central subvention is of the order of Rs. 28 crores. In case of Manipur whereas their revenue is more than Rs. 2 crores, the Central subvention is of the order of Rs. 18 crores. Therefore, when the question of financial viability comes up, in what way do the Government of India justify the financial viability of Nagaland and why do they not justify the financial viability of Manipur, when their subvention is less and their annual revenue is more? Will the hon. Minister be pleased to justify the position?

SHRI K. C. PANT: I do not take that position at all. It is because of the special circumstances then prevailing that Nagaland State was created. It is not on this ground alone that one can make a comparison. One has to take all circumstances into account.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: But he has said in the course of his statement that financial viability and security are the two major considerations for the determining of Statehood. In this case financial viability I uphold. About security considerations, I do not know what is the difference in security considerations between Manipur and Nagaland. Therefore, he should be very explicit in this matter. He has not answered it clearly.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I have already answered.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Since Nagaland became violent they attained Statehood, whereas Manipur, which has not so long taken to violent methods, has not got the qualification for attaining Statehood. Is that the reason? Is that the only difference? This is the reason which is suggested by my friend, Mr. D. I. Sen Gupta.

SHRI HAMID ALI SCHAMNAD (Kerala): Without taxing the patience of the people of Manipur any further, will the Government consider immediately giving Statehood to Manipur so that we can prevent any further violence or anything further happening which we may not contemplate? What is the general policy of the Government to give Statehood to the Union Territories? May I know if there is any particular reason why

Statehood is being denied to the people of Manipur when they are very eager to have their Statehood? They have expressed their feelings in different ways. Does this Government want the people of Manipur to express their feelings in unconstitutional ways? Does the Government mean that if they express their feelings in an unconstitutional way, then only we would give them Statehood? Considering the sentiments and the feelings of this House and the other House and also the people in general, will Government consider immediately that Statehood is given to them before it is too late?

SHRI K. C. PANT: I have already indicated that the matter is under consideration and so there is no question of making any immediate announcement.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: While supporting Statehood for Manipur, I would like to ask the hon. Minister how much more cost it would involve if Statehood is given to Manipur. That is number one. Number two: he said there was some difficulty about security, thereby he meant security of India. If security of India is endangered by giving Statehood to Manipur, how was it not endangered by giving it to other border States? If that is so, why should he not think of bringing some amendment to the Constitution whereby he could protect the security of India to his satisfaction? I would like an answer to these points, and if he could kindly clarify these points, probably I would be much clearer in my mind as to what type of security he means. If he means security in respect of one State, Manipur, how does it not apply to other border States of India?

SHRI K. C. PANT: I will be glad to clarify. The question of security has been emphasized by more than one hon. Member. If they would take the trouble of again considering what I said, I shall quote: In considering the grant of Statehood to any of the Union Territories factors like area, population, terrain, level of economic development, financial resources and security considerations, if any, have to be carefully gone into before any conclusions can be reached.

I did not emphasise one at the cost of the other, among the various considerations. No one can say that security considerations should be ignored. So, these are the various considerations that have to be brought out. It would be wrong to emphasise one at the cost of another. All are relevant and all have to be taken into consideration.

So far as the question of revenue receipts and so on is concerned, Manipur's revenue receipt is Rs. 2.2 crores, estimated share of Central taxes Rs. 1.61, non-Plan expenditure Rs. 12.89, gap on revenue account Rs. 9.06, gap on capital account Rs. 0.57 crores. Then he asked a general question as to the assistance from the Centre. Now, as a Union territory, naturally...

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: How much additional cost would it be if they have an Assembly? By Statehood they would have an Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: They have got an Assembly.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Enlarged Assembly. How much would be the additional cost for the Statehood?

SHRI K. C. PANT: Now, there was an Assembly there already; there was an Assembly till it was dissolved. But there is provision for an Assembly, Chief Minister and so on. That is already there. I cannot tell you the exact figure.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Banka Behary Das.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): I am here, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have called an Independent Member already.

SHRI A. D. MANI: My name is there.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have already called one Independent.

SHRI A. D. MANI: No, no, Sir. Independents are not parties. You must allow me, Sir.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa): He will claim that he is the leader of the Independents.

SHRI A. D. MANI: You allow me one question, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I had the pleasure of going to Manipur as far back as only last year and I know how acute is the feeling among the hill leaders there. I have got personal knowledge from the talks that we had with the hill leaders. May I ask the Minister whether he cannot think of other forms of government besides full Statehood as we understand in terms of the Constitution? For example, our late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, spoke about the Scottish type of autonomy. There is autonomy in the Island of Man, there is autonomy in the Channel Islands. When you have given Himachal Pradesh which is a very strategic area Statehood, how can you possibly deny it to Manipur saying that there are many other considerations? Why can't the Government have an open mind on the kind of State that we want to create in this vulnerable area. I would not like a stereotyped pattern to be applied. I want the Minister to answer whether it is not a fact that Jawaharlal Nehru always talked in terms of a Scottish form of autonomy for many of these regions in this country?

SHRI K. C. PANT: As far as I can remember, Jawaharlalji did put forward this idea of the Scottish pattern in relation to what is now the Meghalaya, and I can assure my hon. friend that the Government has an open mind on what pattern to adopt in these areas, which is proved by the fact that Meghalaya itself has a different kind of arrangement from those that exist elsewhere in the country. Meghalaya has a separate kind of arrangement. He has a very fertile mind—I know that—and if he has any constructive suggestions, I would be glad to receive them.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: It is strange that the Minister told Mr. Bipinpal Das that he has trust in the people of Manipur, but it is also equally important that the people should trust him. I do not want to remind him that when Prime Minister visited Manipur he must have seen to what extent the people trusted her and the incidents that took place were very unfortunate. So, I want to know from the Minister as to why they are considering this matter for so long so that the stage of desperation has reached in Manipur. There are no two opinions among those MPs who went there from your side and from this side; they have seen this feeling of desperation which might create a situation which my friend, Mr. Bipinpal Das, envisages.

May I know, Sir, what change would be there if we grant Statehood to Manipur because they have already an Assembly? But they have only limited power. What they want is full power as any other State enjoys. As regards finances and other things, you are already giving them these things. So what difference will it make excepting that you will trust the people more and they will have a sense of involvement in the governance of the State? This will be the net gain to the people of the State. And to that extent all of us in India will have satisfaction. It is no use considering aspects which have been considered in the case of others. When are you going to finalise this matter because you are considering it for the last two or three years just like Himachal Pradesh? There was a Resolution here. We all demanded full-fledged Statehood and you went on considering it. So I want to know how long you will consider and in what way you feel that it will be bad for the people if they are given full Statehood and are not treated just like a zamindari as my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, put it.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Sir, it is a very argumentative question. It marshals a lot of arguments in favour of Statehood for Manipur. I am not going to argue the points from a narrow point of view. I have not said that we have turned down the thing. I have said that we are considering it and we are considering it in all its aspects. I think as a

responsible Government it is expected of us that while taking such decisions we should take all aspects into account; otherwise my hon'ble friend will charge us of irresponsibility. Therefore, if there is any delay in considering these matters in detail and with all seriousness in giving all aspects due consideration I do not think he should grudge it.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI (Rajasthan): Even if the delay is deliberate?

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Gujarat): There are certain tests, financial viability and others, mentioned by the Home Minister for granting full-fledged Statehood to the Union territories. But it seems that there is one more test which I call the 'grand test'. Dr. Parmar, the Chief Minister of Himachal Pradesh, has successfully gone through this grand test of supporting the Prime Minister. Delhi does not support the Prime Minister. Am I to understand that if a Union territory wants full-fledged Statehood it has to go through this grand test of supporting the Prime Minister?

SHRI K. C. PANT: Sir, as a matter of fact, as somebody mentioned earlier, the Congress Party is supporting the movement there. The Manipur Legislative Assembly consisted of 29 elected and 3 nominated Members before it was dissolved. One of the elected seats was vacant. The party-wise break-up was as follows in a House of 32:

Independent	1
People's Party	4
C.P.I.	1
S.S.P.	4
Congress	22
				<hr/> 32 <hr/>

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA: I mentioned Delhi. Delhi does not support the Prime Minister. You should say something about it because financial viability and other tests mentioned in the Home Ministry's report are fulfilled by Delhi if it is the only test.

SHRI K. C. PANT: The theory you advance, you say, applies everywhere but it does not apply to this case.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (विहार) : मैं एक ही सवाल करूंगा लेकिन सवाल करने से पहले मैं माननीय मंत्री जी को यह बतला देना चाहता हूं कि इस सदन में जो हमारे मणिपुर के सदस्य श्री कृष्ण मोहन सिंह जी हैं वे वहां पर कांग्रेस के बिल्डर हैं तथा सब से पुराने नेता

वहां के हैं। वे वहां की स्थिति के बारे में बहुत अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं और उनके सिवाय कम लोगों को वहां की स्थिति के बारे में मालूम है। मैं भी 1943 से लेकर अब तक वहां जाते रहता हूं। जब वहां पर आजाद हिन्द फौज की लड़ाई हुई थी तो हमने सबसे पहले मणिपुर को आजाद करवाया था और नागालैण्ड के कोहिमा आदि को बाद में करवाया। वहां की स्थिति को मैं बहुत अच्छी तरह से जानता हूं। यह बात सही है कि यह मणिपुर स्टेट के रूप में पहले था जब कि महाराजा ने भारत यूनिन में मणिपुर को विलय करवाया। लेकिन मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि मणिपुर की अपनी भाषा है और जब वहां पर इस संबंध में मणिपुर एसेम्बली में स्टेटहुड के सम्बन्ध में प्रस्ताव आया तो चाहे वे नागा लोग हों, चाहे कृषी लोग हों, चाहे पैत हों या चाहे मैत लोग हों, सब के एम० एल० ए० ने एक स्वर में असेम्बली में प्रस्ताव पास किया था कि इसको एक स्टेट का दर्जा दे दिया जाना चाहिये।

और जब उन्होंने ने देखा कि नागालैण्ड जो उनका पड़ोस है, उनका छोटा भाई है, जिसकी उनसे आधी पापुलेशन है, आधा एरिया है वह स्टेट हो गया। हम स्टेट नहीं हुए तो उन्होंने यह समझा कि नागालैण्ड वालों ने शायद कुछ कार्यवाही की इसलिए उन्हें स्टेटहुड मिल गया। अभी तक जितनी पौलिटिकल पार्टियां हैं सब शांतिमय तरीके से स्टेटहुड के लिए मांग कर रही हैं, जद्दोजहद कर रही हैं, संघर्ष कर रही हैं लेकिन वह धैर्य टूट सकता है। मैं आपको बताऊं हमारी यूथ कांग्रेस के वर्कर लोग पीकिंग में बैठे हुए हैं, चटगांव में बैठे हुए हैं, दो-दो हजार चले गए, उनकी रिक्वायर्समेंटरी कौंसिल बन गई, उनकी गवर्नमेंट बन गई, वहां वा. हालत निहायत ही खराब हो रही है। सरकार देरी करेगी तो जितने लीडर हैं कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के, दोनों कांग्रेस के, एस० एस० पी० के० में समझता हूं, सबकी

लीडरी खत्म हो जायगी, जनता बिल्कुल उनके साथ नहीं रहेगी, इस तरह की भावना वहां बन गई है।

देश की सुरक्षा का सवाल उठाया गया। देश की सुरक्षा के नाम पर मैं माननीय होम मिनिस्टर साहब से कहना चाहूंगा—सीक्योरिटी ही एक रीजन हो सकता है क्योंकि वह चारों तरफ से घिरा हुआ है—कि मनीपुरी लोग इतने बहादुर हैं कि उन्होंने बर्मियों को भी पीटा, चाइनीज को भी भगा दिया, उनसे लड़ाई मोल लेने में हमको घाटा होगा। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में केवल एक अनुरोध करना चाहूंगा कि देरी नहीं होनी चाहिए, महात्मा गांधी का जन्म दिवस दो अक्टूबर आ रहा है, बड़ा शुभ दिवस है, तब तक आप जल्दी से जल्दी इसका फैसला कर लीजिए, नहीं तो वहां के लीडरों के पैर के नीचे से जमीन निकल जायगी।

और ज्यादा मैं नहीं कहना चाहता हूं धमकी भी नहीं देना चाहता हूं। वहां के लोगों में यूनिटी है, चाहे वे शेयूडल्ड ट्राइब हो या मैत हो। असेम्बली में जब एक स्वर से रिजोल्यूशन हुआ है तब आपके सामने दिक्कत नहीं होनी चाहिए, जल्दी से जल्दी फैसला लेना चाहिए। एक ही रिक्वेस्ट मैं आपसे कर रहा हूं कि गांधी जी के जन्म दिवस के पहले ही इस काम को कर डालिए।

श्री के० सी० पन्त : जिस भावना से माननीय सदस्य ने अपने विचार व्यक्त किए उसका मैं आदर करता हूं और उसको मैं समझता हूं। उन विचारों को हम मद्देनजर रखेंगे जब हम इस प्रश्न पर विचार करेंगे।

श्री बालकृष्ण गन्त (बिहार) : उप-सभापति महोदय, डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया मनीपुर में आज से बीस बरस पहले जेल गए थे। यह मनीपुर का मामला कोई नया नहीं है। यह हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने अपनी गलत नीति की वजह से बिगाड़ दिया है और वह

(श्री बालकृष्ण गुप्त)

और बिगड़ता जा रहा है। मनीपुरी लोग स्वशासन चाहते हैं और वह उनको बिना किसी शिक्षक के दे देना चाहिए और उनको स्टेटहुड फॉर्म मिल जाना चाहिए, नहीं तो जिस तरह मिजो वाले और नागा वाले पीकिंग चले गए, ईस्ट पाकिस्तान चले गए, उसी तरह वहाँ की हालत होने वाली है। मनीपुर में जो हमारी पार्टी एस० एस० पी० मौजूद है वह भी स्टेटहुड मांगती है और इसलिए मैं गृह मंत्री-साहब से बार-बार निवेदन करूंगा कि इसमें ज्यादा विलम्ब न करे, नहीं तो स्थिति बहुत बिगड़ जायगी और फिरदेरकरने में वह अहसान भी नहीं मिलेगा जो आज मिल सकता है।

श्री उपसभापति : सवाल तो इसमें है ही नहीं ? Now, Papers to be laid on the Table.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

PREFACE TO FOURTH FIVE YEAR PLAN

THE MINISTER OF STATE (SHRIMATI NANDINI SATPATHY): Sir, on behalf of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of a document (in English and Hindi) entitled "Preface to Fourth Five Year Plan." [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3878/70.]

THE PAYMENT OF WAGES (PROCEDURE) AMENDMENT RULES, 1970

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION (SHRI BISHWA NATH ROY): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (6) of section 26 of the Payment of Wages Act, 1936, a copy of the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) Notification S.O. No. 2410-PWA/Procedure/Rule/Am, dated the 6th July, 1970 (in English and Hindi), publishing the Payment of Wages (Procedure) Amendment Rules, 1970. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3853/70.]

I. ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS (1966-67) OF THE INDIAN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, NEW DELHI AND RELATED PAPERS

II. THE WEST BENGAL LAND REFORMS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1970

SHRIMATI NANDINI SATPATHY: Sir, on behalf of Shri Annasaheb Shinde, I beg

to lay on the Table--

(a) A copy each of the following papers (in English and Hindi):—

(i) Annual Report and Accounts of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi, for the year 1966-67, together with the Audit Report thereon. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3858/70.]

(ii) A statement showing the reasons of the delay in laying the above Report on the Table. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3859/70.]

(b) A copy of the West Bengal Land Reforms (Amendment) Act, 1970 (President's Act No. 16 of 1970), under sub-section (3) of section 3 of the West Bengal State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Act, 1970. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3946/70.]

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER THE ESSENTIAL COMMODITIES ACT, 1955

SHRIMATI NANDINI SATPATHY: Sir, on behalf of Shri Annasaheb Shinde, I also beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications (in English and Hindi) of the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Department of Food) under sub-section (6) of section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955:—

(i) Notification G.S.R. No. 987, dated the 26th May, 1970. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3856/70.]

(ii) Notification G.S.R. No. 934/Ess. Com./Sugar, dated the 9th June, 1970, publishing the Sugar (Price Determination) Fourth Amendment Order, 1970. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3855/70.]

(iii) Notification G.S.R. No. 956/Ess. Com./Sugar, dated the 18th June, 1970, publishing the Sugar (Price Determination) Fifth Amendment Order, 1970.

(iv) Notification G.S.R. No. 967/Ess. Com./Sugar, dated the 25th June, 1970, publishing the Sugar (Price Determination) Sixth Amendment Order, 1970.

(v) Notification G.S.R. No. 970/Ess. Com./Gur, dated the 26th June, 1970, publishing the Gur (Regulation of Use) (Second Amendment) Order, 1970.

(vi) Notification G.S.R. No. 1000, dated the 1st July, 1970, publishing the Roller Mills Wheat Products (Ex-mill) Price Control (Amendment) Order, 1970.