

MR. SPEAKER : You said, it was a point of order. It is not at all a point of order. Don't misuse the right to raise a point of order. You can make a submission.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : You have not heard me. Just now, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs said that the Half-an-Hour Discussion is not directly on the Report but it is only incidental to it. He said that the Government is examining the Report. But the wording of the Half-an-Hour Discussion is :

"...for fair scrutiny of Pay Commission's Report."

Is it incidental to the Report? Is it not directly on the Report itself? They do not permit us to have a discussion on it because it is under examination. But here is the Half-an-Hour Discussion on the "scrutiny of Pay Commission's Report". Is there any difference between "examination" and "scrutiny"? Is not what the minister says contradictory and self-defeating?

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola) : What is the point of order?

MR. SPEAKER : I have not been able to follow.

12 24 hrs

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE:  
 PROCLAMATION IN RELATION TO  
 THE STATE OF MANIPUR  
 AND

MANIPUR STATE LEGISLATURE  
 (DELEGATION OF POWERS) BILL—

*Contd.*

MR. SPEAKER : We now take up further discussion on the Statutory Resolution and the Manipur State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill.

SHRI MOHANRAJ KALINGARAYAR (pollachi) : MR. SPEAKER, Sir, the approval of this House is being sought through this Resolution for the proclamation of the President's Rule in Manipur.

I rise to express my views on the Resolution. If the Central Government takes effective and energetic steps to improve the tourist potential of Manipur, I believe that Manipur, a beautiful place, would become a second Kashmir. This is not only going to attract thousands of tourists but it

is also going to earn us a large amount of foreign exchange.

Manipur is strategically located—in the extreme corner of the eastern part of our country. And unless the Central Government makes the people of Manipur happy and contented, the people there will not have faith in the Government, and being a border State, we need the support of the people there to safeguard and defend our borders.

I would like to know the real situation obtaining in Manipur. The Manipurians are the pawns in the political game of chess in the hands of the ruling Congress party. Instead of performing the duties of a referee, the Central Government has been partisan towards the ruling Congress party. The interests of the ruling party are always kept in the forefront. The Governor, Mr. B. K. Nehru, recommended suspension of Manipur Assembly. But this recommendation was not accepted by the President. As the Orissa Assembly was dissolved a couple of days before, they never wanted the Manipur Assembly also to be dissolved. The Government was a bit scared that the public opinion would go against them; the Central Government was scared of the scathing criticism that might come from all sides of public opinion if they were to suspend the Manipur Assembly while they had dissolved the Orissa Assembly. The Home Minister has already stated in this House that the Government did so against the advice of the Manipur Governor, to put an end to all kinds of political horse trading. I would like the Minister to tell this House whether the Governor was not aware of this while recommending suspension of the Assembly. If he were to perpetuate political horse-trading by recommending suspension, he would have to be removed from the Governorship without delay. Was the Governor of Manipur ignorant of the political precedents which took place in other States like Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, West Bengal, Rajasthan, Punjab, Madhya Pradesh and Mysore? Either he should have been ignorant of these revolting political defections or he should have been influenced by the Centre when he recommended the suspension. On both the counts his action deserves severe condemnation.

[SHRI MOHANRAJ KALINGARAYAR]

I, therefore, demand his resignation on this ground that, by recommending suspension, he wanted to serve the interests of the ruling Congress Party. The Centre also can not take shelter under the plea that they did accept the Governor's recommendation in the interests of ending defections. If the Centre was so particular about defections, why has it not brought forward the Anti-Defection Bill to this august House ?

The Centre is also aware of the various recommendations made by the Committee of Governors under more or less similar circumstances. But we see the Governors act according to their own sweet will and wish and there has been no uniformity in all these cases the underlying objective has been to serve the interests of the ruling party by encouraging directly or indirectly defections from one Party to another. That is why the Central Government are not keen to bring forward this anti-defection Bill. Even after three years of getting the report of the Committee on Defections, the Government has not taken steps to bring this anti-defection Bill.

**श्री मधु लिमये (बाका) :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे इस बात पर खेद है कि मणिपुर में राष्ट्रपति शासन के लागू किये जाने पर जो बहस हो रही है, उस में बहुत कम रुचि और दिलचस्पी लोग ले रहे हैं। अध्यक्ष महोदय, मणिपुर को एक अलग राज्य का दर्जा मिले, उस राज्य की जनता को लोकतन्त्र ने पूरे अधिकार मिलें, इस के लिये चौथी लोक सभा में हम लोग मुस्तैदी के साथ लड़ते रहे, लेकिन खेद की बात है कि लोकतन्त्र को यह सरकार वहां चलने नहीं दे रही है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, लोकतन्त्र के लिये जिस तरह स्वतन्त्र और निष्पक्ष चुनाव, भाषण और संगठन की स्वतन्त्रता की जरूरत होती है, उसी तरह राज्यों के जो स्वायत्त अधिकार हैं, उन के बारे में भी सरकार को इस ढंग से अपना व्यवहार करना चाहिये कि यह स्वायत्तता बनी रहे, खत्म न हो जाय। लेकिन मैं देख रहा हूँ—क्या राज्यों की स्वायत्तता, क्या स्थानीय संस्थाओं की स्वायत्तता, क्या विश्व

(Delegation of Powers) Bill

विद्यालयों की स्वायत्तता—एक एक को सरकार समाप्त करती चली जा रही है। शायद आप को पता नहीं होगा—हिन्दुस्तान में इस वक्त 40 के आपरास महानगरपालिकायें हैं, इन में से 11 महानगरपालिकायें इस वक्त मौअतिल हैं। इस देश में इस वक्त तीन राज्यों में राष्ट्रपति शासन चल रहा है—उड़ीसा, आन्ध्र प्रदेश और मणिपुर में। अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ—मणिपुर के मामले में राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने से कार्यवाही की है, सूप्रोमोटो कार्यवाही की है या गवर्नर की रपट पर उन की कार्यवाही आधारित है, क्योंकि संविधान की 356 धारा में दो तरह का प्रावधान है—राष्ट्रपति अपने से भी कार्यवाही कर सकते हैं और राष्ट्रपति गवर्नर की रिपोर्ट के आधार पर भी कार्यवाही कर सकते हैं।

गवर्नर की रपट को मैंने बड़े गौर से पढ़ा। घुमा-फिरा कर सारा मामला क्या है—गवर्नर साहब कहते हैं कि कुल 18 सदस्यों ने दल परिवर्तन किया है और सदन की कुल सदस्य संख्या 60 है, तो दल परिवर्तन को दण्डित करने के लिये, दल परिवर्तन करने वाले लोगों का सजा देने के लिये गवर्नर ने आप को यह सलाह दी कि राष्ट्रपति शासन को जारी किया जाये और विधान सभा को उन्होंने बरखास्त करने के लिये नहीं कहा, उन्होंने कहा कि उस को निलम्बित कर दीजिये। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या हमारे संविधान में, क्या इस भारत के किसी भी कानून में दल-परिवर्तन कोई अपराध है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह दल परिवर्तन का मामला 1948 से इस मुल्क के समने है। जब हम समाजवादी कांग्रेस से निकले, तब हमारे कई लोग विधान सभाओं के सदस्य थे और हमारे दल में उस समय बहस चली कि हम लोगों को विधान सभा की सदस्यता से इस्तीफा देना चाहिये या नहीं। कुछ लोगों ने यह तर्क दिया—चूँकि कांग्रेस एक राष्ट्रीय संयुक्त मोर्चा है, जिस में आप लोग भी

हिस्सेदार थे, इस लिये यह मोर्चा अब आज़ादी के बाद टूट रहा है, आप को इस्तीफ़ा देने की कोई ज़रूरत नहीं है। लेकिन हमारे दल के नेता—आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव और दूसरे नेताओं ने एक सही मिसाल, एक आदर्श मुल्क के सामने पेश किया, उन्होंने विधान सभा की सदस्यता से त्यागपत्र दिया। लेकिन क्या इस का सरकारी दल पर कोई असर हुआ, क्या सरकारी दल ने इस तरह का कोई नियम बनाया कि जो भी विधान सभा या संसद् का सदस्य है, जिस टिकट पर वह जीता है, उस दर से जब त्यागपत्र देता है और सत्ता कांग्रेस में जाता है तो उस को विधान सभा या राज्य सभा या लोक सभा या विधान परिषद् जहां का भी सदस्य हो, उस को इस्तीफ़ा देना चाहिये—आप ने ऐसा नहीं किया।

एक अर्थ से दल परिवर्तन का मामला चौथी लोक सभा के सामने भी था। जब कांग्रेस से लोग टूट कर विरोधी दल में आने लगे तो दल परिवर्तन के बारे में इस सरकार को चिन्ता होने लगी। इस गवर्नर की रिपोर्ट में दल परिवर्तन को दण्डित करने का प्रयास किया गया है। मैं सरकार से कहूंगा—जब तक आप कोई ठोस कानून नहीं बनाते, कोई परिपाटी नहीं बनाते, तब तक दल परिवर्तन को लेकर विधान सभा के अधिकारों को छीनने का आप को कोई अधिकार नहीं है। इस के बारे में कोई वस्तुनिष्ठ दृष्टिकोण होना चाहिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, कुछ ही दिन पहले आपने अखबारों में पढ़ा होगा चन्दोली या वाराणसी—मुझे ठीक याद नहीं है, क्योंकि चन्दोली भी वाराणसी में है—दिनेश सिंह जी यहां मौजूद हैं, जरा ध्यान से सुनें, राज नारायण गुट के कुछ कार्यकर्ता इन्दिरा कांग्रेस में चले गये, उन में श्री प्रभू नारायण सिंह जी भी थे जो विधान परिषद् के सदस्य हैं.....

श्री एम० रामगोपाल रेड्डी (निजामाबाद):  
नैशनल कांग्रेस कहिये।

श्री मधु लिमये : राष्ट्रीय कांग्रेस कहिये, सत्ता कांग्रेस कहिये, इन्दिरा कांग्रेस कहिये—मतलब एक ही है। प्रभू नारायण सिंह जिस दल के टिकट पर विधान परिषद् के लिये चुने गये, विधान परिषद् से इस्तीफ़ा करवाये बिना आप उन को अपनी पार्टी में लेने जा रहे हैं और उस समारोह में प्रधान मंत्री जी भी उन का स्वागत करने के लिये गई थीं और इस रिपोर्ट के अनुसार आप दल बदलुओं पर एक किस्म की पाबन्दी कहिये, दण्ड कहिये, देने जा रहे हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि आन्ध्र प्रदेश की विधान सभा को निलम्बित क्यों रखा गया, बरखास्त क्यों नहीं किया गया। उड़ीसा में गवर्नर ने कहा था कि इन को बरखास्त करो, आप ने उस को मान लिया, लेकिन मणिपुर के मैं बारे गवर्नर ने कहा था कि इन को निलम्बित रखें, बरखास्त न करो, आपने नहीं माना क्या आप की कोई नीति है, कोई सिद्धान्त है।

दल परिवर्तन का जहां तक सवाल है, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं—अगर आप लोगों में हिम्मत है तो एक स्पष्ट कानून इस सदन के सामने लाइये। उस पर बहस हो। उस कानून को पास करने के बाद जो दण्ड देना हो दीजिये, लेकिन दल परिवर्तन के अकेले मुद्दे पर आप किसी भी विधान सभा को निलम्बित नहीं कर सकते, बरखास्त नहीं कर सकते। मैं यह आज कहना चाहता हूं कि इसमें कुछ लोग कहेंगे कि विधान सभा बरखास्त करने से, जो कांग्रेस पार्टी या कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी है उनकी जो मांग थी उस मांग के विपरीत हमने काम किया लेकिन मेरा वह सवाल नहीं है, मेरा सवाल है कि राष्ट्रपति शासन के बारे में कोई सिद्धान्त होना चाहिए और उन सिद्धान्तों के ऊपर आपको हर राज्य में चलना चाहिए। ऐसा नहीं कि सत्ता कांग्रेस की अपनी राजनीति के लिए कभी मनमाने ढंग से 356 धारा का इस्तेमाल करें।

उसी तरह से संसदीय लोकतन्त्र में कई परिपाटी आई। मुख्य मंत्रियों को बरखास्त करने का अधिकार गवर्नर को है ऐसा हमेशा कहते

## [ श्री मधु लिमये ]

चले भाये हैं, उत्तर प्रदेश में आपने एक मुख्य मंत्री को बर्खास्त किया, पश्चिम बंगाल में एक मुख्य मंत्री को बर्खास्त किया लेकिन मेरे जैसा आदमी कहता है आप परिपाटियों पर नहीं जाते हैं, परिपाटी यह है कि मुख्य मंत्री की जो सरकार है उसको शक्ति परीक्षा का मौका सदन में मिलना चाहिए, राज भवन में इसका निश्चय नहीं होना चाहिए, यह संसदीय परिपाटी है जिस पर अध्यक्षों की सभा में मोहर लगाई गई है लेकिन राज्यों के मामले में इस परिपाटी को आप तोड़ेंगे और जब मेरे जैसा आदमी कहता है फिर केन्द्र में यह परिपाटी क्यों चले, राष्ट्रपति, प्रधान मंत्री को भी बर्खास्त कर सकते हैं अगर संविधान की शब्दावली को लेंगे तो आप हल्ला करेंगे। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ यह परिपाटियों, नियमों और कानूनों का मामला आपने उलझा दिया है, यदि आप इस संघ राज्य को चलाना चाहते हैं और केन्द्र की जो वायस है, तुष्णा है जो दूसरों के अधिकारों को निगलती चली आ रही है उस पर रोक लगानी पड़ेगी।

जहां तक राज्यों का मामला है वे अपने दायरे में स्वतन्त्र रहें। स्थानीय निकायों में जो महानगर पालिकाएँ, जिला परिषदें और ग्राम पंचायतें हैं उनकी स्वायत्तता को खतम मत करो। उनमें आपने 11-11 महानगर पालिकाओं को निलम्बित कर रखा है। ग्वालियर की महानगर पालिका को कहा गया कि कांग्रेस का मेयर बनायेंगे तो बर्खास्त नहीं करेंगे।

इसलिए मनीपुर का जो मामला है, मेरी इच्छा है कि मनीपुर हमारा सीमान्त राज्य है, मनीपुर की जनता की एक राष्ट्रीय और लोकतंत्रीय परम्परा है उनको आप लोकतन्त्रीय अधिकारों का उपभोक्त लेने दीजिए। हो सकता है वहां लोग कुछ गलती करेंगे लेकिन क्या केन्द्र में आप गलतियां नहीं करते? आप केन्द्र में बड़े पैमाने पर गलतियां करते हैं वे तो छोटे दायरे में गलतियां करते हैं। इसलिए मनीपुर की जनता के साथ इस तरह का आप व्यवहार न कीजिए और वहां पर जल्दी से

जल्दी लोकतन्त्र की प्रस्थापना हो सके, उनको अपने बुनियादी अधिकार मिल सकें, इस तरह की व्यवस्था कीजिए। और राष्ट्रपति प्रशासन के बारे में आप कोई सिद्धांत बनाइये और उसका विवरण सभा घर के सामने रखिए जिस पर यह सभा बहस कर सके।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE  
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI  
K. C. PANT): Sir, I have  
been listening to the debate which is a  
spill-over from the last day and  
I found that today's speeches are, perhaps,  
wider off the mark than on the last day.  
I heard both Shri Mohan Raj and  
Shri Limaye very carefully and I found  
that there were certain misapprehensions  
in their mind which would not have arisen  
if they had carefully read the Governor's  
report and tried to understand the rationale  
of our action.

Sir, Shri Madhu Limye, for instance, referred to the fact the ordinarily the majority of the ruling party should be determined on the floor of the Assembly whenever this question of alternative government arises. Actually, if he had carefully seen the facts of the situation in Manipur, he would have realised that a no confidence motion against the Ministry was being discussed in the Assembly for several days and in fact, when the discussion was about to start, I think it was on the 15th, the Speaker adjourned the Assembly saying that there was a law and order situation outside and, therefore, the Assembly session could not be held. Later on, the Governor prevailed upon the Chief Minister to convene the Assembly once again and thereafter, on the 22nd I think the Assembly, met once again, and then the no-confidence motion was discussed. But apart from the discussion, the facts became obvious when 32 members sat on one side of the House, and they were in the Opposition and 26 sat on the other side. I am speaking from memory, but I think that these were the figures, namely 32 and 26. So it became obvious on the floor of the House, inside the assembly, that the governing party or group or coalition had lost its majority, and, therefore, the Chief Minister



himself submitted the resignation of his Ministry and that led to the situation which the Governor has discussed in his report. Therefore, in this particular case, in the case of Manipur, his reference to a matter being decided on the floor of the Assembly is not quite relevant.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप मेरे मुद्दे को समझे नहीं। वैकल्पिक सरकार को भी शक्ति परीक्षा करने का मौका सदन में देना चाहिए। लेकिन वह तो आपने राज भवन में किया है।

SHRI K. C. PANT : If he had followed the Manipur episode, he would know, and I have no doubt that he knows, that the question of the formation of an alternative government would have arisen if the Central Government had accepted the advice of the Governor to suspend the Assembly. But once the Central Government decided to dissolve the Assembly, naturally, this question did not arise.

श्री मधु लिमये : क्यों किया ?

श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र पन्त : क्यों किया वह तो बाद में होगा। आप तो लाजिकली बोलते हैं। आज ऐसा बोल गए इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ।

श्री मधु लिमये : एक तर्कसंगत नीति रखिए। एक आन्ध्र के लिए, एक मनीपुर के लिए और एक उड़ीसा के लिए, ऐसा न कीजिए।

SHRI K. C. PANT : The example which he has slected I am saying, does not fit with his broader analysis or theory.

He referred to the fact the the Governor had recommended suspension, and then he goes on to attribute motives, if you like or to go into the reasons in the Governor's mind for recommending suspension of the Assembly. He says that it was just to punish the defectors that he did so. I would submit that if had carefully read the Governor's report, he would have realised that the Governor had recommended this for reasons which he has stated very clearly. He has not said that

he is going to punish the defectors, but he has pointed out that if out of 32, 18 persons had defected and redefected to one side or the other, that majority was not likely to be very stable. This is what he has pointed out, but even after that, he has not come to a decision that the Assembly should be dissolved. He has recommended suspension, although in the last sentence, he has said that it may be that the situation may ultimately force the Assembly to be dissolved. This is the way he has put his case.

Then he has talked about the budgetary deadline and the reasons for the immediate imposition of President's rule on that account. I think it is a well argued report, and the facts are very clear in the circumstances, and I do not think that the Governor can be blamed for having put forward this point of view. Therefore, I did not understand my hon. friend Shri Mohanraj Kalingarayar asking for the Governor's resignation on this account that he had recommended suspension of the Assembly. I would bring it to his notice that the President of the Manipur people's party, which was the major party in the coalition which formed the Government in Manipur had himself recommended suspension of the Assembly; the Chief Minister had recommended dissolution of Assembly, but the president of the party in his latter to the Governor had recommended suspension of the Assembly. That was his judgment of the situation. So there is no question of the interests of the ruling party being served in that matter.

He even took into account, at any rate, the advice rendered by the President of the ruling party or the majority party in the ruling group and recommended suspension. I do not see how Shri Mohan Raj can take objection to this and why he should read motives into this action on the part of the Governor. I think that was very unwarranted.

The fact of the matter, if one looks at the history of this Ministry in Manipur, is that in the course of one year it had gradually been losing support. My hon. friend from the CPI(M) who spoke, Shri Biren Dutta, as well as my hon. friend from the Jan Sangh, both tried to make out cas that

[Shri K. C. Pant  
the Congress Party somehow wanted to form its own Government and, therefore brought about the downfall of the other Government. Nothing can be farther from the truth.

I would briefly like to refer to certain facts. On 20th March 1972, the Ministry headed by Shri Alimuddin was formed. It consisted of the United Legislature Party which comprised the Manipur People's Party, the Socialist Party, the United Naga Integration Committee, Congress(O) and some independents. Skipping over the detailed account of what happened. I will only refer to the fact that on 4 August 1972, within five months of the formation of the Government, the United Naga Integration Committee merged itself in the Congress. Then on 10 October, some Manipur People's Party members announced the formation of a lobby inside the United Legislature Party entitled the United Progressive Parliamentary Group. On 16 November, Shri Raj Mohan Lakshman Singh and Shri O. Tomba Singh members of the Manipur People's party forming the UPPG, resigned from that party. So the effective strength of the ruling group became 31 out of 60. In March 1973, two Ministers of the ULP coalition resigned and with them several other MLAs resigned. They formed what is known as the Progressive Independent Group and they went over to the Opposition. This led to the resignation of the Ministry on 26 March. 1973.

I am mentioning this only to show that it was a progressive weakening of the Government and its strength in the Assembly over the months that brought about this situation. I can say with all sense of responsibility—and there are two members from Manipur here who, in fact, may not have liked the Central Government's attitude in the matter—that during those twelve months or so in which this Government was in power, the Central Government was more anxious to keep them in power than it is normally with regard even to Congress Governments in other States. We have not only co-operated with this Government which was an Opposition Government, but we have been advising our own partymen all along not to create situations in which this Government falls. The reason is that

because this was the first Government formed in Manipur, we wanted the democratically elected Government to have its full chance in the State. It is in spite of our efforts to keep this Government going that it ultimately fell because it could not keep its members together. And it is thereafter that we were forced into this situation where President's rule became necessary. To suggest that we were at any stage encouraging this process would be a travesty of facts and would be utterly out of line with the actual efforts we were making from here.

Then, thereafter, the simple point is, if the Congress had again to form a Government there, what was there to prevent us—the Central Government who are today being charged with having an interest in forming a Congress Government in Manipur—from accepting the Governor's advice for suspension of the Assembly? After all, if the Assembly had been suspended, the likelihood was that the Congress would have been able to form a government along with some other parties and groups. So, by not suspending the Assembly we prevented the Congress from forming a government in Manipur; how can anybody in the face of these facts charge the Central Government with having protected the interests of the congress party there? . . .  
(Interruption)

SHRI BIREN DUTTA (Tripura West) :  
The Congress was weak in number.

SHRI K. C. PANT : The Congress was the largest party in Manipur after the last elections. Not the majority but the largest party. Please do not be under the illusion that the Congress is very weak. So, if we had wanted, the simplest thing would have been to accept the Governor's advice and gone ahead, but we felt that it would be only proper for the people of Manipur to have another chance to elect a government and in the light of the facts which have been explained by the Governor, we felt that the proper thing to do was to dissolve the Assembly even if it meant that the Congress could not come to power in Manipur at this stage. Therefore, I think there is absolutely no one who will accept this charge of an interested action on the part of the Central Government in this matter.

Then the question of early election was raised. We are interested in early election in Manipur, but as I have explained in respect of Orissa also in the House, after the census operations have been completed, the law requires that the delimitation of constituencies should be done and this process will have to be gone through before the elections take place in Manipur, and this will inevitably take some time.

Shri Biren Dutta asked me what would be the link between the NEC and the administration during President's rule. Actually, the link is obvious. In all such cases, the administration, namely, the Governor's administration there takes over the function of the State Government and would have the same relationship with the NEC as in other States. In this particular case, the Governor is also the Chairman of the NEC. He would also be in charge of the administration of Manipur directly, and there will be a very close link and liaison....

**SHRI BIREN DUTTA:** You have formed an Advisory Council. Would any member of the Advisory Council, also be associated during this period with the North-Eastern Zonal Council?

**SHRI K. C. PANT:** No; certainly not. One redeeming feature of the debate from the point of view of the contribution of the CPM Member was that I found that he is very concerned about democracy in India and that I hope, is a change from the past and a change for the better.

My hon. friends Shri Tombi Singh and Shri Paokai Haokip, both have made very useful speeches and many suggestions, and I have made a note of these suggestions and I will try to profit by them. In particular they both referred to the charges that have been levelled against the erstwhile ministry in Manipur, and they asked for a probe to be carried out. Sir, when I visited Manipur recently, a memorandum of charges was given to me and in all such matters the allegations have to be examined, whether there is a *prima facie* case, whether the allegations are correct, etc. Preliminary enquiries in respect of these are to be made by the Governor and we are referring the matter to him. Further action will be considered on receipt of his report.

13 hrs.

Shri Tombi Singh took objection to certain remarks by Shri Dutt and said that there should be no patronising attitude towards the North-east and there should be no feeling of we and they, that they are receiving money or we are giving them money. I entirely agree with him; I am sure that the whole House will agree with him. There is no question of having a patronising attitude towards the North-east. We have to see to it that we develop all the backward regions in the country, and we take care of their special problems. For instance in this case the problem of communications and other special problems, we have to take care of them as part of the national policy and the country has to help the North-east to the maximum extent possible to make for lost time, because time has been lost in the North-east; of that I am personally aware.

Shri Tombi Singh referred to the various acts of commissions on the part of the previous Government and certain cases of corruption and so on. He wanted the public life of Manipur and the politics of Manipur to be clean. I am completely at one with him and it will be our endeavour during President's rule to give a clean Government to Manipur.

He referred to the drought situation. Unfortunately both last year and this year there has been a shortage of rainfall in Manipur and the result has been that the crops have suffered: during the last year rains failed in almost all parts of the State. Hence the khariff crops suffered by fifty percent and the State Government took steps to launch rabi crop and double the area under paddy, but unfortunately this year during January-March rains failed once again. I am aware also of the fact that even drinking water is scarce in certain areas and this has to be tackled on an emergency basis. He made the point that the money given by the Government of India for minor irrigation had not been fully utilised. I shall have to look into this point.

About the general question of development of the region, particularly Manipur, Shri Tombi Singh made many useful suggestion and Shri Haokip also made so me

Shri K. C. Pant

suggestions. All I can say is that President's rule has been brought in at a time when the Fifth Plan is under preparation and when the Northeastern Council will also start functioning. So it will be our endeavour during President's rule to promote the long-term interests of Manipur and other areas by helping in the drawing up of projects, in the allocation of funds, in the preparation of the Fifth Plan for the region which will at least to some extent meet the requirements and needs of this area.

He referred to deer of a very rare variety which required protection in the context of tourism. I would submit—tourism or no tourism—that this is a matter which should be looked into and the deer should be given protection. I think that he has taken up the matter with the concerned ministry.

My hon. friend from the Jan Sangh made a very amazing statement. He said that the fine arts, music and cultural heritage of Manipur is not given any importance at all. Somehow he blames the Centre for this. I do not know how his mind is working in this matter. But, the fact of the matter is that Manipur has a tradition of fine arts, of songs and dances and it has a rich cultural heritage, of which we are all proud and the whole country has been supporting in its own way the growth of this culture, the growth of all the elements of culture, fine arts and dances and so on. Today, Manipuri dance is almost a household word in the whole country and the girls all over the country to-day are taught Manipuri dancing. And so, there is no question of the Centre or any part of the country not being proud of the cultural heritage of Manipur. We are proud of it and it will be our continued endeavour, here I speak not only for the Central Government but for all parts of the country also, to see that the culture of Manipur grows to its full height because, in that lies the beauty and the splendour of Indian culture as well. When all parts grow, then only the composite whole grows to its full height. Shri Jharkande Rai referred to the fact that feudal exploitation still continues in Manipur. I will only mention here that the Manipur Land Revenue and Land Reforms Amendment

Bill, 1973 is one of the legislative measure which we propose to enact as President's Act during President's Rule.

Manipur is a sensitive border area and we have to see that it is strengthened so that it can discharge its responsibility as a border State and, at the same time, we have to be aware of the problems of Manipur. In this context, you know that in some areas in the hills and in the plains, in the past, there have been youngmen who have often spoken of secession. We have taken note of this fact; the House should take note of this fact. It is fortunate that in the last so many months, there has been no perceptible activity in the plains and the activity of these elements in the hills has also been much less than in the past. But, this task still remains for us and we have to see to it that in Manipur there is full integration between the hills and the plains and also between the rest of the country and Manipur, there is the kind of relationship which does exist for almost everyone except this small group. We should try to win over this small group also. I would submit that here is a task which is still left for us. I do not think that it is a big task. I do not want the House to get the impression that there are many such people. But, there are a few youngmen which we should accept and it should be our endeavour to win them over all to the right path.

Some hon. Members referred to the Defection Bill. My hon. friend, Shri Madhu Limaye referred to Chandausi where our Prime Minister had gone and where Shri Prabhu Narain Singh and so on has joined the Congress.

I do not know why he should be sore about it. They have parted company from him in any case.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह सबाल नहीं है। आप चाहे कितने लोगों को ले लीजिए, लेकिन उन से विधान परिषद् से इस्तीफा दिलवाइए।

SHRI K. C. PANT : He has not lost anybody to us. He had lost these people earlier. So, I do not think he should feel sore on that account.

So far as the Defections Bill is concerned, he said that we should have the courage to bring forward that bill. I am very glad

to say that Defections Bill is now ready and, as I have said on an earlier occasion, I have every hope that we shall be able to introduce the Bill in this session. We have been trying very hard to get the Bill finalised and we may have to crave your indulgence to allow us to do so without the requisite period. I hope the House would also agree with me that in regard to this measure there would be justification for waiving the notice period so that we can introduce this Bill in this session and the House will have an opportunity, the members will have an opportunity, to study this Bill during the inter-session period, till we meet again.

I think I have dealt with all the points. I thank you for giving me this opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER. The House had agreed for the discussion of both the Resolution and Bill together for which two hours were allotted. Those two hours are over. I will first put the Resolution to the vote and then the Bill without any further discussion. The question is :

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 28th March, 1973, under article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Manipur."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill to confer on the President the power of the Legislature of the State of Manipur to make laws, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. SPEAKER : We will take up clause, consideration. The question is :

"That clauses 2 and 3 stand part of the Bill"

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.*

*Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

SHRI K. C. PANT : I beg to move :

"That the Bill be passed"

MR. SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That the Bill be passed"

श्री मधु लिसये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं जब बोल रहा था, तो मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि

राज्यपाल की रपट में दल-परिवर्तन को दंडित करने की कोई बात नहीं है। मैं उन का ध्यान गवर्नर की रपट के पृष्ठ 7 की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

"It is true that in a Legislature in which 18 members have changed sides, including the 13 mentioned above, within a period of one year, there is no certainty that any Government would be stable and there is the temptation to try to clear the air by the ordering of fresh elections."

उन्होंने एक स्थायी सरकार न बनने का कारण दल-परिवर्तन ही बताया है। उन्होंने जो टेम्पटेशन की बात कही है, उस की शिकार तो केन्द्रीय सरकार ही है।

गवर्नर लोग दल-परिवर्तन के बारे में लगातार अपनी राय देते चले जा रहे हैं। उड़ीसा के गवर्नर की रपट के पृष्ठ 7 से एक वाक्य मैं मदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ :

"It will thus be clear that political defections by members of the Legislative Assembly in the State from time to time either for consideration of office or for personal gains has become common and has affected the political life of the State adversely. This tendency is harmful to the functioning of democracy... ."

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब तो वह बिल आ रहा है।

श्री मधु लिसये : मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब गवर्नरों द्वारा लगातार इस बारे में टिप्पणियाँ की जा रही हैं, तो सरकार कोई कानून बनाये, संविधान में परिवर्तन करे। वह गवर्नर को दल-परिवर्तन करने का अधिकार क्यों देती है?

मंत्री महोदय ने उन मौजवानों के बारे में कहा है, जो मणिपुर को भारत से अलग करना चाहते हैं। जब मैं सुप्रीम कोर्ट में अपने मामले में जाता था, तो उन लड़कों से मेरी भी बात हुई। आप की मार्फत श्री पन्त से मेरी बिनती



[श्री मधु लिमये]

है कि वह उदार बन कर उन नौजवानों को छोड़ दें और उन को मौका दें कि वे अपनी नीतियों और अपने रवैये पर दोबारा सोचें। मैं नक्सलवादियों के बारे में भी यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय उदार बन कर उन को छोड़ दें। अगर वह उन को जल्दी छोड़ना नहीं चाहते हैं, तो कम से कम मुझे उन लोगों से मिलने की इजाजत दे दें।

**SHRI N. TOMBI SINGH (Inner Manipur):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the Report of the Governor, it was mentioned very prominently that the people of Manipur were already tired of President's Rule. In this case, remembering what happened during the one-year rule of ULP Ministry, the people, in spite of their tiredness of President's Rule, had some consolation that there was a change. What would have been better was to enable the party which had a commanding majority then to form a Ministry. But the Governor in his peculiar and very unique way, taking all the arguments of the people's party and then of the Chief Minister, spoke with two voices in his own report.

In the Report, he gave a very discouraging picture and the conclusion was to console the Congress group to some extent; but he also encouraged the other group by taking all the arguments from them; and then to consolidate the Congress group, he recommended a mild action. The Government of India had realised that the report was self-contradictory to some extent. I do not want to say much about what had happened.

As I have said, we are already tired of President's Rule. It should not be a repetition of the old picture. What I mean to say is that bureaucracy should behave. It is not very difficult to create division in Manipur, the valley against the hill and the hill against the valley, one party against the other and so on. We have seen during the last 25 years that officers have a very easy role to play by dividing the people in this way. During President's rule the Home Ministry should take care to see that no officer, particularly those who are high-ranking officers, Secretaries and Advisers, who supply brain to the Government, plays the role which

the Britishers had played. It is in the interest of the nation that the people of Manipur, particularly, the relationship between the hill people and the valley people should be kept up. They should not take the opportunity of playing this role, perpetuating their stay there setting one against the other. This has been our bitter experience. It is our request that the Home Ministry should take care of this particular aspect.

One more point and I am done. The ULP Ministry, forgetting the major aspects of the people's faith, spent the funds allotted by the Government so generously in some subjects for their own welfare, in the promotion of their tasks and in the maintenance of so many of their personal luxuries I have got a report that the students of Manipur are now agitating on the subject of low income scholarship. This is a very important subject concerning almost all the students, particularly of the low income group. There is no industry and the people are poor. Almost every family excepting a few falls in this group. If this issue comes, the Home Ministry, and particularly those who are concerned with education of the state, should not take this casually; they should not take merely a casual view of this but should take a permanent view and provide funds in all the budgets sufficiently for the grant of low income scholarship. I hope, particularly this year, the Home Ministry will rush and save the situation by providing necessary funds by moving Finance and other Ministries concerned, so that the students who are now agitating may be satisfied. At least, on this aspect of low income scholarship, there should be a solid policy, a permanent policy; no casual decision should be taken on this.

**SHRI K. C. PANT :** Mr. Madhu Limaye had referred to the Governor's report. May I also refer to the same report, page 4, para 10?

"As it had become increasingly apparent as time went on that the Government would be defeated, I have been attempting to assess whether, if I called upon the leader of the 'Progressive Democratic Alliance (PDA) Shri Daiho of the Congress party, he would be able to give to Manipur a stable and

viable Government or whether it would be necessary for you to take over the Government of Manipur, etc."

Then, later on, on page 5, under (b), he says:

"Of the 31 members of the P.D.A. no less than 13 have changed their party loyalty since they were elected. Some of them more than once."

Then, under (c), he says:

"While it is possible that to a P.D.A. Government is established, it will gather more support for the usual reasons in such circumstances, it is also possible that it will lose some members who are now supporting it when they find that their hope of office are not fulfilled."

Therefore, it is this situation that confronted the Governor, and being anxious to provide a stable Government, he naturally made this recommendation. This explains his hesitation in the matter.

About the young men, I am not very clear whether any of them is in prison now. I shall find out. But my impression is that they are not. As I said earlier, our approach is one of sympathy and of trying to win them over to the path of sanity, to a path which will enable them to give out their best for the construction of not only Manipur but the whole country.

I agree with Shri Tombi Singh that no attempt should be made to divide the hill people from the valley people. It is fortunate that Manipur has been an integrated entity for a very long time. Therefore, unlike some of the other areas on the north-east, there is integration between the hill people and the valley people to a large extent. Of course, we have to provide certain safeguards to the Hill People. That is only because of the agreement of the valley people to these safeguards and therefore, these safeguards have emerged as a result of a dialogue carried on between the Centre, hill people and the valley people and I am very glad that the leaders of the valley people themselves have suggested that certain safeguards are necessary. I certainly accept his advice and if there is any instance in which an officer carries on activities which

\*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

tend to exploit this idea of dividing the valley people and the hill people or intention to divide them anyway, if he brings to our notice any such instance, we shall certainly take action in the matter.

Finally, with regard to scholarships to the low income group students, this matter is a matter which has to be discussed with the Education and Finance Ministries. I am not in possession of all the facts just now but I can assure my hon. friend, Mr Tombi Singh he knows my interest in Manipur—that I shall certainly do my level best to help him in the matter and together, we shall move the Ministries concerned.

MR SPEAKER The question is :

The motion was adopted  
"That the Bill be passed."  
 13.26 Hrs.

#### COAL MINES (NATIONALISATION) BILL

MR SPEAKER : Now, we take up the next Bill - Coal Mines (Nationalisation) Bill. Time not allotted.

I think two hours should be sufficient.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): No, Sir. At least four hours are required.

MR. SPEAKER : We are at the fag end of the session. All right, you can have three hours, (Interruptions). Any way I can make marginal adjustments.

13.27 HRS. MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR.

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI S. MOHAN KUMAR-MANGALAM) : I beg to move\* :

"That the Bill to provide for the acquisition and transfer of the right, title and interest of the owners in respect of the coal mines specified in the Schedule with a view to re-organising and reconstructing such coal mines so as to ensure the rational, co-ordinated and scientific development and utilisation of coal resources consistent with the growing requirements of the country, in order that the ownership and control of such resources are vested in the State and thereby so distributed as best to subserve the common good, and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, be taken into consideration."