

SHRI MANORANJAN BHAKTA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, briefly I want to know from the hon. Minister whether it is a fact that the State Government are going to release these TNV activists who were under detention, on the eve of elections for the furtherance of the prospects of the Communists Party Markists. (*Interruptions*).

Part (b) of my question is, whether it is a fact that after the Mizoram Accord, the Defence forces have been withdrawn in some parts of Tripura and these areas are worst affected by the TNV activists. If so, will the Government contemplate to provide Defence forces in such areas ?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : Sir, answer to part (a) of the question is, according to statement given to me by the Government of Tripura, 10 listed TNV were arrested in the year 1987, between 17-1-1987 and 21-6-1987. All the 10 have since been enlarged on bail. I have brought this to the notice of the Chief Minister and requested him to examine the issue in all its implications. If the security forces, at grave risk to their lives, arrested the listed TNV, the Government must find every way possible to keep the arrested persons in judicial custody, I requested the Chief Minister to invoke those laws under which it will be possible to keep the listed TNV in judicial custody. Unfortunately, these laws are not being invoked today. They are being arrested under normal laws. (*Interruptions*).

That is why, even when 10 listed TNV have been arrested at great risk, by the security forces in 1987, they have all been enlarged on bail. I have discussed this list with the Chief Minister and I must say, he has realised the gravity of the situation. He has promised to look into it and to see whether some other laws can be invoked. I hope he will invoke other laws and I have given him the list of the laws.

On the second part of the question, the hon. Member is referring to is Jampui Hill area, which is a disturbed area. But it was declared in a different context when the MNF agitation was at its peak. It is not correct to say that no security forces are deployed in that area. But after discussion with the Government of Tripura,

we have agreed that some more forces would be deployed in that area by re-deploying some other forces. I am sure, this will be attended to,

Statehood to Delhi

***64. SHRI MOHANBHAI PATEL :** Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state :

(a) whether Government are considering a proposal to grant Statehood to Delhi ;

(b) since when this proposal is under consideration ; and

(c) by when the decision is likely to be taken ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI) : (a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c) Do not arise.

SHRI MOHANBHAI PATEL : Sir, I have asked the question :

“(a) whether Government are considering a proposal to grant statehood to Delhi ;”

The answer is negative. I want to know, whether there is no such proposal or there is a proposal but the Government is not going to consider it. In the past, there was an idea to give a separate State to Delhi, Why this idea has been dropped or rejected, on what grounds, I would like to know-

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : In regard to part (a) I have said, “No, Sir”. But as Mr. Mohanbhai Patel is very much interested, I have to say that this question of Statehood to Delhi has been considered for long years, But every time it was considered, the conclusion drawn was that in view of the special position of Delhi as the National capital having a large number of foreign legations Embassies. etc., to have a separate Statehood along with the national centre of administration, it was not found conducive

to the planned growth and efficient administration of the national capital Delhi. Every time, this was the conclusion arrived at.

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAMSWAROOP RAM : Mr. Speaker, Sir, in view of the regional imbalance, from the point of view of administration, rising population, whether the big States of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar...

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER : No relevance.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK : I am not pleading for the case of Statehood for Delhi. But, my point is that Delhi is having a Metropolitan Council. Those Union Territories which have no Assemblies have Councils next to Assemblies or in lieu of Assemblies. For instance, in Chandigarh we do not have anything. In Andaman, we have got a Provincial Council. In Lakshadweep, we do not have anything. In Delhi, we have got a Metropolitan Council. In Dadra and Nagar Haveli, we do not have anything. My question is whether in lieu of Assemblies in the Union Territories, you are going to have a uniform standard of Provincial Councils for all Union Territories which do not have Assemblies.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : Provincial Councils are different. We have Municipal Corporation of Delhi. It has been given more autonomous powers and it is more broad-based. We have also Metropolitan Council having 56 elected Members and 5 nominated Members. This Body is permitted to discuss and make recommendations in respect of legislative proposals for development and other important matters. They are given more autonomous powers.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN : The hon. Minister has very conveniently said 'No' in response to part (a) of the Question. I would like to know what is to be done regarding the difficulties which the Delhites are finding in the matter of transport, medical facilities, housing, water supply etc. Unless they have their own self-governing and self-regulating set up

and unless, of course, the hon. Minister is going to assure the House that these problems will be solved in a short time, it will not be possible to solve these problems.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (S. BUTA SINGH) : The hon. Member has raised a very vital issue so far as Delhi Administration and the functioning of Delhi Administration is concerned. It is true that there are various statutory bodies, independent authorities, Municipal Corporation, NDMC, DTC and DDA. All these Bodies are trying their best to serve the citizens of Delhi but there is lack of cohesion. There is multiplicity of authority also. I am sure the House will agree with me that there is a need to bring more coordination and more cohesion among the various authorities functioning in Delhi so that the Capital is served better and the people also. For that matter, the Government is seriously considering having either a Commission or a high-powered Committee to go into all these aspects to bring some kind of a cohesive administrative set up with properly defined authority so that the Delhi people could be served better. For that, the Government is willing to come to this conclusion that we will have a high-powered Committee or Commission to go into all these aspects.

RAO BIRENDRA SINGH : Sir, the hon. Minister has stated that Delhi's case to be formed into a State cannot be considered because it is the national Capital. I would like to know whether it is not a fact that Delhi was a State administered by the Union with an Assembly in the 1950s, while Delhi was still the national Capital. What difficulties arose on account of that, that the Assembly in Delhi was abolished. And, whether it is not a fact that the population of Delhi is larger than many of the Union Territories which have been recently created as full-fledged States? Then, what are the reasons for depriving the rural people of Delhi, particularly from taking part in a democratic set up with an Assembly of their own and a Government of their own? Also, whether it is not possible to keep the national Capital confined to the limits of New Delhi and merge the rural areas of

Delhi under the Corporation with Haryana so that Haryana also can be enlarged.

(Interruptions)

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : Sir, it is good that the hon. Member has brought the question of Haryana again. But Delhi has been carved out of some of the neighbouring States also. Therefore, I must bring to your kind notice that this question was gone into, in detail, by the States Reorganisation Commission and they devoted special attention to the needs of Delhi and as it is a national Capital. I must read out the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission :

“The Commission came to the conclusion that the national Capital must remain under the effective control of the national Government. They recommended that since the population of Delhi was largely urban, its problems fall within the domain of the Municipal Government and that Municipal Autonomy for Delhi in the form of a Corporation would appear to be the most appropriate method of meeting and reconciling the broader requirements of the national Government as well as the total needs and wishes of the people of Delhi”...

We have just gone according to the recommendation of the S.R.C. Also, again this question came up in the year 1978. *(Interruptions)*. The question of granting Statehood to Delhi was again re-examined in 1978. The then Prime Minister recorded the following remarks :

“I am convinced that it is not possible to concede to the Delhi Administration the Status of a State. Short of that, this is the best that we can do for this.”...

It was very thoroughly examined at that time.

(Interruptions)

RAO BIRENDRA SINGH : Washington D.C. is also a Capital !

[Translation]

SHRI JAI PRAKASH AGARWAL : Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is very strange that

whenever elections are held in Delhi, every party promises in its manifesto that if it is voted to power, it would get Statehood for Delhi. During 1977 elections it was publicly announced by the Prime Minister that Delhi would be granted statehood. During 1983 elections also the Congress Party made the same promise, but this has not been fulfilled so far. The situation in Delhi at present is that there is no co-ordination between the activities of the Delhi Municipal Corporation and the N.D.M.C.; and the D.D.A. is directly under the Ministry of Urban Development. Even the house tax, water and electricity rates are not uniform. The development of Delhi is not being carried out in a planned manner. Until Delhi gets an Assembly its planned development is not possible. When Union Territories like Nagaland, Goa and Arunachal Pradesh can be granted statehood, then there seems to be no basis for not doing the same for Delhi. If a certain decision has been taken in this regard, then that decision can be reconsidered. Delhi should be granted statehood so that its planned development can take place.

S. BUTA SINGH : Mr. Speaker, Sir, Assembly or statehood for Delhi are two different things. In the present set-up of Delhi, there are multiple authorities and now it is being deliberated as to how to reorganise and restructure it. Whether the alternative should be an assembly or not will be decided by a high-powered committee which has to be appointed for this purpose. At that time the M.Ps. will get an opportunity to express their opinions. Khan Sahib will also be present. The Assembly will be formed only after discussing the issue with everybody,

[English]

Pak Prime Minister's Statement Regarding Pak National's Bid to Export Nuclear Making Material From U.S.A.

*65. **SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY :** Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state :

(a) whether Government have taken note of the reported statement of Prime Minister of Pakistan that India is involved