

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish that there should be no more questions on this but if you insist, I will allow.

HON. MEMBERS: No, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next question.

STATEHOOD FOR HIMACHAL PRADESH, DELHI,
MANIPUR AND TRIPURA

*62. SHRI A.D. MANI:†

SHRI CHITTA BASU:

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA
REDDY:

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS:

SHRI NIRANJAN VARMA:

Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether all the Members of Parliament from the Union Territories have adopted a resolution requesting the Union Government to confer the status of full statehood on Himachal Pradesh, Delhi, Manipur, Tripura without any further delay;

(b) if so, what is the reaction of Government to this demand; and

(c) what are the criteria for granting statehood to Union Territories?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA): (a) Government have seen a press report to this effect,

(a) and (c). A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT

So far as Himachal Pradesh is concerned, its financial position is being studied. The matter was discussed with the Chief Minister of Himachal Pradesh in November 1969, but further discussion will be necessary before reaching any conclusions.

Demand for statehood for Manipur and Tripura can be considered when the financial resources of these Union territories are sufficiently developed to meet their administrative expenditure. At present these Union territories are depending on Central assist-

ance to a large extent even to meet their non-plan revenue expenditure.

Delhi was made a Union territory at the time of reorganisation of States in 1956 and kept as a Centrally administered area because of its special position as the Capital of the country. In September 1969 the 11-Member Committee of the Metropolitan Council nominated by the Chairman of this Council gave a report recommending that with a view to provide a uniform and powerful set up there should be a Legislative Assembly for Delhi as a whole having full financial and legislative powers in respect of all subjects including law and order like any other State in India.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I have seen the statement which has been laid on the Table of the House. It is extremely unsatisfactory because it does not answer part (b) of the question. It only says that these areas are not financially viable. May I ask whether the Government would at least set a time-limit for these areas to attain statehood as was done by the U.N. in the case of the Trust Territories where a ten-year time-limit was fixed? Is the Government going to fix such a time-limit for the attainment of statehood by these Territories?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: For such questions a time-limit cannot be fixed. We can only fix criteria. If those criteria are fulfilled by the various Territories, only then the question of granting statehood would arise. As far as Himachal Pradesh is concerned, the House knows that there was a debate here and the Government's point of view was put forward that if the Union Territory attains financial viability, we shall immediately take steps to grant Statehood to that Territory. On this assurance the Chief Minister of Himachal Pradesh was called and we had detailed discussions with him with the paper prepared by the Planning Commission as the background material and the Government's consideration of this particular matter is going on very actively. As far as the other Territories are concerned...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What about Manipur?

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri A. D. Mani,

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: As far as the other Territories are concerned like Manipur and Tripura, the question is that their non-plan gap is very wide. In the case of Manipur it is about Rs. 41 crores.

SHRI A. D. MANI: For every Territory it is like that.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: For Tripura it is Rs. 50 crores in the Fourth Plan.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is the budgetary gap?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: Will you allow me to continue?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let the Minister answer.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: As far as this matter is concerned, we are going mainly by the financial viability because the funds of the Union Government are involved to a very large extent. We have examined this question very thoroughly and I have also stated the general policy of the Government that we do not wish to keep any Union Territory as a Union Territory provided it can look after its own finance and meet its expenses, non-plan as well as plan expenditure and we are willing to consider this question actively, sympathetically and immediately provided those criteria are fulfilled. Therefore as far as the Government is concerned, there is no hesitation in the Government's mind. We have laid down certain criteria and as soon as they are fulfilled, we shall take immediate action.

SHRI A. D. MANI: May I know whether Nagaland is financially viable? May I know whether the Metropolitan Council of Delhi has not recommended that Delhi should be made a State? When little Haryana can have statehood, why should the Government refuse to give statehood to Old Delhi and the Delhi area?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: Delhi is very different because it happens to be the capital of the nation. Obviously it cannot be put on par with other Union Territories. Haryana, as a State, is viable financially. There is no difficulty about viability. Nagaland was never a Union Territory. There is no question of com-

paring Nagaland with the Union Territories. It is wrong to compare it with a Union Territory.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Again I want to emphasise the particular point raised by Mr. Mani. When Nagaland was created and when Meghalaya was created they were not as financially viable as the Government would require them. The question of creating a separate State was based more on political consideration in the case of Nagaland and Meghalaya. In the case of Manipur particularly, may I say that considerations other than financial viability should be taken into consideration in the matter of granting statehood. In the case of Manipur, today a very massive movement has been launched, spearheaded by all the political parties. Am I to understand that unless sufficient political pressures are created by the people of that State, the Government is not going to concede that demand? Will the Government consider it wise to concede the demand of the people of Manipur because if the situation goes out of control in the Manipur area which is a sensitive region, it is not in the interests of the country's integrity and security. Therefore may I know whether the Government would also change the criteria with regard to granting of statehood to Manipur. It should not be limited to the consideration of financial viability but the other political consideration should also be taken into consideration.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: I would request Members not to make comparisons which are not applicable. I have said about Nagaland that it was not a Union Territory. Meghalaya was not a Union Territory nor is it a State. It has not been created as a State. It is autonomous within the State of Assam. As far as Manipur is concerned, there is no question of political pressures. For instance about Himachal Pradesh there was no political pressure but when we found that it had a case, we agreed to examine it particularly after they had the financial viability.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Manipur Chief Minister came here. Was it a cultural troupe?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: The territory of Himachal Pradesh got certain additional territories from Punjab after the reorganisation, and

the Himachal Pradesh Government also made very good efforts to mobilise their internal resources and got more and more revenue, and when it came to the point where that case can be examined, we have started examining it, and if we find that it is feasible to do so we shall grant them Statehood. We will also examine the case of Manipur sympathetically and we will also go to the extent that is possible for us to go to see if we can grant Manipur Statehood, because it is our basic policy to grant Statehood to them as soon as they fulfil the criteria that we have laid down. We are for the Statehood of any territory provided it can be done within the criteria that we have laid down.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: Sir, from the Minister's reply it seems that he is applying different standards for converting Union territories into States. In the case of Delhi he says that it is most important because the capital of India is located here in Delhi. And even during the debate about Himachal Pradesh the Minister himself countered the argument that there is financial viability about that territory. So, in any application of standards, not only the standard that should be applied to Union territories should be taken into consideration but also the standard that has been applied in the reorganisation of States because, when the reorganisation of States came, financial viability was one of the considerations, not the sole consideration. So in this context may I point out to the Minister for consideration that the aspirations of Manipur people and Tripura people should be respected as early as possible, because it is a very strategic area and the situation demands an early solution?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: Sir, we have applied the criteria that were laid down by the States Reorganisation Commission in 1956, and according to those criteria also we have fixed the other criteria which I mentioned. I concede that Manipur as well as Tripura have a case but, since they are not able to come up to the important criterion of financial viability, we have not been able to consider their case. *(Interruptions)* It is not a political question at all. It is a question of their being able to run the Government within their own resources, and if they can present a reasonable case, then we are prepared to examine it

but, as far as our examination goes up to date, there is no such case.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : क्या श्रीमान यह बतलाने का कष्ट करेंगे कि एस० आर० एक्ट 1956 के अन्तर्गत किन परिस्थितियों में दिल्ली की स्थिति में परिवर्तन करने के लिए आपको बाध्य होना पड़ा ? क्या यहां के सारे राजनीतिक दल, सारा प्रेस और दिल्ली प्रशासन उसी समय से 1957 से बराबर आपसे मांग करता रहा है कि दिल्ली की विशेष स्थिति होने के कारण और पूरे भारतवर्ष की राजधानी होने के कारण यहां पर जितने आन्दोलन, प्रदर्शन होते हैं, उन सबके कारण उनको अपने काम में सहूलियत पहुंचाने की दृष्टि से सुरक्षा के मामले में और पुलिस के मामले में और यहां पर आवास की कठिनाइयों को देखते हुए, आपकी आज्ञा के बिना वे कोई कदम उठा नहीं सकते, इन असुविधाओं को दूर करने के लिए इसलिए उनको स्टेट का दर्जा दिया जाय ? इसके लिए इन सबने जो यत्न किया, उस सम्बन्ध में आपने क्या किया ? तीसरी बात यह कि 11 आदमियों की जो कमेटी बनाई गई, उसकी रिपोर्ट आपको प्राप्त हो गई या नहीं और अगर हो गई तो आप उस पर कब तक निर्णय ले लेंगे ?

श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल : मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल ने 11 आदमियों की कमेटी बनाई थी और उसकी रिपोर्ट हमको प्राप्त हो चुकी है। हमने इसके बारे में पहले विचार किया था और अब भी विचार कर रहे हैं। ऐसा नहीं है कि हमने विचार नहीं किया है। लेकिन विचार करने के बाद मैंने यह मुख्य बात कही कि हम यह चाहते हैं कि प्रजातांत्रिक प्रणाली जितनी ज्यादा से ज्यादा लागू कर सकें, उतनी ज्यादा से ज्यादा लागू करें, लेकिन यह नहीं कर सकते कि जो एक मूल चीज है कि यह भारत की राजधानी है उसको छोड़कर, उस पर विचार न कर जैसे दूसरी यूनियन टैरीटरीज की बात करते हैं, वैसे ही इस पर भी विचार करें। यह एक विशेष जटिलता हमारे सामने है और इसलिए इस बात का खयाल रखते हुए

बाकी बातों का हमको निर्णय करना है। यह बात हमेशा हमारे सामने मौजूद रहेगी और मैं समझता हूँ कि माननीय सदस्य भी इस बात का खयाल करेंगे कि यह भारतवर्ष की राजधानी है, इस पर पूरे भारतवर्ष का अधिकार है और इसका जो काम-धाम है, वह इस हिसाब से चलना चाहिए कि भारत के हितों की रक्षा हो सके। अगर केवल दिल्ली निवासियों का सवाल होता, तो दूसरी बात थी। दिल्ली निवासियों का ही सवाल नहीं है, पूरे भारतवर्ष का सवाल है। इसलिए उसके बारे में अलग ढंग से विचार करना पड़ेगा। यह सब सोचने के बाद भी हम चाहते हैं कि जितने ज्यादा से ज्यादा प्रजातांत्रिक ढंग से राज्य चलाया जा सके, हम चलाने को तैयार हैं और उसके लिये हम कोशिश करना चाहते हैं।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I am very glad that for the first time perhaps a categorical statement has been made that it is the intention of the Government to grant them full Statehood. *(Interruptions)* Now, Sir, the only argument that has been given is that the States would not be viable. The hon. Minister said that they would not be in a position to meet the Plan and non-Plan expenditure. May I know, Sir, whether there is any State in India which is in a position to meet Plan and non-Plan expenditure on its own? Well, there is not a single State in India today. Do I understand that Maharashtra or Madhya Pradesh is going to be converted into a Union territory on the ground that they are not in a position to meet the Plan and non-Plan expenditure themselves? I should like to know from the hon. Minister whether it is not a fact that even as Union territories they are receiving financial aid under different heads from the Centre and that it is quite feasible to run them as full-fledged States with perhaps a little more additional financial assistance from the Central Government and why in that case the demand should not be made, I should like to know what is the budgetary gap. It is no use trying to tell us about the Plan gap, the Plan requirements and Plan realisation. West Bengal is deficit, Maharashtra is deficit, Madhya Pradesh is deficit, every State is deficit when

it comes to developmental activities and Plan projects.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now please put your question.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My friend, Mr. Bhandari, is asking me to put my question.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: No, I am enjoying the short supplementary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be brief, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, is the hon. Minister aware that if Manipur, for example, is not granted immediately Statehood, there may be serious political complications, because a section of the young people of Manipur are thinking in terms of taking to arms even because Government think theirs is not a reasonable demand?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: I have stated that it is our basic policy and I again repeat that we would not mind granting Statehood to Union territories provided they are financially viable. Here I referred to the gap between non-Plan expenditure and non-Plan resources. As far as Tripura is concerned, it would be to the extent of about Rs. 50.2 crores during the Fourth Plan period. For Manipur it would be about Rs. 41.2 crores; that would be the non-Plan expenditure gap for the Fourth Five-Year Plan period as far as Manipur is concerned. *(Interruptions)* No, Sir; it is not so. Almost all the States of the Union are able to meet their non-Plan expenditure. It is not a question of all States not being able to meet their non-Plan expenditure. Almost every State can meet it. Therefore, Sir, here..

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Even now the overdraft is Rs. 123 crores.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: Almost all States are able to meet it. If we want to discharge our responsibility, with seriousness we will have to consider whether we have not to reduce the non-Plan expenditure gap and also encourage the Union territories to mobilise their internal resources to bring them forward, as Himachal Pradesh has done so very admirably, and when it happens, we shall definitely do it; we will have no objection. But, as long as it is not done, it will create serious hindrances in the way of their attaining Statehood.

श्री एस० डी० मिश्र : श्रीमान्, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि हिमाचल प्रदेश की दो मांगें हैं, जैसा कि मंत्री जी ने कहा कि एक तो उस की स्टेटहुड की मांग है और उस के लिए तो अभी इसलिए इन्कार किया जा रहा है कि आप उसकी फाइनेंशियल वायबिलिटी इग्जामिन कर रहे हैं। उसकी दूसरी मांग के बारे में वहाँ के 25,000 कर्मचारी महीनों से हड़ताल कर रहे हैं और उनकी मांग यह है कि उनके नेबरिंग स्टेट्स, जो पंजाब और हरियाणा हैं, उनके बराबर का वेतनक्रम उनको दिया जाय। तो क्या कारण है कि जब यह यूनियन टेरिटरी है और जिसके बारे में होम मिनिस्ट्री ने 1956 से ले कर आज तक 3 सर्कुलर्स निकाले हैं कि हिमाचल प्रदेश को जो उसके नेबरिंग स्टेट्स हैं, उनके वेतनक्रमों के बराबर तनखाहें दी जायेंगी, वह तनखाहें नहीं दी जा रही हैं? एक तरफ तो आप फाइनेंशियल नान-वायबिलिटी की वजह से उन को स्टेटहुड नहीं देते और दूसरी तरफ सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट अपने सर्कुलर्स के मुताबिक उनको अपने पड़ोसी स्टेट्स के वेतनक्रमों के बराबर वेतन नहीं देती, तो इस बारे में आपको क्या कहना है?

श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल : इस बारे में कई बार हमारे यहाँ बहस हो चुकी है, लेकिन माननीय सदस्य चाहते हैं तो मैं संक्षेप में बता दूंगा कि स्थिति क्या है। स्थिति यह है कि पहले इस तरह का नियम बना हुआ था कि जो यूनियन टेरिटरी जिस राज्य के पास होगी, उस राज्य के जो पे स्केल्स होंगे, वही स्केल्स यूनियन टेरिटरी के एम्प्लाइज को आटोमेटिकली मिल जायेंगे। लेकिन बाद में हमने यह देखा, खास कर 1968 में कि कुछ राज्य सरकारों ने अपने पे स्केल्स कुछ वर्गों के लिए इतने बढ़ा दिये कि जो केन्द्रीय पे स्केल्स से भी ऊंचे थे, ज्यादा थे। जब इस तरह की स्थिति आई सामने तो यह सोचा गया कि अगर इस तरह की स्थिति होगी तो कुछ यूनियन टेरिटरीज के कर्मचारियों को इतनी ज्यादा तन-

खाह मिलेगी, जो कि केन्द्रीय सरकार के कर्मचारियों को भी नहीं मिलती है या दूसरी जो यूनियन टेरिटरीज हैं, यूनियन में उनके कर्मचारियों को नहीं मिलती है। तो ऐसी स्थिति में यह निर्णय लिया गया कि हम उनको नेबरिंग स्टेट्स के पे स्केल्स दें या सेंटर के पे स्केल्स दें और इनमें, दोनों में जो कम हो वह हम उनको दें। यह हमारा निर्णय हुआ। इसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि जो स्टेट्स के स्केल्स थे और जो नेबरिंग स्टेट्स के स्केल्स थे, उनमें जो स्केल्स कम थे, वह उनको दिये गये। हिमाचल प्रदेश पर भी इसका असर पड़ा। पंजाब सरकार ने कुछ ऐसे स्केल्स बना दिये थे जो कि सेंटर के पे स्केल्स से भी ज्यादा थे। तो हिमाचल प्रदेश के कुछ एम्प्लाइज जो चाहते थे कि उनको पंजाब के स्केल्स मिलें, उनको वेतन कम मिलने लगा। इससे उनको असंतोष हुआ और वह कहने लगे कि अगर हम पंजाब में होते तो हमको ज्यादा मिलता और हिमाचल प्रदेश में आ गये हैं पुनर्गठन के कारण तो हमको पे स्केल्स कम मिल रहे हैं। इस बारे में उन्होंने हमारे पास रिप्रेजेंट किया और हमारे पास इस सिलसिले में लोग मिलने जुलने आये और बात चीत हुई और हमने दूसरे सदन में जवाब दिया है कि हम विचार कर रहे हैं कि किस तरह से इस स्थिति को सुधारा जाय और मैं समझता हूँ कि शीघ्र ही हम इस बारे में निर्णय ले लेंगे।

श्री० एस० डी मिश्र : इसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश में एक कांस्टेबल 120 रुपया पा रहा है और दरोगा जी 115 रुपये पा रहे हैं। यह हालत है इस सरकार की।

*63. [Transferred to the 5th March, 1970.]
PROPERTY TAX ASSESSMENT OF DELHI CINEMAS

*64. SHRI M.V. BHADRAM: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Central Bureau of Investigation has been requested by the Delhi