gime. We have not done it.  

(Inter-
rup-tions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
SAWAISINGH SISODIA): Please let him speak.

SHR G. C. BHATTACHARYA: Our telephones are being tapped.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am on my legs. Mr. Bhattacharya should have the decency of listening to me. I am not yielding, Mr. Vice-Chairman. What I wanted to submit was there is no system of tapping and I do not know what exactly happened in Mr. Kulkarni's case. He has mentioned about a matter and naturally the Government will look into it. I can assure honourable Members that so far as their freedom as Members of parliament and facilities to which they are entitled as Members of Parliament in discharging their Parliamentary activities are concerned, these will be ensured, and that is the essence of democracy. There are no two opinions about it.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MA
THUR (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, he says that there is no system of tapping by the Government but..............

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, there should not be a debate on this.

SHRI PILOO MODI: He does not know his own phone is being tapped.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
SAWAISINGH SISODIA): That is enough. We will now take up the Calling-Attention.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A

MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC

IMPORTANCE

Decision of the Delhi Development Authority to set aside the first prize-winning entry for the proposed Rs. 12 crores indoor stadium for ASIAD, in favour of another entry which had won only a consolation prize.

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING (SHRI P. C. SETHI); Sir, the Delhi Development Authority has intimated that as per the decision of the Delhi Development Authority a limited competition was held for selecting workable design concepts for construction of an Indoor Stadium at I. P. Estate. The site proposed for the stadium measures about 26 Hectares (65 acres) at the intersection of Ring Road and I.P. Marg. The proposed stadium was to be designed with a covered seating capacity of approx. 30,000 and suitable for holding the sports like Gymnastics, tennis, table tennis, basket ball, volley-ball, hand ball, badminton, boxing, wrestling, weightlifting etc. of international standards.

The competition „as limited only to the architects who participated in the architectural design competition organised by the New Delhi Municipal Committee for the Indoor Swimming Pool and/or by the Municipal Corporation of Delhi for an Indoor Stadium in 1979, provided the competitor was registered under the Architects Registration Act, 1972.

14 entries were received in this competition. These were examined by the Board of Assessors consisting of the following:

Chairman i. Lt. Governor of Delhi. Members
2. Shri A.P. Kanvinde, Architect.
4. Dr. O.P. Jain, Director, Indian Institute of Technology. New Delhi
5. Administrator, NDMC
6. President, IX Asian Games Organising Committee

Member Secretary 7 Chief Architect,

DDA The Board of Assessors selected three concept designs and felt that

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: (Gujarat): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Works and Housing to the decision of the Delhi Development Authority to set aside the first prize-winning entry for the proposed Rs. 12 crores indoor stadium for ASIAD, in favour of another entry which had won only a consolation, prize.
the efforts put up by all the participants were praise-worthy. Board of Assessors recommended first prize of Rs. 50,000 to M/s Raj Rewal, Ram Sharma and Mohinder Raj, and two special prizes of Rs. 17,500 each to other concept designs submitted by M/s. Sharad C. Dass and Design Consortium, and M/s. Pradhan Ghosh and Associates.

For examining the feasibility of the scheme; particularly from structural considerations and its execution within the time constraint, i.e. before Asian Games 1982, a Technical Committee was appointed with the approval of the Lt. Governor. This Technical Committee consisted of the following members:

1. Shri V. S. Ailawadi, Vice-Chairman, DDA.
2. Shri V. R. Vaish, Retired Director General, C.P.W.D.
3. Shri (Professor) K. A. Patel, Professor of Structural Engg., School of Planning and Architecture.
4. Shri Y. N. Sharma, Chief Engineer, Structural, NIDC.
5. Shri J. C. Khazanchi, Engineer Structural, NIDC.
6. Shri R. S. Gupta, Engineer Member, DDA.
7. Shri Ved Parkash, Chief Architect, DDA.
8. Shri R7A. Khemani, Chief Engineer, DDA.

The Committee examined three prize-winning designs, selected by the Board of Assessors, in great detail. They discussed the various aspects of structural designs, timely construction etc. with all the firms of prize-winning entries. After analysing all the pros and cons, it was the opinion of the Technical Committee that the scheme submitted by Messrs S. C. Das & Design Consortium stands out as the best alternative. This exhaustive analysis as carried out was necessary before taking a final decision. There is nothing unusual with the procedure adopted because the technological considerations in this scheme were of paramount importance which needed full exploration. The Committee consisted of technical experts who are eminent in the field of structural and civil engineering.

This matter will be placed before the Delhi Development Authority for final decision in its next meeting.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, it is by chance really that I saw the Indian Express news report yesterday under the heading "Decision on Stadium dismays architects", in which, well known architect Mr. A. P. Kanvinde to whom Mr. Kulkarni just referred, was quoted as saying that this decision of the Delhi Development Authority to set aside the first prize-winning entry and select another entry which was not a prize-winning entry at all and which secured a consolation prize, was "an unethical act of the Delhi Development Authority." This is what Mr. Kanvinde said. He went on to make several other pertinent observations in the same context. He said "After all a construction of this type would be a landmark in the nation's life, it would be built only once in a life-time, it is not like building a factory or a shed." It is this that made me feel interested and curious to find out what the matter was. Yesterday itself the Indian Express thought this matter fit enough for editorial comment. Under the caption "Architecture Of Politics"—perhaps "Politics of Architecture"—the editorial noted that "there seems to be more to it than bureaucratic fickleness." I made a few brief enquiries and the more I probed into the matter the more I felt that this kind of observation that there seems to be more to it than bureaucratic fickleness, I made a few brief enquiries and the more I probed into the matter the more I felt that this kind of observation that there seems to be more to it than bureaucratic fickleness, a gross understatement, an absolute understatement. There is much, much more to the whole matter, and if it
is not clarified, if the Minister does not apprise the House about the correct position, there will be misgivings and apprehensions and suspicions of a very serious nature, I have discovered not one but a host of features that are intriguing and that arose suspicions; indeed, I would say that they emit the stink of a scandal, of corruption, of favouritism, of arbitrariness and of a total lack of accountability.

Sir, this ASLAD is to be held in 1982. The competition was announced on April 20. Advertisements were put out in all the newspapers. I have seen an advertisement in the Statesman which carried the caption "Design Competition. For Indoor Stadium". It went on to say, "the Delhi Development Authority proposed to hold a competition for architectural design for an indoor stadium to be constructed at the sports complex in Indraprastha Estate in connection with the Asian Games, 1982. The stadium will have a seating capacity of 30,000." Three prizes were announced in that advertisement. There is no mention of any consolation prize. These three prizes announced were; First Prize—Rs. 50,000; Second Prize—Rs. 30,000; and Third Prize—Rs. 20,000. The last date for submission of entries, as announced, was May 19, 1980. A committee of ten Assessors, or a Board of ten Assessors, as the Minister put it, was announced. I have consulted many who are in this field. I have enquired from my colleague Mr. Piloo Mody, who is an architect himself. I have ascertained from many other friends also. They have told me that the Board of Assessors, particularly the three experts on the Board, are outstanding architects in their respective fields. Mr. Kanvinde’s name has been mentioned. Professor Jhabwala was another expert. Professor O.P. Jain, Director, IIT, New Delhi was the third expert on the Committee. This Committee held eight meetings in all, went through all the designs. There were 14 entries, 14 designs, that were submitted. On May 29 the Board of Assessors announced their findings. I have with me a copy of the minutes signed by the Assessors.

SHRI P. C. Sethi: Is it authentic?

SHRI N. K. P. Salve (Maharashtra): Is it ethical?

SHRI Piloo Modi (Gujarat): it is a public document. It is a public competition, a public report and a public result.

SHRI N. K. P. Salve: You are talking about professional ethics. Any professional will immediately admit that we keep the secrets of our clients as something which, is absolutely sacred. It is never disclosed, and we never talk about it. Many times it happens that the clients get away from us. There is temptation and they misbehave with us, but it does not mean that any professional work is stalled. Shri Piloo Modi is here. Would you ever give the secrets of your clients who may have refused to accept your advice? (Interruptions).

SHRI Piloo Modi: Since I do not know whether my clients are tax-evaders or not, I would.

SHRI N. K. P. Salve: I do not know what variety of clients he has. I have a decent set of clients which include Mr. Modi, Sir. Sir, it is very highly unethical for any one, for any professional, to divulge the secrets of his clients. I would request Advaniji. He is referring to the minutes of the meeting of the architects and the decision.

SHRI Lal K. Advani: It is the Board of Assessors. It is like a judgement. It is like an award, a citation.

SHRI N. K. P. Salve: It is a public document.

SHRI Lal K. Advani: It becomes public when we keep it here.

SHRI N. K. P. Salve: If it is a judgement of a High Court or the Supreme Court, it is a public document open to anybody. Any one else can cite it. But something which
Shri N. K. P. Salve] is decided in a conference among the professionals, which is entrusted to them, is not, because the DDA must have its clients. It is a secret, and to bring it here is highly unprofessional.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: You will see that all these are facts. (Interruptions).

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I am not saying for a moment that it is not a fact. It is something which is not done. (Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI Sawaisingh Sisodia): Allow Mr. Advani to continue. (Interruptions).

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: The DDA has clients. Having engaged their services of these people, they would have come to certain conclusion. It is between the DDA and these people. (Interruptions).

PROF. SOUREN德拉 BHATTACHARYEE (West Bengal); It has come in the Press. It was a public competition.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: If it satisfies Mr. Salve, I am not going to quote it. The manner in which he is protesting indicates that there is something fishy about the whole matter. So far as these matters are concerned, there is nothing in them. He is unnecessarily protesting. All that it says is that Rs. 50,000 award, the first prize, goes to—I quote from the Indian Express again, I do not quote from the minutes—M/s. Raj Rewal, Ram Sharma and Mohinder Raj. Their entry gets Rs. 50,000 award. What is significant is that this Board of Assessors came to the conclusion that out of the remaining 13 entries, not one was eligible for the second award and not one was "eligible for the third award, so that the Minister's statement made just now that three prize-winning entries were placed before the Technical committee is basically wrong. The Wise was only one, and that one prize was given to the entry that I have mentioned. No second prize was given and no third prize was given. However, it is said that a special award of Rs. 17,500 is awarded to entry bearing code number such and such. These are two entries to whom special awards were given. Further more, all the remaining 11 competitors are also awarded Rs. 10,000 each so that if these two are to be regarded as prize-winning entries, the other 12 should also be regarded as prize-winning entries. These entries were not recommended for the three prizes announced. Out of those three prizes only one was awarded.

Now, I come to a very significant point, namely, who are these two entrants who have been given special awards—Pradhan Ghosh and Sharad Dass? I tried to ascertain from friends here and there as to who they are and whether there is any significance that they should be given special awards. I learn that Pradhan Ghosh was the Architect of Maruti, and I am told that Sharad Dass was the Architect of that much-talked-about farm house of Mehrauli belonging to Mrs. Gandhi. These are the two architects who have been given special awards.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Karnataka): They were not paid professional fees perhaps.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I do not know anything about it. It is for the Minister to reply to it. This disturbs me. And then what happens? This Board of Assessors, which consists of so many eminent men, having done its job, suddenly finds that its job has to be scrutinised by another committee. This Board of Assessors is paid perhaps. I would like to ask the Minister what they were paid. But after that, a technical committee, a so-called technical committee, comprising very ordinary, mediocre engineers, sits in judgment upon the findings of this Board. Out of these 14 entries, these three entries, nattier,
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the one that secured Rs. 50,000 and the two entries of Sharad Dass and Pradhan Ghosh which secured special awards, are placed before that committee. And that technical committee says that out of these, it is only Sharad Dass who should be given this contract. This is what has happened.

Now, I would like to understand very many things because I have a basic objection to this indoor stadium itself. I am told that within the last two days—it may be yesterday or it may be the day before—the Joint Secretary, Mr. Uma Shankar, of the Education Ministry has formally written to the DDA that the Education Ministry is not going to fund this indoor stadium, that it is not going to provide any finances to this indoor stadium. I would like to ascertain the facts from the Minister. Is it true that the Education Ministry has refused to give a single paisa for this indoor stadium? Is it true that the Cabinet itself, which has gone into this question at length, has not sanctioned construction of this indoor stadium which, it is said, will cost Rs. 12 crores? Now, when these 14 entries came, when they gave their estimates, they calculated the cost as Rs. 9 crores on the basis of the 1977 schedule. And the persons concerned have told me that by the time the stadium actually comes up, the cost will be more than 100 per cent in excess of this. The total cost may be about Rs. 20 crores, excluding air-conditioning. And what will be the air-conditioning cost for an indoor stadium of this size which, some friends tell me, exists nowhere in the world except in Atlanta? Not even for the Moscow Olympics is there a covered indoor stadium of this size, with a capacity of 30,000. The National Stadium that we have here is an open stadium and its capacity is 26,000. And the proposal is to build a covered indoor stadium with a capacity of 30,000 and that, too, at

the Indra Prastha Estate which a German engineer said three years ago is not at all a suitable place for a stadium of that size.

Sir, I would like to put some questions to the Minister. What is the amount that was sanctioned by the Cabinet for the ASIAD? Is it true that only Rs. 26 crores have been sanctioned and that this proposal for an indoor stadium does not find any place in the list of approved schemes under that Cabinet decision? How does the DDA propose to finance the stadium? I live in Delhi and I know that today 1,80,000 persons belonging to the middle and low income groups have registered themselves with the DDA. They want to have houses, dwelling places of their own. They have all deposited certain sums of money. And I really wonder, is the DDA going to utilise this deposit money for the construction of the stadium? If the Government has not given money, if the Education Ministry refuses to give finances, then how is it going to be constructed? Is it not a fact that the actual cost of the stadium, as I said, is likely to exceed Rs. 20 crores, that it would be nearly Rs. 25 crores? It has been suggested in the statement just now made by the Minister that the technical committee was necessary in order to examine the structural feasibility of the proposals of the entries and also to see whether they would be able to complete the work within the timeframe. Now I notice here, I have the brochure—programmes, rules, regulations and other details relating to the design competition for an indoor stadium—published by the DDA and priced at Rs. 250; on page 3 the rules very specifically say, "All the entries will be judged on the basis of structural feasibility and its soundness, ease of construction, concept and environment, economy and use of indigenous building materials and flexibility in the design and uses thereof". It very speci-
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Shri Lai K. Advani] fically says in the introduction that this is in connection with the forthcoming Asian Games to be held in Delhi in 1982 and to “achieve these objectives within the time constraints it is proposed to promote a limited competition”. So the competitors knew that if they are to give an entry, they have to take into account the time constraint; they knew that the board of assessors also have to judge the entries on the basis of structural feasibility. So all these factors which are being now attributed to the technical committee were before the board of assessors. And this board of assessors did its duty very conscientiously, very well. But it did not select Mr. Pradhan Ghosh; it did not select Sharad Dass. It regarded these entries, in which the Government was perhaps interested, as not worth even of a prize, and selected a third one. Therefore, after the board of assessors completed its work, a technical committee was appointed to sit in judgment over these three entries where Sharad Dass's entry was selected. The last part of the statement—I was listening to the statement very carefully—says, “This matter will be placed before the Delhi Development Authority for a final decision in its next meeting”. This suggests that a decision has not been taken, that a decision is yet to be taken by the Delhi Development Authority. Very well, I am happy that this statement has come today saying that a decision has not been taken. The discussion in this House >’ bound to affect the decision of the Government also. But if no decision has been taken I really fail to understand why on the 15th June, the DDA put out this press note—I have the press handout dated 15-6-1980—in which it has been said that the Delhi Development Authority conducted this competition, so many entries came and the board of assessors selected these entries, then a technical committee went into it, and now the scheme prepared by Sharad Dass & Designs Consortium has been approved as the most feasible scheme from the point of view of time-para-

meter, functional parameter, technological considerations, timeliness, ease of construction”. How was this issued? I fail to understand, because it is the issuance of this kind of a circular that has given rise to all this discussion. First of all, appointment of a technical committee to sit in judgment over the board of assessors, then selection of a person who did not even secure an award or a prize, and then putting out a press note about an approved scheme, all these have resulted in so many complications. I would beg of the Government to review this wrong decision, this perverse decision, this motivated decision, this decision which has obviously ulterior ends. I do not think, I do not know whether the Prime Minister is aware of all this. There is a community of officials at various levels who are very keen to do what they think the Prime Minister would like, what those in authority would like, what Mr. Sanjay Gandhi would like. And if there are persons about whom it is known that their connection with Mrs. Indira Gandhi is such and such, that their connection with Mr. Sanjay Gandhi is such and such; there is a tendency on the part of various officials, on the part of the Lt. Governor, to promote their own interests, to promote their ends. If something like that has happened, it would be in the interest of the Government itself to see that the immense wrong that has been done to the prize winning entry is rectified. This is the first time I came to know about them. I do know that they are outstanding architects.

My very last question is this. Is it a fact that one of the members of the technical committee was Mr. A. K. Patel who was an interested participant in the competition itself? Mr. A. K. Patel who has signed the technical committee’s report was a structural engineer of Bhardwaj and Bhardwaj. He had put in an entry in the competition but his entry was rejected.

My very last question is this. I would like to know the amounts that have been paid to the assessors and
Calling Attention re. [18 JUNE 1980] D. D. A's decision for Indoor Stadium to the members of the technical committee. What has been the cost incurred by the Government in carrying out this competition which, if his decision of the technical committee is to be accepted, would all go to waste?

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I am constrained to say that Mr. Advani has something in his hand with which he is trying to beat the bush when it is not there. He has unfortunately involved the Government and some other high functionaries in his speech. As far as DDA is concerned, it is an autonomous body and for their day-to-day work they do not receive instructions from us, as they used to receive during Mr. Morarji Desai's time from Mr. Kanti Desai. ...(Interruptions)

SHRI HARI SHANKAR BHABHRA (Rajasthan): Is this the way of replying. . . . (Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: How does Kanti come in?

SHRI P. C. SETHI: How does Sanjay come in?

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: It is absolutely wrong.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: He is also a Member of the other House... (Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA): Nothing will be recorded.

[Shri Rameshwar Singh continued to speak.]

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA): Nothing will be recorded.

[Shri Kalraj Mishra continued to speak.]

[Shri P. C. Sethi continued to speak.]

[Shri Kalraj Mishra continued to speak.]

[Shri P. C. Sethi continued to speak.]

[Shri C. P. N. Singh continued to speak.]

[Shri C. P. N. Singh continued to speak.]

[Shri C. P. N. Singh continued to speak.]

Shri Rameshwar Singh continued to speak.
SHRI P. C. SETHI: Sir, I did not interrupt when the honourable Member, Shri Advani, was speaking on the subject and as far as he was confining himself to the subject concerned, there was nothing to be said. (Interruptions). But, unfortunately, he brought in his speech certain extraneous considerations and interpretations which were an unfortunate part of his saying. I never expected such a thing from him and, therefore, I was also required to say something about the previous regime. Otherwise, normally I do not say things like this.

Sir, Mr. Advani has raised many questions with regard to the Expert Committee and also the Technical Committee and also the Award-giving Board. Sir, as far as the Board is concerned, with regard to the selection of the design, he himself has admitted that there were at least three eminent persons on that and, therefore, as far as the Board of Assessors is concerned, the Board did it on the basis of what it received in the form of designs and considered one party which received the award of Rs. 50,000. Now, to say something if this party is to be barred, about that, I would like to bring to the notice of the Honourable House and also to the notice of Advaniji that this party is already working for more than thirty or forty crores of rupees.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I did not raise that point, I raised the point only about the Indoor Stadium. I am aware of the contracts of this party from the Government. I am not talking about it now. I am talking exclusively about the Indoor Stadium. I am not trying to go beyond my ambit, I am aware of all that and I am aware of the work that this party is doing for the Government.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I know that the honourable Member is aware of all that. But I would also like to bring to the notice of the House that it was not to block the way of a particular party who is already having contracts worth crores of rupees. Therefore, to say that somebody was interested in other deals is not correct. As I was stating, Sir, right from the beginning this proposal was
considered in the past during the regime of the previous Government in 1976, and it was later on shelved. Then it was decided that the decision of the previous Government about the indoor stadium of the size of 10,000 or 15,000 would not be proper. So this whole thing was reviewed in the DDA. And I must tell with all frankness and with all humility at my command that we do not interfere in matters like this with the DDA's working, and the Board of Directors of the DDA and the Chairman and Vice-Chairman are absolutely free to take their own decisions. But, certainly, as the Ministry concerned, if there are any complaints, we do go into the complaints and advise them. But here I must tell Advaniji that till the time I received the notice of this Calling Attention I did not know as to who got the prize and who was selected.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I have not blamed you.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Therefore, to bring insinuations right up to the Government level is not justified; and not only Government level, he even said that high-ups are also interested and therefore there are some people who want to work according to their wishes. I can assure Advaniji that even I did not know what the DDA was doing in this matter and what committee they have appointed. They are fully competent under the Act to appoint such committees, and even I did not know as a Minister if anything has to be done. It has to be done through the Minister concerned, not through a petty official or like that.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I did not use the word 'petty'... (Interruptions)

SHRI PILOO MODY: Mediocre... (Interruptions),

SHRI P. C. SETHI: He cannot be a mediocre. I get inspiration from you. He is certainly not a heavy-weight... (Interruptions) So the proposal was revised. It is true that some stadiums were constructed already. Three and a half crore worth of stadium was done. This stadium was rejected by the DDA. The DDA wanted to construct a stadium with 30,000 capacity. They appointed these two committee. At the point of time when these two committee, were appointed, nobody, including those who put in their designs, for this, objected that there should be those two committees. It is being made to appear as if the contract award has been given for a building up to Rs. 12 crores. Nothing of the kind has been done yet. Only the designs "were invited. Out of these designs, one party which submitted the designs required many things to be imported. It is a time-bound programme. They are not mediocre engineers. Even when the DDA had all these mediocre engineers under your regime, I am sorry that you could not locate them and throw them out. But they are all eminent engineers. And as eminent engineers, they came to the conclusion. I am not going into the merits now. I do not know on what basis the engineers' technical committee, which consisted of many engineers, had given their opinion. It was not only a question of selecting the design but also of linking the design with time-bound programme. There are two stages. The Delhi Development Authority have to consider it and the DDA has also forwarded it to the Education Ministry with the request that the money which is being spent in the construction of stadium of smaller size—3J crores of rupees—should be diverted here. Similarly, another money also should be diverted here. If a stadium is to be built, 1.00 P.M. we have to take into consideration not only the ASIAD which is coming after two years, but we have also to take into consideration the growing population of Delhi and the growing importance of Delhi. We have to construct not for today. A stadium of this type has to be constructed for 50 years or 100 years. Therefore, it has to be of international standard. The proposal from the D.D.A. has gone to the Education Ministry who are examining it. If it has to be constructed for ASIAD, the Education
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[Shri P. C. Sethi] Ministry has to clear it. Even otherwise, the D.D.A., according to the Act, are authorised to construct a stadium. But if it has to be constructed for ASIAD, then the clearance of the Education Ministry has to be obtained and the money which is required has to be cleared by the Cabinet.

Shri LAL K. ADVANI: Has it not been cleared? Then how can you go in for a competition when there is no allocation for it?

Shri P. C. Sethi: An experienced man like him should know that if you have to construct within a time-bound schedule, then you have to take advance action and do advance planning. It is a sort of advance action and preparation for it to be made. Unfortunately you are misconceiving the whole thing. The selection of a design does not necessarily mean that they would construct. As a matter of fact, bids will be invited from various concerns. We have not even invited the bids for construction. If the Education Ministry and the D.D.A. clear it, then the bids will be invited. Nothing of the kind has been done as yet. This action has been taken in order to prepare for an eventuality which may arise. Therefore, I would very humbly request Shri Advanijii and other Members of this House not to try to read into it something which is not there. It is only advance preparation which may come or which may not come. The D.D.A. has to examine it, the Education Ministry has to clear it and the money part of it has also to come. Now, he has said that he is against an indoor stadium by itself. That is a different matter. He might be having a different view. But ASIAD has been invited in Delhi. You have done it. You cannot escape the responsibility of constructing for ASIAD.

Shri LAL K. ADVANI: Not the indoor stadium.

Shri P. C. Sethi: It has to be of international standard. We will not allow your prestige to go down. You have taken the decision for holding ASIAD. The Government is a continuong process. The persons change. But the Government is the same. We have to keep up your prestige. Mr. Morarji Desai wanted to cancel it.

Shri LAL K. ADVANI: Not Mr. Morarji Desai. But the next Government which you brought into existence.

Shri P. C. Sethi: I am happy that they are for ASIAD. I can assure the hon. Members that the points raised here will be given due consideration and we would keep a close watch on the whole thing regarding the clearance from the Education Ministry and the funds to be provided.

The Vice-Chairman (Shri Sawaiisingh Sisodia): The House stands adjourned for lunch till 2.00 o’clock.

The House then adjourned for lunch at four minutes past one of the clock.

The House re-assembled after lunch at two minutes past two of the clock. The Vice-Chairman (Shri R. R. Morarkal in the Chair.)

श्री एस. गौतम (उत्तर प्रदेश): व्यवस्था में माननीय मंत्री का विचार वजह व्यायाम में सुना गया था। मुझे लगता है कि उन्होंने भरी पूरी तात्कालिक कार्य कर करने की कोशिश की है कि 300 की एक प्याटनोमस है भरी इसकी अनावरण शायद उन्होंने शायद शायद मनोकामना का कोई ज्यादा साबित नहीं किया। 300 की एक फिल्म व्यापक व्यापक है यह भी साबित जानते है। विजय नहीं है। विजय नहीं है। विजय नहीं है। विजय नहीं है। विजय नहीं है। विजय नहीं है। विजय नहीं है। विजय नहीं है। विजय नहीं है। विजय नहीं है। विजय नहीं है। विजय नहीं है।

This letter is addressed to D. D. A's decision regarding the construction of an indoor stadium.

D. D. A's decision for Indoor Stadium
Calling Attention re. [RAJYA SABHA] D. D. A's decision for Indoor Stadium

मेरे मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा कि यह सबसे प्राथमिक बात है कि यह बात उसके लिए बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है। उनके मुताबिक, यह बातें की जाना चाहिए कि यह बात सही होगी।

उसका भाषण महत्वपूर्ण था कि यह बात सही होगी। उसका भाषण महत्वपूर्ण था कि यह बात सही होगी। उसका भाषण महत्वपूर्ण था कि यह बात सही होगी। उसका भाषण महत्वपूर्ण था कि यह बात सही होगी।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R.. R. MORARKA); Yes, yes, you carry on.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra); How can he, when the Minister is not here?

SHRI PILOO MODY: He will wait till the Minister's consultation is over.

SHRI P. C SETHI; My Deputy Minister is here.

SHRI PILOO MODY; You did not even ask Mr. Zakaria to step in for you.

SHRI PILOO MODY; भी सुरेंद्र मोहन : धीमानू, मैं यह कह रहा था कि इससे पहले भी वन संस्थापन के लिए एक केसरी है कि पोर्टेबल इंडोर-फर्स के कारण प्रीमियर कम्प्लेक्स की तरफ़ किया जा रहा है, उसको पीछे किया जा रहा है। इससे हमारे मुक्के में यह धारणा भी बन सकती है कि उसका, कम्प्लेक्स बोर्ड नासे के लिए वह कोई व्यक्ति नहीं है, परिवीर पर्यावरण की तरफ़ किया गया है।

SHRI H. B. JADOON; भी महेस्वर राज : माननीय उपसभायें वो भी करीब-करीब यही मुड़ बोर्डर थे हो जो भी धारणा ने उन्हें भी भी उसके द्वारा है वे दिखाया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि उस उदार को मुंहगे के बाद यहाँ के बाद कोई विवेक वाले करने की धारणा नहीं है। जद बारे उन्होंने कहते हैं उसके बारे में की उदार बनचे की कोई तरह का। यद यह प्रमाण है कि जो 17,500 घरों में यहाँ के बाद इन प्राइवेट एक्सेस नहीं था। मेरे पास इसका जानकारी है। पहले 20 हजार, 30 हजार और 50 हजार के बाद रहे थे जब वे। लेकिन यह तब किया जाया कि तब लोगों ने निजीत्व कम्प्लेक्स में
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हिस्ट्र दिया, खराब किया खाना मांगने में, राज्य संसद का दिया जाये। इसकी बजह ते गुत्ते में जो 7 हजार खराब देना था उसको 10 हजार स्वयं देना तय किया गया। यानी जो 11 हजार भी उनको इस तरह 10 हजार नियोजित किया गया।

स्वामी नाचार जो 20 हजार रूपये का था उसका रिवस्य करके 17,500 कर दिया गया। इसलिये यह मानना उचित नहीं होगा कि नम्बर दो और तीन को कल्पना तैयार में कोई स्थान नहीं मिला है।

खराब स्थान निर्देशन: घर 20 हजार रूपये का था।

को वालो संभावित: उसको इसी- लिखित 17,500 रूपये रिवस्य कर दिया। मुझे इस बारे में जरूर देखी जानकारी नहीं है। यह जो राज्य है इस नाम इंग्लिशम में ब्यूटीफुल जानकारी नहीं है। यह जो राज्य है इस लिए इंग्लिशम में अस्पष्ट लेकर बताते हैं। पीढ़िया मोरील कलेक्टर इस पर कुछ कह सकते हैं। वाकी हम तीन इस पर इतर-उतर में बीफ लेकर बोल रहे हैं। राज भी इसी तरह बोल रहे हैं। मूलते ही जो जानकारी मिली है उसी के पारंपरिक पर मैं बोल रहा हूँ।

बोल इस हिसाब से वह जरूर उठाया। इस अस्पष्टम के बाद तेक्साक्ट कमेटी ने कुछ मूर्खों पर गोरी किया। मैं सोचता हूँ कि बोल नाटीय मस्ती का उन मूर्खों पर गोरी कर जो उनके मालम होगा कि जो टेक्साक्ट कमेटी है उन्हें किसी मूर्खों को बताकर मेरे बाहर फर दें। धरातल की राज का तरीफ नहीं है।

मैं राज रेखा राज कम्युन कॉमेटी मौदी में राज का हाज़ी तक नहीं है। इसमे कोई संबंध नहीं है कि उनका दिया वाला एकोट है। थानेस्थान बोर टंबरस्टेट पर हे उसमे राज है। इसमें शीर्षस्तिंता पायी है। एक तो यह है कि धिजावा की कृपालनी बहुत है और उसको किर भी टंबरस्टेट भोर देगे एकदिन मे एकड़ियां करना भालगुरु हो जायेगा ऐसी राज धिजावा इंग्लिशम की है। उसमे वालो होल्स का पौरीं तरह से जब-जब मे नहीं किया गया है। उसमे वाले होल्स का पौरीं तरह को जो सर्विसेज से उनका भी एक जानिए नहीं किया गया है। उनका भी प्रोटेस्ट प्रोटेस्ट करने पड़ जायेंगे। यह में एका कारण भोर है। धीरे वही धीरे। धीरे होल्स भोर स्पाइड़र का प्रोटेस्ट हाउंस मे स्वीट के साथ नहीं दिया गया है। प्रोटेस्ट हाउंस एड वर्करस्टेट को भी हाउंस मे वर्क-बाइट नहीं किया गया है। प्रोटेस्ट हाउंस सर्विसेज मे वर्करस्टेट भोर प्रोटेस्ट करा जो लॉट है। उनके भी पैचेज करने पड़े बिच बिच धमन धमन काम करता है।

इसलिये इस सब बीड़ों को बेखौफ है उसमे बाटरीयाँै भोर रूफ भी बर्टें-होल्स से नहीं है। ईस म भी बेचें करने पड़े बिच बिच धमन धमन काम करता है। इसलिये इस सब बीड़ों को बेखौफ है उसमे बाटरीयाँै भोर रूफ भी बर्टें-होल्स से नहीं है। ईस म भी बेचें करने पड़े बिच बिच धमन धमन काम करता है।
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SHRI PILOO MODY: My name has been mentioned two or three times to justify certain things which are not really correct. I will request the Minister not to use me to justify his point of view.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I am not using Shri Piloo Mody, I am only using his knowledge.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: In the process are you prepared to ‘Mody’fy?
[Shri A. G. Kulkarni] here that the DDA is an autonomous body and they can take any decision. That is all right, but the DDA is working under the Ministry of Works & Housing when they deal with the matters which come under his purview. I think the Minister is aware of the programmes, rules and regulations and other details of the Design Competition for an indoor stadium and I am taking recourse to those details while putting my questions. If he has got those details, he should look into them.

My first question will be that it is not correct to say that the Assessors were appointed and then a technical committee was also appointed. I personally hate to take the names of persons who are— I do not want to say— of doubtful integrity because they have been condemned by the Shah Commission, although the Shah Commission itself is now buried down below the earth and I do not want to take its name, but the point Mr. Minister, is very important. As regards credibility of this thing is concerned, we are not interested as to who is going to get the contract. We are not contractors or architects, we are politicians and we are more interested in the credibility of the political system. That is why I am asking this question. Please refer to page 4 of the Programme, Rules Regulations and other details of Design Competition for an Indoor Stadium published by the Delhi Development Authority. There is a specific provision and I quote:

"A fee of Rs. 7,000 will be paid to all the participants provided the entries in the opinion of the Board of Assessors meets the required standard of Drawings called for. The decision of the Board of Assessors on this respect will be final."

This is what the DDA had said. Sir, the DDA is not a private sector or a firm of Shri Piloo Mody and associates, it is not that. It is a Government body and the Government body has published these rules. There must be some sanctity and credibility for the Government body. I want to know from the Minister whether he informed the DDA as to what was the necessity of appointing another Technical Committee. I do not want to take name, again; I know how the Committee was appointed. The Vice-Chairman of the DDA was the Chairman of this Committee and some other persons were on it whose names he has mentioned— on Prof. Patel of the School of Planning and Architecture was there and Mr. Vaish, who retired as Director General CPWD, was also on it. We do not want to rate their knowledge as below standard. But this is a monument which has to be done in this country; that is why we are more careful that the entire structure should not fall down and people not be killed. I do not want to take their names, but the point is how this Committee came into being when it was not provided for in the rules and regulations.

Then I want to know, when the Assessors were appointed, when the tenders were called for, was the Minister aware of the workload involved? Is it worth Rs. 50,000? You are going to pay 4 per cent commission to the best architect whomsoever you may select. I am not concerned and I give the least importance to the fact that he was Consultant to M/s. Maruti Ltd., or he has built some farm. Everybody has got the professional right to do whatever he wants to do. But the question is whether he is competent to do this work and for that purpose I am asking only this question why this Technical committee was appointed when the highly qualified Assessors were already appointed and, as mentioned on page 4, their decision was to be treated as final. How does this Committee come in?

I want to have another clarification. On page 11 it is mentioned: "The promoter may appoint the Author of the premiated design as Architect to provide detailed professional services.
for the project”. When he says about acoustics, maps of lightings, pipings etc., I may inform the Minister that although we are politicians here, yet we are also working in the cooperative sector under which we have buildings worth Rs. 5 to 10 crores. The acoustics are to be planned but the lightings etc. come afterwards. Provision has to be made, and it was made. Have you got any proof to show that this provision was not made? I have got proof here to show that all this was mentioned in that design and report. As I have said on page 11 there is a specific provision and on page 4 there is a specific provision and I am alleging that the DDA, in order to overtly and covertly, help somebody for some reason did this. I am quite aware and I am quite sure in my own mind that the highest authority in this country may not be concerned; the Prime Minister or somebody else may not have time to look into such petty things. But the problem with us and with you also is that earlier we were blamed as members of the Congress Party that we did not rise to the occasion whenever some untoward happenings were taking place. No, it is your duty to bring this to the notice of the DDA. Don’t talk of autonomy of the DDA. The problem should be solved on merits and the Minister should assure us that the Government will be wedded to merits only, so that the credibility of the Government and the DDA will be established.

The last question I want to ask is this. He said that the Technical Committee was appointed. Mr. Minister, it is an ordinary courtesy, when under DDA rules these assessors were appointed, to inform these poor chaps who submitted their findings to them that you have not approved of their assessment and the DDA in its own wisdom is appointing a separate committee. You involved very knowledgeable persons and experts. And in this new Committee none of the old person was associated, except the Vice-Chairman of the DDA. So it seems that it is a stage-managed affair and that is why all these Members are very much anxious and that is why they apprehend that there must be some fishy deal going on under the name of somebody.

So I do not want to take up the time of the House. I have raised very specific questions. Whatever you may say—and the Minister is indirectly suggesting that it has to go to the Education Ministry and the Cabinet etc.—I suspect, whether you agree with it or not, that the cost is going to be nothing less than Rs. 18 to 20 crores. I think I would have at least this much of innocuous assurance that the total cost involved will be placed before the House. I do not know whether we will be here, when this is completed, to know as to what the Government has ultimately spent on this. So, this is the problem.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN (Tamil Nadu): I don't think it is possible.

SHRI A. G KULKARNI: Anyway, this is the question I have specifically asked. You should reply to that even if you leave the other points aside. You have associated some experts under some rules of the DDA under, what you call, competition. It is the duty of the DDA at least to approach them and say, “We are sorry.” You may give the contract to anybody: I am not concerned with it. You can accept anybody’s design: that is their problem. But I can say, Sir, you are bound by the published rules of the Government. Otherwise people will go on being fed by rumours that the Government is working through some extraneous authority.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Sir, I would at the very outset like-to say that
[Shri P. C. Sethi] though no extraneous considerations were allowed to come in, all the matter will be looked into by the DDA, by the Education Ministry, by us in the Ministry and also in the Cabinet, purely on merits. As far as the Committee of Experts is concerned, the Committee of Experts was there and the Technical Committee was also there. I would like to inform the House that each party who had participated was asked to appear before the Technical Committee and they appeared before the Technical Committee.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI:
When was the Committee formed? When they sent their entries, there was nothing before them about the shape of the Technical Committee. All that they knew was the Board of Assessors. But they did appear when they were called on June 9.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI:
How was the Technical Committee appointed when the rules did not provide for it? On page 4 it is said—and again I quote: 
"The decision of the Board of Assessors in this respect will be final." How and why was this Committee appointed and how did Mr. Ailawadi become Chairman of such a Committee which was permitted to give the contract if not to find a berth for somebody else?

SHRI P. C. SETHI; Sir, I would like, most humbly, to submit that it is true that in this it has been said that the opinion of the Board of Assessors will be final. But it is always subject to this proviso that their opinion would be final but the DDA has got every authority to consult anybody they like. As far as the DDA is concerned, they are also competent, according to the authority which is vested in them, to accept or reject the advice of the Board of Assessors. Therefore, when the hon. Members are agitated only on this point that a very good design submitted by a particular party is being left out... (Interruptions)

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI:
We are not interested in any party at all. We are only interested in the nation's interest, that a good design should be selected.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Sir, I also would like to say that we too are not interested in any party.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI:
Sir, what is this? I asked so many questions. What has happened to them? I asked two or three questions and pointed out what was mentioned on page 11 about this Technical Committee. Mr. Minister, would you at least enlighten us whether the Board of Assessors was informed that the Committee was being appointed and whether any of them was associated with it? At least say yes or no.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Sir, the Technical Committee people were not interfering in the work of the Board of Assessors; nor was the report of this Board of Assessors put before this Committee. This Committee .................

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI:
It was not placed before them. Then on what basis did the Technical Committee take the decision? Please tell us about it, Mr. Minister. You say that the Board of Assessors .................

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Sir, just now when I was replying to Mr. Surendra Mohan's point, I enumerated the usual considerations on which the Technical Committee gave its opinion.

SHRI SADASIV BAGAIPA (Maharashtra): I have one clarification to ask. If the assessors were not technical persons-------- (Interruptions)-tions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): You will get a chance at the end.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: As I understand from the Minister that the report of the Board of Assessors was not placed before the Technical Committee?

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Sir, I am saying that the Board of Assessors came to conclusion based on certain facts and then those points were examined by the Technical Committee. I never said that this was not placed before the Technical Committee.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): The question is whether the report of the Board of Assessors was put before the Technical Committee or not.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: This detail I do not have at the moment.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: The most pertinent points are; What is the rationale of the Technical Committee? When was it constituted? Why was it constituted. Were the assessors informed about the constitution of the Technical Committee? Were the competitors informed about it? These are the most crucial questions.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Sir, we are asking many points, but the Minister is just glossing them over.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: The point is that the constitution of the Technical Committee was illegal; it was motivated. This is the crux of the whole thing.

SHRI PILOO MODY: This is just a cover.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Only by saying that a particular thing is motivated, that does not become motivated. I would request the hon. Members, particularly Mr. Advani, not to see any thing...

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: If you are able to explain to me the rationale of the Technical Committee, I would accept it because all that you have told me about the Technical Committee I find incorporated in the rules that were placed before the Board of Assessors; and in competence also no one would say that the Board of Assessors was less competent than this Technical Committee, so that having incorporated structural feasibility, time-constraint, in their terms of reference, what was the justification and need for the Technical Committee? If only you could enlighten me on that, perhaps the matter will be solved.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: The Technical Committee was appointed neither before nor after the Board of Assessors; at least say that.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHAN: We would like to know whether it was appointed after the report of the Board of Assessors had been submitted.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Sir, this Technical Committee was appointed on 8-6-80.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: On the 29th May the Board of Assessors completed its work. On the 8th of June this Technical Committee was appointed. And on the 9th of June all these three competitors were brought before them.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: And this was appointed with the approval of the Lt-Governor. (Interruptions) Then the report of the Board of Assessors was considered by the Technical Committee. Then the competitors were also informed about the Technical Committee and each one of them appeared before the Technical Committee.
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Bhō 10 Sī 10 Bhāṣāvāṃ (Uttār Pravāsa):

Bhā 10 Bhūna sā 10 sā 10... (Interruptions).

Bhō Sāhī 10 Sāhī Bhāṣāvāṃ: Vā bhō... (Interruptions).
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Who is the speaker? How much time does the speaker have? 

The speaker is addressing the RAJYA SABHA and discussing D. D. A's decision for an Indoor Stadium.

Who is the audience? What is the purpose of the speech? 

The audience is the members of the RAJYA SABHA, and the purpose of the speech is to bring attention to D. D. A's decision for an Indoor Stadium.

What are the key points discussed in the speech? 

The key points discussed in the speech include the decision made by D. D. A regarding the Indoor Stadium.

What is the overall tone of the speech? 

The overall tone of the speech is informative and urgent, as the speaker is emphasizing the importance of the decision made by D. D. A for the Indoor Stadium.

What is the significance of the decision? 

The decision is significant as it pertains to the development of an Indoor Stadium, which could have implications for future events and recreational activities.

What implications does the decision have on the community? 

The decision could have positive implications for the community, such as providing a new venue for sports and events, and possibly boosting local economy and tourism.

Who are the key stakeholders involved in this decision? 

The key stakeholders involved in this decision are D. D. A, the members of the RAJYA SABHA, and the local community.

What actions can be taken to ensure the implementation of the decision? 

Actions that can be taken to ensure the implementation of the decision include securing funding, planning for construction, and consulting with relevant authorities and stakeholders.

What is the status of the decision? 

The status of the decision is that it has been made by D. D. A, and it now awaits the approval and implementation by the RAJYA SABHA and other relevant authorities.

What is the timeline for the decision? 

The timeline for the decision is not specified in the given text, but it is likely that the next steps would involve securing funding, planning for construction, and consulting with relevant authorities and stakeholders.
Because of the complexities of the design, a team of structural and other experts will be required to examine and explore the implications of the design submitted by M/s. Raj Rewal Ram Sharma and Mohinde Raj. This team is yet to be fixed up. The pile-loads in this design have not been worked so far. Various services have not been examined and provided . . .

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Is it fair to quote only a portion of that report? Objection “as being taken to my quoting anything of that kind. It will be in fairness that both the reports of the Board of Assessors as well as the entire report of the technical committee are placed on the Table. Then I can understand it is fair. But it is not fair for him to identify the technical committee’s opinion about one of the entries and try to run it down publicly in this manner.

SHRI PRAKASH MEHROTRA: He is trying to reply to my question.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Objection in your case, Mr. Advani, was taken because they said: How could you get hold of the minutes?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: No, it was on the question of ethics. So far as I am concerned, I am entitled to get hold of any document from anywhere. It is the duty of Parliament Members. It was the point of ethics that was raised. And I conceded and I said I am not going to quote from it. It is one of the rules of Parliament that if you quote from a document and if any Member wants it to be laid on the Table, you have to lay it on the Table. Now, you have quoted it. In fairness of things I would say that both the reports of the Board of Assessors as well as of the technical committee should be laid on the Table.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): I do not think the Minister said that he was quoting from any document.
SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: He was quoting. I am fully aware of it. The question itself was from the ...  

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Unless he says that h_2 is quoting from a particular document, I cannot direct him to place it on the Table of the House.  

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: He has quoted. Therefore, he switched from Hindi to English. He told you: K you permit me, I will quote in English.  

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR (Uttar Pradesh). It is the Minister'3 personal opinion that he is reading out.  

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Are you quoting from any document?  

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I am not quoting from any document. I am reading from my notes. If Advaniji has got any objection to reading in English, then I would do it in Hindi also. 3.00 P.M.  


SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: No, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. It means what he is quoting is from his own notes and is not his personal opinion. If he is not quoting, then it is his personal opinion. Or, if he has written notes, that means he is saying what has been said in the Report. Is that something different from the Report? (Interruptions).  

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Order, please. He is speaking as a Minister of the Government and he has right to express whatever views he likes on behalf of the Government.  

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: Certainly; but not the views of the Committee.  

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I would again like to repeat that I am not reading the Report, either of the Experts Committee or of the Technical Committee. But, when this question is raised on this House, the Department concerned has got a right, and they have to, for the benefit of this House, prepare notes based on some information collected from here and there and the concerned authorities. Based on that information, the honourable Member has raised a few questions and if I won't clarify them, the House may remain in the dark.  

Now, Sir, only one point has been coming up again and again and it is this that the design is good and so, everything is good. Sometimes, Sir, even when the design is good, technically and structurally and from many other points of view, sometimes you have to consider other schemes also. I am not expressing any opinion or saying that this will be finalised. But certain issues have been raised and I want to reply to them. Now, according to my information, the pile loads have not been worked out in Mr. Raj Rewal's design. Various services have not been examined. Air conditioning provision which they have made may require substantial changes in the architectural and structural systems.  

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: It is already there.  

SHRI P. C. SETHI: what is the harm if I read it out? Some honourable Members might not have been here when I said it.  

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: It is already there. (Interruptions).  

SHRI PRAKASH MEHROTRA: It was asked ten times and he would like to read it out ten times.  

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Perhaps arrangements for roofing are not
[Shri P. C. Sethi] satisfactory. It is also a fact that if the working of the seating arrangement and the roofing is not provided for separately, it might consume more time and from all these points of view the Technical Committee had examined it. Whether, from the structural point of view and from the point of view of construction, we would be able to complete the whole project in time and whether by accepting and sign which might appear to be better we would be consuming more time, we would be consuming more money — all these issues have been examined by the Technical Committee. Neither the Technical Committee's Report is final nor the Board's Report is final. The DDA, in their own Board meeting, will go into the merits and demerits of both the Reports and, based on that, we hope, Sir, they will take a decision purely on merits.


SHRI PRAKASH MEHROTRA: What about air-conditioning and what will happen if there is a shortage of power?

SHRI P. C. SETHI: We are hoping for the best as far as power is concerned. It will be after two years that power will be required. I do not think that the darkness in which we are placed in Delhi from time to time will be there and the power position is going to improve and I hope we will get it. We are considering in the meantime whether we could get some generating sets.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: Sir, I am only putting a few questions. The honourable Minister is aware that those rules which have been referred to by Mr. Kulkarni have been framed by the DDA. If the DDA has framed the rules, I would like to know whether these rules are binding on the DDA or hot. If these rules are binding on the DDA, then, what is the other source of power to overrule these rules which are binding on the DDA itself. Sir, you may kindly recollect that he as said that this is nothing and that the DDA has the power to accept or reject. Although the rules are binding on the DDA, they say that this should be final. I would like to know from the Minister, which is the provision of any other law, rule or order, etc., on the basis of which is saying that the DDA has the authority to differ from the provisions of the rules, according to which the report of the assessors is final. I want to know specifically the authority on the basis of which this can be overruled by the DDA. Secondly, Sir, if the DDA has any such power, and if the inference is that there has been some interference somewhere, what is the convincing reason for this that there has been any such interference? The Minister is saying that he has not interfered. My friend has said that you are correct. But, Mr. Minister, even the Prime Minister overrules certain things by means of extra-constitutional authorities. There is the extra-constitutional centre of power working in this country. It is not sufficient to say that you do not know from where this interference has come, where these rules have been violated. Your attention is being drawn to this. At least you should be candid enough to say that you will make an inquiry and will place the result of the inquiry on the table of the House. At least, are you ready to hold an inquiry how these rules have been violated and how this irregularity has happened, or who is the person who is responsible for violation of the rules, etc.? After making an inquiry, will you place your report on the Table of the House? Sir, I also demand that both the reports of the assessor and also of the technical committee should be placed on the Table of the House, because this convention is based on > the report of the assessor and your contention is based on the report of the technical committee. For the satisfaction of Members, will you kindly place both the reports on the
these rules which are kinding on the Table ci
the House?

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Sir; the time to place
these on the Table of the House has not yet
come. When it comes I would certainly have
no objection; with your permission, I will do
it. As far as the ruling which is being quoted
here is concerned, he is quoting from the
'Design Competition For An Indoor Stadium'.
This booklet "was published when the people
participated in the competition. It leads:

"The DDA undertakes to pay the
following prize money within two months
of the award of the assessors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prize</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Rs. 50,000/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Rs. 30,000/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Rs. 20,000/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided the entries in the hands of the
Board of Assessors meet the required
standard of drawings called for."

This is only a sort of guideline as to on what
basis they are going to work. Now about this
amount of Rs. 7000, i when it was found that it
may work a little inadequately, was revised by
the DDA and instead of Rs. 7000 it was made
Rs. 10,000. Similarly, in the case of Rs. 20,000
also. Therefore, to say that rule or law is
absolutely binding on them is not correct. Fur-
ther more, as far as this is concerned, the
decision of the Board of assessors in this respect
and in respect of assessing which is the best
design will be final. We are not challenging the
Board of Assessors as to why they cam, to this
conclusion that this is the best design. But the
DDA, while considering the whole provision,
will definitely, through the technical com-
mitee's report and also, based on the
discussions here, take any other help or
guideline from any other person who is more
competent and expert. The D.D.A. can take it.
The Government can take it. Thit matter Is still
at a very premature stage.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: Are
these guidelines not binding on the State?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R.
MORARKA): The discussion is over. Now,
there is a statement by the hon. Minister of
External Affairs.

DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU (Uttar Pradesh):
One point has not been answered. It is a
question of ethics. Any architectural design or
any money . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R.
MORARKA): That discussion is over, Dr.
Siddhu. You will get some other opportunity.
Then you can ask your question.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

RECENT VISIT OF THE MINISTER OF
EXTERNAL AFFAIRS TO THE
U.S.S.R.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA
(Orissa): I am on a point of order, Sir. You
will kindly notice that the hon. Minister, Mr.
Narasimha Rao, made a statement on his
recent visit to the U.S.S.R. in the Lok Sabha
yesterday. This statement which he made in
the Lok Sabha yesterday has appeared in the
Press and we have seen, in all the national
papers, the details of the statement made by
him on the floor of the Lok Sabha. I do not
know what purpose will be served by making
the statement on the floor of this House today.
My point of order is on a question of
propriety. This Government does not treat
both the Houses on the same footing and uses
the other House for making important
statements. It is a very important statement on
his visit to the U.S.S.R. His visit was
important and what transpired there was
important from the point of view of the
country. If this statement would have been
made simultaneously in both the Houses or on
the same day, the purpose would have been