

gime. We have not done it. (*Inter-
ruptions*)

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.
Mr. Advani.

**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.**

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: (Gujarat): Mr.
Vice-Chairman, I beg to call the attention of
the Minister of Works and

for Indoor Stadium

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 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 was 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 com-
petition. 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.
 3. Shri C.S.H. Jhabwala, Architect.
 4. Dr. O.P. Jain, Director, Indian Ins-
titute 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

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 I/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.
8. 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 deci-

sion. 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 that, 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 and 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" would have been a better caption—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 is 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 sitting 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 Jhab-wala 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. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE (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 mannerⁱⁿ 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 winner 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. There 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, namely,

for Indoor Stadium

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-

[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 is 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 hand-out 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 revise and 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 next 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

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 got 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 श्री रामेश्वर सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश)
उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA): Please take your seat. Let him complete his statement.

SAWAISINGH SISODIA): Nothing will be recorded. >

[Shri Rameshwar Singh continued to speak.]

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : मेरी बात एक मिनट सुन लीजिए । मैं एक मिनट से ज्यादा नहीं लूंगा ।

for Indoor Stadium

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA): No interruption. I won't allow it. आप बैठिये ।

[Shri Rameshwar Singh continued to speak.]

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सवाई सिंह सिसो-
दिया) : रामेश्वर सिंह जी, आप बैठिये ।
पूरी बात सुनिये ।

[Shri Kalraj Mishra continued to speak.]

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

[Shri Rameshwar Singh continued to speak],

[Shri Kalraj Mishra continued to speak].

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

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सवाई सिंह सिसो-
दिया) : रामेश्वर सिंह जी, बैठिये ।
आपने कह दिया है । पूरी बात सुनिये ।

[Shri Kalraj Mishra continued to speak].

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सवाई सिंह सिसो-
दिया) : आप दृष्टा करके बैठिये ।

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

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सवाई सिंह सिसो-
दिया) : आप बैठ जाइये ।
(Interruptions).

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

Shri Rameshwar Singh continued to speak.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सवाई सिंह सिसोदिया) :
रामेश्वर सिंह जी आप बैठ जाइये ।

[Shrimati Kumudben Main Shankar.
Joshi continued to speak.]

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सवाई सिंह सिसो
दिया) : आप कृपया बैठ जाइये ।

[Shri N. K. P. Salve continued to
speak.]

[Shri Rameshwar Singh continued to
speak.]

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सवाई सिंह सिसो-
दिया) : नहीं आप मत बोलिए ।
माननीय मंत्री जी को अपना कथन पूरा
करने दीजिए । उसके बाद यदि आपको
कुछ पूछना हो, तो पूछिए, बीच में
नहीं ।

[Shri N. K. P. Salve continued to
speak.]

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सवाई सिंह सिसो-
दिया) : साल्वे जी आप मेहरबानी करके
बैठिये ।

[Shri Shiva Chandra Jha continued
to speak.]

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सवाई सिंह सिसो-
दिया) : आप सुनना चाहते हैं कि नहीं ।

[Shri Shiva Chandra Jha continued
to speak.]

आप शांति से काम चलने देना चाहते
हैं कि नहीं..... (Interruptions)
मैं खड़ा हूँ, आप बैठे जाइये । देखिये
बड़े महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न अडवानी जी ने
उठाये हैं । आप शांति से सुनिये । अगर
आप शांति से काम नहीं चलने देंगे तो
काम कैसे चलेगा ।

(Interruptions) I will not allow. No
interruptions, please. (Interruptions). No one
will interrupt. Now, the honourable Minister
will speak. No disturbances.

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 this 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 As-
sessors 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 as if this party is to be barred,
about that, I would like to bring to the notice
of this 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 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 committees. At the point of time when these two committees 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 total. 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

[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 has 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 Advaniji and other Members of this House not to try to read him 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 conti-

ning 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 SAWAISINGH 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 सुरेन्द्र मोहन (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन् मैं माननीय मंत्री जी का जवाब बड़े ध्यान से सुन रहा था मुझे लगता है कि उन्होंने मेरी पूरी बात को यह कह कर कम करने की कोशिश की है कि डी० डी० ए० आटोनोमस है और इसके अलावा शायद उन्होंने आडवाणी साहब के किसी सवाल का कोई जवाब नहीं दिया, डी० डी० ए० कितना आटोनोमस है यह भी सभी जानते हैं। जिस तरीके से डी० डी० ए० के डिप्टी चेयरमैन मिस्टर ब्रुच के साथ व्यवहार किया गया उससे डी० डी० ए० की आटोनोमी का पर्दाफाश हो गया। यह भी मान लिया जाए कि डी० डी० ए० आटोनोमस था तो उसमें ऐसा काम हुआ कि एक व्यक्ति चुना गया, उसको फर्स्ट प्राइज दिया गया, यह मान लिया गया कि उसमें ज्यादा प्रोफेशनल कंपिटेंस है उसके बाद उसको खत्म कर दिया गया और

किसी दूसरे आदमी को, तीसरे आदमी को चुन लिया गया और मिनिस्टर साहब को यह बात मालूम नहीं हुई। इस बात से बहुत ताज्जुब हुआ। ताज्जुब इसलिए होता है कि हम अपने मुल्क में इस तरह का स्टैंडर्ड कायम करने जा रहे हैं कि हम चुनें किसी एक आदमी को और दूसरा ईनाम, तीसरा ईनाम दें किसी को और किसी एक व्यक्ति को आब्रिज में कंसोलेशन प्राइज दिया। फस्ट प्राइज वाले को छोड़कर हम दूसरे को देते हैं तो इसका मतलब यह होता है कि प्रोफेशनल कंपीटेंस को कोई महत्व नहीं देता। इसको चाहे आप राजनीतिक दबनश्रंदाजी कहिये चाहे और कोई कंसिडरेशन हो वह कहिये, लेकिन ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि प्रोफेशनल कंपीटेंस के बजाय और बातों पर ध्यान दिया जाता है। तो मैं मंत्री महोदय से बहुत अदब के साथ यह जखर पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या प्रोफेशनल कंपीटेंस को इस मुल्क में कोई जगह नहीं मिलेगी? अगर नहीं मिलेगी तो प्रोफेशनल्स क्या करेंगे। वह इस तरह के काम में दिलचस्पी क्यों लेंगे? इस किसम के टेंडर बुलाये जायेंगे या कंपीटिशन लिये जायेंगे उनमें वह क्यों आयेंगे? अगर वह दिलचस्पी नहीं लेंगे तो इस मुल्क में उनका क्या बनेगा? इस चीज की तामीर की जा सके और अगर तामीर की जाए तो वह तामीर कितनी बा-बुनियाद और बेबुनियाद होगी इस बात का जवाब मंत्री महोदय खुद दे सकते हैं। अगर यह पोलिटिकल अफेयर्स होता रहा तो मेरे ख्याल से कोई भी प्रोफेशनल अपनी स्किल को, अपनी एनर्जी को इन कामों में लाने के लिये तैयार नहीं होगा।

दूसरी बात इस संबंध में यह कहना जरूरी है कि जब पहली कमेटी बनी थी तो पहली कमेटी को देखने से मालूम होता है कि उस कमेटी में कुछ स्ट्रक्चरल

इंजीनियरिंग जानने वाले लोग थे। अगर उस कमेटी में स्ट्रक्चरल इंजीनियरिंग जानने वाले लोग नहीं थे तो उस कमेटी को बनाना किस माने में सही था और अगर कमेटी में स्ट्रक्चरल इंजीनियरिंग जानने वाले लोग थे तो किसी और कमेटी की क्या जरूरत थी। मेरी समझ में यह आता है कि जो पहले कमेटी बनाई गई थी वह खुद इतनी कंपीटेंट होती कि वह इन सारे मामलों पर फंसला करती लेकिन दूसरी कमेटी बनाई गई। मैं आडवाणी साहब की बात से इत्फाक करता हूँ और मुझे अफसोस है कि मंत्री महोदय ने इस बात का पूरा जवाब नहीं दिया। मेरी राय में वह तसल्लीबख्श जवाब नहीं था। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अगर वह कंपीटेंट लोगों की कमेटी थी तो उसके बाद इसके मुकाबले में जो लोग ज्यादा कंपीटेंट नहीं थे उनकी कमेटी बनाने की क्या जरूरत थी। इस संबंध में एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ कि डी०डी०ए० के संबंध में यह सवाल जरूर उठता है कि क्या डी०डी०ए० एक्ट में स्टेडियम बनाने का प्रोविजन है। डी०डी०ए० की क्या अपारिटी दी गई थी कि वह स्टेडियम बनाए? डी०डी०ए० के एक्ट सेक्शन 10 में यह दिया गया है कि डी०डी०ए० को क्या-क्या काम करने हैं। उन कामों में स्टेडियम बनाने का कहीं कोई जिक्र नहीं है। उसके अंत में मनोरंजन के संबंध में कहा गया है। मनोरंजन के लिये जो काम हैं उसमें यह है कि अगर किसी जगह कोई कालोनी विकसित की जाती है, डेवलप की जाती है तो उस कालोनी में पार्क बनाए जाएं। लेकिन डी०डी०ए० पार्क बनाने की बजाए, मकान बनाने की बजाए, लैंड डेवलप करने की बजाए स्टेडियम बनाने का काम ले लिया।

[श्री सुरेन्द्र मोहन]

स्टेडियम बनाने के संबंध में भी एक बात यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब उनको यह काम दिया गया तब यह कहा गया था कि 12 करोड़ रुपये का प्रोजेक्ट है और अब यह कहा गया है कि 25 करोड़ रुपये, 30 करोड़ रुपये खर्च होंगे। अभी तक भी सरकार ने यह फैसला नहीं किया कि उस पर कितने रुपये खर्च होंगे जब कि कास्ट बढ़ती जा रही है। सीमेंट और कंक्रीट की समस्या है। इसका एस्टीमेट भी उनके पास नहीं है कि उसको बनाने में कितना सीमेंट और कंक्रीट लगेगा और कितना और ज्यादा खर्च बढ़ जाएगा। डी० डी० ए० से अब कहा जा रहा है वह इस काम को पूरा करे। उसकी इकोनोमी का भी जिक्र किया जा रहा है। लेकिन मैं आपसे अर्ज करूँ कि जो डिजाइन बनाया गया उस डिजाइन में भी 30 हजार लोगों के बैठने की व्यवस्था है। इस किस्म का फैसला किया गया कि ऐसा डिजाइन बनाया जाए जिसमें 30 हजार लोग बैठ सकें। ऐसा मालूम होता है कि यह न तो इतना बड़ा है कि वह जरूरत को पूरा कर सके और न इतना छोटा है कि वह छोटे स्टेडियम की जरूरत को पूरा कर सके। अंग्रेजी में कहा जाता है—'It is neither fish nor fowl.'

मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से बड़े अदब से यह दख्ता करूँगा और यह जानना चाहूँगा कि जो 30 हजार का फैसला किया गया है वह किस आधार पर किया गया है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि मुझ को लगता है कि इस हाउस में एक टेंडेंसी है और मिनिस्टर साहब भी उसके शिकार हो

गये हैं। वे बाहर की बातें, जो डिस्कशन की बातें नहीं हैं उन बातों को हर मिनिस्टर जवाब देने में हिचकिचाता नहीं है। यह होता है कि जब एक मिनिस्टर जवाब देने लगता है तो न जाने बाहर के किस-किस आदमी का ख्याल आ जाता है। कभी कांति देसाई का ख्याल आ जाता है तो कभी किसी और का ख्याल आ जाता है। हाउस की डेकोरम कैसे रखी जाए इसको मिनिस्टर साहब खुद तय करेंगे या चेयरमैन साहब आप तय करेंगे। इसमें सवाल यह नहीं है कि बाहर के कौन लोग थे। सवाल यह कि है अगर उस डिजाइन को मंजूर नहीं किया गया और किसी दूसरे डिजाइन को मंजूर किया गया तो इसमें क्या कंसिडरेशन था? और अगर कोई अन्य कंसिडरेशन, टेक्नीकल कंसिडरेशन्स मंत्री महोदय नहीं बता सकते हैं तो इसका मतलब यह होगा कि उसमें पोलिटिकल कंसिडरेशन्स को सामने रखा गया और पोलिटिकल इन्टरफरेन्स किया गया। मेरा ख्याल है कि ऐसी हालत में उनका यह फर्ज है कि वे सरकार की स्थिति को स्पष्ट करें। इस बारे में स्पष्ट बात कर का सरकार को मौका मिला है, उनको मौका मिला है। इस संबंध में जो शुबहा किया जा रहा है, संदेह किया जा रहा है, उसको वे गलत साबित कर सकते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस संदेह को दूर करने के लिए वे बेबुनियाद सवुत पेश न करें। डी० डी० ए० का मुख्य काम मकान बनाना है, यह कह कर वे अपनी जिम्मेदारी से अलग नहीं हो सकते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय की तरफ से इस तरह से जवाब दिया जाना चाहिए, इस तरह से सफाई पेश की जानी चाहिए जिससे हम लोगों के अन्दर इस बारे में जो शुबहा

बंद हो गया है कि इस मामले के संबंध में पोलिटिकल कंसिडरेशन्स को ध्यान में रखा गया है, उसको खत्म किया जा सके। जिन दो आर्किटेक्स का नाम इस बारे में सामने आया है उनके बारे में उनके पोलिटिकल कनेक्शन्स का भी जिक्र आया है। ऐसी हालत में यह और भी जरूरी हो जाता है कि सरकार इस बात की सफाई करें। एक तरफ तो प्रोफेशनल डिजाइनर और आर्किटेक्ट को जिसकी कम्पीटेन्स के संबंध में एक बहुत बड़ी कमेटी ने कहा था कि उनको फर्स्ट प्राइज मिलना चाहिए, उनको अलग कर दिया गया। दूसरी तरफ जहां तक मुझे मालूम है, मंत्री महोदय की तरफ से यह कहा गया कि उनके पास 25-30 अन्य कंटेक्ट्स भी थे। क्या इसका मतलब यह है कि जिस व्यक्ति के पास 25-30 अन्य कंटेक्ट्स हैं उसको इसमें नहीं लिया जा गा? लेकिन जब इसको इत्तिला दी गई तो उसमें इस किस्म की कोई पाबंदी नहीं थी। सब लोग जानते हैं कि इनमें एक आर्किटेक्ट और डिजाइनर ऐसा था जिसकी कम्पीटेन्स के बारे में कोई शक नहीं था। श्री महेन्द्र राज एक ऐसे आर्किटेक्ट हैं जिनका हिन्दुस्तान में कोई जवाब नहीं है। ऐसे लोगों को हटा कर कुछ अन्य लोगों को कंसोलेशन प्राइज दी गई है जिनके बारे में श्री अडवाणी जी ने काफी अच्छा प्रकाश डाला है। मंत्री महोदय ने अपने जवाब में कहा कि कुछ लोगों को दस-दस हजार और सतरह-सतरह हजार रुपये दिये गये हैं। फर्स्ट प्राइज के लिए 50 हजार रुपये दिये गये हैं। इस सारी स्थिति को देख कर लोगों के मन में एक शंका रहेगा, एक संदेह रहेगा कि इस मामले में पोलिटिकल इन्टरफरेन्स किया गया है और...

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.

श्री सुरेन्द्र मोहन : श्रीमान्, मैं यह कह रहा था कि इससे यह धारणा भी बन सकती है कि पोलिटिकल इन्टरफरेन्स के कारण प्रोफेशनल कम्पीटेन्स को खत्म किया जा रहा है, उसको पीछे किया जा रहा है। इससे हमारे मुल्क में यह धारणा भी बन सकती है कि स्कूल, कम्पीटेन्स और नालेज के लिए अब कोई जगह नहीं है, सिर्फ पोलिटिकल इन्टरफरेन्स को स्थान दिया जा रहा है। इस प्रकार से जो ये बातें कही जा रही हैं, मैं चाहूंगा कि मंत्री महोदय इन सब बातों के संबंध में अपनी सफाई दें।

श्री पी० सी० सेठी : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, श्री सुरेन्द्र मोहन जी ने करीब-करीब वही मुद्दे दोहराये हैं जो श्री अडवाणी जी ने उठाये थे और उनका उत्तर मैंने दे दिया था। मैं समझता हूँ कि उस उत्तर को सुनने के बाद कोई विशेष बात करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। जो बातें उन्होंने कही हैं उनके बारे में मैं उत्तर देने की कोशिश करूंगा। यह पूछा गया है कि जो 17,500 रुपये दिये गये वे प्राइज एन्ट्रीज नहीं थी। मेरे पास इसकी जानकारी है। पहले 20 हजार, 30 हजार और 50 हजार के प्राइजेज रखे गये थे। लेकिन यह तय किया गया कि सब पार्टियों ने जिन्होंने कम्पीटीशन में

[पी० सी० सठी]

हिस्ता लिया, खर्चा किया माडल बनाने में, सब को दिया जाये। इसकी वजह से शुरू में जो 7 हजार रुपया देना था उसको 10 हजार रुपया देना तय किया गया। बाकी जो 11 इंडीज थी उनको इस तरह 10 हजार अमाउंट दिया गया। स्पेशल अर्वार्ड जो 20 हजार रुपये का था उसको रिड्यूज करके 17,500 कर दिया गया। इसलिये यह मानना उचित नहीं होगा कि नम्बर दो और तीन को कन्सलटेंसी में कोई स्थान नहीं मिला है।

श्री लालकृष्ण ब्राह्मण : थर्ड 20 हजार रुपये का था।

श्री पी० सी० सठी : उसको इसी-लिये 17,500 रुपये रिड्यूज कर दिया। मुझे इस बारे में अधिक टेक्नीकल जानकारी नहीं है। यह जो राय है हम लोग इंजीनियर्स का ब्यू-प्वाइंट लेकर कहते हैं। पीलू मोदी साहब इस पर कुछ कह सकते हैं। बाकी हम लोग इस पर इधर-उधर से ब्रीफ लेकर बोल रहे हैं। आप भी इसी तरह बोल रहे हैं। मुझे भी जो जानकारी मिली है उसी के आधार पर मैं बोल रहा हूँ। तो इस हिसाब से यह असेसमेन्ट हुआ। इस असेसमेन्ट के बाद टेक्नीकल कमेटी ने कुछ मुद्दों पर गौर किया। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर माननीय सदस्य-गण उन मुद्दों पर गौर कर लें तो उनको मालूम होगा कि जो टेक्नीकल कमेटी है उसने किस मुद्दे की वजह से बोर्ड आफ असेसर्स की राय को तरजीह नहीं दी। मैं राज रैवल राम शर्मा और मोहिन्द्र राज का जहाँ तक ताल्लूक है इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि उनका डिजाइन बहुत एलीगेंट है। आर्किटेक्चरल और स्ट्रक्चरल मेरिट पर है उसमें दो राय हैं इसमें डीमरिट्स काफी हैं। एक तो यह है

कि डिजाइन की कम्प्लेक्सिटी बहुत है और उसको फिर भी स्ट्रक्चरल और दूसरे एक्सपर्ट्स से एक्जामिन कराना आवश्यक हो जायेगा ऐसी राय डिजाइन इंजीनियर्स की है। उसमें पाइल-लोड्स को पूरी तरह से वर्क-आउट नहीं किया गया है। उसमें वेरियस दूसरे किस्म की जो सर्विसेज हैं उनका भी एक्जामिनेशन नहीं किया गया है उनका भी प्रोविजन नहीं किया है। जो एयर-कंडीशनिंग की डिजाइन उन्होंने दी है उसकी वजह से उसमें बहुत सारी चेंजेस स्ट्रक्चरल और आर्किटेक्चरल करने पड़ जायेंगे। यह उनका एक कारण और है। टी० वी० कैमरा और स्कोर बोर्ड का प्रोविजन डिटेल में स्कीम के साथ नहीं दिया गया है। प्रोविजन आफ लाइट एंड अक्वास्टिक्स को भी डिटेल में वर्क-आउट नहीं किया गया है। प्रोविजन आफ सर्विसेज में रिजलेंट स्ट्रक्चरल और आर्किटेक्चरल जो सर्विसेज हैं उनमें भी चेंजेस करने पड़ेंगे विच विल अग्रेन टाइम कंज्यूमिंग। इसलिये इन सब चीजों को देखते हुए उसमें वाटरप्रूफिंग और रूफ भी सटेस-फैक्टरी नहीं है या इन सब मुद्दों को देखते हुए टेक्नीकल कमेटी की राय में मैं अपनी राय नहीं कह रहा हूँ, टेक्नीकल कमेटी ने राय दी कि यदि इस प्रोजेक्ट को लिया गया तो यह टाइम के अन्दर कम्प्लीट नहीं हो सकेगा। मैं फिर एक बार पीलू मोदी साहब से कहूँगा कि वे आर्किटेक्चर को समझने की कोशिश करें। यह जो डिजाइन सबमिट करने वाली कम्पनी है यह कन्सल्टेशनल काम नहीं करेगी। कन्सल्टेशन के काम में डी० डी० ए० की तरफ से उसकी सलाहकार हो जायेगी। ऐसी सूरत में यह मानना कि करोड़ों रुपये का काम इनके हाथ में से निकलकर किसी और के हाथ में दे दिया है यह सही नहीं होगा। उनकी कन्सलटेंसी फीस जो है,

जो उनके डिजाइन की होती है वह उनको मिलेगा ही। बाकी यह प्रोजेक्ट जो है वह 12 करोड़ से 16 या 20 करोड़ का प्रोजेक्ट होगा यह माननीय सदस्य का जो ख्याल है और जैसा कि आडवाणी साहब ने कहा कि दो साल में जब यह प्रोजेक्ट कम्पलिट होगा तब तक यह 20 करोड़ रुपये का हो जायेगा यह ख्याल सही नहीं है। 12 करोड़ का एस्टीमेट इस आधार पर रखा गया है कि प्राइस इन्क्रीज होंगी और उसको मद्देनजर रखते हुए इवन अकाडिंग टु दि फस्ट डिजाइन 8-9 करोड़ रुपये का यह एस्टीमेट है इसके लिये 12 करोड़ रुपये रखा गया है। जब तक यह कम्पलीट होगा तब तक के लिये यह 12 करोड़ रुपया होगा। इसलिये माननीय सदस्य की 20 करोड़ तक इसके जाने की जो शंका है वह ठीक नहीं है। मगर जैसे कि मैंने पहले कहा कि यह तो डी० डी० ए० ने एक बोर्ड आफ असेसर्स बनाया और उसके साथ एक टेक्निकल कमेटी बनाई जो कि उनके अधिकार क्षेत्र की बात है। इसमें उनको गवर्नमेंट की मंजूरी लेने की जरूरत नहीं पड़ती कि बोर्ड आफ "असेसर्स" बनाया जाए और टेक्निकल कमेटी कैसे बनाई जाए। उन्होंने यह सब बातें ध्यान में रख कर यह कमेटी बनाई। जब इन लोगों ने जिस समय कम्पीटीशन में हिस्सा लिया है उनको पता था कि इसका बोर्ड आफ असेसर्स है, टेक्निकल कमेटी भी है ऐसी सूरत में टेक्निकल कमेटी को एक्स-ट्रेन्यूस नहीं माना जा सकता। टेक्निकल कमेटी की राय है। सब से ऊपर जो बात मैंने कही है जो विशेष तौर पर ध्यान देने योग्य है। अभी तो यह मसला स स्टेज पर है। बोर्ड आफ असेसर्स की राय है टेक्निकल कमेटी की राय है। दोनों मुद्दों के पक्ष-विपक्ष कागजों में अभी है और उनके मद्दे

नजर रखते हुए डी० डी० ए० का बोर्ड इस पर विचार करेगा। यदि इसको एसियाड के लिए बनाना है तो सब मुद्दे एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री को एग्जामिनेशन के लिए क्लियरेंस लेने के लिए सौंप दिए गए हैं। मैं आपको आश्वस्त करना चाहता हूँ कि जैसे कि उनका ख्याल है एक्सट्रेन्यूस कंसीडरेशन से काम किया जा रहा है ऐसा नहीं होगा। उस पर पूरा ध्यान दे कर सब मंत्रालयों से विचार करके सब चीजों को तय किया जाएगा।

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?

श्री सुरेन्द्र मोहन : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने यह पूछा था कि यह जो बोर्ड आफ असेसर्स है इसमें क्या स्ट्रक्चरल इंजीनियरिंग वाले कम्पीटेंट लोग नहीं थे। दूसरा मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि यह जो टेक्निकल कमेटी बनी जैसे कि आप फरमा रहे हैं क्या इसका पहले से एलान किया गया था? मंत्री जी जरा इस चीज को दोबारा लें कि टेक्निकल कमेटी का क्या उनको पता था?

श्री पी० सी० सेठी : अगर माननीय सदस्य की जानकारी जो मैं कह रहा हूँ उसके विपरीत है तो I will go into it

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI; Sir, I want to have clarification on two or three points. I will be very brief. Now the Minister has all along been suggesting

[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 in 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 Pilloo 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 names 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 premediated 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. Noyy 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 teleus 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 BAGAIKAR (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?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): That is what he says.

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 60 man, 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.

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम (मध्य प्रदेश):

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, वैसे मेरे पूर्व-वक्तार्यों ने इस मामले में सभी पहलुओं पर रोशनी डाली है, मुझे सिर्फ इस वास्ते बोलना पड़ रहा है क्योंकि— मैं किसी की नीयत पर शक नहीं कर रहा—मैं यह जरूर चाहूंगा कि मंत्री जी

[श्र: लाडली मोहन निगम]

और उनकी सरकार की पाकदामनी पर कोई धब्बा न लगे। जिस तरीके की अफवाहें इस मामले में चली और फैली हैं, जिस तरीके से सवालालात इस मामले को लेकर उठाये गये हैं उससे तो किसी भी आदमी के लिए शक करने की गुंजाइश बन जाती है। आपकी कार्य कुशलता, आपकी निष्पक्षता पर पूरा भरोसा है। लेकिन मैं एक बात जानना चाहता हूँ। सदन में बयान देने की भी कुछ सीमा है, ऐसा कोई काम आप से न हो जाये कि सदन की मर्यादा तो भंग हो ही, गलतबयानी भी हो जाये। अगर एक बार इन सर्वोच्च सदन में गलतबयानी होने लगे तो मैं नहीं जानता कि क्या हालत होगी इस मुल्क की, क्या हालत होगी इस देश की राजनीति की। सवाल जो दरपेश है वह यह है कि आपने एक कमेटी बनायी, एक बोर्ड बनाया। फिर एक दुसरी कमेटी बनाई उसकी जांच के लिए। स्वाभाविक है कि जो पहले कमेटी आपने बनायी थी वह ज्यादा काबिल लोगों की कमेटी थी। यह मेरी नहीं सभी लोगों की राय है कि उसमें देश के सब से काबिल लोग थे। यह आपका हक है कि आप जिसको चाहें उसको पुरस्कृत करें। लेकिन समय का तकाजा यह है कि पुरस्कृत करते समय कहीं ऐसे आदमी को पुरस्कृत करने तो नहीं जा रहे हैं—चाहे आपकी नीयत कितनी ही साफ हो—कि जिसका पिछला जीवन पहले से ही शक और शुरुवा से भरा हुआ हो। मैं उनका नाम नहीं ले रहा हूँ। इसलिये क्या यह सच नहीं है कि कि आपकी टेक्निकल कमेटी जो आपने बनायी उस में ऐसे इंजीनियर साहब भी थे जो किसी कम्पनी से संबंध रखते हैं कि जिस कम्पनी ने खुद टेंडर दिया था—भारद्वाज एंड अण्द्राज कम्पनी, और जो इंजीनियर हैं श्री ए० के० पटेल साहब उसके इंजीनियर हैं। इरादे आप के नेक हैं लेकिन आपके नेक इरादे ही आपके जो काम होते हैं उनकी

बजह से आपको नंगा कर देते हैं। दूसरा सवाल यह है कि उन लोगों का जिनको पुरस्कृत किया गया ऐसे लोगों से जो पिछले जमाने में सत्कार रहे हैं उनके साथ क्या कोई रिश्ता रहा है? इसको मद्दे नजर रखना चाहिए। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि यह गलत होगा अगर उन्होंने अपना रिश्ता बनाये रखा है, लेकिन ऐसे मामले में जिसमें सरकार की नीयत पर शक होने लगे कम से कम ईमानदार सरकार को यह नहीं करना चाहिए। इसके साथ-साथ यह भी सवाल है कि जिस तरह से साईंस और टेक्नोलॉजी की तरक्की हुई है, आप भी मेरी राय से मुत्तफिक होंगे कि यह स्ट्रक्चरल डिजाइनिंग बहुत बड़ी तकनीक होती है। सवाल यह है कि ठेका लेने वाला आदमी कोई भी हो लेकिन पुल बनाने का ठेका लेने वाला मकान बनाने का ठेका नहीं लेता। तो ऐसे लोग उन लोगों से तो नहीं जुड़े हुए हैं कि जिन्होंने यह काम जीवन में कभी नहीं किया। आज जिस मुल्क में एक लाख 15 हजार गांवों में पीने का पानी नहीं है, आज दिल्ली में जहां गली कूचों में लाख डेढ़-लाख बेधरबार लोग फुटपाथों पर पड़े हुए हैं, जहां लाख दो लाख लोगों के मकान के लिए दरख्वास्तें दे रखी हैं और जिनको आज तक मकान नहीं मिला है, आप उनको मकान अभी तक मुहैया नहीं करा सके और आपने डी०डी०ए० बनाया ही इसलिये कि हाउसिंग मिनिस्ट्री इस काम को पूरी तरह से कर नहीं सकती थी, लेकिन इसके साथ ही मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि शरीर का कोई भी हिस्सा शरीर से बड़ा नहीं होता। पार्लियामेंट में बजट पर बहस होती है लेकिन वह डी डी ए अपने आप में आटोनामस बरडी है लेकिन उसका बजट भी सदन में पेश होता है आप उसमें कोई दखलान्दाजी क्यों नहीं कर सकते? जिस बात का केबिनेट ने फंसला अभी तक नहीं किया है, उसके लिये कोई बात फाइनल

होने के पहले आप टेंडर मंगवा लें यही चीजें हैं कि जो शक पैदा करती हैं। और टेंडर भी बुलवा लिये, तो उसके बाद कमेटी जो बनी, या केबिनेट का जो फैसला हुआ, जो भी एक्सपर्ट का या बोर्ड का फैसला हुआ, वह केबिनेट में एप्रुव हुआ नहीं उसके पहले ही डी०डी०ए०ने एक दूसरी कमेटी बना कर उसमें दूसरा एक फैसला ले लिया गया, तो यह दो तीन चीजें हैं जो आपके दामन पर दाग लगाती हैं। मुझे शक है कि अगर यह काम सम्पन्न हो गया तो फिर आप अपने चेहरे को अपने हाथ से काला करेंगे और उसके लिये आप किसी और को दोष नहीं दे सकते। वैसे आपको हक है अपना चेहरा काला करने का। हर एक को हक है कि अपना चेहरा काला करने का, लेकिन आप कम से कम ऐसा काम मत करिये कि कोई इतनी बड़ी गलती हो जाये और खास कर ऐसे इलाके दिल्ली शहर में जहां खुद आपने कबूल किया है कि 40 फीसदी लोग शहर में गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे दम तोड़ते हैं। तो मेरी गुजारिश है कि अगर यह मंजूवा है, चन्द मुट्ठी भर लोगों की विलासिता के लिये, उनकी ऐय्याशी के लिये तो इस मंजूवे को बलायेताक रखिये। मैं खेलकूद के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ, लेकिन उसका हथ क्या हुआ है। एक खेल में जिसमें हम सरताज हुआ करते थे आज हम सातवें नम्बर पर आ गये हैं। हाकी में जो हमारा नाम था, जो हमारी जगह थी, वह पता नहीं हम कबो पहुंच पायेंगे या नहीं। खेलकूद के लिये हम चिन्ता करने नहीं जा रहे हैं। खेलकूद का तो रिश्ता ही अलग हुआ करता है। उसमें तो जिसमें जितना दम है वह उतना ही दौड़ सकता है। जिस मुल्क में खुराक की कमी हो वह नया खिलाड़ी पैदा नहीं कर सकता है। दूसरों को दिखावट के लिए आप यह करते हैं तो आपको यह शोभा नहीं देता है। इस देश में यह ठीक नहीं है जब तक कि 70 फीसदी आदमी गरीबी की

रेखा के नीचे दम तोड़ रहे हों या गरीबी की चक्की में पिस रहे हों।

अब मैं आपसे तीन सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। क्या यह सच है कि उस कमेटी में कोई ऐसा आदमी था जो ठेके लेने वाली किसी कंपनी से संबंधित था? दूसरे, डी० डी० ए० को कोई हक नहीं था कि वह किसी डिजाइनर को बुलाती जब तक कमेटी उस पर फैसला नहीं कर लेती। तीसरे, आपकी यह दलील कम मे कम मुझे तो सन्तोष नहीं देती कि डी० डी० ए० आटोनोमस बाडी है, क्या उसको हक है कि वह जो चाहे करे? पैसा कहां से लायेगा डी० डी० ए०। पैसा तो सरकार ही देगी। बेटा बाप से बड़ा नहीं हो सकता। अब तो राजनीति में उल्टी धारा बन गयी है कि बेटा मां-बाप से बड़ा हो गया है?

श्री जी० सी० भट्टाचार्य (उत्तर प्रदेश):
अब तो खुदा से बड़े हो गये . . .
(Interruptions).

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम : वह तो आप मानते होंगे, मैं नहीं मानता हूँ। आप मानते हैं तो मानिए। इस वास्ते मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप इस बात का विश्वास सदन को दिलाइये कि जिनको पुरस्कृत किया गया है, जिनकी डिजाइन पास की गई है, उन लोगों का उनसे कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं था जो सत्ता में बंटे हुए हैं। किसी के मकान बनाने, किसी फर्म का बंगला बनाने में उनका हाथ नहीं था, इसकी तरफ भी जरा ध्यान रखिए। नाम लेने की मेरी आदत नहीं है। मेरे पास नाम हैं, आप चाहें तो मैं आपको नाम दे सकता हूँ। आपकी इजाजत हो तो कह दूँ? . . .
(Interruptions).

श्री पी० सी० सेठी : आपको कौन रोक सकता है ? . . . (Interruptions)

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम : एक प्रधान घोष था। मैं आप से इतना ही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आटोनामी की परिभाषा कुछ होती है। एक तरफ आप राजनीतिक स्वतंत्रता को हड़पते जा रहे हैं। आर्थिक स्वतंत्रता पर जहाँ बन्धन लगाना चाहिए वहाँ बन्धन नहीं लगा रहे हैं; लोगों के लूट की गुंजायश और छूट वहाँ है। दूसरी तरफ नौकर-शाही को हावी होने देना चाहते हैं। तो मेरा इतना ही निवेदन है कि जो बोर्ड या डाइरेक्टर्स ने फंसला किया था, अगर उसमें बदलनियती है नहीं है, हम मानते हैं कि आपमें नहीं है, अगर आप उसका निदान चाहते हैं तो उस फंसले को रद्द करिए। देर आयद दुरुस्त आयद। अगर घोखाधड़ी से कुछ रिश्वत देकर किसी आदमी से कुछ कर लिया हो तो मजबूत मन से, ईमानदारी से आप सारे मामले को खत्म कीजिए और पुनः यह फंसला करिए। जिस मुल्क में रहने को मकान न हो, पीने को पानी न हो उनको नष्ट होने से बचाइये। बाकी सवाल जो आड-वाणी साहब ने कहे, वह प्रश्न मेरे मन में हैं, मैं उनको दीहराना नहीं चाहता, उनका जवाब आपकी तरफ से कम से कम सन्तोषजनक नहीं है और हमको वे सन्तोषजनक जवाब नहीं दे सकते। मैं समझता हूँ कि आपका कोई जवाब संसद को जब सन्तोष नहीं दे सकता तो यह जवाब किसी सड़क को भी संतोष नहीं दे सकता। इतना ही मुझे कहना है।

श्री पी० सी० सेठी : मैं माननीय सदस्य श्री लाडली मोहन जी का मशकूर हूँ कि उन्होंने एक भावात्मक विचारों का

दिग्दर्शन कराया। मैं शुरू से इस मामले में कह रहा हूँ कि सरकार का इसमें किसी भी प्रकार का कोई मोटिवेशन नहीं है। सब मेरिट्स पर ही करना चाहते हैं और और यह कहना कि किसी कंसल्टेसी का काम किसी ने किया था या मकान का काम किया होगा इसलिए पुरस्कार के रूप में उसको दिया जा रहा है, यह बात ठीक नहीं है। उस प्रकार के जीवन में बड़े सम्बन्ध होते हैं। अगर आपका मकान किसी ने बनाया हो और किसी बड़े कर्पि-टेंस में वह कभी आ जाए तो ऐसा कहना ठीक नहीं है। आपने पटेल और भारद्वाज का नाम बताया, यह बिल्कुल सही खबर है। लेकिन इसके साथ ही साथ मैं आपकी जानकारी के लिये यह बता देना चाहूँगा कि इवन मिस्टर कानचिन्दे जो आक्टिविस्ट मेम्बर है असेसर्स आफ दि बोर्ड में, वह भी असोसिएटिड हैं विद दन आफ दि कंसल्टेंट। यह को-इन्विसेस की बात है। वह कोई कारण नहीं है कि एक साहब इधर के हैं और एक साहब उधर के हैं। एक आधमी ने सारी कमेटी को इन्फ्लुएंस किया होगा यह मानने का कोई कारण नहीं है। आटोनामी का जहाँ तक ताल्लुक है इसका मतलब यह है कि रोजमर्रा का जो उनका काम है उसकी पूरी जिम्मेदारी के साथ उनको करना है। पार्लियामेंट को भी अधिकार है, सरकार को भी अधिकार है, केबिनेट को भी अधिकार है अगर कोई अनुचित बात हो रही है। उसको रोकने का या उनको आदेश देने का अधिकार सरकार के पास है इसमें कोई शक नहीं है। इसमें आप जो दुर्गन्ध देख रहे हैं मुझे तो अभी इसमें नजर नहीं आ रही है। जिरै-गौर है इसके लिये फंसला देना। अभी तो बहुत जगह प्रोसेस होना है। न कांटेक्ट दिया गया है और न अभी तक विड्स मांगी गई है। दो कमेटी बनी थी। एक ने तो कंसट्रक्शन प्वाइंट आफ व्य से देखा और जो

डिजाइन आया है वह कंस्ट्रक्शन और टाइम फैक्टर के प्वाइंट आफ व्यू से हमारी रिक्वायरमेंट को पूरा कर सकेगा या नहीं। एक कमेटी ने यह देखा कि कौन-सा डिजाइन बेस्ट है और कौन सा अपनाना चाहिये। मैं माननीय सदस्य को आश्वस्त करना चाहूंगा कि डी० डी० ए० के अन्दर भी इसको मेरिट्स पर विचार किया जाएगा और हम इसका पूरा ध्यान रखेंगे कि कोई एक्स्ट्रीनियस कंसिड्रेशन न हों मेरिट्स पर ही इसका फैसला हो।

श्री प्रकाश नेहरोत्रा (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
आदरणीय उपउभाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय मंत्री जी के उत्तर से एक बात साफ है कि अभी इस सम्बन्ध में कोई अन्तिम निर्णय नहीं हुआ है और किसी को कम एवार्ड नहीं किया गया है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि यह जो प्रति-योगिता हुई है उसमें जिस को 50 हजार रुपये का पुरस्कार दिया गया क्या वही पर्याप्त होगा आखिरी फैसला करने के लिये या आखिरी फैसला करने के पहले माननीय मंत्री जी इस बात का भी ध्यान रखेंगे कि जो दूसरे डिजाइन है उनमें से कौन-सा ऐसा डिजाइन है जो समय में पूरा किया जा सकता है और टेक्नीकली कौन-सा ज्यादा उपयुक्त होगा और किसकी कास्ट सबसे कम होगी। एक प्रश्न मेरा यह है और दूसरा प्रश्न यह है कि माननीय मंत्री जी ने यह कहा कि यह कंटेक्ट रिस्ट्रिक्टीड है। मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि जब इतना बड़ा टेंडर था तो यह प्रतियोगिता रिस्ट्रिक्टीड क्यों रखी और उसको अपन क्यों नहीं रखा गया जिससे देश भर के जितने अच्छे आर्किटेक्ट थे वे भी उस कंपिटिशन में पीटीसिपेट कर सकते। संभवतः उससे आपको लाभ मिल सकता था। तीसरा प्रश्न यह है कि यह जो तीन डिजाइन है जिसमें आपने किसी को 50 हजार और किसी को साढ़े सतरह हजार का

पुरस्कार दिया है उनमें से किस का डिजाइन स्ट्रक्चरली सबसे ज्यादा रिगल है और क्या किसी के डिजाइन पर कोई काम शुरू किया है अभी तक? चर्ची बात पाइल लोड जो है उसके बारे में है। यह बताये कि कौन-सा डिजाइन ऐसा है जिस पाइल लोड का काम जल्दी से जल्दी तैयार हो सकता है। इसके साथ-साथ एक महत्वपूर्ण चीज यह भी है कि उसमें जो सर्विसेज हैं, एयर कंडीशनिंग है, एकोरिटेक्स है, टॉ० वी० कमरा है, इलुमिनेल स्कॉर बोर्ड है, लाइटिंग है इन सब चीजों की दृष्टि से भी यह देखना चाहिये कि कौन-सा डिजाइन अच्छा है। क्या मंत्री महोदय यह आश्वासन देगे कि अन्तिम फैसला करने से पहले इन सब चीजों पर भी ध्यान दिया जाएगा और दूसरे यह कि कब तक फैसला होगा। उसके बाद ऐसा कहा जाता है और मैं उसके बारे में स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूँ कि जिसको पहला पुरस्कार मिला है इस प्रतियोगिता में, उसकी जो रूफिंग की डिजाइन है और जो ग्रेडिंग और वाटर प्रूफिंग है वह ठीक नहीं है। दूसरी बात यह कही जाती है कि उन्होंने जो डिजाइन दिया है उसमें कार्ट आफ साइडिंग के अनुसार अधिकतर काम साइड पर होगा जिससे काम में काफी रुकावट पहुंच सकती है और समय भी ज्यादा लग सकता है। तीसरी बात यह कही जाती है कि इस डिजाइन में एक त्रुटि यह है कि इसमें कुछ काम ऐसे हैं जो एक साथ करने पड़ेंगे क्योंकि सिटिंग एरेन्जमेंट और रूफिंग अलग-अलग नहीं हो सकते हैं, साइमलटेनिएसली नहीं हो सकते हैं। जब तक सिटिंग का काम पूरा नहीं होगा तब तक रूफिंग का काम नहीं हो सकता। इससे संभावना इस बात की है कि काम में काफी खिले हो जाएगा। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ

[श्री प्रकाश मेहरोत्रा]

कि क्या ये बातें सही हैं? इसके अलावा इसमें यह भी कहा जाता है कि जो दूसरा डिजाइन है उसमें यह कहा जाता है कि जो कन्फिग मेटिरियल है वह लाइट है और कमरे के ख्याल से उसका रिफ्लेक्शन ठीक नहीं है। हमारे देश में बिजली का इतना संकट है और आप एयर कन्डी-शन्ड स्टेडियम बना रहे हैं। इसलिए क्या इस बात को ध्यान में रखा गया है कि बिजली जनरेट करने के लिए अगर बिजली की आवश्यकता हुई तो क्या आप ने कोई व्यवस्था कर रखी है? इसके साथ-साथ मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि जिन लोगों ने इस प्रतियोगिता में भाग लिया है, क्या आपने इस बात को एवेल्यूएट करने की कोशिश की है कि आपका जो डिजाइन कजोरडियम है या टेक्नीकल टीम है उसने यह बताया है कि किस का काम ठीक होगा और समय पर पूरा हो जाएगा?

श्री ३० से० सेठी : माननीय उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, ने पहले अपने बयान में जो मैंने मुरेन्द्र मोहन जी के बयान के बाद दिया था उसमें इस बात को साफ किया था कि मेसर्स राज रावल का जो डिजाइन एप्रूव हुआ है उस डिजाइन में टेक्नीकल कमेटी ने क्या-क्या खामियां पाई थी। मैं माननीय सदस्य की जानकारी के लिए दोनों के जो मुद्दे हैं जिनकी वजह से डिमेरिट उनकी आती है वह बताने का फिर से प्रयास करूंगा। मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि मेसर्स रावल राम शर्मा और महेन्द्र राज के डिजाइन में कम्प्लीकेशन्स बहुत हैं? If you permit me, I will read it in English. That will be better.

"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 Mohinder 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 was 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 he 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's 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.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Do whatever you like.

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 the 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.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Mr. G. C. Bhat-tacharya.

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 not. If those 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 has 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 he 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 over-ruled 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 over-rules 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 kind of on the Table of 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:

| | |
|--------------|--------------|
| First Prize | Rs. 50,000/- |
| Second Prize | Rs. 30,000/- |
| Third Prize | Rs. 20,000/- |

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, 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. Further 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 came to this conclusion that this is the best design. But the DDA, while considering the whole provision, will definitely, through the technical committee'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. The 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